OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

62-63 VICTORIA, 1899

VOL. XLIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MAY TO THE SIXTH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA

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

1899

House of Commons Debates.

FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) further to amend the Adulteration Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

Bill (No. 124) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

Bill (No. 125) to amend the Act respecting canned goods.—(Mr. Ellis.)

ADMISSION TO MILITARY SCHOOL, FREDERICTON, N.B.

Mr. McDOUGALL (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

What commanding officer recommended the admission for instruction at the Military School at Fredericton, New Brunswick, of the following persons from the county of Cape Breton: Archibald J. McDougall, Dan. J. McDougall, Hugh P. McKinnon and Francis H. McKenzie? To what volunteer companies did they belong and how long have they been members of such company?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The information has not been received yet.

MR. D. C. F. BLISS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. What is the position, or what are the positions held by Mr. D. C. F. Bliss in the public service and when was he appointed to it or them?

2. What positions has he held, if any, in the Yukon district? (a) What, if any, positions does he now hold there? (b) What salary has been paid him and at what rate in connection therewith?

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister answered part of this question yesterday, but subsection (b) and section 3, as to what amount of salary has been paid Mr. Bliss since holding a position in the Yukon district and what amount of travelling expenses, he has not answered.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In addition to the information given yesterday, I may say: That Major Bliss was paid up to June 30th last his salary as second-class clerk at the rate of $1,400 per year. In addition he was paid for the two months, May and June, his pay as major at $115 per month, equal to $230. Since the 30th June last, his salary as second-class clerk has been discontinued and his name removed from the civil service list, and he has been paid by the day at double pay of his rank, equal to $7.80 per day, amounting to $2,371.20. I am unable to give the travelling expenses as there is no separate account in the department, and there will be no separate account for his expenses, except those of his recent trip made to Ottawa, the account for which will come in later on. I will be very glad to give the particulars.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it possible that that part of the question could be answered by giving the allowance? Something might have been allowed him for which he would have to account.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not observe that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will let the question go, so far as I am concerned. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) can give the information across the floor of the House at some future time.

POLES FOR ST. LAWRENCE TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Is the Government getting out cedar posts for the telegraph line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence ?

2. If so, who has the contract and what is the price per post, and where deliverable ?

3. Were tenders called for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Mr. L. P. DeCourval, of Arthabaska, P.Q., at 85 cents per pole, deliverable at Chicoutimi, St. Alphonse, Grande Baie, St. Alexis, Anse St. Jean, Tadousac or Bergeronnes. 3. Tenders were called for. Four were received, the lowest of which was that of Mr. DeCourval for $1.15 per pole, but the Minister considering the price too high succeeded in having it reduced to 85 cents per pole as stated above.

W. T. O'DONAHUE, OF ROBERVAL.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Is it true that the Government is paying, or has paid a salary to one W. T. O'Donahue, of Roberval, in the county of Chicoutimi, as caretaker of the dredge in winter quarters at that place

2. If so, what is the amount per day, or per month, paid to that person ?

3. How much has the care of the said vessel cost to date ?

4. Who recommended O'Donahue to the Government for that service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. $20 per month. 3. $20. 4. Mr. P. V. Savard, M.P.

CLAIMS OF J. A. CLAREAU.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

Has J. A. Clareau, hotel-keeper, of Chicoutimi, presented, since June, 1896, to the Department of Public Works, through the intervention of J. C. Blais, engineer, claims for timber and other material furnished by him for the construction or repairing of the wharf at Chicoutimi or at Ste. Anne ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Mr. J. A. Clareau has been paid the following sums for timber supplied to the work at Chicoutimi:—1896-97, $246.50 ; 1897-98, $78.50 ; 1898-99, so far, $325.

LEONCE P. BILODEAU, OF ROBERVAL.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Has one Léonce P. Bilodeau, of Roberval, been employed by J. C. Blais, superintendent of the construction of wharfs in Chicoutimi, as a carter or otherwise, since June, 1896 ?

2. If so, what sums has he received for his services as a carter, and how much has been paid to him for other services ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. It does not appear that Mr. Léonce P. Bilodeau, of Roberval, has been employed in any capacity.

DR. J. A. DUCHESNE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Has Dr. J. A. Duchesne, veterinary surgeon, of Chicoutimi, solicited, directly or through others, the work of inspecting cattle for tuberculosis in the county of Chicoutimi, since June, 1896 ?

2. Is it true that he has complained of the fact that Dr. Hall was appointed to do the work in his district ?

3. If so, what were the reasons given to Dr. Duchesne for refusing him the said work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a considerable correspondence on this subject in the department which cannot be properly represented by a categorical answer to this question. Therefore, I must ask the hon. gentleman to make a motion for the papers, and I will bring them down at once.

DR. HALL, OF QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Has Dr. Hall, veterinary surgeon, of Quebec, been appointed to inspect cattle for the discovery of tuberculosis, at Hébertville, and elsewhere, in the county of Chicoutimi ?

2. If so, who authorized him to act, and on whose recommendation ?

3. How many herds has he examined ?

4. Is it true that he has been replaced in the work of inspection by one of his brothers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I must answer this question in the same way as I did the one that immediately preceded it.

WHARFS AT PERIBONKA AND RIVIERE-A-LA-PIPE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Is it true that P. Pednault, Thos. Tremblay and two others, day labourers, of the town of Chicoutimi, now are or have been employed since the 1st January, 1899, at the construction of the wharfs at Péribonka and Rivière-à-la-Pipe, in Lake St. John district ?

2. If so, what is the price per day paid to each of them, and how much are they paid for travelling expenses and board ?

The MINSTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The department has no means of ascertaining whether any of the men employed on these works come from Chicoutimi. The name of Thomas Tremblay appears for twenty-five days at Péribonka in March, 1899. 2. Twenty-five days at $1.50 ; total, $37.50—no board and no travelling expenses. The name of P. Pednault does not appear.

P. PEDNAULT, OF CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Has Mr. P. Pednault, of Chicoutimi, been employed by the Government since June, 1896, at the construction of wharfs at Chicoutimi, or otherwise ?

2. If so, what amount of money has been paid to him since that date, and what for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The vouchers in the department do not contain the name of P. Pednault in connection with construction of wharfs at Chicoutimi or otherwise.

NAVIGABILITY OF HUDSON STRAITS.

Mr. ROCHE asked :

1. What was the cost of the expedition sent by this Government to test the navigability of the Hudson Straits ?

2. What action does the Government propose to take on the strength of information obtained by the expedition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The cost was $40,141.98. 2. No action is at present contemplated.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS—MR. FRED PETERS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I regret to say I am obliged to trouble the House, but only for a moment, in regard to a personal matter. I desire to call attention to a misrepresentation of myself and of a gentleman who happens to be connected with me in the profession of law, by a return laid on the Table of the House. I do not remember ever having occasion to refer to a newspaper article before, and the "Globe" correspondent, in regard to matters before the House, I can safely say, so far as I know, has been singularly fair in statements of fact. But, in connection with a return of correspondence about liquor permits with Mr. Frederick Peters, a return was brought down to this House in which, notwithstanding that the House ordered copies of all letters and all telegrams, there was, on the first page of the return, in regard to the most important document that had been discussed in debate, merely a memorandum saying "A private telegram in cipher had been received from Mr. Frederick Peters by Sir Louis Davies"—no date and no particulars—"the answer was as follows"—then follows a telegram without a date. Consequently, the "Globe" is able to infer :

A return placed on the Table of the House this afternoon shows some interesting correspondence that took place between Hon. F. Peters, of Victoria, who is Sir Hibbert Tupper's law partner, and the Federal Government. A private telegram in cipher from Mr. Peters solicited permission for a client to take in a quantity of whisky. To this despatch Sir Louis Davies, to whom it was addressed, answered——

Now, not so much in my own defence, but in justice to Mr. Peters, who happens to be, I suppose, as good a Liberal as there is on the Government side, I desire to say that that statement is false on the representation of Mr. Peters to me, to whom I have spoken on the matter. He could not honourably have had a client at that time. He was not then a partner of mine. I know no more of the matter than this—the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) sent to borrow my personal cipher with Mr. Peters, who, with me, was waiting for a call to the bar of British Columbia. I never was shown either by Mr. Peters or by the Minister a line of that cipher telegram. I never asked as to its contents and never knew as to its contents, whether it was a request for a permit or what it was. It was no more my business than it was the business of any hon. member in this House.

If the insinuation in the "Globe" newspaper was right, Mr. Peters had no right to be called to the bar of the province of British Columbia, as he was not permitted, when waiting for a call, to have clients or deal professionally with matters of that kind. While I am on my feet, and in justice to him, in view of this statement, I may add that having heard what was said in regard to his application, I asked him about it, after the statement was made in this House, and he told me that he had written or communicated that telegram to his old friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in a purely personal and non-business way, that he had not an interest of a dollar, or a sixpence, let alone being concerned with me in any way, shape or form. Under these circumstances, I again call the attention of the Government to the matter, as I did yesterday, before this misleading statement was put in the paper. I call their attention to it in order to have the return at the earliest possible date. I do not ask to have the contents of that cipher, though I am perfectly ready to have them put with the returns before the House, and, from Mr. Peters' statement to me, there is not a word of that telegram that cannot see the light of day. But the dates are important, for he was not my partner until July, 1898, and these telegrams were sent in February, while I was here attending to my business in the House, and he was at Victoria, B.C. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have done everything I could. I moved in my place for returns, and I have called attention to them across the floor of the House. I handed the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a memorandum of those that I am urgently in need of for the preparation of very important work to be brought to the attention of the House of Commons; and I have to say, that I shall regret exceedingly, if it becomes my duty, to-morrow or any subsequent day when the House is moved into Supply, to take up considerable time in discussing the nature of all these requests and all these motions, and the reasons at large why I want them.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I think the House would like to learn from the Government, as early as possible what they intend to do with regard to the adjournment for Queen's birthday, next Wednesday. Probably, the members would like to know in order that they may make their arrangements. Monday is private members' day, and I notice that a large portion of the notices of motion have been run over two or three times. Tuesday is Government day, and, of course, if there was an adjournment given, say from Friday night till Thursday, we might, if the Government were disposed, take the following Saturday in place of Tuesday. That would give the members an opportunity of going home. Of course, if we took the following Saturday in place of Tuesday, no time would be lost. I think it would be well that we should learn the intention of the Government on this point as early as possible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I would like to say, that there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said. The Government would lose no time; the only day that would be lost would be a private day, and, as private business is pretty well advanced, we would probably be on Saturday quite as far advanced without putting members on both sides of the House to the inconvenience that would naturally follow a meeting for a single day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a matter as to which the Government would be disposed to yield largely to the views of the House. At the present time I must say, that I had not contemplated any such step, and I have just given notice of the usual holiday on the Queen's birthday. But members can think it over, and, if our friends in the Opposition can give us some assurance that we will proceed with the business, we might agree to the proposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Assuming that the return will be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid that no returns will satisfy my hon. friend. At all events, we will let the matter stand until eight o'clock.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

Mr. N. C. WALLACE (West York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Prime Minister to a despatch appearing

in to-day's Montreal "Gazette," with reference to the meetings and the proceedings of the International Commission. I will read a brief extract or two:

It can be stated that if the commission re-convenes it will only do so upon a complete abandonment of the old basis, which proved to be unsuitable to the erection of a complete agreement, and the United States Government will have some sort of assurance in advance of the nature and degree of the concessions that may be expected from the other side, the lack of which, it is said, caused the failure of the first negotiations. The negotiations have taken a new turn by the suggestion that the Alaskan boundary question be submitted to arbitration, independent of the other issues involved, thus leaving the commission free to resume its work on the many other pending questions.

Then, I read, in another despatch:

It has now been ascertained that when the commission adjourned, Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador at Washington, and Secretary of State Hay had a conference at which it was decided that the topics under consideration by the commission should form the subject of private negotiations between the Ambassador and the Secretary, with the understanding that if a settlement was reached its details should be communicated to the commission, and formally promulgated as the official conclusion of its members. The negotiations have progressed steadily, and since Sir Julian Pauncefote's return to London, have made unusual rapid headway, as the Ambassador is able to consult daily with Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain concerning all questions of interest to the Foreign and Colonial Offices.

I would like to ask the First Minister, if it is true, that arrangements have been made for a commission to be appointed to settle the Alaskan boundary, and if the statements made in this despatch are correct.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to say to my hon. friend, that the Montreal "Gazette" is evidently astray. The question is to-day in the same position that we left it at Washington. When we left it at Washington, as it has been stated on the floor of the House, and I can repeat now, substantial progress had been made upon most of the questions submitted to the commission, with the single exception of the Alaskan boundary. On that question, as the House knows, we could not come to an agreement, we could not agree to accept the terms which were laid down by our American fellow-commissioners, and we referred the matter to the two Governments interested, which have had it in hand ever since.

THE CASE OF MR. CHRISTIE.

Mr. ROCHE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I move:

That all the papers brought down to the House relating to the case of Mr. Christie, lately an officer in the Inland Revenue Department at Winnipeg, be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion should be made under the head of motions.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true, but the committee are very eagerly waiting to be called together, and this business will be taken up at the first meeting.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection; but this is not the proper time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is only by consent.

Motion agreed to.

FRIENDLY SOCIETY INSURANCE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Two or three weeks ago, the Minister of Finance introduced a Bill dealing with the question of friendly society insurance. Since that time, we notice in the public press that the Canadian Fraternal Association, which represents all these societies, have made certain representations to the department over which the hon. gentleman presides. It has also been stated in the public press that the local Government of the province of Ontario have made representations, presumably upon the question of the powers of this Parliament to deal with the question referred to in the Bill. These matters have, no doubt, been under the consideration of the Government. The matter is of considerable importance to a great number of these societies, and, if the Bill is to be pressed, they desire to call their members together, and I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), whether the Government have yet formed a policy upon this question, as to whether they intend to proceed this year with the Bill or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to avail myself of the hon. gentleman's question to make a statement upon the subject. It is correct, as the hon. gentleman has said, that I was waited upon by a deputation representing fraternal organizations, who stated to me that before further action on the Bill they desired an opportunity of calling their various bodies together to consider its provisions. It was represented that the calling of special meetings of these societies would entail considerable expense. In consideration of that I have decided not to proceed with the Bill during the current year. An announcement will be sent to-day to the gentleman at the head of the deputation which did me the honour to wait on me upon the subject. As to the second question of my hon. friend, I may say that the Government of Ontario did make representations on the subject touching the constitutionality of the measure. I think that they have some erroneous impression as to the aim and intention of the Bill. However, as we are not to proceed with it this session, no

good purpose could be served by going into that question.

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter of very great importance. We saw by the papers the other day that the steamer "Gallia," belonging to the Allan Line, has already gone ashore, and although I have no doubt, from the report I have seen, that it is not the fault of the buoys or the channel, still, I think it is about time to find out from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), whether he has come to any agreement with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), as to which department the work of protecting this channel belongs —the Department of Marine and Fisheries or the Department of Public Works. I understand that it has been under the management of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not want, at this present moment, to remind my hon. friend that the contract seems to have been carried out better in years gone by than it was last year, but the only point that I now wish to bring to his notice is as to whether he has come to arrangement or an agreement with the hon. Minister of Public Works as to the future way of giving that contract. Last year was a most disastrous year for the trade between Montreal and Quebec. I think about fourteen vessels went ashore or went astray due to the placing of buoys in bad places.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No, not due to the placing of the buoys.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The ships drew too much water.

Mr. BERGERON. This remark has nothing to do with the "Gallia," I think. I am only drawing my hon. friend's attention to the matter, because the trade of Montreal has been much interested in it. Last year was a most disastrous one, and when the trouble has commenced so early this year it is time that my hon. friend, or his department, should consider whether his department or the Department of Public Works are responsible for seeing that such disasters do not occur again.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I cannot see that disasters will not occur again. All I can see is that everything is done, so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, to make the best use of these aids to navigation. The "Gallia" is ashore very far away from the channel, altogether out of her course, and I am sorry to say, from the report I received this morning, that the prospects of her getting off are not as good as I had hoped they would have been. The water is falling, and there are a very few feet of water at her prow. How she got so far out of her course I cannot understand. No inquiry has been made, but it is alleged by the pilot that the vessel would not answer her helm, and it is alleged by others, according to the officer, whose report I have received, that the steering gear would not work. Efforts were made yesterday to get her off and they are being repeated to-day by a number of tugs and other boats. As to the buoying of the St. Lawrence channels there is no dispute, nor has there been, between the Public Works Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The work was let last year, and although many complaints have been forwarded——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To the old contractors?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a pity.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I called for tenders, and, of course, I had to accept the lowest tender.

Mr. BERGERON. You are not bound to do it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The discrepancy between the tender I accepted and that of the old contractors was large. Sincennes & McNaughton were the old contractors, and Mr. Kane, of Quebec, was the contractor for last year. Although there was a good deal of talk in the newspaper press as to the manner in which he carried out his contract, my officers are not able to state very serious grounds of complaint. The commercial body of Montreal did not seem satisfied unless the contract was taken hold of by the department, and, as we are anxious to comply with their wishes, the work this year will be carried out by the department, and under the direct supervision and responsibility of the officers of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Which department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Marine and Fisheries Department. Effective measures are being taken to ensure the buoys being laid down properly so that there will be no ground of complaint at all. I have not heard any complaints this year. The officer who was in the employ of Sincennes & McNaughton will be engaged in this work. A steamer was built last year, specially for the purpose, which I propose to purchase from Mr. Kane, of Quebec, and I will ask for a grant to enable me to pay for it. Col. Anderson will have direct charge of the work, which will be carried on under Mr. Fraser, the engineer. We have also the officer who for

years has done the practical part of the work, and whose services we are retaining.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the estimated cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do not assume that the cost of the work will be greater than it was before, but there will be some extra expense for the reason that the anchors used for anchoring the buoys were said to be dangerous to ships, and we are substituting new and improved anchors. There will also be a number of new buoys, erected at the request of the Montreal commercial and insurance bodies. In point of fact, I may say, everything is being done which they desired to be done, in regard to new lights and new buoys being put wherever they desired them, and everything that possibly can be done. There is nothing reasonable that they think we should supply that is not supplied.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to hear that, because, I think, it is the best economy. It is better to spend some money and see that these disasters are avoided.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL

The House went into committee to consider a certain resolution respecting the Drummond County Railway.—(Mr. Blair.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) in introducing this resolution, the other day, spoke of the policy of the Government in reference to this extension, and in support of that policy referred to some remarks which I had made some time ago in the House, and also to my evidence before the committee that was appointed to inquire into this expenditure. At first I intend to spend a few moments for the purpose of considering this policy. As I stated before, in the House, in 1894, I ordered inquiries to be made by my department to find out what the cost would be of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. My reasons, as I stated them in the House at that time, for doing this, were that, on account of the difficulties which I had contiuually with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and with the Grand Trunk Railway Company on account of the want of connections between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway at Point Lévis, the state of affairs was becoming intolerable, and I thought it would be in the interest of the country that means should be taken for the purpose of remedying it.

Before going into that question it may be well to consider the arrangement we had with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister (Mr. Blair) declared the other night, that it was, perhaps, the most infamous arrangement that ever was entered into by a Government. He did not hold me exactly responsible, because the arrangement was made by Sir John Macdonald when Minister of Railways in 1890, but as the successor of that gentleman, I adopted the policy and became responsible for it. Mr. Speaker, I may state to this House that I am responsible for it in every respect, and the statement made by the Minister of Railways cannot be borne out by the document which I have at present in my hand. I intend to dwell particularly on that point, as, perhaps, that arrangement was one of the reasons which entered into the consideration of the policy of extending the road. The hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), in speaking of that arrangement, said, as reported in "Hansard":

> There was one provision under which the Government of Canada or the Department of Railways solemnly and firmly bound itself to observe, through its officers and employees : absolute neutrality between the Canadian Pacific Railway and its own line.

I need not tell you that there is not a word of that in the agreement.

> Under that contract the Canadian Pacific Railway had the right to go into Intercolonial Railway territory anywhere from St. John to Halifax, or along that branch of the line and its connections, to send its agents and employees to solicit business for that line.

The Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other railway on the continent of America, has that right. That is no extraordinary power at all. I asked the Minister :

> Mr. HAGGART. Can you not do that to-day ?

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said :

> I will tell the hon. gentleman before I get through just what can be done to-day. The Canadian Pacific Railway had the right under that contract to send their agents to solicit that business for the Canadian Pacific Railway short line from St. John to Montreal in preference to its going by the Intercolonial Railway via Moncton and Lévis, and under this agreement the Government of Canada solemnly bound itself with the Canadian Pacific Railway so that the employees of the Government could not solicit business.

I gave the most empathic denial to any such statement, and said :

> Mr. HAGGART. There is nothing of this kind in the agreement.

Nor is there, Mr. Speaker. However, the Minister said :

> I do not think it would be possible to imagine any more humiliating position for the Government or our railway to be in than that which I have depicted. Just imagine the employees, our paid agents, who would naturally have an interest in seeing us do the business, in seeing the business come over our own road, the long haul to Montreal, rather than leave it at Moncton to then take the Canadian Pacific Railway to the west, not caring to make an appeal to the patrons of our road to send their business over it, but being compelled to stand by and allow our road

to be run down and all sorts of representations to be made derogatory to it without being allowed to open their mouths in dissent, under the penalty of being charged with violating the compact entered into.

And there is a lot more talk to that effect. Let me read the agreement which bears upon that particular point, and let us see how much support that agreement gives to the observations made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). Here is the part of the agreement which refers particularly to that:

The Minister of Railways and Canals shall use every endeavour to cause the station agents or local ticket and freight agents at stations on the line of the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John, excepting St. John, except as hereinafter provided, to be strictly neutral as between the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John, N.B., and other lines competing with it, and to waybill freight and sell tickets by such of these routes as may be indicated by shippers or passengers.

A subsequent clause says:

Either party shall be free to employ such canvassing agents as it may see fit, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be free to establish such agencies at points on the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John as its interests may require; provided, however, that should it establish agencies for the sale of tickets and canvassing for freight at points on the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John where other lines of railway competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway, via Point Lévis or Chaudière Junction, have not established similar agencies, the preceding clause as to neutrality shall not apply to such points; but if the Government or any railway company competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Point Lévis or Chaudière Junction, shall likewise establish such agencies at the same points the conditions as to neutrality shall be observed by the station agents, local ticket and freight agents of the Intercolonial Railway at such stations.

This agreement was made in 1890. It was the policy of the Conservative Government at that time to draw as much traffic as they could to Halifax. Their object was to give close connection to the Grand Trunk Railway, and to induce the Canadian Pacific Railway to make its terminal point at Halifax to the sea-coast. In order to do that the Canadian Pacific Railway said: What is the use of us looking for freight at the points were Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and transatlantic freights. The Government said to them: We will maintain our own rates for freight and passengers, and the control of them both local and otherwise over our own line, and any arrangements which you can make for freight, taking it over the road on these conditions, we are perfectly agreeable to. We made such freight and passenger arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway—and the Grand Trunk Railway had a contract similar at the same time—that I hope the hon. gentleman's present traffic arrangements will be at least equal to them. If they are they will be satisfactory. Now, as to the statement made by the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair). I wonder how he could come to make such a statement when he has an interpretation of these two clauses, and an opinion upon these two clauses in his own department, from the then Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, as to the liability of the Intercolonial Railway, as to what the Intercolonial Railway employees had a right to do under the circumstances. What we stated was simply this: That when two railway companies, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, had established agencies at any point on the Intercolonial Railway, that the Intercolonial Railway authorities should be perfectly neutral between them; and that if the Grand Trunk Railway should not establish agencies on the Intercolonial Railway in opposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway, we had the right to establish agencies ourselves for the purpose of taking passengers over our long route. What is there, then, to complain about? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) had an opportunity of terminating that agreement. The agreement lasted only for seven years, and he has given a year's notice, and why does he not at the end of the year, when the notice has expried, put a termination to this agreement. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, it is because it is not possible for him to make with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other railway company, a better arrangement. He will be obliged, in the interests of Nova Scotia, and of the eastern provinces, to see that communication is kept up with St. John and Halifax.

If he does not accede to the traffic arrangement which Sir John Macdonald entered into in 1890, he will not be able to make terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying on business; and, if he terminates that agreement, he will run the risk that the traffic now carried to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway will find a port of exit outside of our own country, and the hon. gentleman and this House will find, when they come to consider this question at the next meeting of Parliament, that no more favourable arrangement can be made with the Canadian Pacific Railway than at present exists.

Now, as to the policy which I adopted, which the hon. gentleman cites in support of his scheme, let me say a word. I had continual trouble with the connections made with the Grand Trunk Railway. They did not seem to care a bit about their connections with the Intercolonial. Passengers arriving at Lévis found themselves delayed for an hour, perhaps, before the Grand Trunk train would start for Montreal. The Grand Trunk Railway Company had not agents in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick looking after freight. The Canadian Pacific Railway agents were far more intelligent, industrious and active, and the consequence was that freight was being diverted around by St. John instead of being sent over our own road. Efforts were made to obtain better

arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway, but they appeared utterly indifferent. If the Grand Trunk Railway had had its present active management, there would have been no necessity for those efforts or for making the connection. For some time I considered the matter. I ordered my deputy to inquire what would be the cost of making the connection. I got figures from him ; but, after considering the question for a couple of years, I abandoned the project. I will say for my colleagues that I only consulted one or two—I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who was greatly opposed to it, and Mr. Ives, who was favourable to it. I never had even a consultation with the rest of the Cabinet on the subject. So that, however much I am bound by the policy of the present Minister of Railways in regard to an extension of some kind to Montreal from Lévis, the late Government were in no way bound to it.

What was open to the hon. gentleman, then, when he decided on making a connection with Montreal ? There were three or four routes open to him. There was the Grand Trunk via Richmond to Point Lévis. There was the road he has adopted via Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière Junction. There was the South Shore road, with the connection from Montreal to Sorel, on which subsidies have been paid, and on a part of the line from Sorel to Point Lévis. There was also the connection of the North Shore road when it was finished, and when we have the bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, which I suppose we may look for in the near future, if these hon. gentlemen keep the promises they made on that subject when in Opposition. We have also the promise of the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Leduc), that subsidies will be granted to the South Shore road ; and the Minister of Public Works says : " My promise, gentlemen, is as good as gold, and the Government will give assistance for the extension of that road from Sorel to Lévis." I am glad the Government did not consider the connection by the Grand Trunk via Richmond to Point Lévis, because if we had to pay for that in proportion to what we have to pay for the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, the Grand Trunk would have received a sum of money that would have built two Grand Trunk railways of that length. The hon. gentleman has adopted the route from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal ; and of all the bargains that a Parliament of this country ever considered, to use the hon. Minister's own language, the two most vile and infamous ones were that made for the lease of the Drummond County Railway and that for the use of the Grand Trunk line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. Let me deal with regard to the bargain made for the lease of the Drummond County Railway. let me read the two bargains which the hon. gentleman made at different times, and let us compare the one with the other. Here is the lease and agreement made on the 15th day of May, in the year 1897, between Mr. J. N. Greenshields, the President of the Drummond County Railway, and Andrew G. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals. This is one of the provisions :

That the company, for the consideration aforesaid, will build and finish, according to the Intercolonial Railway standard, the uncompleted portion of its main line at or near Forestdale——

The distance between Ste. Rosalie Junction and Chaudière Bridge is 115 miles, and the distance from Chaudière to a place called Moose Park is 43 miles, but the contract is for eight miles more, or 51 miles, which was to be the new portion of the road.

——to the western side of the Chaudière River, subject to the satisfaction and approval of the Government railway engineer, on or before the 1st day of November, 1897, and will lay the roadbed of the said uncompleted portion of its line hereby agreed to be constructed with new steel rails of not less than 70 pounds weight per yard for the same distance, and as part of such construction will make all proper and necessary connections with the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway at or near the west end of the Chaudière Bridge to the like satisfaction of the Engineer of Government Railways, and will, in connection with the said construction, construct and finish all proper and necessary station buildings, stations, sidings, switches, tanks, buildings, coal sheds, cattle guards, crossings and other necessary appurtenances, as required by the Minister, and to the satisfaction of the Engineer of Government Railways, and according to such plans as shall be furnished on the request of the company by the Department of Railways and Canals.

With regard to the uncompleted portion, this is the agreement :

That the company will, in the construction of the uncompleted portion of its line, construct the same to the satisfaction of the Government engineer and with a uniform grade of 52·80 per mile, and in addition on the line already constructed will reduce the grades at Carmel Hill and at the St. Francis River to a maximum grade of 52·80 per mile.

The part of the road from Forestdale to Chaudière was to be constructed up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, and the constructed portion from Ste. Rosalie to Forestdale was to be left as it was, except that these two gradients were to be changed. There is not a word about the $1,600,000 ; there is not a word in that agreement about the deduction of the money which was given in the form of a subsidy for the completion of the road ; there is not a word of the expenditure on that completed portion for the purpose of bringing it up to what the officers of the department thought was then the required standard. Let me make a contrast between the two agreements. Here is the subsequent agreement which we had such difficulty in obtaining, and which we have not yet all produced before the House, but only the extracts

that appeared before the Railway Committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The whole agreement was before that committee.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is it now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was handed in to the committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has not been printed and distributed.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister said last session that the agreement had been put before the committee. It was to all intents and purposes. All the clauses which were necessary to include in the report were included.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that only a certain portion of the clauses of that contract were furnished to the committee last year.

Mr. HAGGART. No, what I said, or intended to say, was this, that a copy of the agreement was before the Committee of Inquiry last year; and in the report of the evidence all the important clauses that were worth printing are printed. But the hon. gentleman, that same session, promised to lay the agreement upon the Table. We wanted to see the original, because when we saw the original of the agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway last year, we found that the hon. gentleman had made no agreement at all. He put in the word "east" instead of "west" and maintained in the House that that was correct; but when he went back to the department he found he was entirely wrong. It has always hitherto been the custom of the House, when these matters are discussed, to have not copies of the agreements but the originals themselves on the Table. Let me, anyway, show the distinction and difference between the two contracts, in order to justify, from the hon. gentleman's own words and documents, the action of this House, not only with regard to this particular arrangement, but the more infamous arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway:

That Her Majesty shall and will ask Her Parliament of Canada, at the present session thereof, for an appropriation sufficient to enable Her Majesty to continue this lease for a year from the 30th day of June next, upon the same terms, provisos and conditions as are herein contained. That it is agreed by the said company that it shall be optional with Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, subject to the ratification of Parliament, at any time during the term hereby granted, or any renewal or continuation thereof, to purchase the said line and branch lines, and the said other rights, interests and property (not including rolling stock), absolutely and free from all incumbrance, at and for the price and sum of one million six hundred thousand dollars ($1,600,000), from which sum is to be deducted all amounts paid or entitled to be paid under the Subsidy Act, 60-61 Vic., chap. 4, and all amounts remaining unexpended or unpaid by the company in improving the said railway upon the works hereafter specified.

The third clause states:

That the company shall and will immediately, as soon hereafter as the season will admit thereof, lay out and expend a sum of money amounting to not less than one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) upon such portions of the said line of railway and upon such works.

Look at the difference between the two of these. Capitalize the payments which were to be made under the agreements of 1897, and they amount to nearly $2,100,000, but under this agreement the hon. gentleman asks for $1,600,000 and besides deducts from that amount the subsidies that he is paying to this road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, in making the criticism he is now making, it is at all material to know that there was no subsidy promised, arranged or contemplated until after that agreement was defeated by Parliament?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know it.

Mr. HAGGART. I want to show the difference between the two. He was to complete the road for a certain annual allowance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How could you deduct the subsidy when one was not promised?

Mr. HAGGART. We had an agreement to give it anyway in 1897. It might have been afterwards that it was granted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly it was.

Mr. HAGGART. I think a subsidy was likewise granted for a portion before 1897. I am sure of it, because I read it in the Subsidy Act myself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not in force. It had expired.

Mr. HAGGART. Then they only renewed the subsidy. There was also a subsidy granted by the local government, which had not expired, but which the local government had legislated itself out of. Not only does the hon. gentleman pay $400,000 less under this agreement, but he deducts the subsidy and we cannot find out what amount of subsidy has been paid. He says it is all paid. Whether it is $100,000 or $123,000 I do not know. But the amount, whatever it is, is to be deducted, also the amount to be expended on the completed portion of the road, according to his engineer's estimates, in order to bring up the standard of the

road that is under contract to the specification of the Intercolonial. It required $35,000 to do that, and that left $65,000 to be expended on the completed portion of the road. The bargain which he has made at present is better than the former one by $400,000, and also by the amount of subsidy he has paid, plus the $65,000, which he has not to expend on the completed portion of the road. Could there be a greater justification for the opposition by this Parliament to the scheme, for the rejection of it by the Senate, than he has presented himself. He said quite naively and innocently, in introducing his Bill: We calculated the interest on the amount of subsidy at a basis of 4 per cent and that would only realize $1,600,000. But we got Mr. Fitzgerald to calculate it, as we were paying the money, and what was the value he put on it? By the estimate made by the Department of Finance, the value was $2,100,000. Yet the hon. gentleman asks us to accept the value estimated by the company itself. He said: Oh, this is merely an interpretation of the old arrangement, of the arrangement of last year, but here is the value that the company itself puts upon the payments made to it.

Those are the simple facts of the case. I have here the agreement as it was in 1897, and as it was in 1898, and there is another part of it of which we have not had any information. We are proceeding in this debate without the contract or specifications being brought down, without the report of the engineer as to whether the road is finished, as to whether the subsidized portion of it is finished or not, or as to what standard it has been completed. There is no report brought down to this House of the expenditure of this $100,000 upon the road. Nor do we know the amount of subsidy that has been paid by the hon. gentleman in this transaction. We are voting entirely in the dark. Just fancy a road, nearly 80 miles of which was completed in 1890, an option upon which was hawked from one end of the country to the other, for $500,000, and that included what the hon. Minister has not got in his bargain, the rolling stock, which the engineers of his department estimated at a value of $45,000, which was included in the offer of $500,000. The road was offered to me for $500,000, and it was offered to others for a far less sum. I have an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway in my possession which shows that it was offered to that company for 35 per cent of the earnings of the road—and that would not have realized one-third of the amount which the hon. Minister has given. It is notorious that this railway was virtually a bankrupt concern, that it was indebted to the Eastern Townships Bank for $156,000, and to others in different parts of the country, $20,000, making a total liability of $176,000. And the owners, I believe, would be glad to have taken the sum of, say, $50,000, or say, $75,000, or say, $100,000, which they never expected to realize, and not one tithe of which they ever put into the road. The hon. gentleman says we have the sworn testimony before the commission as to the expenditure of over $2,000,000 on the road. What was the expenditure? Mr. Fee, Mr. Church and Mr. Mitchell, we are told, subscribed $133,000, or a total of $400,000, which was the capital in the first place. Is there a person in this country, except the Minister of Railways and Canals, so innocent as to suppose that these gentlemen put up $133,000 in cash? If there is such a man in this country, I do not think there is one in this House. Any one acquainted with modern railway building knows that they never did any such thing. With great difficulty we got from the book-keeper the statement that before they could proceed, under the law, $40,000 in cash had to be paid up, and he says he thinks he is positive that the $40,000 in cash was paid up. It calls for a considerable amount of faith on the part of any one acquainted with railway promotion to believe that even $40,000 in cash was put up by the parties who built the road. The fact of the matter is that the road now handed over to the Government, had been built out of the subsidies from the Dominion and provincial Governments and municipalities, and the balance showed the amount of credit, $176,000, which they had managed to obtain. No person who is acquainted with railroad building would suppose that Mr. Church put $133,000 in cash into this undertaking, or that Mr. Fee, or Mr. Mitchell did it either. But the calculation of the hon. Minister is founded upon the assumption that they did. According to the hon. Minister, this road cost $2,000,000, and even if you deduct the amount of bonuses, you take away only $400,000. And he says it is not right to deduct these bonuses, that there may be something in it, but that they should not be deducted altogether. Why, then, did he consider it in his new bargain and make it one of the conditions that the bonuses these gentlemen had received for building the road should be returned to the Government? Look at the nice time they had in the extension of the road. I have not found out from the Minister yet whether the amount due to them for subsidies was taken from the amount expended in the repairs of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman has not found that out, because he has not taken the trouble to ask.

Mr. HAGGART. I think we should have it before the House. Let us hear the facts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been endeavouring to furnish, as far as I possibly could anticipate his wants, the information that the hon. gentleman would require. But my limited capabilities has not suggested to me that he was going to ask a question of that kind.

An hon. MEMBER. You do not know, then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister cannot tell.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) will tell me what he wants to know, I shall be glad to get him the information.

Mr. HAGGART. There is an amount of subsidies paid in the four months up to the end of 1898, and the amount of subsidies paid since then; and we do not know whether they were paid beside the bonus of $123,000 and the $100,000 expended in building the road. These gentlemen have entered into a contract for the extension of the road from Forestdale to Chaudière Junction. Though they had an agreement with the Government they were by no means certain that such an infamous agreement would pass the Parliament of the country. They wanted to know that they would have some money for the extension of the road. Under the first agreement they entered into, in 1897, they got, I suppose, the subsidies—for I have heard no denial—they got $123,000 in bonuses and the Minister comes to their relief with the expenditure of $100,000. Thus they have at least $223,000 at the hands of the Government, because that is the advance to them by the Government of the country for the purpose of carrying out the Drummond Railway arrangement. These are the principal features of the transaction.

This 115 miles of road is built over a comparatively level country from Ste. Rosalie to the Chaudière Junction, passing, as the Minister tells us, through a populous country well settled the whole way. But one of the witnesses before the committee, when asked what the character of the road was and whether it was equal to the Intercolonial Railway, said the fencing was not as good. When asked in what respect the fencing was not up to the standard, he said there were twenty miles along the road where there was no fencing at all. The Minister of Railways and Canals put it to the witness: Do you know that that is a country in which there is not a single settler, a wooded country? And yet, in introducing his resolution he told us that there was a magnificent country along the whole road.

The Minister makes a comparison between the purchase of this road and the purchase made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), of the road from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis. He states that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) paid $14,000 a mile for that road, while he got this road for less than that. He says that the road purchased by the present leader of the Opposition was in a degraded state; that the country had to spend large sums to bring it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. But he forgot to mention—and he knew it—that the object in taking over that road from the Grand Trunk Railway was not merely to secure connection with Quebec, but that one of the conditions was that the money obtained was to be used to build a connection for the Grand Trunk from Detroit to Chicago, and to double the track between Toronto and Montreal. The hon. gentleman says that that was not in the arrangement. If he will look to the Grand Trunk Act of 1884, one of the conditions of the arrangement related to the securities of the Grand Trunk Railway. A certain set of the securities were to be applied towards doubling the track between Montreal and Toronto. I heard the debates in the House. I heard my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition introducing the resolution into the House, and stating that these two conditions were the conditions of the purchase of that road, and comparing the road, such as it is from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis, with the portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie to Forestdale, built under a subsidy contract, but not finished up to the subsidy contract. The only difference the hon. gentleman made in the contract was, that the two grades were to be reduced to 52 feet, as embodied in every subsidy contract, and the part to be finished was to be finished under a subsidy contract with the Government, plus this arrangement that was afterwards to be worked up to the standard of the Intercolonial. That is the contract that he made in reference to this road.

Now, there are some very suspicious circumstances about the sale of this road. The negotiations for this road were made in January, 1897; the contract was virtually completed in February, 1897; the Order in Council was passed by the Government in March, 1897. Let me draw your attention to some peculiar occurrences that took place in February, 1897. A debate took place in the House on June 26th in reference to the cheque which was received by the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works is not in the House, and I will not discuss the matter, but only read his statement before the committee. I will also read the affidavit of Mr. Greenshields in reference to it, and let the House and the country draw their inference. This is what the Minister of Public Works said, as reported on page 5302 of the Debates, June 26th, 1897:

> I arranged that Mr. Greenshields, who was my lawyer in many other cases, should act as the purchaser of "La Patrie," as the lawyer of the party. They speak of a cheque which Mr. Greenshields gave. There is no secret about it. Mr. Greenshields had a cheque in his hands, not of his own money, but of the money of the party, and he paid that cheque. Let an inquiry take place, and all this shall be proved. Every private act of ours is scrutinized; our private affairs are no longer private. We are treated as if we were thieves and knaves.

Mr. Greenshields gave evidence in reference to that before the committee. He said:

I think the first official interview I had for the sale of this road with the present Government or any—because I had no interview with the other Government—was one time when Mr. Hays, Mr. Wainwright and I came to Ottawa, after the return of Mr. Blair from the coast. I conducted the negotiations for the leasing of this road with Mr. Blair alone. I did not discuss the terms of the matter with any other Minister of the Crown. It has been stated that Mr. Tarte had to do with it. He had nothing to do with it. No part in these negotiations were between Mr. Tarte and myself.

Mr. Greenshields, in his evidence before the committee, stated that he had contributed funds for the party, that he had advanced his cheque, that $5,000 of it was given one day, and the other $15,000 was given the next day. The Minister of Public Works also gave evidence before the committee, in which he said :

You say that Mr. Greenshields had a cheque in his hands, not that he gave you an accommodation cheque, but that he had a cheque in his hands, not of his own money, but of the money of the party ?—A. My answer is that I did not think it proper to say everything in the House—

He was not making a breast of it in the House.

——then, because Parliament was just closing, and I knew right well that if I had said that Mr. Greenshields had given his own cheque, and it was paid the next day, that the Tory press would have lied just as much as they would have been able to. I said what was true, but I did not give out the whole thing. It is perfectly true that he loaned his cheque, that he paid that cheque, and that it was not his money.

Now, the Minister of Public Works is perfectly aware of the transactions between the Government and the Drummond County Railway Company. All the negotiations occurred in January, 1897, this cheque business occurred in February, and the deal was closed and the Order in Council was passed in the beginning of March, in the same year. It is a curious train of circumstances. The Minister of Public Works ought to have been very careful, even though Mr. Greenshields was his attorney. This Mr. Greenshields purchased the bonds of the company about this time, or before the arrangement was made by the Government. Mr. Greenshields' relations with the Government were notorious ; the whole of the transactions in reference to that road prove the statement that I made in the House, namely, that, at least, this affair savoured of corruption. The road could have been bought, and built, and extended, for a much less sum than the Minister of Railways and Canals paid for it. He was so ashamed of his own transaction that he made in 1897, that he had to make a further agreement, which was better for this country to the extent of $700,000. The facts prove it. The hon. gentleman made a quibble, and said : Oh, but the $1,600,000 only represents $40,000 a year. Yet the country knew that for $64,000 a year for ninety-nine years they could get value in the neighbourhood of $2,100,000. We were buying it, we were paying the money, and we could have got it for that sum. Besides that, there is the $123,000 of the subsidy which the hon. gentleman said that, under the first agreement, he could not control. They purchased the road altogether, as he says, for $2,100,000. What is the argument worth, that he passed the Subsidy Act afterwards to give that $100,000 ? The transaction, on the face of it, bears the mark of corruption. There are only two horns to the dilemma : either the set of men entering into this agreement for the purpose of constructing this road, or taking it over, were a set of fools, or they made it for a consideration.

The country may draw either inference it likes. I will deal with this subject perhaps a little further again, but first of all, I want to draw your attention to another subject which is possibly worse than the one to which I have drawn attention at the present moment. At the same time there was an agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of getting a connection between Ste. Rosalie station over the Victoria bridge, and for obtaining the use of the terminals in the city of Montreal. Under the first arrangement the Government was to pay $140,000 for that consideration. They were to pay for half of the improvements which were to be made. The Grand Trunk Railway Company had the right to receive from the Government the promise of that amount, plus 5 per cent per annum interest on it. Every one knows that the bond of this Government, bearing 5 per cent interest, would readily sell at a large premium in the money markets of the world. So they were not only to be paid for half of the improvements made, but they were to be paid in debentures or securities that bore 5 per cent interest. The arrangement was made then that we were to be half owners of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, thirty-two miles in length, and we were to have the use of the Victoria bridge, and, what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) calls, the user of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway from the end of the bridge to Montreal. Now, what is the change that has been made in the agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company ? We pay a certain sum per year for the use of the property which I described before. We are only to pay for the use of terminals in the city of Montreal, and the improvements that are made on those terminals on the basis of user or wheelage. We do not pay one-twentieth of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway ; under the old arrangement we were to pay for one-half. We were to pay 5 per cent interest. Under the new arrangement we pay 4 per cent interest, and have no option for cash. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), besides that, says that he has got an important addition, in

obtaining a connection between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway at a place called Jacques Cartier Junction. Now, I want to read to you the different agreements entered into by the hon. gentleman. Those of you who are lawyers in the House will be amused by the drafting of the documents. They appear not to have passed through the hands of the hon. Minister of Justice. No first-class lawyers would ever be responsible for any document of that kind. If there is any legal gentleman in the House who can tell me where a conveyance of properties is mentioned, I would like to hear it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If it is of any interest to the hon. gentleman to know, I can tell him that it did go through the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. HAGGART. So much the worse for the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And I think it will be found pretty nearly right.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, it may be; we will criticise it a little further anyway, and I am prepared to put my opinion against that of the hon. the Minister. The particular section that I want to draw your attention to in the agreement which was made in 1897 is this:

That Her Majesty shall and will pay to the company a share of the cost of maintenance of this railway between and including Ste. Rosalie and Point St. Charles and Chaudière Bridge and connections, including tracks,——

And so on.

——such share of the cost of maintenance to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains running over the above mentioned sections of railway bears to the total combined engine and car mileage over the above mentioned sections of railway during each month,——

That refers, of course, to that particular section of road which was owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which was a part of this contract, which was made by the Drummond County Railway in connection with six miles of road running into Point Lévis.

——every engine, passenger and freight car, counting each as one car, and from Point St. Charles and west to Bonaventure station, including the yards, such share of the cost of maintenance as aforesaid to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains running over the above last mentioned railway section and yards bears to the total combined engine and car mileage running over the above last mentioned section of the railway during each month; but notwithstanding anything herein mentioned, the cost of maintenance of the Victoria bridge shall not include the cost of maintaining any part or portion thereof except that which shall be used by the Intercolonial Railway and the company, and for that class of railway purpose, which cost of maintenance shall be apportioned as aforesaid.

Now, we will get the 35th section:

That if at any time hereafter the business or traffic shall, in the opinion of the parties hereto necessitate or warrant the laying of double tracks between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, or the making of more extensive yard improvements at Point St. Charles or intermediate points between that point and Bonaventure station, or the laying of additional tracks between such points, or shall warrant or necessitate any further expenditure for the proper and efficient conduct of its business, and the company shall lay the said tracks or make the said improvements or make the said expenditure, Her Majesty may have the full and unlimited use of all or any such work in the same manner and to the same extent as if the said work had been included in the premises hereby leased, the right, use or privilege in which are demised hereby, and if Her Majesty should determine to use any such works or improvements, and the Minister should so declare, such works and improvements are hereby understood and agreed to form part of the leased premises, and Her Majesty shall pay annually for the use of any such works and improvements five per cent upon one-half of the actual cost to the company of the construction of said works and improvements; but in case of all betterments or of additional works on such joint sections which the company may be required to make under the provision of any statute or of any order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or other competent authority, Her Majesty shall pay the interest upon one-half the cost thereof at the rate aforesaid.

For all the improvements that were to be made over the terminals and connections, from Point St. Charles to Montreal, they were to pay for half, and that was calculated on the basis of 5 per cent per annum that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had the right to pay.

Now, under this agreement of 1897, the Intercolonial Railway took over one-half the undivided interests from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, the right of running over the Grand Trunk Railway bridge and the user to the extent of one-half, I suppose—although there is no mention to what extent the user is on that portion of the line from the Grand Trunk Railway bridge to the terminal in Montreal. We pay one-half the price of the cost of the terminals in Montreal, and we receive none of the rent or profits accruing to the company from that. We pay for half of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, and we will receive half of the profits that the Grand Trunk Railway get from the other companies for the use of that. So we were confined to the simple user of what we purchased, from the end of the Intercolonial Railway to the station at Montreal (whatever use the Intercolonial Railway made of that station), paying to the Grand Trunk Railway for all the staff they used on that a proportion of the wages according to wheelage basis arrived at between the two companies. Under the new agreement we do the same

in reference to the portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. As to the Victoria bridge, it is precisely the same, but as to the payment we have for improvements upon the terminals at Montreal, we only pay to the Grand Trunk Railway according to our user on a wheelage basis, and at the rate of 4 per cent a year, or we have the right of making the payment in cash. That is a distinction, and it makes an immense difference between the two contracts. Besides that we have the right, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the user—but whether we get it at all we do not know—of the connection between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me read the last agreement. I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to this, and the attention also of legal gentlemen of the House to this; I draw their attention to the wording and drafting of this arrangement:

Now this indenture witnesseth that the expression "Montreal joint section,"——

As I interpret this, it gives a meaning of what the Montreal joint section is:

——wherever used in this indenture, shall mean the company's line in connection at Ste. Rosalie and the whole line and branches and appurtenances hereby demised from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lamber and the Victoria bridge, together with the terminals at Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and at Point St. Charles, St. Henri, and between Point St. Charles and the Bonaventure station, and also——

What does "also" mean?

——and also with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Jacques Cartier Junction; and the expression "Chaudière joint section" shall mean the Chaudière bridge and connections, except when the meaning shall conflict with the context or otherwise plainly expressed terms of the clause in which the same is used.

Look at the demise. In the demise there is not a single mention of this connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Jacques Cartier junction road.

That the said company, in consideration of the rents, covenants, conditions and agreements hereinafter contained and reserved, granted, demised and leased, and by these presents doth give, grant, demise and lease unto Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, all undivided one-half share, interest, right and title to all the company's line of railway, road-bed and property from and including Ste. Rosalie station, in the county of Bagot,——

See how plainly the section between Ste. Rosalie and the bridge is conveyed:

——in the province of Quebec, to the Victoria Bridge, and also the undivided one-half right, share, title or interest in the company's line of railway from a point on the western side of the Chaudière Bridge, at the proposed junction of the Drummond County Railway, with the company's line and including the Chaudière Bridge, and to and including the switch at the westerly side of the Chaudière Curve station, being the said rights and privileges agreed to be leased to the Drummond County Railway by the company,——

There can be no doubt as to these two points.

——with the full and unlimited right and privileges, such as the company itself enjoys, of running the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains of the said Intercolonial Railway, either separately or combined, and as frequently and at such times as its business and traffic may require, and in both directions over any and every portion of the said company's railway between and including the said points aforesaid, and the use of the Victoria bridge across the River St. Lawrence, as it at present exists or as it may at any time during the subsistence of this lease be improved, reconstructed, enlarged or extended, and over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria bridge.

You see, it does not give them a half interest in it, but only gives them the right of passing over the company's line of railway:

Over the said Victoria bridge and into the Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the company hereinbefore more particularly described.

Where is the conveyance of that section of the road between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? If it is conveyed, or if it is included in the reference to "Montreal joint section," why does it not mention it? It does not refer to it at all. Where is the conveyance even of the terminals? There is not a word of conveyance. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) may laugh, but if it is not included in the word "connections," what are the connections and in what terms have you the right of user? Is it free or is it on terms arranged between the Grand Trunk Railway and you. The Canadian Pacific Railway has the right of user and a lease over that section of the road. I say that my interpretation of that clause is that there is no conveyance. I remember the definition given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) of the word "connection" in a former discussion, and I want to know if it means the same thing here. Does it mean a line of railway? Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) say in this House that that conveys the line of railway between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? I say it does not. If it refers to the section above, the most it conveys is a connection. I am glad that the Minister says that he is not responsible for this piece of drafting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not saying I am not responsible for it.

Mr. HAGGART. You said it was drawn over in the Justice Department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not misunderstand me on that point.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the Minister of Justice will accept the responsibility for any such drafting as that. Whether it conveys the meaning the hon. gentleman intended it to convey or not, the drafting is a disgrace to any department. Look at it again and see where is the conveyance of the side track, and where is the conveyance of that portion of the road between Montreal and the station.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have made up your mind that it is not there.

Mr. HAGGART. It is very indefinite, to say the least of it. It appears from the deed that you can construct the stations, tracks and siding afterwards if they do not let you use them. Here is the conveyance:

> And over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria bridge and into the Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the company.

Does that convey the right of the use of the siding? Does it convey that section of the road between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway?

Now, look at the benefit which accrues to the country from the change in the contract which the hon. gentleman made between 1897 and 1898. You have not to pay half the expenditures at the stations at Montreal. You have not to pay at the rate of 5 per cent per annum for these facilities. You got them on the user basis, and you have the use of that portion of the road between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That alone was sufficient justification for our refusing to pass the contract. The Minister comes with an entirely different contract, which is a complete justification of the Senate's action in throwing out the Bill. In order to make connection with the Jacques Cartier branch, you have to run eight or nine miles on the main line of the Grand Trunk above Montreal. Where is the conveyance of that, or the right to use it, to the Intercolonial Railway? The hon. gentleman's colleague in the Senate, Sir Oliver Mowat, when introducing the resolution there, said:

> I believe the object is this, that hon. members having doubt, or more than doubt, whether the business to be done would warrant the expenditure, it was felt desirable that there should be an opportunity to all of us to know by actual experiment how that would be.

And yet what did the hon. Minister of Railways state in this House the other day? He made a statement which every man belonging to a railway company in this or any other country in the world knows cannot possibly be correct. He stated that the officers of the department were unable to furnish information as to the earnings of the railway, or as to the effect of extending it from Point Lévis to Montreal. Does he not know—and, if he does not, I will tell him; and, if his officers tell him anything different, they tell him what is untrue—that the accounts of every railway in the country are kept in such a fashion that, with very little trouble, the earnings of every section of the road can be stated? What is the reason he put that statement into the mouth of Sir Oliver Mowat, the leader of the Government in the Senate, unless he was aware of that? Sir Oliver Mowat, when he asked the Senate to pass the grant, said he would be able to give the House information which would justify the expenditure, or which might justify another bargain being made. Yet the hon. Minister of Railways is unable to furnish the information to this House. We are asked to pass these resolutions without the information, which he should be able to bring down at any moment, as to the amount of the expenditure in the improvement of the road, or as to the present state of the road. No Minister of the Crown ever before had the presumption or daring to introduce into this House a resolution of this kind without being prepared to lay on the Table of the House every necessary document and the fullest information, and without even an apology for the statement of his colleague in the Senate, that the earnings of the road would be made known. Have the members of the Ministry ever considered the amount they are giving for this Grand Trunk Railway connection? Do they know what $140,000 a year means to the people of this country? It means a capital of over $5,000,000. Do they know what $5,000,000 would build? Did the hon. Minister of Railways ever inquire what the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge across the St. Lawrence cost? If not, I will tell him, that the whole bridge and its approaches were built for $1,400,000; I got the information from the contractors. I have a letter from the parties who paid for the building of the bridge, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, stating that the bridge and its approaches were built for less than $1,500,000. Have they ever calculated the distance between Chaudière Junction and St. Lambert? I will tell them: the distance is 147 miles. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), the other day, estimated that a new double-track railway could be built for $30,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can build it a good deal cheaper on paper than you can after you get to work, judging from past experience.

Mr. FOSTER. According to who has charge of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, judging from the last fifteen or seventeen years.

Mr. FOSTER. We need not go further back than a year and a half.

Mr. HAGGART. The calculation of the officers of the department is, that that portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie towards Moose Park was built for between $13,000 and $14,000 a mile, and that the Grand Trunk Railway extension could be built for between $11,000 and $12,000 a mile. You have no faith in the officers of your own department; you have no faith in their calculations. I will take $30,000 a mile as the cost of a double-track railway through a country the easiest on the continent of America to build a railway in, except, perhaps, a few portions of the prairie; and at $30,000 a mile, you could build a double-track railway from Point Lévis to St. Lambert station for $4,410,000, and you could build a bridge of your own across the St. Lawrence at the amount expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the building of their bridge. You could build it for $200,000 less—yes, $300,000 less—than the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost when it was built. But take the full amount which they state their bridge and its approaches cost—$1,500,000—and that would make the cost of a double-track railway from Point Lévis to the end of the bridge and a bridge across the St. Lawrence, $5,910,000. You would then have to expend on your terminals in Montreal, $1,481,540. You would own the railway the whole way, you would own the bridge, you could build the terminals for half the amount, and you could double-track, because the Government have the best entrance to the city of Montreal possessed by any railway entering that city. They could come down along the bank of the Lachine Canal; for the right to do which, application after application has been made to the Department of Railways. They could go round their own property, and have $1,500,000 for the purpose of erecting a station. That is the popular view of the question. Now, can the hon. gentleman blame the people of this country for suspecting the honesty of such a transaction? Can they blame the people or the Opposition for scenting corruption in it? Do they expect the people to believe that any set of men, honestly looking to the interest of the country, would be so neglectful of these interests as to expend an immense sum for the purpose of getting through a job of this kind?

The hon. gentleman compares the cost of this road with the building of the road at Point Lévis, but the construction of the road at Point Lévis was cheap enough. We, however, got into the courts with the owners of property, and the expenditure on this little line of road in consequence became an enormous amount. But the hon. gentleman and his friends could have looked to railway construction all over the continent of America, the cost of which can be now estimated to a fine point, and could have made calculations to show the cost of this road. They never, however, made a calculation, and we have never had information whether the deputy head of the department went over the road or not to examine it. When he was before the committee, he had never seen the road, but he made a calculation. What a hurry they were in to build it. There seems to have been great necessity to hurry through this legislation.

Mr. BERGERON. The Quebec elections were to take place in May.

Mr. HAGGART. That, no doubt, was the reason. Why, it was necessary the arrangements should be completed in March. But the hon. Minister says that by the sworn evidence, the expenditure to complete this road was $2,000,000. I have referred already to the extraordinary way in which the paid-up stock was subscribed by these three gentlemen I have mentioned to the extent of $133,000 each. He says that we had the books of the company before the committee, and the right of thorough inquiry into them. I ventured to state, when he was making that assertion, that we had not the books. An hon. gentleman who was on the committee, rose and contradicted me, and said we had. Let me tell you what books were before the committee. We had a set of books, the first entry in which was a transfer from some other books of $729,000. We had not the details of this expenditure, and we wanted to get the construction books which contained these details, but never could get them. The information never was before the department at all. What was this construction company? There was an arrangement entered into by these parties, who had secured subsidies from the Dominion and provincial Governments, with themselves for the purpose of carrying on the undertaking. The Minister of Railways told us that each of them paid in $133,000 to this construction company, and then he argued that it was in the interests of those parties who owned the road to build it as cheaply as possible. Why, Mr. Speaker, their interest was to get as high a price as possible for the construction of the road, in order that this subscription of $133,000 each would be swallowed and covered up. That never struck the Minister of Railways, but he contended the bargain he had made was a perfectly good one to pay this $1,600,000 or $2,000,000, because these gentlemen had expended $2,000,000 on that road. Does he expect us to accept any such contention? The first item in the account is an entry of $729,000, but we never could get the books of the construction company in order to ascertain whether any such amount had ever been expended or not, and there is not a man living in that section of the country, who knows the standing of the three parties, who were the proprietors and owners of that road, who would not scout as an absurdity the statement that they had ever made arrangements with any bank by which they could be advanced $133,000 each to put into this company.

Then, the hon. gentleman was asked why did he not get back the subsidies we had paid, and he replied that he does. But he deducts from the $2,000,000 only $400,000, which is $250,000 short of the actual subsidies received from the Dominion and provincial Governments. He says he doubts the logic of subtracting the subsidies from the amount of the real purchase. But what is the reason we give a subsidy? It is because, on account of a road being built in a new country, those who build it are not likely to get back the interest on the full amount expended. Therefore, we pay them a certain sum to enable them to do without that interest for a certain time, trusting that, in the course of years, the increase in immigration and trade will recoup them. But what kind of a road was this? It was a road built by a couple of lumber firms into a lumber section for the purpose of taking lumber out of a section of the country which is not settled at all—that portion between Moose Park and Chaudière Junction. The lumber became exhausted, and these parties found themselves with a useless undertaking on their hands. Owing to the political services which a certain party, who is closely connected with the hon. gentlemen opposite, who is a leader and organizer of his party, and in order to recoup him—for we can come to no other logical conclusion—this party received money for this road largely in excess of what it could be bought for by any person who wished to acquire it as a commercial undertaking. They ask us to make specific charges and prove them before the House. The chairman of the committee addressed me, and said: What charges do you make? I made no charges; the charges were ringing throughout the country, and these hon. gentlemen appointed a committee to clear them in the eyes of the country. That committee was presided over by a gentleman who, at the very moment, I believe, had the promise of a judgeship in his pocket. He received that judgeship, I believe, before the proceedings of the committee had terminated. I thought that the first thing we should have a discussion upon this session would be a motion for the adoption of the report of the committee, but no such motion has ever been made. The Premier and the members of the Government, last session were very anxious that that motion should be made. They were anxious to override the rules of the House in order to have such a motion brought forward—no doubt desiring the benefit of the extraordinary ability of the gentleman who had acted as chairman, to excuse and apologize for one of the most disgraceful transactions ever known in the history of this country.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the peculiarity of the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in introducing this resolution. He wandered off to a consideration of the Intercolonial Railway and took the opportunity of discussing my management of the road a number of years back. He said I had been living upon a reputation I had gained in the management of the road, but that the credit was not due to me, but to my predecessor, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who for a short time was acting Minister. I have no desire to detract from the ability displayed by that hon. gentleman in the management of the road. He was and is entitled to credit. I asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) who told him that, and he replied that it was a gentleman who had been in intimate communication with him for a number of years. Now, if a gentleman who had been in intimate communication with him for a number of years, informed him of that, he should be careful not to mention it. I know the relation of the permanent to the evanescent in this matter. And I will tell the hon. gentleman that when he departs from office—and I hope it will not be long before then, it will be pretty sure to follow an appeal to the people——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It looks very like it.

Mr. HAGGART. Very like it. I can tell the hon. Minister that when he has departed from office, these gentlemen who gave him the information will not offer him a word of consolation, but their whole time will be taken up with congratulation to his successor upon his appointment to office. They will congratulate that successor upon replacing a person who is little adapted to the work he undertook and they will enlarge upon the trouble they had in carrying on affairs under him. That is the air they assume over the evanescent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) the evanescent?

Mr. HAGGART. I was the evanescent, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is now. There is a distinction between those who are appointed permanently and who have a knowledge which permanency and experience give. The hon. gentleman, with all his assumption of knowledge, can be nothing but the political head of the department. It is impossible for him to have the technical knowledge for the management of a railway. And when he poses and assumes the role of a judge of locomotives and passenger cars and assumes to decide what is necessary for the Intercolonial Railway in regard to these matters, he is assuming a role which was never intended and which he cannot fill to advantage. That role he should leave to the permanent officials of the department. And he should be careful about taking evidence against his predecessor in office. The hon. gentleman says that the prosperity of the Intercolonial Railway was not due to myself. I never took the credit for it. I laid down a general political policy, and instructed the officers, within certain bounds, what they were to

do. They carried out that policy faithfully. My only credit was in giving them a free hand, leaving them free to do what they deemed best in the management of the road, and protecting them in doing it. When they reported to me that there were nine or ten thousand useless hands on the Intercolonial Railway, I gave instructions to reduce the staff to what was absolutely necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Who put them there?

Mr. HAGGART. Most of them were remnants from a regime that lasted from 1873 to 1878. However, they were there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When did my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) put them out?

Mr. HAGGART. I put them out when I had the power and found that they were unnecessary. However, it does not matter. I will have an opportunity when the Estimates of the Intercolonial Railway come up to discuss this matter with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. We have now only to deal with this Drummond road and to deal with it on the evidence before the House. The hon. gentleman states that we are going to have an era of prosperity. I hope that is so. I hope that era of prosperity has struck the maritime provinces. I hope that in a year from now his prophecy will be fulfilled and that we shall have a larger surplus on the Intercolonial Railway than all the surpluses that have ever been known in the history of that road. But it was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to prophesy about it. We are now in the month of May. We have the expenditure up to April. If affairs in the office are conducted as they were during that time, he has his estimates from his officers of what the expenditure will be for the month of May. Generally the estimate is a little in excess of the real expenditure. Then he had eleven-twelfths of the year, he had only to guess for the month of June. If the hon. gentleman had brought down, up to the 1st of May, what the real state of affairs was, and the estimate of his officials for the month of May, then this House and himself would have been on a par, and we would know exactly the expenditure for the whole of the year. But we can only judge of the year from the information that we have at present. I notice that there has been a deficit on the Intercolonial this year of $209,978, and there has been an expenditure on capital account of $252,756 on that island which has been so much neglected in carrying out the terms of confederation, which called for proper railway communication.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the tunnel?

Mr. HAGGART. We do not hear much about that. There is an expenditure on capital account of $17,541, and on revenue account of $72,468, notwithstanding the improvements which have been urged upon the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), the shortening of the line of the Prince Edward Island road, improving the gradients and shortening the curves. While I was listening to my return, I noticed a smile on the face of the Minister of Railways and Canals when he answered the questions in reference to the particular part of the Intercolonial Railway where there had been an expenditure in the neighbourhood of $20,000 that shortened the line 2,000 feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it not as much as that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A different railway altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend tells me it was 3,000 feet, and they raised the present gradients from eighty-three feet, as they were before, to 103 feet, as they are at present. The Minister has promised that when the expenditure is completed the road will be levelled down to the maximum gradient of the Intercolonial Railway, and a running gradient of fifty-two feet. The curvature has been changed about 1-10th of a degree. I think the largest curvature before was eight degrees, and it is now 8·40. Notwithstanding these improvements on the Prince Edward Island road, I am sorry to see that the expenditure over the revenue has been $72,468, or an expenditure altogether on the Intercolonial Railway system in excess of the revenues of $552,000. Although it added to the expenditure which we are making on that Drummond County Railway for the purpose of getting into Montreal, he would have had at least the gratification of saying to our friends in the maritime provinces that the people of Canada were at least generous; for, after spending a large amount in building the road for which they have no return in the shape of interest on the capital, the people of Canada are generous enough besides to give the sum of $552,000. But that is nothing to what the hon. gentleman proposed. I suppose he intends to take it out of capital expenditure. I see that he asks for an expenditure of over $990,000 on capital account next year, for straightening out more curves on the Intercolonial Railway, and reducing gradients, and an expenditure of $440,000 for the purpose of better terminal facilities at St. John. When I was Minister of Railways and Canals, I was hounded by the Opposition for the enormous and corrupt expenditure—I would be afraid to use similar language concerning the present Minister of Railways and Canals—I was denounced for making a corrupt

expenditure in the purchase of the Harris property at St. John for the purpose of affording better accommodation at that port. But my iniquities pale in comparison with those of the Minister of Railways and Canals. He is looking out for his friends, he is looking out for his pets in St. John. He is going to carry the grain and produce of the western country round by Moncton, down to St. John; he is going to enter into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, who already have an elevator in the western part of the harbour, and are to-day doing all the business in the grain trade from Montreal to St. John. The hon. gentleman is going to enter into competition with them and carry freight and grain round by Moncton, 254 miles further. How is he going to do it? Where is he going to get his grain? Is he going to get it from the Grand Trunk Railway? All the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway lie in carrying grain to Portland. What a beautiful traffic arrangement he has made! He is going to get grain and through traffic at Montreal for the purpose of shipment to St. John and Halifax, and the hon. gentleman allows them a difference of 400 miles in mileage between Halifax and Montreal. This is the excellent arrangement he has made with them. This reminds me of the calculations that the hon. gentleman presented to this House in reference to the profits which were to accrue to this road. He entered into elaborate calculations, he had gone over them carefully with his deputy, and where are they? At least, you would expect to find them in the "Hansard." The hon. gentleman, in the revised edition of the "Hansard," has cut them all out; there is not a single portion of them there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I did not catch the last statement that he made.

Mr. HAGGART. What I say is that the hon. gentleman went into elaborate calculations as to the results which would accrue from the building of the road from Point Lévis to Montreal, showed the calculations made, either by himself or his deputy, of the increase of freight and increase of passengers. I remember perfectly well that he made these calculations in the House, but in looking over his speeches I do not see anything of them in the "Hansard" now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if they are not there, I am not responsible for the omission.

Mr. HAGGART. I am only telling the hon. gentleman the facts in reference to it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman forgot to give his figures to the "Hansard." There has been something done. We would like to have the figures for the purpose of comparing them with the results. There is an expenditure of $440,000 for the purpose of erecting an elevator at the port of St. John. I ask the hon. gentleman, where he is going to get his grain? The Canadian Pacific Railway have an elevator of their own there, and they have no use for it. Does he really expect the Grand Trunk Railway, who have their terminal at Portland, who have their own arrangements for the purpose of carrying grain over to Europe, are going to give him any grain to carry over his road? Is he going to erect a monument in the shape of an elevator there, something like what we had at Halifax? I must say that at one time, perhaps, I was a sinner myself in that respect. We were carrying grain to that elevator at a price that would not pay for the oiling of the wheels on the local railway. Is it for the fun of carrying it round that way to St. John that the hon. gentleman is going to spend $440,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And 250 miles further.

Mr. HAGGART. 250 miles further for the purpose of building an elevator at St. John.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is exactly the same distance as it always has been.

Mr. HAGGART. That is all very well. If the Intercolonial Railway was receiving a surplus from the people of the maritime provinces, I would go as far as any hon. gentleman in this House in advocating that that surplus should be expended for the purpose of bettering the Intercolonial Railway, and that it should be expended among the people of those provinces. Because we, the people of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion, have long ago come to this idea, that the perfect management of the Intercolonial Railway is to make the receipts and expenditures balance. We have no wish to put into the treasury of this country any receipts or any moneys taken out of the people of the maritime provinces; but, when it comes that the people of this country are asked, on capital account, for an expenditure of $990,000 for the present year, it is time that the people should cry, "Halt." The people of this Dominion are not willing that such an expenditure as that should be made. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his place there, a supporter of the Government, protested against expenditures of that kind, and I, as a member from Ontario, state that the Ontario members, or the members of any party, are not willing that $1,000,000 should be taken out of the people of the country for the purpose of any such expenditure as is proposed in this particular undertaking. I think I have a knowledge of the Intercolonial Railway, as well as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has, in reference to the facts of the case, and I will take the opportunity, when the Estimates come up, of discussing fully with him the manage-

ment of the road during the time when I was in charge of it, and when he was in charge of it. I will tell the hon. gentleman that the reference which he made to me, the other evening, was quite uncalled for, when he said that, when I was in charge of the department, in order to make a surplus for that year, the expenditure that ought to have taken place before the 1st of July, was deferred until a later period, and that, when the hon. gentleman came into power, he had to put it into its normal condition, and that accounts for the enormous difference between his expenditure, as compared with the expenditure during the year of my management of the railway. The hon. gentleman might as well, with equal truth, say, that he is making all the expenditures on the repairs for the present year and charging everything he can to capital account, caring nothing whatever for any deficit this year, in order that he may have a favourable statement to show the people of the country when he goes to the elections, in a year or two from now. He does not care: he can stand all these charges against himself of raising the rates on the Intercolonial Railway; he does not mind how much is expended on capital or revenue account, provided that, when the time comes that an appeal is made to the country, he can show a surplus greater than all of the surpluses that ever occurred on the Intercolonial Railway. That is a system that I cannot understand in reference to the expenditures. Surely, the expenditure accrues in the next year; that was borne in the beginning of the year he mentioned. The receipts for the two years following the year he mentioned show that the revenue was greater than the expenditure for these two or three years at least, so that the hon. gentleman could have no fault to find. What the hon. gentleman seems to say is, that the expenditure in the first year should have been in a particular portion of the year, and he justified his expenditure by saying that in the first year he restored it to its normal condition by making the expenditure at the proper time. I doubt that. I gave no instructions to any officer of the Intercolonial, while I was managing the road, to do any such thing as the hon. gentleman has stated. My instructions to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway were, to keep up the standard of efficiency in the best possible manner, to see that the rolling stock and the road did not degenerate, and that the road was equipped in the most efficient manner. I am astonished at the lavish expenditure for cars which is now going on, in view of the fact that, when I was in the department, the officers informed me that they were not necessary at all. The officers of my department told me that, if arrangements were made for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway for the purpose of getting into the city of Montreal, there was such a big surplus of rolling stock on the Intercolonial that we would not need to buy one single passenger car or locomotive. It was on this groud that I made the statement before the committee, that I did not expect to make an expenditure for establishing that connection of more than $1,500,000. I never would have thought of giving $5,000,000 for that connection from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. Why did not the hon. gentleman do as other railways do that are travelling into Montreal—secure the user of the Grand Trunk Railway for the Intercolonial, and get the terminals on a wheelage basis, or a basis of user? Would not that have been a proper arrangement? Do not other railways adopt that system? The Grand Trunk Railway Company were willing to arrange with him on that basis. I could have made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the basis of user, and we could have found out from the Delaware and Hudson, the Central Vermont and other lines of railway that are running into Montreal, what they pay. Every one of them pays on a basis of user, or wheelage, for the right of going into the station. The same thing obtains in every part of America, and the hon. Minister could easily have found out what the cost would be. Have the officers of the Government made an estimate of the amount of the user that the Intercolonial would make of the terminals of the bridge and of the road to St. Lambert? They could have told the hon. gentleman within a few thousands of dollars what he would have had to pay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman be surprised, when I inform him that such an examination was made, such an estimate was made, and such figures were put in my hands, and, if my recollection serves me, they were furnished to the committee of investigation?

Mr. HAGGART. I am not surprised, in view of the figures, when I remember that one of the estimates of the value of the Victoria bridge was $10,000,000 to $12,000,000, and that we were to pay for the user of that bridge, for the half user—no, not for the half user, but for the fiftieth user—three or four million dollars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not doing himself justice now. I was not speaking about the estimate of the cost of the Victoria bridge, nor was he. I was speaking of the estimate of the terminals.

Mr. HAGGART. I was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will see that he is quite in error. He was speaking of the Government procuring an estimate in reference to the probable cost, upon a wheelage basis, of running the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal. I have stated to

the hon. gentleman, and I think his own recollection will corroborate what I have said, that such an estimate was procured, that it was placed in my hands by my officers, and that, if my memory serves me, such an estimate was placed before the investigating committee. If the hon. gentleman remembers the figures, the cost would be in excess of the cost of the permanent arrangement entered into at last.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the cost, as estimated :

Cost of Drummond County Railway..	$1,535,500
Ste. Rosalie to Drummondville.....	291,500
Drummondville to St. Léonard.....	304,000
St. Léonard to Chaudière Bridge....	770,000
Nicolet Branch	170,000

The other calculation was not on the basis of that estimate at all. According to the other calculation, the hon. gentleman intended to pay one-half of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, and half of the terminals in the city of Montreal. The calculation which was handed to him was, that the Victoria bridge had cost the Grand Trunk Railway in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000, and the estimated value of it then was from $8,000,000 to $10.000,000. Then, I am to infer that the basis upon which he paid the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was the calculation of the value that was put upon it by the officers of the department. The officers of his department knew that a bridge for all the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway, and ten times over, could be built across the St. Lawrence for $1,500,000. The hon. gentleman knows that the calculation was made upon the basis—if I remember aright, and I will have the details after dinner, for I intend to go specially into the subject—the calculation was made upon the basis of from eight to ten million dollars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) must know that there were various calculations and various estimates of every possible kind made by the officers of the department, and what I am trying to point out to him is, that the particular kind of estimate which he said I could have got, I did get, and the figures are furnished to the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the sworn evidence of the hon. gentleman before the committee, exhibit 16, page 13 :

> The cost of the construction of the bridge was, I think, $10.000,000 ; it could now be completed for $6,000,000.

That is Mr. Blair's sworn evidence before the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does that prove ?

Mr. HAGGART. It proves, as I say, that the evidence that was before you upon which you based your calculation of payment of the subsidy for each year to the Grand Trunk Railway, was based on some figures like that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that was all the evidence that was before me ?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not say anything of the kind. I should judge from the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) some time ago, to the effect that there was no evidence of any kind, that he was taking a leap in the dark.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you understood that, your mind was not working.

Mr. HAGGART. The evidence that was adduced before the Minister (Mr. Blair), and the only evidence that I know of that he gave before the committee in reference to the value of the bridge across the St. Lawrence, was a statement which is now in the office of Mr. Panet, clerk of the committee, that the bridge cost in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000, and that it could probably be built now for $6,000,000. Mr. Schreiber, the Deputy Minister, knows perfectly well that for one-fourth of this estimate a bridge could be built there. He knew that he had the evidence that the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost only $1,500,000, and he knew that such a bridge could be built at the present day for $1,200,000. Yet the Minister led the committee to believe that the basis of his calculation was a bridge that cost $10,000,000, which could now be built for $6,000,000. He would need a better basis than that, and more enormous figures for the payment of $5,000,000 for the purpose of building into Montreal. I have stated before—and we must have this information before concurrence, and before this bridge Bill becomes law the information in reference to it—I have stated here, that I have information from nearly every railway throughout the country, and I make the bold statement now, that the books of the Intercolonial Railway are kept in such a manner that the Minister can bring down to this House the receipts and expenditure on every section of the road. That is done on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Done everywhere.

Mr. HAGGART. It is done on the Canadian Pacific Railway ; it is done on the Canada Atlantic Railway, and it is done on the Intercolonial Railway. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) was correcting and contradicting the statements that were made by the Montreal "Star," the leader of the Opposition told him that the accounts on the Intercolonial Railway were so prepared. Is it not more probable that the statement of the leader of the Opposition is correct, the statement of the Minister of Railways to the contrary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I must correct my hon. friend. What I said was that I could name officials in the department who could establish the fact that it was perfectly practicable to give such information as the House required. I may say that I had no information from any official, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) immediately turned around and intimated that he would very soon take off any official's head who gave such evidence.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the inference I drew from the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him so that I may set the hon. leader of the Opposition right. What the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did say was, that if the Government would give him a committee he could hold an investigation which would establish the fact that such information could be procured.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He invited me to give him a committee, but I thought that the result of the committees which the hon. gentleman was having lately had been so unfavourable to him, that it was not necessary to give him another one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What about the committee you promised to decapitate the officials?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said we would give him an investigating committee as to the officials who were furnishing false information.

Mr. HAGGART. The information which we now require was promised to Parliament and the country, and it was on the faith of our getting that information that the vote was got from this House and the Senate. Why did the hon. gentleman allow the Minister of Justice to promise in another Chamber, that if they voted the amount asked, there would be sufficient evidence produced in another year to show them whether they should continue the vote to the Drummond County Railway, or whether they should make arrangements with the other two companies. We ought to have that information now. The Minister (Mr. Blair) knows that the Drummond Railway was completed under a subsidy contract, and we have no information from the department as to whether that subsidy has been earned, the amount paid, or the report of an engineer upon it. We have not a report from the department as to what was the difference of expenditure between the subsidy contract and bringing it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. We are fighting this question to a great extent in the dark.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think you are, but that is not our fault.

Mr. TAYLOR. You promised the information.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister made a statement in this House that it was impracticable to furnish the information in reference to the receipts and expenditures of this line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So I say still.

Mr. HAGGART. Tell it to any railway man in this country, that the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway are kept so that the receipts and expenditures cannot be given on any independent section of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) must not mistake what I said. The hon. gentleman knows that what is desired by the other side of the House, if they desire anything in this connection, is that a statement should be furnished of what the proportionate earnings and expenditures on the Drummond County Railway was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As compared with the whole of the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is it exactly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) said.

Mr. HAGGART. That is exactly what I said.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. What has just dropped from the mouth of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is what I have stated, that upon the Intercolonial Railway there is no statement kept, no memo. or account of the receipts upon any section or the expenditure upon any section. That is not at all correct. I say we keep an account of every dollar of receipts that comes from every station on the Intercolonial Railway, and we know what amount of money we actually expend on each section and on each station of the Intercolonial Railway—not only on the 130 miles that compose the Drummond County road, but on every section of three miles; but we cannot tell what the proportionate receipts and expenditure on the Drummond County Railway have been, as compared with those on the whole line.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because it is utterly impossible to do it. I said in the committee the other day, and I will repeat it in the face of any railroad man whom the hon. gentleman will

produce, that you can only do that on estimate and conjecture largely : and I defy any hon. gentleman to get a responsible railway man to contradict my statement. If I come here with estimates, it is only another way of postponing the condemnation which these hon. gentlemen will pass. They will say, why did you not estimate a great deal more ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. How about the statement made in the Senate ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not responsible for what was said in the Senate.

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

After Recess.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before my hon. friend proceeds with his speech, I would like to have the attention of the House for one moment. The suggestion was made this afternoon that the House should adjourn from to-morrow evening till next Thursday. After considering it, we will agree to this. Therefore, to-morrow afternoon I will move that when the House adjourns to-morrow evening it shall stand adjourned until Thursday next, and then when it adjourns on the following Friday it shall stand adjourned until the following Saturday ; so that we shall sit on Saturday.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock I had about concluded my remarks in reference to the resolutions at present under consideration. I had intended to summarize them, but I may have an opportunity to do so at another stage of the Bill. In the further remarks I have to make to-night, I will simply amplify some of my observations in reference to this contract with the Drummond County Railway Company. I stated that there was an option of $500,000 given to Mr. Farwell of the Eastern Townships Bank, presented by Mr. Hugh Ryan. I forgot to mention that Mr. Greenshields in his evidence before the committee stated that there was a concurrent agreement in writing with Mr. Ryan. We asked him in whose possession that agreement was. He said it was in the possession of Mr. Farwell. Mr. Farwell, in his examination, stated that there was no agreement in writing, but that there was a verbal understanding with Mr. Hugh Ryan that certain other terms were to be entered into with the contractor and the Government under this option of $500,000. Mr. Hugh Ryan, in his evidence before the committee, said he never heard of any such thing, that the only condition attached to the offer was the payment of the $500,000 to the company. Certainly I never heard of the agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If my memory serves me, the line was to be built and completed.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Greenshields said that there was a concurrent agreement with Mr. Hugh Ryan, in which it was provided that the line should be completed and some other things besides the $500,000 were to be given.

Mr. MORRISON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? In what part of Mr. Ryan's evidence does he state that which the hon. member now says ?

Mr. HAGGART. On page 146 :

Q. What was the price they were to sell the road for ?—A. The price they talked about was this $500,000 ; but I had never seen the road, and never was over it.

Then, in speaking of the last agreement with the Grand Trunk, I pointed out that under it the connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway were not conveyed. That is a question for the legal gentlemen ; but I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is no connection conveyed to the Intercolonial Railway between the end of the bridge and the Canadian Pacific Railway, according to the most literal interpretation of the agreement. There is no conveyance of the main line to the Grand Trunk Railway from the end of Victoria bridge to this Government, and the whole document, if I am a judge of the matter, makes no conveyance at all of that right of connection between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

One of the principal reasons which the Minister gave for the purpose of showing that this was a far better agreement than the old one——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never said it was a far better agreement than the old one.

Mr. HAGGART. You will find by the evidence of Mr. Wainwright, before the committee, that one of the most strenuous objections of the Grand Trunk Railway was, that it was an important link in connection with their road, and they nearly split upon the conveyance to the Government of that connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought you were attributing a certain statement to me personally, but now, it appears, it was made by somebody else.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister said, before the committee, that the Government had not only made a satisfactory agreement,

but had made an arrangement for a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so; but the hon. gentleman said, that I stated it was a very much better agreement than the other. I never said that.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, it is not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whether it is or not, is another question; but you said, that I said so.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman was drawing the attention of the committee to the more advantageous arrangements he had made in a new agreement than in the old one, and that was one of them, and it is a much more advantageous arrangement than the old one, especially with regard to the terminals and the amount we had to pay for them, and thereby constitutes a sufficient justification for the action of the Senate in throwing out the old agreement.

The hon. Minister, just before recess, stated to this House that he was not responsible for the statement made by a Minister of the Crown in the Senate, in the introduction of the resolutions last session——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said it in this sense. It was stated that I had instructed, or authorized, the statement to be made by some gentleman in the Senate, which I entirely deny. But, of course, every member of the Government is responsible for what his colleagues may say on the matter.

Mr. HAGGART. I was not arguing in that direction, but I was stating that a Minister of the Crown had declared in the Senate, on his responsibility as a Minister, that we would be furnished with an account of the earnings of that branch of the Drummond Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway combined from Lévis to Montreal. Now, the hon. Minister said that it was impossible for him to furnish that statement. I here state boldly that he could do it on every section of the road with a little trouble. There is not a leased line along any railway in Canada or the United States on which the receipts and earnings are not kept separate; and the proposition for the leasing of this line from the Grand Trunk Railway was, that they were to pay a percentage of the total receipts of the road. How would it be possible for them to pay a percentage of the total receipts, unless an account were kept of the gross receipts? I was emphasizing this, when I said that the promise was made by the responsible leader of the Government in the Senate that such an account would be furnished to the country. Then the hon. gentleman replied: I am not responsible for any statement that was made in another House. That is a new idea of the duties of a Minister of the Crown, given expression to by a Minister of the Crown, that, when a Minister who represents the Government in the Senate, makes a statement in that body in order to induce them to confirm the bargain, the Minister in this House is not responsible for that statement. Let me say, that in the manner in which the accounts are kept at present on the Intercolonial, it is quite easy for the Government to give us the gross earnings and the gross expenditure and the net receipts upon that section. We were promised that, and what I complain of is, that the Government come down here with a set of resolutions, and give us no information.

The hon. gentleman did not say a single word about the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement. I would like to know, whether the Government intend to carry it out or not. I would like to know, whether it is their intention to complete the arrangement which they exhibited to this House last session and the session before, for the purpose of carrying the Intercolonial traffic over the Grand Trunk Railway into Montreal. Where am I to get that information? I look at the public accounts, I look at the Auditor General's Report, and I do not see the payment of one cent to the Grand Trunk Railway. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, as he was using that road, and paid a subsidy to the Drummond Railway Company for four months of the financial year ending July last, whether he has paid to the Grand Trunk Railway any portion of the subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the Minister be kind enough to answer me that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is engaged in private conversation on another subject altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you paid to the Grand Trunk Railway any portion of the subsidy promised them under the resolutions introduced last year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). You mean the subsidy on the bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. On the connection between Ste. Rosalie and the city of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You mean the rent? We paid all the rent.

Mr. HAGGART. Why does it not appear on the public accounts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot find it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has not looked.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no entry in the Auditor General's Report of any payment,

and I naturally drew the inference that perhaps the Government have changed their mind with reference to that. The hon. Minister, who dealt so clearly and explicitly with Intercolonial matters, never said a word about this important connection.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must have lost his hearing entirely.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be entirely mistaken; but I took a great deal of trouble to look for it, and could not find it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated, as emphatically and as distinctly as I could, that, up to the 1st July, 1898, the rentals, maintenance, and so on—our proportion of all these charges—had been paid in full. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of my department, he will see that the sum of $70,000 is added to the deficit, as shown in the ordinary running accounts, making the amount $209,000, in place of $139,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not included in the first account I saw in the hon. gentleman's report. I looked at the receipts and expenditures, and, after a great deal of trouble, I found in a back part of the volume that an amount was paid, not to the Grand Trunk Railway, as I understood it, but to the Drummond Railway Company. However, it does not appear in the public accounts or in the Auditor General's Report, and it looks, even from the hon. gentleman's own report, as if the payment of this amount was something subsequent. However, I may be entirely mistaken, and the hon. Minister may be entirely right, and I will look into the matter more carefully. I only draw his attention to the difficulty of discussing this subject without the proper information before the House. And, as I said before, I may have an opportunity, and I intend to have an opportunity, of summarizing my remarks of this evening and discussing this Bill in full, after I have heard the objections and criticisms to the remarks I have made.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). Mr. Chairman, I think it goes without saying that there is no division of opinion worth considering as to the soundness of the policy of extending the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal. That being so, the question before the House in connection with the Drummond County Railway resolves itself into a problem of business details. And, if it is found that these business details are unconnected with any wrongful business method, then, I think, all that can be said as to the question is that it is open to fair discussion and criticism. Beyond that, I think it is not permissible or honourable for hon. gentlemen opposite to go. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), upon assuming office, was confronted with a certain condition, which would be supposed to be an elementary condition in railway affairs, a condition which, I am safe in saying, could not continue to exist in the case of a private corporation, because as soon as it arose it would be grappled with. It goes without saying that the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway would be one of the very first matters pressed upon the Minister's urgent attention on taking office. He found that the great Intercolonial Railway system, costing somewhere from $40,000 to $50,000 a mile, or, on the whole, about $55,000,000, with one of its termini at a small town some 170 miles from the great commercial metroplis of the country, the city of Montreal; the converging point of every road of any consequence in this Dominion; the point to reach which such great systems as the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the New York Central, the Wabash, and numbers of others, have been regardless of expense; the point at which the Government have spent and are spending large sums of money to improve the trade facilities to meet the present exigencies as well as to be prepared for the great volume of trade which is bound to come to that very important point. I suppose there is not a gentleman in this House or in the country who for one moment considers this question of transportation through this country but would admit that Montreal is destined to be the point to which particularly the vast grain fields of the west will look for an outport in the east. The city of Montreal is the entrepot, I may say, of three continents—I may be modest enough to say—the Vancouver of the east; the point to which all avenues of trade of this continent, at any rate, converge and to which all are tributary; a point to reach which under the old regime the present Intercolonial Railway system was obliged to compete with a very strong rival, traversing this same distance of 170 miles. The Intercolonial Railway was entirely at the mercy of this rival and of several rivals under the old state of affairs. The hon. Minister, on taking office, also found the Intercolonial Railway encumbered with deficits as many as there had been years of its existence. It was badly and expensively managed, and, as I have said, at several points was completely at the mercy of other systems of railway. I am sure hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the conditions, as the hon. Minister found them, could not be worse. He determined that they should be remedied, and he has set about and remedied them; and I trust he has remedied them for all time. In setting about a solution of this problem, a problem simple in itself, no doubt, but one which gentlemen opposite shirked for the years during which they had an opportunity of doing something to improve the lamentable condition in which this railway had fallen. The Minister

of Railways and Canals has set gentlemen opposite to scolding and figuring. Those who could not or would not scold, started to figure, and those who could not or would not figure, started to scold. And, between these two characteristics, it is no marvel that they should come to such diverse and mixed-up conclusions as we have seen to-day and on previous occasions when this matter has been up for discussion. Those who attempted to figure in this matter have illustrated the old saying that while it is true that figures cannot lie, those who use them frequently do. A very few examples will suffice to illustrate that. By referring to the "Hansard" of 1897, when this matter was being discussed somewhat briefly, it will be seen that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) stated that the Drummond County people had received subsidies to the amount of $782,000. That he stated categorically. Almost immediately afterwards, or as soon as he could get occasion to express himself, the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), in the most positive way, affirmed that the amount of subsidies was $605,000. The ex-Minister of Finance further stated that the company had expended $720,000 on this piece of road. He does not state the date up to which that amount was spent, or whether upon the forty-two miles of road or upon the whole 132 miles, or whatever it is. The ex-Controller of Customs again comes out, and in a more conservative way, but with equal positiveness, states that the amount expended was $360,000. Then the "Mail and Empire," inspired doubtless by hon. gentlemen opposite, stated that the cost to the owners of this road—again they do not state the date or the extent of road—was only $749,000, and that the profit to the owners, in consequence of some dealings of this road, amounted to $714,356. But the minority report makes the profit $1,209,548. Now, taking all these deliberate statements, made by gentlemen who pretend to be men of repute, where do we find ourselves? Which is the true statement and which is not? For they cannot all be true. That is a sample of the result of some of the figuring of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this important matter; and I will give further illustrations as I proceed. Now, they start out, as I said, by scolding and figuring; and, as in the case of all gossipers, the older the gossiper, the more vile, misleading and unfounded the gossip. Scandal, of course, was evolved, and must be investigated. As hon. gentlemen opposite did not seem to be sufficiently matured to grapple with the question, they passed it on to the other House, and the hon. gentlemen of the Senate made a giddy pretense of dealing with the matter. I may say, without wishing at all to use the language of the street, that they made quite a bluff at an investigation; they dilly-dallied from day to day until this House and the Government got tired waiting, and the Government took hold and forced an investigation. However, these matters are historic. The Government proceeded with an investigation, a committee was appointed, the committee sat from day to day, and elicited all the available information. Evidence was taken even from such remote countries as Mexico, and everything that gentlemen opposite suggested should be produced in the shape of evidence, was produced, at the expense of the ratepayers of this country. Every opportunity was given to gentlemen opposite to come forward and produce any evidence which might be pertinent to the question at issue. In fact, the investigation could have been closed some days sooner than it was, had the majority of the committee elected by the Government chosen to close it. At one sitting, notwithstanding that the amplest notice was given of the sitting, not a single gentleman representing the Opposition appeared, and, at the request of Mr. Greenshields, one of the men who, above all others, is blackguarded and slandered in this connection, suggested a postponement of the investigation, and it was postponed in order to give the Opposition absolutely no ground to say that there was any disposition to stifle or curtail any evidence they had to adduce. The evidence adduced at that committee, evidence which has not been impeached and which cannot be impeached or controverted, is now before this House and the country. Every hon. gentleman in this House may have a copy of that evidence if he wishes, indeed, I am sure that every member of the House, on both sides, has a copy of it. It is not often, in discussing any question in this House, that we have before us so explicitly and clearly all the available and pertinent facts in relation to it. Hon. gentlemen cannot go behind these facts, they cannot escape from the conclusion to which the evidence points, and in producing which they had full swing.

Now, based upon that evidence two reports were made, a majority and a minority report. The majority report was based on the facts produced at that investigation; the minority report, I am sorry to say, was not based upon the facts or evidence produced at that investigation, and I think I will be able to satisfy the House that I am correct in saying so. Those are the two judgments delivered upon the evidence taken on that occasion; and I venture to say that among gentlemen, reading all that evidence, there can be only one opinion derived from it, and that is, that the arrangement made by the Government through the Minister of Railways and Canals, is not only the best arrangement that could be made at the time, but the very best possible arrangement that could be made at any time in the past up to the present date. To any one who gives the matter a moment's consideration, the question will occur: Why did gentlemen opposite allow the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway to exist in the shape in which they were

found when the present Government took the reins of power? To me, knowing, perhaps, as little about it as any gentleman in this House, it is utterly inexplicable that they should have allowed matters to drift as they did. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to explain, if they can, their conduct up to the year 1896. It is now too late for the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, or any gentleman opposite, to come here and criticise this arrangement and say what could have been done or what ought to have been done. The fact remains staring us in the face that nothing was done by the Conservative Government, notwithstanding that the ex-Minister, of all the Ministers in the Cabinet of that day, and whose duty it was to have the courage of his convictions and to have pressed them upon his colleagues, sat dumbly by, and though thoroughly convinced that the very best that could be done for the Intercolonial Railway was to extend it into the city of Montreal, he sat idly by and, on his own sworn statement, alleges that he did not even broach the matter to the Cabinet. They did not attempt in any practical way to remedy the state of affairs, they simply drifted. Now, I do not wish to reflect upon the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals by saying that he tried to do his best, because he was of the opinion that the proper thing to do was to extend that road into Montreal. He did not do his best by simply sitting idle and entertaining an opinion that that was the best thing to do; he did not do the best he could, and to that extent he is culpable. It does not lie in his mouth now to criticise the fair, business proposition made by the Minister of Railways and Canals to remedy the state of affairs which he admits should be remedied. He was not alone in the opinion on that side of the House, that the road should be extended to Montreal. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) was of the same opinion, and is of the same opinion still; the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) was of the same opinion, and is of the same opinion still. At the investigation, the hon. member for Compton gave evidence, and I will read a portion of it, as found on page 141 of the report:

> I was always favourable to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, and, my friends being interested in the Drummond County, and believing it to be as good an extension as could be got, I was always at the disposal of the Drummond County Railway people, in any way that I possessed any influence, to assist them in the disposal of that road.

For the purpose of extending the system into Montreal. That being so, the Minister of Railways and Canals cannot be blamed for entertaining the same opinion. Entertaining that opinion, he began to consider what was the best means of remedying the state of affairs then existing on the Intercolonial Railway, and how best to carry into effect the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. In order to reach Montreal, then, it was agreed, both by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, that one of three routes was available, namely, the Drummond County Railway, which had a mileage of 157·37, the Grand Trunk Railway, which had a mileage of 173·73, and the South Shore, with a mileage of 159·39.

Now, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals referred to the South Shore Railway in such a manner as to lead a person taking a superficial view of the three routes to believe that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should have in preference to the Drummond County Railway selected the South Shore, but we find in the sworn statement what it cost per mile to build railways, and the cost of the South Shore, if built by the Government, or anybody else, would have been $23,000 per mile, whereas the Drummond County Railway would have cost some $16,000 a mile to build, and, I may say, parenthetically, that the Government have succeeded in acquiring that road for $12,000 a mile. It goes without saying that we must be confined to these three possible, available, practicable routes. The question of the Government building into Montreal, I think, need not be considered for a moment. We need only recall the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite in building railways to come to a conclusion, that it will be impossible to controvert the position that the Government could not have seriously entertained the proposition of building. Therefore, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals saw these conditions existing, these cardinal conditions. I may call them, and these same conditions, perhaps to a greater extent, existed during the incumbency in office of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. I think it would be a matter of considerable interest to the House, because it was a matter of considerable interest to myself, as well as a matter of curiosity, to notice how the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals approached this question, and how the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals approached it. To show you the absolute difference of methods of these two hon. gentlemen, in transacting the business of the country, I will begin by reading extracts from the evidence of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He gave his evidence at that investigation. He felt it incumbent upon himself, at the last stage of the investigation to come forward and put himself under oath and testify, one of the most solemn positions in which any human being can place himself. He was questioned as to the negotiations in regard to the acquirement of this extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, and this is what he says. I would like hon. gentlemen to carefully note the method in which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals gives his testimony and the way in which he swears to what he did, or attempted to do, or what he did not do on this occasion:

In reference to this matter, the first that I remember about it is a conversation that, I think,——

I think——

——I had with Mr. Ives in 1894.

He is not positive about that, but he thinks he had a conversation, in 1894, with Mr. Ives:

The result of a little conversation we had between ourselves in reference to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal.

It was simply a little conversation between these gentlemen about this important question out of which hon. gentlemen are now attempting to make so much capital. This is a question which, in 1899, has grown to such tremendous proportions, such vast magnitude, which was made the subject of a little conversation between the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and Mr. Ives.

He was a colleague of mine. I entertained favourably at that time an opinion of the extension of the road, for a good many reasons.

He entertained an opinion for a good many reasons. I may anticipate and say that he did not give these reasons and, doubtless, he had reasons for not doing so.

We had trouble making connections with the Grand Trunk Railway, we had a great deal of trouble with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I thought that it was in the interest of the country that the road should be extended to Montreal.

Why, in heaven's name, he did not extend that road into Montreal, or do something whereby that road could be extended, when he swears that he was of the opinion that it was in the interest of the country that the road should be extended to Montreal, is something that it is impossible to understand.

That was my personal idea at that time. Mr. Ives proposed to me, then, the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. Ives could not have been moved by anything of private motives in suggesting to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that the proper thing to do would be to extend the road into Montreal. He turned a deaf ear to that.

He told me—or at least I do not know if he told me——

I just want hon. members to note the style of the evidence and the manner of giving the evidence which, if attempted before any judge of any Superior Court in this country would result in the witness's expulsion from the witness stand immediately. There is not a judge from one end of the country to the other but would have asked that witness to step down if he had given his evidence in the way in which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals gave his evidence in this case:

He told me—or at least I do not know if he told me—I made inquiries about it.

He does not say from whom he made his inquiries.

And I found that the railway could be very cheaply obtained.

If he was of the opinion that it was in the best interest of the country that the road should be extended to Montreal, as he swears, and if the road could be obtained cheaply, why did he not obtain it cheaply and conserve the interests of the people whose interests he was sworn to protect?

If I remember rightly, the principal indebtedness of the railway at that time was, as I understood it, in the neighbourhood of $170,000, to the Eastern Townships Bank. They had floating liabilities of from $25,000 to $30,000 more. I heard they were anxious to realize, and for a sum, I do not know how much above that, that the railway might be obtained.

At a certain stage he does swear the amount he was offered the road for. He stated today, and I venture to say that there is not an hon. gentleman, on either side of the House, but who would go out of this room and say truthfully and honestly that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals stated that he could have obtained that road for $500,000, yet, he swears that he does not know for what amount he could have obtained it.

Mr. HAGGART. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to misrepresent my evidence.

Mr. MORRISON. I am giving it as it occurred.

Mr. HAGGART. The explanation is entirely different from what the hon. gentleman is giving. This conversation I had with Mr. Ives was prior to the option I got, and that is what I referred to in my evidence.

Mr. MORRISON. But this has no reference to the conversation with Mr. Ives at all.

Mr. HAGGART. It was at that time.

Mr. MORRISON. It is disassociated from the evidence, and in any event it is needless for me to make any further remarks, because the evidence speaks for itself. Does the hon. gentleman deny that he said, more than once, that he might have obtained the railway for $500,000? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to deny that? The words have hardly stopped resounding in this Chamber that this railway could have been obtained for $500,000.

How to get in from the terminus of the railway to Montreal was another matter for consideration. I went down, and I think I saw the then president of the Grand Trunk Railway. I had a conversation with him upon the subject, and although he could not speak authoritatively without consulting his board, I understood from him that there would be no difficulty in making an arrangement to get into Montreal, and for the user of the terminal facilities there on the same terms as he allowed other railways, or on a mileage basis.

The hon. Minister of Railways of to-day not only got these facilities on the same terms as are allowed other railways, but on better terms than are allowed other railways. I will show that to the committee:

There was not much further to be done in the matter, though Mr. Ryan and I had a conversation on the subject. In conversation with Mr. Ryan, he stated to me he had spoken to Mr. Farwell upon the subject, and asked me if I was ready to consider a proposition from him.

I draw the attention of the committee to the statement that follows:—

I told him that I would have nothing to do with it, and advised him to have nothing to do with it.

Notwithstanding that he swore that, in the interest of the country and the interests of the people, the thing should be done, and that he could get it cheap. The ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) continued:

I may state that I never submitted a proposition to Council—any proposition to Council—but I had a conversation with the Premier,——

Whether it was out on a fishing excursion, or whether it was on the street, or whether in the House, or whether in Council, he does not say.

——I had a conversation with the Premier, I think it was Sir John Thompson, in reference to the matter.

He does not even know who was Premier at the time: whether it was Sir John Thompson, or Sir John Abbott, or Sir Mackenzie Bowell, or Sir Charles Tupper.

I had a conversation with the Premier, I think it was Sir John Thompson, and I think with the Finance Minister (Mr. Foster),——

He thinks; he is not sure of that.

——but the matter never took any form, and never was considered in Council.

I say, in all earnestness, that the people of this country had the right to ask the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), why he did not mention it in Council, why he did not consider the proposition that was made to him, why he did not deal with it, and satisfy himself that he could not make a bargain? He continues:

If I remember rightly, Mr. Ryan spoke to me something in the direction of which he stated to-day, something about his finishing the road, or making some arrangements with them for finishing the road.

A few moments ago, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) stated that he said nothing about finishing the road, but I will refer to Mr. Ryan's evidence later on. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) continued:

I never heard of any proposition for a higher price to be charged for the road than the one named in the option of $500,000, and from information which I had at the time, correctly or not, I understood that other parties had options for the road for a less amount.

I want the House to remember distinctly what he states here: That he had never heard of any proposition for a higher price for the road than $500,000. I ask, if any other interpretation can be put on these words, than that the Minister of Railways had the option of buying this road, with all that it means, for $500,000. He continued:

I understood that they had been negotiating for the sale of the road both to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

That statement is an absolute contradiction of himself. He was not cross-examined to any great extent. It was not a question of being on the stand two or three days, and on the last day being cross-examined as to something he said on the first day, without having an opportunity of having his memory refreshed as to what he did say; it could not be more than five minutes after he swore that he had an opportunity of buying this road for $500,000, that he swears to the following:—

Q. Do you undertake to swear that he gave you to understand the road could be bought for $500,000?—A. Oh, I do not think so.

And then the hon. gentleman further mixes himself and winds himself up, for he goes on to say:

Q. And you knew they were willing to sell out for $500,000?

This is a question put by Mr. Powell, one of his own committee men. Mr. Powell puts this question to him, evidently trying to cover over the slip of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), that he had an opportunity of buying it, and then saying he did not have that opportunity. Mr. Powell comes back, and says:

Q. And you knew they were willing to sell out for $500,000?—A. Yes, and I said that I knew they had given other options for less, for $100,000 less, and were negotiating with the Grand Trunk Railway and other companies, and I would have nothing more to do with them.

That is categorically denied by the gentleman who would have made the offer, and who knew all about it. I refer to the evidence of Mr. Farwell. Mr. Farwell is the gentleman in reference to whom Mr. Pope, the hon. member for Compton, stated on oath, that he would believe Mr. Farwell on oath, and he would believe anything Mr. Farwell said on oath to be absolutely true. Mr. Farwell gave his evidence with respect to this $400,000, and it was not impeached in any particular. He desposed as follows:—

Q. There were no other options given in connection with this road?—A. I might have had another, but it was simply to me.

Q. I suppose for a similar amount to this?—A. I do not remember; I was under the impression that this was for $400,000, but it is put here at $500,000.

Q. What did you think the other option would be for?—A. The other option would be for $400,000; but I do not know that this is an exact copy. It was not less than $400,000

And again, at the bottom of the page:

Q. It was for the same purpose—to sell to the Government?—A. Yes; we never offered to sell to anybody for any less than that.

Q. That was for $400,000?—A. For $100,000 rental, or two and a half millions, until this last lease came up.

Q. Was there ever any authority given to anybody to sell for $400,000?—A. Never.

Q. You would not have taken it, I presume?—A. Never.

That is the evidence of Mr. Farwell on oath. I would ask any dispassionate person listening to the evidence of these two people, listening to the evidence of the Minister of Railways, where he contradicts himself, and listening to the evidence of Mr. Farwell—I would ask, would any sensible person hesitate as to which of these two gentlemen he would think was correct? No person with reason would for a moment hesitate to believe Mr. Farwell, who states there is no option for $400,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not read all the evidence of Mr. Farwell on that point?

Mr. MORRISON. I did.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Farwell swore this:

Q. What do you think the other option would be for?—A. The other option would be for $400,000; but I do not know if this is an exact copy. It was not less than $400,000.

Mr. MORRISON. I have just read that. I need not refer to Mr. Farwell at all. It makes no difference what Mr. Farwell said or what he did not say. What I am concerned about is, what the Minister of Railways said, and what he has sworn to, and how he has contradicted himself. And, taking the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), and comparing it with the statements of other gentlemen that were not contradicted, I want the House to be in a position to judge as to which of these two gentlemen it should believe, because either one or the other must be stating that which is not a fact. Take the evidence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), when he approached this question of the extension of the railway to Montreal. The Hon. Andrew G. Blair appeared also before the committee, and this is what he swore:

Shortly after the session of Parliament in 1896—that is the first session of the new Parliament—I began to turn my attention to the subject of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. I may say that I did this of my own motion. I was not invited to do so, nor was it suggested to me by any gentleman connected with or interested in any way with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Drummond County Railway.

This is Mr. Blair's sworn statement, and, as I know hon. gentlemen wish to be fair, I would like them, when they attribute, and slanderously attribute, motives to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) on ex parte statements not on oath—I wish that they should remember this sworn statement. And I wish them to remember the opportunity they had of cross-examining the Minister (Mr. Blair) on his sworn statement, and of impeaching that evidence, and bringing evidence in rebuttal. Neither of these they did. Mr. Blair continues in his evidence:

I thought it would be in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, if it could secure a terminal at Montreal.

In that respect, he quite agrees with the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart).

My first purpose, rather my first object, in the matter, was to ascertain how such a policy would commend itself to my colleagues, and I found that they were well disposed towards it, providing that arrangements could be made on satisfactory terms.

Compare that with the attitude of the ex-Minister of Railways, who never broached or attempted to broach the subject to his colleagues.

Without being at all able to speak positively as to the dates between the time that Parliament closed and the middle or latter part of November, I put myself in communication with Mr. Wainwright, of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

A proper thing to do—

I told Mr. Wainwright what was passing in my mind, that if we could make satisfactory arrangements it would be to our advantage to get into Montreal, and I asked him whether he was in a position to say that the Grand Trunk would be open to negotiations on the subject. He told me he thought they would, but that he would confer with the general manager and let me know later, which he did. Later on, he told me that Mr. Hays, the general manager of the Grand Trunk, would be open to a discussion of the subject, and, if my memory serves me, that was about all the progress made before I left for the Pacific coast, about the middle of last November. I did not return until the first week of January, and on my return I resumed my interviews with Mr. Wainwright. Up to this date I did not—I think up to this date—at all events until after I had been some little time in communication with Mr. Wainwright and the Grand Trunk Railway Company—I did not know who was interested in the Drummond County Railway.

I want hon. gentlemen to remember that also, when considering the unworthy insinuations of hon. gentlemen opposite, that Mr. Greenshields and the Drummond County people had initiated these negotiations with the Government and the Minister of Railways. Then. Mr. Powell asked:

Q. That was in January, 1897?—A. Yes; when I returned from the Pacific coast. I am not positive, I might have known it before I went away, as to who were the owners of the Drummond County Railway. I did not know it before I had spoken to Mr. Wainwright. I am quite sure about that, and I think it was on my suggestion that Mr. Wainwright spoke to the Drummond County people, and I early learned for the first time that Mr. Greenshields was largely interested in that company and road. Nothing of a very definite character transpired until after I returned from the Pacific coast.

Then the Minister proceeds to show the way in which he started to take into consideration the various propositions and problems which he had to face. There is a part of the evidence which it is not quite necessary to read in this connection. I will go on from the middle of page 9:

In considering this question of the extension to Montreal, I looked with some carefulness into the whole question of possible routes. There were these three routes already spoken of in Parliament and the newpaper press. First, there was the route over the present Grand Trunk Railway, and instead of deflecting from the Grand Trunk at Ste. Rosalie it was open to us, if we chose, to arrange with the Grand Trunk to continue to Richmond on the main Portland line, and further take their Chaudière branch or line, or whatever you would call it. That line is longer, as I think I could show you, and as I think I ascertained, some miles longer than the Drummond County Railway, and it had not the same desirable grades. They were more frequent and heavier, and on the whole the line would not be as desirable a line as the Drummond County Railway.

That evidence is corroborated by railway experts and engineers, whose evidence I will read later on—

Moreover, I remember saying to Mr. Wainwright: "Mr. Wainwright, supposing we concluded to consider this, what would your people want for your line?" "Well," he said, "we talked about two and a half millions—between two and two and a half millions—for that piece of line from Richmond to Chaudière." Then we would have had to lease or acquire rights from the Grand Trunk from Richmond to Ste. Rosalie. We could not have acquired that part of the road, for that is part of their trunk line. This is in the neighbourhood of 35—perhaps a little over 38—miles, and we would have had to pay them rental on that and then to acquire from them about 60—a little over 60—miles, and, I think, from Richmond to Chaudière. That phase of the question did not strike me very favourably, I confess, and I turned my attention to the subject of the South Shore Railway.

Now, throughout the whole course of the evidence of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), he did not condescend to let us know, and, even when he gave us the opportunity of knowing, he did not show that he went to that extent into the consideration of the matter:

That line had been built to Sorel, and there remained considerable mileage yet to be constructed, and from all the information I could get it would be longer, and moreover a much more expensive line. The line would necessarily cost for bridging a very much larger sum than the Drummond County Railway.

Nobody denied that, and it has not been denied yet—

On the whole, it appeared to me, if we could arrange upon suitable terms to acquire the Drummond County Railway, that that was the best route of the three, and I communicated my tentative view on this subject to Mr. Wainwright. I think it was Mr. Wainwright, the first time I met Mr. Greenshields, who brought Mr. Greenshields to me. In the meanwhile, the Grand Trunk were preparing a memo. of the terms upon which they would let us have the use of their bridge and of their terminals. I received this memorandum either in the latter part of February or March.

At page 58, Mr. Powell examines Mr. Wainwright on this point:

Another matter I do not understand quite, Mr. Wainwright, is about the 15 miles extension to enable the Intercolonial to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. We gave them the right to run from Montreal, although it is a piece of railway and not a siding. The department made such a point of making such a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway that, although it was a disputed point, I admitted it, and Mr. Hays gave way upon it, that they should have the right. It gave them about 15 miles of railway.

Then Mr. Wainwright goes on to show that this was quite an important concession for them to make in the premises. Now, at no stage did the ex-Minister of Railways, at the time he had the opportunity of negotiating, approach the matter in the business-like way in which the present Minister of Railways did. I have read this simply by way of parallel to show you the business-like way in which the present Minister of Railways approached the matter, and the very slovenly, unbusiness-like way in which the ex-Minister of Railways dealt with it. Both gentlemen considered these different routes. The present Minister elicited all the information he could as a basis on which to proceed. The ex-Minister of Railways did not seem to bother his head about it, but let it go, apparently thinking that the thing might adjust itself hap-hazardly, that somebody might die, or that the Government would go out of power, and the responsibility would be shifted upon the shoulders of some one else, which, fortunately for the country, has been the case.

In order to decide whether this is a reasonable business transaction on the part of the Government, certain tests must be applied, as in ordinary business transactions, such as comparing it with similar transactions at other times and under similar circumstances. Fortunately, we are not without abundance of similar conditions under the old régime; and I am not going to make any statement, if I can help it, that is not based on sworn testimony. To give an illustration, I will refer to the evidence of Mr. Wainwright. The Drummond County Railway, which it was determined to use in extending the Intercolonial to Montreal, was organized in 1886, and was constructed under the eye of the Grand Trunk Railway. Mr. Wainwright, at page 50, says:

Had you a favourable opinion of the road and the possibilities of traffic?

It is hardly necessary, I suppose, for me to tell the House and country who Mr. Wainwright is. He is the assistant superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway—a gentleman who has been in the country some 40 years, connected with that railway, and

known to the people of Canada for that period of time as a man whose integrity and experience nobody will gainsay.

A. Yes, sir, Mr. Church originally undertook the construction of the road in full touch with the G. T. R. Co., and the idea at that time was entertained by the late Sir Joseph Hickson that the Grand Trunk Railway would acquire it. We expected we should be able to secure quite a good traffic off the line, and that was our reason for desiring to retain possession of it.

Now, the Grand Trunk Railway people are not running its railway system for the benefit of their health, but to make dividends, and to cater at the same time to the public by giving it an efficient service, and they had this Drummond line built under its own supervision.

Q. Have you any reason, from your recent experience and knowledge of the business upon that road, to alter your opinion in that regard? —A No.

Q. Will you kindly state what your view would be with regard to the relative merits now of that road with others that have been spoken of as through lines for the Intercolonial in reaching Montreal?—A. Well, as regards the connection of the Intercolonial with Montreal, the Drummond County Railway, as far as I know from the engineers' reports, is the shortest line and the easiest line to St. Lambert that could be acquired. The distances have already been given, I think, in your evidence, Mr. Blair, and these figures are correct according to my report.

Q. How about the grades?—A. Of course, the Grand Trunk Railway has some longer and has some heavier grades. The South Shore road is a little longer, according to the engineer's reports, and would have a good deal of heavy bridging; therefore, would be very costly and, under the circumstances, I presume, that the Drummond County is about the easiest method of extending the road to Montreal.

Q. The rate at which we acquired it is the cheapest, is it not?—A. I should think so. I think the price agreed upon represents, as far as I remember, about $12,000 a mile, which is certainly a very low price for the railway.

Presently I will read sworn testimony to show that this extension to Montreal did cost all the way from $14,000 to $19,000 per mile. And to show that it is the easiest and best route into Montreal, we are not confined to the testimony of Mr. Wainwright, for we find that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), who sits on the other side of the House, in giving his evidence, as reported on page 141 of the report, corroborates that opinion.

Q. You went over the road for the purpose of satisfying yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your judgment as to the character of the road?—A. I think it is a good road.

Q. What do you say as to probable traffic?—A. It has a fair local traffic. It all depends upon the arrangements made by the Government as to the through traffic.

Now, while this line may have a very good local traffic, I go so far as to say that even if it had not, its acquisition was desirable, not on account of its local traffic, but as a link of the Intercolonial, connecting it with our great transcontinental road to the Pacific, and that was the point of view urged for its acquisition.

As to the cost of the road, I would draw your attention to the evidence on page 43, of Mr. Newton, whose evidence is not controverted, and who is a man who knew whereof he was speaking.

Q. Give us the amount this firm passed to you as the amount of construction at that time?—A. The amount paid out to date for building the line and received from the foregoing, as per construction-book, on June 30th, 1890, was $729,-314.52.

And later on, he swore that the whole outlay up to 1898 of this company on the line was somewhere about $2,000,000, in round numbers.

Now, as to the cost, I might go into details and refer you to page 89 of the sworn testimony, as against which the bald statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), or any other hon. gentleman on that side cannot stand for a moment. We find, by the evidence of Mr. Newton, that up to the 28th of February, 1898, the road cost $1,908,271.33, made up as follows: There was expended up to the end of June, 1894, $1,163,970; to the end of June, 1895, that rose to $1,255,076; to the end of June, 1896, the expenditure was $1,366,485; to the end of June, 1897, it amounted to $1,527,-437, and in February, 1898, it reached the sum of $1,908,271. Yet that is the road which hon. gentlemen opposite state categorically, but which, none of them, with the exception of the ex-Minister of Railways, dare to state under oath, could have been obtained by them for $500,000. The effrontery and colossal absurdity of such a statement cannot fail to strike us at once. What further proof is necessary? How can these hon. gentlemen for one moment go back on the sworn testimony which they had every opportunity of controverting and did not. Take the evidence of Mr. McLeod, as to the value of the road, to be found on page 111. Mr. McLeod is a gentleman of integrity and experience, whose evidence was not impeached in any respect or attempted to be impeached. Let me draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to what he said:

Q. Your valuation of the road, when completed under contract with the Government, what do you estimate its value per mile?—A. It ought to be more than $15,000 for the portion from Moose Park.

Q. How much was it worth from Moose Park to the Chaudière per mile?—A. It would cost about $16,000 to $17,000 per mile.

This is the estimated cost of that road which hon. gentlemen opposite say could have been purchased for $500,000.

Q. That is the new part?—A. Yes. The new part, from Moose Park to Chaudière.

Q. Then the value of the rest of the road from Moose Park to Ste. Rosalie, I think, you said was $15,000 a mile; do you still adhere to that?—A. With the improvements, it would probably cost about $16,000 a mile.

Q. And the other about $17,000 a mile?—A. Yes.

Q. And the total can be figured upon that ?—A. Yes.

Q. It is only a few minutes ago that you made an estimate of what you put the value of the road at ?—A. That was without these additions that I propose to make.

Q. Read them over again.—A. $17,000 a mile was the estimate I first gave.

Q. Divide it into two sections; now, from Moose Park to Chaudière, how much was that ?

Here Mr. Blair interjected : "He told you in addition that for masonry you ought to add $1,000 a mile more."

Q. How much was it from Moose Park to Chaudière ?—A. I think it was $17,000 a mile.

Q. And how much from Ste. Rosalie to Moose Park ?—A. $15,000 a mile.

Q. Then from Moose Park to Ste. Rosalie would be $16,000 a mile ?

Mr. Blair here interjected : "More than that, because there is $100,000 to be spent on the 72 miles."

Q. From Moose Park to Ste. Rosalie is the old part ?—A. Yes.

Q. When completed, what will, in your judgment, be the cost—worth per mile or the cost per mile ?—A. According to the estimtae I have made of $65,000 being expended upon it, that will bring it up to about $16,000 a mile.

Q. Then, from Moose Park, these 42 miles to Chaudière, you say are equal to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway ?—A. With these additions.

Q. What will that be worth ?—A. About $17,000 per mile.

Q. If you were asked to state whether the price of $12,000 a mile, which the Government agreed to pay, is a reasonable price or not, what would you say ?—A. I would say it was a very reasonable price.

Q. What would you say if the Government needed the road that it was a good purchase at that figure ?—A. I should say so.

Q. Could any reasonable exception be taken by any reasonable man to the purchase price ?—A. No.

That is the evidence of Mr. McLeod. Then, we will take the evidence of Mr. Wainwright at page 148. And I would like hon. members to place it alongside of the bald statestatement, the irresponsible statement, of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals :

The point upon which I wish to ask you is this, generally, whether the arrangements were more or less favourable to the Intercolonial Railway ?

That is the present extension into Montreal.

A. The present arrangement is more favourable.

Q. Much more so ?—A. Yes, a good deal more so.

And the evidence also at page 50, which I have already read, that the Drummond County Railway was the best and easiest method of reaching Montreal. We have also the evidence of Mr. Greenshields on the same point. I am reading these quotations at the risk of wearying the House, but the question is a very important one. And, speaking for myself, I feel a great responsibility in rising in my place and contradicting categorically the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals before this House and before this country. I feel it a tremendous responsibility to stand up and, putting my sentiments in as mild terms as I can, contradicting him—with all that that may mean—in his statements made seriously and with the object and motive no doubt, of having the people believe that he is a man of truth. I say, at the risk of wearying the House, I shall read a few extracts showing that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals absolutely misled this House, or tried to mislead this House, in the statements he made this afternoon. The evidence of Mr. Greenshields at page 32 :

Was that agreement in writing ?

This has reference to the option.

A. Yes, this agreement was in writing with Mr. Farwell. Mr. Farwell has copies on the lines which I have just indicated. In other words, if the arrangements had been carried through on the basis of $500,000, and on the provisions I have said, the shareholders of the Drummond County Railway would have received infinitely more for the road than they now propose to receive under the present arrangement with this Government.

That is, this proposition which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has distorted and misrepresented, Mr. Greenshields swears —and he has not been contradicted—was infinitely more advantageous to the Government than the other would have been. How can the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals reconcile his statements with the sworn statement of Mr. Greenshields. And again, at page 37 :

Q. Now, do I understand you to say, Mr. Greenshields, that the result, if the negotiations had closed with the Government, would have been financially a better one for the Drummond County Railway than the arrangements you have made with the Government to-day ?—A. Undoubtely it would have been.

And again, Mr. Farwell, at page 135, as I before stated. Now, this was the state of affairs presenting itself to the Minister of Railways and Canals. He also had the experience of dealing with other roads almost under similar circumstances. We turn to page 48, Mr. Wainwright's evidence. I will not make the statement myself, but I will read Mr. Wainwright's statement on that point. As to three different instances which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals had before him and which the Minister of Railways and Canals also had before him, in deciding as to whether these propositions of the Drummond County acquisition was the best available or not.

Q. What would you say the Drummond County Railway was worth per mile as it stands to-day ?

And Mr. Wainwright answered that question in this fashion :

A. Well, I can answer that question with regard to the construction of roads in the province of Quebec, by giving you the figures of what we have expended in the construction of lines. To-

give an opinion on the Drummond County Railway, I should require to make some examination of it, and know something about the details. I might say to you that there are three railways in Quebec constructed under my own supervision, namely, the Beauharnois Junction Railway, which was built in accordance with a subsidy contract, with a light rail of 56 lbs., running from the county of Beauharnois, cost the Grand Trunk Railway about $17,000 a mile; the Champlain Junction Railway, with a 65-lb. rail, and built in the same manner, cost the company between $18,000 and $19,000 per mile; the Jacques Cartier Railway, which connects the Grand Trunk Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway in Jacques Cartier, with a 56-lb. rail only, cost the Grand Trunk $19,000 a mile—a little over. I have been over the Drummond County Railway, and will say this much, that the 43 miles recently built is, in my opinion, far superior in construction to the construction of any of these roads I have named. The other portion of it, of course, is not so good, because it carries a lighter rail; therefore, it is not so expensively constructed.

There were these three samples of roads ranging from $17,000 up to $19,000 a mile. Do not forget, however, that the Minister of Railways and Canals has acquired this road at the rate of $12,000 a mile. Institute a comparison for a moment. But there is more than that. At page 54 Mr. Wainwright gives the instance of the Rivière du Loup extension:

Q. You were saying about the value of railways at the present time, as compared with years ago, do you carry in your mind the value that was agreed upon between the Government and your company for a bare road-bed between Rivière du Loup and Lévis, without rail, without ties, and without the usual equipments?—A. Do I understand that you refer to the purchase of the Rivière du Loup line?

Q. I suppose that would be involved in it. Do you recollect the price paid at that time?—A. Do you mean the amount that was paid?

Q. Yes, if you like.—A. It would be a million and a half dollars.

Q. How many miles was that?—A. Mr. Schreiber will know the distance; I think it was 126—about 126 miles.

Q. That was bought by the Government from the Grand Trunk in what year?—A. In the year 1879, I think.

Q. That was simply the road-bed in the shape it was then in, without rails, sleepers or any equipment?—A. Yes.

Q. How much was paid?—A. $1,500,000, I think was the price paid. The agreement shows.

Then, there was the Lévis to Richmond line, referred to at page 55:

Q. You spoke of a portion of your line from Lévis to Richmond—you estimated that portion at what price?—A. About $2,000,000; between $2,000,000 and $2,500,000.

Q. That is about 80 miles, is it not?—A. More than that; nearly 90. We figured it out at $20,000 or $25,000 a mile.

So, the Minister of Railways and Canals had those examples before him, when he was trying to determine whether the acquisition of this Drummond County Railway at $12,000 a mile was a reasonable business proposition. I ask, if any hon. gentleman on either side of the House will undertake to say, that the acquirement of this road at $12,000 a mile, in view of the sworn testimony as to the price of these other roads, was not a perfectly reasonable and sound business transaction. No man who has any respect for his opinion can undertake to deny it. I say, that any reasonable business man would be quite satisfied with that evidence, and would consider that information sufficient to justify him in proceeding to close the bargain at once.

But the Minister of Railways and Canals had some further matters to look into, some further circumstances to consider. For instance, there was the question of the earning capacity of the road. Now, from the little I know of this business, I am of the opinion that the present, or past, or possible local earning capacity of that link is of no consequence in considering the question of getting the system extended into Montreal. The value of that piece of road, in my opinion, except as a link in a system, would not be so great. However, the Minister of Railways and Canals was a little more particular, and he inquired into the earning capacity of the road, as it then existed; and he found that, for the last two or three years, and up to the time that he undertook negotiations, the net earnings of that road ran from $30,000 to $35,000, which earnings by the way, were applied to improvements of the road. Therefore, any road with a net earning capacity of $30,000 to $35,000, operating under the great difficulties which that road must have been operated under, is no mean piece of road. Certainly, I would say it is not a road that could be acquired for $500,000. A moment's reflection will convince any gentleman that a road earning $30,000 or $35,000 should certainly be worth more than $500,000. However, after ascertaining the cost of the road and its earning capacity, the Minister of Railways and Canals then set about ascertaining what concessions he could get from both these concerns, particularly the Grand Trunk Railway, because the Grand Trunk Railway must be considered in connection with the discussion of this proposition. The first matter that he turned his attention to was, what concessions he could obtain from the Grand Trunk Railway in respect to its main line and the traffic over the Victoria bridge, also as to terminal facilities. Now, the terms which he obtained over the main line and over the Victoria bridge are set out clearly on pages 10 to 14 of the sworn testimony; and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, to take time and read the evidence there given, in view of the statements he made here this afternoon. There you will find the estimates of the Grand Trunk Railway people and of Mr. Schreiber, the Deputy Minister of Railways, as to what would be a fair rental for the use of the Victoria bridge. The Grand Trunk Railway people estimated the value of the use of ter-

minals at Point St. Charles, Bonaventure, and use of railways, at $62,500; and Mr. Schreiber estimated them at $61,960. Mr. Schreiber's estimate tallied very closely with the figures of the Grand Trunk Railway people, as you will observe. Then, on pages 12, 13 and 14, will be found, from the evidence of the Minister of Railways and Canals, the result of the negotiations that he had in regard to terminal facilities and the land alone. On page 49, we find Mr. Wainwright's evidence. Now, Mr. Wainwright is the man of all others whose evidence on this point must be considered, and to which absolute credence must be given. What does he say with regard to terminal facilities?

Q. What rights have the Intercolonial Railway in the terminals of Montreal?—A. They have rights in common with the Grand Trunk Railway. I thought this matter might come up, and to show the extent of our terminals, I have here plans showing all the terminals west of the bridge to Jacques Cartier Junction.

Now, I would like hon. gentlemen to listen carefully to what Mr. Wainwright swears regarding the value of these terminals:

Q. What are the value of these terminals?—A. Mr. Chairman, they are invaluable; I do not think you can give them a money value. We have in Point St. Charles about 150 acres of land which to-day I do not think could be bought; well, I cannot give you any figures. We consider our terminals in Montreal worth many million dollars; but it is very difficult to name a cash value. Point St. Charles is now a very thickly populated district, and here the shops and freight sheds are situated, and are invaluable.

Q. And you say that the Intercolonial Railway has a right to use these in common with the Grand Trunk Railway?—A. Yes.

Q. Freight sheds, round houses, tracks, and so forth?—A. Yes, all the sidings; also the right to run to Jacques Cartier Junction to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was a point we did not like to give, but it was demanded by the Minister, and means running over 15 miles of railway to reach that point, and represents nothing to us but a proportionate payment, and it means in addition to these sidings 15 miles of railway. That is all shown on the plan.

Then, Mr. Wainwright says, with regard to the local traffic:

Q. And was there not another point that we came nearly dropping the whole business upon, and that was in regard to our right of ownership of such traffic as we would have on the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Ste. Rosalie?

Gentlemen who know anything about the old arrangement between the Intercolonial Railway and the companies, know that the Intercolonial Railway was completely under the thumb of the Grand Trunk Railway in regard to its local traffic. This is Mr. Wainwright's answer:

Yes. It would have come to an end if I had had to deal with it.

Mr. Wainwright says, that the Minister of Railways and Canals forced him and drove a hard bargain. He would not have granted the concession, but would have ended the discussion then and there. He goes on to say:

We divided once or twice on that question. We have made a great many trackage arrangements—this between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Government is not the only one—but it is not usual when a railway grants another running powers over its line, either in England or in this country, to allow it to pick up local traffic. We have trackage arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway between Hamilton and Toronto and to North Bay, and with the Canada Atlantic Railway between Lacolle and Rouse's Point, but they get no local traffic. The Minister insisted upon it, and it was a considerable time before our general manager would allow it, and he gave way on that point, which he has not done in any other case. They have the right now to secure local traffic between Montreal and St. Hyacinthe.

Now, these hon. gentlemen opposite give no credit to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals for wrenching that concession from the Grand Trunk people, and it is no small concession. Then at page 147, we read the evidence of Mr. Wainwright again:

Q. What are the several roads that enjoy terminal facilities over the Grand Trunk in Montreal?—A. There are no roads that have terminal facilities in Montreal.

I would like hon. gentlemen to listen to this:

Q. Are there any roads that have the right to go into Montreal on your track on any terms whatever?—A. Simply the interchange of cars, on which we get a proportion of the traffic charges. There are no running rights over our tracks similar to the proposed Intercolonial Railway agreement.

No other road running into Montreal has the same favourable terms or ranks as favourably as the Intercolonial Railway, under the arrangement consummated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Then, in addition to that concession, there is the concession of handing over the traffic at Montreal and shutting out the Grand Trunk line to Point Lévis, reference to which is found at page 62. So that, considering the situation as found by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and the manner in which he sought to negotiate and did negotiate, the result of these negotiations, I think, should satisfy any impartial, any dispassionate, fair-minded gentleman that the very best possible arrangement was made under the circumstances. But hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be blind to all these things. They attempted to bring in the most irrelevant and foreign matters, such as the question of deals in the way of purchasing newspapers and boodling and dragging the name of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) into it, dragging his son's name into it, dragging Mr. Greenshield's name into it, and trying to draw red herrings of that kind across the track. Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to hoodwink the people by adopting the line of argument which they are following in this matter. It may be a fair me-

thod of discussion, as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House consider these things, to make false and irrelevant statements about any subject matter that may come up for discussion; but I am surprised that the gentlemen composing the minority of the committee of investigation, should in their report, drag these matters in. But, to that, I will refer later on. The people who composed this Drummond County Railway Company were dragged before the House and placed before the country as being dishonourable men in trying to dispose of this road. Let us see if they are. I would refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), and there is no gentleman, on that side of the House, for whose opinion I have greater respect. I do not say that because, on this question, he had the manhood to stand up and say what he did in a fair way. He is a gentleman who knows more about this matter than any gentleman on the other side of the House, and perhaps more than any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. What does he say about these men, and I will direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the evidence as given at page 141 of the report, and to his speech, as reported in "Hansard," page 4312 in 1897. Let us see what the hon. member for Compton says about these people composing the Drummond County Railway Company who were boodling and buying up newspapers and prostituting Cabinet Ministers, and all that sort of thing:

I heard some remarks made also with regard to the gentlemen who are connected with the Drummond County Railway. I heard very serious reflections cast upon them, and perhaps it is only natural, in a hot contest, as this promises to be, that such remarks should be made, but being personally acquainted with them for years, I must bear testimony to the honour and uprightness of the gentlemen associated with that road. I have known them for years, and have never known anything dishonourable against them or any institution with which they are connected. It is stated that they are going to make money. Well, suppose they do make money. I am bound to say that they would be a pack of fools if they invested their money in that road, and if they pledged their credit to the extent I know they did, notwithstanding what is said to the contrary in this House, to acquire sufficient funds to carry the road out to satisfactory completion, without expecting a fair remuneration for their enterprise. Out of this transaction I do not believe—it may be a weakness of mine not to be a believer—that the amount of money these gentlemen are going to receive will be, after everything is paid, more than a fair recompense.

That is what Mr. Pope said. I need not go any further as to the standing of these people, but I will refer particularly to the arrangements and dealings with the Drummond County people. If hon. gentlemen will turn to page 16 they will find what dealings the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had with these Drummond County people, and when he had them. It is insinuated that the whole matter of the acquiring of the Drummond County Railway by the Government was instituted, initiated and suggested by the Drummond County Railway people in secrecy to some Minister of the present Government. This is what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says on that point:

The arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company was, as you know, closed on the basis of $140,000, and that contract was not approved by Parliament. The arrangement was made with the Drummond County Railway Company on the basis of $70,000 a year rental. We estimated that the road completed as we would require it to Chaudière would be worth $1,600,000 at least. Interest on that at 4 per cent would be equal to $64,000, and the $6,000 at the Chaudière end made the $70,000. The contract we made with the Drummond County Railway Company, as the papers will show (the papers have been before Parliament; I can produce another copy if you wish it) was to build and complete from Moose Park to Chaudière, in round figures a distance of 43 miles, up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway.

Q. What is the length?—A. 42·60 or ·70 miles, or, in round figures, 43 miles. We required them to lay that portion of the line with rails weighing not less than 70 lbs. to the lineal yard. And we required that they should reduce certain grades and make certain improvements on the old part of the line. All that was stipulated in their contract. A vote was passed authorizing a subsidy to be given to the Drummond County Railway in aid of these 43 miles. They entered into a contract with the Government under the Subsidy Act, and went on to construct their line, and it was during that construction that Mr. Kingsford was superintending or inspecting on behalf of the Government. They prosecuted the work quite vigorously, but they were unable to complete it to our satisfaction; in fact, they had not yet completed it entirely, up to the date when we took the road into our hands or over from them temporarily, and began to run it on the 1st of March. The work which they were required to do was heavy, I presume; at all events, although they worked very vigorously and energetically at it, time did not permit of their completing it entirely to our satisfaction.

Showing that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals took every precaution to watch these people and was most exacting in regard to the work which they were undertaking. At page 19:

Q. You have all the quantities under the contract in the department. They are filed in the department, I suppose, and Mr. Kingsford's report?—A. Well, I think it is likely we have all that, but I do not know whether it would convey an accurate idea of the actual cost. In connection with this temporary contract with the Drummond County Railway, and before entering into it, we came to an arrangement with the Drummond County whereby we have the option from them, whenever Parliament should so authorize us, to purchase for cash the Drummond County line for its entire length from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière at the valuation which we originally put upon it, and the cost at which it is calculated by the railway, $1,600,000. A good deal has been said about our having made an arrangement for a rental which was excessive, and which, capitalized, represented two or three millions of money. We knew well the Drummond County could not negotiate their line on any such basis as the country could borrow money, and we took for granted that it represented to them $1,600,000.

We figured on that expectation and basis, and, therefore, in order to remove the possibility of an objection on the ground that we were really giving more than we purported to give, we proposed to the Drummond County that they should give us an option, either to lease the road or to purchase it by cash on a basis of $1,600,000. That is in the temporary arrangement we made with them, a copy of which I will leave with the committee.

Again, on page 20, referring to exhibit 17 :

Q. What is the date of that document (Exhibit No. 17) ?—A. February 25, 1898. You will observe, gentlemen, that this will show clearly, at all events, what some of the Drummond County people imagined they were getting, supposing they were offering it in a capital sum instead of the lease contract they made with us. The $1,600,000, you will observe, includes the original cost of the line to the company of the 73 miles, includes the cost of construction of the 43 miles which they have made, and includes $100,000 in addition, which is to be expended under our direction. I may be permitted to say that it will be somewhat difficult to find that we bought a road and paid $1,000,000 more than it was worth in the face of such figures as those. With the exception of one statement, that is all I have to say. That statement is this : A good deal has been stated in the public press, and something more or less hinted in Parliament,——

If the witness were speaking to-day he could have said it was not only hinted, but "stated" in Parliament, because it was stated this afternoon :

A good deal has been stated in the public press and something more or less hinted in Parliament, in regard to fraudulent and corrupt transactions carried on with reference to negotiations over this Drummond County Railway.

The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) got up on the floor of this House to-day, and if he did not categorically say so, he, at least, imputed corruption on the part of the Government in this transaction, notwithstanding that he swore that he did not impute corruption ; that he did not state there was any corruption in this transaction. Notwithstanding that he explicitly withdrew and emphatically denied under oath, that he intended to make such an insinuation of corruption ; to-day he stultified himself by standing up in this House and repeat that insinuation in the presence of gentlemen who heard him make the statement, and swear to it, that he did not impute corruption to the Government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On what page of the evidence did the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) swear that ?

Mr. MORRISON. At page 158, when he was under oath. What I say is, that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), whilst attending the sittings of that committee, and whilst that committee was sitting was under oath from the first time he kissed that book, whether he was in the witness chair or not ; and, as a matter of fact, when he made that statement he was sitting in the same chair as when he gave his evidence, and anything he said was as much under oath as that which is set out on page 185.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Pardon me ; we might as well settle this matter now. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) would then say, that the counsel who goes on the witness stand and makes a statement on oath, is under oath during the rest of the trial.

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, appertaining to the subject matter of the evidence, and I say this was the subject matter of the evidence. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) cannot escape from the position by saying he was not on oath. Even if he had not gone through the form of swearing or taking the oath, I say that as an ex-Cabinet Minister, as a member of this House, his statement should have the same binding effect as an oath, so I care not whether he was sworn or not.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) does not intend to misrepresent me. The first time my attention was drawn to it I made a statement in the House with reference to it. What I meant, and what I did say was, that I never made a charge in this House in reference to corruption.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). What are you doing to-day ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Your statement was that you never made any charge.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), of course, is trying to shirk the question. The chairman of the committee referred to the imputation——

Mr. HAGGART. Read what the chairman said.

Mr. MORRISON. I shall read it at the request of the hon. gentleman. This is what occurred :

The Chairman spoke as follows :—"I wish to say that I have caused to be brought before the committee every person who might throw any light on the transaction, and before we close the evidence I would ask members of the committee who are here to say whether there is any further evidence which they desire to have brought before the committee. Of course you are aware that in the press and in the House it was charged that the Government collectively, as well as certain individual members of the Government, were guilty of corruption in connection with the purchase of this road. So far as I have been able to see, no evidence of corruption has been adduced, and if my friends on the opposite side of the committee, the Conservative members of the committee, have any evidence at all showing corruption, I ask them now to give the names of these witnesses, and we will have them brought here and examined. If, as Mr. Haggart says, it is a mere matter of policy with which he agrees, the policy of bringing the road into Montreal, then the only difference is as to the price paid, and of course the question of corruption does not arise at all.

Mr. Haggart.—That was my point of view. We never made any charges of corruption.

The Chairman.—I suppose you read what was said in the press.

Mr. Powell.—Candidly, I never heard anything in the House about corruption.

Mr. Haggart.—Sir Louis Davies made a statement in a speech in Toronto that there would be an inquiry into the circumstances of the Drummond County Railway, and I think he said that it would be found after investigation that some of his opponents would be up to the neck in the mire.

And so they are.

The Chairman.—Certainly the press of the country charged the Government with corruption.

Mr. Haggart.—We are not inquiring into newspaper statements; we are confined by order of the House to the inquiry referred to us.

The Chairman.—Then, that closes the evidence, and we will adjourn till Wednesday next the 25th instant, to consider our draft report.

Here we have the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), that he made no charge of corruption, and he heard no charge of corruption made in the House. He and the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), and a number of other responsible or irresponsible gentlemen on that side of the House, in a most direct fashion charged and imputed corruption to the Government in this transaction. They might be excused for doing that before the evidence was adduced before the investigating committee, but there is no excuse for them doing so after the investigation was held. They had an opportunity of coming before the committee and eliciting anything that would show corruption, but they failed to do that. For them to come on the floor of the House and repeat these insinuations after their failure to substantiate them on oath before the committee, is cowardly in the extreme. Since the investigation, the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) is absolutely estopped from making such insinuations. He could have produced his evidence upon which he founded the charge of corruption before that committee, but he did not do so. He did not have any such evidence, and he has not any such evidence now. I challenge him to stand up in this House, and to mention the name or to give to me privately the name of one individual who will undertake to swear, or who will state outside the protection of the privileges of this House, that there was corruption in connection with this transaction between Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Farwell and the Government.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) must remember the statement I made in the House and the statement I made before the committee met. I said that this transaction savors of wrong and corruption, and to-day, after the evidence has been taken, I repeat it from my place in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). When you had an opportunity you withdrew the charge.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not a charge. The words I used then were these, that the whole transaction savored of wrong and corruption, and I repeated the words to-day.

Mr. MORRISON. I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman says it. Any hon. gentleman who will stand in his place in the House, or stand up anywhere whilst he has the power of speech, knowing the facts as the hon. gentleman knows them, and make a statement of that kind, is, I will not say capable of saying anything; but I will put it in the way in which Lord Beaconsfield replied to a gentleman whose statements he wished to controvert on the floor of the British Parliament, by telling an anecdote. Circumstances arose similar to those that have arisen here; and Lord Beaconsfield stated that he did not wish to give the lie direct to the gentleman before him; but, addressing the Speaker, he told this anecdote. Sir Robert Peel, I think it was, having replenished his larder with a new wine, afterwards known as dry champagne, invited a number of kindred spirits to test it. Among them was a gentleman named Colonel Jones, a connoisseur in wines, who, after tasting the wine, was asked by Sir Robert, "What do you think of my dry champagne?" Colonel Jones, turning, replied, "Sir Robert, any man who will undertake to tell you he likes dry champagne is capable of saying anything." Turning to the Speaker, Lord Beaconsfield said, "I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of tergiversation; but, upon my soul, he is capable of telling this House that he likes dry champagne." I will not charge the ex-Minister of Railways in this instance with tergiversation, but I will say that he is capable of telling this House that he likes dry champagne. To return to the evidence of Mr. Blair, on page 20 he says:

A good deal has been stated in the public press, and something more or less hinted in Parliament, in regard to fraudulent and corrupt transactions carried on with reference to the negotiations over this Drummond County Railway.

Now, I ask the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, as an honourable man, if he can controvert, and if he can why he did not controvert, this statement of the Minister of Railways, given at an early stage of the investigation:

I want to say that I negotiated the transaction from beginning to end myself. I negotiated it with Mr. Greenshields. I know of nobody else, with the exception of a few minutes' conversation in my office, in the presence of Mr. Greenshields, with Mr. Mitchell, I think. The whole negotiations, from the beginning to the end, the conversations and the negotiations in the transaction, took place with Mr. Greenshields. I do not know of any other member of the Government having had any part in the negotiations. I had, of course, from time to time, repeatedly, in the course of these negotiations, communicated with my colleagues in the Government and con-

ferred with them upon the various phases. The Drummond County Railway Company wanted to be paid $100,000 a year rental. They had reasons. They claimed that when they had completed the new 43 miles, the road would cost them over $2,000,000. I never saw their books, but they brought figures from their books, which Mr. Greenshields stated were correctly transcribed from their books, estimating that the extension would cost in the neighbourhood of $600,000 or $700,000, showing that their outlay would be all of $2,000,000, if not in excess of $2,000,000. These negotiations, from beginning to end, took place between Mr. Greenshields and myself, and at no time, and under no circumstances, from the moment when the Drummond County Railway was first spoken of down to the present time, did Mr. Greenshields say to me, or did I say to him, or to any person else in his presence, one syllable having reference to any contribution for elections, or of any other kind in any shape or form. I do not know, I have no reason to suppose, that anything of the kind took place between Mr. Greenshields or any other member of the Government ; but I can say what took place between Mr. Greenshields and myself.

That was Mr. Blair's statement on oath before the investigating committee, and hon. gentlemen opposite had an opportunity of cross-examining him and impeaching that evidence, and calling evidence in rebuttal and completely controverting it if they could ; but they never attempted to do so, and they cannot do it. I say, in the face of that, hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be absolutely silent on the subject of corrupt dealings between the Minister of Railways and Mr. Greenshields.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment ? I want to correct a statement which I made during my speech, that certain payments made to the Drummond County Company were not to be found in the Auditor General's accounts. I have since found that they are there, and I wish to correct that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Is that the only correction the hon. gentleman is going to make now ?

Mr. MORRISON. Now, we can go further than the evidence of the Minister of Railways and Canals. We have the evidence of Mr. J. N. Greenshields, of Montreal. Since coming into Parliament, I have thought, and I think now, that it is a somewhat reprehensible proceeding to refer in debate to gentlemen outside of the House, business men particularly. However, it has been done by gentlemen having much more experience in parliamentary matters than I have, and that is my excuse for doing it now. Mr. Greenshields's name has been mentioned in this matter, and imputations have been cast upon him ; but I think gentlemen should seriously reflect before casting imputations upon Mr. Greenshields, who is an honourable practitioner in the city of Montreal and a gentleman of repute ; and he has been included in the references made to the Drummond County people by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). Now, anything that Mr. Greenshields may say, particularly on oath, which cannot be controverted—and it has not been in this instance—cannot be ignored or taken lightly. What does he say in regard to these transactions between himself and the Government ? The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), and the hon. leader of the Opposition, have all started in and told us in the most solemn way that this piece of road could have been acquired by them for $500,000. I was amazed—I was absolutely disappointed, would be the expression more appropriate for my feelings—at hearing the hon. leader of the Opposition get up on the floor of this House and stand in with the ex-Controller of Customs and the ex-Minister of Railways in that statement. The hon. leader of the Opposition, for whom I have the most unbounded respect, is a gentleman very much my senior, and I have the greatest regard for anything he says, so long as I think it is in line with fact ; but I feel that if what he said on that occasion was true, I have no right to be sitting on this side of the House. The other day, in his speech, which is to be found at page 2889 of "Hansard," referring to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, he said :

> He said that he hand never looked at it from that standpoint at all, but that he had looked at it from the standpoint that he wanted to bring the Intercolonial into Montreal, and he found that a warm and devoted friend of the Government and of the party was willing to sell, for $2,100,000, to the hon. gentleman that which he had been hawking about the country and was willing to sell for $500,000.

I wish hon. gentlemen opposite to remember that statement, in view of the evidence which I will adduce. At another point he repeats the statement. It is not a slip of the tongue, but is said with the greatest deliberation.

> I do not hesitate to say that when a Minister of the Crown makes an arrangement with a great party friend to spend $2,100,000 of the public money to obtain possession of a property that that party has been trying to sell for $500,000, it is, to say the least of it, clouded with suspicion, and it is due to the House, to the hon. gentleman's own supporters, to every intelligent man who is called upon to deal with public questions, that full and accurate information shall be had on that question.

Now, the opportunity of obtaining full and accurate information was afforded the hon. gentleman by that committee before which he appeared, and yet he never even touched upon that part of it. I ask why he did not do so ; and in view of the fact that he had full opportunity of dealing with it and did not, I ask him in all fairness what he meant by rising in his place in this House and making that statement he did without furnishing the slightest proof of it. I am afraid, Sir, that he did it in order to mislead this House,

and the course he followed is one that must cause any categorical statement which this hon. gentleman may make in this House to be viewed with the greatest suspicion.

Mr. Greenshields, at page 31, referred to that option of $500,000, and it is at this juncture that that aspect of the case arises. Mr. Borden, in examining him, put these questions:

Q. Do you remember in 1894 executing a power of attorney, or so-called option, for the sale of this road, about the 16th July, 1894 ?—A. Have you a copy of it there ?

Q. I have.—A. Do you intend to file this, Mr. Borden ?

Q. I do propose to file it.—A. All right ; I want to have it marked, so that I can identify it.

Now, there is a little circumstance connected with this, which the members of the committee noticed at the time, and which will be fresh in the mind of the hon. member for Halifax, who will correct me if I am wrong. The hon. gentleman had that option in his hand. I think I am fair in saying that he did not intend to make the use of it that was afterwards made. He thought he would catch Mr. Greenshields, but Mr. Greenshields knew a little too much, and would not say anything until the document was marked and filed as an exhibit, so that all parties might have access to it, and thus it was taken beyond the control of the hon. gentleman, who had it in his hand and intended to keep it for his own use.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman was never more mistaken in his life. I intended to put it in, and it was put in that time as Mr. Greenshields requested.

Mr. MORRISON. Because he requested ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At that time.

Mr. MORRISON. Just so, and I say that the credit for unearthing that option at that time was due to Mr. Greenshields, who had absolutely nothing to conceal. He dragged it out of the hands of the hon. gentleman, and those gentlemen who are lawyers will appreciate the point, when I tell them the circumstances. He had that document and intended to keep it in his hands to the very last moment and have it referred to by the press of the country as the great trump card which he intended to play. But Mr. Greenshields made him produce it there and then, in order that he might have it filed and marked so that he could identify it.

Mr. POWELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me just to ask him one question ? As the hon. gentleman who presumes to know something about law, in criticising the course taken by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), I would ask him if the mere fact that Mr. Borden cross-examined Mr. Greenshields on this document did not put it in evidence of itself ?

Mr. MORRISON. It would be put in evidence in the way in which the person cross-examining Mr. Greenshields chose to put it, and it might elucidate other evidence in connection with the matter or might prove not pertinent to the issue.

Mr. POWELL. It was put in evidence.

Mr. MORRISON. It was put in evidence, but my point is that this option containing this mare's nest was dragged out of hon. gentlemen opposite by Mr. Greenshields himself, against whom all this vilification was directed. That is my point. It is not necessary for me to go into abstract questions of principles underlying rules of evidence. I speak of this question as a layman. This option was put in evidence at this juncture by Mr. Greenshields, and it contains this clause:

We, and each of us, hereby give to said William Farwell, a thirty days' option in which he may pay to us the round sum of $500,000, for which sum, if paid within thirty days, we agree to sell, transfer and deliver to him or his assigns, the Drummond County Railway, both main line, branches, sidings, rights of way, stations, other buildings, rolling stock, tools, franchises, charters, bonuses, subsidies, and appurtenances whatsoever, exactly as a whole property stands and is.

That is the clause in that option to Mr. Farwell by the shareholders which is put in evidence, and upon which hon. gentlemen opposite based the statement that the Government could have obtained this road for $500,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It was only built to St. Leonard then.

Mr. MORRISON. But apart from that, let us see what this means, in the light of what Mr. Greenshields swore to:

Mr. Farwell called a meeting of the shareholders of the Drummond County Railway Company about the time that this document was signed. He said that he was then negotiating or was about to open negotiations through Mr. Hugh Ryan, with the Conservative Government for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, and that the negotiations were conducted on the basis of the leasing of the road for $100,000 per annum, to be completed through to a mile. He said: "I must have a complete assignment of the stock of the road, so that it will be entirely controlled by me. This assignment I propose to give to Mr. Hugh Ryan, who is to conduct the negotiations."

You can see how essential it was to Mr. Farwell to have nominally the absolute control, and knowing Mr. Farwell to be an honourable man, the other shareholders had confidence in him and signed the option.

A subsequent agreement was made, by which, if the road was leased for a rental of $100,000, or sold for $17,500 a mile after it was completed through to Chaudière, the cost of the completion was to be deducted out of the difference between $500,000 and the price received and the total amount remaining was to be divided into three portions—one portion to go to Mr. Farwell and two-thirds of the difference to Mr. Hugh Ryan and his friends, and the one-third going to Mr. Farwell was to be added to the $500,000 which

was to represent the real purchase price of the road to the shareholders.

There is Mr. Greenshield's sworn statement of what that clause in the option meant.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). How many miles of the road were built then ?

Mr. MORRISON. About 45½. Then Mr. Borden asked :

Q. Was that agreement in writing ?—A. Yes, this agreement is in writing with Mr. Farwell. Mr. Farwell has copies on the lines which I have just indicated. In other words,——

Here is a further elucidation of that option :

——if the arrangement had been carried through on the basis of $500,000 and of the division.

Not " or the division."

As I have said, the shareholders of the Drummond County Railway would have received infinitely more for the road than they now propose to receive under the present arrangement with this Government, because the road was not completed through to Moose Park in 1894. We had only begun the construction, and there were some 28 miles of the road to Moose Park and 42 beyond that, making about 70 miles more, to complete at the time the option was given, than than there is now.

Q. Do I understand that the shareholders were to receive nothing more than $500,000 ?—A. Certainly, the shareholders were to receive the difference. For instance, to illustrate, if the road were sold on a cash basis for $2,500,000, which it would bring if you calculated at $17,500 per mile, out of that $2,500,000 was to be deducted the cost of the construction to complete the road through to Chaudière ; and they were to get subsidies from the Conservative Government at Ottawa on the road to Chaudière, which were to be added to the purchase price. From that was to be deducted the cost of construction and the difference, divided into three pieces, one-third to go to the shareholders, in addition to the purchase price of $500,000.

Q. Do you know how much of the 28 miles had been constructed ?—A. No, I could not tell you ; they may have been working all over the line.

Q. Was this $500,000 intended to represent the road as completed to any particular place ?—A. It was intended to represent the road, plus the third which we would get out of the deal when completed as it would exist at the end of the 30 days to which the contract was made.

Q. Between 1894 and 1897, did you have any negotiations for the sale of the road ? A. Oh, yes ; Mr. Farwell continued the negotiations with the Government up to the spring of 1896.

Now, Mr. Haggart at page 151, stated :

I never had any communication with any one of the company, or otherwise, after that date with reference to the road.

That is after July. Mr. Greenshields gave a categorical contradiction, and Mr. Greenshields, from the first syllable to the last, has never been contradicted in any way, nor his evidence been invaded. Not only did the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals contradict himself, but he is contradicted by every other witness in every matter he referred to in his evidence. Then, taking page 54, referring to Mr. Ryan :

There was no bond given to any other railway company. In 1894 the negotiations were not carried through.

Q. There was no option given to any other railway company ?—A. Not in 1894. We had negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but that was previous to 1894.

Q. Were those negotiations in writing or oral ?—A. I think they were in writing.

Q. What part of the road was completed then ?—A. The Nicolet and Drummondville, I think.

Q. The negotiations with the Grand Trunk were not carried through ?—A. No.

Q. You say they were in writing ?—A. Yes.

Then, at page 36 :

Q. Well, how long did Mr. Hugh Ryan continue to be the go-between ?—A. I think Mr. Ryan continued to be the go-between the Government and the company till some time in the spring of 1896.

Again contradicting the statement of the ex-Minister, that he had no communications or dealing with these people after July, 1894.

But I may say this further, that at no time had this road ever been offered for $500,000, or anthing like it.

Mr. Greenshields swears to that part of the evidence, and I would like the leader of the Opposition to consider that before repeating this statement, that the road had been offered at this figure. Then, at page 36 :

Q. You can offer us an explanation why nominally $500,000 was put in ?—A. Understand that it was Mr. Farwell who came to us and said : " I have got to show something that I have absolute control of this road, and for that purpose I must have the signature of all the shareholders so that no question can be asked beyond me," and we considered that there was no question that it would facilitate the division of the profits if a fixed price was agreed upon.

Q. Between Mr. Farwell and the shareholders ?—A. He said it was absolutely necessary to have a fixed price as a basis in the event of a sale.

Q. Then the $500,000 was first to come out of the profits of the sale to the Government ?—A. The arrangement was this, that if the road was sold by lease to the Government, and the lease realized on, that to that should be added——

Q. To what ?—A. To the price of sale.

Q. That is the $500,000 ?—A. The net price at which the road was sold to the Government. Suppose it was sold for $2,500,000, then to that was to be added the subsidies that would be received on the extension of the line and from that was to be deducted the cost of the construction of the line to Chaudière, and the difference between that and $500,000, the amonut of this option, was to be divided in thirds, one-third to go to Mr. Farwell to be added to the $500,000 and divided among the shareholders.

Now, what could be clearer than that to show what was meant by the $500,000 aspect of the case ? And how can hon. gentlemen opposite say this road, at any time, or under any circumstances, or in any shape, was ever offered for $500,000 ? I am completely amazed that gentlemen with any particle of sense, or reason, or honesty, would assert that such was ever the case.

Q. Now, do I understand you to say, Mr. Greenshields, that the amount of the negotiations had closed with the Government, would have been financially a better one for the Drummond County Railway than the arrangements you have made with the Government to-day ?—A. Undoutedly it would have been.

The reference to Mr. Hugh Ryan is also at page 36. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the gravamen of the attack of gentlemen opposite has been this statement, that the road can be acquired for $500,000. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if they do not care to listen to what has been said, in fairness to themselves as well as to us, to read the evidence contained in that report. And I contend that this evidence should be the basis of consideration of this matter, that we cannot travel outside of it, and that we should not try in any way to avoid it. As I said before, there were two reports, a majority report and a minority report. Now, as I have said, the majority report was based on the facts. It is found at page viii. of the report. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to read it, and I venture to say, they will find that there is not a statement in it that is not fully borne out by the evidence. The first statement in that report is:

The only difference between parties being the price to be paid for the extension. There was no question of corruption.

The Drummond County Railway, as it exists, consists of a completed line from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière, a distance of one hundred and fifteen and one-half miles, and the branch known as the "Nicolet Branch," extending from St. Leonard to Nicolet, on Lake St. Peter, a distance of seventeen miles, making a total mileage of one hundred and thirty-two and one-half miles.

That in order to connect the Intercolonial with the city of Montreal, it was necessary that the said road should be extended from Moose Park Station to Chaudière Junction, a distance of about forty-two and one-half miles. That has been done by the owners of the road and the road now has a total mileage, including the Nicolet Branch, of one hundred and thirty-two and one-half miles, as before stated, and has actually cost in its construction upwards of two million one hundred thousand dollars. (See evidence of S. Newton, p. 46.)

Then it goes on to refer to the cost of the road and the negotiations. It is a resumé of the salient parts of the evidence, and it is entirely based upon the evidence.

But contrast the minority report with that for a moment. I venture to say, that there is hardly a line, if there is a line, in that minority report that follows the evidence, and not a statement but is fallacious and unreasonable. I say that advisedly, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to stand up and contradict successfully what I say. I would expect the functions of a committee to be to fairly and dispassionately state their conclusions, and not to draw inferences unless they had facts to support them. It is bad enough to plaster a report over with a lot of inferences, even if you have facts upon which to base them ; but, when you have no statements of facts, or, at least, when the inferences are not based on the evidence, then the gentlemen who signed that report misconceived their duties as committee men. The first important point is this :

In 1893 the Drummond County Railway Company unsuccessfully endeavoured to dispose of their railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

There was the first instance they tried to give this "hawking" of the road, as they choose to call it. Then, they make a statement as to the indebtedness of the road, the amount borrowed from the Eastern Townships Bank, and so on, things that, in my opinion, were quite irrelevant and surplusage. Then, they put in the option which I read, the option pertaining to the $500,000. Now, clearly, the object of putting that there was to mislead this House and the country in the way gentlemen of that committee and other responsible gentlemen on that side have tried to mislead them before and since the investigation, by trying to make out that the railway could have been purchased for $500,000. Then, they say :

This option was either extended from time to time or there was an understanding that it might be acted upon at any time to the end of 1894, but as it did not result in the sale of the road, a second option in similar terms was subsequently given by the shareholders to Mr. Farwell at the price of $400,000.

I ask gentlemen opposite to produce categorical evidence upon which they based that statement.

Options were also given to other persons by the company, but without any result.

Where is the evidence for that ? There is not a jot or tittle of evidence for it.

The object of granting the first-mentioned option was to induce Mr. Hugh Ryan, a contractor, to undertake the task of completing the road and afterwards selling it on the best terms possible.

If that is true, is it not slightly contradictory to the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals ?

From the amount which he would receive there was to be deducted, in the first place, the amount of the option, $500,000, then the cost incurred by Mr. Ryan in completing the road, and the balance, if any, was to be divided, according to Mr. Farwell, between him and his associates, who were to receive one-third thereof, and Mr. Ryan, who was to receive two-thirds thereof. Mr. Ryan, however, does not remember this feature, but says that he was offered the road for $500,000.

Mr. Hugh Ryan, from one end of his evidence to the other, says nothing of the kind, nothing upon which such a construction could be placed.

In consequence of the unsatisfactory service afforded by the Grand Trunk Railway between Lévis and Montreal, Mr. Haggart, at that time Minister of Railways and Canals, turned his at-

tention, in 1894, to the question of extending the Intercolonial Railway to the latter city.

He "turned his attention," but how? He had a little private conversation with one of his colleagues, he had an opinion of his own, but he did not make any overtures to his colleagues to the end of putting his opinion into effect. That is the way he turned his attention to it, and the gentleman making this report seriously put that statement in to try to make it appear that he was serious. Any way, this herculean effort of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals proved abortive, for some reason for which he was not responsible.

He caused an estimate to be made of the cost of constructing such a railway as the Drummond County Railway would be when completed, according to the requirements for subsidy, and made inquiry as to the cost of running rights over the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, and of terminal facilities at that city.

What evidence is there of negotiations by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals about terminal facilities? Is there a syllable of his evidence showing any terminal facilities that were available to him at that time? Not a line.

At a later stage, Mr. Ryan opened negotiations with Mr. Haggart for the sale of the Drummond County Railway, but the latter, after making some investigation of the matter, declined to recommend the purchase of the road, and no further negotiations appear to have taken place between the company and any member of the Government until the year 1897.

That is not the fact, because Mr. Farwell and Mr. Greenshields both positively state that they were negotiating, and that Mr. Ryan was a go-between up to 1896. This part of the report is not based upon any evidence or any fact. Now, I want to show the invidious and unworthy nature of this report, and the procedure adopted by the hon. gentleman.

In 1897 the present Minister of Railways and Canals entered into negotiations with Mr. J. N. Greenshields, the president of the Drummond County Railway Company for the acquisition of the road by the Government of Canada. These negotiations were principally carried on between Mr. Greenshields and the Hon. Mr. Blair, but Mr. Greenshields and his associate, Mr. Mitchell, had interviews also upon the subject with the Hon. Mr. Tarte, Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Tarte, at page 120 of his evidence, categorically states that any of the interviews that he had with the Drummond County people were interviews for which he was not responsible, such interviews as he was bound to give any person who choose to come and ask for one. He could not shut the doors on Mr. Mitchell or anybody else, and if they choose to come there and discuss this question with him, he could not refuse to do so. But he says that in no case did these interviews amount to anything that could be termed negotiations. Then they go on to say something that is absolutely extraneous to the point at issue. They drag in "La Patrie" the paper that was acquired by Mr. Tarte's son, but in which Mr. Tarte himself has not a farthing's interest. In the most irrelevant way they refer to Mr. Greenshields acting as solicitor for Mr. Tarte and his sons, and quote Mr. Tarte's statement that Mr. Greenshields gave his cheque for $25,000. Now, the fact is that, according to the evidence of Mr. Greenshields and Mr. Tarte, it was simply an accommodation cheque, no money was passed. No matter what Mr. Tarte said, he might not have used just the right words in stating that it was simply an accommodation. What does it matter in what words we clothe a fact so long as we are able to express the fact? We find that in all these dealings, Mr. Tarte had had nothing to do with these negotiations about the railway, nothing of a substantial nature; that neither Mr. Tarte nor Mr. Greenshields had any idea of this railway when the purchase of "La Patrie" was arranged. Mr. Tarte was only doing the most natural thing in the world, doing nothing but what the leader of the Opposition himself or any other gentleman would do for his own son, or for persons who occupied a less fiduciary relation to him than a son. He simply tried to assist his sons in the acquisition of that paper, and he succeeded in doing so. But that had absolutely nothing to do with the negotiations for the Drummond County Railway. That has been sworn to time and again on oath; still hon. gentlemen will put that reference to the purchase of "La Patrie" by Mr. Tarte's sons into their report. They cannot produce one jot or tittle of evidence to show that there was any connection between the purchase of "La Patrie" and the Drummond County Railway. They do not dare to follow out the insinuation that they make. You would suppose that, after giving place in their report to that reference to the purchase of "La Patrie" they would follow it up, and show a connection between the purchase of "La Patrie" and the purchase of the Drummond County Railway by the Government. Why did they not do so when they had an opportunity of completing the link between the two transactions? But they did not do it, and they did not have the decency to acknowledge that they were unable to accomplish their unworthy effort for the reason that there was no evidence upon which they could do so. These are the same gentlemen who reiterate on oath that there were, forsooth, charges of corruption against the Government. What is the use of stating that if there is no attempt to prove the charges? I will not read the whole of the report, because it is rather long; but I tell you that every syllable of that report proceeds upon a false basis, and is wanting the element of fact upon which to rest. Then, they wind up by saying:

Your committee are satisfied that the rental payable to the Grand Trunk Railway Company

under the agreement of 1897 and 1898, is exorbitant.

I ask gentlemen opposite to produce a word of evidence in that volume to substantiate their statement. It does not exist, it cannot be adduced.

That the rental, as well as the payments for betterments and maintenance should all be fixed on the basis of user.

What authority have they for making that categorical statement? Evidence to the contrary has been produced, evidence given by Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Blair, Mr. Newton, Mr. Farwell, Mr. Greenshields and Mr. Wainwright.

And that the payments provided for in those agreements are enormously in excess of what they would be if calculated upon such a basis.

Why did they not, in a single instance, give some statement or fact which would corroborate this conclusion? Why did they not make some reference to the page where such evidence could be found? Simply because it does not exist. That is the point of their report. I will read it again. They state that they are satisfied that the rental payable to the Grand Trunk Railway is exorbitant. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not produce one word of evidence in support of that. They did not state upon what they based that statement, and there could not be one tittle of evidence in support of it.

That the rental as well as the payments for the betterments and the maintenance should all be fixed on the basis of user.

They had the opportunity of producing evidence, but they did not do it, nor did they even controvert the evidence that we put in. They say further:

And that the payments provided for in these agreements are enormously in excess of what they would be if calculated upon such a basis.

I say that the conclusion come to in that report is entirely without support in fact, entirely without any evidence upon which to base it. Now, one of the hon. gentlemen opposite who signs that report, at page 66 of the evidence, lets the cat out of the bag and shows the extent to which he apparently understood this question. He puts the following question to Mr. Schreiber:

By Mr. Powell:

Q. Now, last year when this contract was before Parliament——

That was in 1897.

——the only objection, I think, that was made to the Drummound County in respect to taking it off the hands of the Drummond County Railway, as respected the finished portion, was that the gradient at one or two places was a little high.

This was the conception of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) of what was then in the way of taking the road over. He states that, and Mr. Schreiber says "Yes," and confirms it. After that is he not estopped from going into this wild disquisition upon the negotiations between the Government and Drummond County people. He says that it seems to be a matter of gradient, that the grade was a little too high.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I need only refer to the debate that took place in this House, I think, yesterday, if I can recall it correctly, and participated in by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in regard to the transportation facilities of this country, to show the importance to this country of having this road extended to Montreal. It is all very well for us to say that there is already a line from Montreal to the maritime provinces. That line goes through the United States, and what would happen if the bonding privileges which are now accorded to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were withdrawn? What position would the Government be in if this road stopped at Montreal as far as having free connection with other corporations is concerned. I ask hon. gentlemen to consider what would be the position of this country if this bonding privilege were abrogated. I do not dispute that this is within the absolute possibilities. I venture to say that the day has come when this country is absolutely independent of these bonding privileges. I say the people are independent of these bonding privileges to-day, and are as independent of the United States in that respect as they are in any other respect, and I trust the day may not be far distant when we may take the stand of absolutely and completely ignoring the people of the United States in negotiating a transaction of this kind, or of any other kind, as far as the Government of this country is concerned. We are coming to that point that we are independent of the people to the south of us, and we need have no regard to their railway facilities or railway systems, and, in that event, it is necessary for us to have connection with our trade centres, and, in this behalf, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did well in extending this road to Montreal. Even if it had cost him very much more than it has he would have been justified in extending it to Montreal. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and this Government would have been justified in paying even more than they did pay for that road. It is not enough to say that some gentlemen may have made money out of the road. If Mr. Greenshields succeeded in making any amount of money out of the road, which he let us have for $12,000 a mile, when the road cost $19,000 a mile, it is very much to his credit; but nobody can say that Mr. Greenshields did what any person should not have done. I trust that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House may be able to make money, and I say that people are mistaken in saying that these gen-

tlemen did anything unfair in order to make money out of it. The question is what amount of money did the Government save to the country in acquiring that property. What was the value of it? We have evidence that the road cost $19,000 a mile, and the Government were able to secure it for $12,000. We had the statement put in evidence that we paid $12,000 for a railway which cost $19,000, or at any rate an average of $16,000 a mile. I care not what are the circumstances, so long as they are dissociated from corruption and wrong-doing. I anticipate that some hon. gentlemen opposite will desire to introduce a lot of irrelevant matter, as was done in this investigation. Let them get down to the absolute point, the cost of the road, and try, if they can, to show that the Government paid too high a price for it. For my part, I congratulate the hon. Minister of Railways, I congratulate the Government, and I congratulate the people of the country, upon the acquiring of this connection with Montreal, and stopping this vast question of a deficit-making railway system. I am confident that the days of deficits on the Intercolonial Railway have gone by, and now that we have put it on a business basis, we will have passed the period, at last, of losing money. This Government have started in very creditably in trying to put all their transactions on a business basis, and dealing with the business of the country in the way in which they deal with their own business; the way in which a person would deal with his own private concerns, and the way in which, I believe, the business of the country should be carried on.

Mr. J. ROSS-ROBERTSON (East Toronto). I do not want to weary the House, but I do want to explain, briefly, why I am unable to agree on the question contained in these resolutions, with the hon. gentleman whom I usually follow. I am willing to leave the unravelling and the discussion of the legal evidence, and the other irrevelant matter spoken of by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) to my professional friends on both sides of the House. I wish to speak of this Drummond County Railway proposal as a matter of value for the money that is being paid for it by this country. I do not want to sit in judgment on the conclusions which hon. gentlemen may have reached on this question, and any hon. gentleman who cares to sit in judgment on my conclusions is, of course, at perfect liberty to do so. It rather amused me the other night to hear my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), in starting an avalanche of criticism on this bargain and in referring to the position of the Drummond County Railway and the Canadian Pacifice Railway, say "the mode in which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals proposed to shrivel up Van Horne and Shaughnessey and all these Canadian Pacific magnates who were induced to spend millions of their money in building this line to the west of the city of St. John, where admirable facilities have been provided for doing the business, is to take the traffic from them and carry it for nothing." This, of course, Mr. Chairman, is a ghost story. I am for the first time made aware that Sir William Van Horne or Mr. Shaughnessey ever put a dollar of their own money into the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Indeed, according to all accounts, they have taken out a mighty deal more than they ever put in. Better, I think, that the Minister of Railways should shrivel up Van Horne and Shaughnessey, than that these twin tyrants should shrivel up this country.

I cannot regard this matter of putting the Intercolonial Railway on a commercial basis as a party question. To my mind, it is an issue of national importance, and I am not going to give a vote which can tend to keep the Intercolonial Railway tied up as a sort of milch cow to be run on shares—the country buy the hay, and the Canadian Pacific Railway takes the milk. I have never believed that the Intercolonial Railway should be hung up, like Mahomet's coffin, at one end, without any direct relationship to the originating point of through traffic from the west. To my mind, the spectacle of the Intercolonial Railway becoming an actual factor in the transportation of through freight, and paying its way, would help to educate the people of this country to demand fair-play from the roads that are not owned by the Government. I believe that the best interests of this country demand the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, and I cannot reconcile a vote against the principle of this resolution with the position I have always taken in this House on the railway question—a position that I will adhere to both inside and outside this House. Now, while I have approved of the principle, I have not approved of every detail in the proposal of the Minister of Railways, and I did not approve of his failure to lay on the Table of the House the contract and the other details, when he moved these resolutions the other night. Now, however, that he has given us all the details available, the proposition is simply: That the Drummond County Railway shall be bought for $12,000 a mile, or for a sum aggregating, I believe, $1,600,000. This seems like a good deal of money. But I am not an expert, I confess, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, by an overwhelming majority, declared that it was right and reasonable to let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sell a piece of railway to the bondholders for $35,000 per mile. This Parliament of Canada, in its wisdom, declared, a few nights ago, that the Columbia and Western

Railway was worth $35,000 a mile to the bondholders, although I am told that much of that same road could be built for about $8,000 a mile. I can quite see, Mr. Chairman, that the Columbia and Western would probably cost more to build than the Drummond County Railway, but I cannot see how hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who voted in favour of allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to sell a piece of railroad at the rate of $35,000 a mile, can blame the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) for buying another piece of railroad for $12,000 a mile. I am not, however, entirely at ease in regard to the terms of this bargain. The truth of the matter is this, and I might as well confess it, that I do not know what to make out of the hon. Minister of Railways. I have heard him talk like an archangel in defence of public rights, and I have come away from meetings of the Railway Committee, and from meetings of the Banking and Commerce Committee, rejoicing in the hope that the people had at last found a deliverer, and that he would protect and shield the victims of tyranny. I do not know that the hon. the Minister of Railways has given these people anything more than kind words, so far; but even kind words are more than most members of the present Government will give to persons who have just grievances against the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is possible that the hon. the Minister of Railways might have gotten this Drummond County Railway for less money, and it is possible that he has acted in the party interest. But hon. gentlemen on this side would not listen to a statement made some nights ago in this House, that there was said to be a steal for the Canadian Pacific Railway in the right to sell the Columbia and Western to the bondholders at $35,000 per mile; and how can these same hon. gentlemen expect any independent member to follow them when they suggest and insist that there is a steal for somebody in the right to sell this Drummond County railroad to the country at $12,000 a mile? I fully appreciate the possibilities, and I fully realize also, that whatever faults the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) may have, he has done more than any of his predecessors, Liberal or Conservative, to make the Intercolonial Railway something better than a mere feeder to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and holding that belief, I cannot do otherwise, Mr. Chairman, than vote for these resolutions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that it will be possible for me to finish to-night, in reply to my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Morrison), who has detained the House to the extent of two and a half hours, but I will be willing to proceed until half-past eleven o'clock.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will go on until twelve o'clock, at any rate.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman from Westminster (Mr. Morrison) has made a very warm address to the House in regard to these resolutions, and, among other things, he has made the somewhat extraordinary statement, that the minority report, which I, together with two other gentlemen on this side of the House, had the honour of signing, was a report not one syllable of which was founded on evidence or on facts. He also made the statement, that the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) gave his evidence in such a way before the committee that he would have been turned down by any judge and dismissed from the witness-stand. He also made the somewhat extraordinary statement, that the members of the committee from this side of the House made false and irrelevant statements in their report, and did so for the purpose of misleading the House. He lectured gentlemen on this side of the House generally with regard to their conduct on this and other questions, and he even ventured, towards the close of his speech, to put forward the proposition, that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), in speaking, as a member of the committee, after he had been discharged as a witness from the witness-stand, was still under oath. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to waste the time of the House with very much of a reply to language of that kind. Such exaggerated statements made by any gentleman in this House—even by a gentleman who has the standing of the hon. member for Westminster—are best dismissed with a few words of contempt. I say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison), that he cannot point out one word, or one line, in the minority report which is not amply sustained by the evidence, so far as it purports to be a statement of fact. When the hon. gentleman, standing in his place in the House, ventures to say, that that report, signed by three responsible gentlemen on this side of the House, contains not one word, or syllable, that was founded on fact or supported by evidence, he takes a responsibility upon himself which I do not think adds to his credit or standing in this House.

Mr. MORRISON. Will the hon. gentleman proceed to controvert what I said?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will proceed to controvert what the hon. gentleman said, and I would like to know now whether the hon. gentleman, in his sober moments, ventures again to state that not one word or syllable of that minority report is founded on fact or supported by evidence. Does he venture to adhere to that?

Mr. MORRISON. I repeat what I stated, that the minority report is not based on fact or evidence. The hon. gentleman may make what he chooses of that. If he can show

that the statements in that minority report are based on fact or evidence adduced at that investigation, I will apologize to him and the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman does not venture to repeat what he stated before.

Mr. MORRISON. That is what I stated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And I am glad for his own reputation and credit that he has not the courage to stand up and repeat the statement he made a moment ago; and, not having the courage to repeat that statement, I think it ill-becomes him to lecture the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals for his demeanour on the witness stand. Probably I have had as much experience of witnesses on the stand as my hon. friend, and I venture to say that neither in the language used by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals nor in his demeanour on the witness stand was there anything to justify the very extraordinary and extravagant criticism which the hon. gentleman, for reasons best known to himself, has seen fit to pass upon that hon. gentleman.

Now, I do not intend to deal very much with the matters affecting the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte); but as the hon. gentleman, somewhat badly advised in that connection, has seen fit to bring that hon. gentleman's name before the House and to state that we on this side are seeking to draw the Minister of Public Works and his sons as red herrings across the path—something I do not quite understand—I would like to recall to the House just what did take place in this House and before the committee in connection with the circumstance to which the hon. gentleman has adverted. If the hon. gentleman will turn to "Hansard" of 1897, he will find, at page 5301, that the hon. Minister of Public Works made this statement in the House:

I know that my name has been connected with this transaction, because "La Patrie" newspaper has been bought by the Liberal party, and because Mr. Greenshield's name has been connected with that purchase. I will state frankly what took place.

The hon. gentleman will note that the hon. Minister of Public Works was not only making a statement in the House, but he was making it upon his honour, saying that he was going to be frank, which meant, I suppose, that he was going to tell the whole truth; and before I get through, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works will not thank my hon. friend for drawing attention to this matter, which, in the absence of the hon. Minister, I would not have touched upon at all, except for the way in which the hon. gentlemen has dealt with the matter. The hon. Minister of Public Works said further.

I arranged that Mr. Greenshields, who was my lawyer in many other cases, should act as the purchaser of "La Patrie" as the lawyer of the party.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The hon. gentleman will note that.

They speak of a cheque which Mr. Greenshields gave. There is no secret about it. Mr. Greenshields had a cheque in his hand, not of his own money, but of the money of the party, and he paid that cheque.

Now, Sir, what is the evidence of the Minister of Public Works, which is to be found on pages 118, 119 and 120 of the committee's report? The hon. gentleman told this House that he was going to be frank with it; what does he say when he is put on the witness stand? I put that to him, and what is his answer?

It is perfectly correct. At the time I did not feel any necessity to go into the details, but what I have said is perfectly true. Mr. Greenshields paid it by cheque. It was not his own cash. He gave his cheque, which was simply a matter of accommodation; it was not his money. I simply said that in a vague way, because I knew right well if I said more, I would be accused of having said what was not true, not by you, but by some of the Tory pressmen.

And further down, when it is pointed out to him that his answer is not consistent with what he stated in the House, what does he say?—and I direct the hon. gentleman's attention to this:

My answer is that I did not think it proper to say everything in the House then, because Parliament was just closing and I knew right well that if I had said that Mr. Greenshields had given his own cheque and it was paid the next day that the Tory press would have lied just as much as they would have been able to do. I said what was true, but I did not give out the whole thing.

Now, I do not think the hon. Minister of Public Works will feel very much indebted to my learned and hon. friend for dealing with this matter in the way in which he has seen fit to do. Further, the question is put to him:

Do you mean that you were not quite frank in this statement because you were afraid the Tory press would lie?—A. Yes, they have lied so much about me—not the whole of them, some of them are decent.

Now, does the hon. gentleman think upon reflection that he has assisted the Minister of Public Works very much by again drawing attention to this matter, with which, as I said before, I would not have attempted to deal except for the way in which the hon. gentleman has dealt with it.

Mr. MORRISON. What has that to do with the price of the road?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it had nothing to do with it, why did my hon. friend see fit to deal with it in his speech?

Mr. MORRISON. Because the hon. member put it in his report. It is utterly irrelevant, but I commented upon it because you made it a subject of report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It was not made a subject of report. It was incidentally referred to in the report, because the Minister

of Public Works came before the committee for the purpose of backing up his statement in the House after Mr. Greenshields had made a statement on the witness stand which was absolutely inconsistent with the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works in the House.

Mr. MORRISON. Will the hon. gentleman show us in the evidence where that occurs?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will show it before I conclude, and the hon. gentleman knows where it is just as well as I do. It was brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works on the witness stand by me at the very time he gave the evidence which I have read. Now, this further question is put to the hon. Minister of Public Works:

Q. That is, you did not tell the truth to prevent them lying?—A. I did not say that. I did not divulge all the truth because there was no necessity for making that statement to the House.

The position was this. The Minister rose in his place in the House and said he was going to be frank with the House, and then, on the witness stand, he said: "I did not divulge all the truth because there was no necessity of making that statement to the House."

My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Railways, made a certain statement in this House with regard to certain suspicions he had, and I venture to suggest to my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) that when a transaction of this kind is of such a nature that the Minister of Public Works cannot, in his place in the House, after stating that he was going to be frank, state the whole truth to the House, there is something in that possibly to excite some suspicion. I would put it to my hon. friend, who is a lawyer and understands how to weigh evidence, that in the case of a circumstance of that kind, if he were addressing a jury he might be inclined, and if he was doing his duty would be inclined, to lay some stress upon it.

My hon. friend dwelt at some length on what was said by the Minister of Railways and Canals at page 8 of the evidence, namely, that without his attention being brought to it at all, he was minded, of his own motion, to make some bargain with the owners of this railway for its acquisition. But I desire to point to my hon. friend from New Westminster the circumstance which he does not seem to have borne in mind, that during the progress of these negotiations, which began in January and continued until March, this very gentleman, Mr. Greenshields, who is practically the owner of this road, was in communication with the Minister of Public Works on the subject, and that the Minister of Public Works was the very gentleman to whom Mr. Greenshields lent his cheque on the occasion I have referred to. Does not my hon. friend think that that is a circumstance which it was proper to bring out in evidence and dwell upon? Does he think it is a circumstance that requires no comment, that Mr. Greenshields, the owner of this road, was in communication on several occasions, according to the evidence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), with that gentleman dealing with the acquisition of this road, and that during the progress of these negotiations Mr. Greenshields saw fit to lend his cheque and endorse notes for the purpose of purchasing a paper for the sons of the Minister of Public Works—a paper which the Minister of Public Works, in this House, said was not purchased for his sons but for the Liberal party.

We thought fit to ask the hon. Minister, when on the witness stand, who were the persons that advanced the $50,000 for the purchase of that paper, but did not get much satisfaction. We asked him: Have you any objection to stating the names of the political friends who advanced the money? He told us it was not Mr. Greenshields, and we were bound to accept his statement. But he would not give us the names of the friends in question. He said:

That is my business just as in the past all of you have given notes and endorsed notes in political business.

That was all the information we could get from the hon. gentleman on the subject.

My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) made one or two other singular remarks. He quoted some evidence of Mr. Farwell, at page 135; and when challenged about it, he said it made no difference what Mr. Farwell said. That seems to be rather an extraordinary view to take of evidence, and I should think that, on the whole, my learned friend would be inclined to withdraw that proposition. He said also: I will not deal with these matters at any length, that it was plain beyond doubt that this road was worth $17,000 or $18,000 or $19,000 a mile. I think he mentioned these different sums at different times, but $19,000 was the largest. Of course, we all sympathise with Mr. Greenshields and his associates, who are giving away this road worth $19,000 a mile to the Government for $12,000 a mile; and particularly do we feel the force of that when we know, as I shall point out further, that Mr. Greenshields got $50,000, I think it was, of that stock for practically nothing—for his influence as a financier or his advice or something of that kind, and very large blocks of stock he got at times at a nominal figure. The stock of the company, whose road was worth $19,000 a mile, was worth only that figure, and the hon. gentleman will also bear in mind that although Mr. Greenshields did buy a portion at par, he bought it at par after he had secured this agreement with the Government. Possibly the hon. gentleman upon reflection might think that this was a circumstance worthy to be dealt with. And, as a matter of fact,

that is one of the things in the minority report, which is amply supported by the evidence, although my hon. friend ventured to make the assertion that not one syllable or one word of that minority report is supported by the evidence.

Coming down to the real question before this House, and leaving the hon. gentleman to congratulate himself upon the speech he has made with respect to this matter, if he sees fit to do so, because I shall not trouble myself very much more with him, I want to say now, as I have said before, that on general principles, I am in favour of the Intercolonial Railway obtaining access to the city of Montreal. The hon. gentleman spent about three-quarters of an hour in arguing in favour of that proposition, although he followed the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), who stated, not only here but before the committee, that he always had that view. I well remember that when the Grand Trunk Railway was operating the line between Montreal and Lévis, the service was not very good so far as passengers were concerned, and I can well believe that it was not very good, so far as freights were concerned, and in view of the manner in which that road was operated, I think it would have been a prudent thing to attempt to obtain access to the city of Montreal for the Intercolonial.

The main question, therefore, is whether or not, in the first place, this was the best way to get into Montreal, and, in the second place, whether or not the price which the Government is paying is a fair and reasonable price. It has been suggested by the leader of the Opposition that both this Government and the late Government committed themselves to the project of assisting in the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence from Lévis to Quebec. If that bridge should be accomplished, if this Government see fit to give it adequate aid, a much better arrangement might have been made for running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Montreal. I may say in passing that the argument which the ex-Minister of Railways has made to the House with regard to the cost of construction of a railway on the one side or the other, has not in any way been answered by the hon. member for New Westminster.

Let us see what would be the state of affairs if such a bridge were constructed. I am assuming that it is the policy of this Government to adequately assist the construction of that bridge. Then you would have about 275 miles from Halifax to St. John over which it is desirable, not only in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but in the interest of the country as a whole, that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have running powers; and you would have, I believe, about 172 miles from the city of Quebec to the city of Montreal, over which, in that case it would be extremely desirable that the Intercolonial Railway should have running powers. The Minister of Railways and Canals told us the other night that it was monstrous and ridiculous to talk of a project of that kind, for this reason—in the first place, he said the road from Halifax to St. John was very much longer than the other; and, in the second place, it ran through a very much better country. Now, so far as the first is concerned, no one suggests that such an arrangement should be made except on fair and reasonable terms It might be made on a mileage basis or in half a dozen other ways so as to give to the Government every advantage that they might fairly claim by reason of the fact that this line from Halifax to St. John was a longer line. And, so far as the country through which it runs and the traffic are concerned, all these matters are capable of adjustment; and if the project is carried out, you would have the Intercolonial Railway with running powers into Montreal with terminal facilities there, and you would have the Canadian Pacific, for which the province of Nova Scotia has paid its full share and out of which, up to the present time, it has got very little benefit, with access to the city of Halifax and having that city practically as one of its termini. And I venture to think that if the project of the Quebec bridge is to be carried out, even if there is a reasonable probability of it being carried out, it is not a very wise thing for the Government to bind itself to the acquisition of this Drummond County Railway. It would have been better, for the present, to have dealt with the Drummond County Railway as an experiment, and to ascertain whether or not the proposed bargain was a good bargain.

Well, Sir, assuming that we are for the present to lay aside that suggestion, we have the question of the present proposed bargain with the Drummond County Railway. Now the question of value of this road, as I understand it, ought to be determined by the Government on the basis of its value to the person who owns it. I think that some confusion of thought in regard to that point was expressed in the speech of the Minister of Railways and Canals in dealing with the question of the deduction of these subsidies. I say that the value with which we are to deal, the basis on which this road is to be purchased, is the value of the road to the persons who own it. If the Government were expropriating this road, what would be the basis on which they would have to pay for it? Not on the basis of what it cost or of what it was worth to the Government. Every lawyer knows that it is upon the basis of the value of property to the owner that the Government or any other corporation is to pay for property taken for public use. To such an extent has that been carried out that in one case in England where an ecclesiastical corporation had its property taken by a railway company, the

amount paid by the railway company, under the judgment of the court, was practically nominal, because, although the property was immensely valuable to the railway company it was not a profitable property to the owner inasmuch as the owner was restricted by the terms of its title from making profitable use of it. So, the Government were not called upon to pay the Drummond County Railway Company either on the basis of what the road cost or on the basis of the value of that road to the Government, but the fair value of it to the company which owned it, as would be the case if the road were sold by the company to any other person. I do not think my hon. friend from New Westminster would venture to controvert that proposition. I do not think he would say that this Government should purchase that road on any basis other than the basis on which they would pay for it if they expropriated it. It is worth only so much to the Drummond County Railway, and the Government should pay only that to the Drummond County Railway Company for it.

Now, let us see what this road was worth to the Drummond County Railway Company. In the first place, let us observe what the Government propose to pay for it. They proposed to pay a sum which, as capitalized by the expert of the Finance Department at the rate of interest paid by the Government on their last loan, amounted to $2,094,192. And I mention to my hon. friend from New Westminster that that is another fact stated in the minority report which, possibly he will concede is supported by the evidence. Now, Sir, if you will take their bargain this year of $1,600,000 and deduct from that the additional expenditure by the company required by the agreement of 1898 and not by that of 1897, viz., $65,795, you have a balance of $1,534,205, leaving a balance of $559,987 in favour of the bargain of this year. And, as the hon. gentleman from New Westminster is so fond of giving advice and suggestions to us on this side of the House, I would venture to give this advice and make this suggestion to him—that it was not a very wise thing, not a very prudent thing, for him to stand up in his place in this House in 1897 and vote for that bargain which was $559,987 worse to this country than the bargain, which by the interposition of the Senate, the Government were afterwards able to make. I put that not in the lecturing tone which the hon. gentleman adopted, but merely as a mild and humble suggestion from a young member on this side to the hon. member for New Westminster.

Now, I would also call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this. That under section 35 of the Grand Trunk agreement of 1898, the Government are paying for improvements hereafter to be made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the basis of user or wheelage, and not in the basis of one-half.

Well, Sir, does not the hon. gentleman know that the user of the Grand Trunk Railway, according to the evidence in this case must be about twenty to one the user of the Intercolonial Railway? Will he stand up in his place and deny that? Why, then, does he venture to ask, as he did to-night, what the question of user has to do with it? I was astonished that any hon. gentleman would stand up in this House and ask what the question of user had to do with it, when he knows that, according to the evidence in this case, user by the Grand Trunk Railway of the terminal facilities at Montreal must be many times any possible user which the Intercolonial Railway can make. Yet the hon. gentleman asks: What has user to do with it? User has this to do with it—I make this as another humble suggestion from this side of the House—that as the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial are both to use these terminal facilities at Montreal, we should not pay anything but our proportionate actual user of them. If the Grand Trunk Railway, with its enormous traffic with the west, uses those terminals twenty times as much as the Intercolonial Railway, then it is right and just that the Intercolonial Railway, in respect of betterments to be made in future, should pay for, not one-half of these betterments, but one-twentieth of those betterments. Yet the hon. gentleman has repeated over and over again that the question of user or wheelage has nothing at all to do with it. Why, if I adopted the unkind suggestion which the Minister of Railways and Canals was good enough to make the other evening, I would say that the hon. member for New Westminster is the advocate of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The leader of the Opposition, because he ventured to make a suggestion the other night, was told that he held a retainer for the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the hon. gentleman thinks that under circumstances of that kind the question of user has nothing at all to do with the matter, what shall we think of that hon. gentleman's position with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway? I do not say that the Grand Trunk Railway would not have a very able and a very capable advocate in the hon. gentleman, although I think that they would probably expect him to do a little better justice to their case in court than he has been able to do for their case in this House to-night; and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman would do much better in court, because I know that he is as capable of making a good point as any hon. gentleman in this House for a client who retains him. The difficulty, as suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was not in the matter of ability or competency, but merely the fact that he

had not a very good case to argue, and I for one am willing to admit that he made the very best out of a bad case.

Now, I will not go over the other items of this Grand Trunk Railway agreement, which I might go over; I will leave it with that one. I venture to think that my hon. friend from New Westminster, upon consideration and reflection, will come to the conclusion that if the Intercolonial Railway uses these terminals, these betterments, to one-twentieth only of the extent that the Grand Trunk Railway uses them, it is only fair and right that it should pay on the basis of user, and not on a one-half basis. The hon. gentleman will also bear in mind one other thing, that we were to pay interest at the rate of 5 per cent upon the cost of these betterments, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, with this Government guarantee, would have been able to borrow nearly the whole cost of the betterments with the 5 per cent interest which they were to receive from the Intercolonial on one-half the cost. So that the net result of that agreement, which is so fair and so just according to the argument of the hon. gentleman, would have been that the Grand Trunk Railway, for all time to come, so long as the rate of interest remains as it is at present, would be in a position to make any betterments which the Intercolonial Railway had to use, at the cost of the Intercolonial Railway exclusively and alone.

Now, Sir, coming down to what we are dealing with more particularly, the question of the price of this Drummond road, let us take it first on the basis of these options. My hon. friend, I think, challenged me to give any evidence in support of what is stated in the minority report concerning this option for $400,000. Well, I will give that to my hon. friend. As a matter of fact, he read it himself to-night, but forgot, apparently, that he read it, and stated afterwards that no such evidence existed. I will read to him from the evidence of Mr. Farwell, as found on page 145:

Q. There were no other options given in connection with this road?—A. I may have had another, but it was simply to me.

Q. I suppose for a similar amount to this?—A. I do not remember. I was under the impression that this was for $400,000, but it is put in here at $500,000.

He was referring to the document which he had before him.

Q. What do you think the other option would be for?—A. The other would be for $400,000, but I do not know if this is an exact copy. It was not less than $400,000.

What the witness means by "this" is that he had before him the option for $500,000, or at least a copy of it. He says that there was another option; he says he does not know whether the document before him is an exact copy of the original, but the purport of his evidence is that if that is an exact copy of the original, then the other option was exactly in the same terms except that it was for $400,000. Now, my hon. friend from New Westminster has not gone very much into the details respecting the price of this road or the value of this road, if you work it out on the basis of this option. If you work it out on that basis you have this result: An option was given for $500,000, and $500,000, according to Mr. Farwell's evidence, was the basis on which all the shareholders were to be paid except himself. Does my hon. friend controvert that? I think not. According to Mr. Farwell's evidence, who differs in this from Mr. Greenshields, and who undoubtedly had better knowledge of this than Mr. Greenshields, $500,000 was the price at which the shareholders were to be paid with the exception of Mr. Farwell, who was in the arrangement with Mr. Ryan to make whatever they could out of it, over and above that. Therefore, so far as the main body of the shareholders were concerned, they were to be paid on the basis of $500,000 under the one option, and on the basis of $400,000 under the other option. Now, in the minority report, we worked out as carefully and conscientiously as we could, spending a good deal of time over it, the amount that was expended on that road after the date of these options, and we made it $685,000. I have here an abstract of every item and detail of that road taken from the Government returns, from the time they were first put in, until the end of 1897; and I challenge my hon. friend or any other gentleman on the other side of the House to show that that statement is materially incorrect. I remember the Minister of Railways and Canals putting it the other evening as nearly a million dollars. But I say it can be shown from the sworn returns, and from the evidence in this case, that the amount which you are to add to the amount of that option is in the vicinity of $685,000. Now, what is the result of that? The result is that giving to these people the benefit of every doubt in this case, you come to the conclusion that in 1898, when this road is to be purchased by the Government from this company, it is worth, on the basis of the $500,000 option, $1,115,000, or nearly $500,000 less than the Government pay for it. On the basis of a $400,000 option, it is worth $1,015,000, or nearly $600,000 less than the Government were paying for it. Are these options and the cost of the road subsequently to the company a fair basis upon which to pay the company for this railway? I say, it is more than a fair basis, as I will show to my hon. and learned friend in a moment. Let us take another basis of calculation, the value of the stock. I do not say, that the value of the stock, taken alone, is a fair basis, but I do think, if you take the value of the stock in connection with

the floating indebtedness of the company, if any, you can get at a fair value for the road. Mr. Greenshields got $50,000 worth of this stock for practically nothing; he got $80,000 of the stock for $24,000, which he told us he paid for in the equivalent of cash. It was not in cash, but we took his word for it that it was the equivalent of cash. He got $50,000 worth of the stock for his advice and financial assistance, $80,000 worth for $24,000, and the balance of $137,600 he paid for, he tells us, at par. If he did pay for that at par, which I am bound to concede, he paid for it at par by exercising, after this arrangement with the Government, options which he had procured before this arrangement with the Government. Has that circumstance any significance in the sight of my hon. and learned friend? Is it of any importance in the eyes of any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, that $50,000 of this stock was given to Mr. Greenshields merely for his financial aid and assistance, and that he bought $80,000 worth for $24,000 in cash, let us say, before this arrangement with the Government? He was willing afterwards to pay par for $137,600 worth. Now, Sir, the result of that is, that, for $267,600 out of $400,000 worth of stock, Mr. Greenshields paid $161,600, of which $137,600 was paid by him after he had secured this arrangement with the Government. If you take the floating indebtedness of the company, which was the only indebtedness they had, outside of this, and if you apply it to the value of the stock of this company purchased by Mr. Greenshields, and if you give Mr. Greenshields the benefit of this stock that he purchased at par, you cannot make out the value of the road at the time of its proposed acquisition by the Government as being worth more than $1,000,000, and the minority report shows that the profit Mr. Greenshields will make out of the road is certainly excessive. Upon the basis of the agreement of 1897, Mr. Greenshields would have received upon his investment of $24,000 a net profit of more than $400,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) says, that he hopes that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will make money. I do not exactly know why he should have expressed the hope, for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House: he might have extended it to this side of the House as well. Certainly, if the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite are to get bargains like that, it is evident that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will not stand much of a chance to compete with them. Then, upon the basis of the agreement of 1898, the one that is now being sought to be enforced, Mr. Greenshields's net profit would be $240,000 upon his outlay of $24,000. Does the hon. gentleman venture to deny that portion of the minority report, because I can give him the figures in extenso? That report is founded on fact and supported by evidence.

Another basis of value is the earning power of this road. What was the earning power of this road? The average earning power of this road for the last three years—by which I mean the net earnings—amounted to $33,124.28, and the cost of maintenance, as the hon. member for New Westminster will find by reference to the returns to the Government of other railways, was abnormally low. Therefore, this railway, which, according to the argument of the hon. member for New Westminster, had cost $1,908,000, was yielding, on that investment, the net sum of $33,124. It was not a very paying concern; $33,000 was the net average earnings for the three years before 1897, and $33,000 is a good deal less than 2 per cent on the amount that this road cost these gentlemen, if my hon. friend's argument is correct. The floating debt of the road increased from time to time. It stood at its highest mark in 1897, when it reached the sum of $297,396. That is another circumstance which shows that the road was not a very paying concern. Therefore, when you sum these things up what result do you have? You have, in the first place, this fact, that the owners of this road in 1894 had offered it over and over again to different parties, at a price which would now realize from $1,015,000 to $1,115,000, if you add to what had been expended then, the subsequent cost of construction. Therefore, on that basis, the amount which is being paid by the Government is excessive. You have, in the next place, the purchase of the stock, taken in connection with the floating indebtedness, and on that basis you find two things: First, that you cannot value the road up to $1,000,000 by any process whatever; in the second place, that Mr. Greenshields, who is the person almost wholly interested in the road, would make an enormous profit upon the purchase of his stock before this agreement with the Government was secured, and would make even a very large profit by his purchase of stock, after this agreement was secured. In the third place, you find that the earning power of this road indicates that it was worth no such sum of money as that which the Government are paying. Will my hon. friend venture to assert that a road which has a net earning power of only $33,000, represents a value of $1,600,000? I venture to think not.

Now, there is one further test, and that is the basis on which the whole business before the committee was given, the basis of the cost of this road. I have endeavoured to show you, Sir, that this is not a fair basis on which the value of this road should be computed. I have endeavoured to show that the price of this road should be the value to its owner to-day, and that the basis of cost is not a fair basis. But let us suppose for a moment that the basis of cost is a fair basis, what is the result? The Deputy Minister of Railways

and Canals valued this road at $11,000 per mile, which I think, brings its value to $1,565,000. Now, you may say, gentlemen on the other side of the House probably will say, that you should not deal with this company on the basis of value; you should be generous with them and deal with them on the basis of cost. If you deal with them on the basis of cost, I ask any hon. gentleman in this House if it is fair to the Government of this country to include in that cost the subsidies which have been paid. I say it is not. I say that if you are not going to take the legal basis of value—that is, the value to the company—if you are going to be generous with these gentlemen, and say that you wish to take the basis of cost; then, in all fairness, take the basis of actual cost. And, if you deduct from the amount at which Mr. Schreiber, the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, has valued the road; if you deduct from it the subsidies which these gentlemen have got from the Dominion Government and from the provincial Government, and from municipalities, you will find that you bring the value down to about $900,000. If you are going to deal with these gentlemen on the basis of cost, for what possible reason shall you pay to them moneys which they had not expended out of their own pockets. Cost is not the basis on which you deal with a man when you are buying his property; value, to him, is the basis on which you deal with him; at least, if you are expropriating his property. If you are dealing with him on the basis of cost, surely it is right and fair to take what it actually cost him, and not pay over to him subsidies which this Dominion and the province of Quebec have paid him, and thus practically give these subsidies over twice. Now, I would like, if any hon. gentleman on the other side who happens to follow me, would show in what respect my argument in that regard is not a fair and legitimate argument. Summed up, it is simply this: That you deal with a man on the basis of value and not on the basis of cost, but if you do go to him on the basis of cost, go to him on the basis of actual cost, particularly when you yourself have furnished a portion of the money which he is now seeking to get back from you, for the reason, and on the theory that the road has cost him that amount. The subsidies which have been paid to this road are as follows:—

Dominion of Canada subsidy.....	$287,936
Province of Quebec subsidy.....	347,420
Municipality subsidy.....	15,000
Total.....	$650,356

Deduct from that $1,565,000, which I think is the amount at which the road is valued by Mr. Schreiber—and you have a little over $900,000 as the fair amount which you should pay this company, if you deal with them on the basis of cost, and not on the basis of value. As it is approaching 12 o'clock, the hour at which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries suggested the adjournment, I take the liberty of moving that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I have no objection.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What business does the Government propose to go on with to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One or two small Bills; an Act to amend the Railway Act, an Act to amend the Insurance Act, and after that the House will probably go into Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand the hon. gentleman will not go on with this debate to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not the intention of the Premier to go on with the debate to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN. It is not material: I was just asking for the purpose of convenience.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 19th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That when this House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned to Thursday next, the 25th instant, and that when it adjourns on Friday next, it stand adjourned to the following Saturday at three o'clock in the afternoon, and that Government Orders have precedence.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT—AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. THOMAS BAIN (South Wentworth) presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, as follows:—

The Committee recommend that the House authorize the printing in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, in the form of

advanced sheets of the committee's final report, twenty thousand (20,000) copies of each of the following divisions of the evidence given before the committee in the current session of Parliament on the specific subjects of "The fattening of chickens," "the fundamental principles that underlie the growing of crops," "The Canadian apple trade," and "The making of butter"; and that fifteen thousand (15,000) copies of each of the said advanced sheets be for use of members of Parliament, and five thousand (5,000) of each for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BAIN. With the consent of the House, I would like to move the adoption of the report presented from the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. I may briefly explain that there were two or three matters before the committee that appeared to the members of the committee to be of considerable public interest and such as should reach the community somewhat earlier than our report would under ordinary circumstances. Among these were the evidence given respecting the fundamental principles that underly the growing of crops, the poultry trade and the fattening of poultry, and the apple-shipping trade. It is proposed simply to revise the evidence touching these points and publish them as advance sheets of the report in bulletin form. It is anticipated that if we get the arrangement carried out at once, the printer will be able to complete the work so that the copies will be in the hands of members in the course of a month before prorogation. We ask for 15,000 copies in this form for the use of members of the House and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture, to be printed in the usual proportions of English and French. Of course, I am cognizant of the fact that without the consent of the House I cannot move for the adoption of the report, as it was presented only to-day.

Mr. W. B. IVES (Sherbrooke). I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Bain) to consider whether 15,000 copies is large enough edition for the use of members. I have some general knowledge of the subject and the nature of the evidence which has been given, and, to my mind, it will be exceedingly useful to have a pretty general circulation of it. I am quite certain that members on both sides of the House, if they could get copies before the House prorogued, would give this evidence a large circulation. I think that 15,000 copies would be altogether inadequate. In fact, I think we should have two or three hundred copies for every constituency. If the evidence is what I am informed it is, it is of very great importance, and would be very useful to the agricultural interest.

Mr. BAIN. I may explain that the limitations are practically at the Printing Bureau. I was given to understand that we could secure an edition of 20,000 chapters without particular inconvenience with the other work in hand. Beyond that, it would, perhaps, be difficult for us to secure the necessary accommodation there, that if the work was delayed, we should frustrate the object we have in view. It will become a portion of the report of the committee at a later stage, and with the consent of the House, I will ascertain if it is possible to extend that edition somewhat further.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest that my hon. friend might make his motion not to exceed 50,000 or 60,000 copies; then he could obtain what he found necessary.

Mr. BAIN. Then I will amend the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would suggest that this motion be adopted, and that the committee bring in an additional report later on providing for the additional copies.

Mr. BAIN. We might strike out the recommendation as to the numbers, and I will move that at a later date.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend and colleague, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), being unavoidably absent to-day, I have undertaken, with the view of expediting business, and in order not to disappoint the very legitimate impatience of the public with regard to the measure which stands in his name, to present it to the House. I may say at once that the object we have in view in presenting this Bill is not to make a total redistribution of the electoral districts under which the House of Commons is now constituted. We deem that it would not be expedient at this time to do more than undo, so far as we can, the most glaring violations of a principle which we have always held, and which has always been universally held by public opinion in this country, to be the fundamental principle of representation. We think it is a principle which will commend itself universally to public opinion, that the basis of representation in this House should be the municipal county organization. It is in the recollection of all the members of this House that this principle was to a large extent interfered with by the Redistribution Act of 1882. That Act was a violation of the principle which had prevailed up to that time, and had been maintained, not alone by the Liberal party, but by the Conservative party as well. There are many well-known reasons why the municipal county organization should be preserved as the basis of representation; and I cannot do better upon this point than to quote the language of Sir John A. Macdonald, when the first Redistribution Act after confederation was introduced, in 1872. Sir John A. Macdonald, at that time, went over the question very fully, and gave in graphic language, the reasons from which there was no dissent

expressed at that time, why the municipal county organization should be laid down as the basis of representation. The language which he made use of on that occasion reads as follows :—

It is desired, as much as possible, to keep the representation within the country so that each county that is a municipality of Ontario should be represented, and if it becomes large enough, that it should be divided into ridings—that principle is carried out in the suggestions I am about to make. That rule was broken in 1867 in three constituencies, namely, Bothwell, Cardwell and Monck ; and I do not think on the whole that the experiment has proved a successful one. I do not think it was unsuccessful as far as the representatives of those new constituencies themselves were concerned, as they are well and ably represented by the gentlemen who now hold seats for the constituencies ; and I hope that if I am returned again to the next Parliament I shall meet those hon. members. But it is obvious that there is a great advantage in having counties elect men whom they know. Our municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts. We all know the process which happily goes on in western Canada. A young man in a county commences his public life by being elected by the neighbours who know him to the township council. If he shows himself possessed of administrative ability he is made reeve or deputy reeve of the county. He becomes a member of the county council, and as his experience increases and his character and abilities become known, he is selected by his people as their representative in Parliament. It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose abilities they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two several counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest ; they do not meet together, and they have no common feeling except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in another. This tends towards the introduction and development of the American system of caucuses, by which wire-pullers take adventurers for their political ability only, and not from any personal respect for them. So that, as much as possible, from any point of view, it is advisable that counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased it should be by subdividing the counties into ridings.

Now, the wisdom of these remarks nobody will controvert. It is true that the Redistribution Bill of 1882, which was introduced while Sir John A. Macdonald was in office, was not drawn upon these lines ; but while the principle was departed from on modifications which we intend to propose to so far as my memory goes, express any views at all differing from those he had expressed on the previous occasion. I think the country at large will be prepared to come back to the adoption of those views. I may say at once that this is the guiding principle which we have adopted in proposing the modifications which we intend to propose to the Redistribution Act. As I said a moment ago, we do not intend at this time to undo the old representation Act ; we intend to deal with it only so far as is necessary in order to do away with the most glaring violations of the principle which was laid down as a cardinal and guiding principle in 1872.

There is another principle which we think ought to prevail whenever a redistribution of constituencies is to be made. According to the Constitutional Act, it becomes the duty of Parliament, not only the optional, but the obligatory duty of Parliament, after every new census, to make a redistribution. If it were simply an optional duty, there would not be so much force in the contention which I intend to advance; but as it is a mandatory, an imperative duty, imposed upon Parliament by the constitution itself, it becomes all the more important that we should adhere to the well-known principles hitherto laid down and accepted when it becomes the duty of Parliament to interfere in any way with the representation of the House of Commons. The first principle that we lay down, as I said a moment ago, is, that municipal county organization shall be the basis of representation ; the consequent principle of this is, that county municipal organization should not be interfered with, and that boundary lines should not be interfered with. If the population of a county should become so small, according to the development of the population in other counties, as to no longer justify it to be represented by one member on the floor of the House of Commons, then we hold that that county should not be separated piecemeal, but that it should be annexed to the neighbouring county, as was done in several instances in this House : in Cornwall and Stormont, Niagara and Lincoln, Three Rivers and St. Maurice, Chambly and Verchères, Laprairie and Napierville, and St. John and Iberville. In all of these cases, the people of these counties had the privilege of sending one member to the House of Commons, but the population had become so small, relatively to the population of other counties, that it was thought advisable to deprive them of the privilege that they had up to that time of sending each one member to the House of Commons. In these cases, county lines were not interfered with, but adjoining counties were combined together to form one single electoral district. We have thought that, when such a case arises, this precedent should be followed, as it has already been closely adhered to. This is a case which, I believe, is not likely to arise very often ; a case that is more likely to arise is, where the population of a county may become so large that it will be entitled to more than one representative. Under such circumstances, it is provided that a county may be divided into ridings on the principle we want to lay down, and which we do act upon, which is, that, whenever a county has to be divided into ridings, whenever a county which, up to that time, is entitled to one member, becomes entitled to two or

three members, the division should take place by judicial decision and authority. This is the second principle upon which we base the Bill that we introduce to this House now. After these preliminary observations as to the guiding principles upon which we have acted, I will now proceed to give to the House the character of the Bill which we have introduced. I may say, at first, keeping in view the main observations with which I started, that it is not our intention to have a general redistribution, but simply to undo certain wrongs that we think were done to the people, and certain of the more glaring violations which took place in regard to the principle we hold as sacred. It is not the intention to have any disturbance in the following constituencies :—Ottawa, Algoma, Carleton, Addington, Durham, Frontenac, Glengarry, Grenville, Halton, Hastings, Kingston, Lanark, Leeds, Lennox, Dundas, Nipissing, Northumberland, Peterborough, Prince Edward, Renfrew, Russell, Stormont and Cornwall, Victoria and Waterloo. These remain undisturbed. In the remarks which I quoted a moment ago, Sir John Macdonald said, that county lines had been interfered with in three instances at confederation, that is to say, in the cases of Cardwell, Monck, and Bothwell. The House, it seems, agreeing with Sir John Macdonald, has already caused Monck to disappear. It is proposed, on this occasion, that Bothwell, Cardwell and West Ontario shall also disappear. It is proposed, also, that Middlesex, which now returns four members, shall return only three for the four constituencies. These will be replaced by giving representation to the county of Dufferin and to the territorial district of Parry Sound, and by giving two additional members to Kent, Ont.

Mr. BERGERON. That will be three members for Kent.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes; that takes in part of Bothwell. The Bill proposes to restore county lines to the following electoral districts :—

Brant, Bruce, Elgin, Grey, Haldimand, Huron, Kent, Lambton, Lanark, Middlesex, Norfolk, Ontario, Oxford, Peel, Simcoe, Welland, Wellington, Wentworth, and York.

To give these representation the details would have to be as follows, taking the changes which I have just indicated :—

The electoral district of the city of London shall consist of the city of London, and shall return one member.

The electoral district of the city of Hamilton shall consist of the city of Hamilton, and shall return two members.

The electoral district of the city of Toronto shall consist of the city of Toronto, and shall be divided into four electoral districts, each of which shall return one member.

The counties of Dufferin, Haldimand, Lincoln, Peel, Welland and Wentworth, and the territorial district of Muskoka and the territorial district of Parry Sound shall each be an electoral district, and shall each return one member.

The counties of Brant, Elgin, Lambton, Norfolk, Ontario, Oxford and Perth shall each be divided into two electoral districts, and shall each return one member.

The counties of Kent, Huron, Bruce, Grey, Middlesex, Simcoe, Wellington and York shall each be divided into three electoral districts ; each of the districts shall return one member.

This is the provision which we have inserted in the Bill in regard to the judicial division of the counties into ridings :

Where, under the foregoing provisions, any county or city is to be divided into more than one electoral district, such divisions shall be made by a board of commissioners, consisting of at least three persons, being judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario, who, for that purpose, shall be appointed by letters patent under the Great Seal, and who shall divide the city of Toronto and each such county into the number of electoral districts by this Act assigned to them respectively.

The letters patent appointing the commissioners shall request the commissioners in making the divisions to consider the distribution of population according to the last Dominion census, the public convenience, and such divisions as appear to them best calculated to do substantial justice.

In case of the death or resignation or refusal of any one or more of such commissioners to act, a successor or successors shall in like manner be appointed.

The commissioners shall complete such divisions within a time to be limited by said letters patent, and shall report such divisions to the Secretary of State, making a separate report as to each electoral district so set apart by them, and shall set forth in such report the boundaries of the electoral districts to which such report refers and the municipalities comprised therein, and assign and appropriate designation to the electoral district in question, and upon receipt by the Secretary of State of the reports of the commissioners completing the divisions aforesaid, the respective territories by such respective reports described as constituting the respective electoral districts into which the said city of Toronto and the respective counties shall have been divided as aforesaid, shall, subject to the provisions of section 18 of this Act, become and be electoral districts as if the same had been so set apart and established as such by this Act.

Let me say, that section 18 is simply to provide that this Bill shall not come into force so long as the present Parliament continues, but shall come into force only at the dissolution of this Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The last portion ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The whole of this Bill. This is section 18 :

Nothing herein contained shall operate as to change the constitution of the electoral districts as they now exist until the dissolution of the present Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the judicial arrangement applies to this Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, it is a part of this Bill.

Each report shall be signed by the commissioners, or, in case of disagreement, by a majority of them, and the report of the majority of the commissioners shall be the report of the commissioners.

Each separate report shall be published by the Secretary of State in the "Canada Gazette" forthwith after its receipt thereof by him.

These are all the provisions in regard to this point.

In regard to the province of Quebec, it is not proposed to make any alterations in the representation as it exists to-day, except in so far as it is necessary to bring back the different municipalities which had been transferred in the Redistribution Act of 1892 from one county to another. Thus the parish of Lavaltrie, which for all purposes, municipal, judicial and otherwise, belongs to the county of Berthier, but which by the Act of 1892 was transferred from Berthier to L'Assomption, will be restored to the county of Berthier.

The same applies to the Indian village of Caughnawaga, the Indian village and reserve of Caughnawaga is transferred from the electoral district of Chateauguay to the electoral district of Laprairie and Napierville.

Mr. BERGERON. What about Caughnawaga? Under the new Franchise Act the Indians have no longer the right to vote there.

The PRIME MINISTER. They have no more the right to vote, and I do not think it affects the case one way or another. But in order to be consistent, we place Caughnawaga where it belongs. At present it is immaterial whether it is in Chauteaguay or Laprairie or anywhere else, because the Indians have no right to vote.

The parish of Lacolle, together with the islands situated in the River Richelieu, opposite thereto, is transferred from the electoral district of Missisquoi to the electoral district of St. John and Iberville. The parish of Lacolle, for all purposes, municipal and judicial, belongs to the county of St. John, and ought to belong to it.

The parishes of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges de Stanbridge, together with the islands situated in the River Richelieu, opposite thereto, are transferred from the electoral district of St. John and Iberville to the electoral district of Missisquoi.

The parish of St. Pie is transferred from the electoral district of Rouville to the electoral district of Bagot.

The parish of St. Marcel is transferred from the electoral district of Bagot to the electoral district of Richelieu.

The parish of St. Eugène de Grantham, now in the electoral district of Bagot, is transferred from that electoral district to the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska. It belongs to Drummond County for all purposes, judicial, municipal and otherwise.

The parish of St. Nazaire and Ste. Christine, as municipally constituted, shall be included in the electoral district of Bagot, and that electoral district, as reconstituted, shall consist of the town of Acton, the village of Upton, and the parishes of St. André d'Acton, St. Ephrem, Ste. Hélène, St. Hugues, St. Liboire, St. Pie, Ste. Rosalie, St. Simon, St. Théodore d'Acton, St. Dominique, St. Nazaire and Ste. Christine.

The parishes of St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure d'Upton, are transferred from the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska to the electoral district of Yamaska. That is done for the same reason that for all purposes except for federal electoral purposes, they belong to the county of Yamaska.

The parishes of Ste. Eulalie and St. Samuel shall be in and form part of the electoral district of Nicolet.

All that part of the township of Stanfold, to wit: the twelve first lots in the three first ranges of the said township, which form part of the parish of Notre Dame de Lourdes, are transferred from the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska, to the electoral district of Megantic. All this for the same reason.

Now, coming to the province of Prince Edward Island, subsection 6, of section 2, of chapter 11, of the statutes of 1892, which refers to Prince Edward Island, are repealed, and the following substituted so as to provide there as elsewhere county lines.

In the province of Prince Edward Island there shall be three electoral districts, designated as follows:—

The electoral district of Prince, which shall consist of the county of Prince, and shall return two members.

The electoral district of Queen's, which shall consist of the county of Queen's, and shall return two members.

The electoral district of King's, which shall consist of the county of King's, and shall return one member.

With regard to the province of New Brunswick, no changes are contemplated with the exception of the city of St. John, which, as everybody in this House knows, is in a peculiar condition. An elector in the city of St. John has two votes. He votes first for a member for the city of St. John, and then he votes for a member for the city and county of St. John. It is proposed to do away with this anomaly, and to have two electoral districts, one for the city of St. John and one for the county and city of St. John.

Section 5 of the statute of 1892, is hereby amended by striking out subsection (b) and substituting the following:—

The electoral district of the county of St. John shall consist of the county of St. John only.

Nothing herein contained shall operate so as to change the constitution of the electoral districts as they now exist, until the dissolution of the present Parliament.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the provisions of the Bill which we intend to propose. I hope they will commend themselves to both sides of this House, and above all to the country, and I therefore move the first reading of this Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Might I ask the leader of the Government if it is the intention to have two members for Prince, P.E.I., and two for Queen's, P.E.I., running together as formerly, and one for King's, P.E.I ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). It is quite impossible to deal at any length or minuteness with a Bill introduced in this way, and which is presented for the first time to the consideration of the House. I may say at once, I expected that my right hon. friend in introducing this Bill, would have drawn the attention of the House to what I regard as an extremely important feature of the measure. My right hon. friend refers to the constitutional Act providing for a decennial census, and he intimated that it was not proposed, before the arrival of that period, to make any material alterations. I would like to ask my right hon. friend why he resumed his seat without giving to this House, the reason why, for the first time in the history of Canada, this course should be pursued in regard to this measure. The Act of confederation provides under what circumstances a measure of this kind shall be passed. It provides that after every decennial census is taken, and when the result of that census is known, that there shall be a redistribution Bill touching representation in Parliament, as provided for under that Act. But, Sir, it is not usual in a law to provide that certain things shall not be done. The constitution of Canada provides that a redistribution Bill shall be passed at a particular time, and as I understand that constitution, it not only makes no provision for a redistribution at any other time ; but, so far as the law can do it, it suggests that the time, and the only time, for dealing with a change in the distribution of the parliamentary seats of Canada, shall be at a particular period and only then.

I say that while the constitution does not expressly state that it cannot be done at any other time, the very fact that that provision is distinctly made as to the time that there shall be, under the constitution of the country, a redistribution Act, leaves the inference that it can only be done after a decennial census, an inference that has been respected by every Government of Canada and by every party in Canada from confederation down to the present hour. There has been no redistribution Bill introduced by any Government or by any party during the more than thirty years of the life of this confederation, and this House had a right to expect from my right hon. friend that before he resumed his seat he would give some reason why this unusual and unprecedented—and as I think a study of the constitution will show—this strictly unconstitutional proceeding of passing a redistribution Act at the present moment.

Is my right hon. friend afraid to go back to the electorate who clothed him with power ? He obtained power under very exceptional circumstances. His party obtained power without having obtained a majority of this country upon one single great question at issue between the two parties in this House. It looks very much as if my right hon. friend believed that by converging the power of two Governments upon by-elections in local sections of the country, and with the adoption of the most startling means that this country has ever been a witness to, it looks very much as if my right hon. friend believes that though he is able to carry by-elections in this way, he is unable to face the general verdict of the people as that verdict would be recorded under the present law. I regard this measure as a confession from the right hon. gentleman that he is afraid to go back to the electors of Canada from whom he, under very exceptional circumstances, obtained power. The right hon. gentleman obtained power on the great issue that was put before the people of Canada on the occasion of the last general election, in regard to what was called the coercion of Manitoba. Will my right hon. friend venture to say, that the electorate of this country gave him a majority on that question ? He knows that he cannot say so, because he knows that his policy on that question was a Janus-faced policy. The policy propounded on the floor of this House was, that there must be no coercion in Manitoba ; and the policy propounded to the French Catholics at St. Roch's, in the province of Quebec, was, that if he did not obtain the fullest and most complete restoration of the rights of the French Catholics in Manitoba, he would resort to the same measure that I resorted to, and ask this Parliament to give him the means of redressing the wrongs under which his fellow-countrymen and co-religionists have suffered. It is to those two policies—one in Ontario declaring that there should be no coercion in Manitoba, and another in Quebec declaring that there should be coercion in Manitoba, if it was necessary, to restore to his fellow-countrymen and co-religionists the fullest and most complete rights they were entitled to under the constitution—that the hon. gentleman owes his position on the Treasury benches to-day. It was by appealing to the passions and prejudices of the people on a question of race and religion—

appealing most unjustly and unfairly—and by the grossest misrepresentation of the position of his opponents in the province of Quebec, that he was enabled to obtain the position he now occupies in this House. Then, Sir, take the question of free trade, which he had been agitating for twenty years in this House and out of it. The hon. gentleman will not dare to say, that upon that question he obtained a majority of the electorate of Canada to support him or his views.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). What about the Drummond County Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the hon. gentleman mean? Unless it is an impertinent interruption, I will wait to learn what the hon. gentleman means.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I want to know. It has as much to do with the question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, the Drummond County Railway has a good deal to do with the question. The Drummond County Railway matter is one of those fraudulent measures by which hon. gentlemen opposite obtained funds in order to corrupt constituencies and carry elections. The hon. gentleman knows that in connection with the Drummond County Railway he has used the public funds of the people of Canada to sustain his party and his views in the province of New Brunswick. That is the answer I have to give to the hon. gentleman on that subject, and I think he will find that the less he says, in this House or out of it, about the Drummond County Railway, except when he is obliged to deal with the question, the better it will be for him and for his party. We find, first, that the leader of the Government has adopted a change in the franchise of the country. What was that change? To deprive this Parliament of the power of establishing the franchise under which the members of this House of Commons should be elected. That was the first move—to adopt the most corrupt, the most indefensible, the most scandalous system of obtaining a majority, by local action, and by action that no Government in this House would dare to sustain, as we have witnessed it in the province of Manitoba and in other sections of the country. We have seen a Government who pledged themselves to this House that they would endeavour to carry out in the lower provinces, under that Franchise Act, the same law that obtained in Ontario, by which there would be an appeal to a judge. The New Brunswick legislature, after being elected, with the view of aiding and supporting hon. gentlemen opposite—for it could have no other object—have struck out of their Bill the appeal to the judges, and handed it over to the sheriffs, who are the creatures of the government of the day. Is that not enough? The hon. gentleman confesses, openly, that he is afraid to face the electorate of this country, as it existed when he obtained power. He is afraid to submit his claims to that tribunal. He first changes the franchise in a manner that is nothing short of an absolute public scandal to any impartial person who chooses to examine into the question. Next, in the by-elections we have public money and public patronage used in a manner the most scandalous and the most disgraceful that has ever been exhibited in the history of Canada. In addition to that, in the election that took place in West Huron, we found that arrangements were made by the Government of the day by which, if the election could not be obtained by fair means, it should be by foul—by which, if there was a close contest, they would be in a position to steal the power to send members to this House. I have under my hand affidavits from 43 respectable men in a polling district in West Huron, that they voted for the Conservative candidate; and there were only 30 ballots found in the poll-box in his favour. I say, it is by means of that kind, Ministers of the Crown associating with the lowest political heelers—a brigade of ruffians sent from one polling district to another throughout the province of Ontario, and headed and generalled by Ministers of the Crown, who ate with them, slept with them, remained with them night and day while the contest was going on—that hon. gentlemen opposite carried that election. And you had the same thing in Brockville the other day. The recount had shown that, if the election was a close one, you were in a position to get the man returned who had not been elected, instead of the man who had been elected, by the same resort to improper and corrupt means. Does the right hon. gentleman not know that one of the deputy returning officers, when he had the ballots sent to him, was waited upon by one of these political heelers and instructed as to what his duty was? And what did he do? He came back with the ballot-box to the returning officer, and said to him: "I have been an honest man up to the present, and, rather than follow these instructions, I refuse to serve." And he threw up his position rather than submit to the degradation which has made these elections at the hands of hon. gentlemen a by-word in the history of this country. Is that not enough? It appears not. Change the franchise; put it in the hands of the local governments, who have so scandalously abused their power in the making up of the lists. That is not enough; supplement that by using public and private funds and every other means to corrupt the elector. That is not enough; and now, before the right hon. gentleman dares to go back and make his appeal to the electorate of Canada, we have to have an act for which there is no authority within the four walls of the constitution of Canada.

The constitution of Canada provides when and how and where such an Act as this can be passed, and that is after the decennial census. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that there is any principle in this Bill which he has introduced? The great sovereign principle recognized by the constitution of Canada, and in its administration down to the present hour, is the principle of representation by population. It does not matter whether an adjoining county or an adjoining polling district be added to another, the great principle that underlies the present redistribution of seats in the whole Dominion is the principle of representation by population. Does the hon. gentleman tell me he has any regard for that in this Bill? Why, what has happened. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) tells me that an important feature in that part of the Bill relating to Ontario is the utter abandonment of the principle of representation by population. They take from East and West York about 35,000 of a population and add that to Toronto, and keep Toronto down to four members the same as now.

The hon. gentleman challenged the arrangements that were made by the last Act of redistribution under the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald. But what does he say to the redistribution of Ontario under Sir Oliver Mowat, one of his colleagues? My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), put in my hand three or four illustrations of constituencies as exhibited under the Redistribution Act of Sir Oliver Mowat; and when the hon. gentleman challenges the present distribution of seats, I ask him what he has to say to the means by which that was entirely thrown into the shade by the gigantic gerrymandering of one of his own colleagues, whom he has since made Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. What now do we find? The Bill does not make any material change in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman leaves Quebec pretty much as he found it. Why? Because Quebec gave him an overwhelming majority. But when he turned to Ontario, he tears that to pieces. Why? Because Ontario did not give him a majority at all. Under the circumstances, I am astonished that just on the eve of a decennial census, when, under the constitution of the country, as my right hon. friend knows, a redistribution must take place, he has given no justification for this measure which I regard as a violation of a principle recognized by all governments and their public men down to the present. My right hon. friend, by converging the power of two Governments, by adopting gigantic bribery with public and private money, and by those fraudulent practices which in Ontario now bid fair to make an honest election impossible, has sought to keep himself in power. Take what is going on in West Elgin now. The most gigantic frauds and attacks on the independence of the electorate are being established by the most incontrovertible testimony and brought home to the individuals who perpetrated them. But my hon. friend knows that, despite all his bribery and frauds, that which can be done in a single election cannot be done when the whole electorate of Canada is appealed to. He knows that unless he can resort to some means of juggling with the franchise and the distribution of seats, he will be swept out of power by the overwhelming tide of public indignation that is fast rising and will engulf him and all those who by bribery and corruption, private and public, and in every shape and form, are degrading everything like public life in Canada. My hon. friend knows he must resort to this deplorable, improper and unprecedented means to keep him in power, which he feels is slipping from his hands, and will pass away when the intelligent electorate have an opportunity of passing on the maladministration, the incapacity that has marked not only the career but the position of every member of that Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Without exception, of course.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry to say I do not know where to find an exception.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not think you could.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will point out to me any person in the present Administration who has not exhibited incapacity and convince me that I am wrong, I will at once withdraw; but so far as I am aware, there is not a man on the Government benches at whose hands the public interests of Canada has not suffered. When the Minister of Railways produces an exception I shall deal with it, but I cannot see any such now. I am only surprised that, under these circumstances, my hon. friend should not have attempted to gloss over this invasion of the constitution of Canada, in the interests of his party and Government, and put some plausible pretext before the House for doing that which was never done before and which I do not believe will ever be attempted again by any Government.

I do not intend to go at length into the various points. Take the county of Prince, P.E.I. My hon. friend hardly waited until the breath was out of the body of its former representative before he appealed to the Chair to issue a writ for a by-election. But in the case of Bagot, we demanded that a writ should issue within a reasonable time after the death of the lamented predecessor of the present member. How were we treated? My right hon. friend was not ready. He had not his machinery ready; he had not his emissaries to bribe and bulldoze and devise measures for the wresting of

that constituency, that he knew was Conservative then, and which he knows is Conservative now, from his opponents. The proof is here—he dare not go back to the county of Bagot. By a great struggle, and by such bribery and intimidation as can only be practised at a by-election, he succeeded in getting a supporter here from the electoral district of Bagot. But he knows that at a general election his friend would be swept aside, and that Bagot, like fifty other constituencies now held by people who call themselves Liberals, but who are Liberal in nothing but in providing for themselves and their friends, would be represented by a Conservative. Therefore, Bagot he must lay his hands upon. He knows the means by which, after six months keeping Bagot disfranchised for the purpose of having it purchased from under a Conservative candidate, he was able, by a bare majority, to secure the election of a friend there. But Bagot he dare not face in a general election.

Now, that is the position. I ask my hon. friend if he thinks that the great electorate of Canada, the independent, intelligent people of this Dominion, will not feel that a Prime Minister and a Government that is able to resort to such unworthy, such unconstitutional, such improper means of clinging to power, should be set aside that better men may fill their places. It is not my opinion alone, but the opinion of the Treasury benches and of the men who sit behind them, that after the votes they have been forced to give or induced to give—by judgeships and high offices, the promise of which they had in their pockets session after session while they were giving a slavish support to the Government—the independent electorate of this country are waiting, impatiently waiting, for an opportunity to redress these wrongs and to show that the time has come when the men who obtained power by promises, every one of which they have broken and disregarded, must be denied a longer continuance of the confidence that they have abused. I challenge them, in the face of this House, and I challenge them in the face of this country, to name one single act, one single public principle ever professed as the cardinal principle by that party that they have not trampled under foot since they obtained power. I challenge them to quote one single promise by means of which they thus obtained power to misgovern this country, that they have not violated. I have given that challenge before, and it remains unmet. No attempt has been made to show a single principle that they have professed that they have not utterly violated or a single pledge on which they obtained the confidence of the electorate of Canada, that they have not trampled under their feet.

Of course, we cannot take up this Bill in its present shape. It will be printed and placed in our hands. But I undertake to say that the more closely it is examined, the more palpably will it appear that I have not misunderstood the objects and aims that the hon. gentleman has in view in putting this measure before the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has just told us that he is shocked and horrified at my conduct on this occasion. I tell him very solemnly that I am not shocked or horrified at anything he says, scandalous as it was, as it always is. The hon. gentleman has given proof more than once this session that he is no longer able to discuss, that he is only able to abuse, and to use language so scurrilous as to be unworthy even of Billingsgate. The hon. gentleman says that we obtained power by appeals to prejudice. Does he forget his own history? Who went to Winnipeg in the year 1896 and asked the people of Manitoba not to place power in the hands of a Roman Catholic and French Canadian? This, of course, was not an appeal to race prejudice. The hon. gentleman should be ashamed, if shame could show itself upon his brow, to use such language and try to fasten such charges upon men better than himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was not a word of truth in the statement the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made to his friends in Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am accustomed to that. Whenever a charge is brought against the hon. gentleman we hear from him that there is not a word of truth in it. We have won by-elections by corruption, he says, and by the lavish use of money, private and public. Sir, there have been more than thirty by-elections won by the Liberal Government since the general election of 1896. These hon. gentlemen opposite tell us to-day, when there is no responsibility behind their words, that we have obtained these victories by the lavish use of money, private and public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. "Hear, hear," again repeats the hon. gentleman. If he speaks his mind in that, how is it that he has not had the courage to bring a single case before the courts. Not a single election has been contested. They have had their opportunities to prove their charges. The courts were open to them to establish their allegation that we had used money wrongfully in the by-elections. But in this, as in other matters, they have failed to act. Charges were made on the floor of this House that certain contracts had been given improperly, and when a committee was given them to make good their words, they drew back and said: We never made any insinuations. To-day the hon. gentleman says that I have used money in the

elections. I defy him to bring a case before the courts. But it is evident that he is afraid of courts and judges. He is afraid of this new measure. We do not want a gerrymander; we refer this matter to the judges of the land. But the hon. gentleman does not want to have it dealt with by the judges.

But I have every reason not to exchange abuse with the hon. gentleman, but simply to answer the only question that he has asked me. He asked me if we have power to bring in such a measure, since there has been no census. I answer in words which I hope he will adopt, that, according to the precedents laid down on the floor of this House more than once, we have that power. Redistributions of constituencies have taken place under similar circumstances not only after a census, but during a session when there had been no census. I would call to the hon. gentleman's attention the fact that in 1883 or in 1885, Parliament, at the suggestion of a Conservative Government, brought in a measure to redistribute the counties of Argenteuil and Terrebonne. One or two years later the Government introduced a Bill to reconstitute the constituencies of Terrebonne and Montcalm. If that can be done for one, it can be done for many. There is our power. As to the reason why we bring this measure forward to-day, it is simply to undo the great wrong done by the Conservative Government in 1892 to the electorate of the province of Ontario. That is the justification for our act, and the more it is scanned the more it will be seen there is in it nothing but principle of substantial justice.

The hon. gentleman has referred to Bagot. What are the facts? Two parishes were taken away in 1891, one the Liberal parish of St. Pie, which would give a majority of one hundred, and put into Rouville, as you, Sir, know; and another, St. Martel, which gave a Conservative majority, was taken from Richelieu and was added to Bagot. We end that injustice and bring back Bagot as it was. The hon. gentleman tells us that the people are with him. As I have said, he cannot discuss, but he can abuse. And he can brag. Abuse and brag are the whole stock-in-trade of the hon. gentleman. I tell him at this moment that all we desire is to have a fair appeal to the people, and when the people pronounce, I am willing to leave the victory to the best man.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is adopted, may I ask my hon. friend if he will lay on the Table of the House at an early date a schedule of the population of the districts which he is redistributing, their population, both before and after the redistribution?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think my hon. friend has got that information largely already in a book which was published two years ago, and which contains an atlas of the electoral constituencies of Canada. He will find there the population of the districts as they exist to-day. As to the other districts, I will endeavour to have the information which he wants before the second reading.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew that I could refer to the atlas as well as my hon. friend for what the population was before; but what we want is a chance for comparison.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not quite understand what the right hon. gentleman said with regard to one point. Are we to understand that every county which has more than one member is to be redistribued?

The PRIME MINISTER. No; every county where the county boundaries are restored, and which is entitled to more than one member, and is to be divided into ridings, should be so divided by the judges.

Mr. McNEILL. Not those counties which do not include any part of another county?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Bruce is one; you are all right.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are a certain number of counties as to which county boundaries are restored. All of these counties, I believe, are entitled to more than one member, and the division in their case will take place by the judges.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With regard to these districts which are to be arranged by the judges, when is that to take effect, previous to the next general election or after?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is provided in the Bill that the report of the judges, as soon as it is deposited in the office of the Secretary of State, should become part and parcel of this Bill, but the Bill should not come into force during the present Parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman a question respecting the rearrangement of the city of Toronto? Is it the intention to add to the city of Toronto, as at present constituted, the wards of St. Paul, St. Mark, St. Matthew and St. Albans, and still confine the representation of the city, increased in size as it will be by the addition of these wards, to four members?

The PRIME MINISTER. The intention of the Bill is to give to the city of Toronto, as municipally constituted, four members.

Mr. N. C. WALLACE (West York). Before the motion passes, I would like to draw attention briefly to some of the features of the proposed Bill. A distinguished citizen of the province of Quebec made this threat not many weeks ago as to what would be done in this matter. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), speaking in Brantford on the 28th of April, is reported in the Montreal "Herald" of May 3rd, to have said:

I have no hesitation in saying that, knowing Ontario as I do, when the gerrymander is undone

—and we will undo it—when the gerrymander is undone. we are going to take the life out of them in Ontario as we have done in Quebec.

Now, Sir if there ever was a scientific attempt to destroy a political party, it is the Bill now presented to this House. We who live in the province of Ontario know that Sir Oliver Mowat's Government, after two gerrymanders. got up on the scientific principles that this one is, but not equalling it in iniquity. have endeavoured to stifle public opinion in the province of Ontario.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Nonsense.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. member remember that when they could not secure a member for the city of Toronto they adopted the principle of giving three members to Toronto and allowing a citizen to give only two votes. and the minority had the third member for the city of Toronto, in order that in the local legislature Toronto should only have a majority of one Conservative member? They became so ashamed of their course in that respect that they had to repeal that measure. But, Sir, this Bill abounds in iniquities of the same character. What do they propose to do? The Minister of Justice. we are told, prepared this Bill. He has his revenge out of Bothwell, who refused to return him to Parliment, and he wipes Bothwell out of existence.

Mr. FOSTER. Tit for tat.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Bothwell was called after a pirate, and they have abolished it.

Mr. WALLACE. Take the city of Toronto and the county of York. Toronto is a pretty Conservative city. It is true they have only one representative from there now, and their prospects for the future are not good. So they say: We cannot carve a Grit constituency out of the city of Toronto in any way that we know, so we will hive the Tories in the city of Toronto. We will take the Conservative element from the two ridings of East York and West York, and we will add them to the city of Toronto. They will take from the west riding of York, probably one-half the constituency, a constituency that has not had its boundaries changed for more than 50 years. They take one-half of that and add it to the city of Toronto. They do practically the same thing with the east riding of York, taking about one-half of it and adding it to the city of Toronto. Toronto to-day has four members. With the additions to be made from the east and west ridings of York, Toronto will have a population estimated at over 200,000, so that Toronto will have four members, each representing about 50,000 of a population. West York, with these portions of it gerrymandered, will have 50,000 or 60,000, or less than 20,000 for each representative in the county of York; while there will be 50,000 for each representative from the city of Toronto. The county of York is Liberal in its tendencies, therefore, every 20,000 people will have a representative. The city of Toronto is Conservative, therefore, it will have only one representative for every 50,000 people. That same principle is carried out through the whole of this Bill. Take the county of Simcoe. According to the last census it had a population of 82,700; with three members, that will give an average of 27,569 to each. The county of Simcoe is a Conservative county, it usually sends three Conservatives to Parliament, and may be depended upon in the future to preserve its record. The unit of population, according to the last census, is 22,900. Kent, with a population of 58,019, is to have three members. or an average of 19,378. Kent is supposed to be a Liberal county, and 19,000 people in Kent being Liberals, are as good as 27,000 people in Simcoe being Conservatives. Wellington, with 59,000 people, is allowed to have three members. That would be 19,840 for each constituency. Wellington is supposed to be a Liberal county and may send three Liberal members to Parliament, as I believe it does to-day. Therefore, every Liberal constituency is to have a small population, and constituencies are to be divided in this way so that the Liberal population will send far more representatives to Parliament than the Conservatives. Brant, with 33,217 people, is to send two members, or with an average of 16,608. Why, Sir, I can remember when the voice of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was raised so that you could hear it, I was going to say, from one end of Ontario to the other, in denunciation of those who opposed the principle of representation by population, while here to-day the principle is violated—Toronto, with 50,000 people for each member, and Brant, with one-third of 50,000 people for each member. Is that a fair distribution; is that what the right hon. Prime Minister spoke of a moment ago when he said that we are going to undo the great wrong of 1882. wherein the principle of substantial justice will prevail? Where is the principle of substantial justice in such an iniquity as that? I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister. or any hon. gentleman on that side of the House, to justify such an iniquitous scheme as is proposed in this Bill. So it goes all the way through. The whole of the province of Ontario is to be cut up by a scientific process. Hon. gentlemen have arranged everything as it suits them, and then they go through the farce of saying we are going to call in the judges.

Mr. CLARKE. We had better call in the police.

Mr. WALLACE. They fixed the whole thing up and they attempt to shield themselves behind the judges who can do nothing. What could the judges do with the city of Toronto? There are 200,000 people in Toronto, or more; they will tell them to parcel it out so as to give four members to these 200,000 people. They will say that they did not do it; it is the judges that have done it;

and the thing cannot be wrong because here are the impartial judges—Jim Lister, or some others. They are called commissioners. Then we have the county of Brant, which is to have two members, if I understand right. Did I understand the right hon. member correctly ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Brant is to have two members. There are 33,217 people there. if my figures are correct, and they are to have two members.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Are there any townships that were put out of Brant County, some few years ago, when the redistribution took place, that are now going back into the county of Brant ? They were put out of the county ten or twenty years ago under the two redistributions. Are they going back into the county, and will they not add to the population ?

Mr. WALLACE. My figures as I have them here, I think, are correct——

Mr. LANDERKIN. May I ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down, sit down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Excuse me ; I am going to ask the hon. gentleman a question. The hon. gentleman is making statements which he will find are not borne out by the facts. I am anxious to keep my hon. friend right. Will these townships come back again into Brant that were taken out, not by the hon. gentleman, but by the Government that he supported a little while before he resigned ? He will find that he is wrong, and that he is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, knew what he was talking about he would scarcely make these remarks. I am giving the figures of the municpal county of Brant, the population of which was 33,217, and on that basis each member would have an average of 16,000 people.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does that include the city of Brantford ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The city of Brantford has 22,000 of a population.

Mr. WALLACE. I say this, that the judges are told to apportion four members to 200,000 people in the city of Toronto, and they have nothing to do but mark out the divisions to allow 50,000 people to send four representatives to Parliament.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Will the hon. gentleman allow me. He is taking the figures from the municipal county of Brant as one of his illustrations from the census of 1891, is he not ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you taking the figures for the city of Toronto from the census of 1891 ?

Mr. WALLACE. No, I am not.

Mr. COWAN. Why not ?

Mr. WALLACE. If I took the figures for 1891, we would have 47,000 people, about three times as many as the people of Brant, so that it would not materially alter the figures. I am taking the latest information I have, and the latest information I have is the municipal record of the city of Toronto, wherein they have over 200,000 of a population. If my recollection is correct, the census of 1891 gave 188,000 people for the city of Toronto. Then, the city of Toronto will only have these four members. while the Minister of Customs will represent a constituency in which each member will represent 16,600. The member for Toronto will represent a little more than three times 16,600, or, if you take the last census, in each case, the Minister of Customs will represent 16,600 people, while the member for Toronto will represent 47,000 people. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs if he is going to justify that infamous gerrymander? Our judges are to be called in to whitewash this Bill and make a pretense that it is fair by saying that it has been adjudicated upon by the judges. The judges are not fixing the righteousness of this matter ; they are not fixing the fact that Brant is to have two members, when, by its population, as compared with that of Toronto, it is not entitled to two members. They tell the people that they are adopting the principle of representation by population, and why should we not ? Why should we proclaim to the world that three citizens of the city of Toronto are only equal to one citizen of Brant ? This Bill, as it is laid down, and as we will have occasion to point out in full, on several occasions, at a later day, is a more iniquitous gerrymander even than that of Sir Oliver Mowat, when, in two succeeding gerrymanders, he tried to keep Ontario in line with him. This is a more scientific system of robbing the Conservative party of its rights, but I will venture to predict that hon. gentlemen will not succeed in attaining their object.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question in regard to this Bill. Will the judges be instructed to proceed on the basis of population for the purposes of representation, and, if so, what will be the basis for city and country constituencies ?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows that in every country in the world where you have representative institutions, that you have not the same proportion of re-

presentation in cities as in rural constituencies.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not ?

The PRIME MINISTER. For the reason that cities are generally better represented, because you will find a great many men residing in cities representing rural constituencies. The judges, so far as the city of Toronto is concerned, as well as other constituencies, which have to be divided, will divide the municipal city of Toronto into four ridings, taking into consideration the census of 1891, and the convenience of the population, so as to do substantial justice, so far as it is possible to do it.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I am not asking in regard to Toronto. I want to know what the basis of representation will be. What will be the unit of representation in cities and in country constituencies ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The principle which we hold, on this side of the House, is that representation is to be taken upon municipal county organization and city organization, and, therefore, the question of the unit does not come in.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the right hon. gentleman pretend to say, that he will disregard the unit of population in those constituencies, or does he say that the judges are to have instructions on that matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have not forgotten that, since the county of Kent is to have three members and the county of Simcoe three members. Some other counties are also to be given three members. The judges have no instructions as to the manner in which they are to proceed, but I suppose without giving instructions we can assume they will try to make a fair division.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). As I understand it, Parliament lays out the field and says whether a county shall have one member, two members or three members, and then to make it look fair, the Government ask the judges to come in and divide what cannot be divided in any other way, than to give the Government a political advantage. That is a farce, and nothing else but a farce. After the Government decides upon the counties politically, and which county shall have two members and which counties three members, it will be found on investigation, I venture to say, that the judges cannot divide the counties left to their decision in any other way than to give the Government a political advantage. Consequently the judges are added to give it a respectable appearance ; whereas they have practically nothing to do with it. The judges may not have their black caps on, but nevertheless they will be there under this Bill for the decapitation of Conservatives. The Government take mighty good care where the county is strongly Reform and where there are two or three members, that the judges cannot help, even if they tried, securing the return of two or three Liberal members. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) was wrong when he said that the right hon. gentleman has not considered population at all. He has considered population because, in the counties which they submitted to the judges, the judges will regard the constitution and in the Reform counties the judges will go by population. It no doubt has been usual to give the city constituencies in a degree a larger population than the rural constituencies, but to say the proportion is to be 16 to 50 is no correct basis at all. The beauty of the thing is that taking some of the counties they do not regard population at all, while where it suits them they do. Take my own county which I know well. There they can afford to do the generous to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). They add a Conservative township to him, but taking the municipal results he will have a comfortable majority of two or three hundred, even though there is a Conservative majority of 100 added on to his riding. Now the result of that will be that South Norfolk will be a very close constituency. There is a case where the riding will be on the basis of population, and in that sense it is fair enough because they will about equalize the population of the two ridings. They do that where it cannot hurt them and where it is sure to hurt the Conservative party. But, Sir, under this Bill, it is hopeless to divide the county of Brant into two ridings ; it is hopeless for a judge or anybody else to do it with any reference to population and not give them two Reform members. That, it seems to me, is the whole principle of the measure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You mean the want of principle.

Mr. TISDALE. As I understand the constitution, it places population as a basis of representation beyond county boundaries. I am not discussing now the question of who is right or who is wrong in regard to attempts to obtain party advantage, but I am speaking of the highest principles that should guide men in a thing like this. I hold that under our constitution county boundaries as a basis of representation should not override the question of representation by population, and I defy the right hon. gentleman to produce any authority to the contrary. No doubt it is a difficult thing for any political party to distribute ridings and electoral districts without being tempted to take political advantages ; but I tell the hon. gentleman, that if he wants to take a political advantage, I would rather see him do it by giving a fair representation by population. I am not saying you can equalize the population, but I say you can make a fair attempt to do so. It is monstrously unfair, that you should give large bodies of people only one member, and give small bodies of people two mem-

bers under the cry that you are respecting county boundaries. If you are to bring in the judges at all, lay down some principle upon which they can act in a judicial manner, and I am disappointed and surprised the Government have not done that. Say how many people are to be the basis of an electoral district, and then ask the judges to distribute them without reference to county boundaries; that is the fair principle of representation. I tell the right hon. gentleman and I tell the Government, that they have lost a great opportunity to once and for all settle this question of redistribution. They were strong enough in the country to introduce a fair Bill and to follow the English system. When I heard mention of judges in connection with this matter, I had hoped that we would have a system followed which might be taken as a precedent. I am a believer in seeing such things being relegated to the judges, but do not give us the pretense of following the English system while you are departing from it entirely. I tell the Government that if they had been equal to the occasion, it would have strengthened them and weakened my political party, and I am willing that my party should be weakened and the other party strengthened if a just and honest act is performed. Follow the constitutional principle in your Redistribution Bill. Do it if you dare. If you do it, the country will respect you, and if you do not do it, either now or in the days to come the country will punish the parties that trifle with the principles of our constitution. I would rather sit in Opposition a long time and see the Government do a just thing, than be in power and see the Government do what is unjust. I would rather the Government had taken all the responsibility on their own shoulders than resort to the farce of sending such a thing as this before the judges. I say to the Government: Reconsider this matter in your own interests as a party, reconsider it in the interest of this Dominion, and let the judges have full power as to an equal division of the constituencies. We are somewhat wedded to our municipal institutions, and why not submit this measure to the judges so as to give us a fair representation, while at the some time disturbing these municipal institutions as little as possible. Who dare stand up at this period, in any free country, and say, that population shall not form the basis of representation? Mr. Speaker, I shall probably have more to say before this is through, and today I shall not say any more than that I regret exceedingly that this principle, which is so fair and wise, has not been adopted in this measure.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I desire to put a question which, I think, the House will be very glad indeed to have answered, if the hon. First Minister will give the information. I understand that it will be the duty of the judges to divide the counties into ridings. In a county entitled, say, to three members, it may be quite impossible for any commission of judges to form three ridings having anything like an equal representation. One riding might have 20,000, another 21,000, and another 30,000, if they strictly adhered to the boundaries of townships. Now, I would like to know, from the First Minister, whether it is the intention to adhere strictly to the boundaries of townships, towns and villages, or will the judges be permitted to divide some of the large townships, so as to give an equal representation to each member representing a portion of a county?

The PRIME MINISTER. The instructions given to the judges, as my hon. friend no doubt knows by this time, are general. It is impossible to divide counties into ridings which will have exactly the same population; but I assume, and I hope also, that it will be the duty of the judges to make the ridings as equal as possible in population. My hon. friend knows that, under the Act that we have at present, though the unit is 21,000 or 22,000, there are many constituencies in which the population is under, and many in which it is above, that number.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the right hon. First Minister has misunderstood my point. If it is necessary to an equal representation, will the judges be permitted to divide the townships, and put one-half of a township in one riding and the other half in another?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say, this is a point which I have not considered. The instructions to the judges are general, and they cannot but be general. I assume, that the duty of the judges is to divide according to the population, as determined by the last census, and according to the convenience of the people. This is the guiding principle which they have been instructed to follow.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). The right hon. gentleman has told us that, in considering this Bill, the Government were guided by some principles. The first principle he mentioned was a regard for county boundaries; and, when the right hon. gentleman opened his address, it seemed apparent to the Parliament, that he and his colleagues had been guided solely by the desire to stick to the municipal county boundaries. But, as the right hon. gentleman proceeded, the members found that the Government had, where it suited them presumably, regarded county boundaries; and, where it did not suit them to do so, they disregarded county boundaries. Now, the right hon. gentleman is in a very communicative mood, and I am sure he desires the House to be in possession of the very fullest information for the future discussion of this Bill. As he has been so ready to tell us the guiding principles by which they have been lighted on their path, I should like to ask, in a very

few words, what principle guided him in selecting the constituencies which are returned to county boundaries, and what principle guided him in rejecting those which are not returned to county boundaries? If the principle is good in the counties of Oxford, Brant, Haldimand and Norfolk, I submit, that it is good for the other constituencies in the province of Ontario; and I submit, that the right hon. gentleman owes it as a bounden duty to this Parliament to tell us why, in some constituencies, that principle has been regarded, and why, in other constituencies it has been disregarded entirely. That, Sir, is the pith of the game which the right hon. gentleman is playing upon the sympathies and convictions of the people of the province of Ontario. Why has he not applied the one principle all over the province of Ontario, instead of in a number of constituencies? Then, I think we ought to be told what is to be the future course. Of course, this Parliament cannot bind the Parliament which will discuss and legislate upon this question ten years hence, or two or three years hence, when the result of the decennial census is known. While we cannot bind them, I submit, that, by laying down a general principle, we might guide them; but there is nothing in this Act to guide the Parliament for the future. If the hon. gentleman says, that for all time in the future the judges will be permitted to divide the ridings and make the representation of the various provinces, that is a principle by which Parliament in the future will be guided. But the right hon. gentleman has not done that in the Bill which he has brought down this afternoon. Then, there is another question which I should like to ask the hon. gentleman. Are the judges to be paid for their duties? To know this is essential to a discussion of the question. If so, what are they to be paid? I am not, in any sense, desiring to reflect on the judges of the land. I have always desired in this Parliament to defend them. I am asking this question, therefore, with no sinister motive, but simply for light which I think we ought to have, when we come to discuss the bill in detail.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let us have an answer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, if you will permit me to say so, there appears to be no principle in selecting the constituencies to which county boundaries will apply, and those to which they will not apply, except the principle of party gain.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have just this to say to my hon. friend, that, if he wishes, I have no objection to extend it all over the province of Ontario. He has only to signify his wish.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. If the principle is right, why not carry it out?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I think the record of this Government will be a notable one in the history of this country, because, since they came to power, they appear to have been turning the hand on the dial of time backward, so far as the constitution is concerned. Their first act was to interfere with the constitution by passing a franchise law under which members should be elected to this Parliament by a different franchise in every province of the Dominion. They destroyed the principle of a Dominion franchise shortly after they came to power. Now they propose to destroy the principle of representation by population, which was fought for so hard and so vigorously for so many years in the province of Ontario. After the basis or unit of representation had been arranged for the province of Quebec, the same principle was extended to the province of Ontario and to other portions of the country. As the unit of representation for the province of Quebec at the last redistribution was between 22,000 and 23,000, the late Government endeavoured to apply the same unit in the province of Ontario, and that province was divided on that basis. The principle of representation by population was carried out in the province of Ontario, not only with regard to the relative strength of the representation of the two provinces, but it was carried even further, and was made to extend to the number of people who should be represented by one member in this House. I have always regarded it as unfair that one member should represent 50,000 or 60,000 people, while another should represent only some 12,000 or 13,000 people. That imposed too much work on the one and too little on the other. It gave the larger number too small a voice in the affairs of the country, and the smaller number too large a voice.

The right hon. gentleman, however, has destroyed the principle of representation by population. That is another bulwark of the constitution which these hon. gentlemen have deliberately overthrown. They have gone further. For 32 years the principle was carried out and recognized that a redistribution of seats should take place after each census. But these hon. gentlemen have destroyed that principle; and when the future historian comes to write the history of this country, he will describe this Parliament as noted chiefly for its violation of the constitutional principle hitherto recognized. The only object of this Bill is to secure the election of as many Reformers as possible. Let me give you an illustration. It may fairly be said that Toronto is a Conservative city. You may say what you like, but if the whole city were given a fair opportunity of deciding, it would not return one Reformer. The population of Toronto is 200,000, and by this Bill it will return four members, or one for each 50,000. But let me pick out such

constituencies as Kent, Wellington and Brant, which rarely elect anybody but a Reformer. These three would represent about 200,000 population. But take the same number of population in the city of Toronto, and divide it up according to the unit of population in those constituencies, where Reformers will be purely elected, and you will find that if Toronto got its just rights, it would have nearly nine members instead of four. In other words, the same number of Conservatives send only four members here compared with nine members sent by the Reformers. If there ever was a measure designed to destroy the rights of a political party, it is the one introduced to-day.

Mr. McGREGOR. Your party went further.

Mr. SPROULE. Not by any means. Our party went further in carrying out the principle of representation by population. It did not apply that to the provinces only, but went further and applied it to the individual representation, so that as nearly as possible, about 23,000 or 25,000 should be the unit of representation. You, however, have made it possible for 200,000 Reformers to send thirteen members to this House, while 200,000 Conservatives can only send four. If that is not unfair, then I do not know what can be regarded as unfair.

You go further and allow the judges to divide up these counties, and I assume they will not cross the municipal boundary lines. They will take, no doubt, their inspiration from hon. gentlemen opposite and will manage so that even less than 16,000 Reformers will send a representative to this House. I venture to say that when this Bill is worked out to its legitimate conclusion, you will find that 10,000 or 11,000 Reformers will send a representative to this House, while 50,000 Conservatives will be required to elect one.

While, at first sight, one would think this a fair measure, because the judges are called in to make a division, the great evil is done by the first division made, in which the judges have no voice whatever. A principle is laid down, within the lines of which the judges must act; and no matter how they may act there will be great injustice done the Conservatives, especially in Ontario. Why did not the hon. gentleman apply this principle to his own province? He dared not, because that would wipe him out. But he saw that Ontario is the strong element in confederation, the largest, the most dangerous province, and, therefore, he muddled that province in such a way as to prevent its having a fair representation in this House. If I know anything of the principles that govern the Conservative party, I am confident that should a Conservative Government be returned to power, it would at once repeal this measure, or it would not be worthy the name of Conservative. Every important measure of this Administration is noticeable chiefly for breaking down some important principle of the constitution, and each succeeding measure appears to be worse than its predecessor. This third and last is the most objectionable and disgraceful yet submitted to us.

Mr. GEO. E. CASEY (West Elgin). My hon. friend closed his remarks by an utterance of undoubted truth. He said that the Conservative Government which would not repeal this law would not be worthy of the name. In that sentiment I thoroughly agree. Conservative Governments have shown us what sort of redistribution law suits them, and we have shown by this measure what principle of redistribution suits us. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that if the Conservative party were to continue faithful to its traditions and ever had the chance to repeal this measure—which my hon. friend assumes correctly enough will go through—it would certainly do so. The hon. gentleman says this is a breach of the constitution, because it assumes to redistribute the seats at a time not immediately following the taking of the census. He totally misunderstands the constitution. The constitution says that we shall redistribute the seats after the census, allowing to each province the number to which it is entitled by the results of the census, but it does not, and could not, say that, in the meantime, any irregularity or impropriety in the distribution of seats in a particular province should not be remedied. There is no constitutional question involved whatever, but there is involved the question of keeping faith with the electorate. When the Liberal party came before the electors in 1896, they promised that if returned to power they would repeal what they called the iniquitous, unjust and unfair distribution of the seats which had been made by the Government then in power. The electorate sent them back with the understanding, gave them the order, when they came into power here, to undo that injustice. They expressed their opinion at the polls that the present redistribution was an injustice, and told their servants, the Ministers of the Crown here to remove that injustice and put things back on a fair basis. The Government are, therefore, only doing what they are obliged to do, in consequence of their pledges and in consequence of the orders given by the majority of the people of Canada, in introducing a Bill of this kind. As to the Bill itself, this is not the time, on the introduction of it, to say very much; but a word or two with regard to the principle may not be out of place. I said on a former occasion in this House that if this Bill, when it came down, bore the appearance of a gerrymander similar in any respect to that passed under the previous Government, I would oppose it by word and vote. I meant it. But I am happy to say that this Bill is not a gerrymander; it is not an attempt to snatch any political advantage in the subdivision of the counties that are to have more than one member, but an attempt to put the redis-

tribution of the seats in these provinces on a fair and equitable basis. So far as can be seen on the Bill, it merits the support of every fair-minded man in this House. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that the Bill does not observe the principle of representation by population. But the principle of representation by population was never observed in any Redistribution Bill. It is not observed by the present law on that subject, which I could easily show if I took the time to go into details. But, take for instance the case of the ridings in my immediate neighbourhood. East Elgin and West Elgin are very far from being equal in population and they were arranged, not with any view of making them equal in that respect, but to make a safe seat in one end of the county for a Conservative to spoil the seat formerly held by the Hon. David Mills, the constituency of Bothwell, at the other end.

Mr. WALLACE. What are the figures ?

Mr. CASEY. I do not remember the exact figures, nor am I discussing matters of detail at this moment. It had always been our principle in reference to representation that exact equality of population was not so much a desideratum as the keeping together for political purposes of those who are naturally associated for municipal and other purposes—in other words, to limit constituencies within county boundaries. Now, my hon. friend from East Grey says that in adopting this principle we are preventing justice from being done by the people. I say that in adopting this principle we are adopting the only possible check that can be put upon the power of a Government with a large majority to cut and carve constituencies to suit their own ends. We have seen what can be done in that line in the act of the late Administration. On the other hand, we see this Government refusing to take advantage of its majority, refusing to put forward the excuse of equal representation as a reason for cutting up the country in such a shape as to return the greatest possible number of Liberal members ; but tying their own hands, saying to the judges : You are to finally shape the constituencies, but you must not, in shaping the constituencies, go outside of the county boundaries. That is proof, not of an intention to gerrymander the country, but of their willingness to prevent themselves gerrymandering the country. I thought it necessary to say these few words in reply to the insinuation of the hon. member for East Grey ; a full discussion must be postponed to the second reading of the Bill, when we shall have had time to consider the measure more fully.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). When the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was explaining the Bill, I understood him to say that the dividing of ridings in the province of Ontario would be left to the judges of the Supreme Court of that province. I wish to ask him if such division as may be made in the province of Quebec so as to equalize the population of the different counties, will be made by judges ? If the hon. gentleman replies in the affirmative—of course, it is only a matter of detail, still it is one with regard to which accuracy is necessary—he will have to change the wording from " Supreme Court judges," because we have no such thing in the province of Quebec. And I think the right hon. gentleman will admit that the matter should be left to the judges in Quebec if that is the course to be followed in Ontario. I hope the right hon. gentleman will say whether this is the system to be followed in Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. The question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) does not apply. In the province of Quebec there is to be no division of the counties under this Bill. The only thing that is done in the province of Quebec is simply to restore those municipalities that, in 1892, were taken from one county and put into another.

Mr. BERGERON. My reason for speaking as I did, was that, if we are proceeding on the principle of having representation by population, it should apply to Quebec equally with Ontario. It is true, you cannot increase or diminish the representation of Quebec, but you can change the delimitation of counties. The right hon. gentleman represented for many years a very large county, Drummond and Arthabaska, the population of which is over 43,000. The next county to it is Yamaska, the population of which is only 16,000. But if the hon. gentleman said they are not going to use the judges in the province of Quebec, the question I have put falls to the ground. I listened attentively to the right hon. Premier in his answer to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). The right hon. gentleman got very much excited, and I was much surprised to see him in that condition. But, as a matter of fact, he did not answer one of the strong arguments put before the House by the hon. leader of the Opposition. In his warmth, he forgot to deal with the charge made by the leader of the Opposition that he had gained power by promising things which, in coming into power he had not carried out. Another thing he forgot was to deal with the question raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition, whether the constitution of the country allowed the passage of such Redistribution Bill as is here proposed. I think this is the most important question that is to be decided before we proceed to deal with the Bill. My right hon. friend, I am sure, will acknowledge that he has forgotten to answer that point.

The PRIME MINISTER. I not only answered it, but I answered it most effectively by quoting your own precedents. I quoted the Bills of 27-28 Victoria, and 32-33 Vic-

toria, where the limits of the counties of Terrebonne, Montcalm and Argenteuil were reorganized by this Parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. But surely my right hon. friend will admit that that is not the same thing. I was in the House when this change took place in the counties of Argenteuil and Two Mountains. As the hon. gentleman remembers, there were two parishes which were taken from the county of Two Mountains and put in the county of Argenteuil. But what was the reason? Argenteuil is looked upon as an English-speaking county, while Two Mountains is a French-speaking one. These two parishes were inhabited by English-speaking electors who desired, and expressed the desire, by petitions to the Government, if I remember well, to be put into the county of Argenteuil, as their municipal affairs were connected with that county. The Government, purely and simply, acceded to their request. It was not a gerrymander; and if you take the figures of population, you will see that it made very little difference, as the two of them, according to the census of 1891 have a population of about 15,000. We are not in a good position to discuss that Bill at present, we can only speak of its general outlines, but there is certainly some gerrymandering in it, since we are obliged to use that word. My hon. friend brings in this Bill, which he thinks will be accepted with enthusiasm by both sides of the House. Speaking of Bagot and Rouville, he says he is going to put them back almost in the same position in which they were before. At first sight one would almost think that was a right thing to do. But my right hon. friend has forgotten one thing. This was done for a purpose. It was not done for the purpose of giving my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) an increased majority in a county where he has already about 400 of a majority. It was not done to help our late lamented friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont), whom the hon. gentleman respected as much as I do. He had always carried his county, whether he had that parish or not. It was done because the county of Bagot has a population of 21,695, and the county of Rouville has only a population of 16,000. Putting the parish of St. Pie in the county of Rouville simply equalized the population. My right hon. friend spoke of the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska. Hon. members may remember that a road called the South Shore Railway crosses those two counties. By-elections have taken place in those two counties, and great promises of subsidies have been made to the people. But if rumour is true, these two counties have manifested in many different ways their disapproval of the policy of the Government in the case of the Drummond County Railway, for instance, because it would deprive them of the subsidies which they should have had. Of course I cannot speak from knowledge, but it seems to me that the object of the Bill is to enable the Government to carry these two counties. I have every reason to believe that the additions that are to be made to Yamaska and Nicolet must be some two or three good Grit parishes of the county of Drummond and Arthabaska.

The PRIME MINISTER. There will be a difference of only about 30 in Nicolet.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course I only say at present that this seems to be the object of the Bill. Now, my right hon. friend has said for the hundredth time that this Government is powerful and has the confidence of the country because they have always carried the by-elections. Well, that contention has been answered time and again in this House. We all know by what means they have been carried. The right hon. gentleman said: If the by-elections have been carried by corruption, why do you not appeal to a court of justice? Mr. Speaker, we are rendering a service to the country by not doing so. In all these by-elections, where does the money come from which is used as a corruption fund? It comes out of the pockets of the people? So the fewer by-elections there are in the country the less money will be spent in corruption, and the less money will come out of the public treasury. The fewer counties that are opened the better it is for the country. It is not because the country has confidence in him that he carries by-elections, but because he has recourse to means which he cannot have recourse to in a general election; and I imagine that this redistribution is made with that end in view.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I am not at all surprised that the Prime Minister made it convenient for the Postmaster General to be absent to-day so that he might have the pleasure of introducing, with his sunny smile and pleasant voice, this Bill now before the House, thinking that the impression would go to the country on Friday night that it was a fair redistribution, and was going to be made by the judges of the land. That was the impression he tried to convey, and he thought his speech, made on the introduction of the Bill, would be the only speech made. But the hon. leader of the Opposition read between the lines, and he provoked a discussion which has taken nearly all the sunny smile away from the right hon. gentleman, and has shown him up in his true colours. Sir, this thing was foreshadowed on the 3rd of May. The wicked partner of the Prime Minister gave away a Cabinet secret. Speaking on the 3rd of May, of the Conservative party, he said:

> They cannot down me. I feel that I am ten times stronger now than I was before.

If he is ten times stronger than he was before, it is because he has ten times, a hundred times, more money behind him than he had before.

I cannot understand why my Conservative friends have treated me as they have done. I parted from them in a very open way. I sent to my late lamented chief, Sir John Macdonald, and said: "Here are the facts and the papers, and if you do not move I will be obliged to move." Still, vituperation will not lead them to the goal. There is no mistake in that. I have no hesitation in saying that, knowing Ontario as I do, when the gerrymander is undone—and we will undo it—when the gerrymander is undone we are going to take the life out of them in Ontario, as we have done in Quebec.

There is the whole thing in a nutshell. The hon. Minister of Public Works says they are going to take the life out of the Conservative party in Ontario by this gerrymander Bill. The Bill carries out the words of the dictator of the Government. But the Prime Minister, with his sunny smile and his eloquent words, tried to have the report go to the country that it was a fair measure, that the judges of the country were going to make the redistribution. But the judges are not to have anything to do with it. The Conservatives are hived by the Bill, and then they set the judges at work. There is the county of Brant, you are dividing that. That county has hitherto sent three members, and they wipe out two Conservative members. The Government define the limits of the counties, and then they say to the judges: You will say who the voters shall be within the limits of the line that we draw. Talk about this being a fair Bill, and talk about the Bill that the Conservative party made as unfair. The Conservatives were obliged to make a Bill, giving representation by population after the census. Why, this is a ten times worse gerrymander than ever that Bill was. It is unconstitutional, and every act of this Government since they came into power, has tended in the same direction. They want to tear up the constitution of this country piece by piece. I say the Opposition in this House would not be discharging their duty if they did not discuss this Bill month after month until the snow flies, before they allow this Government to pass it. I will be one of 20 members on this side of the House to stay till Christmas Day before I will allow the Prime Minister and his followers to tear up the constitution of this country as has been foreshadowed by the wicked partner, the Minister of Public Works, who has threatened to take the life out of the Conservatives of this country.

Mr. W. McGREGOR (North Essex). The hon. member for Toronto says that Toronto will be partially represented. In looking over this House to-day we find Mr. Ross Robertson, Mr. Osler, Mr. Bertram, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Maclean, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Wallace and Mr. McCarthy from the city of Toronto. Do you want any more representation than that? If there is any question comes up in reference to the city of Toronto, its interests will be properly taken care of in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to ask the hon. gentleman if that applies to Mr. Wallace, who lives sixteen miles away from Toronto?

Mr. McGREGOR. A portion of Mr. Wallace's constituency is in Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. It will not be after this.

Mr. McGREGOR. After this we will have other representatives in this House instead of the hon. member for York, and they will be more near the city of Toronto. In Hamilton we have Mr. Wood, Mr. MacPherson and Dr. Montague. The cities have proper representation. How much does Toronto want? Do they want the whole earth and the fullness thereof?

Mr. BERGERON. They want the Canada Life.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is Parliament to hold to the principle that is now in force? The present Opposition were elected by a gerrymander by which the constituencies were hived. Is that to continue for ages? No, Sir; we are prepared to deal justly with the Opposition, but we want them to remember that it is fair-play we want and nothing more.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I certainly have to return thanks to the Government for introducing into this House the Bill they have to-day, inasmuch as I have been relieved of about 150 of an adverse Liberal majority.

Mr. GIBSON. You ought to be satisfied.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will take it back now.

Mr. BENNETT. They did even worse that that; they did what I have been promised for months past. When the question was first introduced in this House the Prime Minister made so many protestations of innocence that I rather felt uneasy, and when he called on high heaven to witness that we were to have no loaded dice in this game I grew deeply suspicious. I do not think heaven should be invoked to bless this Bill, but I think that all honest and fair-minded men will rather shudder at it. What is it proposed to do? It is proposed to tell the judges: there is certain material upon which you can work, and the judges—poor souls—will be unable to help themselves. For instance, in the riding of Durham they will find 32,400 people, and when they get to Brant they will find 33,200 people. The Government will tell them that it is desired to give two members to each of these counties, and the judges will be under the necessity of carving up these counties in a manner so that each shall have two members. Then you come to Simcoe, which had a population in 1891 of nearly 83,000, and which, I am bound to say, since the census was taken, has increased very considerably. The judges are told that they

can only have three members for that county or an average of about, on the basis of the last census, 29,000 in each riding. But the beauty of the whole scheme, as it will work out in the country, will be seen when these judges come to perform their duties. The Prime Minister failed to inform the House how these judges are going to divide the population in that manner that the Bill contemplates. We were told in my riding months ago what was going to be done in this matter. The political wire-pullers announced months ago what was to be done there. There is a township in my riding, the north end of which gives an adverse majority of 200, and the south end of which gives me a favourable majority of 150. I am to be deprived of the Conservative part, but I am to be left with the Liberal part. If that is the principle of this Bill, and this Bill has been framed for nothing except the party advantage, how in the name of all that is fair can the right hon. Prime Minister stand up and justify it and say that Brant, with 33,000 people shall have two members, while Simcoe, with 83,000, shall only have three members? He said that cities should not have as large representation as the rural districts. He must know that Brantford contains nearly half of the population of Brant, and the whole fact of the matter is that they have sitting behind them an hon. gentleman who sometimes turns his guns upon the Government. I refer to the hon. member for North Wentworth and Brant (Mr. Somerville); they are afraid to wipe him out. They are going to let him have a riding with 16,000 people in it, and the hon. Minister of Customs, being afraid to go back to North Grey, is going to seek to hold South Brant, with 16,000 of a population. Yet the Prime Minister says it is a fair Bill, and a few months ago he called high heaven to witness that it would be fair, and that it would be found that we were not going to play with loaded dice. What are they going to do all over the province of Ontario? They are going to call the judges into disrepute. I can tell the representative of the Justice Department, who is sitting here to-day, and the whole Government, as a matter of fact, that a little while ago, in Toronto, an alderman rose up in his place and charged that a certain judge, who had been called in to conduct an investigation, had, when he came to the crucial point, that certain parties were being implicated, stopped the investigation. He further charged that that judge's two relatives were to-day in the employ and held splendid positions under the party in power. I have a respect for the judges of this country, but I say that judges are only human, as we all saw in this House last session, when we saw Justice Lister standing up, using violent language in the Railway Committee, and sitting there in his place on the last day of the session, and throwing across the floor of the House a denial of the statement that he was to be appointed to a position on the bench, when, before the House was a few days older, that gentleman had ascended to the woolsack. I hope that Judge Lister has forgotten his political predelictions, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that this Mr. Lister, who sat there declaring that he had not a promise of a judgeship in his pocket, and the judge who went on the bench at once was one and the same man.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to do any injustice to Judge Lister. I was present on that occasion, and I am quite confident that Mr. Lister made no such statement as the hon. gentleman now attributes to him.

Mr. BENNETT. I have not the "Hansard" in my hand, but I will tell any hon. gentleman that if he will refer to it he will see that my remarks are borne out.

Mr. McGREGOR. How about Mr. Justice Meredith?

Mr. BENNETT. Justice Meredith will not be on the commission.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would be quite willing that he should be.

Mr. BERGERON. Justice Meredith did not have a seat in this House; he had no whitewashing to do before going away.

Mr. BENNETT. My recollection is that the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), stated that the chairman of the Drummond County Committee would not be here next session to discuss the matter, and that then the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) stood up and said, "You have no authority for saying that I am going on the bench." This was a point-blank denial of the statement, in effect. What more was seen in this House? We saw that the then hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) was named for a position on the bench; and we saw that it was necessary for the right hon. Prime Minister to write a letter to Toronto to say that he had not promised that gentleman a position. All I can tell the right hon. gentleman is that Mr. Lount's friends do not accept that statement that he had not a promise. Mr. Lount's best friends will tell you that he has been most shamefully treated, and that the promise which was made to him had not been carried out, although if he had had taken the precaution of the then hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) to secure a promise in writing, he would have had his position long ago.

Mr. McGREGOR. What about Judge Masson in your own district?

Mr. BENNETT. I have noticed that only two members from Ontario who have risen to say a word on this matter were the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor)

and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), both of whom have been named for positions.

Mr. BERGERON. Inspector of tobacco.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who are rather a heavier class of politicians, may perhaps be able to explain to us upon what principle it shall be right to say that there shall be in the constituency of Simcoe, nearly 30,000 people, while the hon. Minister of Customs gets off with a paltry 16,600. What is to be done? Why, the judges have no choice. If the Government wished to be fair, why should they not turn over the whole province to the judges and say: You divide it as you think is fair. But, Sir, that proposition will meet with a refusal from the Government, because it would not carry out their designs. The county of Lennox with a population of less than 15,000 is not to be interfered with. The county of Prince Edward with less than 19,000 (and I give the figures according to the last census in all these cases) is to have a representative. The county of Frontenac with 16,600 is to have a representative. The county of Haldimand with 18,200 is to have a representative, and the county of Leeds with 20,000 is to have a representative. Now, the county of Kent with 64,000 population is to have three members, giving them a unit of 21,000, and if you cross the concession line into Simcoe, there the Government think it necessary to have a unit of 29,000. Simcoe could have been fairly divided into four constituencies, while each would have given considerably over the average rate of population in the province of Ontario, but the Government saw it would be to their discomfiture to do that, and so they perpetrated this injustice. I have seen the gentlemen from the county of Simcoe here, who were steering the Bill for that county as friends of the Government, and I expected what might follow their presence in Ottawa. I know it is not any good-will of the Government towards me that induced them to relieve me of an adverse majority of 150, but I know they have sized up the whole situation, and I know that the county of Simcoe could have been given four members with an average of about 20,000 in each riding, and that the Government could not possibly carry one of these ridings. Now they tell the judges: Take the county of Simcoe, and you find it with about twenty-nine thousand odd for each riding, and divide it up as you may see fit. It is to be regretted that the Government should ask the intervention of the judges in such a matter. Better by far that they should stand or fall by the measure, than they should have dragged the judges down to help them out in their schemes. Sir, I would be surprised if any judge in the province of Ontario, having regard for his high position, would demean himself to have anything to do with this.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. On the basis that the Premier now proposes. The Premier says "hear, hear," but I may give him reasons to change his mind on that point. If the judges were asked to take the province of Ontario as it stands, and make an arrangement of that province, something fair might be expected from them, but the Government is not asking that. They say: We are dividing the ridings for you, and then you are to divide them afterwards according to the principle we assign. I understood the Premier to say, in reply to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that there were to be general instructions to these judges, and I now ask the Prime Minister if these instructions are to be in writing, and if he will lay them before the House?

The PRIME MINISTER. All these instructions are in the Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. Verbal instructions.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot say as to verbal instructions, but I know the Prime Minister did not deny that there might be, as a ruling principle in the Bill, the splitting up of individual municipalities. I have been told that this is proposed in my own riding, and that a township is to be divided in half, the Liberal half to be left with me, and the Conservative half to be taken from me. If that be the case, it is patent on the face of it, that this is the most palpable gerrymander Bill that could possibly be devised. Wherever a constituency has been interfered with, it has been done for nothing but party gains. For instance, Kent, Ont., with a population of 58,000 would have exactly the same unit of population with two members as Simcoe County would have, namely, 29,000 for each member, but they give Kent County three members. There is nothing to be gained by that except a party advantage, for every one in Ontario knows that Kent is a Liberal county, and that it is represented in the local legislature by two Liberal members. The Government say that in Simcoe the unit of population shall be 29,000, but that in Kent it shall be 19,000, and so they give an extra Liberal member to Kent. The Government holds three ridings of Huron to-day, and they hold the ridings in Wellington County, and why should they change them? In all these counties with a single member, the unit of population is much lower than it is in the county of Simcoe. Let it be understood that this Bill entirely wipes out representation by population in the province of Ontario. It is a Bill simply made for the purpose of gaining party advantage by the Government, and finally let us understand that the whole thing is a piece of hypocrisy to be shrouded around by the supposed intervention of the judges, whoever they may

be. I can tell the House that in the province of Ontario to-day, the judges are regarded as mortal men, and the judges who will undertake to make a re-arrangement under this Bill, with the material placed before them, must be very mortal.

An hon. MEMBER. Immortal.

Mr. BENNETT. I will not say immortal, but I will say that in deference to the public opinion of the province of Ontario, they will soon have to be superannuated, and if they are superannuated, it will give an opportunity to a number of gentlemen opposite and their friends who are on the look-out for judgeships in the province of Ontario. So far as I myself am concerned, I gain a personal advantage under this Bill. But, Sir, notwithstanding that, I feel that it is the duty of every man inside and outside of this House to see that justice is done in such a matter as this, and with that view I am going to oppose this Bill. It gives me an advantage, but there is not the slightest doubt, that it works injustice to many of my hon. friends. It is an engine for the destruction of the Conservative party, and I would be untrue to the teachings and principles of that party if I failed in my opposition to such a measure as this. If this proposal of the Government means simply a trial of strength in remaining here until the snow flies, I for one shall do that, nothwithstanding that it will incommode me as much as it will incommode hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McGREGOR. We will stay with you.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well. I heard an intimation from a gentleman on the other side of the House to-day as to a proposition for an increased indemnity if this session would hold out long enough, so that I suppose some hon. gentlemen opposite expect to stay. That is my answer to the remark of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor). However, I suppose the Bill will go on, but like the Drummond County deal and the Yukon deal it will have to go before that great court of review, the Senate of Canada. And, if the Senate of Canada does what it thinks is right, I believe it will have the endorsation of the people of Canada, as it had in the case of the Drummond County deal and as it had in the case of the Yukon deal. But, as was said by an hon. gentleman this afternoon, it would be better by far, for the Government to withdraw this Bill, and substitute for it a Bill handing over to a commission of judges the whole work of arranging the constituencies, not only for the province of Ontario, but for the other provinces as well. Such a measure would redound much more to the credit of the Government than the iniquitous measure which is now before the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that these hon. gentlemen had not entertained the ideas they are now expressing, any time during the preceding thirty years. During that period we have had, not one or two, but half a dozen different Bills introduced by them for the purpose of redistributing the constituencies, and in not one of them has there been the slightest pretense of giving a semblance of fair-play to their opponents. We are not imitating these hon. gentlemen by undertaking to gerrymander the constituencies. We are not obliterating county boundaries for our own advantage. We are simply and solely engaged in the endeavour to undo a wrong—a gross and grievous wrong—perpetrated by their own supporters fourteen or fifteen years ago. If these gentlemen had the faintest ground for saying, that they had at any time paid the slightest regard to the principle of representation by population, there would have been some force in the remarks they have made to-day. I have sat in this House for thirty-three odd years; I have sat here before the present Parliament existed; and never, in any case, have I known the late leader of the Conservative party fail to lay down as a principle, that, while, as between the provinces, it was right that the principle of representation by population should prevail, yet, as regarded the different constituencies of which each province was composed, he was not prepared, on any one occasion, to introduce that principle. Look at what he did in 1882.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce permit me to ask him, if he can quote such a declaration as that by Sir John Macdonald?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did quote a declaration to that effect, and I quote what is a great deal better than a declaration; I quote his acts. I quote what he did in 1872, and what he did in 1882. I will believe that in 1882 Sir John Macdonald—who, with all his faults, had some relics of statesmanship about him, which, I regret to say, are most greviously absent in the present leader of the Opposition—was, I believe, dragged and dragooned into a measure which, at heart, he objected to, and would not have proposed, if he had been a free agent at that particular time. But what I point out is, that in 1882, if the so-called principle of representation by population had been attended to, the entire representation from Toronto eastward would have had to be torn up by the roots? Why was it not done? Because that part of the country was a Conservative stronghold at that time; because it would not have suited the then Conservative party to interfere with the unequal representation by population which undoubtedly did exist in 1882 east of Toronto, and which, to a certain extent, exists to-day, but which we do not disturb, because, as my right hon. friend has stated, we do not wish

to interfere with more than the glaring instances which have been forced upon our attention. The purpose of the measure of 1882 was perfectly plain to everybody at the time. That purpose, Sir John Macdonald declared time and again, was to hive the Grits, as he did hive them in half a dozen constituencies by the gerrymander of South Oxford, North Oxford, the Brants and the Elgins. Why was it, except for this very reason, that he placed within the limits of some half dozen ridings an electoral vote large enough to have carried sixteen constituencies, if he had left them alone, or allowed them to be properly distributed? If ever there was a case in which a Government was acting directly on the mandate of the people, the present is such a case. On every hustings of Ontario, and, I believe, generally throughout the Dominion, we invariably declared to the public that, if returned to power, we would repeal the gerrymander of 1882; and that is exactly what my right hon. friend is doing to-day, only he is doing it in an infinitely more upright manner than that in which the gerrymander was perpetrated. We have returned to the county boundaries, as we declared we would do. We have abolished the iniquitous Franchise Act, as every man knows we declared we would do. It was the policy announced in the platform of the Liberal party. We have also the mandate of the people for repealing the gerrymander of 1882. There was one objection raised by one or two hon. gentlemen which my right hon. friend has answered, but to which I may repeat the answer, with respect to the representation by population. Every man who has paid any attention to the manner in which the representation of England is divided, knows that in that country, where the divisions to some extent resemble ours, it has always been laid down, for obvious reasons, that to the great masses of population it is not wise or expedient to give as many representatives as are usually assigned to rural constituencies. That principle was admitted and acted upon in 1872, in 1882 and in 1892 by these hon. gentlemen. Unless they have new light, why is it that they are now so anxious to see the urban communities here represented according to the full measure of their population? If in a few years hence it is discovered that these urban populations have increased very largely, then, when we are not redistributing the constituencies, but reappointing the representation between the various provinces, it would be right to consider that matter, and we would be prepared to consider it. But to-day, when our sole object is to undo a grevious wrong which was done in 1882, what reason can be assigned why we should give Toronto more representation than it has to-day? Toronto, as my hon. friend has said, is very amply represented, and it will have full weight in the counsels of the nation, as it deserves to have, whether it is Conservative or Liberal. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of their desire in 1882 to attend to the representation of the counties. I had occasion to contest a constituency in a county adjoining Cardwell at that time, and what was the facts? Before 1882 Cardwell had 16,000 people, and after 1882 it had the same number. Adjoining Cardwell lay the riding of North Wellington, and which had exactly the number which the unit of population required. How did these hon. gentlemen mend this state of things? They added 3,000 souls to North Wellington, and left Cardwell as it was. What did they do with regard to the riding which I now represent? They took away from it two townships, and added them to a county on the west, and they added to my riding two townships which had no earthly connection with it, for the purpose of embarrassing my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). These are samples of what was going on everywhere. Everywhere they did all the injury they possibly could to county boundaries. What does my hon. friend propose to do? He lays down the principle, that county boundaries are to be respected; and, within these county boundaries, he proposes to strip himself of all power, and to give to the judiciary of Canada, men in whom every man of either party has the utmost confidence, the power to distribute the representation as fairly as they can. We have no power to interfere. If we did attempt to interfere, the judges of Ontario, as hon. gentlemen know right well, would refuse to be interfered with. They will do their duty and make a fair and honourable division, and I must say, if anything could astonish me, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is the manner in which this proposition, the fairest, with respect to the divisions of counties, that has ever been laid bfore a Canadian Parliament, has been received this day.

Mr. CLARKE. A remark was made by my hon. friend from East Simcoe respecting the conduct of an inquiry by one of the judges in the city of Toronto, and I would not like to let the opportunity escape me of saying that, so far as that judge is concerned, there is no more honourable, upright man on the bench of Ontario.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Though honourable and upright, he is not above the insults of the hon. member for Simcoe.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for East Simcoe did not insult the judge, so far as I can recollect his remarks; but lest the impression should go abroad that any threat that might have been made against that honourable judge prevented him from doing his full duty, I rise to emphatically protest against any such impression.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is it?

Mr. CLARKE. I refer to Judge McDougall.

Mr. BENNETT. I only repeated what appeared in all the city newspapers of Toronto—the charge made by Ald. Gowanlock, a leading Liberal of the city of Toronto.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope this will be a lesson which more than one member will profit by, that it is high time we should not take newspaper gossip as a ground for accusing honourable men.

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

After Recess.

LA BANQUE DU PEUPLE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE moved third reading of Bill (No. 6) respecting La Banque du Peuple.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I promised the other day my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) to give an answer to the question he raised as to the costs which may be in suits against the bank. The Bill makes no provision for the payment of costs. I caused an inquiry to be made, and received a statement from the counsel, that in all the suits which have been instituted so far, and on which judgments were rendered or were still pending, the costs had been paid.

Mr. BERGERON. Paid by the bank ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not stated in the letter, but there are no costs due at this moment, except for an action taken a few days ago for the amount of $120, and which has not yet been returned to the court, but Mr. Archer, the solicitor, says he will see that these costs are paid. This is the letter I have received :

Dear Sir,—As requested by you yesterday, I send you a certified list of the different suits which were entered against La Banque du Peuple since it had closed its doors.

By 60-61 Vic., chap. 75, sec. 3, an extension of two years was granted to the bank to reimburse its creditors and depositors ; the recourse of the latter against the directors personally was to be suspended for the lapse of time. Therefore, from the 29th of June, 1897, date of the sanction of the Act granting this extension, no suits were taken against the bank.

In the statement inclosed you will find the different amounts paid to the attorneys representing the plaintiffs in the different cases mentioned. All these costs have been paid.

Since the 1st of May one action has been taken against the bank to recover the sum of $120 ; this action has not been returned into court. Should it be returned we will see that the costs are paid.

I also send you the original letter which I just received from Mr. Victor Geoffrion, one of the attorneys of the bank.

By section 4 of 60-61 Vic., chap. 75, you will see that the extension of two years given did not apply to the costs, so our costs had to be paid.

Hoping that the above informations will prove satisfactory,

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your devoted servant,
CHS. ARCHER.

Another question was raised as to the jurisdiction of this House, and I promised to obtain the opinion of the Minister of Justice. I have his opinion, and he gave it without hesitation. He referred me to the Cartwright cases on the British North America Act, and the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of Quirt vs. The Queen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that the case the Solicitor General mentioned ?

The PRIME MINISTER. One of them :

The power to legislate generally on the subject of bankruptcy and insolvency conferred on the Dominion Parliament includes the right to legislate specially for particular cases arising in connection with bankruptcy proceedings.

This is a case exactly in point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be, of course, that the case referred to covers every thing in this Bill, and I do not pretend to have investigated the question at all. I only gathered some idea during the discussion that took place the other evening. I thought then that, speaking generally, the ground taken by the right hon. gentleman was probably a good one, and that possibly the jurisdiction of this House might also be sustained upon the ground taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is quite clear that this House has, as incident to its power to legislate in many matters, the power to deal with civil rights. In the Criminal Code we have provisions that actions shall not be brought except after certain notice, and that action shall not lie in certain cases for acts done by police officers and constables, and so with regard to the expropriation of land and the provisions of the Banking Act, which provide in what way security should be taken. But there was one matter which occurred to me—I do not know whether there is anything in it—that after a right against this bank has been merged into a judgment, whether or not it is such a matter of civil right as might possibly not be governed by the case to which the right hon. gentleman has referred. To make my meaning a little clearer, I would illustrate—it is quite clear, of course, with respect to banks, for instance, that this Parliament can say that a bank must take its security in a particular way, and if it does not take its security from a customer in a particular way, that security shall be invalid. But now suppose, within the scope of legislation of that kind, a customer had obtained a judgment against a bank or a bank against a customer. Suppose that judgment had been obtained properly within the legislation which has been passed by this Parliament of Canada, that

is, there is no legislation of this Parliament that interferes with it, would it be competent, in such a case, for this Parliament to come in and, by an Act, release that judgment or deal with the rights of the parties to it, simply for the reason that the matter with respect to which the judgment had been obtained would have been subject to the legislative power of this Parliament as a matter relating to banks. I do not know that I have made myself very clear, but this is the only matter I had any doubt about, and, on this ground, I still have some doubt as to the right of Parliament to legislate. It may be, however, that it is covered by the case to which the hon. gentleman refers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think there is an answer to the suggestions that the hon. gentleman has made, and it is to be found here: There might be doubts as to whether Parliament could properly deal with a single individual case of a judgment creditor, setting that judgment aside especially, under its general legislative authority to deal with matters of insolvency. But that does not appear to me to be a case arising under the present Bill. This Bill purports to deal with all the creditors of this bank——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With a class of creditors.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With all the creditors, and it proposes that their claims shall be extinguished upon the distribution of the estate as it now exists or upon the payment to these creditors of a certain sum declared by Parliament to be the proceeds which the estate realized. It does not distinguish in favour of one creditor and against another, but it disposes of all creditors. This, I think, discriminates the present case from the supposititious case which my hon. friend suggested. But there is another principle which has not been invoked in the discussion and which would apply here, and it is this —Parliament does not always nor does it in the majority of cases, refuse to exercise its jurisdiction because a doubt exists. There are numbers of instances in which it is deemed prudent for Parliament to claim and to exercise the right to legislate and leave it to be determined later whether that legislation was within its legislative competency or not. And more especially is that the rule applied where it is in doubt. If it were abundantly clear that we had no such jurisdiction, that then there would be, no doubt, a consensus of opinion on all sides that legislation should not be passed. But where, to put the strongest view, there is only a doubt of our power, and where it is as clear in the opinion of many that we have that power as it is in the opinion of others that we have not, Parliament would not be justified in refusing to pass legislation merely on the ground that there might be a doubt. That is a principle very properly to be applied in this case. There is another consideration which arises here. I attended the meetings of that committee. The subject matter of this Bill was very fully discussed. It was opposed with a great deal of force and vigour, and the subject of existing claims and even judgments was mentioned. It was claimed by gentlemen who discussed it that suits had been brought and judgments had been recovered, and it was unfair to include them in the general classification and extinguish them by this Bill. But it was not suggested by anybody, even by the lawyers, one of whom, if I am correctly informed, was solicitor in connection with one or more of the suits pending, that there ought to be an exception as to costs. That was not put forward until the Bill was brought up in the House. As the Bill was thoroughly discussed in a very large committee attended by a large proportion of the members, it would not seem to me to be wise for us to refuse the adoption of the Bill, now that it has come before us in this shape with the recommendation of the committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am inclined to think that, while there is a very nice question involved here, under all the circumstances of the case and in view of the opinion of the Minister of Justice, there is no reason why the passage of the third reading should be prevented on the question that has been raised. I might point out that a reasoned opinion from the Minister of Justice, if such had been possible, would have been very interesting, for this case of Quirk and the Queen might be distinguished from the one under consideration because there was a different procedure, and the point decided was not altogether the one raised by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden). The point there was the general power in connection with the winding-up of companies, and in regard to bankruptcy and insolvency, did not prevent this Parliament dealing with special cases, and that therefore this Act that had been passed in 1867, which was a complete winding-up Act for a particular bank, could not be successfully assailed. Hon. gentlemen will see that while going some distance and covering some of the points raised the other night, it does not altogether meet the case here. This is not a Bill to wind up this bank or to deal with all the powers of this bank or any particular bank; but it is a special Act relating to a civil contract, and the point of this case is brought out by Judge Strong, page 471, where he bases the whole reason for his judgment on the point I mentioned—that the general power gave practically the special power. But they were

dealing with a complete winding-up Act in regard to a particular bank.

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

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Canadian Inland Transportation Company.—(Mr. Bertram.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax.)

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutherford.)

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. McCleary.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.—(Mr. Penny, by Mr. Wood.)

RELIEF OF DAVID STOCK.

Mr. McCARTHY (by Mr. Stubbs) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 88) for the relief of David Stock.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a Bill, I presume, which provides for the sundering of the marriage tie between two parties. The House is called upon in this matter to act in a judicial capacity. I wonder how many members know anything about the merits of this case, or how many members are in the habit of troubling themselves about the merits of any of these divorce cases that are referred to us. There are, of course, a portion of the members of this House who act in all these cases with perfect consistency, and in accordance with a fixed principle, who refuse to grant divorces and vote against them because of a religious belief that it is not the proper thing to do. There are other members of the House who believe that divorce may be granted for proper cause. I suppose our laws define what is a proper cause for the sundering of the marriage ties. But it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that there is an incongruity in the treatment of these cases in calling upon this House to decide upon matters of so grave a consequence, in the perfunctory manner in which we discharge our duty. I, for one, know nothing about the merits of this case. I believe that divorce is proper for one cause, and for one cause only. I believe that the existence of that cause should be clearly proven, that it should be proven to the satisfaction of the judges. As a member of this House I am placed in the position of a judge in this matter, and I know nothing about it; I am in no position to act upon this case intelligently.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Have you read the evidence?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have not read the evidence. It may be said that I should have done so, but I venture to think there is not one member in this House who has done so, or who reads the evidence in these cases. Now, Sir, the granting of a divorce is a judicial act. If it is proper at all, if relief of that kind should be granted under any circumstances, the aggrieved parties should have an opportunity to secure that relief at a reasonable expense, and in a way that involves less trouble than is involved in the course that they are obliged to pursue under the practice that now prevails. If it is proper to grant a divorce, I hold that these matters should be dealt with judicially, that there should be a divorce court, that before a divorce court established for taking cognizance of this kind of cases, these cases should be tried, that it should be proven to the satisfaction of the court that circumstances exist which under the law are held sufficient to warrant the granting of a divorce, and that such divorce should be granted by a properly constituted divorce court, after examination of the case, after hearing the evidence, and after arriving at a decision in a proper judicial manner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a very clear case.

Mr. CHARLTON. This may be a clear case, there may be many clear cases. But I do not believe that the way of granting divorces by this Parliament is consonant with the proper principles of administering justice, because if divorce is to be granted, it must be granted for cause, and that cause must be defined by law. The granting of a divorce for a cause defined by law is essentially a judicial act, and should be performed by a duly constituted court. So I raise my voice and protest now, as I have on other occasions, against the method of granting divorces which applies in Canada. I do not propose to oppose the granting of this petition, for I do not know anything about the circumstances, but I assume that they have been examined in the other House, and that the testimony is considered sufficient. But I protest, nevertheless, that in every case where I am called upon to act in a matter of this kind, I am acting in the dark, I am acting against my conscientious scruples, I am acting under the belief that I am obliged to act in a way which I ought not to be called upon to act, and that I am performing this judicial act in the capacity of a judge without having been duly seized of the circumstances, and without having been placed in a position to understand them thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I may say

to the hon. gentleman that the question to which he invites the consideration of the House is a most important one, but I doubt very much whether this is the exact time and place to discuss it. I would think, perhaps, the hon. gentleman might take another opportunity of inviting the attention of the House to the whole subject, and, perhaps, they might come to a conclusion adverse to the existing system. But I may say that in this case the Bill came before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee, who read the evidence carefully, and there is not a shadow of doubt that the relief should be granted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The case was in the courts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The case was in the courts. The woman consorted with another man and committed bigamy and married him, and was prosecuted before the stipendiary magistrate of Toronto. The man with whom she went through the form of marriage was also prosecuted; they were both convicted and sentenced to imprisonment. They are living together now as man and wife. The facts are clear, and are beyond the peradventure of a doubt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They received a very mild punishment, though.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I believe it is true that we have the anomaly of the existence of a divorce court in some of the provinces, yet we deal here in the House of Commons and the Senate with divorce cases from other provinces. Would it not be well to have a uniform practice in that regard?

Mr. HENDERSON. In case it might go abroad from the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that hon. members are so neglectful of their duties as not to read evidence in a matter of this kind, I think that a contradiction should be given to this statement. For my part I may say that I read the evidence from beginning to end, and I doubt very much if there are many members in this House who did not read it. It is generally one of those pieces of literature that men indulge in, whether from a right motive or not I do not know. It is to enable us to give a proper judgment in cases of this kind. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that this is one of the cases where the Bill should pass.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac, and to change its name to "The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pembroke."—(Mr. Poupore.)

Bill (No. 60) to authorize the amalgamation of the Erie and Huron Railway Company and the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Ottawa Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Savard.)

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Frost.)

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

REPRESENTATION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The House resumed discussion on motion for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite agree with the right hon. gentleman who referred to the judges, and expressed the hope that attacks on the character of the judiciary would not be rashly made in this House. But in administering, apparently, a rebuke to one particular member of Parliament, the right hon. gentleman seemed to have overlooked the attack which, last session, I and some others had occasion to resent, which was not only made by one of the hon. gentlemen behind him, but embodied in the action of the Government itself, whereby they practically withdrew their confidence from certain judges in the province of Quebec, and asked for legislation to prevent these judges from taking too much out of the treasury by way of travelling expenses and so on. There was a very interesting discussion on that occasion with regard to the judges. I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will recollect my successfully having him called to order by the Chair. While the right hon. First Minister was quick to rebuke a gentleman who, he supposed, on this side had attacked a judge in this debate, I call attention to his omission, on that occasion, which is the more remarkable because of his action to-day.

That suggests one of the dangers that appears in the Bill before the House. The right hon. gentleman may know of some legislation by which the judges are brought so directly into the political arena as this proposal will bring them. No doubt, how-

ever, he had in his mind the use which is made of judges in England in connection with some legislation of this character. However, a very slight examination will show that this is not in any way a like proposal as that adopted by the British Parliament in utilizing the services of judges with regard to the fixing of the seats or the boundaries for seats for the House of Commons of England. The right hon. gentleman will see that when a purely party measure requires the co-operation of the judges and in which party feeling is naturally aroused, it will be impossible to prevent, as much as has hitherto been possible, attacks upon the judges and suspicions and reflections being cast upon them. This is not a case in which, so far as I have been able to gather from explanations of the right hon. gentleman, the duties of the judges will be judicial. Their duties will be ministerial rather, under the instructions contained in this Bill, and if politicians or candidates in different ridings consider that the judges have determined the lines too much in favour of a Grit section here or a Conservative section there, there will naturally be aroused the very bitterest feeling possible, and one dangerous in connection with the position which the judiciary occupy. I have no doubt that if the Government were looking at all for a precedent where the judges were connected with legislation of this kind, they had in mind some such legislation as obtained in England; but the difference in that case is this, that the judges did not come into this class of legislation at all, nor were they connected with anything so intimately involved with political considerations until the question of the distribution of seats in England became an entirely and absolutely non-political one, by concert between the leaders of the two great parties and the change in feeling with regard to this work due to years of experience and education in that country. It was not, therefore, until all the political aspects had been removed out of legislation of this kind that the services of the judges were invoked.

I think it was in 1884, when Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury removed from the political arena the question of the arrangement of the different counties and boroughs for representation in Parliament, and true to Liberal traditions in that country and in fact to the traditions of both parties in 1884—as I supposed was the feeling in this country until the hon. gentleman made his introductory speech to-day—the principle of representation by population, a Bill was introduced in 1884. Then the scheme was submitted to Lord Salisbury, and after consultation and co-operation by means of committees, at any rate, by these two gentlemen coming together with their help, the original scheme was considerably changed and revised. I notice, for instance, six agricultural boroughs of the Liberal scheme, as proposed, became, under the Gladstone-Salisbury scheme, nineteen boroughs, and various other divisions took place. Macclesfield and Standish, two, became eight, according to the statement in the annual record. Quite a change, at any rate, took place in the Liberal scheme, when it was put on a broader basis, as a matter that should be removed wholly from political considerations, so that Mr. Gladstone, on that occasion, was able to speak to the House with an entire absence of political motives and without harking back to some supposed principle that had been abandoned by his opponents years before; and in explaining his Bill was able to refer to this principle of representation by population—the principal question for which the Liberal party, to which the right hon. gentleman is supposed to belong, fought so strenuously for in this country, bringing at one time the country almost to the verge of open riot. Mr. Gladstone was able to say:

> The present reputation of the country gives to the counties one member through the United Kingdom for 78,000 persons, and to the boroughs one member for 41,200 persons. That ratio of borough representation is rendered even more unequal when we come to divide the towns into large towns and small towns. As a rule, the ratio is one member for 54,200 persons over the whole country.

I refer to that passage in the debate simply to call the attention of the House to the evident fairness of that proposal and the principle upon which it was possible for the two parties to come together and settle this matter on a different basis than either party, when dealing with it alone, had ever before in the history of England been able to settle it. So in that speech, Mr. Gladstone says:

> We have expressed our profound satisfaction in what was first a surmise, but what has gradually become a belief, that there is no broad or vital difference of opinion on this subject between the several sections of the House. The discussion, when it comes—and probably in the necessities of the case it may be an extended discussion—will, we believe, be a discussion rather of a practical than of a polemical character. We have striven to keep in view all those considerations which equity, which practical needs, which the regard for usage and the general spirit of English legislation commended to our notice.

Now, these are the principles of a gentleman to whose school the right hon. leader of the Government at one time used to pretend to belong, and they are principles remarkable for their absence from the Bill now before the House; because the right hon. gentleman proposes to break down the traditions of this country in regard to the proper time for the question of redistribution to engage the attention of this Parliament. According to the constitution—whether it be to the strict letter of the British North America Act or not is a very interesting question—but viewing our constitution in the way

the British constitution is considered as being based on practice and consideration handed down, it is clear that for the first time in the history of confederation an attempt is made to depart from the rule of having a redistribution only after a decennial census, And, consequently, the right hon. gentleman will see that, not only is an interesting legal question involved, but there is a departure from the sound principle that underly the practice in England and that underlay this great reform in Mr. Gladstone's time. Not only that, but where are we to end, if this sort of thing is begun? If this becomes the practice, what pressure will there be upon whomever he may be who succeeds the hon. gentleman as Prime Minister if he should be defeated. How can that pressure be resisted, with the passion of the conflict still strong for a powerful and dominant party, instead of considering the interest of the country and the great question of practical legislation for the benefit of the people, to begin considering ways and means by which they can all the more easily defeat their opponents. We had the Minister of Trade and Commerce referring to old sores and old practices and endeavouring to justify his Bill by pretending that it was on the lines that Sir John Macdonald adopted, not in 1872, but in 1882, and pretending that this is a fair and above-board attempt to enforce the county line system. The explanations the right hon. gentleman read show us, without our having to look at the Bill, that where these county lines suit the exigencies of the Liberal party, they will prevail, and where they do not suit them they will not prevail. There were notable instances mentioned by the right hon. gentleman, and, no doubt, the explanations will be forthcoming. To get rid of an awkward historical fact the Minister of Trade and Commerce suggested the absurd idea that Sir John Macdonald was wedded to the old county line idea, not to the representation by population idea, which was the principle of the last general Redistribution Bill in his hands—that he had been dragooned away from his first love. In short the attempt was made to bring to the support of this Bill the weight of Sir John Macdonald's name. In this attempt the hon. gentleman resorted to an argument or statement which is absurd on the face of it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke of having been hived, or of the hive of South Oxford. Sir John Macdonald had been singularly kind to him in this respect and had heaped coals of fire upon his head for all his malignity, for it was that feature of the Bill which alone enabled the Minister of Trade and Commerce to put in an appearance in this Parliament—for it was only from a so-called hive that this hon. gentleman was able to be in this House for the last years that he has sat here. And, then, not contented with that, the right hon. gentleman, as we know, has hived him in the Cabinet, placed him in an easy office, but deprived him of all opportunity to do much one way or the other. The explanation of the right hon. gentleman, followed by the statements of the hon. gentlemen from the province of Ontario, have convinced me that not only is there an entire absence of that sort of fairness and that sort of reform which has prevailed in England and which the Liberal party when in opposition to the Conservatives used to profess to admire, but there is shown in the Bill a fell determination to take advantage, so far as advantage could possibly be taken of the Conservative party, notably in the province of Ontario, and for reasons that have been already gone into to-day and that I need not go over. And, while the hon. gentleman was introducing his Bill, this Bill fraught with such danger, with such unfairness to his opponents, I was thinking of his reputation for sunny smiles. I could not avoid the reflection that a man may smile and smile and be—in the right hon. gentleman's position, the leadership of the Liberal party. I join in the expressions that have been given voice to to-day by hon. gentlemen from the province of Ontario on the Conservative side of the House, who, knowing exactly the situation, have been able to follow the explanation and to be warned of the purpose of this Bill—the real purpose. There must be some malign consideration of that kind in a Bill brought in at this time. There was no occasion for it, no earthly occasion for a measure of this kind. If the right hon. gentleman thinks for a moment that he really possesses the confidence of the country according to the present arrangement of the constituencies as they were in June, 1896, there would be no necessity to make this ruthless attempt to break down a healthy and sound practice. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that there have been attempts by the dominant party to gain advantage over their opponents in Ontario, whether in the local House or here, still it could never be said, no matter what the majority was, small or great, that from 1867 down to the present time an attempt was made to take advantage of opportunities outside of the time contemplated by the British North America Act itself and according to the practice that obtains in the old country and that obtained in Canada itself. I certainly will join those on this side who intimated their intention of watching very narrowly every feature of this measure.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the First Minister a question? I understood him to say that certain counties where county lines were disturbed by portions being taken out of them, would be dealt with by the judges. But there are certain other counties that he named in which the county lines were not disturbed. Are the judges to deal with the redistribution of seats in those counties as well?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. The judges will be called upon to deal only with such counties where the county lines are restored.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to mention the county of Bruce where there is no disturbance of county lines.

The PRIME MINISTER. The county of Bruce is among those that are to be divided by the judges.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BANKING ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 127) to amend the Banking Act. He said: Among the many matters in which Canada has made great progress from year to year may be mentioned the banking business. The banking institutions of Canada have not only distributed themselves over our wide territory, but have also extended their operations abroad. Several of our great banking institutions have established branches in the United States, and one of our enterprising banks in the lower provinces, the Bank of Nova Scotia, has established its business in the Island of Jamaica. Application was made by the Bank of Nova Scotia in a special Bill this session for power to issue notes in the Island of Jamaica, expressed in pounds, that being the currency of the island. They desired to issue a one pound sterling note. This they could not do under our Bank Act, which of course requires the notes to be issued in the currency of Canada. It was thought better to have a general Bill which would enable other banks to extend their operations to other British possessions if they desired to do so, rather than pass a special Bill for the convenience of this particular bank. I therefore requested that my hon. friend the member for Halifax, who has charge of the Bill respecting the Bank of Nova Scotia, to let it stand, and I promised that the Government will present a Bill dealing with the matter. We propose by this Bill, therefore, to facilitate the extension of our banking institutions to any British possession they desire. Under the Act they will have the power to issue notes expressed in the currency of the colony in which they extend their business. These notes will be redeemable in that colony, and will be so expressed upon their face. If at any time the bank should cease to do business within that colony, then its notes become redeemable at any agency of the bank within the Dominion of Canada. I think that that proviso will be found entirely satisfactory to the banks, and will be useful in encouraging the extension of our banks to other colonies, and particularly in the matter of the West India trade. As we all wish to encourage that, I think we are all agreed that we can have no better agency for the extension of the Canadian trade than to have our Canadian banks establish branches in those islands.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that while the bank is in a solvent state and is doing business, these notes issued anywhere outside the colonies are not redeemable in Canada during that time?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they are only redeemable in the event of the bank ceasing to do business in that colony. They are stamped on their face to be redeemed only in the colony where issued, but if at any time the bank got into difficulties and suspended, the bank's funds are responsible wherever they are found in Canada, and the circulation forms part of the circulation under the general Bank Act, with all the securities which the Bank Act provides.

Mr. FOSTER. If a citizen of Jamaica happened to be here and had those notes in his possession, and wanted them to be honoured by a bank, I suppose, of course, the bank would do that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt they would be honoured in such an exceptional case, but it is deemed expedient to make them legally redeemable only in the colony where issued.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the Minister what effect this will have on the circulation upon the bank's bills in Canada. Is this to be considered part of the bank's circulation, thereby reducing the amount of the circulation of the bank in the Dominion of Canada?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is distinctly declared that this shall not give them any power to enlarge their circulation, subject to all the provisions of the Bank Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me it is a little dangerous, it might curtail the circulation too much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then they must come and get power to increase it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I regret that there is no other course left for me than to call attention to the importance of the returns that I have been endeavouring to obtain from the Government. I have sent notes, I have made out slips on separate pieces of paper, I have spoken from my seat in the House on several occasions.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will suggest to my hon. friend that he mention this matter when we move the House into Committee of Supply, as we shall do in a few minutes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall have something else to say on going into Committee of Supply. I suppose one may be pardoned for taking advantage of an opportunity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the hon. member conclude with a motion?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, on the Orders of the Day I am only calling attention to the returns. But I will conclude with a motion if necessary. No one regrets more than I do that I am compelled to occupy so much time in regard to matters concerning which the only course usually open is to make a motion for the papers, and then to have the pleasure of seeing them brought down. There are some papers that I should not be compelled to wait for at all. Under the rules of this House, when a Minister of the Crown refers to documents, he is bound to lay them on the Table of the House. If he is proceeding with close regard to the rules of the House, he will not refer to these documents unless he is going to lay them on the Table of the House at conclusion of the speech. Some days ago I called the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to many phases of his speech where he referred to public documents. I gave him the pages, and I told him I would explain them in particlar, if he desired, as I went along. I have not seen these papers yet, they have not been laid on the Table of the House. I refer to pages in the present "Hansard," 852, 856, 857, 858, 861, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 880, 885, 888, 889, 896, 904. I refer to the speech of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, page 1642, and to that of the hon. Minister of Finance, pages 1696 and 1879.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are not public documents.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not make that statement when I questioned him. If the hon. gentleman does not intend to comply with my request I will bring the matter up in another form. I understood from the hon. Minister of the Interior that he was willing to comply with my request and bring down the papers that I expected and that I required. I know of no other course, preliminary to the courses open to me, except to call attention across the floor of this House, but I give the Government warning that unless there is some celerity shown in producing these documents I shall avail myself of the opportunity that I shall have to see that the supplies which are wanted by the Government are not voted too quickly, and I shall deem it my duty to speak a good deal more on various subjects than I otherwise would.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would rather be an inducement, perhaps, to defer bringing them down if you are going to regale us in that manner.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the compliment, and I know it is sincere from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and, if he prefers that I should take that course, I am ready to oblige him.

Mr. McGREGOR. We will stay with you.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know the hon. member from Essex (Mr. McGregor) always listens to the speeches that I make, although he is continually saying that I am wasting the time of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that there should be no discussion at this stage.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, if you would keep hon. gentlemen quiet there would be no discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am trying to do my duty, but I would remind the hon. gentleman that the only permission that can be granted him is to ask a question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am calling attention to the fact of these returns not being brought down. I have to call attention to this; it is my duty and it is my right to do so. There was an Order of the House on the 19th of April for a list of employees in the Yukon, which has not been complied with. No comment on that is necessary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). What does that order comprise? If the hon. gentleman will look at the order he will find that the order comprises a request for the particulars which he has mentioned as well as particulars relating to the expenses which have been paid to all employees in the Yukon district. The hon. gentleman speaks of that as if it were a simple matter. I can assure him that it involves a full two weeks work by the accountant of the department. Every day, since the hon. gentleman began talking about Yukon matters, without exception, I have called the attention of the officers of the department who have charge of this work to the necessity of getting these returns out as quickly as possible, and they are working in order to get them out as rapidly as it is possible to do. It is impossible for anybody to prepare these returns because it can only be done by the officers who are acquainted with the papers and who know their contents. Since the opening of the House I have laid on the Table returns comprising 10,000 pages.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have had some experience in connection

with the hon. Minister of the Interior's expedition which makes me not doubt his present statement. It is specific, and I accept it, but I doubt whether he has been active because I asked for very simple information across the floor of the House, and I believe the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked for it in writing—documents that are printed, Orders in Council, and so on. I sent to the department, after having in vain asked for them from the hon. Minister of the Interior, and got them from the deputy; I asked the deputy if he would be good enough to oblige me with them, and in an hour I got them. This should not be a necessary course to have to adopt in reference to public papers. In connection with the removal of Mr. Fawcett there is an order which has not been brought down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no correspondence in the department and the return can be laid on the Table of the House at any time, but in order to establish the fact that no letters had been written it was necessary to make an examination of something like 700 or 800 pages.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It may be that these returns of papers in connection with these important matters are bulky, but if we are going to govern the country by parliamentary government it is necessary that we should have them. An enormous number of these papers are connected with the administration of that far-away country, the Yukon, and they should have been in course of preparation for Parliament. There are a great many subjects in the different departments in regard to which the departments are only too willing to furnish reports in full. The Minister should not simply pigeon-hole these papers which are not printed. This simply means that we are asked to vote supplies in the dark in the absence of these papers. They say that they are very voluminous; vote the supplies and see the papers next year. I do not propose to follow that course. If they are voluminous and bulky they are important, and extra clerks may be got to copy them. Then the instructions to Mr. Wade were asked for. It is said that these papers do not necessitate a return coming down. It is the usual course where there are no papers to make a return of that fact.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That return was laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, I do not find it in the Votes and Proceedings.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is in the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is another return ordered on March 30, 1898. What is the trouble about that?

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the subject of that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is an order for papers in connection with the prosecutions in Manitoba. That order was passed and the subject has been before one of the committees.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Wade return is there, page 294 of the Votes and Proceedings, 18th of May: "Return to an Order of the House of the 19th of April, 1899, for copies of instructions given to F. C. Wade, &c."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accepted the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You said that it was not in the Votes and Proceedings; you were wrong in that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and I beg his pardon most willingly, but I am now referring to an order of the 30th March, 1898. Is there any excuse for not complying with that after thirteen months have passed, and not a particle of attention has been paid to it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. gentleman give me the form of the order of March 30, 1898. What does it call for?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For the papers concerning the prosecutions in connection with the election frauds in Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Are they in my department?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, not in terms. They would go to the department where these papers are ultimately sent.

There are two Orders on the 19th of April in regard to liquor permits in the Yukon, and a return has been made in connection with one Order, but the other has, apparently, been overlooked. We have a particularly interesting case, for the papers must have been prepared and submitted to the Justice Department and to the Privy Council in regard to this Stanley Park or Deadman's Island affair, and, although the Order passed on the 1st of May, the papers are not down yet. There is no excuse for keeping this House in the dark in regard to a matter which has already produced a riot, the Riot Act being read in connection with the action of the Government. I have spoken to the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) privately, and I have asked questions across the floor of the House, but without avail. You have the provincial government, as well as the lessee of this Government making a claim, and you have a profound con-

viction on the part of many people in Vancouver, regardless of politics, that there has been a most valuable piece of property spirited away for a song. According to reputable persons in the city of Vancouver, men regardless of party, this property is worth $40,000, and it is handed over to Mr. Ludgate, under a lease of twenty-five years, for $500 a year. I admit that a large portion of the labour element in Vancouver are in favour of it, and, from an economical point of view, it may be a good thing for the city, but there are serious questions remaining as to why and how this property was handed over. First, whether this Government had the title, which is in dispute, and secondly, whether it is a proper business transaction for them to make. If these papers are kept back longer, it will be impossible to have a full inquiry into the circumstances this session.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Did the hon. gentleman speak to the Minister of Militia ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes ; I told him particularly the reasons for haste, and, as I say, outside of party politics altogether, the leading men in Vancouver are absolutely bewildered as to why the Government has acted in this matter as they have done. There are other questions which I will not refer to now, in order to be brief, for I take it for granted that the Government will show haste in the matter. The Minister of Marine is pressing for his supplies, and I call his attention to an Order with reference to steamboat inspection, which I would ask him to hasten.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). This Order was only passed two days ago, and it has not reached my department yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I merely say, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) is pressing for his supplies, and will come before the House again shortly, and I remind him that these papers are of great importance, and should be in our possession before his supplies are voted.

The PRIME MINISTER. Next Thursday, when the House meets again, we will make a supreme effort to satisfy the over-fastidiousness of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is unfair to add that, for I made my remarks short, and accepted the hon. gentleman's promise without reservation.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Railway Act. He said : When introducing this Bill the other day, I explained there was nothing in it of an important character, and that we were merely proposing to incorporate in the general railway law two or three particular clauses that we were in the habit of adding to the special Railway Bills, as they go through the committee. I thought it better that in the future this should be dispensed with, and that we should incorporate them in the general Act. Since then, however, two Bills have been introduced in amendment to the Railway Act by private members, and some questions have arisen in respect to important matters, which I am considering, and which may eventuate in my proposing some further amendments to the railway law. My present purpose is, as soon as this Bill takes it second reading, to ask the House to refer it to the Railway Committee. It is a Government Bill, but I am willing it shall go to that committee for the purpose of considering these other matters to which I have referred, and for the purpose of incorporating the clauses of the other Bills that have been introduced by private members, of course, providing that it shall meet with the approval of the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

THE INSURANCE ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 86) to further amend the Insurance Act. He said : When I introduced this Bill, I mentioned some of its provisions, and I intimated I would propose that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, as I believed it could be more conveniently discussed in the committee than in the House. Since that time I have been favoured with a visit from a deputation representing the insurance companies of the Dominion, who have made some suggestions which I think to a very large extent we may find ourselves able to accept. But these matters can much better be dealt with in the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TIDAL SURVEY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I attempted to ask some questions the other day, and, according to the rule of the House. I was not able to get the information; but I shall now do my best to give it. It has reference to the question of tidal surveys. In 1896 this Government asked for $15,000 in the Supply Bill to make the usual progress that had been made previously in connection with a very important service in this country. The Minister of Marine, who had just come to his department, then stated in the Committee of Supply, that he had an open mind on this subject, and that he had not come to a conclusion, one way or the other. In 1897 his mind had got down to this question sufficiently far to give the proposition a general endorsement, when, for some reason or other—the only reason I have been able to learn is, that Captain Spain, in some informal way, not by any written report, apparently told the Minister that he had not yet convinced himself of the importance of this question, and that Captain Moore, of the steamship "California," Allan Line, had his mind made up adversely to the importance of this question. From the best inquiries I have been able to make, there is no Captain Moore of the "California." Captain Brown is captain of the "California."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken. When I came out from California a year ago, Captain Moore was in command.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The statement was that Allan captains had given the hon. gentleman information, and as Allan captains and Dominion Line captains and the leading mariners that go up and down the gulf had been battering at the doors of the Marine Department with petitions and deputations when I was Minister, it struck me with considerable surprise that Allan captains had sneered at this proposition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say sneered.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was the practical effect—that it was not a matter of practical necessity, but merely theoretical. This is a most serious condition of affairs. I can understand the Minister of Marine saying in 1896, notwithstanding the fact that Parliament was then appropriating considerable sums for the service, that his mind was open on the subject, but how could he go on keeping a special officer in the department, and while his mind was kept open, starving that officer with regard to appropriations for the successful carrying out of the work, and then coming before Parliament and intimating that he had not mastered or examined the subject, that he had not taken the trouble to look into the papers that were within his reach? When I recollected the active interest taken by deputations, consisting of the leading underwriters of Montreal, the men who were most anxious that the navigation of the St. Lawrence should be in such a condition that the charges to either coast could be lowered, and when I remembered the pressure from men like these and also from eminent scientists, whose opinions on questions of this kind are of the greatest value to navigators, I was bewildered at not being able to obtain an official reply, to which I think I was entitled, as to whether there were or not the names of practical seamen in the department asking for this survey. I was told by the Minister of Marine that he did not know whether they were practical seamen or not, and that I could have the papers if I moved for them. There was no course left for me then but to do what I propose to do now, to speak the sentiments of some of the best informed men in Canada on a subject of vital importance to the marine interests of this country. With the record in that department of the splendid work done by Commander Gordon, it pained me to hear that because Captain Spain or any other master mariner in his department had, in an off-hand way, told him he had been unable to come to a conclusion that this was a necessary and important work, there was to be a stop in the progress of this work so important, and to which such able men as Captain Gordon had given so much of their time and attention. In the reports of the Marine Department the hon. gentleman will find, as far back as 1894, information, the existence of which he was absolutely ignorant of, or he would not have discussed this subject with me in Supply as he did the other night. It would have been impossible for him to have said, in his light and airy fashion, that there was on the one side the theoretical views of scientists and on the other side practical seamen, and he had yet to hear one practical seaman who was in favour of the survey, and that Allan's captains had told him it was not wanted. He will find information in the blue-books laid before Parliament, on the basis of which I was able to get a large grant, but not so large as I would have desired, and I had to apologize to this House and the country for not being able to obtain a larger amount. I explained to the committee at the time—and no one challenged it even then, though the opposition was very critical—the wisdom of this work, approved as it had been by the very best examples we could have, the example of the English Government in regard to their own coasts, and the example of the Indian Government with regard to the coast of India, and the example of our neighbours to the south, all of whom have put their houses in order and done what they possibly could in this direction so as to give to navigators the information, which, forsooth, the Minister of Marine thinks will be found on Bayfield's charts or some charts he has in the department. There is not a chart in ex-

istence in England or the United States that will give him the information that this tidal survey and the survey of the currents will give to Canada and has given to the United States. To our shame be it spoken, on the Pacific coasts with regard to some of this work we have to go to the United States charts where they have not been niggardly in expending moneys to survey parts of the coasts of Canada, and can give you the direction and force of the currents, which we should be able to find on our own charts if we had the national spirit and enterprise that has brought about this assistance to navigators on the English and American coast.

There are men who could not pass the examination, as the papers will show, but who are in the service and are good pilots around our coast, and such men may tell you that this work is of no use to them. If you put into their hands time tables and all the necessary data, they could not work out of them the results that these masters of these other vessels do. We have, however, a great many of our own navigators on the vessels going to the coasts of England, and they have this information as they approach the English coast, but not as they approach our coast. In the St. Lawrence, the force of the currents is such and the direction is such, that they constitute an admitted danger. In speaking of this danger, I am not doing, in any sense, our country an injury, because all navigators are absolutely aware now of these lurking dangers and are anxious to get rid of them. I was speaking by the book in 1896 when I pressed this subject on the attention of the Minister of Marine; I was speaking of the advice of the best informed practical men on this subject, when I pressed him in 1897, and again in 1898, when, to my surprise, the recommendations of his own engineer were not adopted and the vote required was not even asked from Parliament. Now, there is hardly a subject more interesting than this to a large part of the people of Canada, so far as concerns the mercantile marine and the business of the great ports of Montreal, and Quebec, concerning which we are so deeply interested. The Minister will find, that I had not to wait until I gave notice of motion, and until days rolled by and I could move for a return, in order to get the information I sought. I found it in the reports of the department that had been laid before Parliament, and these disclosed how very unfair, to put it mildly, the Minister was, if he had the slightest information that these reports contained, and how very reprehensible it was on his part if he had not the information. For he cannot get rid of the responsibility in any other way than that he attempted. Still, it would be the greatest misfortune if he devoted his abilities and talents to seeking a justification for his inaction by belittling the service—which was, in effect, his defence. That was the reason for this reference to Captain Spain's unpublished report. That was the reason for this reference to two Allan captains, who dwindled afterwards to one, and to a captain who was in the "California," but who is not in the "California" now. Here is the information that the hon. gentleman had before him when he took his position, the report of Mr. W. Bell Dawson, C.E., addressed to W. P. Anderson, C.E., Chief Engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Before I quote it, I may say that there was a reference by the Minister—and the same tendency is shown by others—suggesting: Oh, that is only Mr. Dawson's report—as though they suggested that, being an enthusiast, and this being his line of business, any one would expect him to say the very best that could be said for this service. Fortunately, this report, though signed by Mr. Dawson, has the advantage for people who do not appreciate him—that is, people who do not know him—that he refers to other authorities outside of the Marine Department altogether. He says:

> As long ago as the meeting of the British Association held in Montreal in 1894, the importance of publishing tide tables for Canadian waters, and the necessity of establishing stations for tidal observations was discussed. The association adopted a resolution drawing the attention of the Government of the Dominion to the matter, and also appointed a committee to collect information and make representations to the Government regarding it. The committee consisted of Dr. A. Johnson, chairman,——

That is a professor who was connected for a long time with McGill University and a very eminent man.

> ——Professor J. G. McGregor, Halifax,——

An equally able man and distinguished scholar, connected with Dalhousie University.

> ——J. B. Cherriman, of Toronto, H. T. Bovey, of Montreal,——

The head, I think, of the scientific department of McGill University.

> ——C. Carpmael, director of the Meteorological service.

Now dead, but a most eminent man and great mathematician.

> The Montreal Board of Trade were at the same time considering the question independently, and they concurred in addressing a strong memorial on the subject to the Dominion Government. Ship-owners and masters were also practically unanimous as to the pressing need for knowledge on the subject of the tides and currents.

So, there you have the scientists represented by some of their most eminent men and you have the commercial interests also of the great commercial metropolis of Montreal. Now, this gentleman, Mr. Dawson, the Minister will bear me out, whether an enthusiast or not, is singularly careful in any statement of fact he makes, whether in a report or elsewhere. He traces his history down to 1894, when a deputation representing the British Association and the Royal Society of Canada, with representatives in the city of Montreal, waited on my hon.

friend from York (Mr. Foster) and the late Sir John Macdonald. The result of that was a promise to deal with that matter in the near future. We had undertaken very heavy work, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will remember. We had the survey of Georgian Bay, that is, the hydrographic survey, requiring a special ship and special officers, including a highly paid officer, loaned by the Admiralty of Great Britain, the expenditure being some $40,000 a year, I think. Then, we had undertaken to build up one of the finest branches in the Marine Department, the nucleus of a hydrographic survey, made up of officers drawn from the Kingston Military College, chosen regardless of politics, being certified by the commandant as to their aptitude for this kind of work. Thus, we finally succeeded in inducing the Government to provide what was, admittedly, a small vote, but it was a beginning—$10,000, afterwards increased to $15,000. He says further:

While admitting that these observations——

Speaking of some preliminary points of tidal stations that Commander Gordon and Mr. Carpmael had been able to provide for at little expense out of the scientific and meteorological vote.

While admitting that these observations were too few in number and too rough in their nature to found any conclusion on, Lieut. Gordon considers that the result certainly strengthens the opinion that the whole question of the determination of tidal constants should be taken up in Canada, and a number of stations established for taking tidal observations, as these would be——

Now, here is the main conclusion, as I referred to it from memory the other night. This is the recommendation of a man whose reputation is established in Prince Edward Island, among the seamen, and also in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where he has sailed for years and where he was regarded as a man who passed in the royal navy an examination on which he got perfect marks on the subject of navigation, a man who was an enthusiast in his profession. He regarded this as "of the greatest practical value to seamen."

He further points out the special value which this work will have when completed, as it will enable an intelligent shipmaster not only to see at what time the tide will be high or low, but also to see at once how the tidal current is setting his ship, when once the currents are charted for the waters of the gulf.

As Staff Commander Maxwell, R.N., was at that time carrying on the re-survey in the lower St. Lawrence, his attention was called to the memorial of the British Association, and he was asked by the department to state the nature and extent of such tidal observations as he was making.

It was the ordinary hydrographic work done around the coast, begun by Bayfield and paid for half by the Canadian and half by the British Government, for making soundings and depths of shoals in the navigable waters and entering them in the charts.

His attention was called to the memorial of the committee of the British Association, and he was asked by the department to state the nature and extent of such tidal observation as he was making. His reply is to the effect that he was doing what he could to observe the tides and currents with the means at his disposal; but they were confessedly imperfect, and were confined to a limited area, and did not necessarily establish any comparison with any other portion of the river.

To do this work in a comprehensive way, he considers the most trustworthy method to be the establishment of self-registering tide-gauges at various points in the river and gulf of St. Lawrence.

I call attention again to the authority of this officer, in connection with the statements I have made time and again in this House.

With one or more vessels from which to observe day by day the condition of the tidal streams under varying states of wind and weather.

Now, they put the "Lansdowne" in charge of these officers, but they never followed this up; the hon. gentleman says he was never able to spare a ship. I say, in connection with the currents, that this is a work which is required, but he has reduced it down to what a small vote of $5,000 will permit him to do. It is merely a hand-to-mouth business, and does not contemplate anything like a reasonably short time for the conclusion of this work. It is not such work as would enable a ship master to tell the course and the direction of these currents. Further on:

As Lieut. Gordon had spent the summer of 1888 in navigating the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, he addressed a report to the Minister based upon the further information he there gained, after carefully watching the effect of currents on his ship's course.

This is the report, as I told the House the other night, which gives the work in regard to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where Captain Gordon, with all the assistants he had on a Government ship, with the best appliances the department could give him, took special observations, and, in directing a course somewhere in the vicinity of the island of Anticosti, in twenty-four hours he was 19 or 20 miles out of his course, knowing nothing of the course and direction of those currents, of which there is no survey in existence. Now, Mr. Dawson says:

In this report he expresses the conviction that until we have an exhaustive examination of the whole system of tidal movements, carried out on similar plans to those which have been made on the United States coasts, and on the coasts of Great Britain, we shall always be subject to an annual amount of maritime loss due to the lack of information in regard to tidal currents. He also points out that in the 18 years from 1870 to 1887, the aggregate loss was a little over $50,000,000, or an average of $2,782,000 per annum; and in the same period the loss of life has been 4,308 lives. A certain proportion of this loss of life and property is certainly due to the imperfect knowledge of the currents; and if

the number of narrow escapes of vessels from disaster or wreck were known, it would add a powerful argument in favour of proceeding with the work forthwith. He also adds that if we could only get a record of the narrow escapes, the delays, and the errors of position discovered when a fog clears away, no further argument would be required.

We have evidence there, not merely that a number of men have had an opinion as to the value of these surveys, but we have the reasons from a practical and able navigator.

But captains of vessels as a rule dislike to admit that they have been out of position; and danger escaped next voyage, when, if the weather is thick, it may be found that the ship is as far to the north as she was on the previous trip to the south. It is the more difficult under these circumstances to collect evidence on the subject.

That is taking the statement of a commander of what his position was, when he found himself affected by a current.

He is himself convinced, however, of the extreme desirability, if not the absolute necessity of proceeding with this work as soon as possible.

Then, reference is made to the slow progress of the work, in the absence of that boat. In 1889 there was nothing but the same kind of work that is going on now, that is, looking after the establishment of tide-gauges.

At the conclusions of the re-surveys in the lower St. Lawrence with this season, the expenses of which were being shared by the Canadian Government and the British Admiralty, the time was regarded as opportune to make further representations as to the pressing need for information about our tides and currents.

I ask the particular attention of the House to this paragraph of Mr. Dawson's report, bearing on the extraordinary position taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Accordingly, in December, 1889, a petition was addressed to the Marine and Fisheries by the committee of the British Association, and the Royal Society of Canada, and was signed by 393 masters and officers of vessels, to the following effect:—

Compare that statement with the lack of information the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had, when he said, that, so far as he was concerned, he had yet to learn of the name of a practical seaman who thought this was a necessary aid to navigation, and the statement against it of the unwritten opinion of Captain Spain and the opinion of some captains on the Allan Line. If my memory serves me right, I think, on this question, instead of the Minister taking a technical position, when I was pressing for information, he could have told from that petition a great deal more than is in this, and could have found there the names of not merely the captains of the Allan Line, and the Dominion Line, and other lines, but he would have found them purporting to be signed by the commanders of the particular ships.

We, the undersigned masters and officers of vessels engaged in the navigation of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the waters on the Atlantic coast and of Newfoundland, desire earnestly and respectfully to petition the Government and Parliament of Canada, that they would promptly take such steps as they may deem advisable to obtain as thorough a knowledge as possible of the currents in these waters, whether due to the tides or to any other cause, and to distribute amongst mariners the information obtained. We believe that the serious loss of life and property due to shipwrecks attributable to unknown currents during fogs or hazy weather may thus be greatly diminished. In such weather these currents are a cause of great anxiety and danger.

That was, so far as practical seamen were concerned. There is a petition signed by them; yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told me across this House, that he did not know whether these men were seamen or not, although the petition purports to be signed by no other persons than masters and officers of vessels.

A further memorial was presented to the Minister by the shipping interest of Montreal, bearing the representative signatures of Messrs. H. & A. Allan, David Torrance & Co., H. E. Murray, Anderson, Mackenzie & Co., and F. W. Henshaw.

Comprising nearly the whole of the owners of the great shipping lines.

This memorial points out the special deficiency in Canada of such information to mariners as is supplied by the Imperial Government in the British tide tables, which show not only the change in the depth of water due to rise and fall of the tide, but also supply very full information about the currents in the waters surrounding the British Islands, whether due to the action of the tides, or influenced by atmospheric causes. The annual wreck list is referred to as showing the urgent need of similar information for Canadian waters, and, as far as ascertained, ship masters were unanimous in their anxious desire for information on the subject.

Yet, in 1898, we have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries telling us, that this is an opinion, only on one side, of scientists and theorists, and that, so far as practical seamen and navigators go, those he has had an opportunity of talking to, are opposed to it, and that Captain Spain has not made up his mind about it.

The need of taking immediate action in the matter is urged, as the necessary observations will occupy some years, and every year before their completion will show its list of preventable wrecks. This memorial was also heartily endorsed by the president of the Quebec Board of Trade.

This memorial was also heartily endorsed by the president of the Quebec Board of Trade, and it was referred to a gentleman who is a good authority on navigation and an authority on our Atlantic coast approaches to Halifax and St. John, a gentleman who is in the service of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that is, Captain

Smith. I made the statement, that Captain Smith had strong opinions upon this question, and that he had been commodore of the Allan Line. It was heartily endorsed by the president of the Quebec Board of Trade, by the Board of Trade of Montreal, by the Board of Trade of Quebec, by the owners of ships, by 393 of the masters and officers whose vessels are going up and down the river, and by Captain W. H. Smith, R.N.R., chairman of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, who has had thirty years' experience in the Atlantic service.

And in reply he concurs in recommending that self-registering tide-gauges be placed at all the prominent ports and observations taken by competent persons.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not concur with Captain Smith or with what Mr. Bell Dawson says there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I concurred with him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. These gentlemen would give you the information required.

About the same time a further communication was received from Dr. Johnson——

And, mark you, Mr. Speaker, the information is in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and easily available at any moment. The present Minister, who said, that he had an open mind on this question in 1896, and his mind has apparently become more open since.

About the same time a further communication was received from Dr. Johnson on behalf of the committee of the British Association, which reviews the representations already made by them. Amongst other reasons adduced, the rule of the Imperial Board of Trade is referred to. This requires all masters of ships to obtain a certificate of competency, and for this purpose to pass an examination, which examination, in the case of masters desiring a certificate for the coasting trade, includes a knowledge of the tides and tidal currents. The information enabling them to pass this examination is found in the tide tables published by the Admiralty. This is cited to show the need of obtaining data for Canadian waters on which similar information could be based. The recent re-survey of part of the lower St. Lawrence under Staff Commander Maxwell, is also referred to; and his endeavour, as far as time permitted him, to investigate the tides and currents in the part of the river in which he was at work; although he acknowledges his means to be limited and insufficient to establish comparisons with other points. The opinion of Captain Lackey, R.N.R., is also quoted from his work on "Practical Navigation."

That is a famous work, and that information was available to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

This work has received the approbation of the naval authorities of Great Britain and of the United States, and is supplied to the fleets of both these countries. In it he gives a list of sixteen books which he says "may be considered absolutely essential to safe navigation in the present day, when the question of speed enters so largely into the calculation." His list includes the Admiralty "Tide Tables" and Galbraith and Houghton's "Manual of the Tides and Tidal Currents" for the waters surrounding the British Islands.

With this review of the work and the progress made. the report concludes. Last year I read to this House the urgent recommendation of the chief engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which is contained in Appendix No. 3.

Annual Report of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

It is as follows:—

In consequence of the material reduction of the vote for the tidal and current survey, it was necessary to abandon for the season all work in connection with observations of current.

This is the result of the hon. Minister not knowing anything about this subject. That is not an unfair observation to make, and yet it is a serious one, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us frankly, the other night, the position which he was in, that his mind was open. He told us his mind was open in 1896, and he has not made up his mind about it yet, and it is this suggestion that is so alarming to the people in Montreal and in Quebec who are interested in the St. Lawrence having the very best possible name, and who believe that all reasonable expenditure should be made by the Government in regard to these waters and the waters on the Atlantic coast. These people are alarmed, when they find that the hon. gentleman has not taken the trouble to read the information that is in his department, the information to which I have called his attention time and time again, reports from his officers, all these memorials from the boards of trade of Quebec, of Montreal, and from these captains. So, we find the chief engineer, although not wanting a very large amount for the survey, made a report, in which he said, that it was necessary to abandon for the season all work in connection with observations of current—

The sum allotted for the service barely suffices for the maintenance of the seven tide-gauges previously established,——

The whole thing was whittled down to that. This country, with its great coast, its boasted waters and mercantile marine, and all the efforts we are putting forward to advertise our ports and to make them available for the navigators' trade in this manner, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has confessed, that he does not know anything about the subject. Then, this officer proceeds:

——and to utilize the records obtained from them, which are yearly increasing in value, some help will have to be given the engineer in charge, and some additional outlay incurred to pay for computation. It is also important that tidal differences for the regions commanded by these gauges should be determined while they are all in

good working order. This would require the placing of temporary gauges during the summer season. A beginning was made at this in 1896. Mr. Dawson spent the summer in visiting and inspecting the several tide-gauge stations. His report of progress for the season is hereto annexed.

I am particularly anxious to have an investigation of the currents between Cape Breton Island and Cape Race undertaken as soon as the necessary funds and a steamer can be allotted for the work.

That is the work that was begun when I was in the department, in 1893 or 1894. We supplied them with the "Lansdowne," not as good a ship as is really required for the work, but we gave Mr. Dawson the "Lansdowne" and carte blanche, within the appropriation, to employ his assistants, because there are reasons for having those who are specially fitted for the work, and here we are with the work practically stopped in 1899. The Government means to comply with the wish of the chief engineer, but the statement was made the other night by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that Mr. Bell-Dawson's health was broken down. We are all sorry for that, and I regret it the more, because I know what an able man he is. But that service should not depend upon Mr. Bell Dawson. This service, if it is as important as all these people prove it to be, should have been considered by the Minister so that the fact of one officer breaking down would not affect his plans.

I am particularly anxious to have an investigation of the currents between Cape Breton Island and Cape Race undertaken, as soon as the necessary funds and a steamer can be allotted for the work. The large number of wrecks that have occurred on the south-east shore of Newfoundland and the concurrent testimony that there is a strong indraught in that direction emphasize the fact that such an investigation would have eminently practical results.

The Minister in whose department the chief engineer is, tells us that this is not a practical question, that he has yet to get the name of some practical navigator who cares about it, and that it is theory and science on one side and practical seamanship on the other.

The expenditure on the survey of tides and currents to date is given below. In these amounts there is no charge for the steamer used in the survey during three months in the seasons of 1894, 1895 and 1896,——

I thought myself, when I made the statement, that we only had a steamer in 1894, but I find now that it stopped when the hon. gentleman came into office in 1896, and it stopped because he had an open mind, and he now tells us that his mind is in that same unfortunate condition.

——but the anchorage appliances and equipment for the survey are included. The amounts also include the orignal construction of the principal tidal stations and the recording instruments for them, maintenance and supplies for these stations, salaries for observers, the expense of the observations at the temporary stations during the summer season of 1896, with travelling expenses and incidentals, and also the cost of reducing the results of the observations and calculating tide tables from them, so far as this has yet been done.

I believe that used to be done in England. I do not know whether it is done in England yet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is done in England yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER——

Fiscal year—.	
1891-1892	$ 711 59
1892-1893	5,099 17
1893-1894	10,187 91
1894-1895	11,507 24
1895-1896	9,627 45
1896-1897	7,134 56
Voted for—	
1897-1898	2,500 00

Add to these years the expense of the ship and you will find that there was a reasonable beginning, but for the purpose of comparison, as the ship is not included in any of the other years, this will do. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) came into office, and this is the way it goes. We had a vote for $15,000 in the fall session of 1896-97; he spent $7,134, and in 1897-98, all he took, according to his chief engineer, was $2,500, practically giving the whole thing a black eye; and telling us this very year, that he attaches no importance to the subject outside of its being an interesting scientific one. That is his reason for not asking for such an appropriation as would enable him to grapple with this work in a manner that is absolutely essential, if we are to have a useful aid for the safe navigation of our waters. Here is this confession to which I referred a little while ago, corroborated by the chief engineer, as to where we have to go for information about our waters:

Last spring, application was made to the Canadian Government by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey office for permission to land a party at Seymour Narrows, on the east coast of Vancouver Island, for the purpose of obtaining tide gauge records at this point, in the general interests of commerce and navigation, their Pacific coast tide tables requiring data which could only be conveniently obtained by taking observations in the Narrows for an extended period. I understand that a party has been located at this place during the past year. I also learn that the publishers of the British Columbia Almanac are indebted to the United States Government for the tide tables of British Columbia waters which they issue.

According to Mr. Anderson, we have seven tide gauge stations, and our neighbours to the south are actually doing this work for us in the Pacific waters:

I beg to draw attention to the desirability that tidal observations in British Columbia waters should be made and the records reduced for use by our own service. We have been supplied with two years' records of the tide-gauges maintained by the Department of Public Works at the Fraser River and Victoria, the latter station lately

transferred to Esquimalt. If these records could be worked out they would probably give results more accurate than anything yet obtained respecting British Columbia tides, which are very irregular and very interesting.

I think I have established, from the Minister's own report, and from other documents, the absolute necessity of grappling with this subject in a proper manner. I have shown out of his own report, and out of the reports of his department in years gone by, that the reasons the hon. gentleman has advanced this session are not supported by the official records, that the importance of the subject has not been appreciated by him, and that he was in entire ignorance of these representations on the part of practical men—owners of ships and master mariners, 393 masters and officers of ships using Canadian waters. In all fairness, if these were his only reasons, he is bound to take this subject up and represent it again to his colleagues and obtain a sufficient appropriation to put the work on a proper basis.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It is very much to be regretted that in a matter of this kind, the hon. gentleman should persist, day after day, in trying to make it assume a controversial character. The hon. gentleman knows very well that from the time this question was first introduced to the House, up to the present moment, I have never uttered one word saying that my mind was adverse to the continuance of this proposed system of trying to establish the ocean currents around our coasts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I complained that you were not in favour of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I stated in 1897, and I repeat it again to-day, that there is an astonishing lukewarmness with regard to this matter on the part of practical seamen. I consulted a number of them, and I have not found any one enthusiastic about them. I have spoken to my chief engineer, Mr. Anderson, about it, and he admitted a wonderful lukewarmness on the part of practical seamen. Let us understand what we are considering here, because it is most injurious that a wrong impression should go abroad on this subject. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says that Captain Smith, the chairman of the Master and Mates Board, cordially agreed as to the benefit which would be derived from the system of self-regulating gauges. Does he want this House to understand that I have minimized the importance of those gauges? On the contrary, I have established more self-registering gauges than the hon. gentleman ever did. The work is going on from year to year, and it would be lamentable if the impression got abroad that in this matter we were withdrawing our hand. Last year I sent Mr. Bell Dawson down to make an exhaustive examination of the Bay of Fundy. He established seven or eight gauges in that bay this very year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman serious? I would like to have the positions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend, who is such an omniverous reader and can condemn so severely any Minister who has not read every file in his department for the last fifteen years, would, if he would look up Mr. Bell Dawson's report, find the places given there. But he has rushed in without trying to post himself. If he had read Mr. Bell Dawson's report for this year, he would not have displayed such astonishing ignorance. I speak warmly, because I think his speech, if published abroad, is calculated to do a great deal of harm. Not only did we establish these gauges, but Captain Douglas was appointed especially to inspect the established gauges at St. Paul's Island, Belle Isle, Father Point, etc., when Mr. Bell Dawson was in the Bay of Fundy establishing these gauges, at the different points—West Port, Briar Island, Digby, N.S., Campobello——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's chief engineer says that the vote was barely enough to maintain the seven already established. So, when the hon. gentleman says there are seven more this year, there is no money to maintain them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has probably read the report of the year before. I am showing what was done the past year. I am as desirous as he is of doing everything necessary in this connection. I realize as much as he does the vast importance of placing our aids to navigation on the best possible footing. Even if my mind were adverse to the value of tidal current survey—I would, if I found a large number of scientific men in favour of it, appreciate my own ignorance sufficiently to yield my opinion to theirs. When we sent Mr. Bell Dawson down to spend the summer in making a tidal survey of the Bay of Fundy, Captain Bloomfield Douglas was appointed to go round and inspect the other tidal surveys—at Father Point, St. Paul's Island, down in the Straits of Belle Isle, and other places. He did rebuild some of these tidal gauges altogether, Altogether we have placed, so far as the tide gauges are concerned——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A $25,000 vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The other night when the hon. gentleman asked me the cost, I told him it was nearly $5,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have just read from your chief engineer's report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is reading from the previous year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I gave the year 1897-98, your own engineer's report, and I gave you the page you asked me for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amount voted last year was $4,000. That amount was expended, and we have to take a supplementary vote for this very year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman the year 1897-98 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1897-98, we spent $3,081, and the vote for 1898-99 was $4,000. I have to take a supplementary vote in addition, because I have not only to provide the tide gauges on the Atlantic coast, but on the Pacific coast.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I read this from the chief engineer's report, and I do not think the statement is contradicted by any information read in reply. The vote for 1897-98 was $2,500. Does the hon. gentleman's information show that to be wrong ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I have read the hon. gentleman the expenditure and have not got the vote. The expenditure was $3,081 in 1897-98, and for 1898-99 the vote taken was $4,000, and I have to take a supplementary vote because I have to supply Mr. Dawson's branch with some additional assistance to work at the tide tables. I have given him two excellent young men and may have to enlarge the staff still more because, as he explains in his elaborate and able report—which you will find in the report of the Marine Department from page 78 to page 114—he requires extra assistance and I at once told him he could have it. So far as Captain Smith's concurrence in the benefit and establishment of these self-registering gauges is concerned, I agreed with him, and gave Mr. Dawson all the assistance he wanted. As far as Captain Spain is concerned, he concurred in the necessity and benefit to be derived from these self-registering gauges. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to say that the captain of an Allan steamer, the "California," whose name I gave him, did not exist. He will remember that the other night I said I had crossed in the "California" with Captain Moore, and had a long conversation with him, and Captain Moore expressed the opinion that practical seamen did not place much reliance on the surveys of ocean currents, but we must draw a distinction between the advantages to be derived from the establishment of tide gauges and the surveys of ocean currents. Captain Moore was the captain of the "California" until last fall, and, if I am correctly informed, Captain Brown only came in the month of January. I said the other day, as I say now, that I have an open mind on the subject, and am willing and anxious to be instructed. A Minister of Marine is not supposed to have a perfect personal knowledge of all these matters himself. He must depend on his nautical advisers, and I have found nothing more than lukewarmness, as far as the surveys of the currents are concerned, on the part of practical men. The only question that remains open is whether we should have continued the surveys of the ocean currents. Now, when I came into power, one of the steamers was entirely disabled, and I had no steamer to put on the service, and I did not consider myself in a position to come down and ask Parliament for a vote of $20,000 to supply a steamer, at a time when no one could tell me what was the value of the surveys of these ocean currents. I shall be very sorry if the hon. gentleman should have the impression that I am either indifferent or not anxious to be thoroughly instructed. The very moment he mentioned Captain Smith, I wrote to Captain Smith, asking him to report to me his opinion as to the value of a survey of ocean currents.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you write to Commander Spain too ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I should like to see the reports.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You shall see them, because the letters were official. I asked them to let me know, not only their own opinion, but the opinion of practical seamen with whom they came into contact, as to whether they had derived any benefit from the surveys we had made, and considered them of any value. Are they using the survey ? Do they look upon them as of any value? Would they advise me to go on with the survey ? Even if there was a doubt, I would give them the benefit of the doubt and go on with the work. I am not anxious to curtail in this matter, but the hon. gentleman knows that a Minister cannot get funds for everything ; and where there are doubts, the Minister does not press as strongly as he does for those things concerning which his mind is in a state of certainty. The hon. gentleman must understand that, so far as aids to navigation are concerned, there never was a time in the history of the Dominion when there was so much money spent on them or when they were in as good condition as they are to-day. And I am prepared to prove that statement. But, more than that, I am prepared to ask my colleagues for every necessary dollar for this purpose. When any man can point out an aid to navigation that is necessary, I am ready to ask for the money to provide it. This is not a matter where parsimony should be practiced. I shall be able to show what

we have done in this matter, and I think we have done a great deal on which we may fairly be congratulated. And if I find that the opinion of those whom I ought to look up to is that the survey of the ocean currents should be resumed, I shall ask for the money necessary for that service. The hon. gentleman says that the geodetic surveys show both the ocean and the shore currents. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. They show the shore currents, but not the ocean currents. And it is the ocean currents, as I understand, of which he wants a survey made. I should be very sorry if the discussion drifted into anything of a controversial character. It should not be a matter of political controversy, at any rate; and the assurance I have given him, I hope he will accept in the spirit that I offer it. What object have I to put a stop to the expenditure of money that I think to be of advantage to the marine interests? None whatever. I am as anxious as he is to have everything done that should be done, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be satisfied with that assurance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is not approaching this question in any controversial spirit, as suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), but entirely with a desire to increase, if possible, the energies of the Minister in a desirable direction. Now, if any reliance is to be placed on the chief engineer in his report of 1897, it is evident that the service of tidal observation has not been continued as it was previously. While the sum appropriated for this purpose in 1894-95 was $11,507.24, it was reduced in 1897-98 to $2,500.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a supplementary vote of $1,500. That made a total vote of $4,000. That year the steamer was not employed in the survey of the ocean currents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That was not in 1897-98, if my recollection is correct. The $4,000 was voted for 1898-99—a very desirable increase, no doubt, but still not enough to bring the total nearly up to the figures of 1894-95.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain that in 1897-98 the sum in the Estimates was $2,500, but there was a supplementary vote of $500, making $3,000 for the year, and the expenditure was $3,081.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is somewhat larger, but still——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, I do not base anything upon the amounts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, it is not large as compared with that for 1894-95. I believe it was not found by the officers in charge of the works adequate for the work to be done. If the hon. Minister will pardon me, I may direct his attention to the report of the chief engineer for 1898, in which his statement made in the previous report is referred to:

> In the survey of tides and currents, the further investigation of the currents was again suspended this year for lack of funds, although there are several regions in which a better knowledge of the currents is much required, as pointed out in my last report.

Of course, I do not profess to have any knowledge of this subject at all—much less knowledge than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries possesses, but still that is the official report of the officer who is responsible for this work, and, in his view, it seems to be a matter which would require a much larger appropriation than which has been made. And a little lower down on the same page of the same report he says:

> The records from the tide stations are yearly increasing in value; but for want of sufficient means and assistance in the work, nothing further has been done in the analysis of additional record, by which the basis of the tide tables would be extended and their accuracy improved.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have explained that I have supplied that hiatus by furnishing an additional staff.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are very glad to know that. Still, this is the last report we have on the subject. Further down the chief engineer refers to the tidal stations on the Bay of Fundy:

> During last summer, a series of secondary tidal stations were established at points around the Bay of Fundy, for the purpose of securing tidal differences with reference to the principal station at St. John, N.B., for which tide tables are now issued. These differences in the time of the tide for other ports around the bay will extend the usefulness of the St. John tide tables to this whole region.

Now, I should not suppose there could be very much difference of opinion among persons who have given any attention to the subject as to the value of these tidal stations and the observations obtained. It may be that these observations and the results obtained from them are not used very much by our coasting vessels, but certainly they are used, I should suppose, by large vessels and steamships; and it is with regard to these that so much difficulty has occurred with respect to matters of insurance. We in the maritime provinces feel that we are just as much interested in the Gulf of St. Lawrence as are the people of the upper provinces themselves, because everything that throws discredit upon the aids to navigation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and leads to such disasters there as

sometimes occur, tends to throw the same discredit upon all Canadian waters. I beg, therefore, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not suppose that in directing his attention, however warmly, to this matter, we on this side are doing more than discharging what we conceive to be our duty, and that he will take our remarks in a kindly spirit, and will endeavour to make the appropriation an adequate one, so as to do justice to the service, which seems, at the present time, to be somewhat neglected.

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

(In the Committee.)

Lighthouse and coast service—Salaries and allowances of light-keepers..... $217,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). This increase of $10,000 is owing to the establishment of thirty-two new lights, and the salaries of light-keepers have to be provided therefor. Of these, six are in Ontario, nine in British Columbia, two in Prince Edward Island, four in Quebec, seven in Nova Scotia, two in Manitoba, one in New Brunswick and one on the Newfoundland coast.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there not the usual increase for these men ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The salaries and agencies are in this.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many lights on the Newfoundland coast are under the maintenance of the Canadian Government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Three.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are you going to increase the salaries of these officers ? The second officer is always an important man at these stations. Some of these salaries are small. For instance, take Blanchet at Quebec, I do not think Blanchet has had an increase for some time. Tremaine has been at $950 for a couple of years, he is an active man, and almost indispensable. Mr. Parsons came in over his head. I am certain these officers will show that Tremaine has been a very useful man. Blanchet must be a good officer, too. Gregory has been a long time at the agency there. I suppose a good deal depends on a good second man. I think on general principles the Government lose nothing, where the salary is small and there is a good deal of responsibility, in paying these men well who have a good deal of work, in the summer season particularly. Those men are most obliging and useful in many ways where there is no record of the particulars on the files of the department. I would be glad to see them get some encouragement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is in these matters to make increases. You have not to deal with an individual case, but in relation to a lot of other officers who stand in somewhat the same position. Blanchet and these others are very good men, but if you increase one you have to increase all round. We give only one increase here this year, that is in the New Brunswick agency.

Mr. KAULBACH. Will the Minister inform me of the location of these lights on the Newfoundland coast ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is one at Cape Race, we are building one at Flower Ledge, and one at the mouth of Belle Isle.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister revised his opinion with reference to the dismissal of Mr. Palmer, at Palmer's Point ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not thought much of Mr. Palmer since.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, I am sure, does not want to commit any injustice. The subject was thoroughly discussed last year and the year before. Mr. Palmer himself was dismissed without any cause, dismissed against the report of the High Commissioner who was sent out to investigate, but in the end the Minister simply had to confess that he could not stand the pressure of the present member for King's, and that he took his authority rather than the commissioner's authority, and dismissed the man because he happened to be the brother of a man who was in active politics. Now, it was abundantly proved that the man who was really the lighthouse keeper took no interest in politics at all, that is, in political work. He is a quiet man who simply goes about his work and does his work. Politics may come and politics may go, he votes, but that is all he does. Now, does not my hon. friend think that it is the maximum of injustice to take away the salary of a deserving employee simply because he happens to be the brother of a man who took part in politics against the present member and in favour of the old member ? I think my hon. friend should at least make the amende honourable and put this man back in the place which he always filled with satisfaction, and from which he was dismissed without any shadow of reason.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will look up the case again.

Mr. TAYLOR. In this vote, does he include the sum of $100 to pay Mr. Samuel McCammon for investigating the case of a lighthouse keeper who was dismissed some years ago ? A sum was agreed upon by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and a letter was written which is in the hands of the Minister, which I handed to him a year or two ago, showing that he was to be

paid $100. But the sum was not put in the Estimates, and he has not yet been paid. On behalf of Mr. McCammon, who was the commissioner, and who has a claim against the Government which the late Minister promised to settle, I ask that the sum be now placed in the Estimates, or that permission be given to Mr. McCammon to bring suit against the Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I remember the hon. gentleman calling my attention to this case. Of course a special vote will have to be taken. To pay a claim for any year previous to the current year, you have to take a special vote. I will look up the papers concerning this case. But before the supplementaries are brought down, if he asks me, I will tell him what the conclusion is.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is an officer on the Pacific coast, a Mr. Gaudin, who is a very good officer, and is increased from $1,500 to $1,600. He not only serves the district he resides in, but he has to do outside work altogether. I think the hon. Minister will agree with me that $1,700 is not a large salary on the coast, as any one knows, and $1,600 is not a large salary at St. John for a responsible officer. Mr. Gregory has $2,200; he is an old officer, of course; but still, I think, if it is not too late that the hon. gentleman should take that into consideration. He is a good officer, a useful man, and his salary is increased only $100.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The object was to put Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia on the same level. The inspector in Nova Scotia receives $1,600, and it was a subject of complaint, that the others were below him. They all get $1,600 now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That cannot be the reason; it was not to put the others on a par with the British Columbia agent, because he is being increased $100 to reach $1,600.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The British Columbia agent is being raised $100. Mr. Harding is being raised only $200 a year. I recommended Mr. Harding's raise, so as to put him on a level with the Nova Scotia agent, and I did the same thing with the British Columbia man, so that they would all get $1,600 a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not object to Mr. Harding getting $200 of an increase, and practically making them all $1,600; but it does not bring them up to the Quebec agent. The Minister's reason does not seem fair in that sense. This hard and fast and dogmatic rule will not work out. The hon. Minister says, that he has recommended these increases to put all the agents on the same level, but there is the Quebec agent, who gets $2,200. Of course, I know that we cannot get away from the consideration that Quebec is Quebec. You are putting Nova Scotia and New Brunswick on a par, and that is right. But this officer in British Columbia is to get only $100 of an increase, while Mr. Harding gets $200.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think he is satisfied.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt he is. I have never had a word with him. I have nothing to say against Mr. Harding's increase, but I think the hon. gentleman should encourage an old officer like Gaudin.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember there was an undertaking to limit and restrict these contingencies and to bring matters down to an economical basis. It was, not to allow these outside agencies to subscribe for newspapers for their offices. I see that my hon. friend has gone back on that, which I think was a good rule. I find subscriptions for newspapers in some of these officers, and not in others. I find, amongst the New Brunswick contingencies, a reference to $5 for newspaper subscription for a paper about which I have nothing to say, whose editor is my hon. friend sitting opposite to me (Mr. Ellis). But the question is, as to whether these subscriptions should be made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has to have a paper to know about the ships going and coming.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the reason?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He ought to have it. The agent ought to be kept au courant of shipping.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not buy that paper for shipping news. He knows the shipping news long before the paper gets out, and I dare say, the paper sends its reporter to him for shipping news.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is only $5.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not what the money amounts to; it is the system of allowing one office to get these papers, and another office does not do it. It had become a great abuse, and we had to draw it down, when we made an arrangement in regard to the expenditure for newspapers in the departments at Ottawa.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to mention a matter that has been brought to my attention, and, I think, to the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in respect to the loss of the schooner "Zina M," which belonged to Mr. Joseph H. Newcombe. The vessel, while on a voyage from Parrsboro' to St. John, laden with a cargo of coal, when making a harbour at

Grindstone Island, Cumberland Bay, and in consequence of the buoys at the entrance at said Grindstone harbour having been placed in the wrong positions, through the fault of Government officials, struck on a ledge at the entrance, resulting in a total loss and the drowning of Mr. Newcombe's son. Mr. Newcombe presented a petition to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, asking that he be at least partially reimbursed. No attention has been paid to it, and he cannot get any satisfaction. I can see that there may be a grave objection to entertaining these claims, from the standpoint of the Government and of the public. In fact, I think he says in his letter that a reason of that kind was assigned to him in the first instance, but still it seems to me to be a pretty hard case, from the standpoint of the man, considering the loss of his vessel and of his son. I do not know whether there is any precedent in the department for any compassionate allowance in cases of this kind, or whether the Government have ever considered, if there is no such precedent, as to whether they would allow a petition of right to be brought, or the matter put in such a position that the person aggrieved might present his claim to the Exchequer Court. I do not disguise from myself the difficulties the hon. Minister and the department may have in entertaining a claim of that kind, but I would like the hon. Minister to state what the view of the Government is in regard to this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I remember the application that the hon. gentleman refers to, and the general tenor of the reply. In the first place, the Government could not acknowledge liability, because it would be making a tremendous opening for claims to be made against the Government under circumstances where there was no real bona fide claim. In addition to that, there is the general principle, that we could not hold ourselves liable if the buoys were out of place, or, if the facts were disputed, we could not refer that to the courts, because, even if the facts were proved, it would never do for us to acknowledge liability. I have no knowledge of any precedent for allowing a compassionate allowance. However, I shall make inquiries into that.

Mr. BERGERON. I find the name "Paquette" in the Auditor General's Report, in this instance, for $17. It occurs in many cases. Is that the Senator?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it is possible.

Mr. BERGERON. I find that name in many places.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I consulted my officer, and I find it is not the same.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the Minister get his oil supply?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is Canadian oil, obtained under contract and tender from John Macdonald, of Sarnia. Some Standard oil is used for special purposes.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). Does the Minister remember a lighthouse, situated in my county at a place called Point Jerome, near St. Peters? I suppose the hon. gentleman does not remember who is the keeper of that lighthouse at the present time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not.

Mr. GILLIES. The Minister will recollect, I dare say, that very considerable correspondence took place between himself and some gentlemen in St. Peters with reference to the late keeper of the lighthouse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who was the late keeper?

Mr. GILLIES. A man named McNeill, and he was dismissed, and I feel inclined to hold the Minister responsible for that dismissal. I am sorry to have to do so, because it was done in a manner that was most unjustifiable. I got a copy of the evidence furnished the Minister, in a sort of circumambient way; I could not get it direct; and there is not a scintilla of evidence in the report of Captain Douglas pointing to any action that Mr. McNeill took in politics. But pressure, cruel pressure, that was brought to bear upon the Minister of Marine, caused him to succumb to the unreasonable request of parties occupying irresponsible positions in that county, and requests coming from men who do not understand the duties that devolve upon a representative. The Minister will remember distinctly that it was with the greatest possible reluctance that he himself complied with the unreasonable request, the almost brutal request, that was made to him to have this man summarily dismissed in midwinter, and himself and his family thrown out in the street for no cause whatever. I will have something more to say on this subject when the papers are brought down, and I will ask that the item shall stand until then, so that the House may see upon what evidence this man was so harshly treated by the Department of Marine. If the Minister can find any justification for his conduct in that regard, then he has more ingenuity than I or any one else in the House can give him credit for. I, therefore, ask the item to stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will give the hon. gentleman the amplest opportunity of discussing this item on the supplementary Estimates.

Mr. GILLIES. I ask the Minister to bring down the file as it is, with all the papers and letters in that connection, and I hope

that none of the letters will be missing from the file.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will not take anything from the file.

Mr. GILLIES. If the Minister promises to bring down all the papers by next Thursday, I will withdraw my request to let the item stand. I want all the letters, and they are just as necessary for the information of the House as the report of Captain Douglas himself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will bring down all the letters the hon. gentleman is entitled to, just as if he made a motion.

Mr. BERGERON. Why should we pay the Kingston city corporation for attending to the city clock light. I see it set forth in the Auditor General's Report. How does that come about ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is an old story. I tried to withdraw it two years ago, and we had the whole corporation of Kingston down about it, and they contended that it is a beacon light for vessels coming into Kingston harbour.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a bad old habit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, one of these old habits.

Mr. FOSTER. Charles F. Caron, of Quebec, is entered here for an amount of nearly $5,000. Does the Minister get these articles by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are not got by tender. As I explained the other night, a list of names is given to the agent with whom he is supposed to deal, and he has to certify to the accounts as being the fair market price of the articles, and he is held responsible for his certificate in more ways than one by the officers here who examine these things very closely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong about that. He is asked with regard to what forms a very large amount of supplies; it it not for an allowance to lightkeepers, or salaries. There has never been anything changed. Tenders were called for to supply the lights above Montreal and that same system is continued now.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any good reason why you should not call for tenders below Quebec and in the city of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not logically, but Quebec is Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. That is no answer at all. These are merely all stock articles, which are easily tendered upon, which are kept by all the large merchants ; and though I have not made a very close inspection of prices, I would venture to say that these are pretty stiff prices, if I can judge from some of them. The whole item amounts to about $5,000, which is a very large sum. It is a tremendous patronage to put into the hands of a political friend, just on a letter sent down from the department to Mr. Gregory at Quebec, telling him : For all that class of articles you are to deal with Chas. Parent. Mr. Parent, no doubt, is a very good friend of the Administration, and no doubt has paid in good contributions to the party fund, and no doubt as every gallon of oil fickles out of the tank into the can, Mr. Parent says to himself : I must get back a little of what I gave ; and the price will be made more than it is to other customers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman could point out any overcharges, he would make a good case.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that it is impossible there should not be overcharges. The only way possible to secure reasonable charges is to ask for tenders. Even if you ask for tenders only among friends of the Administration, that would not be so bad. But the practical way taken is to order Mr. Gregory to buy certain classes of articles from such a man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the way.

Mr. FOSTER. And the hon. gentleman confesses that he does it, not because it is a good principle, but because Quebec is Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the custom that has always been followed. I am surprised that such an energetic reformer as my hon. friend and his friend beside him did not introduce a reform.

Mr. FOSTER. These reformers who have been going about the country for seventeen years telling the people that if they would turn out the Liberal-Conservatives and put in Reformers the affairs of the country would be administered in a businesslike and economical manner—these reformers, when they get into office, fall into the old holes and conduct business on the same basis. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) will not stand up and attack this expenditure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am just waiting for the Finance Minister to explain why he has the same system now as existed before, and why that distinction exists to-day, as it did in past years. Perhaps the ex-Minister of Fisheries, who has had more experience of this system, will be able to explain the reason.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend has no reason for this expenditure, but what he can get from us. He did not say that on the hustings. He did not say to the people: Put me in office and I would do exactly what these Tories have been doing and get them to furnish me with the reason.

Mr. RUSSELL. In regard to Halifax, I know pretty well how things are done there, and I know they are done on a business basis, but I really was struck with the anamoly of the different way of doing things in Quebec and other parts of the Dominion of Canada. I presume that as this has always been the custom, the ex-Minister of Marine will be able to give us the real reason for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not think that as the administration is not now in the hands of the ex-Minister of Marine, but the present Minister of Marine and his friends, a good and faithful public servant should look to them for the explanation of the course of the Government instead of to these old Tories?

Mr. RUSSELL. Everybody knows that those things go by routine, year in and year out, and it may be years before anybody discovers them. I do not think anybody knew until to-night that there was any distinction in the way this matter was conducted at Quebec and other places. But when attention is called to it, surely those who had been continuing the custom for eighteen years must know the reason for it. I thought it would be a rather interesting study for the Minister of Finance to inquire into this matter as one of the most interesting branches of ancient history. I was very dull the last couple of hours, under the soporific influence of the ex-Minister of Marine and the ex-Minister of Finance, but this little antiquarian subject which has been suddenly started, has aroused my interest—not because of the amount expended but because of its interest as a subject of curious and antiquarian research.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend is an antiquarian politician. When he was making his canvas before the poor taxpayers and the honest yeomen of his county, did he stand frankly before them, and say: I do not care anything about a pound spent here or a dollar spent there, but I would have great anxiety to understand certain antiquarian problems that I thought might be with interest pursued if you would send me to Ottawa. Send me there, I will not try to lighten your taxes, I will not try to encourage habits of economy in the Administration, but will be a tremendous power in finding out certain antiquarian reasons for certain peculiar things. If I do find out the reason, I will not pledge myself that a pound will be struck off here or a dollar there.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take all my pleasure out of it by pursuing antiquarian researches and getting the answers of Tory Ministers explaining the reasons for these long-dated customs. My hon. friend is a perfect sample of the genus Grit.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a high compliment.

Mr. FOSTER. He will make the most astounding proposals and allegations before the electorate in order to get into office, but when he once gets there, he does not think he ought to ask his own men for explanations, but whenever a tight place is met by my hon. friend, all he has to do is to gratify his inordinate desire for a research and get a reason from members of the Opposition.

Mr. RUSSELL. In Halifax we hear the complaint that the agency of the department there is not as generous to the friends of the Government as it used to be to those on the other side. Of course, I do not quite say that Mr. Parsons is not fair to them, as he, perhaps, was to the others. I only say that that ground of complaint does, to a certain extent exist. As a rule, in the city of Halifax, the patronage of the department is very carefully administered, indeed, and I do not believe there is a case of overcharge allowed. As to myself, where matters of dollars and cents are concerned in my own constituency, I am very careful to see that every dollar gets a dollar's worth for the Government. I am pretty sure that Mr. Parsons vises every account that comes into the department, and I am sure that there is no overcharge. I have been present when parties were complaining that he was cutting down bills too much.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That complaint is not confined to Halifax.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is fair and reasonable that he should do so. He has a scale of prices that he has established after very careful inquiry, and, in the main, I think the administration of the department is very economical.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how much less is spent now than was spent before?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not examined the blue-books.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no less. Governments exchange, but expenses do not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that Mr. Parsons is a very careful man. If my hon. friend can bring a charge against him that he is not careful and prudent and economical, I know that there are many persons who would ask me to get rid of him.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you looking for a position for some one?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden) knows I am not. There is no difficulty in finding a person who is just as competent as the incumbent to fill the position in Nova Scotia. I feel inclined to defend Mr. Parsons, but I never thought to live to see the day when it would be necessary to defend him against his own friends.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) would be accurate enough to say who made the attack.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not at all necessary. It was made at many points. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and others attacked him very vigorously a few days ago. I was silent. I feel now that I was doing him an injustice in this; but I hear so many members talking in this House that I feel tempted to keep silent.

Mr. FOSTER. And would the hon. gentleman devote his mind to this anomaly, above Montreal and below.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was driven out of my mind when it was insinuated that I was not careful in the way the pounds, shillings and pence were spent in my constituency. If any one can say what can be done to correct it, I shall be glad, but it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to show how this curious antiquarian anomaly has arisen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Unless the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) has his curiosity satisfied, I am afraid he will obstruct to an unreasonable length the proceedings of this committee. In regard to this question of the maintenance of lights, I did not know he had reached that subject or I would have been glad to contribute a few remarks to the discussion. It is some time since I was connected with the department—it was in 1894, I think—and, as I stated to the hon. Minister, I am taken by surprise at the statement made, on the information of one of his officers, and, no doubt, in good faith. But I think the hon. Minister is misled. My recollection does not bring before me any such distinction as has been pointed out—a distinction which he is not able to explain. I can conceive of no reason for it. My recollection is that in regard to bulky supplies for the lights, whether above Montreal or below, we laid in supplies, receiving offers by tender, and taking great care to secure the department against abuse by getting supplies and otherwise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You speak of oil and so on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All supplies that could be so treated. We had samples of everything which went into the regular supply ship. A ship was chartered for the lights above Montreal, and below our own ships took the stores. It was on this contract system that all supplies were got, it being the exception where things were supplied otherwise. There were some supplies required for ships that had to be got by the retail system—things that were not kept in store. My understanding was—and if I am wrong, I have been under an erroneous impression for a long time—that the bulk of all the materials were kept in store and were bought by regular competition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By public tender?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. And in the case of other goods, the agent had general instructions to buy from those on a patronage list at not more than certain prices, and they had to certify that what they paid was the market price. But the question is more important than whether I was lax or any predecessor of the present Minister failed to observe proper checks. I could plead guilty, and would not object to do so if it would afford any one pleasure. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries can give no reason for such a condition of things except as it affects Quebec, but that would not be satisfactory to the country at large. So far as my experience goes in the department, I would not be in favour of continuing this system, and I think the sooner it is abolished the better. He is putting a fearful responsibility on the men that does not prevail in any of the ordinary departments. For instance, can the hon. gentleman say how much of the $230,000 required for maintenance and so forth, goes for supplies below Quebec?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oil would be quite an item. I will look into that and see.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to refer to a matter that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) attacked me for the other day. He charged me with making an attack on Mr. Parsons, of Halifax. I never referred to Mr. Parsons at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman referred to the agency at Halifax, and Mr. Parsons was the agent.

Mr. TAYLOR. I referred to no agent; I referred to persons generally who supply the goods at outrageous prices in Halifax, as shown by the Auditor General's Report. The Minister now asks me to point out some articles in this amount which have been overcharged, and he will investigate them. I am going to point him to a few. I say it is an outrage that this department purchased from a political friend in the city of Quebec $4,775 worth of goods without tender, and simply allowed him to charge his own prices for them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not correct; he is not allowed to charge his own prices, he is bound

to supply the goods at the lowest market prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give my hon. friend a few items, and ask him if they are the lowest market prices. The first item is 100 brick at 4 cents a piece, $40 a thousand for brick; and 1,400 at 3½ cents each. Whoever heard tell of brick being sold at those prices?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Are they fire brick?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not care if they are gold brick. Then, they had to have some lime to set those brick in, and there are six barrels of lime at $1.25. Every one knows that lime is worth 15 cents a bushel by retail; you can buy it by the wagon load for 10 cents a bushel. There are three bushels to the barrel, and he charges $1.25. Then, there is 523 pounds of putty at $1.85. Who ever heard tell of putty being sold at $1.85 per pound?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That must be by the hundred.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, we come down to an article that everybody knows the price of, iron.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Where is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. On page K—46, 4,117 pounds of iron at 3½ cents a pound, which, everybody knows, is worth $1.25 a hundred?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What kind of iron is it? It may be manufactured iron.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know. Then, a keg of nails and spikes at $5.75.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Where are you reading from?

Mr. TAYLOR. K—46. Charles A. Parent, of Quebec, one keg at $5.75, one at $4.50 and 18 kegs at $4, when everybody knows that they are worth $1.75 to $2 retail in the country last year. One pair or scissors at $3.50, and another at $5.75. Five screw-drivers at $5.75. Everybody knows that you can buy screw-drivers at 10 to 15 cents. Nine shovels at $8.50, when you can get iron shovels for 50 cents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How does the hon. gentleman know what kind of shovels they were?

Mr. TAYLOR. Shovels are made in Gananoque, and I know that a miner's shovel, or a farmer's shovel sells at 65 cents retail, the best made in the country. Here is a water barrel, $3. Probably it was some old empty oil barrel picked out of a back yard, and he charges $3 for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What about these shovels? 90 cents is not such a terrible price for a shovel.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can buy them in any store in the country for 60 cents. Then, there are half a dozen wrenchs, $12, $2 each. You can buy a cast iron wrench for 5 cents; even for a large monkey wrench, $2 would be an outrageous price. Sundry hardware $100, we do not know what that is.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You can easily get the vouchers.

Mr. TAYLOR. The late Government purchased these supplies by tender.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, they did not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I heard the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals say that a paint brush was not bought on that entire system unless it was bought by tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is an absolute mistake, as any man in the maritime provinces knows with regard to railway supplies. The patronage was given to their political friends; I am not complaining of it if the price was fair. But they did not invite public tenders for their supplies, as everybody knows in the maritime provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. But you always said it was bad, and you promised when you came in that you would do better.

Mr. TAYLOR. The late Government never had a system like this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, they had the same system.

Mr. TAYLOR. Turn up the Auditor General's Report in 1894 and 1895, and see if you will find the same class of items charged in this way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Take 1895 and 1896.

Mr. TAYLOR. Lime, $1.25 per barrel, and bricks, 4 cents a piece. There is $4,475 paid for this class of items—iron, 3½ cents a pound; nails and spikes, $5.35 a keg.

Mr. COCHRANE. Three cents a pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to stay his hand. Of course, these accounts have been certified by somebody.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have been certified by the agent, and he has been the agent for many years there.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will have to have these accounts looked into, and, if that agent has certified that these prices are the regular market prices for these goods, he should not be allowed to remain in office. There is in these prices either a commission for the agent or a commission for this Government. Mr. Parent has supplied $4,475 worth of

goods, when about $2,000 should have been paid for these goods.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You know that statement is absurd.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that neither you nor any other hon. member on either side of this House would pay such prices for goods for your private use. Why should we pay double prices for goods, when they are bought in large quantities for the use of the country, simply to help a political supporter? If this system had been conducted in this manner by the late Government, my hon. friend promised to change all this. He promised to run this Government on an economical basis. Is he doing it, when these people are allowed to charge these prices for the goods that I have named, and when, as I will show, on a later occasion, they pay double prices in a third-rate store for goods supplied to Rideau Hall?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you suggest that the Minister should personally supervise all these purchases?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I do not make any such suggestion, but what I do say is, that the system should be changed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Put in new men.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Government should ask for tenders for supplies, according to samples in the department, so that in every article you will have a standard for the article required. You should call for tenders and purchase the goods from the lowest tenderer, no matter what political party he belongs to, if he can furnish the goods according to sample at the lowest price.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is done in regard to the larger articles, such as coal and oil.

Mr. TAYLOR. You paid for a great many large articles in this amount of $4,475, bought from one man.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would you ask for tenders for 400 bricks?

Mr. TAYLOR. You could ask for tenders for all the brick required by the department throughout the country. The hon. gentleman would not pay 4 cents a piece for brick to build a chimney.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not think that they are common bricks at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. They must be uncommon; they should be gold bricks.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised, as an humble member of this House, to see hon. gentlemen lounging in their seats that used to be so energetic when the Conservative party was in power. Is it not a fact that, when we were in power, these hon. gentlemen would get up and say, that these prices were extravagant? Why does the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries take shelter behind some poor Tory official? And the member for Halifax comes forward and says: We will turn these fellows out; there are enough Grits who want these positions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would it not be right, if he had certified to a wrong account?

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, turn him out, if he has certified to a wrong account. He is trembling in his boots to-day, and, if he does not follow the instructions which are given him, he will get his walking ticket. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman who never lost an opportunity of denouncing every transaction, when on this side of the House, will sit there, lounging in his chair, supporting such expenditures as these.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not lounging. I am sitting in my chair.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen have gone back on their promises in this way. The hon. Minister of Finance says, that he did not say these things, but at the same time these promises were made by the party he is now supporting. If he did not make these promises, he is supporting the party that did make these promises. I say, it is no justification, and any man in this House who knows anything about a business transaction, knows that the Government can go to any hradware store in Ontario and buy nails for 3 cents a pound by retail. Is it any excuse to say, that the Conservatives did these things when they were in power? We would not have this spectacle, if tenders were asked for—above Quebec and below Quebec every thing given to their friends, because it is Quebec. Is it because Quebec is different from any other part of Canada, or because the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has got the Government by the throat or because business is business, and you have to do what he tells you?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Perhaps hon. gentlemen are more familiar with what has been said in Ontario than I am. I am not familiar with what may have been said in Ontario, but I am bound to say, that in all discussions of public questions that took place before the elections in Nova Scotia, I never heard anybody refer to these matters. Hon. gentlemen say this was one of the great questions at the general elections.

Mr. COCHRANE. We heard it in this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be; the hon. gentleman has probably a better knowledge of what took place in this House than I have. But the question is

whether the prices mentioned here are fair and reasonable.

Mr. COCHRANE. They are not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has no information upon which to make that statement, because he can form no opinion on the information contained in this book. The details are not given in such a way to enable the hon. gentleman to say whether the price is fair, and whether a shovel is worth so much or not. There is no information in the possession of the hon. gentleman which will enable him to say whether the prices are excessive or not, but if the hon. gentleman can prove that they are, before the Public Accounts Committee, we will deal with that matter. The hon. gentleman had no ground for attacking Mr. Parsons as he did by representing that that gentleman had certified to excessive accounts. I have had a complaint from a gentleman in Halifax who thought Mr. Parsons was too exacting. He wrote to me, and I said I could not interfere, as Mr. Parsons was required to certify that the prices were fair and reasonable. I agree that, if an officer of the Government certified to prices that were outrageous, he should be dismissed, I do not care whether he is a Tory or a Grit. Let us ask ourselves, whether these prices are fair and reasonable, and, if they are, and if we take the statement of those who are informed upon that point, the committee will come to the conclusion that there is no ground for complaint.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In reference to this question of responsibility resting on the Government, which professes to be a business Government, to see that these extraordinary prices should not be paid, the ground is taken, that the officer who permits such extraordinary prices, ought to be dismissed, but if he is not dismissed and the Government retain him, I contend the Government is responsible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is evidence that the prices are unjust.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but not to be brought to their notice by people making charges. The Ministers have the opportunity to censure or dismiss an official, and if they submit the Public Accounts without taking such action, they cannot shelter themselves behind a statement that it is a Tory or a Liberal official. I protest against the Minister's interjection now and again that an officer was this or that. The Ministers are responsible to Parliament and the officers are responsible to the Ministers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is theoretically right, but in this practical world, we know that, as a matter of fact, a Minister has to permit a great many things to be done by his subordinates of which he can have no personal knowledge, but for which he has to accept the responsibility. The practice in the Marine Department is that these accounts are certified by the agent, reviewed by an officer in the department, and if he thinks they are too high, it is the subject of correspondence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And the item refused payment sometimes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A gentleman finds one shovel charged at 65 cents and another at 90 cents, but he takes no trouble to inquire about the quality of these, and he makes a complaint. Now, a shovel is not a shovel in all parts of the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a little knowledge of shovels.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there is said to be a little combine in them that you know of.

Mr. TAYLOR. You need not only refer to shovels, but how do you account for the high price of nails and the high price of baking powder. All the reference I made to Halifax was that these things cost more in Halifax than they did in St. John, and I did not refer to the agent in one place or the other. I will have Mr. Parent's account at the next meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, and I will get an explanation of it there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is fair.

Mr. TAYLOR. No sensible man in the country would pay 50 cents a pound for fifty-nine pounds of baking powder. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle) tells me that baking powder bought for the Yukon district this year under tender cost only 13½ cents per pound, and it is of the very best quality and equal to any made in the town of Brantford.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The city of Brantford.

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg your pardon, the city of Brantford. Look at all the items through the account, and see what the charges are. Nails, $5.75 a keg; iron, 3½ cents a pound, and brick 4 cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If you look at the same item you will see 700 bricks at 1½ cents. Why do you not read that?

Mr. TAYLOR. There are hard brick and soft bricks, and if these were fire brick they would be so entered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General's clerk does not copy the whole account.

Mr. TAYLOR. These are no doubt soft brick.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why do you say "no doubt."

Mr. TAYLOR. Because, if they were not they would be entered differently. This is money paid to some political friend, the same as they paid two prices for iron and two or three prices for nails.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we pass this discussion, I want to know from my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) and from the Government, what is meant by the expression, "Quebec is Quebec."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know, I heard the phrase coming from the other side of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt, the people of Quebec did wrong on the 23rd of June, 1896, but that is no reason why the Minister of Marine should reflect upon them. I heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce speak badly of the maritime provinces, but I do not want to hear any of the Ministers speak badly of the province of Quebec. The Minister of Marine used the expression, "Quebec is Quebec," and there must be some reason given for it, or else the people of Quebec may change their minds about the present Government.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is very well that these items should be inquired into, but was the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) quite fair in his criticism when he mentioned bricks at 4 cents a piece, and in the very same item, where there are bricks entered at 1½ cents each, he never said a word about them until the Minister of Marine called his attention to it. He knows that these bricks at 4 cents a piece may be fire bricks, and that they are very expensive. The hon. gentleman must know that an agent would not, in the same account, certify bricks at 1½ cents each, and again certify the same bricks at 4 cents each. The hon. gentleman must know that there was a difference in the quality of the bricks. That very fact would tend to show that the hon. gentleman was not fair in his argument.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs knows the commercial name of brick. He knows also the commercial name of fire-brick, and he knows he cannot buy fire-brick for four cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How much do you pay for them?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know what I pay for them. You cannot buy them under 12½ cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think you are mistaken.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not. I buy them every year for my furnace.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So do I.

Mr. TAYLOR. I pay the Rathbun Co. about 12½ cents a piece for them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Those must be gold bricks.

Mr. TAYLOR. If an entry is made in the Customs Department of brick, what will it call for? The ordinary building brick, and there are two qualities, hard and soft. If there is an entry for fire-brick, the goods will be entered as fire-brick.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In the customs these entries must be specified, but the Auditor General does not go into the full commercial details in every case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman called notice to the expenditure of nails, and said they were charged at $5, but I find by the account they are charged $2.90 to $5, and $2.90 is not excessive for good nails.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's illustration of "Quebec for Quebec," he has not yet explained. I suppose my hon. friend's hand is not quite free in the city of Quebec. Down in the maritime provinces, things are carried on differently. I notice that when Mr. Burpee, of St. John, or Mr. Black, of Halifax, charged for iron, they charged the commercial prices, but in Quebec I find the iron is charged at a tremendous price. Shovels in Halifax are charged at 55 cents, but in Quebec we have to pay 90 cents. Iron is charged at 1¾ cents in Halifax and St. John, but at Quebec it is paid for at the rate of $5 to $2.90. On the face of it, there is something that ought to be looked into, and when the hon. Minister of Marine gave the explanation that outside of Quebec no tenders were called for, but that Quebec is Quebec, he had no doubt some arrière pensée. He is not quite free, and not master of the administration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How many masters are there?

Mr. FOSTER. Just at present every Minister is his own master.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a large item here on K—42 for coal. What instructions does the hon. gentleman give to the Quebec agent in regard to the purchase and sale, so far as the domestic coal is concerned. My great difficulty was to prevent him buying Scotch coal when we could supply any amount of our own.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has ceased for some time, and there is no foreign coal got at Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to withdraw the statement that I made a moment ago. The Minister said that by looking at the Auditor General's Report, I would find I had made a mistake. I find I did, because I find the

first item $5, then comes the next item, thirty-five at 4½ cents, eighteen at 4 cents, two at $3.50, two at $3.25, four at $3, three at $3, two at $2.96, and two at $3.25. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that double prices are charged all there, if compared with the average. Some charge more for shingle nails than for the large size, but these are all charged at the rate of high-priced nails, and when bought at the factory, large and small nails are bought at the same price.

The committee rose and reported progress.

ADJOURNMENT—SPRING STEAMER TO CHARLOTTETOWN.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I promised the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin), who is not present, that I would draw the attention of the Government to a statement in the "Daily Examiner" of Charlottetown, May 16th, in regard to a matter of public interest in Prince Edward Island:

> We have a striking instance of this fact in the failure of the Government to authorize the expected visit of a spring steamer to sail from Charlottetown to Liverpool. Farmers and exporters who have fed and purchased cattle in the expectation that an ocean steamer would call here this spring have been disappointed and put out on account of the dilatoriness of the Government in this regard. The cattle and other things prepared for export to England have now to be sent to Halifax, St. John, St. John's and other places.

I know little about the subject, but the hon. gentleman desired me to press upon the Government, if possible, that the same convenience should be afforded as was afforded in a former season.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year a sum of $5,000 was voted, and they had a steamer that made three trips, and very useful they were. This year we are asking for another grant of $5,000, but it is not available until the 1st July. I have not been lying on my oars in this matter. I have made repeated applications to different steamship owners in Montreal to see if they would not put a steamer on. I have consulted the Minister of Agriculture——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They seem to expect it just as they had it last summer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No doubt. Nobody could do more than I have done to get it. I am in correspondence with Mr. Campbell at this moment. I forwarded to the Board of Trade at Charlottetown Mr. Campbell's last letter. The prospect is not very bright for getting it just now.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m.

Mr. TAYLOR.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) to amend the Weights and Measures Act. He said: The Bill relates to a difficulty that has risen, especially in Nova Scotia, with respect to the correct measurement of apple barrels. In that province apples form one of the most important products of agriculture. I may also mention that several hon. members of this House have given notice of other Bills which will affect, to a certain degree, the legislation on weights and measures, if their views are adopted by the House. I would suggest that all their Bills, after they have passed their second reading, should be referred along with this one to a Committee of the Whole House to be dealt with in the same way in which we proceeded last year with a measure of a similar nature.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY NEAR STEVESTON, B.C.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

> Has the Government transferred any property near Steveston, British Columbia, and adjoining section 9, Range 7 West, Block 3 North, N.W.D., to the Government of British Columbia?
> (a) If so, when?
> (b) If not, has any correspondence on this subject passed between the two Governments, and if so, what is the nature and effect of it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. No. (a) Answered by No. 1. (b) No correspondence upon the subject can be found.

ACCOUNTS BETWEEN DOMINION AND ONTARIO GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. FOSTER (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

> In what sum was the province of Ontario indebted to the Dominion Government on 30th June, 1898, and what rate per cent was chargeable thereon?
> In what sum was the Dominion Government indebted to the Ontario Government on 30th June, 1898, and what was the rate per cent allowed?
> What was the net amount of interest due to the Ontario Government on 30th June, 1898, and what payments have been made thereon since that date?

At what periods of each financial year is it usual to make interest payment to the Ontario Government, and what payments thereon have been made during the current fiscal year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Until the arbitrators have made their final awards the indebtedness of the province of Ontario to the Dominion Government on the 30th June, 1898, cannot be exactly determined, but an approximation of the indebtedness was made at $1,650,000, which did not include any amount for the claims made by the Dominion for payments to the Indians under the Robinson Treaties and Treaty No. 3, as these claims were before the courts and the arbitrators. On this approximate indebtedness 4 per cent per annum was chargeable in accordance with the agreement with the provinces in 1894. There have been at the credit of the province of Ontario since confederation :

The Upper Canada Grammar School Fund	$ 312,769 04
The Upper Canada Building Fund, now amounting to	1,597,076 59
And Ontario's share of the Common School Fund, which fund now amounts to	2,521,501 25

And on these amounts 5 per cent interest has been allowed to the present time. As the indebtedness of Ontario to the Dominion could not be determined, the net amount of interest on the 30th of June, 1898, could not be definitely arrived at, but $95,000 was paid to the province pending a final settlement of the accounts. It is usual to make interest payments to the Ontario Government in July and January, and in July, 1898, $45,000 (charged in the accounts of 1897-98), and $50,000 (charged in the accounts of 1898-99) were paid, and in January, 1899, $50,000 were paid.

MR. J. C. BLAIS, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Dugas) asked :

1. Was J. C. Blais, engineer, of the Public Works Department, at Chicoutimi, a boarder with J. C. Clareau, at Chicoutimi, in 1896 and 1897 ?
2. How much per day or per month did he pay?
3. What sums were paid to Mr. Clareau for the board of Mr. Blais, in 1896, and for how long a time, and what sums in 1897, and for what length of time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. $2 a day. 3. For 1896, 41 days at $2, $82 ; for 1897, 166 days at $2, $332.

RESIDENCE OF MR. JUSTICE MARTIN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. In what county of British Columbia does the Hon. Mr. Justice Martin reside and usually discharge his duties ?
2. What is the county assigned to him as the county in which he shall reside, &c., by the terms of the Order in Council appointing him ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). To the first portion of the question the answer is, New Westminster. To the second, Victoria. I may add that, by letters patent, Mr. Justice Martin is not assigned to any place.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the hon. gentleman distinguishes between an Order in Council and letters patent in that case. The first answers to an Order in Council.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. The last portion of the answer refers exclusively to letters patent. I do not know that it makes any difference as to the fact.

RESIDENCE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What district is named in the Order in Council appointing the hon. the Chief Justice of British Columbia as the one in which he shall reside and usually discharge his duties ?
2. In what district does the hon. the Chief Justice actually reside ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The answer to the first question is, Victoria judicial district. 2. New Westminster. Perhaps I may add that, when he was appointed, Chief Justice McColl was assigned to the Victoria district, and Mr. Justice Martin to the New Westminster district, Chief Justice McColl resided at New Westminster and Mr. Justice Martin at Victoria. It was represented to the department that no inconvenience resulted from the fact that they were allowed to continue to reside at these places. The arrangement was concurred in temporarily, with the understanding that if any inconvenience was pointed out, a change of residence must take place.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not put the question on the paper on the supposition that any inconvenience had resulted from the actual residence of these two judges.

DATE OF MR. F. C. WADE'S ARRIVAL AT DAWSON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

Referring to "Hansard," 1899, page 1879, April 19th, where the hon. the Minister of the Interior, in reply to a formal question, says, "Mr. F. C. Wade arrived in Dawson on or about March 20th, 1898," and the "Hansard," 1899, page 3184, where, in reply to a formal question the hon. the Minister of the Interior states that "Mr. F. C. Wade arrived at Dawson 26th February, 1898," which is the correct statement of fact ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The first report of my statement is evidently incorrect. The correct date is 26th February, 1898.

AUTHORITY FOR LEASING DAWSON WATER FRONT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Under what statutory authority, if any, were Messrs. Morrison & McDonald put in or allowed to take possession of or enjoy the control of the land known as the "water front" in Dawson?

(a) Has the Government approved of or confirmed the action taken by the officials in Dawson respecting the so-called "leasing" of this property to Morrison & McDonald?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Under section 4 of chapter 22, Revised Statutes of Canada, the Minister of the Interior has control of all Crown lands, except those under the control of other departments mentioned in this section. The public lands in Yukon Territory are under his control, and Mr. Thomas Fawcett was authorized by the Governor in Council to act for the Minister of the Interior in matters relating to the administration of the Yukon territory. The question whether Mr. Fawcett's action regarding the water front was within his powers has never been formally determined. 2. The Government has taken no action respecting the lease referred to.

SURVEY OF LANDS IN YUKON TERRITORY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. What lands, if any, have been laid off in the Yukon district, under the provisions of cap. 29, Act 1897, section 19?

(a) If the so-called "water front" in Dawson was so laid off, when was it laid off?

(b) Has the town-site of Dawson been duly patented? If so, when?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. The following lots have been surveyed under instructions of the Surveyor General, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 29, Act 1897, section 19:—Lots 1 to 11 inclusive, group 1; also, four lots which have not yet received numbers. Lots 1 to 13 inclusive, group 2. Lots 1 to 4 inclusive, group 3. Lots 1 to 4 inclusive, group 4. There is no information in the Surveyor General's office as to any lands surveyed in the Yukon Territory since surveys were placed under the direction of the present commissioner. (a) The so-called "water front" in Dawson is part of lots 2 and 3, group 2. It was laid off at the end of March, 1898. (b) No.

VOTE OF REPEAL OF SCOTT ACT. IN COUNTY OF BROME.

Mr. MOORE (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. What is the cause of the delay in taking the vote in the county of Brome on the repeal of the Scott Act?

2. When will the vote be taken?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There has been no unusual delay in this matter. The matter has been proceeded with as fast as routine business would allow, and the voting is to take place on the 20th of June.

REPORTS OF MR. OGILVIE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Will the hon. the Minister of the Interior advise the House so soon as he receives it of the arrival of any report of Mr. Ogilvie upon or respecting the investigation into the complaints of the committee of miners at Dawson?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The answer is, yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Has the report of Mr. Ogilvie, referred to on page 14 of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1898, been received?

(a) If so, when will it be laid on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The answer is, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does that refer to both parts of the question?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, both parts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the consent of the Minister of the Interior, I would like to refer to question No. 16. It is not really expressed as it should have been. Subsection (a) which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) answered in the negative, was meant simply to refer to that passage of the report where a reference is made to Mr. Ogilvie's report on the operations of the year, and the regret expressed that it did not arrive in time to be included with his annual report, but would form afterwards an appendix. My question was meant to evoke, in the event of its not being received at present, a statement from the Minister whether that report when received would be promptly laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not the question asked.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not. But I ask the Minister if he would answer it now without my putting a formal question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The first part of the question of the hon. gentleman was as to whether we have received the report or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I admit that the answer to the question as put was correct.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The second part of the question was, When will it be laid on the Table, and, of course, we could not say that as we had not received it. In reply to what the hon. gentleman sug-

gests now, I beg to say, that as soon as the report is received it will be copied and laid on the Table of the House.

I.C.R.—FREIGHT RATES ON FLOUR.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked:

What was the regular tariff collected per carload on flour carried between Chaudière and St. John, Halifax, Pictou and Sydney, over the Intercolonial Railway in June, 1896?

What was the tariff between same points in June, 1897 and 1898?

What was the tariff between Montreal and same points in June, 1898?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return in this case, as the answer will be voluminous.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is a well-known fact that a return cannot be got down to the House this session.

WORKS ON RIVER NICOLET.

Mr. LEGRIS asked:

1. In what years were the dredging and wharf-building works at the mouth of the River Nicolet done?

2. How much has the Government spent yearly on the said works?

3. Is the Government informed whether it is true that the said works are going to ruin?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Works were commenced in the fall of 1881. 2:

1881-82	$ 594 52
1882-83	10,474 12
1883-84	30,995 76
1884-85	17,116 28
1885-86	10,855 54
1886-87	6,778 32
1887-88	19,058 83
1888-89	10,999 93
1889-90	12,492 72
1890-91	8,030 24
1891-92	8,904 61
1892-93	1,953 50
1893-94	562 50
1894-95	72 17
1895-96	10,091 50
1897-98	Nil.
Total	$148,980 54

3. An examination will be made to ascertain the condition of the work. But the Government is aware that it is in a poor state of repair.

MR. J. L. BIGGAR—15TH BATTALION.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Has Paymaster J. L. Biggar, 15th Battalion, been appointed to the militia service in connection with what is called an Army Service Corps? If so, is it a permanent appointment?

2. What military qualification, if any, has he?

3. Will he be sent to England at the public expense for a course?

4. Has the Minister of Militia not stated in this House that no officer would be sent to England for a course unless in possession of the highest qualification obtainable in Canada?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The answer to this question is, no.

PERMANENT FORCE—BREVET PROMOTIONS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Does paragraph 54, Regulations and Orders for the Militia, 1898, in regard to brevet promotion of officers of the permanent force, meet the approval of the Minister of Militia?

2. Is it intended to change it?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). All regulations and orders promulgated in the "Canada Gazette" are recommended by the General Officer Commanding, and approved by the Minister of Militia and Defence Any changes must be similarly recommended and approved. I am not aware that it was intended to change the regulations referred to.

LIST OF REGIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

Has a list of regimental establishments for the years 1897, 1898 and 1899 been submitted to Parliament annually, as required by Order in Council published in Militia General Orders, dated 20th January, 1893? If so, on what date?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The list for 1897 was laid on the Table of the House on August 24th, 1896, but I am unable to find that the list for 1898 was laid on the Table of the House. A general order requiring this to be laid on the Table of the House is no longer in force.

MILITIA REGULATIONS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

On what date, in the years 1897, 1898 and 1899, were regulations made under authority of the Militia Act laid before Parliament in accordance with clause 126 of the Militia Act?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Regulations made in 1897, 1898 and 1899 were published in the "Canada Gazette." They were never specially laid before Parliament, except once, since confederation.

PERMANENT FORCE—APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Has it been found advantageous to the militia to appoint officers to the permanent force who were not qualified?

2. Is it advantageous to the militia to retain officers in the permanent instructional schools who are not qualified?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No officers have been

appointed to the permanent force who were not qualified under the terms of the regulations existing at the dates of their appointments.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

Is it intended to amend the Militia Act this session ? If so, in what respect ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The matter is under consideration.

EASTERN EXTENSION—CLAIM OF NOVA SCOTIA GOVERNMENT.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

1. Has the subject of the claim of the Government of Nova Scotia for a refund of the subsidy paid by Nova Scotia towards the construction of the Eastern Extension received the consideration of the Government ?
2. If so, has the Government decided to pay the claim ? If not, why not ?
3. Has the recent visit of the Premier of Nova Scotia been in connection with this subject ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). To the first question I may say, the matter has received, and is still receiving the consideration of the Government. To the second question I may say, no decision has yet been reached. To the third question I may say, the Premier of Nova Scotia, whilst in Ottawa, did urge this question, with others, upon the Government.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY SUPERINTENDENT.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

1. Whether the Minister of Railways is aware that a report of the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway was favourable to the retaining of the headquarters of the superintendent at Rivière du Loup, or that, at bottom, he desired to maintain them in the same locality as in the time of ex-Superintendents McDonald and Ouellet, but that influences alien to the county of Témiscouata and to the district of Kamouraska prevailed against the decision or opinion, verbal or written, of Mr. Pottinger ?
2. Has there been correspondence between the Minister, or the general manager, and certain persons at Lévis or Quebec on this subject ?
3. Who has suggested this change to the Minister of Railways, or to the general manager, Mr. Pottinger, this year ?
4. Had requests been already made, prior to this year, for the transfer of these offices to Lévis, and if so, when and by whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. To the first question the answer is, no. 2. To the second question the answer is, no. 3. To the third question the answer is, the general manager suggested the change. 4. To the fourth question I say the answer is, not that I am aware of.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

NAVIGABILITY OF BATISCAN RIVER.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Dugas) asked :

1. Whether the Batiscan River is navigable at its mouth ?
2. Whether the Government have received petitions from the parishioners of St. Genévieve de Batiscan and others, complaining that the said river had been obstructed by piers, which impeded navigation ?
3. Whether the Government have inquired into this matter, and whether they intend to comply with the prayer of the said petitions ?
4. What do they propose doing in relation thereto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes, during the ordinary stages of the waters, for boats drawing 3½ feet of water. 2. Yes. 3. The Government has inquired into this matter. A petition has been received from St. François-Xavier de Batiscan, praying that the Messrs. Price Bros. & Co. may be allowed to maintain their works in that river. The remedy suggested by the chief engineer is the removal of a pier from its present position in the centre of the channel to the outer edge. 4. The matter is under consideration, with a view of conforming with the chief engineer's suggestions.

YUKON FORCE—MAJOR BLISS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What amount of public money has been paid to Major Bliss since he was connected with the Yukon service ?
   (a) As salary or pay ?
   (b) For travelling allowance or expenses ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The answer to the first part of this question has already been given. The total amount paid up to the month of April from April, 1898, is $2,829. The answer to the second question is, $1,100, which includes purchase of ten dogs, and travelling outfit for use of the force in the Yukon, and to receipt of which, dogs, &c., has been acknowledged by the commandant in his last despatches.

SUPERINTENDENT, ST. OURS LOCK.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Gillies) asked :

1. Why was Mr. Coderre, late superintendent of the lock at St. Ours, River Richelieu, dismissed ?
2. Who was appointed in his place ?
3. What was the business of the new incumbent previous to his appointment as superintendent of said lock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. Coderre, late superintendent of the lock at St. Ours, was dismissed for irregularities in his accounts and other reasons. 2. Mr. Olivier Laventure was appointed in place of Mr. Coderre. 3. He was a trader of St. Ours, P.Q.

CHAMBLY CANAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Gillies) asked:

1. Is it true that the Government has ordered an investigation into the management of the Chambly Canal?
2. By whom was such investigation demanded, and for what purpose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The Government ordered an investigation into the management of the Chambly Canal, which has taken place. 2. The investigation was demanded by Mr. Willett and others. For contravention of canal regulations and undue political partisanship.

ARRIVAL OF IMMIGRANTS LAST YEAR.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

How many immigrants arrived in Canada during the year ending 31st December last? How many of these became settlers in Canada? How many homesteads were taken up last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 31,702 immigrants arrived in Canada during the year ending 31st December last, with the declared intention of settling in Canada permanently. No means exists for tracing these settlers to their destination absolutely, but the officers of the Government have means of knowing whether substantially the greater portion of them or nearly all of them will settle permanently. It would be impossible, however, to give absolute figures on that subject. In reply to the latter part of the question. 4,848 homesteads were taken up last year.

I.C.R.—PURCHASE OF CARS.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

How many palace or sleeping cars were ordered by the Government for the Intercolonial Railway, between the 1st January, 1888, and 1st April, 1899? To what company or firm were the orders given? Were public tenders called for? What prices are to be paid for each class of car? Why were not the orders for these cars given to Canadian firms so as to provide work for Canadian citizens?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Sixteen palace and sleeping cars were ordered by the Government for the Intercolonial Railway between the 1st of January, 1888, and the 1st April, 1899. The orders were given to the Crossen Car Company for eight of these cars, and to the Wagner Palace Car Company for the other eight cars. Tenders were not called in 1888 for five of these cars, but tenders were called for eleven. $14,045 each for five sleepers and $19,940.80 each for eight sleepers and $9,800 for each of the three parlour cars. The cars recently ordered were obtained from the Wagner Palace Car Company after tenders asked for and obtained from several large firms in the United States. The department, before making a contract with United States manufacturers, had applied to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, Messrs. Crossen and Company, and Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co. for offers. The two last mentioned firms declined to tender for these cars on the ground that the orders they had then on hand from the Intercolonial Railway were all they could fill within the time allowed. The first two companies would not undertake the work, as their shops were overcrowded with their own work. The department needed these cars for the opening of the tourist season this spring, and had no alternative than to place these orders with the Wagner Palace Car Company, whose tender was the lowest of the United States firms.

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Has any promise been made, officially or otherwise, by the Government or any member thereof, to any person or corporation to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway of New Brunswick?
2. If so, what was the amount offered therefor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No promise has been made by the Government, either officially or otherwise, to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has not answered the full question. He has merely answered for the Government, not for individual members.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have answered the question fully.

LEVIS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Dugas) asked:

1. How many persons are employed for carrying the mails from the central post office or from the ferry landing at Lévis to branch post offices in the same town or its immediate neighbourhood?
2. What are the names of such persons?
3. What salary or price do they receive for their services?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Five. 2. Joseph Verrault, Geo. Bordeleau, Alphonse Laflamme, François Gingras. 3. George Bordeleau, $260 (two contracts); Joseph Verrault, $75; Alphonse Laflamme, $150; François Gingras, $315. The services performed by the various contractors are as follows:—Lévis and Beaumont, from Lévis to Beaumont and back. Geo. Bordeleau, $160; Lévis and Guay, from Lévis to Guay and back, Joseph Verrault, $75 (temporary agreement); Lévis and Lauzon, from Lévis to Lauzon and back via Bienville, Geo. Bordeleau, $100; Lévis and

railway station, Alphonse Laflamme, $150; Lévis street letter box service, via Guay and Notre Dame de Lévis, François Gingras, $315. Under this contract mails are conveyed as follows:—(1) from Lévis to Notre Dame de Lévis and back; (2) from Lévis to letter boxes, via Guay, which is also served under the Lévis and Guay service; (3) from Notre Dame de Lévis to Villemay and back.

EMPLOYMENT OF JOSEPH VERRAULT.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Dugas) asked:

1. Is one Joseph Verrault, of Lévis, in the employ of the Post Office Department?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. What is his salary?
4. If he is employed in a dual capacity, what pay or emolument does he receive in each?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Joseph Verrault is postmaster at Guay, County of Lévis, and for his services as such is allowed the usual percentage of the revenue of his office. He also holds a contract for the conveyance of mails between Guay and Lévis, for which he receives $75 a year.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rose to move:

That from this date to the end of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand until the evening session, as the leader of the Opposition would, no doubt, like to be here when it is moved, although I am not aware that he would object to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very happy to extend the courtesy.

Motion allowed to stand.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention, before the Orders of the Day were called, to make a motion which would have afforded me an opportunity of making a statement to this House to which I attach considerable importance; but, realizing that the hon. leader of the Opposition may also attach some importance to it, and that he is unavoidably absent to-day, I will not avail myself of the opportunity to-day, but will wait until to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to remind the members of the Government of a promise, the last, I think, on record made by that Government, that they would make an effort to produce before this House and lay on the Table certain returns which were asked for before the holidays, and to which particular attention was called. The right hon. leader of the Government seems to have forgotten them, and I would now remind him, first of all, of a return ordered by this House in March, 1898, over a year ago, of all the correspondence in regard to the Manitoba prosecutions. That is a subject that engaged the attention of a committee of this House last session, and a committee of the House is now occupied in dealing with it this session. A return of this character would be obviously important, because it would clear up the question as to how many of the papers or documents that were in the possession of the Government have not already come to light in the ordinary way before the Public Accounts Committee, which of course has been furnished merely with such documents as passed through the hands of the Audit Department. Then, there was a question concerning Deadman's Island. The hon. gentleman who moved for the papers on that subject is not in his seat; but it is a subject of such general interest, that I myself, with the hon. gentleman who has charge of the motion, pressed upon the attention of the Government the necessity for some expedition in preparing that return. I have also privately urged it upon the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden). There did not seem and there does not seem to be any reason for the extraordinary delay that has occurred in the preparation of these papers, which involve a question of title—a question that concerns not only the lessee of this Government, but the people of this country and the government of British Columbia. The matter has finally reached the courts, and notwithstanding this House is primarily charged with the matter and this subject engaged the attention of the Government before this session of Parliament was convened, it seems extraordinary that the Government should be pressing the despatch of public business and the consideration of the ordinary supplies without furnishing the House of Commons with the papers that must have been before the Privy Council, because different deputations have been received and final opinions given on the part of the Government with regard to the titles. That is one question, but underneath all that and the reason for expedition is the extraordinary price that was paid for this public property—$500 a year for twenty years—given without notice to the public, without competition, for a property valued, as I have been informed by reliable people wholly devoid of political feeling in the matter—because both Liberals and Conservatives ranged on one side or the

other on the locality question—very much higher. Therefore, there is, I think, all the more reason for extraordinary expedition in the preparation of this return.

Then I have a right to claim some attention at the hands of the hon. Minister of the Interior with regard to procedure I adopted more than a week ago with reference to the ordinary rule that when a Minister in debate refers to written documents, they should be promptly laid on the Table by the Minister making such reference.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going too far.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not intend to dilate upon the matter, but simply draw attention to the fact. In order not to take up the time of the House, I simply gave the reference in "Hansard" to the hon. Minister, taking it for granted that, by his silence, he consented to furnish the documents. But no attention has been paid to that subject, and I mention it now simply to say that I will be absolutely compelled to make a formal motion and a long discussion with regard to it.

There is also a return with regard to the sheriff's appointment in the Yukon. Only the formal papers were asked for, and the House gave its order on May 15th. These papers cannot be voluminous, but none are forthcoming.

Then with regard to the New Westminster investigation of the Crown Timber Agents there, I asked the Minister of the Interior across the House, when that order was carried, to lay the formal papers, the appointment, the Order in Council, the complaint on the Table and have the others brought down in a supplementary return, as they might be voluminous. That order was given the 15th of May, but has not been complied with yet.

Then again the reports of Mr. Ogilvie, the letters and telegrams passing between him and the Department of the Interior, for which an order of the House was carried on the 8th May. Also on the 8th of May there was an order for the correspondence between this Government and the Executive Council in the Yukon, and also an order of the same date for the correspondence with Major Walsh.

With these orders there is no compliance, and I have not been told by any of the Ministers that they decline to lay on the Table the documents specified. I have spoken frequently on the Orders of the Day being called on this subject, and do not wish to take up time by making a motion, but if pressed will have to do so, and in that way occupy a long period of time in showing how much reason I have for pressing these points upon the attention of the Government. As I prefer not to do that, I merely mention from time to time the desire I have for these particular papers.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must frankly tell my hon. friend that I was not at all prepared for the language he has made use of. I expected, on the contrary, some measure of encomium on his part for the great effort we have made to supply his wishes. He knows that this day we have brought down a dozen of reports.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. None of these.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry we cannot come up to the degree of exhaustiveness of my hon. friend, but perhaps tomorrow will be able to gratify him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). With reference to the particular return in my own department, I was not in the House when the matter was brought up. The hon. gentleman spoke to me privately, and I told him I would have the return brought down as soon as possible. I think he might very well have stopped there and not drag in a discussion of this particular lease. The hon. gentleman insinuated, or rather stated clearly, that the price which the Government was to obtain for the property per annum was ridiculously small.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Undoubtedly.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understand that it is out of order to discuss this matter now, but I shall be prepared to discuss it later. It is rather unfair for an hon. gentleman, when asking for returns, to take the opportunity of making a charge or insinuation of this kind. I wish to say that the price obtained was, I believe, very much larger than the one which it was proposed should be paid by a private company in the city of Vancouver only two or three years ago. Further, I wish to point out that the late Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, handed over 950 acres of the public lands of this country in the city of Vancouver for $1 a year. Furthermore, I shall be able to establish that a committee from Vancouver which waited on the Government here—members of it—stated that the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member were prepared for the sum of $1 a year to hand over this particular island to a private company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will not be able to bring down any paper to verify any such statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the evil of breaking the rule forbidding discussion before the Orders of the Day are called, is apparent in this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see no evil.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is the evil of provoking a debate by abusing the privilege of asking questions about returns before the Orders of the Day are called.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will move a motion next time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I beg to lay on the Table the information asked for by the hon. gentleman on the 15th May, 1899, about which he has just been complaining so vigorously. If he had waited a moment, he might have saved himself and this House his complaint.

I may say, by way of explanation in regard to this, that this is not an ordinary return. The hon. gentleman made some remarks in the House calling attention to the fact that I had referred to certain papers and asking me to produce them. My secretary has gone very carefully through the remarks of the hon. gentleman, as reported in "Hansard," and he says he has complied with his requests as far as possible. But if, on looking through what is laid on the Table, the hon. gentleman thinks I have not fully complied with his requests, I will be happy to supplement the information. In the absence of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) I beg to lay on the Table also a return to an Address of the House of Commons dated 30th March, 1898, for copies of all reports to His Excellency the Governor General, minutes of Council, reports, papers and correspondence in any way relating to the navigation of the Yukon or Stikine rivers, or to customs regulations in connection therewith, including the transhipment of cargoes; also all reports to His Excellency the Governor General, minutes of Council, correspondence and papers touching the customs regulations and fees imposed in connection with Canadian goods passing through St. Michael's, Dyea, Skagway and Wrangel. I beg to lay on the Table also a return to an Address of the House of Commons dated the 19th April, 1899, for copies of all correspondence and papers connected with the removal of Mr. Fawcett from the position of Yukon Gold Commissioner; also a return to an Address of the House of Commons dated 15th May, 1899, for copies of all Orders in Council, ordinances, commissions, appointments, bond certificates and oaths, relating to the appointment of the sheriff for Yukon territory, also copies of the same papers respecting the appointment of the clerk of the court for the Yukon territory; also a return to an Address of the House of Commons dated 14th March, 1898, for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada or any member thereof, and the United States Government either directly or through the British Government, or its representative at Washington, in reference to bonding or transient arrangements on the Pacific coast and to the relief of destitute persons in the Yukon or Alaska district. Also any reports of Ministers to the Government on these matters.

Mr. SPEAKER. The first collection of papers referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was not brought down in answer to an Address or an Order of the House, so I shall have to put a motion. Mr. Sifton moves, seconded by Mr. Mulock, for leave to lay on the Table certain papers containing information asked for by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper on 15th of May, 1899.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the procedure, whether that statement by Your Honour is altogether correct—I do not mean as to fact, of course. What I desire to know is whether I was not entitled, without motion, to ask for and obtain any public documents referred to by the Minister in debate. I proceeded on that assumption. It seems to me, therefore, that this motion would not be necessary, if the action of the Minister is, as I suppose it is, in compliance with the point taken by me that he was bound to lay these papers on the Table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) must have misapprehended what I said. I did not suggest that he should have made a motion. The motion I put before the House was by the Minister for leave to lay these papers on the Table, as neither a Minister nor any one else has the right to lay papers on the Table of the House without some order or some authority from the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understood so, but I desired to know if that rule applied—as, I confess, I did not think it did—to the case mentioned by me of a Minister referring to a public document in a debate. I did not suppose that a motion by anybody was required in that case.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think it is, but it can do no harm at any rate in order to have the Journals of the House correct.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all.

I.C.R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

House again resolved itself into committee to consider a certain resolution respecting the Drummond County Railway.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose on Thursday last, I had been discussing the price to be paid by the Government for the Drummond County Railway on the basis of its value, firstly, based upon options which had been given by the company; secondly, based upon

stock purchased by Mr. Greenshields ; thirdly, based upon the earning powers of the road ; and, fourthly, based upon the cost—but pointing out that the basis of cost is not a basis on which property is usually purchased. You will have observed, Sir, that the results obtained by the different methods which I propose are not very greatly different. I said, in the first place, that Mr. Farwell's option of $500,000, plus the subsequent cost of the road, amounting to $685,000, would make the value at present equal to about $1,115,000, if you deduct from the amount so arrived at the fair value of the rolling stock, which was included in that option but which was not included in the purchase by the Government. The value of the rolling stock was admitted to be between $70,000 and $80,000, and I have put it at $70,000. I also pointed out that if you take the second option given to Mr. Farwell of $400,000, you arrive at a result just $100,000 less, viz., that the value of this road in 1898 would be $1,015,000. Also, if you take the basis on which the stock was purchased by Mr. Greenshields, you would arrive at a value to be set upon the road in 1898 of about $1,000,000. Mr. Greenshields acquired one-eighth of the total stock for nothing, except his financial advice and assistance, and he acquired one-fifth of the whole stock of the road for some $24,000. Other stock, which he paid for at par, was stock purchased under options obtained before but exercised after this agreement had been made by the Government. I also pointed out that the average earning power of the road for three years amounted to $33,428.33, which certainly does not represent a value in the road of $1,600,000. I also pointed out that the basis of cost is not a basis upon which property of this kind is generally purchased. The value of a property is not its cost or the value to the person who buys, but the value to the person who sells. In expropriation proceedings, that is the basis that has been laid down over and over again by the courts. But even upon this basis, taking the estimate of cost made by the Deputy Minister at $1,565,000, and deducting the subsidy $650,356, you have a balance of $914,644 as the utmost possible amount which this road could have cost these people who are now selling to the Government. Now, under these circumstances, I endeavoured to argue that the sum of $1,000,000, or at the outside, $1,100,000, would be the utmost possible value you could place upon this road upon any reasonable basis on which the Government ought to buy it ; and that, therefore the price now proposed to be paid by the Government—though their second bargain is an infinitely better one than that for which hon. gentlemen opposite first voted—is an excessive price.

Now, in dealing with the question as to whether this road was the best possible route by which to get into Montreal, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) was good enough to refer to me for an opinion upon the merits of the Drummond County Railway. It is quite true that I have passed over that road on two or three occasions, and while I do not profess to be able to give an opinion of an expert upon it, still I have my own ideas, based upon some slight observation. I do not think it needs the eye of an expert to observe that the road is not constructed according to the standard or in the same manner in which the Intercolonial Railway is constructed, or the Grand Trunk Railway is constructed, or the Canadian Pacific Railway is constructed. This road, as compared with these three roads, does not rise to the same height; as compared with them it seems to be down in the ditch. It is also perfectly obvious that a very considerable portion of this road runs through a forest.

Now, the Minister, in dealing with the question of obtaining running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec, told us that that road was not equal, on account of the country through which it ran, to the road from Halifax to St. John ; and he told us that the road from Halifax to St. John was the best-paying portion of the Intercolonial Railway. I would like to know how the Minister of Railways and Canals, in view of the statement that he has made to this House, is able to give us that information. He told us that so far as the Drummond County Railway was concerned, it was absolutely impossible to give this House any idea whatever as to whether that railway was a piece of road which paid, or which did not pay, he said the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway were not made up in that way. Now, if the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway are kept as he suggests, how does he know anything about the earning power of this road from Halifax to St. John ? How is he able to make a comparison in the one case and not able to make it in the other case ? Any one comparing the road from Halifax to St. John with this Drummond County Railway which he has purchased, would say that the one road runs through a thickly populated country, a country furnishing a large business, and the other road does not. Well, if he bases his opinion in the one case on the appearance of the country, he might base his opinion in the other case on the appearance of the country ; and in that case, I venture to think that he will be able to give his conclusion to this House that the Drummond County Railway, running as it does for a considerable distance through a forest, would not be a very valuable piece of road, so far, at least, as local traffic is concerned.

Now, my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), in dealing with the bargain made with the Grand Trunk Railway,

was good enough to tell us over and over again that he could not for the life of him understand what the question of user had to do with the amount which the Intercolonial Railway is to pay for the use of the road which it is proposed to lease from the Grand Trunk Railway, or with the value of the terminals at Montreal. Now, I think my hon. friend must have overlooked the evidence of Mr. Wainwright, whom he refers to as a witness of great credibility, and whose statement we must take, he says, if we do not take the statement of any one else. I would like to read to the House what Mr. Wainwright says about this bargain, and the importance which he evidently attaches to the question of user. He was asked, on cross-examination, as follows:

Q. But all your business between west and east would come to Montreal?—A. Yes.

Q. And all those terminals are for the purpose of that business?—A. Certainly.

Q. Your use of these terminals would be very much larger than anything the Intercolonial Railway could make?—A. Certainly.

Q. What proportion?—A. That would depend upon the business they do. The position is this: the agreement provides that we have the use of those terminals in common. I have shown in this plan that it involves the use of 40 miles of sidings, freight sheds, round houses and all appurtenances. It is very much like going to a man who owns a palace, with my wife, having married, and asking him to give me his whole house. Of course, I can only use one room, but in a few years there may be a large family. I do not know what proportion will be our use and what will be theirs.

Mr. Wainwright, whose evidence my hon. friend commends so highly, seems to have the idea that what the Intercolonial Railway authorities are doing at the present time is buying a palace when they have use for only one room. Well, no one objects to their buying a palace and using only one room if they pay for only one room. But the difficulty about this bargain, a difficulty which my hon. friend from New Westminster does not seem to be able to grasp, is this, that whereas they are using only one room in the palace, they are paying half rent for half the use of the entire palace. I venture to think that if my hon. friend from New Westminster looks over the evidence again in the light of what I have suggested, he will see that the question of user has something to do with this case. Now, Mr. Wainwright continues:

Q. How long do you think it will take this Intercolonial Railway to have a family large enough to occupy this palace of the terminals?—A. I think it will not take them long, and I think the proposition to extend the road to Montreal is one of those things that will add materially to the traffic.

Q. You have something of an idea of the business that came over the Intercolonial Railway before they connected with Montreal?—A. Yes.

Q. You have an idea of the relative proportion which your business at Montreal bears to that business?—A. Well, it is very large, of course, in comparison.

Q. Could you give any idea of the proportion?—A. No, because it varies materially.

Then the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) asks this question, and I think the answer of the witness is very significant. He asks: "Is it a 100th?" That is, Is the use of those terminals by the Intercolonial Railway a hundredth part of the use of those terminals by the Grand Trunk Railway? And Mr. Wainwright, whose evidence my hon. friend relies on, says:

I would not like to make a positive statement.

So this gentleman, who is as well acquainted, I suppose, as any railway man in Canada could be with the relative amount of user by the Grand Trunk Railway and by the Intercolonial Railway of these terminal facilities at Montreal, is unable to state on his oath, when the question is put to him, that the Intercolonial Railway will make a hundredth part the use of those terminals that the Grand Trunk Railway makes. Yet the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) thinks that the question of relative user of these terminals has nothing at all to do with this case. As a matter of fact, he is carrying out in that the same idea which the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) carried out, and I will show this by referring to the evidence of the Minister of Railways and Canals given upon this very inquiry. Now, Mr. Blair, at page 10 of the evidence, produced a statement made by Mr. Schreiber, who showed to the satisfaction of the Minister, at least, having made up the statement under the instructions of the Minister, that the Intercolonial Railway should, in the first place, pay interest to the Grand Trunk Railway for the use of its railway, not including terminals, on $750,000. This is his estimate:

Interest on line St. Hyacinthe to St. Lambert, one half $750,000, at five per cent..	$37,500
For use of Victoria Bridge and approaches	50,000
For terminals at Point St. Charles, Bonaventure and use of railways.....	62,500
For use of Chaudière Bridge and necessary occupation of line east.....	6,000

Then he recapitulates that, and he also produces a memorandum in somewhat similar terms, which is to be found on page 11 of the evidence. Then the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is examined about this, and I think it is well to bring to the attention of the House what he has to say as to the question of user with which my hon. friend from Westminster thinks this House should not concern itself.

Q. That is for half, or simply the share that the Intercolonial Railway would require of these terminal facilities?—A. That would be on the basis of one-half the value at 5 per cent of such portions of these terminals as he thought he would require to use.

Q. Whether we only required the one-tenth or not, that estimate was based on one-half?—A. This estimate was based on one-half.

So, I desire to point out to the committee that although Mr. Wainwright has not ventured to state on his oath that the Intercolonial Railway will make a one-hundredth part of the use of these terminal facilities that the Grand Trunk will use, nevertheless, we are to pay to the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the basis of equal user of such terminals as we do use. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is examined further on the subject:

Q. Did you take any pains to find out what the proportion would be of the Intercolonial's use of these facilities?—A. I cannot say it would have been very possible to come to a very clear conclusion in regard to that. It would depend altogether on how business turned out.

Q. Did you take any pains to find out what the Intercolonial's proportion would be?—A. We took every pains to ascertain as to what were the best terms we could get the use of these facilities for—the lowest price at which we could secure them from the Grand Trunk.

Q. That is hardly what I asked. I ask if you took any pains to find out the proportion of the user of the Intercolonial Railway?—A. The element of user has two phases. The amount of user of two companies relatively would affect the contribution which each would make to the cost of maintenance, but it would not affect, nor, in my view, should it properly affect, the question of rental. If the Grand Trunk were willing to rent to us all their property at a rate of interest on the whole cost, governed by our proportion of the use of the line to theirs, it would have been all right to make an arrangement of that kind, possibly; but they were not so disposed.

Q. It is not whether you have inquired into the proportions, but simply whether the Railway Department, or you as its head, took the precaution to have an estimate of the proportionate user?—A. There was no estimate of the proportionate user at all. It would be very hard to ascertain that.

And so on, on page 13, making it perfectly apparent that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, from first to last, never took the precaution, the very obvious precaution, to make any estimate or to ascertain, in any way, what the probable proportion of user would be. But there is something more than that. What difficulty, I ask you, would there have been in his making an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the basis of proportionate user? There would have been no difficulty at all, and I would like to ask any hon. gentleman, who may speak after me, to point any possible difficulty in regard to that. It is necessary in this case, under the terms of this very contract, that a correct statement of the relative user by these two roads, of the terminals shall be made, because maintenance is to be paid for on the basis of proportionate user. Well, Sir, if the cost of maintenance is to be based on proportionate user, why should not the rental be based on proportionate user? What difficulty would there be about that? Accounts have to be kept for the purpose of ascertaining what the proportionate user of the Intercolonial Railway, as to maintenance, will be. Upon exactly the same basis it would have been proper to have paid rental to the Grand Trunk Railway, yet the hon. Minister of Railways, instead of paying rental in respect of the user, which is many times less than the user which the Grand Trunk makes of these terminals, proposes to pay them, not on the basis of user at all, but absolutely on the basis of one-half of the rental which would be payable to any company or person acquiring the whole of these terminals under a lease. I may point out, in passing, some figures which were collected by the committee in regard to the proportionate user by these two roads during the months of March and April, 1898. The total number of cars of each railway in and out of the year at Point St. Charles during the months of March and April, is as follows:—

	G.T.R.	I.C.R.
March	53,940	2,171
April	45,167	2,210
Total	99,107	4,381

The total number of passenger trains of each railway crossing the Victoria Bridge daily is as follows:—

Grand Trunk Railway	46
Intercolonial Railway	4

Yet for all this we are to pay on the basis of one-half and not on a proportionate basis. And my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) cannot see any reason why we should not pay on the basis of one-half. The total number of freight cars of each railway passing over the Victoria Bridge, and the railway from Victoria Bridge to Ste. Rosalie is as follows:—

	G.T.R.	I.C.R.
March	17,084	2,388
April	10,491	2,867

Yet for this we are to pay, not on a proportionate basis, but on a one-half basis. The published time table at the time the report of this committee was made showed a daily use of the terminal facilities by 100 passenger trains of the Grand Trunk Railway and by four passenger trains of the Intercolonial Railway. Yet my hon. friend on the other side of the House believes, in view of all that, that we should pay for the use of these terminals on the one-half basis and not on the proportionate basis.

My hon. friend challenged some statements in our report, and I have dealt to a considerable extent with what he said in regard to the basis of rental; but, in passing, I would like to point out to the committee what the Intercolonial Railway receives when it makes an arrangement, somewhat of the same character, as that now being made by the Grand Trunk Railway. The Dominion Atlantic Railway has running powers from Windsor Junction in common with the Intercolonial Railway over 14 miles from Windsor Junction to Halifax. It has exclusive running powers, of every kind, over the road from Windsor Junction

to Windsor, a distance of 32 miles, making in all, 46 miles of the Intercolonial Railway. As to 32 miles, the Dominion Atlantic has exclusive running rights, and as to 14 miles, it has running rights in common with the Intercolonial Railway. The arrangement made in that case is this: The Intercolonial Railway bears the cost of maintenance and receives one-third of the company's gross earnings over this line. The average net rental received by the Intercolonial Railway, during the past eight years, for the 46 miles of road and for the use of the terminal facilities at Halifax, which are very extensive, is $16,682.50, or about one-ninth of the sum which it is proposed to pay the Grand Trunk Railway in this case. Any hon. gentleman who is familiar with the business of the Dominion Atlantic Railway is aware how that business has grown up during the past eight or ten years, and that the business which is done by that railway is nothing like the small proportion which I have indicated. The Dominion Atlantic has a very heavy freight traffic into Halifax over this portion of the Intercolonial Railway. It runs six passenger trains daily instead of four into the station at Halifax, and it obtains the use of this railway for the annual payment of $16,682.50. The Intercolonial Railway bears the cost of maintenance.

Coming back for a moment to what was suggested to me by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) in respect to the value and the character of this Drummond County Railway, I intended to have stated at the time, only that hon. gentleman did not apparently desire to hear my answer, that my experience, during this year, of that road was not an experience which indicated to me that it is a very suitable road, at some seasons of the year at least. I came as far as Lévis on the Intercolonial Railway during the month of March last; I was stopped there for twenty-four hours because the Drummond County was blocked up with snow. The manner in which that road is built, probably, makes it more difficult to keep it clear in winter than other roads; and the passengers on that Intercolonial Railway train, fifteen or twenty in all, after waiting twenty-four hours, were compelled to cross the river to the city of Quebec, take the Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal, and they arrived in Ottawa about two days, I believe, in advance of those who thought fit to stick to the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. GIBSON. Was the Grand Trunk Railway blocked up at the same time?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Grand Trunk Railway was blocked, too, for, I believe, a portion of its line, but I understand it was cleared considerably before the Drummond County road. I am not sure about that, but it is what I was informed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Drummond County was the last cleared.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to what has been stated by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), as to the impossibility of giving any information to the House with regard to the results during the past year of the leasing of this road, I desire to point out, that in 1897 we were told, both by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the temporary lease was only an experiment, that the Government were to test the value of the road, and that, after we had leased the road as an experiment during the year, we would have some information about it. It is to be regretted that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has not been able to carry out the promise which he made at that time, and that we are as much in the dark now about the value of that experiment as we were then. I also wish to point out, for the benefit of members of the Government other than the Minister of Railways and Canals, that, at page 81 of the evidence before the committee, the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals told us, that the success of this experiment, so far as Halifax was concerned, would to a considerable extent depend upon the establishment of a fast line of steamers from Halifax. I merely desire to say this, in comment: that, in view of the difficulties which now stand in the way of the establishment of a fast line, owing to the fact that this Government interfered with the arrangements made by the late Government, it looks very much as if the expected increase of revenue which the Deputy Minister of Railways hoped to realize in that way, would be postponed for a long time—a thing which the people of the maritime provinces, at least, very greatly deplore.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to what the Minister (Mr. Blair) said concerning the running powers which were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway over the line of the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax, I do not need to add very much in comment upon the terms of that agreement to what was said by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). I notice that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) seemed to be somewhat distressed at the idea of Halifax being one of the termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think that there was any occasion for distress of mind on the part of the Minister (Mr. Blair) at any such consummation as that. He told us, that it was very undesirable to exchange running powers from Quebec to Montreal with the Canadian Pacific Railway, for running powers to them over the line from Halifax to St. John, and he based his argument chiefly on the difference in the length of the line. It is perfectly clear to any one, whether he has much knowledge of railway business or not, that the fact of these two lines differing in length would not prevent a reasonable and proper bargain being made,

and I say, that an arrangement of that kind would be very desirable, not only in the interests of the port of Halifax, not only in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but in the interests of this country as a whole. Why should the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) be distressed at the idea of Halifax being one of the termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is it not in the interests of this country that a great railway like that, which has a terminus on the Pacific, should also have access to all the best ports on the Atlantic? The Minister (Mr. Blair) seems to think it a very desirable thing that this Intercolonial Railway should have a terminus at St. John. In what way need he be afraid—even if he has the interest of St. John particularly at heart—in what way need he be afraid of the Canadian Pacific Railway having a terminus at Halifax? Why, Sir, he proposes to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway at the city of St. John, by building at enormous expense terminal facilities on the east side of St. John harbour. To do that, he is handicapped by an increased haulage of 259 miles over the Intercolonial Railway, as compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and then he brings his freight to exactly the same port to which the Canadian Pacific Railway brings its freight. If the Minister desires to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the only place where he has a chance of competing with that railway, is at the port of Halifax, and I think I can show any reasonable gentleman in this House, that this is a fact. At the port of St. John, he must bring his freight 259 miles further than the Canadian Pacific Railway: if he goes to the port of Halifax, he hauls his freight only 97 miles further than to St. John, and he is 250 miles further on the road to England. In other words, by hauling his freight to Halifax, 97 miles further than to St. John, he does not compete with the Canadian Pacific at the same port of St. John, but he competes at the best port in the world, having an advantage of 250 miles on the ocean voyage to European ports. If the Minister is disposed to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I hope he will compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the interest of the country and of that railway itself—I say, the only place where it is proper and competent for him to so compete is at the port of Halifax, for the reasons I have mentioned. Every difficulty lies in his way in the city of St. John, because he has an increased railway haulage of 259 miles, and he starts on the ocean voyage from exactly the same port as the Canadian Pacific Railway does. At the port of Halifax, he has a port where there is practically no tide at all. He has a port which a steamer can leave and in two hours be out in the Atlantic, headed on her voyage to any British port. He has at Halifax a port where the port charges, the expenses of loading and unloading, and all charges of that kind, are probably as low as at any port in Europe, and lower than in any other American port, and it seems to me to be as clear as a mathematical demonstration, that, if the Minister is to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the place to compete is at Halifax, and not at St. John. But, I regret, Sir, that the Minister (Mr. Blair) does not seem to look at matters in that light, if I have gathered his language rightly.

I desire further to submit for the consideration of this House one further point, and it is this. The Minister, in dealing with the agreement which was made between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1890, tells us, that by cancelling that arrangement he will be able to secure practically all the passengers to Montreal, and in that way he will get a greater proportion of the passenger receipts than he otherwise would. Why, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister (Mr. Blair) logically carried out the idea which he there presents, he would refuse to make any connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway; he would compel every one in Halifax and eastern Nova Scotia to have but one means of access to Montreal, instead of two. The arrangements with regard to that, as they at present stand, are, that the people of eastern Nova Scotia, and of western Nova Scotia for that matter, and of the city of Halifax, have two trains daily to and from Montreal, have two means of access to Montreal: you can take the Canadian Pacific Railway in the morning, and you can take the Intercolonial Railway in the afternoon. I venture to think that the people of Halifax, and the people of Nova Scotia generally, are entitled to some use of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are entitled to some use of that road for the purpose of having access to Montreal. The people of my province have paid their legitimate share, a large share, of the cost of that railway, and I submit that any proposition by the Minister of Railways and Canals which would prevent the people of Halifax, and the people of Nova Scotia generally, from using that railway in going to and from Montreal, will not be favourably received by the people of that province. I say that the Minister of Railways and Canals, in ordinary railway competition, if he does his duty, if he does what he said he was going to do in the committee, if he does what the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals said would be done—if he sends out agents and develops the traffic—will be able to compete at Halifax as well as St. John with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and do that without hampering in any way the use of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the people of Nova Scotia, and will be able to do it on a fair and equitable basis for granting running powers to the Canadian Pacific Railway over the Inter-

colonial from Halifax to St. John. Now, I regret to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals, during the past two years, has not given very much evidence of attempting to deal with the business of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as Halifax is concerned, in a very businesslike manner. At page 77 of the evidence, the hon. gentleman, in examining his Deputy Minister, put these words in his mouth :

Q. Now, then, you rely somewhat for an increased traffic over the Intercolonial Railway upon an active and progressive policy, do you not, on the part of the management ?—A. It must be so, or we would not get the traffic.

Q. And you do not despair at all but that Halifax may ultimately, under the Intercolonial Railway, become a port of some importance for through traffic ?—A. If fast steamers are put on better traffic is certain.

Again, at page 81 :

Q. How about passengers ?—A. If fast steamers were to run to Halifax and make that their terminus, I think passenger traffic would increase largely.

Q. As to the expected increase in revenue, it will to a considerable extent depend on the establishment of a fast line from Halifax ?—A. Yes.

I hope the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in a spirit of contrition and repentance will bear this in mind, and will recollect that in 1897 he was absolutely sure of the ability of Petersen, Tate & Co. to carry their arrangement out, the result being, however, that Petersen, Tate & Co. have ignominiously failed, and, owing to the great increase in the cost of shipbuilding since then, experts say that it will be absolutely impossible, even upon the terms offered by the late Government, to have any such arrangement carried out in the next half dozen years at least.

Now, with reference to the administration of this road by the Minister of Railways and Canals, I want to point out how different his views were at a later date, when the Board of Trade of Halifax sought to put them to a practical test. The Halifax Board of Trade brought to the attention of the Government the necessity of some active exertions being made on the part of the Government for the purpose of increasing their traffic over the Intercolonial Railway by the port of Halifax, and the Minister of Railways and Canals, in a letter to that body, dated the 15th November, 1898, about six months after he had put the words which I have read into the mouth of his Deputy Minister, used this language :

We are not guaranteeing freight over our line for shipment from any point, not being so situated as to be able to do it. Perhaps later our organization may become sufficiently complete ; but I am inclined to doubt even the probability of this fact. We must look to the two lines—at most to three—with which we connect westerly, for our freight supply. They will be the originating lines, and they will look up the business.

According to the statement put into the mouth of the Deputy Minister by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals himself, the Intercolonial Railway is going to enter on an active and aggressive policy, otherwise this whole scheme will fall through, and we will not get the traffic ; but six months afterwards, when the Board of Trade of Halifax asks him to inaugurate that active policy, he says :

They will be the originating lines, and they will look up the business. This winter nothing whatever has been done in that direction, and I think until some accommodation has been provided which is yet wanting we will not be able to count upon any large quantity of freight.

Now, Sir, it is needless to say, after the hopes that were held out by the Minister of Railways and Canals, not only in this investigation, but otherwise, that this was a very disappointing statement ; and I might answer the hon. Minister's suggestions in that letter, by quoting the very well-chosen language of the Halifax Board of Trade, in their memorandum in reply, dated the 25th November, 1898, which contains a very full, exhaustive and complete answer :

The balance of his letter shows a much larger range, and if the ideas therein expressed should be acted upon, the effect on our future winter business would be very serious. We must certainly take exception to the assertion that the trade of the Intercolonial must depend solely and wholly upon the originating lines out west, and that it is solely their duty to look up the business. No ordinary railway company having its terminus at a port such as Halifax would think of adopting any such principle with the expectation of business coming to its road. The Intercolonial should have agents out west, who would be in a position to give through rates on grain and other produce from the point of shipment to that of delivery in Europe. To do this, it would, of course, be necessary for the Intercolonial to have specific arrangements with the different lines over which this freight would have to come for delivery at Montreal, and should it be, as is frequently suggested, that any one of those lines should decline to carry the freight so offered on the ground that their rolling stock would not admit of their extending their business beyond that which was absolutely necessary for their own through shipments, in that case the Intercolonial should be in a position to tender sufficient rolling stock or cars to carry the freight engaged by their agents to Montreal, and we have no good reasons to suppose that the use of the rails on any one of the lines referred to could not be had under a reasonable arrangement for such purpose.

Mr. Hays, of the Grand Trunk, when here last summer, asserted most positively that the rail accommodation was equal and capable of carrying two or three times the amount of freight now passing over the roads. This being the case, why should we be constantly met with the assertion that it was not the Government's place to provide freight for their road ? The term "government" should be dropped out of the matter altogether, and the Intercolonial should be run by a competent staff of men, whose interest and duty it would be to develop the business of the road to its very fullest extent in competition with the roads which have their terminal

shipping points at the various ports on the Atlantic coast.

During some years past the through ocean traffic of the Intercolonial to and from the west has so dwindled away to practically nothing, that in extending the line to Montreal an entirely new departure on the part of the management was essential to create a traffic in competition with other routes. The appointment of a live traffic manager trained in an active company was a businesslike proceeding. It is difficult to disassociate the reactionary step taken by the Railway Department in abolishing the office of general traffic manager, and the very unsatisfactory position of the traffic arrangements indicated in the Minister's letters. It is of vital importance that a capable and energetic man of modern training should without further loss of time be appointed to organize the management of the Intercolonial Railway, so that the Minister of Railways may no longer have to announce that the Intercolonial Railway is not able to offer export traffic.

That is the view which the Halifax Board of Trade took of the Minister's course, and we cannot hedp feeling—those of us who are from the province of Nova Scotia—that it would have been better and more in the interests of the country if the hon. Minister had entered upon that active and progressive policy which he proposed in the spring of 1898, and that he should not in the autumn of 1898 have told the Halifax Board of Trade that the Intercolonial should look to other lines out west to hunt up business for it, and make no effort to capture business for itself. Does not the hon. Minister know that two, at least, of the lines which are to hunt up business out west are the Grand Trunk Railway, which is competing with Halifax at Portland, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is competing with the Intercolonial at St. John. And does he expect that these two lines are to hunt up business out west for the purpose of sending it over the Intercolonial, and that all the Intercolonial officials need do is to sit back and wait for the business to be sent them by these competing lines? The idea seems absurdly childish, and I am sure the Board of Trade of Halifax have not been able to understand up to this day why it was that the Minister, having announced an active, progressive policy in the spring of 1898, according to the sworn testimony of the Deputy Minister, should have seen fit, in the autumn of 1898, to have made such an extraordinary announcement.

Possibly uncharitable persons might think the reason of this is to be found in an announcement which the Minister of Railways and Canals was good enough to make at a banquet in St. Johns, I think, on the 13th October, 1897 or 1898. Speaking of the ports of Halifax and St. John, he said it was the duty of the Government to assist both ports in providing proper facilities for trade. Well, he has been doing that to a pretty handsome extent at St. John, because he has spent $750,000 or $1,000,000 in constructing terminal facilities on the east side of that harbour to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway on the west side, although, in order to make that competition he has to haul his freight 259 miles further. But he has not made very active progress in Halifax in the meantime. The elevator which was to have been completed for last season's operations is now, according to his own statement in this House in reply to a question from me, not to be completed until the 1st of next October, and some of his own friends in Halifax have a very shrewd suspicion that the 1st of October will come and go and not see that elevator ready for business. However, I shall, to the best of my ability, during the remainder of the session, endeavour to bring the matter to the Minister's attention, from time to time, and spur him up, if I am in any way able to do so, to complete that elevator by that date at least. The hon. gentleman, in that speech, continued:

> The one having the greatest natural advantage would, of course, be the favoured one.

One would suppose that Halifax, having the advantages which I have already claimed for it, having 250 miles of a shorter ocean voyage, and being probably as fine a port as there is in the world and as cheap a port, would be the one having the natural advantages, not only so far as passengers are concerned, but also freight. But, the hon. Minister continued:

> Speaking as one member of the Government, but not binding the Government, he had no hesitation in saying that to his mind St. John had advantages over Halifax. (Tremendous cheers.)

This speech was made at St. John:

> St. John was nearer Montreal than Halifax. (Cheers.) That was one advantage. The fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has charge of the business on the western side of the harbour was to his mind another advantage. (Cheers.) He believed that when the Intercolonial Railway is extended to Montreal a new day will have dawned too for the Intercolonial Railway, for Canada, for the maritime provinces, for St. John.

So the idea of the hon. Minister is, apparently, if you can judge from that language, that the proper course for the Intercolonial is not to haul freight ninety-seven miles further and have the advantage of 250 miles on the ocean voyage and a splendid and a cheap port, but to haul it 259 miles further than the Canadian Pacific Railway to the port of St. John, and there compete with that line. That is the advantage which, in the eyes of the hon. Minister, St. John has over Halifax. He continued:

> To his mind the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal meant everything to St. John.

Certainly, if the Minister sees fit to carry out the policy announced to the board of trade in Halifax and make no effort to

secure western trade for that port, and to confine his energies solely to competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John, his statement would be perfectly correct; but I would like to know what the people of Halifax and of Nova Scotia, and particularly eastern Nova Scotia, will have to say to that.

Then what the Canadian Pacific could not bring down to the western side of the harbour of St. John the Intercolonial would bring down to the eastern side of the harbour (Prolonged cheers.)

My hon. friends from Nova Scotia will see from this statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, which seems to be borne out by his subsequent conduct in the autumn of 1898, that Halifax and Nova Scotia have no place in his consideration, so far as through traffic over the Intercolonial is concerned. Then, the hon. Minister continued as follows:—

Mr. Blair said the Intercolonial Railway, when extended to Montreal, would enter into friendly competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway for part of the freight business of the west. Although the distance by the Canadian Pacific Railway would be somewhat shorter than by the extended Intercolonial Railway, yet the Intercolonial Railway would be able to cover the distance in exactly the same time. This was because the Intercolonial Railway was in some respects an easier road on which to haul and better time could be made.

So that he is going to expend $750,000 or $1,000,000 to enter into friendly competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway on the west side of the harbour of St. John; and, so far as the Halifax Board of Trade are concerned, they are to be told that the Intercolonial freight in the west is to be hunted up by the very lines which are competing at Portland and at St. John against the Intercolonial and against Halifax. And the Minister of Railways and Canals is good enough to expect that the people of Halifax will be deceived by any such story. I think I have made out in a fairly clear and reasonable manner to any hon. gentleman who has been good enough to follow me that the administration of the Intercolonial Railway under this lease has not been one which conduces to the sending of through freight over the Intercolonial Railway via the port of Halifax. The Minister's declarations in his speech, to which I have referred, coupled with his careful declarations in his written communication to the Halifax Board of Trade, bear out the arguments that I have been making. It should be the desire of the Minister, if possible, to send through freight over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax, because if he is able to carry out that project successfully, he has the advantage of the long haul from Montreal to Halifax. The Minister himself has put in the mouth of his Deputy Minister the statement of the fact that Halifax is 250 miles nearer to England than is St. John, which gives Halifax an advantage over St. John and over Portland in competition for through business. Is it not perfectly clear to any hon. gentleman in this House that if the hon. Minister can utilize the advantage given by that shorter ocean voyage and make his long haul from Montreal to Halifax, it will stand him in better stead than to attempt to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway at the port of St. John? It is perfectly obvious, for the reason I have mentioned, that it is his interest to do so, because, though he has a haul of 97 miles further, that is more than made up for by the 250 miles of decreased ocean voyage, and by the advantages which the port of Halifax presents even to an unprejudiced person, as compared with the port of St. John. In making comparison between the port of Halifax and the port of St. John, I desire to be understood as expressing no jealousy of the port of St. John. Every man in the city of Halifax recognizes, and recognizes with admiration, the splendid efforts which the citizens of St. John have made in competing for through business. We also recognize and appreciate this fact—that if the people of St. John and the Canadian Pacific Railway are able, by means of competition at the port of St. John, to take any portion of the through freight which otherwise should go to Portland or Boston, they were doing a service not merely to the whole country, but to the city of Halifax. We, therefore, not only appreciate their efforts, but we sympathize with those efforts; but we desire, so far as through trade competition is concerned, to have fair-play and to have the Government recognize the natural advantages which the city of Halifax possesses in being a port of the character I have shown and in having the advantage over the port of St. John of 250 miles less ocean voyage, and over Portland of a very much greater distance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have detained the committee at considerable length, but at no greater length than I thought was necessary under the circumstances. I am still of the opinion which I expressed in this report, that the bargain which the Government has seen fit to make with the Drummond County Railway and for which it asks the sanction of this House, is an improvident agreement; that the Government, in paying for the road on the basis of $1,600,000, is paying a very much greater price than that road could have been sold for to any other person; that they are paying for it on a basis which is not justified by any of the tests of value which can fairly be applied to it; and, so far as the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned, that that arrangement is not based on any principle whatever. In that case the user is what we should pay for, the proper proportionate user of the terminus; and, inasmuch as the Minister of Railways and Canals did not see fit even to procure an estimate of the user, as his deputy, under his instructions, proceeded solely on the basis of equal user of such portion of the terminals as he thought it would be

necessary for the Intercolonial Railway to employ, the result has been an improvident agreement. In fact, I think that probably when we have the actual results, the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway will be found to be much more improvident even than the arrangement with the Drummond County Railway. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that he could not force the hand of the Grand Trunk Railway, that he could not compel them to make a better bargain. But, at least, he could look around and use the method pointed out by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart)—he could have told the Grand Trunk Railway that if they did not make a better bargain, the Intercolonial Railway could come in on its own property and erect terminals in the city of Montreal and build a line for about half—as I remember the figures—of the capitalized expenditure under the Grand Trunk Railway and Drummond County arrangements.

It is apparent, therefore, that the Minister was not in a position to have his hand forced either by the Drummond County or the Grand Trunk Railway. He could have stood on the splendid position which he held. But, instead of doing that, he has made this arrangement. I think that both these arrangements were not such as the hon. Minister would have been likely to make with these two companies if he had been dealing as the president or director of a company owning the Intercolonial Railway. I think that if the Minister of Railways and Canals was dealing with the money of a company in which he was interested, having the splendid opportunity which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals pointed out, he would surely have made some estimate as to the user by the Intercolonial Railway and as to cost and value further than he is shown to have made in this case. Therefore, I think that the bargain made with the Drummond County Railway is not one which should be sanctioned by this House, and that the proposed bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway, necessarily involved in this, is not one which should be sanctioned by this House. And, although, as I said in the first place, I am in favour of the abstract project of extending the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal for the purpose of competing with the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways for western traffic, nevertheless I believe it to be my duty, for the reasons stated in the minority report, and for the reasons I have endeavoured to state, however imperfectly, to this committee, to vote against this resolution.

Mr. COLIN F. McISAAC (Antigonish). Mr. Chairman, in discussing the resolutions before this committee, there are three main questions that we must consider: First, is the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal desirable in the public interest? Second, of the three available routes, the Drummond County route, the South Shore route and the Grand Trunk route, is the Drummond County the shortest and best? Third, is the Government paying too much for the Drummond County road, or could they acquire that road for less money, or could they construct another road for less money?

As to the first question, I do not think that there are two opinions in this House or in this country, except perhaps the opinion of the leader of the Opposition, but even his opinion is opposed by hon. gentlemen sitting on his own side of the House. Then on the second question, as to whether this is the best, the shortest and most direct route, I will only refer to the evidence of two witnesses before the committee last year, the evidence of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), one of the ablest men on the other side of the House, and of Mr. Wainwright. Then I will briefly consider the last and only question which I think is in controversy in this matter. Now, the member for Compton, as reported on page 142, says on this point:

Q. You presented it (this scheme) upon the principle that it would be advantageous to the country generally to get an entrance into Montreal?—A. That is right.

Q. Having behind that, of course, this line as being the most likely means of geting into Montreal?—A. Yes.

Q. And you think it still?—A. Yes.

Q. In your judgment it is in the interest of the country that the Intercolonial Railway should get into Montreal?—A. Yes.

Q. And I understand you to say that in your judgment this is the proper way of getting into Montreal?—A. Yes.

Q. It is the best way?—A. Yes.

That is the sworn evidence of the hon. member for Compton. Then Mr. Wainwright, on page 50, testified as follows:—

Q. Had you a favourable opinion of the road and the possibilities of traffic?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. Church originally undertook the construction of the road in full touch with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the idea at that time was entertained by the late Sir Joseph Hickson that the Grand Trunk Railway would acquire it. We expected we should be able to secure quite a good traffic off the line, and that was our reason for desiring to obtain possession of it.

Q. Have you any reason from your recent experience and knowledge of the business upon that road to alter your opinion in that regard?—A. No.

Q. Would you kindly state what your view would be in regard to the relative merits of that road with others that have been spoken of as through lines for the Intercolonial Railway in reaching Montreal?—A. Well, as regards the connection of the Intercolonial Railway with Montreal, the Drummond County Railway, as far as I know from the engineer's reports, is the shortest line and the easiest line to St. Lambert that could be acquired. The distances have already been given, I think, in your evidence, Mr. Blair, and these figures are correct according to my report.

Q. How about the grades ?—A. Of course, the Grand Trunk has some longer and has some heavier grades. The South Shore road is a little longer according to the engineer's reports, and would have a good deal of heavy bridging, therefore would be very costly, and, under the circumstances, I presume that the Drummond County is about the easiest method of extending the road to Montreal.

Then again he answers this question put to him by the Minister of Railways and Canals :

Q. Of the three roads, therefore, which would you consider the cheapest and best road for the Government to acquire, taking it altogether, for this purpose ?—A. Well, as I would like the Government to have taken the Grand Trunk through to Lévis, it is rather—I would, of course, have to admit, after we were out of the race, that the Drummond County, with its shorter mileage and lighter grades, necessarily would be worked more economically and probably make better time for the service. I am bound to admit that.

It is not necessary to quote any further from the evidence to show that this is by all odds the best available route. I will now proceed to consider the third question, the only one, I say, with regard to which there can be any controversy, that is whether the price paid by the Government is a reasonable one, or whether the Government should be expected to get it at a lower figure. In dealing with this matter I am going to confine myself strictly to the evidence. Having listened with a great deal of attention to the speech of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), I must say that it has strongly confirmed me in the opinion that this is an eminently good bargain. Everybody knows that that hon. gentleman picked out the very best evidence that he could find in support of his position, and yet he has been able to find nothing to show that this is not a good bargain. If he had been able to find in this evidence anything to strengthen his position, he would not have resorted to extraneous opinions and statements by outside parties. We had before the committee the evidence of Mr. Schreiber, Deputy Minister of Railways, and also the evidence of Mr. McLeod, an experienced engineer. Let me point out to the House that Mr. Schreiber's estimate was made in 1894. He had not been on the road himself, and his estimate was not made from personal observation, but from information supplied him by his officials and others. When we consider that nearly the whole speech of the hon. member for Halifax, in examining what this road had cost, is based upon an estimate made by the Deputy Minister in 1894 of the cost of that road, the House will be able to realize how weak indeed must be the position of that hon. gentleman. He says that in arriving at the cost of the Drummond County Railway we must take the figures given by Mr. Schreiber in 1894, when we have the evidence of Mr. McLeod, who travelled over every inch of the road last year, and who gave evidence showing that the cost was far above the estimate of Mr. Schreiber. Now Mr. Schreiber says that to construct that road according to the requirements of the Subsidy Act, it would cost about $1,535,500 to complete it. But any person knows that the requirements of the Subsidy Act were entirely different from the requirements of the agreement under consideration here to-day, and the Minister of Railways and Canals has taken special pains to see that this road when completed according to this agreement will be far more efficient in every way than a road completed under the Subsidy Act. The Minister of Railways and Canals has made it a condition that the sum of $100,000 shall be expended in addition to the sum given in Mr. Schreiber's estimate, to bring that road up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. Indeed, 43 miles of that road is already above the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, notwithstanding the opinion of my hon. friend from Halifax. Everybody who knows anything about the transaction knows that the 42½ miles-section of this road is superior to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. The $100,000 additional to Mr. Schreiber's estimate brings the estimated cost up to $1,635,500. Who is Mr. McLeod ? He is an engineer of the very highest standing ; he has been in the employ of all Governments in this country for the last 25 years. In our presence before the committee, the ex-Minister of Railways himself stated that Mr. McLeod's opinion as an expert engineer was entitled to the very highest respect. I propose to read from the evidence of Mr. McLeod. I am not going to weary the House by reading long extracts, but I will read only those portions which are most pertinent to the case in hand, to show that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not deal fairly with this question when they run away from the evidence altogether. At page 111 Mr. McLeod made a statement as to the value of the road. Now, Mr. McLeod, as I stated before, has been over this whole road. He was in charge of the construction of the road since this Government took charge of it up to the present time, or, at least, up to the time he gave this evidence :

Q. Your valuation of the road when completed under contract with the Government, what do you estimate its value per mile ?—A. It ought to be more than $15,000 for the portion from Moose Park.

Q. How much is it worth from Moose Park to the Chaudière per mile ?—A. It would cost about $16,000 to $17,000 a mile.

Q. That is the new part ?—A. Yes ; the new part from Moose Creek to Chaudière.

Q. Then the value of the rest of the road from Moose Park to Ste. Rosalie, I think, you said was $15,000 a mile ; do you still adhere to that ?—A. With the improvements it would probably cost about $16,000 a mile.

Q. And the other about $17,000 a mile ?—A. Yes.

Q. And the total can be figured upon that ?—A. Yes.

That was the estimate of Mr. McLeod. He says the total may be estimated upon that basis. I have an estimate, according to that, which is as follows :—

42½ miles at $17,000 per mile.....	$ 722,500
90½ miles at $16,000 per mile.....	1,628,000
Total.....	$2,350,500

This is the estimate of Mr. McLeod, an engineer who has had the entire confidence of both Governments for the last twenty-five years. He is in charge of this road ; he has walked over almost its entire distance and gone over and over it again on a hand-car, and he knows every inch of it. He knows more about it than any other person, and he swore, before the committee, that its value was $2,350,000. These are only the estimates of two engineers, and I do not pretend to say, that any one should be held to that, which is only an estimate, because all estimates are liable to err on one side or the other, and, as was remarked by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) the other day, they are generally found to be too low. However, I am now coming back to the testimony of witnesses who knew what they were talking about, who gave evidence as to cost of construction. The evidence given as to the cost of construction of this road was pooh-poohed by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), the other night. He told us, that there were no books, and he took me to task for corroborating the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that there were books before the committee. The hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said, that he was surprised that I should undertake to contradict him. I want to refer to this point to show that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was correct in the statement which was contradicted by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, speaking the other night on this question, said, at page 2956 of "Hansard" :

The amount of the cost of construction, I think, expended, and not shown by the books, was $729,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The books were never brought.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None of them were brought.

Mr. HAGGART. The construction-books, containing the construction accounts, were not brought at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Were none of them brought ? My impression is that the books were all available from the date named by Mr. Newton.

Mr. McISAAC (Antigonish). They were all there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My impression corresponds with that of my hon. friend from Antigonish.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the other day, took occasion to refer to this, and tried to make this committee believe that he was right, that no books were produced at all. The statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is correct. As I will show you, by the evidence, the books were all before the committee, except in so far as items up to sometime in 1890, when the items on account of the construction of the railway amounted to something like $729,000, are concerned. Mr. Newton was the secretary of the construction company at that time. As an attempt has been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to charge that we had not proper evidence to show what the real cost of the road is, I want to show, from the evidence, that we had all the possible evidence, and evidence which hon. gentlemen cannot now repudiate. At page 43 of the evidence Mr. Newton says :

Q. Have you any books that will inform you of that ?—A. Yes, I have at Drummondville.

Q. It is very important to have them here.—A. I was not aware of that. I could have brought them as well as not. I have the construction account. On August 7, 1887, the first payment was made on stock.

* * * * * *

Q. Give us the amount this firm passed to you as the amount of construction at that time ?—A. "The amount paid out to date for building the line and received from the foregoing, as per construction-book on June 30, 1890, was $729,-314.52."

This is what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said the other night. Up to this date this was the amount paid. After this date there were books to show what the cost of the railway construction was. Up to this date, although we did not have the books, we had the man who kept the books. At page 44, again, Mr. Newton says :

Q. Mr. Newton, just turn up your books showing the construction account. I understand you to say to us that you transcribed into this book the total cost of the construction of the road up to that date, 30th June, 1890 ?—A. Yes.

Q. As made by you, you keeping the accounts up to that time ?—A. Up to that time.

Q. The total of these accounts were correctly transcribed ?—A. Yes.

Then again, at page 95, he was asked by Mr. Powell :

Q. Then, as a matter of fact, you do not know whether this capital stock was paid up to the amount of $400,000 or not ? As a matter of fact, all you know is that it was transferred to the construction account in these books in 1890 ?—A. It is as I said before These amounts are taken from the construction account, and these accounts I consider are correct. I made all the entries in the other books. I do not think that there is anything charged in this account that I have taken that is not for construction.

Then, at page 96, he is asked by the chairman :

Q. You are book-keeper of the firm ?—A. Yes.

Q. The firm undertook to build the road and owned it ?—A. Yes.

Q. And up to 1890 all the cost of construction was put into the books of the firm and not of the railway company ?—A. Yes.

Q. That is to say, there were no separate accounts ?—A. No.

Q. You were book-keeper ?—A. Yes.

Q. And in the ordinary course of business entered into the books of the firm whatever they claimed should be charged against the railway ?—A. To construction account.

Q. And that account was correctly transferred when you opened the books for the Drummond County Railway ?—A. Yes.

Q. Where ?—A. In Drummondville.

Q. Speaking generally, as book-keeper, would you say the accounts charged to construction were proper accounts ?—A. I think so.

Q. These accounts you say belong to the firm ?—A. To Church, Mitchell & Fee's own business.

Q. And these accounts are with the papers of the firm ?—A. They are with Church's business altogether.

Q. And you have no control over them ?—A. No.

Q. If it is thought desirable to have these accounts produced before the committee, who would be the proper person to subpœna ?—A. The business was sold last fall to Charles Church and his two sons. George Church is carrying it on, and he is the proper person to apply to.

My point is this. I was absolutely correct in corroborating the Minister of Railways when he made the statement that after 1890 the construction accounts were before the committee, and before that date we had the accounts as transcribed by the very person who kept these books before 1890. It may be contended by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that we had not the books in which all the entries up to 1890 were entered, and that the members of the committee from the other side of the House were not able to go through the details of the items of construction, which gave the total of $729,000. The evidence of Mr. Newton, which I have just read, is a complete answer to that. He says he was the man who kept the books of construction up to 1890, and after 1890 up to date. He says, however, that the books before 1890 were not in his custody or control, and he could not produce them before the committee, yet when he was asked in whose possession these books were, he said they were in the possession of George Church, down in Drummondville. This evidence was elicited before the committee, and surely hon. gentlemen on the other side —especially the two lawyers that were there —surely they cannot now contend that they have not had an opportunity to find out the entries that were made in the books previous to 1890, simply because the books could not be produced, when the witness Newton told them where the books were, and gave the name of the man in whose possession they were. But these gentlemen never asked to send a subpœna to George Church, in whose possession the books were. They subpœnaed witnesses from all the other points of the compass before that committee, but they never asked to have Mr. George Church produced. It, therefore, does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say now that these books were not produced. I shall now give to the House the evidence of those who knew the real, actual cost of the construction of the Drummond County road was. First, I will take the evidence of Mr. Greenshields. It is not the strongest evidence, because Mr. Greenshields did not keep the books, but still Mr. Greenshields is a pretty good witness, and he was not contradicted. At page 28, the evidence of Mr. Greenshields, I read as follows :—

Q. What has been the cost of the road up to the present time ?—A. Well, I cannot tell you from memory the total cost. I have sent all the books, and the construction account will show exactly what the road cost. I had the figures from the secretary up to November 30 last, 1897. The construction account up to 30th November, 1897, shows the cost of the road at $1,885,184.54, but there is to be added to that a sum of from $200,000 to $250,000, paid out in December and January on account of construction of the new portion of the line, 42 miles ; so that, in round figures, the construction account, so far as I can get at it now, when we have paid the cost of the 42 miles, and with the $100,000 we are pledged to spend under the temporary lease, will put the cost of the road at from $2,100,000 to $2,250,000. I cannot tell you the exact figures to a dollar, but the secretary will come here and tell you the exact amount.

Q. What is the secretary's name ?—A. Samuel Newton.

That is the evidence of Mr. Greenshields, which goes to show that the actual cost of that road was between $2,100,000 and $2,250,000. At page 133, Mr. Farwell gave his evidence, and by the way, I have a remark to make about Mr. Farwell. We have heard a good deal about Mr. Greenshields being a very prominent Liberal, but I might remark in passing that a meeting which took place at Sherbrooke yesterday at which the leader of the Opposition and some distinguished Conservatives attended, this same Mr. Farwell was present, according to the newspaper report. I have nothing to say against that, and no person can object to it, but, lest I forget, I would point out that if it is true, as charged by gentlemen opposite, that Mr. Greenshields is reaping a tremendous profit out of that road, and that that money has been already expended, or will be in the future expended in the interest of the Liberal party in the federal elections and elections in the province of Quebec, I want to point out that Mr. Greenshields is only a partner, that he only gets his share, that even if there is a tremendous profit, the friends of gentlemen on the other side of the House will get their share, and so these gentlemen need not shed crocodile tears over it, even if it were true. I intend, however, before I have finished, to show that it is not true. Mr. Farwell was under the critical cross-examination of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), and at page 133 I read the following evidence :

Q. And $2,500,000 was all your conscience would allow you to take ?—A. I mentioned the road to-day as worth $2,500,000. Our earnings on a piece of the road for the last three years were $35,000 net per annum, and the capacity of the road for local earnings is equal to the amount we were to receive under such agreement for the road.

That is the evidence of the political friend of gentlemen on the other side of the House. That is the evidence of one of the company, a man who had perfect knowledge of all the transactions concerning this road and as to its cost. I now refer to the evidence of Mr. Newton, who was the secretary of the company, who kept the books from the first day a dollar was expended on this road until it was transferred under the temporary arrangement. At page 46, Mr. Newton says :

Q. That is over the whole ?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, on the whole road, as far as you have received your accounts which are not yet all in, the company has expended $2,000,000 ?—A. When they will all be in, $2,000,000 ; somewhere in the vicinity of that sum.

Q. Will the $2,000,000 include the $100,000 which the Government required the company to expend to bring the road up to standard ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then the $2,000,000 is exclusive of the $100,000 yet to be made under contract with the Government ?—A. I should think it would be about that.

Q. You cannot get an accurate statement ?—A. Yes, sir, in a few days.

Q. With all the vouchers ?—A. Yes.

At page 89 of the evidence, Mr. Newton further deposes :

Q. Just state to the committee what the cost of the Drummond County Railway has been up to the present time ?—A. Up to the 28th February, $1,908,271.33.

These figures were taken from his books. These figures, as I have said before, were given by the man who kept the books from the time the first dollar was expended up to the time they transferred the road under the temporary arrangement, and these figures show that up to that time the expenditure was $1,908,271.33. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), under this agreement, which the House is asked to ratify, made it a condition that above and beyond what they had already expended, they would have to spend $100,000 more in order to bring that road up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. In other words, $100,000 added to the actual cost of construction would bring the cost of the road, according to Mr. Newton, up to $2,008,271.33. These are the figures taken from the books ; these are the figures that cannot be gainsaid by any gentlemen on the other side of the House. Now, what does Mr. Wainwright say about this question. Mr. Wainwright, as you know, is the assistant superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway, and Mr. Wainwright, by the way, was very anxious that this road should not be purchased by the Government, for he would much prefer, in the interests of his own company, that the Government would buy the Grand Trunk Railway or take running powers over it. But, finding that the Minister of Railways was unable to select a better road in the interests of the country and to make a better bargain, and that the Minister had made up his mind to take the Drummond County Railway, Mr. Wainwright, like an honest man, when put in the witness-stand, gave his evidence without prejudice. Mr. Wainwright's evidence is very important indeed, because I do not think we have any person who can throw a better light on this than Mr. Wainwright can, outside, of course, of the witnesss who know the actual amount of the money which had been expended. Mr. Wainwright, at page 48, says :

I might say to you that there are three railways in Quebec constructed under my own supervision, namely, the Beauharnois Junction Railway, which was built in accordance with a subsidy contract, with a light rail of 56 lbs., running from the county of Beauharnois, cost the Grand Trunk Railway Company about $17,000 a mile ; the Champlain Junction Railway, with a 65-lb. rail, and built in the same manner, cost the company between $18,000 and $19,000 per mile ; the Jacques Cartier Railway, which connects the Grand Trunk with the Canadian Pacific Railway in Jacques Cartier, with a 56-lb. rail only, cost the Grand Trunk $19,000 a mile—a little over. I have been over the Drummond County Railway, and will say this much, that the 43 miles recently built is, in my opinion, far superior in construction to the roads I have named. The other portion of it, of course, is not so good, because it carries a lighter rail ; therefore it is not so expensively constructed.

By Mr. Blair :

Q. How does that compare with the other roads you speak of ?—A. The old end of the road, Mr. Blair ?

Q. As it is to-day ?—A. Well, it compares very favourably. The only question with regard to cost would be the question of land damages, which I do not know anything about.

Again, at page 50, Mr. Wainwright is asked:

Q. The rate at which we acquired it is the cheapest, is it not ?—A. I should think so. I think the price agreed upon represents, as far as I remember, about $12,000 a mile, which is certainly a very low price for the railway.

By Mr. Haggart :

Q. How much per mile?—A. I think about $12,000 a mile is the price that is stated. It is a very low figure for a railway of any pretensions.

According to Mr. Wainwright's evidence, this road would cost, at his lowest figure, $2,225,000. We have the estimates of Mr. McLeod, the engineer ; we have the evidence of Mr. Newton, Mr. Farwell, Mr. Greenshields, and Mr. Wainwright, all agreeing that this road did cost over $2,000,000. Now, how does the hon. member for Halifax answer this ? Does he show from the evidence of experts, or people who knew anything about the road, that it did not cost that much, and was not worth $1,600,000 ? No, but he advanced a proposition, which so far as it goes is fair enough, but which does not go

far enough, and does not cover this case. He says the value of the property should be determined by its value to the owner, and not by its value to the purchaser. The truth is that both the value to the owner and the value to the purchaser are to be taken into account in determining the market price of any article. To illustrate this, suppose the hon. member for Halifax had a lot of land adjoining a mill or factory. This lot to him is worth, say, only $500, but to the man who owns the mill or factory, and desires to extend his premises, it is worth $1,000 or more; because if he cannot obtain that, he may have to buy the lot of his neighbour in another direction at perhaps three times the value of the other. If the hon. member for Halifax wanted to sell his lot to the mill owner, he would not be so silly as to ask only $500 for it, but he would try to get what it would be worth to the purchaser. The hon. gentleman's proposition is entirely unfair, and he would not rely on it if he thought he had anything of a case on the evidence. The Drummond County people were in the same position as the hon. gentleman would be in the case I have cited for illustration. They knew that it was the desire of the late Government as well as the desire of the present Government to extend the Intercolonial Railway in the public interest to Montreal; and they knew that of the three available routes the Drummond County Railway was the best, and that public opinion would be behind this or any other Government in making that extension. Therefore, do you mean to tell me that these people did not know that if the Minister of Railways did not buy their road, he would have to make the extension either by the Grand Trunk Railway or by the South Shore Railway, either of which would have cost a great deal more? They were, therefore, justified in asking for the Drummond County Railway every dollar they could get.

But the hon. member for Halifax goes further and says that the Government should have dealt with the Drummond County people on the basis of expropriation. The Government were not in the expropriating business in this matter. They had no authority, as I understand, to expropriate the Drummond County Railway. But even if they had the authority, I take issue with my hon. friend from Halifax in regard to the possibility of making as good a bargain by that means as the one the hon. Minister of Railways has laid before the House. If the Government had authority to expropriate the road, we know that Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Farwell, Mr. Newton, all clever men, would be able to present such an array of evidence as to its value that we would not be likely to get it for $1,600,000 or perhaps even for $2,600,000. We have a very good illustration of the results of expropriation in the case of the purchase of the right of way for the St. Charles Branch, for a distance of 14 miles when the hon. leader of the Opposition was Minister of Railways. Under that beautiful process of expropriation the farmers along that line got from this country $1,000,000 for the land alone. If my hon. friend is not satisfied on this point, I will give him evidence to show that he or any other man on that side of the House should be the last to propose expropriation. I will refer him to page 1225 of "Hansard" of 1888, where he will find the discussion which took place on that question:

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that branch to date?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am ashamed almost to say.

The first time I ever knew him to be ashamed of anything——

The total expenditure up to the 30th June, 1886, was $787,473.47. The expenditure during the year ending 30th June, 1877, was $230,103.78. The expenditure during the two months ending 31st January, 1885, was $55,042.83; total, $1,274,619.31.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To which this $188,000 must be added?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it will be close on $1,500,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the length?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Fifteen miles.

Mr. DAVIES. How much more will be required before the claims cease completely?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are some claims in addition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no tunnel on this that I am aware of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is an enormous cost, and principally consists of what is claimed as land damages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yet we are told the price of property in Quebec is not improving.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government resisted the claim in every possible way. They expended $8,000 for legal expenses, and even brought the cases to the Supreme Court.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In a sense this is satisfactory, as it shows that the value of land within a certain radius of the ancient capital is as dear as at any point of Ontario that I know of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the amount of the claims yet unpaid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A very large sum, indeed—over $500,000.

What are the facts? According to the statement of the leader of the Opposition, 15 miles of the St. Charles branch, the right of way, cost this country over $1,000,000. Now, apply this case to the Drummond County people. Remember that these poor farmers of St. Charles branch had to submit their claims individually—and you know that a farmer, no matter how well off he may be, is not in a position to carry through an expensive lawsuit. Supposing Mr. Greenshields, who is rather a

clever man, were given the opportunity of proving damages, as he would be, if this property were to be expropriated by the Government, do you think he would not make a stronger case than did these farmers along the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman from Halifax must admit that Mr. Greenshields and his associates are less able to prosecute their claims for damages in the courts than were the poor farmers on the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial, or that this Government is far better able to look after the interests of the country than was the former Government, which had to pay these heavy damages. My hon. friend has to take either horn of the dilemma before he can make much headway in his argument for expropriation.

Then, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) resorted to another argument, equally unfair. He said, that the earning powers of a road are a very good test of its value. I admit the correctness of that statement, so far as it goes, but he does not apply his premises fairly. What were the earning powers of this road? The average earning power of the part completed and running amounted to $33.124.28. Therefore, he said, this railway which, according to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), had cost $1,908,000, was yielding on that investment the sum of $33.128. Such was the argument of the hon. gentleman, and he claimed that the line, therefore, was not a very paying concern. But let me point out where his statement is unfair. He makes a comparison between the earning powers of a portion of the road and the cost of the road completed. But the earning powers he referred to were simply those on one-half of the road. They were the earning powers on the branch from Ste. Rosalie to Moose Park, and the Nicolet branch. According to the evidence of Mr. Newton, at page 101, the 28 miles from St. Leonard to Moose Park did not pay at all. The earning power, therefore, applies to only 62 miles of the road, which was the only part paying at the time, and yet the hon. gentleman wants us to conclude that that will be the earning power of the road completed and in full running order. I ask you, Sir, if that is a fair argument. In showing the percentage of profits, he ought to apply that earning power, $33,000, to the 62 miles which actually earned it, and then give us a fair statement of the value of the 28 miles to Moose Park, where the road then ended, and state that there was no connection for 42 miles at all to Chaudière. The amount he gave is, therefore, no criterion at all of what the earning powers of the road will be, as extended and in operation all the way between Chaudière and Montreal. What does Mr. Farwell himself say, in this connection? At page 133 of the evidence he says, on this point:

> I mention the road to-day as worth $2,500,000. Our earnings on a piece of the road for the last three years were $35,000 per year net per annum, and the capacity of the road for local earnings is equal to the amount we were to receive under such agreement for the road.

There is the evidence of Mr. Farwell against the statement of the hon. gentleman, clearly showing that the earning powers on 62 miles of the road is not a fair test of the value of the whole line. But, when we take into consideration the fact that the whole Intercolonial never paid any percentage of profits at all, what becomes of his argument? Every year, under both Governments, there has been a deficit between the ordinary running expenditure and its earnings, except for one or two years. When the Intercolonial is not able to pay expenses, surely my hon. friend cannot make a very strong argument, even if he could show that the Drummond County road is not any better than the rest of the Intercolonial; but, by his own showing, it has yielded a far better return for the money put into it than the whole of the Intercolonial.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McISAAC. At six o'clock I was referring to what I believe to be certain misleading statements of the hon. member for Halifax. I would now refer to another statement of that kind. It is found in the minority report, page 30. It is as follows:—

> Mr. Schreiber's estimate of the cost of the road, if built fairly up to the plans and specifications of the subsidy agreement, is the sum of $1,535,000. Assuming that the road was built up to that standard, it must be remembered that $650,356 of this amount was received in subsidies, and that the balance of $884,644 represents all the money which the company put into the road. The price of $2,094,192, which would have been realized by the company under the agreement of 1897, would have given to the company on this basis a profit of $1,209,548.

I contend that no more misleading statement than that could be made, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should make such a statement. The first figure given is the estimate which Mr. Schreiber made in 1894 of what the road would cost if brought up to the requirements of the Subsidy Act. They assume that that was the cost of the road. But they forget the evidence which shows that, instead of the cost being that estimated by the engineer, the road actually cost, according to the company's books, over $2,008,000. To be fair, the hon. gentleman should give that as the cost of the road. Then, again, they take the subsidy paid from the federal, provincial and municipal sources. I am not going to find fault with that at the present moment, but will say the subsidies were not deducted by the late Government in the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch. And then they conclude:

> The price of $2,094,192, which would have been realized by the company under the agreement

of 1897, would have given to the company on this basis a profit of $1,209,548.

Thus they try to make the House and the country believe that the company, out of their rental of $64,000 a year, which they would get under the first agreement, would realize something over $2,000,000, forgetting the statement put forth by themselves that the present bargain is so much better than the first, because the Government can borrow money much more cheaply than the company can. Now, how can hon. gentlemen, and especially those who signed that report, reconcile their statements? It is absurd to say that out of their $64,000 annual rental, the company could raise the capital amount of over $2,000,000. It is admitted all around that the company could not borrow money at the same low rate of interest that the Government can, and, therefore, the capital amount estimated by hon. gentlemen opposite is erroneous. If hon. gentlemen are going to make an estimate to show how much money the company are making out of the road, they should take the estimate, not of Mr. Schreiber alone, but of Mr. McLeod, whose testimony on this point is far more valuable than Mr. Schreiber's, because, as I stated in the afternoon, he was on the road and travelled all over it. He made the estimate that the road, brought up to the state of efficiency it was in when handed over to the Government under the present agreement would cost $2,225,000. And according to the estimates and figures sworn to by Mr. Newton, Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Farwell, and those who know what actually went into the road, the cost to the company was $2,008,271. They are getting $1,600,000 from the Government, leaving a balance of $408,271 in favour of the Government. So, instead of making a profit, the company are actually losing $408,271. This does not include the subsidies. And I contend we have no right to include the subsidies from federal and provincial sources. The present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) when he was Minister of Railways and Canals carried on the transaction for the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch but did not consider the subsidies that the company received when they were building the road. But I will not insist even upon that point. I will subtract the federal subsidies of $287,000 from $408,000, and even then there is a balance in favour of the Government of over $120,000. This, Sir, is a very much fairer statement, if hon. gentlemen wish to know what the profits of this company would be.

Now, I will refer for a few moments to the question of the option over which the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the other day, spent a great deal of time. He tried to lead this House and this country to believe that he had an option at one time for this road for $500,000, and at another time for $400,000. He gave evidence before the committee, and when he was asked the question whether he understood that the option meant that he could have the road for $500,000 or $400,000, his answer was: Oh, no; I did not say that. His evidence will be found at page 151. The leader of the Opposition took occasion more than once, in this House and out of it, to convey the idea that the company were hawking this road about for the sum of $500,000, and the Government are now giving $1,600,000 for it. The statement is misleading. It is only half the truth, and you know how dangerous it is to give half the truth and conceal the rest. It is true there was an option for $500,000; it is equally true, according to the evidence, that on another occasion there was an option for $400,000; but as explained by the evidence of Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Farwell and Mr. Pope, those figures of $500,000 or $400,000 were simply nominal sums, and the arrangement which the Drummond County people made with Mr. Hugh Ryan and others was that this road was to be disposed of to the late Government for a yearly rental of $100,000, or at the rate of $17,500 per mile when completed. Now we have the evidence of Mr. Greenshields on page 32 on this very point, where he says, referring to this agreement:

> This is only a copy. Mr. Farwell called a meeting of the shareholders of the Drummond County Railway Company about the time that this document was signed. He said to us that he was then negotiating, or was about to open negotiations, through Mr. Hugh Ryan with the Conservative Government for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, and that the negotiations were conducted on the basis of the leasing of the road for $100,000 per annum, to be completed through to Chaudière, or the payment to the company after completion at the rate of $17,500 a mile. He said: "I must have a complete assignment of the stock of the road so that it will be entirely controlled by me. This assignment I propose to give to Mr. Hugh Ryan, who is to conduct the negotiations." A subsequent agreement was made by which, if the road was leased for $100,000 rental, or sold for $17,500 a mile after it was completed through to Chaudière, the cost of the completion was to be deducted out of the difference between $500,000 and the price received, and the total amount remaining was to be divided into three portions, one portion to go to Mr. Farwell and two-thirds of the difference to Mr. Hugh Ryan and his friends, and the one-third going to Mr. Farwell was to be added to the $500,000 which was to represent the real purchase price of the road to the shareholders.

Then again, at page 37, Mr. Greenshields is asked this question:

> Now, do I understand you to say, Mr. Greenshields, that the result, if the negotiations had closed with the Government, would have been financially a better one for the Drummond County Railway than the arrangements you have made with the Government to-day?—A. Undoubtedly it would have been.

Now what is the evidence of Mr. Farwell? By the way, I want to remind the committee again that Mr. Farwell is not a Li-

eral, he is a great friend and supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Q. What were the terms of the verbal agreement ?—A. The understanding was that he (Mr. Ryan) was to undertake to construct—first of all, he was to undertake to effect an agreement for a lease of the road to the Government for $100,000 a year, or a sale for $2,500,000. I will not say he undertook to do it, but that was the condition on which he had this agreement, and on which I signed this option to him. He was then to construct, to furnish the money to construct the road through to Chaudière, and after deducting the expense of that the shareholders were to be paid the amount stipulated in this agreement, and one-third of the profits on the transaction after that was to come to me.

Then again, at page 136, Mr. Farwell was asked this question :

Q. Was there ever any authority given to anybody to sell for $400,000 ?—A. Never.

Now the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, notwithstanding this evidence given before the committee, tried to show that they had an option for this road for the figure of $500,000. I will read the evidence of Mr. Pope, another witness whose testimony will not be discounted by hon. gentlemen opposite :

Q. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that any particular terms were mentioned ?—A. I have often heard Mr. Farwell speak of getting certain terms.

Q. What were they ?—A. $2,500,000—in the vicinity of that.

He was asked again by the chairman :

Q. There was no secret about it. They wanted $2,500,000 of a capital sum, or $100,000 a year ?—A. Yes.

Now, I do not think it is necessary to give any further evidence on this point to show that the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that this road could have been had by the late Government for $500,000, as it stood before the $100,000 was expended upon it, is entirely unfounded. The member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) the other night tried to leave the impression upon the House that while he was Minister of Railways and Canals this road was available at any time for either $400,000 or $500,000. We have his own evidence that he was very anxious at the time to extend the Intercolonial Railway from Lévis to Montreal, for the reasons, as he stated before the committee, that he had a good deal of trouble with the Grand Trunk Railway and with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Lévis, and, therefore, he wished to have the Intercolonial Railway extended to Montreal. He told us that he asked his deputy, Mr. Schreiber, to make an estimate of what that road was worth, and he received from Mr. Schreiber an estimate that that road, which he tried to make us believe could have been obtained by him for $500,000, was worth no less a sum than $1,535,000. What can hon. gentlemen think of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals ? He says that he had been having trouble with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway at Lévis, and was anxious to secure an extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, and he tells us that he could have had that road completed for $500,000, while his deputy told him that the road was worth then $1,535,000. Yet he never did anything. When he found out that the road was worth over a million more than he could have obtained it for, he stopped, and did not take another step. What kind of statesmanship was this for a man who occupied the position of Minister of Railways in this country ? Why did he not take advantage of this great opportunity to get this road at so small a figure ? He could have saved a million dollars, according to his own testimony. But at the same time, under his own eyes, he lost or allowed to be stolen $270,000 on the Curran Bridge at Montreal. He could have saved more—four times more than that sum to the country by buying this road at the estimate of Mr. Schreiber, but he did not buy it though he told us that the road was going begging for $500,000 all these years.

I have shown what the actual cost of this road was from the evidence, which must be admitted by hon. members on both sides of this House ; I have explained away the nature of this option which has also been sought to be misrepresented by some hon. members on the other side of the House. Now, I am going to make a comparison between the cost of other portions of the Intercolonial Railway and the Drummond County Railway. I want to be fair ; I am not going to undertake to say that every section of the road would cost the same amount. I am not going to say that this road ought to be purchased for the sums at which the other portions of the road were purchased, because some portions of the Intercolonial cost more than others. I want to say that a comparison of the price paid for the Drummond County with the prices paid for other sections of the Intercolonial Railway is, to say the least of it, as fair a way of arguing this question as was the argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), who told us that the value of the road to the owners and not the purchaser as well, is the only basis of the value of the road. I will take, first, the Rivière du Loup branch. This branch cost in the vicinity of $17,600 a mile. I put the question to this committee : How much would the Drummond County Railway cost at the price paid for the Rivière du Loup branch when it was purchased ? The Drummond County Railway, 132 miles in length, at the price paid for the Rivière du Loup branch, would cost $2,332,000. In other words, instead of paying $2,332,000 for the Drummond County Railway, the rate paid per mile for the Rivière du Loup branch, we are getting the road for $1,600,-

000. Take the Oxford and New Glasgow branch; this road cost $26,700 per mile. If the Drummond County Railway had cost the same figure as the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, instead of costing this country $1,600,000, it would have cost us $3,537,750. The Cape Breton road cost $33,000 a mile, not including the Narrows bridge or the ferry across the Strait of Canso. At that figure the Drummond County Railway, instead of costing us $1,600,000, would have cost us $4,472,500. Let us take the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial, a railway fourteen miles in length, constructed when the hon. leader of the Opposition was Minister of Railways in this country. That road cost $136,000 per mile, and, at the same figure, the Drummond County would cost about $18,000,000. That includes the right of way as well as the construction. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was fair, I think too fair, when, the other night, he struck off the damages for right of way. It is true the right of way for the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial may have been more expensive than the right of way of the Drummond County, but no person will contend that the price paid by the late Government for the right of way—over $1,000,000—for fourteen miles, could be justified. I read the explanation offered by the hon. leader of the Opposition in 1884, when he actually said that he was ashamed of the cost of this branch and of the right of way. It was the first time that I ever heard that hon. gentleman express sorrow for anything he did as a Minister of the Crown. However, he had to do that, and, on this occasion, I think he was perfectly honest. Fourteen miles of the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial cost this country just $400,000 more than 132 miles of the Drummond County Railway. I would ask hon. gentlemen to compare the record of the hon. leader of the Opposition, when Minister of Railways, with that of the present Minister of Railways, who has been so viciously assailed for the alleged mismanagement of this transaction by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think when a comparison of these records is made it will be found that the hon. leader of the Opposition, when Minister of Railways, did very little to deserve the confidence of the people of this country. Now, Sir, I think it makes no difference from what standpoint you look upon this question. It cannot be contended that the price was extravagant, and it cannot be shown that the Government could have obtained that road for a smaller amount of money than they are paying for it. But hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, but the bargain this year is much more favourable than the bargain of two years ago, and they will try to make it appear that the Senate was justified in throwing out the Bill, and that it is very much to the discredit of the hon. Minister of Railways that the bargain this year is more favourable than that of two years ago. I do not think, assuming even that it is more favourable, that it is any discredit to the hon. Minister of Railways. It shows that the hon. Minister of Railways, when he had an opportunity to make another bargain, put forth again every honest effort to make a better bargain, and, I venture to say that if this bargain is not ratified by this House, or by the other branch of Parliament, the Minister of Railways will again devote his attention to secure every possible concession from the company. If you institute a comparison between these two bargains you will find that the different statements by different hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are not borne out by the facts. Some say that the bargain is $500,000 better than the first bargain, whilst other say that it is $750,000 better than the first. The hon. leader of the Opposition says it is worth a million or more to the country than the first bargain. On what principle they go in these different calculations on a question of simple interest I cannot understand. To my mind, the question is simply this: Under the first bargain of two years ago the Government undertook to lease the Drummond County Railway for ninety-nine years, and they undertook to pay for every year of these ninety-nine years a rental of $64,000, and at the end of the ninety-nine years the road was to become the absolute property of this country, and the country would have no more money to pay. It would simply have to pay the $64,000 every year for ninety-nine years. What is the bargain of to-day. The bargain which the Government proposes to-day is to buy this road out-and-out for a lump sum of $1,600,000. There is quite a difference. In the one case it is the question of an annual rental which includes both principal and interest. In the other it is simple interest on borrowed capital. The first bargain is that, for ninety-nine years, the Government were to pay $64,000, and in ninety-nine years would extinguish both principal and interest. Now, the Government propose to pay $1,600,000 for the road, and it will not be denied that the Government can borrow money at a lower rate of interest than the company, therefore, the Government will have to borrow $1,600,000, and add that to the capital debt of the country. It will have to continue to pay interest—at a lower rate, it is true—but it will have to continue to pay interest until the bonds are redeemed by this country, and at the expiration of the bonds the Government will have to pay in cash the principal amount. So that they are paying a lower rate of interest until the redemption of their bonds, and after that, they pay the principal sum; whilst under the first agreement the $64,000 includes interest as well as, of course, the reduction of the capital year after year for ninety-nine years, until the whole thing is wiped off, and that is the end of it. If hon.

gentlemen will make a calculation on that, they will find that it is not $500,000 or anything near it, and it is just a nice question of arithmetic as to which of the two bargains is the better.

Now, Sir, what has been the result of this temporary arrangement? Will anybody deny that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, both from a financial point of view and from the view of the public convenience and interest, has been a great success. If you compare the expenditure for maintenance and repairs on the Intercolonial Railway, for the two last years of the late Government, with that of the two first years of the present Government, you will find that the present Minister (Mr. Blair) has expended in the vicinity of $300,000 in these two years more than the Conservative Government did, in maintaining and repairing this road. And what is the result of it all? Before the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, the passenger traffic between the east and west, almost without exception was by the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John. The exception then was to see anybody travelling on the Intercolonial Railway, but that order of things is to-day reversed, and the exception is to see any one, unless he has special reasons to go by St. John, travelling on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Before this extension, the Intercolonial Railway was a back number among the railways of this country, but to-day it is in the front van of railway enterprise, and it is useless, in view of the existing state of things, for hon. gentlemen opposite to contend against the principle of extension. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that you will search the parliamentary records of this country in vain to find a case on which so much time and so much energy has been wasted in the vain and hopeless attempt to fasten a charge of corruption and mismanagement against an administration, as has been done by the Opposition in this case. For the last two years these gentlemen have kept up the struggle. Two years ago they commenced by calling this a scandalous, corrupt and extravagant bargain, in which two members of the Government were directly implicated, and by which a huge corruption fund was to be raised for the purpose of carrying federal and provincial elections in the province of Quebec, and, as was stated the other night by the leader of the Opposition, for carrying the elections in New Brunswick also. Well, suppose we admit for the sake of argument that there was some possibility of this, we must remember that there was more than one party to this transaction. Mr. Greenshields is, of course, the man who would be supposed to give a corrupt fund to the Liberal party, but Mr. Greenshields had a partner in the transaction, and this partner was Mr. Farwell, the Conservative organizer of the eastern townships.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) pardon me. Mr. Farwell stated on oath before the committee that he was not the Conservative organizer.

Mr. BERGERON. And never was.

Mr. McISAAC. True, he stated he was not the organizer——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He said he not only was not the Conservative organizer, but that he had very little to do with politics.

Mr. McISAAC. He stated he did not take as active a part in politics as some hon. gentlemen did, but in that respect he put himself on a par with Mr. Greenshields, and they are both in the same position. If he is not an organizer, he is an active and energetic supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and yesterday he was with the leader of the Opposition and other distinguished Conservatives, holding political meetings in the eastern townships.

Mr. BERGERON. No; he left by the morning train.

Mr. McISAAC. If Mr. Farwell was not with them he was not far behind them, and I can tell these hon. gentlemen, that if they think Mr. Greenshields got a huge campaign fund for the Liberal party out of the transaction, it is reasonable to suppose that Mr. Farwell will also keep his share for his Conservative friends. But, Sir, from the evidence given, there is very little margin for Mr. Greenshields or for Mr. Farwell to devote to election funds in the province of Quebec or elsewhere. Two years ago, the Conservative press charged that two Ministers were directly implicated, and they said they had the evidence in their possession. The same charges were insinuated in this House at the time, but not made directly. Encouraged by the tone of the Conservative press, the Senate appointed a committee of inquiry, and what was the result? They organized and they sat, and they adjourned, and they sat again, and at the end of the session they disbanded and nothing was done. Then, a committee was appointed by this House, and it was announced that the Senate committee were watching the House of Commons committee, that the moment it would appear that the Liberal majority on the House of Commons committee would decline to admit the evidence that the Conservatives had, then the Senate committee would proceed. They prowled around day after day like watchdogs over the proceedings of the House of Commons committee, and at the close of that investigation, as is well known to every one in this country, two of the Conservative members of that committee declared, that not only did they not charge corruption, but that they never heard of such a charge being made. The end of the Senate committee that was appointed the second time was, that they disbanded again, and that is the result of all the Conservative talk about corruption. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), in the course of his long speech the other evening, once actually asserted, but

evidently with a faint heart, that he was willing to appeal to the country upon this transaction, and he hoped that the result of that appeal would be to remove the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), in the expectation, no doubt, that he (Mr. Haggart) would take his position. But, Sir, the first hon. gentleman who rose on the Conservative side after the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) had concluded, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) stated to this House, that after hearing the speech of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) he was compelled to support this transaction, and he (Mr. Ross Robertson) stated further, that although the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), for two hours, had said everything he could against the management of the Intercolonial Railway under the present Minister (Mr. Blair), yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) was bound to confess that the present Minister (Mr. Blair) had done more for the Intercolonial Railway than any other Minister of Railways in the past, whether Liberal or Conservative. It is unnecessary for me to say any thing further on this point. The ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) and his friends opposite who support him, have got their answer, from one of their own strongest and most independent supporters in this House. The people of Canada will take no stock in the policy of the Conservative party on this question. The people of Canada are not likely to be in a hurry to discharge the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and to put in his place the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart), whose peculiar administration of the Railway Department is yet fresh in the minds of the people. The electorate of this country have not yet forgotten the Curran Bridge and the Tay Canal, which, in the good old days of Tory corruption, was familiarly known as Haggart's ditch. Hon. gentlemen opposite will have to adopt a waiting policy before they again reach the Treasury benches. They must wait until the people of this country forget their bad record. They must wait in Opposition so long as the people of Canada remember, that the Liberal party in Opposition preferred specific charges of corruption against the Conservative Administration, asked for committees, and proved their charges to be well founded. The people of this country are not slow to distinguish the methods of the two parties in this House. They will not regard as manly political warfare the tactics pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they make wild, extravagant and vague charges. Instead of taking a manly course, making specific charges, if they had any, asking for a committee, and producing their evidence, they invariably conclude by moving the adjournment of the House, in order that they may get an easy way of running out of the House and taking to the woods. That has been their conduct up to date. Not one of them will dare to make any specific charge and back it up with evidence. The public opinion of this country is against these hon. gentlemen, and it will continue to be against them until they change their tactics. This Government is steadily gaining ground in the confidence and esteem of the people of this country. All the by-elections show this, and from all other directions the indications point to the same conclusion. We need not go outside of the four corners of this Chamber to see that public opinion is with us. Hon. members sitting beside and behind the leader of the Opposition changed their seats and are now giving a full support to this Administration; and there are other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who are looking across with longing eyes. The germs of disintegration and decay are spreading with wonderful rapidity and are developing fast among these hon. gentlemen and among their friends in the country. Sir, I do not fear a general election, as has been suggested by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), whether it be this year or next year. So long as the Government whom I support have such a record as they have shown by this Drummond County Railway purchase, so long as their record shall continue as it is up to the present time, they will command the confidence of the people of this country. We will not appeal to the country, Sir, in a state of mutiny, flying at each others' throats; but we will appeal to the electors in the full hope that the record of this Government is such as cannot fail to enlist the sympathy and support of the great majority of those electors.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Mr. Chairman, I have followed with a great deal of interest the remarks of the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). But, notwithstanding the closeness with which I have followed him, I have failed to observe what connection there is between ratting from this side of the House to the other and a justification of the Drummond deal. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman sees a necessary logical connection between the two, and I presume, from its attention, that the House sees probably as much connection between these two subjects as between his speech and the merits of the deal generally.

Sufficient of detail has been entered into, I think, without my wearying the House with further elaborate detail. In order that those who are not from the maritime provinces, however, may obtain an intelligent grasp of this question, I shall state a few facts which, to us who come from the maritime provinces, are unnecessary to be stated, but which may serve to elucidate the question for those hon. gentlemen who represent the west. The Intercolonial Railway, I may say, was a system composed of about 1,141 miles of railway. Its chief oceanic terminals were at the seaports of St. John and Halifax. Its western terminals, which connected it with the great continental systems of railway, were at the port of St.

John and at Lévis, in the province of Quebec. All traffic originating on the Intercolonial system and destined for Montreal or points west, had to seek interchange with the Canadian Pacific Railway at the city of St. John, or with the Grand Trunk Railway at the town of Lévis; and, vice versa, all traffic originating at Montreal or points west and destined to points on the Intercolonial, had to be interchanged either at Lévis with the Intercolonial, or at St. John with the Intercolonial.

It may be necessary to state the distances, in order that you may fully understand the argument. From St. John to Montreal, via the Canadian Pacific Railway, the distance is 481 miles. From St. John to Montreal, via the Intercolonial Railway and its extension to Montreal, the distance is 740 miles. The town of Moncton occupies a pivotal point on the Intercolonial Railway system. It is the point at which the branch to the city of St. John diverges from the main line to Halifax. From Moncton to Montreal, by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the distance is 570 miles; and by way of the Intercolonial the distance is 650 miles. From Halifax to Montreal, by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial to St. John, the distance is 758 miles; the distance, by the Intercolonial Railway and the present extension to the city of Montreal, is 837 miles. The advantages, therefore, are as follows:—The Canadian Pacific Railway has an advantage, in respect to transportation from Montreal to St. John, of no less than 250 miles; the pivotal point of Moncton has an advantage of 81 miles; and all the eastern section of the Intercolonial, between Moncton and Halifax, Sydney and Pictou, has an advantage of 81 miles, as has also the city of Halifax. Now, previous to the initiation of the policy of the present Minister of Railways, through traffic originating on the Intercolonial, and through traffic originating at points west of Montreal, which was destined to or from points on the Intercolonial, were interchanged, as I have said, at the port of St. John or at the town of Lévis. The greater portion of this through traffic was interchanged at Lévis. In the course of time, owing to the lack of business tact, or owing to the lack of desire to accommodate, on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway, the communication by Lévis became very imperfect. Freight was detained, express passenger trains failed to make necessary connections, and it seems that the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) had in view an extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. So far, then, as the general policy of the Intercolonial extension to the city of Montreal is concerned, there does not seem to be any radical or basal difference between the hon. gentleman who now presides over the Department of Railways, and the ex-Minister of Railways. These drawbacks to which I have referred, and these delays in the transportation of freight and passengers made the present question a live one, and, when the present Minister of Railways came into power, he took into consideration, soon after his advent to office, the desirability of an extension to Montreal.

Now, in order to grapple with the question intelligently, let us consider the problem that presented itself to the Minister of Railways and Canals. With a terminal at Lévis, there were opened up to him the two following methods of transportation to Montreal—first, by means of the Grand Trunk Railway around by Richmond Junction and then by Montreal, which was about nine miles longer than the present system; and also the water transportation by means of the St. Lawrence. In addition to these two methods, there was in contemplation a third route. That route would have been completed—and some day, doubtless, will be completed—by the construction of a bridge at the city of Quebec. To the construction of this bridge both parties in this country are more or less pledged. So far, then, as the question of through freight is concerned, the extension to Montreal meant no more, except so far as freight originating at or destined to the city of Montreal was concerned, than had the Intercolonial Railway its terminal at Lévis. But concede that it was desirable and is desirable that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended to the city of Montreal, there were four methods open to the hon. Minister.

First, there was the traffic arrangement. This great system of the Intercolonial Railway—great in its importance as respects the maritime provinces—could have effected virtually an entrance into the city of Montreal by an adequate traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway for the interchange of traffic between them at the town of Lévis. The second course open to the Intercolonial Railway officials was to obtain running rights, which might be a subject of agreement between the Intercolonial Railway authorities and the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway, or, in case of failure to arrive at what would be a fair agreement, might have been a subject of an order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council granting to the Intercolonial Railway running rights, on terms that might be fair and adequate for the Grand Trunk Railway, to the city of Montreal. There was a third scheme that was open. The Intercolonial Railway could have constructed a line from Lévis to Montreal. The fourth scheme was that the Intercolonial Railway authorities could have purchased or leased a line and terminals in order to complete the system.

Now, Sir, so far as the traffic arrangement is concerned there seems to be a disposition on the part of some to say that this is entirely inadequate. But I have no hesitation in saying that if this business Government were disposed to act on business principles, if they were disposed to act on

the same principles as railway companies observe under similar circumstances, there would have been no difficulty between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway that could not easily have been overcome. My authority for that statement is this—that it is to-day, and has been for a long time the custom between great railways in the United States to arrive at just such agreements as this.

However, suppose that we concede that it would be impracticable to make an arrangement of that kind. I ask, then what there was impracticable about the second scheme—that is to obtain running rights over these roads to effect an entrance into the city of Montreal? At the present time the Wabash Railway in the United States and the Grand Trunk itself have a traffic arrangement extending over 200 miles. It might be said that the terminals at Montreal would be crowded and that great inconvenience to the Grand Trunk would result. Against that I could cite a great many instances in the United States of two or more railways using the same terminals. Why, in the city of Chicago to-day, there are the following occupying one set of terminals:—The Wisconsin Central, the Northern Pacific, the Chicago and Great Western, and the Baltimore and Ohio—all great leading highways in the western states. We have also, occupying one station, the Michigan Central and the Illinois Central. Also on the eastern coast of the continent occupying the same terminals, we have the Reading, the New Jersey Central, and the Lehigh Valley. Again, in Chicago, we have, occupying the same terminals, the Chicago and West Illinois, the Chicago and East Illinois, the Chicago and Grand Trunk, the Chicago and Erie, the Atchison, the Louisville, New Albany and Chicago, and the Chicago and Wabash. It is not necessary for me to go further in citing cases of United States systems. I appeal to the practice in Canadian centres. To-day, in the city of Toronto, we have the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific occupying the same station and using the same terminals. The Minister of Railways and Canals said it would have been a very harsh thing to take the Grand Trunk Railway by the throat and force upon them an arrangement of that kind. From that position I entirely dissent. I dissent, in the first place, on the general theory of railroads, which it is well known prevails universally in this country and in the great republic to the south of us and in every civilized country on the globe to-day. Why, what is the theory of railroads in Great Britain—and I shall not pursue this theoretical discussion at too great length as it may savour somewhat of an academic nature? I find that from the time the first railway company was incorporated down to the year 1840, the theory underlying the railway system of the country was this—that each and every man in Great Britain, and each and every corporation had a right to run its trains and engines on any railway without respect to the person to whom the road belonged. Not only that, but under the Railway Clauses Act of 1845, which stands upon the British statute-books still unrepealed, the theory of British law is that any man or corporation in Great Britain can employ his engine and train and run it on any railroad subject to reasonable tolls that the company which owns the road-bed and terminals may impose. The same thing applies to the countries on the European continent that have great railway systems. But we need not consider these instances abroad; we can come nearer home. And, approaching home, what do we find? In this very city of Ottawa, this course that the Minister of Railways and Canals has denounced as harsh and tyrannical has been pursued; and here we see the Canada Atlantic Railway, with vested rights in the Central Station, under an order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council forced to admit to the user of its terminal the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also, I am informed, through the newspaper, though it is not yet a matter of public record, the Ottawa and New York Railway. Here, then, we have an illustration made by the Minister of Railways and Canals himself, of what he considers to be a harsh and tyrannical exercise of power. These franchises were granted to the Grand Trunk for what? For the benefit of the people. The Grand Trunk Railway Company was made a trustee for the people of this country. And, Sir, the theory underlying all railway systems in English-speaking countries justifies that they should be forced, in the exercise of that trust, to admit to these benefits, on reasonable terms, any applicant who can make out a reasonable case. Therefore, all that was necessary was for the Intercolonial Railway authorities to obtain running rights, by agreement if possible, or, if that were not practicable, by an order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The power to give such an order as this is conferred by the Railway Act to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Under section 11, subsection F, this Railway Committee have the right to make regulations for the use by one company of the tracks or station grounds of another; and companies, as defined by the Act, include any person having authority to operate a railway. And by the second section of that Act, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council are authorized to make regulations for running powers or haulage over the lines of one company by other companies. But when the matter came before the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), he decided that he would not exercise the rights he had, but would resort to purchase or lease. There were at that time three ways by which the Intercolonial could

have got into the city of Montreal. There was, first, the Atlantic and Lake Superior, which was not then constructed, but was subsidized and which was pushing its line through to the same terminal point; there was, second, the Drummond County Railway, and third, the Grand Trunk Railway. These roads are substantially equal in length. Yet, without any adequate or regular inquiry, the Minister of Railways selected the Drummond County road and the leasing of the Grand Trunk from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal.

Let us look for a moment at the Drummond County road, and see in what position it was. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) discussed very fully this matter, but at the risk of repetition, I will enter upon its discussion again. The Drummond County line was built as a mere lumber road. The gentlemen who inaugurated that scheme had no idea at the time of doing anything else than build a road which would afford them access to their lumber lands in the counties contiguous to the line of railway. Afterwards it began to dawn upon them that they might do better than construct a mere lumber road, that there might be a good speculation in extending it, and at the time they entered into negotiation with the Government, there were ninety miles of the railway completed—seventy-three miles of the main line and a branch of seventeen miles, which ran down to the St. Lawrence, and forty-three miles not constructed, or, in fact, not begun. Financially, the road was bankrupt. Its construction had been entered upon away back in 1889, and during the nine years in which that railway, or parts of it, had been in existence, not at any time—and I bring this matter to the attention of the House to show what an absolutely bankrupt affair it was—not in one single year had there ever been a dividend of a solitary cent declared, although they showed earnings, year after year, in their sworn reports to the Government. This one-horse road had as an equipment on its ninety miles of railway one first-class car, one second-class car, one baggage car, five engines, nine box cars and twenty flat cars. This was the total equipment of this magnificent railway. Its average net earnings in 1897, as stated in its sworn return, were $33,101.61. I give the exact cents, as they are very important, considering the fact that the undertaking was worth nothing. Averaging the three years, including 1897, the net revenue on that railway was $33,124.28. I make bold to declare that there was not during all that time—and I challenge contradiction from any hon. gentleman opposite—one dollar of that earnings bona fide to show for the company's operations. Later on I will touch upon that matter, and show exactly the method of reasoning and illustration by which I arrive at this conclusion.

As respects its passenger traffic, this road, with its magnificent equipment, that has been swelled by the imagination of the Minister of Railways to an important, great trunk line, had been practically stationary for six years. There was a little annual variation—at times higher and at times lower—but substantially there had not been any increase during the space of six years. Its freight traffic consisted of tan bark, lumber, pulp wood and such like unprofitable kinds of freight, which are the lowest kind of freight a railroad can have. It is freight that is subjected to the lowest traffic rates a railway can charge. But in making up this showing a net revenue of $35,101.61, the company acted upon a peculiar system. I have drawn the attention of the House to the fact that this freight was the cheapest any company could carry, but if you allowed every ton of that freight to pass over every mile of the railway, if you gave it the longest haul possible, you then would have a freight rate of no less than 7-10ths of a cent per ton per mile, which is considerably in excess of the general average tariff for this class of freight on the railways of the eastern part of the United States. It is considerably in excess of the average on those great trunk railways that run from New York, Baltimore and Pennsylvania to Chicago and points west.

I have already stated that there was no bona fide surplus of earnings on this line, and shall proceed to make good that assertion. In the first place, that road was run so cheaply and kept in such a condition that the lowest normal rate of expenditure by railways in Canada on maintenance was far in excess of the charges upon it. Take the railways of Canada as a whole, and we find that the cost of maintenance of the line and buildings is $460 per mile, and this magnificent Drummond Railway was kept in repair at what rate? Not at $460 per mile—the average of the roads of Canada, good, bad and indifferent—but at an annual expenditure of only $186. Therefore, there was expended upon it annually only 40 per cent of what is required as the normal expenditure in keeping the average line or railway in Canada in suitable condition. Such was the case as regards the cost of maintenance, but let us see what the working expenses and repairs of engines cost. The average expenditure on roads throughout the whole of Canada on working expenses, repairs to engines and maintenance, is $650 per mile, and this bankrupt road did not expend even the half part of the average of Canadian roads. Instead of expending $656 per mile, it only expended $229 per mile for this purpose.

Now we come to the car repair expenditure. While the average expenditure over the roads of Canada, good, bad and indifferent, was $185 per mile, what was the expenditure on this magnificent road, which has been compared to the great highways in the United

States, to the most excellent portions of the Intercolonial Railway, and the most notable portions of the great western roads ? They did not expend any such paltry sum as $185 per mile on the repairs of cars. No, Sir, their expenditure swelled to the magnificent amount of $29 a mile. Now, when we come to general operating expenses, the average general operating expenses on railroads in Canada, good, bad or indifferent, are $824 per mile ; similar expenses upon the Drummond road during the same year, were about one-third as much, or $277 per mile. Then, if the road bed had been properly maintained, if it had had its full quota of section men, if it had had its full quota of gravelling every year, if it had had its full quota of car repairs, of engine repairs, of general operating expenses, instead of there being a surplus, there would have been a deficit of quite a large amount.

But not only that. I will prove to this House that there is fraud in these returns, deliberate fraud, and I have no hesitation in stating it. How do I make that out ? If any hon. gentleman in this House will take the trouble to look into the sworn railway returns, he will find that in the year 1895 their capital expenditure had been about completed ; in that year there were 89·53 miles of the railway completed. The subsidies had all been drawn with the exception of the Quebec subsidy, over which there was some little question, but not on account of the completion of the line, or of the requirement on the part of the Quebec Government to make further outlay upon capital account. Well, Sir, at that time we find the total cost of the line had been $1,346,011.76. Now without having a solitary foot of that line to complete, with the capital expenditure already made so that these gentlemen who controlled that railway were able to draw their subsidies, when the sworn statement is completed to the satisfaction of the engineers of the Government, what do we find ? They profess still to make large capital outlays upon it. Why, these capital outlays are a pure fiction. What were they ? They were outlays made in necessary repairs of the road from year to year, outlays that should have been charged against revenue. And why were they charged to capital ? Simply because these gentlemen had in mind the floating of a scheme, and the robbing of some person or persons, or some Government, and their object was to make appear as large a surplus as possible so as to give the road a fictitious commercial value that in truth it did not possess. There is nothing exceptional about this. I am not going to say that Mr. Greenshields and these other gentlemen associated with him are rogues, and thieves and rascals. Unfortunately for the tone of public life on this continent, especially in the republic to the south of us, and in this Canada of ours, this system of what I may call commercial freebooting in railways, is looked upon as respectable. The day will come, I trust, when that sentiment will change. But just the same as in the days of Queen Elizabeth, Drake, Hawkins and Frobisher gathered wealth and accumulated vast fortunes by feebooting, or buccaneering and pirating on the Spanish main, and it was regarded as respectable and their actions met with the favour of their sovereign ; so, to-day society regards these men who make money by commercial freebooting, as most honourable. We are simply adopting the methods so prevalent in the republic to the south of us. I have by this time, I think, left the idea upon the House that my opinion, at least as a member of the committee, was that this whole transaction was a bogus one. I will give you an illustration that these men were not serious. We have the evidence of Mr. Farwell. Mr. Farwell gives his version of things, and Mr. Greenshields confirms it, on pages 32, 36 and 37 of the evidence taken before the committee. These gentlemen deliberately tell us what the scheme was, and I call the attention of every hon. gentleman in this House to that scheme. If it is not freebooting, if it is not fraud, if it is not deception, if it is not cheating, then I do not know what it is. We see they had put, according to these gentlemen's testimony, an estimated value upon the road of $2,500,000. Then they say they were going to add to that the subsidy they were to receive, a further subsidy from this Government of $145,984, if they could obtain it, and I think they had signed the contract for it—putting a total valuation on the road completed of $2,645,984. Now, what do they say ? They say : We intended to complete the road, say for the sum of $650,000, and to leave a net balance of $1,995,000. From this they were going to deduct $500,000 and give it to the ordinary shareholders. Then, what were they going to do with the balance ? Why, Sir, tell it not in Gath, proclaim it not in Askelon ! These gentlemen who pretended they had a valuable asset in this road, which value is endorsed by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and by the gentlemen associated with him, actually proposed this absurd scheme to give to Mr. Hugh Ryan, $998,651 to sell the road, and to keep $498,661 for themselves. Adding that to the $500,000 which I have already spoken of, the shareholders, big fish and little fish, would get altogether out of the concern $997,322, and Mr. Hugh Ryan would get $1,300 more, or $999,651. Yet we are to believe this to be legitimate business.

These gentlemen are relying upon construction account. I may say that we have not the details before us, and I am not going to inquire into this feature of the transaction at any great length ; we have not the details before us that warrant me in making a positive statement in respect to this construction account. But I will say that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Borden), and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and myself, endeavoured time and again to get this construction account, and could not. There was an item of $729,

314.52 which was transferred into the books of the company from the books of the partnership firm which built the road whose members were the only shareholders of the company, but how that amount was made up, or what the items really were, we are in darkness to this day, although we tried time and again to get the books containing the figures. Now, Sir, there is something very fishy about this account, and I call the attention of the House to it. Gentlemen who are acquainted with railway methods in the republic to the south of us, here meet an old acquaintance, the fakir, a construction company. Now, Sir, what is a construction company? Down south, when they wish to defraud the public by swelling their capital account, they take the clerks of directors, and the leading stockholders, and they form a company, and to this company they let the contract for the construction at two or three times what it is worth; and then in making up the capital account, or the construction account, they charge the fictitious amount and not the real outlay. I will simply cite to this House two instances of this gigantic fraud. In the case of the South Pennsylvania Railway, which was constructed by the Vanderbilt Construction Company, which company was composed almost entirely of Vanderbilts and Webbs' clerks, actually cost $6,500,000. It was proved by the sworn testimony of the men engaged in it before the Hepburn Committee in New York state that when it was charged up to capital account the cost of construction of the railway was charged up as bona fide outlay, not of $6,500,000 but of $15,000,000. Bonds were floated upon the market, and the moneyed men and brokers of England, of France and of Germany were swindled to the tune of $40,000,000 on bonds issued upon this capitilization. I will give another case. The Central Pacific Railway was built also by a construction company. The amount actually paid out for construction of the railway was $58,000,000, and there was charged up to capital $139,000,000. So in this item of $729,000 I have no hesitation in saying that I can draw an inference, and, I wish to be guarded in this matter; it is not a matter of positive evidence; it is a deduction I make, and an inference from the facts and figures presented, but I have no hesitation in saying that in this $729,000 there is a fictitious capital construction account to the amount of $400,000. I shall say nothing further about the construction value, except to treat for a moment of the valuation placed upon the road by Mr. Schreiber. When Mr. Schreiber was put upon the stand he gave as his valuation $1,535,000 for the road when completed. This is a matter that has been dwelt upon by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), and I am not going to follow him in that discussion other than to say that when Mr. Schreiber made that estimate it was an estimate of the road if constructed up to the full requirements of the subsidy contract, which meant in accordance with the specification, the profiles, facts and figures in his office. Whether that road was constructed up to the full measure of the contract, whether it met the requirements of the Subsidy Act or not, Mr. Schreiber knew no more than any other man because he had never made any inspection of that road in his life. But that is not enough for the hon. member for Antigonish, and he went on to quote the valuation of Mr. McLeod. Mr. McLeod may be all that the hon. gentleman claims him to be. I say nothing against his honour. He may be the soul of truth; I have no doubt of his veracity, but when Mr. McLeod is held up as a gentleman who is exact in his figures, who had made a thorough investigation of this road and an estimate that ought to command the respect of every man in this House, I say as a humble member of this House that I most positively demur. That gentleman, Mr. McLeod, and I am not going to deal unjustly with him, not only gave one estimate, but he gave three or four estimates differing from each other as widely as absolute guesses will differ, although the hon. member for Antigonish informed the House that this gentleman made a scientific investigation of the cost of the construction of this road, I cannot help thinking that if the hon. gentleman is not mistaken he is wilfully misrepresenting the facts to this House. Let us trust that he is mistaken. I have a few facts and figures by which I will test Mr. McLeod. Mr. McLeod's theories or estimates and valuation of this road are not borne out by the result. These gentlemen have not taken the pains to get the facts and figures given in the returns of this road. If they had they would have seen that in 1896 to the first day of July on the whole of the road completed, with the exception of 43 miles, and on this the total capital expenditure was $1,366,485. They would have found also by reference to the returns given in the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals brought down for this year the statement that the outlay up to July 1st, 1898, was $1,908,261. That shows that the capital expenditure between these two dates was $541,775. That sum represents more than the cost of the 43 miles that by express agreement was to be built up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. It was far beyond the subsidy standard that Mr. Schreiber speaks of. Out of that $541,775, $35,000 was expended to make certain changes in the old line, so that leaves a total of $506,775. That outlay was incurred, we will suppose, in the construction of these 43 miles up to the standard of the Intercolonial. Where is Mr. McLeod? That makes the cost per mile of the construction of this railway up to the standard of the Intercolonial $11,786. Yet, Mr. McLeod went on

the stand and swore that $16,000, $17,000, and I think as high as $18,000 was a fair estimate of the cost of the construction of the railway generally. I give that as an illustration of the amount of credence—I am not using the term offensively—that must be placed in the statements of Mr. McLeod. Mr. McLeod is also candid enough to tell us further, which was concealed—I will not say wilfully, but actually concealed by the hon. member for Antigonish—that he never made an inspection of the road, never measured a solitary dump, never measured a cutting, never measured a bit of masonry on the line, but that he simply jotted down statements, perhaps sitting on the bank, and trusting to his memory, basing his judgment on casual observations made by him of banks that were miles and miles away. He had never inspected or measured the road or the materials, and in this way he arrived at an estimate six or eight thousand dollars in excess of the real cost of the road. At this particular stage I would like to remind the House that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did me the honour to refer to a statement I made in the House in 1897. That statement I quote from the unrevised "Hansard" of May 9th, 1899:

> Then we come to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), whom I do not see in his place at present. He said:
>
> "When it is proposed to pay $1,150,000 over and above the expenditure upon the road, that is a transaction that cannot be justified, and concerning which the wholesome sentiment of this country will be very suspicious indeed as to the motives that prompted the Government to enter into it."

I do not retract one jot or tittle of that sentiment. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals proceeds:

> That is what the hon. member for Westmoreland said about it. I pass by also the suggestion—the utterly offensive and visionary suggestion—that we were to pay $1,150,000 over and above the expenditure on the road, but before I conclude, I propose to show that that was entirely unfounded, whether he will acknowledge it or not.

The statement I made to this House on that occasion was that the amount of money that these gentlemen had paid out of their own pockets, giving them credit for the amount of the floating indebtedness on the property and adding to the floating indebtedness the amount I then estimated it would take to complete the road there was a balance of profit of $1,150,000. I made that statement then; I make it now. It is a correct statement. I do not think it redounds to the honour of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to take a garbled extract from a speech and place in my mouth words that are qualified by the context. As qualified by the context the statement is correct; the garbled statement I am not responsible for. I do not care what the construction value of this road is; I deny that the construction value is a true test. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has given a statement of the law; I will quote the authority. Hon. gentlemen opposite will find it in the third edition of Cripps, a most authoritative text-book on compensation or expropriation. And, Sir, when I make this statement to the House, as a statement that has been universally acted upon by English jurists of late years, I want the House to remember that this statement is a stronger statement in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite than if the statement merely regarded the matter of purchase; because, when you are taking property away from a man, the courts of the country have recognized that there should be some solatium, and that not its ordinary market value, but the full measure of valuation to that man, should be paid. Here is a statement of the law:

> The basis only of compensation for lands required or taken should be assessed as their value to the owner at the date of the notice to treat and not their value when taken by the promoter.

Again, I quote from the judgment of Cockburn, Lord Chief Justice of England, in Stebbings vs. the Metropolitan Board of Works (Law Reports, 6, Queen's Bench, 37):

> When Parliament gives compulsory powers, and provides that compensation shall be made to the person from whom the property is taken for the loss he sustains, it is intended he should be compensated to the extent of his loss, and that his loss shall be compensated by what was the value of the thing to him, not by what will be of value to the person acquiring it.

By an unbroken series of decisions in England, under circumstances less favourable to the Government than the present, the correct method of valuing property is to give the value to the person from whom it is taken. Now, what was the value of this road to the Drummond County Railway Company? For nine years, as I have shown, it did not return to the pockets of the shareholders one solitary cent, and the probability was that it never would. The company themselves recognized that they had an elephant on their hands, after the road had served its purpose as a lumber railway. They found that they were unable to carry out a scheme which they had contemplated, of selling it to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and they then commenced a regular method of hawking it around the country in vain attempts to sell it to some person. They gave an option to Mr. Farwell for $500,000—that is, for the railroad in its then condition. They gave an option to another person for $500,000. They gave an option to Mr. Maze for $400,000, I am informed, though the exact amount does not appear in the evidence. They gave another option to Mr. Pope for $500,000. They gave an option to Mr. Greenshields for $500,000, and Mr.

Farwell, on his oath before the committee, stated, that there was an option of $400,000, and Mr. Haggart, in his evidence, stated, that he knew of an option for $400,000. But even at this they were unable to sell this railroad. With a bankrupt concern upon their hands, the shareholders could not get any respectable financiers to handle the road, and so they became disheartened. And what was the result? In their pitiable condition, they actually appealed to Mr. Greenshields, thinking he had command of the money market and could borrow for them moneys in order to complete their work. What did they do? Let me tell the House, that the total capital stock of this railroad was $400,000, and they actually donated to Mr. Greenshields—without one solitary cent of tangible consideration, except the mere imaginary consideration of his advice and his influence in the money market, which turned out to be absolutely nil—they donated to Mr. Greenshields $50,000 of the capital stock of this railway, which $50,000 represents one-eighth of the whole transaction, subject to about $100,000 floating indebtedness at that time. But, Sir, it is worse still than that. Even while they were negotiating with the Conservative Government, or, rather, while they were approaching Mr. Haggart, what happened? The bank was pressing them at that time, because a large amount was due to the bank. Their concern was bankrupt; it was not an asset that they could hypothecate with any moneyed man, for the bank itself was anxious to get out of the rut it was in; and so one gentleman, a large shareholder, actually sold $80,000 of stock, or one-fifth of the whole railroad, to Mr. Greenshields for $24,000. That is this magnificent road that gentlemen opposite now speak about. Mr. Greenshields comes out of the transaction with $80,000 plus $50,000, or $130,000, almost within one or two thousand dollars of one-third of the total ownership of the road; Mr. Greenshields gets that for $24,000, and for his share he would have a net gain of about $400,000 under the first agreement of sale with the Government. Of course, at that time there was considerable work to be done to the road, but my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) would have this country believe—I heard him state it audibly enough for us on this side of the House to hear him—that at that time there were only 49 miles of this railway completed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), in saying that, made a statement that is at complete variance with the facts, and no man knows it better than himself, because he has in his department the reports which show that statement to be most extremely fallacious and unreliable. Instead of there being 49 miles of the road then completed, there were 89·53 miles completed, almost within a fraction of one mile as much completed as there was at the time the negotiations with this company were closed by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). At that time the floating indebtedness of the concern was somewhere between $178,000 and $133,000. The Minister (Mr. Blair) admits that the statement of the Opposition about the road being offered for sale for $500,000 at that time is correct. But there is a new star in the firmament, to light and glory born—a star not rising in the east, but in the far west—and that hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) tells the House, that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and myself, and Mr. Haggart, not only put falsehoods in the minority report of the committee, but actually published them to the country. There is his leader declaring a week before, on the floor of this House, that at that particular time the road had been offered for $500,000, and the only statement of the Minister (Mr. Blair) respecting it was to charge the leader of the Opposition with not being frank in giving to the country the whole facts, because that was for a half-constructed railway, whereas the offer he (Mr. Blair) had made was for the railroad complete.

I come now to the first agreement that was made with the Drummond County Railway. The hon. gentleman from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) found fault with our method of capitalization. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think much fault can be found with that, for, in order that the matter should be lifted above party spirit, in order that there should be no question as to the exactness of these figures, we had the Deputy Minister of Finance brought before the committee. He did not seem to be mathematician enough to solve the problem—although, to my mind, it is a simple question in mathematics—and he being unequal to the task, we summoned Mr. Fitzgerald, who presides over the department of insurance, and Mr. Fitzgerald gave us a statement he had worked out as to the value, based upon the borrowing powers of this Dominion on the last loan we had floated. He gave the equivalent of the ninety-nine years' annuity which the Minister of Railways had agreed to pay for the Drummond County Railway, at $2,094,192.

Now, when this large amount of money is proposed to be given for a road which is really worth commercially only $500,000 at the very outside estimate—because it was worth nothing commercially before this latter expenditure—which was made in order to complete it—then the enormity of the transaction will be appreciated by the House. I can safely say that of all the railroad deals which have taken place in this country so far this is the cap-sheaf, barring I may say the agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway. Bad as was the agreement with the Drummond, the agreement with the Grand Trunk was a great deal worse. The agreement with the Grand Trunk we may divide, so far as the subject matter of the lease is concerned,

into three parts: first, the terminals at Montreal; secondly, the Victoria Bridge; and thirdly, the thirty-one miles of line from Victoria Bridge to Ste. Rosalie. Now, the Minister proposes to pay for the terminals $62,500; for the Victoria Bridge $40,000, and for the thirty-one miles of railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, $37,500. This rental was on a 5 per cent basis, on a valuation which had been made by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canalas. This, I claim, was a most improvident bargain. The rentals on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond Railway together amount to $210,000. This, capitalized at 5 per cent, would amount to $4,200,000. Now, our borrowing capacity is not at the rate of 5 per cent, but at the rate of 2½ per cent, according to the last loan negotiated; and at that rate this annual rental capitalized would come to the large amount of $7,300,000, or a loss, with respect to these rentals alone, of a capital of no less than $3,100,000. Now, we come to the terminals at the city of Montreal. Mr. Schreiber was put upon the stand, and was asked by myself and other members of the committee whether he had looked into this matter. Well, he had gone to Montreal. We asked him if had taken any pains to arrive at the figures as to the user the Government would have at Montreal. He candidly said he had not. It was the merest guesswork on his part. We placed on the stand Mr. Wainwright, and got from him the fact that the user of the terminals, so far as the working had gone under the terms of the contract, amounted, for the two months, to 99,107 cars for the Grand Trunk and 4,381 cars for the Intercolonial, or 1-22nd of the Grand Trunk user. And yet the Grand Trunk was making us pay rental on one-half the terminals, and was computing that rental at 5 per cent.

Leaving the terminals, I shall not discuss the bridge, because I will be candid enough to say that I consider the rental for the bridge a fair transaction. I do not think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals agreed to pay too much for the bridge when he agreed to pay $40,000. While it may be a little high, it was as fair a bargain as we might expect.

I come now to the consideration of the thirty-one miles from the bridge to Ste. Rosalie. If there is one feature of this transaction worse than another, more worthy of condemnation than another, it is the feature dealing with this particular piece of road from the bridge to Ste. Rosalie. How did the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and his deputy work this out? In the first place, they put a valuation on that particular thirty-one miles. Let me tell this House and hon. gentlemen who have not been over that railroad that the country through which it runs is as level as water—that it is nothing more nor less than a mere prairie railroad, well constructed, but a prairie road as respects its profile. And what valuation did they put on that road? They put a valuation upon it of no less than $50,000 a mile, with no terminals whatever and not any rolling stock. Capitalize that at 2½, and what do we find? We find that its cost comes to $1,304,000. I have consulted eminent engineers, men who are recognized authorities in this country, and gentlemen who have contracts on hand, in regard to this feature of the transaction. Here is the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), who had been engaged in large contracts, and who has no hesitation in saying that that road could be built—that is, the bare roadway, without any rolling stock—for $15,000 a mile. But we will put it at $16,000; and we find that that portion of road could be built for $500,000. Yet we are agreeing to pay, not for the road, but for one-half of the user of the road, not $500,000, which would have built the whole road, but $1,304,347. We are giving a sum of money that would have almost built three such roads, and we do not get half the road, but only half the user, subject to the conditions which hedge it around. We must use it under the direction of the Grand Trunk Railway. We pay for three times the value of the whole road, and the Grand Trunk will regulate the running of trains on it. When the Minister of Railways and Canals in 1897 stated that one of the great features of this arrangement was the local traffic on this line, he either inadvertently or knowingly misled this House; for we have not the right to put on one solitary local train between Montreal and Ste. Rosalie. We can put on nothing but through trains. Now, I come to another phase which is nearly as bad as the last. Under section 3—and it is section 3 in both the old and new agreements—and under section 19 in both the old and the new agreements, the Government contribute, according to engine and car mileage, towards the maintenance of all the terminal facilities; and the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) read to the House a statement of what these terminal facilities were. I think it was given in sworn evidence before us that the terminal facilities in Montreal were 60 miles of tract, 150 acres of land and an immense series of sheds and outbuildings for the accommodation of sheep, cattle and traffic generally; and while the extravagant estimate of the Minister and his deputy was that we might use ten acres and some few miles of track, I call the attention of the House to the fact that we are not limited by the terms of this most extraordinary agreement in our contribution to what we use, but that our contribution is towards the maintenance of the whole terminal facilities according to wheelage, engine and car passing over any part of the terminals. So for the Government has contributed,

according to the Auditor General's Report, for the four months of last year at the rate of $3,000 per month for the use of these terminal facilities. There is another $36,000 for maintenance of which we have heard nothing; and this is but the entering of the wedge. When the full brunt of the burden is borne by this country, I have no doubt that this $3,000 a month will swell to $15,000 or $20,000 a month when we consider the vast outlays which will be necessary to maintain these enormous terminal facilities in the city of Montreal. Mr. Wainwright suggested the analogy of a palace in our user of the terminal facilities. He said it is a very large palace, and we only want a room now. Why, the preposterousness of renting all the terminals and contributing towards the maintenance of them all, could only be equalled, if the hon. gentleman, in a flight of imagination, rented the rings of Saturn or the nebulæ of Orion. These would have been just about as much practical use to the Intercolonial.

But there is another provision in this contract almost as bad—section 35 of the agreement of 1897. I am now speaking of the agreement of 1897, and not of the agreement of 1898. Under that section, how do matters stand? Under it this Government bound itself hand and foot for all time, because it is a lease for ninety-nine years and renewable for ever—bound itself for ninety-nine years, and that is for ever, so far as most of us are concerned. To what did the hon. gentleman bind the Government? He bound the Government to pay 5 per cent on half the cost of making all the betterments in connection with this road, whether terminals or on the joint section. I ask the hon. Minister's attention particularly to this phase of the matter. He may reply to this. He may say: Why, we will only use what we require. But we are not in a position to only use what we require. We are held firmly by the throat by the Grand Trunk Railway, in respect of that portion of the road we use. They direct where cars shall go, where trains shall be made up, they form the time tables; and if they wanted to squeeze the Government, all they would have to do would be to divert from some other portion of their terminals a certain amount of traffic to that we do use and then oblige us to use their betterments, and the moment a betterment is made, under that agreement, we have to pay 5 per cent on one-half the cost. Further, the Grand Trunk Railway are to construct the betterments, and if the sharp managers of that railway could not make another one-fifth out of the work of construction, so that the Government would bear the whole cost, I am somewhat mistaken in my estimate of the men.

On what ground does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals seek to justify this transaction? He puts forward the contention that the road pays. But we have this absurdity in the hon. gentleman's position. In the same speech in which he puts forward this claim, he states boldly to the House that there are no means of telling whether the road is paying, and that there are no means of ascertaining whether it is paying or not. Which statement are we to believe? Are we to believe him when he says he can give no data to this House by which we are to judge whether the road is paying or not or when he says that it is paying? He seems to be possessed of what psychologists call a dual consciousness. They state that some people are possessed of a normal and an abnormal mental condition. In their normal condition, they are ignorant of what took place in their abnormal condition; and in their abnormal condition, they are ignorant of what took place in their normal condition. The abnormal condition of the hon. gentleman seems to be that in which he tells us he has no means of ascertaining the earnings and expenditure in connection with the road, and his normal condition seems to be that in which he says that the road pays. Conceding for one moment that the road does pay, why are the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway to get the advantage of this? That Drummond County Railway, with its termini as they were, might remain there until the crack of doom and the road would never pay. It was there a bankrupt concern, without the slightest chance of ever paying a revenue. But what does the hon. Minister of Railways propose? He proposes to galvanize into life this decaying corpse by conferring upon it the vitality of the Intercolonial Railway system. That large system, which, over 1,140 miles, gathers through traffic, is to have all its strategetic advantages conferred by him upon the Drummond County Railway, and for what purpose? In order to give it a financial standing, a value, it does not really possess. Supposing the Intercolonial selected another route from Lévis to Montreal what portion of its traffic would then go to the Drummond line? Supposing it built a new line and was controlling the traffic originating on its own system and landing it in Montreal, the Drummond County Railway would get none of that traffic. But Sir, taking our through freight—and we have great difficulty in getting this or any facts from the hon. Minister in order to intelligently discuss this question, but so far we have been able to get this fact—that in the year 1897, our through traffic passing by Lévis over the Intercolonial system yielded us $622,304.81. Remember that that is over one-fifth of the total revenue of the Intercolonial, and when the hon. Minister stands in his place here and states that the agreement of the Canadian Pacific Railway was throttling the Intercolonial and was a cancer that was eating out its vitals, I tell him that if he would dare bring down the figures he has in his department, he would find that the amount I have stated is double the amount the Intercolonial reaped from the freight passing over the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of this $622,304.81, think you that the Drum-

mond County Railway contributed one dollar? Think you it had the possibility of contributing one dollar? Not the slightest. Therefore, you see the utter absurdity of giving this line a valuation based in any way upon the power of accumulating through freight.

I deny, however, that the road does pay. It does not pay. The Minister of Railways gave us a return for the eight months from July 30th to March 1st, 1897, and from June 30th, 1898, to March 1st, 1899. What do we find? I have made comparison with the leading railways in Canada, and all the railways in Canada. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, because it requires to be followed out closely. The increase of traffic on all the railways of Canada combined, during the year ending 1st March, 1898, was 14 per cent; the increase on the Canadian Pacific Railway was 18 per cent; and on the Grand Trunk Railway 9·04 per cent. Supposing the Intercolonial had shared in the general prosperity of this country—I will not say to what extent of the general average of the railways of Canada, but as much as the Grand Trunk Railway—now if to the Intercolonial Railway earnings in the year 1898, we add this percentage, and then take the earnings from March 1st, 1899, and work out the calculation, we shall find that this railroad will be, by the end of this year ending July 1st, 1899, behind no less an amount than $227,000. That follows from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. By the figures in the Auditor General's Report for 1898, if we work out the calculation, we find there has been a larger deficit. Arriving at the deficit by still another means what do we find? We find that the operating expenses in 1898 amounted to $3,257,648. One-seventh of this sum, which is the proportion of the mileage of the extension to Montreal, would give us working expenses for that line of $465,378. If to that we add the rental, $210,000, which is not included in the operating expenses, we find that the total operating expenses would be $675,378, from which we have to deduct earnings, which the hon. gentleman has not given us. If we estimate them at $375,000, we arrive at a deficit in excess of that given under the first method of calculation of over $300,000.

The hon. Minister speaks of his economy and of his masterly management of the Intercolonial Railway and says he has reduced expenses. I challenge that statement, and for the benefit of the hon. gentleman's associates, I will give a few facts and figures. The railroads of Canada show an outlay for every dollar of additional earnings, as follows:—The average for all the railroads was 54 cents; the Canadian Pacific Railway, 47 cents; the Grand Trunk Railway, 12 cents. Come to the Minister of Railways and Canals. See what his remarkable management did for the road. For every dollar extra earnings on the Intercolonial Railway last year, the hon. gentleman spent $1.32. The rational way to account for this is that the great loss was made in connection with the Montreal extension. Take 1899, so far as the hon. gentleman has brought down his returns, and his figures show that for every dollar of the Intercolonial earnings the cost was no less than 84 cents, or about double the cost on the Canadian Pacific Railway and seven times that on the Grand Trunk Railway. But the hon. Minister has another scheme in hand. He says that the full scheme is to compete for ocean trade to and from all points west of Montreal with the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railways and the water ways. Mr. Schreiber in his evidence goes into this at considerable length. In order to accomplish his purpose the hon. Minister is running up the capital expenditure. In 1898, he incurred a capital expenditure of $128,188. In 1899, which is not yet completed, he has provided for the expenditure of $1,233,500, and in the estimates for 1900, so far, provision is made for $914,000 on the same account, or a total of $2,245,688 in connection with this advance that the management has inaugurated. This vast capital expenditure is going to increase our interest outlay. Estimating the rate of interest we pay at 2⅞ per cent, there will be a considerable amount that will have to be paid year by year by the country that is fairly to be charged against this extension. The absurdity of the hon. gentleman's contention in respect to railways is well illustrated by a circular published by a transportation company in Halifax seeking to deal in grain. That company is promised rates from the west far and away below anything that the hon. Minister can hope to have his railway do. The rate is not at as much as one-third. But suppose that the hon. Minister is able to compete with the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways. In a speech in the city of St. John, he advanced this political morality—which I claim is most vicious—that the Intercolonial Railway could compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk because these companies had to pay into shareholders and pay interest on their bonds while the Intercolonial Railway had no such charges. He proposed to enter the lists of railway competitors and run others off the ground because interest is not charged against his railway and no dividends have to be paid to stockholders. But the experience of other countries does not bear the hon. gentleman out. In Belgium they tried Government railways in competition with private railways, and notwithstanding the magnificent position Belgium is in compared with this country, it being a country well used to government by bureaucracy, they found that the Government railways, when put into competition with a private railway were actually run off the ground, so that the Government as a matter of self-protec-

tion had to buy up the private railways of Belgium, which they have done almost entirely.

Some former speakers have made comparison of Halifax and St. John. I belong to the province of New Brunswick and represent the county of Westmoreland, which is not interested either in the city of St. John nor the city of Halifax; so that, without running any risk of incurring the displeasure of my constituents, I am prepared to give the freest expression to my opinion. And I have no hesitation in saying that any gentlemen who have visited Baltimore, or Boston, or New York and have looked at the terminals of the Baltimore and Ohio or the Pennsylvania, or the New York Central, or the Erie and compared these magnificent terminals, or the terminal of the Grand Trunk at Portland, with the insignificant terminal facilities with which the hon. Minister says is going to accommodate all the traffic of the west that he hopes to divert to this road must laugh. In the city of St. John, where he is putting his elevator, there is what they call the valley, a narrow gorge, at best a few hundred feet wide, and in that gorge, on a small piece of land bought from the Harrises, the hon. gentleman is erecting his elevator. And on one wharf that will not offer accommodation for more than one or two steamers at a time he is making the eastern terminus of what hereafter is to be a vast transcontinental scheme of transportation, and to be the entrepot for the business of the west. That is an absurdity. The real secret of the expenditure at St. John is that the hon. gentleman is going to contest the city of St. John at the next election. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will find the expenditure in Halifax upon the construction of his grain elevator will prove of about as much use as did the $750,000 worth of mud that he dumped on the highways of Nova Scotia, to be washed by the rain of that humid climate into the ditches of the highways.

But, when we approach the consideration of what we might call this oceanic through freight undertaking the absurdity of the whole scheme dawns upon us. After the denunciations of the late Government made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, as respects the arrangements they had entered into, is this House prepared for the statement, that in respect to its ocean traffic, this Government are bound hand and foot by an iron agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway, and are as absolutely powerless in their hands as if they were children or babes? I will read it. They complained of the share that the Government get from the Canadian Pacific Railway in respect of the interchange of traffic at St. John. What were the terms of that agreement? Now, mark this: The distance from the port of St. John to Halifax is 274 miles, and, under the agreement which this Government had with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that had to count arbitrarily, not as 274 miles, but as 303 miles, on oceanic traffic. Under the late agreement, signed by one of the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway and by the Minister of Railways and Canals, or by his agent, Mr. Harris, and which is known as the "Supplementary Traffic Agreement," on all oceanic freight that comes from the Grand Trunk Railway, what do you suppose our distance counts then? Why, the distance from St. John, which is 740 miles, is only to count, in the distribution of gains, for 375 miles. Whereas, under the agreement between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the arbitrary mileage was more than the actual mileage, under this new agreement, by which the Government are bound hand and foot, 814 miles of haul from the city of Montreal to the city of Halifax, have to count for 425 in the division of the spoils. Now, I will read those particular clauses of this agreement, in order that we may have it upon the "Hansard". It is known as the "Supplementary Traffic Agreement," and bears date of the 1st day of February, A.D. 1898, and is expressly incorporated in and made part of the main agreement of rental between the Crown and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The sections are not numbered, so that I cannot give the number of the sections, but I will read them:

> In connection with import and export traffic via Halifax or St. John, or any other port in the maritime provinces that may be hereafter selected, it is understood that during the life of the agreement that the Intercolonial Railway will accept 425 miles on Halifax, and 375 miles on St. John, the St. John rates to be the same as those quoted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to and from that port or West St. John, and the same as quoted by the Grand Trunk Railway to and from Portland; the Halifax rates to be one cent per 100 lbs. on all classes and special class over the rates to and from St. John or Portland, on both exports and imports, the company to have as its proportion the mileage as per the various groups west of Montreal.

Now, gentlemen, would you believe your own ears? Here is a Government complaining of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway which bound them, and here they have expressly, for the term of ninety-nine years, bound themselves to be governed by the rates of the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland. In the evidence before the committee, Mr. Schreiber, the gentleman with brains in the department, stated, that, at the present rates, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway would take the traffic from them every time; that, in order to get traffic, the Government would have to reduce rates to take it away from them. And here, in face of that knowledge, these gentlemen have bound themselves hand and foot for ninety-nine years not to vary one iota from the Grand Trunk Railway charges on its freight from Montreal to Portland, or the

Canadian Pacific Railway on its charges from Montreal to the port of St. John. But from what source can we get traffic, except from the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway? Whatever traffic they hand over to us, we have to deliver in Halifax, not on the basis of allowance according to our mileage, but on the fixed mileage, which is one-half the actual mileage. We have actually to haul our traffic nearly 400 miles for absolutely nothing. Sir, I may state to the House, that I got hold of two or three divisions of the profits over two roads: one was from Hamilton over the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railway, and the other was from Halifax over the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and the result was this: That the Intercolonial Railway was hauling freight at two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile from Montreal to Halifax, which, according to the sworn statement of Mr. Wainwright before this committee, was two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile less than the actual cost.

Now, I complain of the hon. gentleman for not having brought down the facts, the figures and the data in his possession respecting this interchange of traffic. I have no hesitation in saying, with respect to these two agreements, that, if you will look into one that is complained of, carefully and work out the ratio, you will find that, so far as the importance of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned, the Intercolonial Railway stands in the position of betterment under the former as respects the latter of 110 to 56. The more freight the Grand Trunk Railway gives us under this arrangement, the poorer the Intercolonial Railway is, and that may account for some of the shortage in connection with the running.

Now, the hon. gentleman from Antigonish who last spoke complains of suspicions on this side of the House, and complains that people will not, in a manly way, make charges against them for what they believe to be improper. He has also referred to a statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and a statement made by myself before the committee of investigation. So far as that statement is concerned, I was sorry to hear a gentleman with the ordinarily fair mind of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) assenting to the proposition of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that the charges were withdrawn before the committee of investigation of the Drummond Railway. The hon. gentleman must have known that the statement was far from true. There were no charges preferred to the committee at all: the committee was simply required to investigate into the merits of the agreement, and, having investigated into the merits of the agreement, we were then "functus officio," and our work was done. I there stated, that I had never heard upon the floor of the House any charge of corruption, and I had not, and I have not as yet, but if the hon. gentleman infers from this that I mean to withdraw any opinion I have had in regard to the integrity of the hon. Minister in dealing with business of the character of this scheme I can only tell him that he is entirely in error. Many a man has been hanged on less evidence than there is of corruption in relation to this transaction. There are suspicious circumstances in connection with this transaction. I will look for one moment at the position of Mr. Greenshields. These are all suspicious facts. Because Mr. Greenshields happens to be the cashier of the Liberal political fund, it does not mean that Mr. Greenshields is a rascal by any means. It does not appear in the slightest degree to show any lack of integrity, judging him by the conventional standards, but when you take other suspicious circumstances this fact is not to be left out of sight. Then there is another thing suspicious about it. Here is a gentleman, in the secrets of his party; here is a gentleman with whom a member or members of the Government, whom I might mention, have been closetted here, at Montreal, and all over the country. Here is a gentleman who was sent down during the last local election in the county of Westmoreland, in New Brunswick, to gag the employees in the cotton factory, with a man named Whitehead, their secretary, who took by the throat Mr. Wilson, the manager, who was known to be a Conservative, and said to Mr. Wilson: "You must use your influence for the Liberal party, and if it is necessary you must come out and be a candidate for the party." They forced that gentleman to go to the convention, for the purpose of selecting Grit candidates. This is the gentleman who is mixed up in this transaction. Immediately upon the advent of this Government he knew that his hour had come. He knew that the time had arrived. He hies himself to the different stockholders whom he can control, and gets from each an option to purchase his stock. That was in June; month after month goes by, and then an arrangement was completed between himself and the Government, and he completes the contract of purchase from the men whom he had the option to buy stock. Then we come also to other dramatis personæ in this comedy. Besides Mr. Greenshields we have the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). I am not going to make any personal statements in regard to the hon. Minister of Public Works. He is not here. If there are any reflections upon the hon. Minister of Public Works they are reflections which he has drawn down upon himself. It is well known that he has connected himself intimately with the gang of thieves and marauders who rifled the public treasury of the province of Quebec, and devoted its contents to carrying elections and to political purposes.

Then, Sir, I want to speak of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and if rumour states it correctly he is not entirely free from a division of the spoils of these nefarious transactions which disgraced the public life of Quebec. For I am in a position to make the statement that $5,000 in the form of a cheque came to New Brunswick from Quebec, that that cheque was made payable to the Hon. Andrew G. Blair, that that cheque was endorsed, that the money was got, that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals used part of it in elections in New Brunswick, and the fact that the right hon. leader of the Government had the support that he had from the province of New Brunswick was due to the magnetic power of the $5,000 which came from the marauders and boodlers who followed in the wake of Mercier. Then I come next to the recklessness of the purchase or attempted purchase of the Drummond County Railway. Here is a transaction of great magnitude, a transaction by which it is proposed to purchase a railway costing $2,094,00. You would expect that those persons who were asking this House to accept that proposition would have made inquiries on the subject as to the merits of the road and as to the amount of compensation that they should give for it. What do we find? We find that they never went to work to put a surveyor, or an engineer on the line, but, apparently, the only information the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had, according to his own statement which is given at page 4275 of the revised "Hansard" of 1897, was the following:—

> We have abundance of evidence to satisfy us as to the character of that road. There are numbers of persons whom I have met, and with whom I and others had conversed, who had been over the road, who knew it thoroughly and who had travelled over it at a rate of speed which could not possibly have been safely attempted if the road were not in good condition.

Here is the evidence; numbers of men, he said, who had travelled the line, had told the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals so. On this vague, useless information he entered into this agreement of great magnitude. He comes before this House and asks us to give $2,094,000 for this railway. The thing is so absurd that it is beyond credence that the hon. gentleman should have made such a statement. But he has some evidence besides that. He has the evidence of Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber had never seen the road, but Mr. Schreiber gave him an estimate of the cost of the road if it had been properly constructed up to the full requirements of the law. But when he came to this House we had the inflated statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and of Mr. Schreiber as to the probable traffic of the road. Who does not remember the great flourish of trumpets with which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals introduced this measure to the House in 1897? What does he say? In the arena of history and of facts he knows nothing, but in the arena of prephecy he has been very exact. He told us that there would be a great increase in the gross earnings of $522,000. It was shown by calculation that there would be an increase of 628,137 passengers on the portion of the line between Montreal and Lévis. Then he was going to have an increased freight tonnage of 517,000 tons. After the absurdity of these calculations was pointed out, in some mysterious way they were excised from the revised "Hansard," but they were given to the House. The statement was copied and sent to me; it was copied by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways, Mr. Haggart, and if I were able to put my hand upon the unrevised "Hansard," I have no doubt that these statements would appear. They are expurgated from the revised edition of the "Hansard," and the ridicule that they would have caused was in that way somewhat minified. Two thousand passengers per day was too absurd an estimate to be responsible for and it had to be got rid of. The hon. gentleman procured from his deputy a very absurd statement. He procured from his deputy the statement that these 31 miles of railway would cost about $50,000 a mile without rolling stock. And the hon. gentleman has come down and given some facts and figures as to the cost of railways. He has given facts respecting the Cape Breton Railway, respecting the St. Charles Branch, respecting the Oxford Branch and respecting the Rivière du Loup Branch. If the hon. gentleman had followed this up to the full measure of his imagination and crossed over to Great Britain he could have found that railways cost on an average $265,000 a mile, that Scottish railways cost $196,000 per mile, that French railways cost $133,000 per mile, and that in the German Empire railways cost $99,000 a mile. If we look at these facts a little closer what do we find? Why, Sir, the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, outside of the Rockies—that is the prairie section and another section that was very hard to build—including rolling stock, was $19,000 per mile. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will find that set forth in the report of 1885. The Intercolonial Railway, up to date, including the rolling stock, cost only $47,300 per mile. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that was the cost notwithstanding the charges that have been hurled across the floor of this House for 18 years by hon. gentlemen opposite, as to the Conservative Government capitalizing ordinary expenditure: which they claimed was done by the million. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding—if we may believe these hon. gentlemen opposite—the gross and unnecessary expenditures in the cities of St. John and Halifax, all made for political purposes: notwithstanding all the political corruption they accused the Conservative Gov-

ernment of in connection with that road; notwithstanding that the road runs through a difficult country in places, notwithstanding that very expensive bridges were built at a time when bridges cost quite double what they do to-day: notwithstanding all that, the Intercolonial Railway, up to date, rolling stock included, cost only $47,300 per mile, and yet Mr. Schreiber estimated this prairie or water level road at $50,000 per mile. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) says that the Cape Breton road cost $33,000 per mile. I have not the figures at hand, but I will adopt the figures of the hon. gentleman. Let us look at the Cape Breton Railway. Is this House prepared for the statement, that there is one railway bridge on that road, across the Grand Narrows, which——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It does not include that.

Mr. POWELL. If it does not include that, it includes a number of other bridges, and it includes dozens of immense embankments.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not.

Mr. POWELL. It includes the embankments, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) need not tell me that it does not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It includes the embankments, but my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) said that it included dozens of other expensive bridges.

Mr. POWELL. I have been over that road. I was there when it was built, for I had a contract for transporting a lot of ties, and I saw them spread over a great portion of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not know that.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, I know something about it. I make the statement to the House, that the Cape Breton road traverses almost an Alpine country, and is in the heart of one of the most extremely undulating and mountainous regions that characterize Cape Breton. It is one of the most difficult pieces of railroad construction almost on the continent, with the exception of the Rockies or the Alleghanies, and yet it only cost $33,000 per mile. Take the short line to Oxford, and it only cost $26,700, although it is a very expensive line to build, with long bridges, and runs through an undulating country. And yet, the Minister of Railways adopts the estimate of his deputy, that this canal level road would cost $50,000. Mr. Wainwright is summoned to the aid of the Minister, and what does Mr. Wainwright say. They introduced the figures of Mr. Wainwright for one purpose, and I will introduce them for another purpose. Here is the Beauharnois Junction Railway, built through very much the same kind of country as this "joint section," and did it cost $50,000 per mile? No; it only cost $17,000 per mile. The Jacques Cartier Junction Railway on the Island of Montreal, running through a tract of country, where, from its proximity to the city of Montreal, the right of way would be naturally expensive, cost only $19,000 per mile instead of $50,000. The Champlain Junction Railway, the facts as to which were given by Mr. Wainright, cost, not $50,000 a mile, but $18,000 per mile. Why, Sir, according to Poor's Railway Manual, one of the most authoritative books on the railroads of the United States, what do we find? We find that in 1885, the average cost of all the railways in the United States—including the great transcontinental lines that pierced the Rockies, and had such enormous outlays made on them, including the vast system of terminals at Buffalo, Chicago, Baltimore, New York, Jersey City, San Francisco and other places on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, notwithstanding all these immense charges, these railways, terminal facilities, rolling stock and all, cost, on an average, only $40,000 per mile—and they were constructing at a time when the cost of constructing railroads was probably 50 per cent more than it is to-day. It is a suspicious circumstance to try and railroad this scheme through this House by representations of such a character.

There is another suspicious circumstance, and now I refer to the changes made in the agreement after the Senate refused to confirm the purchase. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) suggests that there is no difference between the first agreement and the last one. Well, we will see as to that. Take the basis of the new agreement as compared with the old. The value of the annuity in connection with the Drummond County Railway under the first agreement was $2,094,192. Under the second agreement, the Minister (Mr. Blair) has the option of purchasing the railway for $1,600,000—which is lessened by $65,795, on account of the extra work that has to be done to bring the road up to a higher standard. That leaves a saving on that portion of the system of $559,987. But that is not all. We will pass to the Grand Trunk Railway. On page 62 of the evidence given before the committee, Mr. Wainwright, referring to the change that had been made in the new agreement as compared with the old, by which traffic was to be delivered to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal, instead of at Lévis or Chaudière, used these words:

> I regard the change of handing over the traffic at Montreal and shutting up our line to Lévis as a great concession to the Government.

And I think Mr. Wainwright was making no extravagant statement when he said it was practically shutting up the Grand Trunk line from Lévis to Richmond. According to the sworn evidence, the interchange of freight at Chaudière gave to the Intercolonial Railway as its share on the west bound freight charges $201,591; it gave to the Intercolonial Railway

on the east bound freight—freight that had originated at Montreal and on the Grand Trunk system—it gave as receipts to the Intercolonial Railway, $420,713, or a total on the through traffic of $622,304. Now, Sir, supposing that the share of the Montreal extension, when it got the through freight, would be one-fourth as much as there was earned by the Intercolonial Railway, we would then have $105,178 of receipts on through traffic accruing to the Intercolonial Railway by virtue of the change by which the freight was to be delivered to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal instead of at the Chaudière. We will say, for the sake of argument, that under the first agreement, the Intercolonial Railway, when extended to Montreal, by competing with the Grand Trunk, could have got $35,000, or one-third of it, which would leave a net gain, by virtue of the change made in the contract, of $70,118.87. Now, as every man who has read anything about railroads knows, all the roads of the continent are struggling for through freight. They are struggling for the additional freight, because this additional freight brings into the treasury of the road the freight charges, less the net expenses of the particular freight. Inasmuch as the additional freight on the Canadian Pacific Railway last year only cost 47 per cent, and inasmuch as the additional freight on the Grand Trunk Railway only cost 12 per cent, I will allow the Intercolonial Railway a profit of 50 per cent. Giving them 50 per cent on this diverted traffic, what do we find? We find that a resulting net profit from delivering the freight to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal as against delivering it at the Chaudière, of $35,000; and $35,000 per annum means at our borrowing rate, a capitalization of $1,219,458.25. There is the gain accruing to this country by this change in the agreement, and I defy the Minister of Railways and Canals to minimize the statement or attack it in the slightest degree, unless he may do it by claiming that my estimate of the cost of earning additional revenue is too low. But I base my estimate of the cost on the general experience of the country.

In the second agreement there was a great change in respect to the betterments. Under the old agreement we were to pay 5 per cent on half the cost of all the betterments. Under the new agreement we pay 4 per cent, not on half the cost, but on a part of the cost proportioned to our engine and car mileage. Now, take one betterment which is in contemplation, which in a few years will have to be made, which Mr. Wainwright said the Grand Trunk Company have had in contemplation for some time. I mean double-tracking the section between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal. Suppose that cost $200,000. On that the gain to this country by the change amounts to $127,623.48. I might go on and enumerate other features in which there will be enormous reductions; but I have not the data. This is largely speculative, largely a matter of opinion, though tolerably authoritative, as it is based on the results of experience. The total gains resulting from the changes in the agreements amount to $1,709,068.73 as far as I have gone.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that on the Grand Trunk alone?

Mr. POWELL. That is on the Grand Trunk and Drummond County combined. In the change made from the first agreement to the second, in respect to the betterments made on the Grand Trunk Railway, to which we are called upon to make a contribution, if you take our user at one-sixth. We make a gain of no less than 63 cents on every dollar expended on those betterments, on the basis of our user being one-sixth, which is entirely too liberal an estimate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Through the Senate.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, through the Senate. Is it any wonder that the joy of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway was so exuberant when he met the shareholders of the company in London, or that he told them that he had made a most magnificent bargain with the Government of Canada? Is it any wonder that the stocks and bonds of the Grand Trunk appreciated several points the moment the agreement was made known to the financiers of London?

Now, Sir, I am coming to the withholding of information, and on this score, if I have to be a little severe on the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, it is simply because he has placed himself in the position——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, I am not alarmed.

Mr. POWELL. I know the hon. gentleman so well that I know that it would take a great deal to alarm him. I deliberately say that that hon. gentleman has withheld information from this House; and I say, with a full knowledge of the force of the statement I am making, that the hon. gentleman has under his control the means of giving the information that he states he is unable to give. Why, Sir, in 1897, when the first agreement was rejected by the Senate, after having passed this House, and afterwards the amount of rental for one year was included in the Estimates of that year, the following statement was made by Sir Oliver Mowat in the Senate, as reported at page 808 of the Senate Debates:

> I believe the object is this, that hon. gentlemen having doubts or more than doubts, whether the business to be done would warrant the expenditure, it was felt desirable that there should be an opportunity to us all to know by actual experience how that would be.

Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States of America exact from every railway company owning the 184,000 miles of railway of the United States, the information that is asked for here, and every one of these railways is enabled to give to the

Interstate Commission the cost of every ton of freight carried by every railway per mile of haul; and if the hon. gentleman takes the trouble to look up these returns, he will find that it is sometimes 4-10ths of a cent per ton per mile, sometimes 7-10ths of a cent per ton per mile, and so on. I have not had very much to do with the Railway Department since the change of Government, but I do not believe that the system of book-keeping has changed, and I know that there was not a railway station on the Intercolonial from Lévis to Sydney which did not every month, through its agent, send a tabulated statement of every ton of freight that goes from his station, its destination, and the charges upon it; and at the end of the year the Auditor General or the general freight agent could go to work, and with very little trouble indeed, could make up this statement; and the hon. gentleman knows it. I state that they have done it also in the case of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. The hon. gentleman makes a difference in regard to that railway; but it was worked as part of the Intercolonial system, and its receipts, and if I mistake not, its expenditures also, are given in the Auditor General's Report. But if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that, we will come to the Dominion Atlantic, which is within the cognizance of the hon. gentleman himself. This is a railway which runs from Halifax to Yarmouth, with a portion between Windsor Junction and Halifax, owned by the Intercolonial. Now, I will read the terms of the lease to the Dominion Atlantic Company, as follows:—

The Dominion Atlantic Company shall pay to the Government one-third of the gross earnings of that line, and the Government shall pay the cost of maintenance of that portion of the line.

Now, I ask the hon. gentleman if his officers do not, year after year, make up the returns for that portion of the line, and are not these returns submitted to the Auditor General? Does he not know that the Auditor General frequently looks closely into the facts and figures, and frequently challenges them? And yet they have been made up with sufficient exactness during the last ten years to satisfy the Auditor General. In the very agreement which the hon. gentleman entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, signed by his own hand, it is provided as follows, in section 3:

That Her Majesty shall and will pay to the company a share of the cost of maintenance of the Montreal Joint Section and the Chaudière Joint Section, including tracks, bridges, switches, sidings, signals, appliances of all kinds, platforms, water tanks, water supplies, fuel stations, fences, crossings and all other appurtenances and appliances used by it jointly with the company, and upon the two joint sections it has the right and privilege of using included in this demise; such share of the cost of maintenance of each joint section to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains made over each of the above mentioned joint sections during each month, passenger and freight car counting each as one car.

There he bound himself by this agreement for ninety-nine years to pay his share of the cost of maintenance of the two joint sections. What did he mean by that? Did he bind himself to something he knew nothing about, or could not possibly know anything about? Does he acknowledge that he acting as Minister of the Crown and representative of the railway interests of Canada, actually entered into an agreement that no man under the sun could tell anything about? Does he mean that he had no idea of the cost, any more than he had in the case of the Yukon transaction, which he told us was a mere gamble, beyond calculation?

But the proof does not end there. Here is the unkindest cut of all. Mr. Schreiber submitted a statement to the committee, which is found on page 137 of the evidence, and which is as follows:—

This is a statement of the amount of traffic on the Drummond County Railway from the 1st to 31st March, both inclusive:

Through freight	$18,867 39
Local freight	11,963 36
Through passenger	7,371 83
Local passenger	6,513 46
	$44,716 04

Mr. Haggart asked:

Q. You have got the working expenses?—A. No, I have not.

Q. How do you apportion the amount of the Drummond County Railway through rates?—A. That is determined on a mileage basis, I think.

Q. The same as for passengers?—A. It must be so, it is the only way to do it.

What does the hon. gentleman think of that? But it does not end there. To-day he has summoned to his aid the superintendent of railways. Well, we got something from the superintendent, too. I may say, that Mr. Schreiber, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, was asked for these, and submitted them under oath, so that they have the sanctity of an oath:

Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, recalled, produced a copy of a telegram from D. Pottinger, as follows:—

I had asked for a return, and so had the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell).

Moncton, N.B., 13th May, 1898.

C. Schreiber, Esq., Ottawa.

No freight charge on material for Drummond County Railway construction or equipment entered into the earnings of Montreal extension for March, as per statement sent you. It covered earnings from freight for the public only.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.

Not satisfied with that one of the 30th May, 1898, we have another telegram from Mr. Pottinger to Mr. Schreiber, as follows:—

Information respecting April traffic over Montreal extension cannot be given until the 2nd or 3rd June, after the April accounts have been

made up. Material carried for the railway does not enter into earnings.

If, on the face of that, the hon. gentleman will still say it is impossible, then he has arrayed against himself the universal practice of companies owning 184,000 miles of the United States railways; he has arrayed against himself his own agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway; he has arrayed against himself the practice of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and he has arrayed against himself the Auditor General of Canada; he has arrayed against himself the agreement of the late Government with the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company and his own practice under that agreement; also he has arrayed against himself his own deputy who, under oath, produced statements which, off oath, he said he could not produce. He has also against himself the statement of his own superintendent, which he knew was asked for and required the solemnity of an oath, and again he has against him what should be the very highest authority he could have—that is, himself

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken at greater length than I thought I would be able to do, owing to my physical condition, and I am very thankful for the kind attention which the House has given to me, on that account. In closing, I may simply say this, that, after an experience, not very long, but an experience in the trial of cases covering some twenty years practice as a lawyer—in all kinds of cases unearthing frauds and hunting down fraudulent manipulators, cases which no man expects to have disclosed by positive and direct evidence, because fraud is invariably detected by indirect and circumstantial evidence—I say, that, if I wished to take a case before a jury, I would not ask for stronger proof to convince them of improper conduct, even if I had the evidence manufactured to order. These transactions in question savour, as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) said they do, of fraud and corruption, and call for a fuller, franker and honester disclosure on the part of the Government than has yet been given to this House, and I make this statement in respect to both the transactions with the Drummond and the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BENJAMIN RUSSELL (Halifax). In discussing the matter now before the House, my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Powell), had advantages of which I am not possessed, some permanent advantages, and also some which are purely adventitious and accidental. My hon. friend was a member of the committee which had the opportunity of inquiring most minutely into this matter, and, therefore, the advantage of having the evidence entirely under his control; so that, probably, he knows everything stated in the volume of evidence published and embodying the results of the investigation. He has also, of course—and that we take for granted—that large mathematical ability which enables him to utterly despise the slender mathematical resources of Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Minister of Finance, who was a financier, I suppose, before the hon. gentleman was born. He is also, of course, as he has informed us, a very able lawyer, who has given this class of transactions very special study, and, I believe, is the author of a work on the nationalization of railways, and, as such, was obliged to go very far afield and familiarize himself with many facts which he has given us at great and somewhat irrelevant length this afternoon. He has further, as he told us, consulted engineers, which consultations, no doubt, enabled him to present to the committee to-day matters which are, of course, beyond my ken and not involved in the book under our consideration this evening. He has, still further, had practical experience, as he told us—and that was a great surprise to me indeed—in the construction of railway ties. Dear knows what other special qualifications the hon. gentleman has; but, outside of all that, he has, as he was careful to remind us, a thorough professional experience in tracking down cases of fraud and inquiring into matters of the nature of that before the House this evening, and concerning which charges of fraud have been distinctly repudiated by these hon. gentlemen opposite, who conducted the investigation. One would have thought that, with his large professional experience and the facilities put at his disposal by the committee which sat a year or two ago, and after having had the opportunity of summoning any witnesses he chose from the four corners of the earth, and of turning every department in the civil service of Canada inside out for the prupose of discovering, and tracing, and tracking down these fraudulent transactions—one would have supposed that, with all those conveniences and facilities at his disposal, it would have been possible for him and his colleagues on that occasion—one of whom, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), is quite as expert a tracker down of fraudulent transactions, and is, I will undertake to say, without any disparagement to the hon. gentleman's ability as a lawyer, a very able and proficient lawyer, quite equal in professional skill and ability to the hon. gentleman himself—one would have supposed that, with all the legal acumen and ability thus at the command of the committee, they would not have been obliged to come to the lame and impotent conclusion with respect to fraud to which they did come, and which is embodied in the last page of their report.

Well, Sir, struggling as best I may under the disadvantages to which I refer, I am consoled with the reflection that a great deal of what my hon. friend has presented to the House it will not be necessary for me to deal with, because it was absolutely and obviously irrelevant to the question before the committee. What is that question? It

was stated with admirable lucidity by the hon. gentleman who preceded me on this side, my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). In the first place, is it or is it not desirable that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended to Montreal? In the second place, if so, is or is not the route by which the Government has chosen to make the extension the most convenient and suitable for the purpose? And, thirdly, having settled these two questions and settled them in the affirmative, has the Government or has it not made a provident bargain for the purchase of the road by which the connection is to be made? As to the first, I supposed that on all sides in this House and among all classes throughout this country there was a practical consensus of opinion that it was desirable that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended to Montreal. I understood the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) to say that in his judgment this was desirable. I understood that every hon. gentleman who has taken part in the discussion, with, perhaps, one exception, which was named by my hon. friend from Antigonish, held that it was desirable and expedient that there should be a connection of the Intercolonial Railway with the great city of Montreal, and that that connection was in due prosecution of the policy which had been acted upon by the Intercolonial Railway in reaching the city of Lévis. Therefore, we need not argue and I shall not attempt to argue the abstract question as to the advisability or desirability of establishing such a connection for the Intercolonial Railway. Whatever the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) may now think about the matter, I think there is a practical consensus of opinion, which we may here take for granted that it is eminently desirable, if the Intercolonial Railway is ever to be a satisfactory means of communication between the maritime provinces and the inland provinces of the Dominion, that it should have a connection with a great metropolitan centre. Therefore, I shall not spend time in the consideration of that abstract question. As to the second question, it is very obvious to any person who studies the map of the Dominion that no better route could be taken for establishing this connection than the one secured by the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. My hon. friend says that the distances by way of Richmond and the Grand Trunk or via Chaudière by the Drummond County Railway, or by the South Shore Railway, are substantially the same. I do not understand that to be the case. I understand the evidence to show that the distance by way of the Drummond County Railway is shorter than either of the others. It is obviously shorter than that by way of Richmond and the Grand Trunk, for the hon. gentleman would not need one-hundredth part of his mathematical knowledge to know that two sides of a triangle are together greater than the third side, and, in this case, the Drummond County road is the third side. Or to put it in a form more in favour in these modern days, that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. I learned enough mathematics myself to know that, and the Drummond County road is simply the third side of a triangle formed by that road and the branch and main line of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is a more advantageous route than the South Shore road, because on that route there are heavy bridges to build, and, properly measured, I understand that it is longer than the Drummond County Railway.

Let me say before further referring to the merits of this road that I forgot to enumerate one of the special qualifications my hon. friend has for the discussion of the matter—his vivid imagination, and, in fact, a gift of inspiration which enables him to look into the hearts and minds of people. He was able to tell us what was in Mr. Farwell's mind when he entered upon the building of this road. Mr. Farwell had the sagacity to see that this must be the means of a through connection to the city of Montreal for the Intercolonial Railway whenever there came into the management of that road a live Minister of Railways and Canals who would have the sense and sagacity and penetration to see what was necessary to be done for the extension of its business. My hon. friend says that Mr. Farwell built it merely as a lumber road. I put against that the sworn statements of Mr. Farwell, which will be found at page 133 of the evidence, that from the very first he had before his mind the belief that this Drummond County Railway being constructed towards Chaudière it might be made a part of a through line, and this was the motive that prompted him in the undertaking from the very beginning of his connection with this road. Whether it was or was not in his mind, it ought to have been, because it is one of the most obvious things that this is the proper mode of connection of the Intercolonial Railway with the city of Montreal. I think we may take the second question as settled without further argument. I think that the crux of the whole problem, and in fact the only substantial question before the committee is whether a provident or an improvident bargain was made by the Minister of Railways and Canals acting for the Government of this country for the purpose of acquiring possession and control of the Drummond County Railway. That, I take it is the whole question before this committee, and I think it is advantageous and serviceable that we should start with some general view as to what point we have reached in the discussion. Enough has been said on both sides to make it worth while for us to pause and see what stage we have reached in the controversy. The Minister of Railways and

Canals when presenting this matter to the House placed several different tests before the House to enable hon. members to determine what was the proper amount to be given, assuming it to be desirable to purchase this road, to make this connection and to make it in this way, what were the fair criteria by which we should determine the proper price to be paid for this road ? The hon. Minister said : One way is to make comparison with previous transactions of the Dominion Government in respect of the purchase and acquisition of control of railways which they have felt compelled or have been advised to purchase for the purpose of connection with the Intercolonial Railway or to be used as branches of that road.

Now that, I admit, is not an absolutely satisfactory way of determining this question, because I frankly and freely admit that I would not be prepared to support this Government in this transaction if the best they could say for it was that it was no worse than what had been transacted by their predecessors in office. But at the same time there is a principle that has some relevancy to this question, there is a sort of principle of moral estoppel which, at all events, should put it beyond the power of those hon. gentlemen opposite to challenge a transaction which is far better, infinitely better, than any transaction of the kind that they have ever entered into, and which has been conclusively demonstrated to be infinitely better than any transaction of a similar nature that has ever been put through by any previous Government in this country. I say that that fact of itself should, at all events, estop those gentlemen who, on the other side of the House, were concerned in those transactions from presenting a single argument upon this subject, or saying a single word in opposition to the bargain entered into by this Government.

Now, let us look at those transactions as presented by the Minister of Railways and Canals. There was a piece of road from Rivière du Loup to Lévis which the Minister of Railways and Canals stated was about 125 miles long. If he made an error at all, he made that error in favour of his opponents, because I find in the debates that took place that the distance was said to be about 119 miles, more or less. I am not going to chaffer over a few miles here or there ; it was in the neighbourhood of 119 miles. The price was $1,500,000, which would bring it to about $12,500 per mile, and it was stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals to be only $12,000 a mile. That was the price of a road which was confessedly in a dilapidated condition, which absolutely required expenditures to be made upon it, and these expenditures brought the price up to $17,600 a mile. That was not the only case mentioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals. There was a second case which has already been alluded to, that of the St. Charles Branch, 14 miles of road, with which the leader of the Opposition is perfectly well acquainted, and which cost, as stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I think his statement has not been controverted, the enormous, the almost unbelievable sum of $136,000 a mile. I find it very hard, indeed, to believe that there must not be some mistake about that. But taking out the land damages—and I understand the land damages were altogether surprising, they shocked and horrified even the leader of the Opposition, who is not easily shocked or horrified, although he easily expresses himself in that way—taking out even these awful land damages, there was still left some $70,000 a mile for that St. Charles Branch Railway. Now, that, I say, is to my mind an almost unbelievable statement. It is certainly a very astonishing statement, and I have been much surprised that no explanation has been offered of that, and no attempt made to break the force of the staggering blow delivered by the Minister of Railways and Canals when he mentioned the circumstances of this St. Charles branch construction ; and I sincerely hope that the leader of the Opposition, if he takes part in this discussion at all, will throw some light upon this matter, and give us some more comprehensible view in regard to the cost of that road and the price at which it stood to the Government of this country, because certainly it is a very shocking and astonishing transaction as it stands. Then, there was the Oxford Branch, at $26,700 a mile. Then, there was the Cape Breton branch, at $33,000 a mile, and the fact which, although the hon. member for Westmoreland did not seem, with even all his vast experience and knowledge in the matter, and his omniscience in relation to this branch of lore, at all events to be aware of, that that $33,000 a mile did not include the cost of the ferry or of the bridge at Grand Narrows. Then the Minister of Railways and Canals might have added a reference to a branch which was very recently constructed, indeed, the branch from Windsor Junction into the town of Dartmouth, which, I believe, cost something like $23,000 or $26,000, certainly about twice as much as the average price which the Government are paying for the Drummond County Railway. Now, I think we might fairly ask ourselves at this stage, if the transaction by which the Government acquired a valuable piece of road at the rate of $12,000 a mile has a savour of corruption, or a flavour of corruption ; has not a road which cost $17,600 a mile a 50 per cent higher flavour of corruption ? And has not a road which cost $26,700 a mile, a 200 per cent flavour of corruption, as compared with a road that cost $12,000 ? And if a road has cost $33,000 a mile, I should have to make a still stronger statement, the $33,000 a mile road would surely have a 300 per cent stronger flavour of corruption. But all these instances absolutely pale into insignificance, if I may be allowed to change the figure slight-

ly when speaking of flavours, odours, aromas and all that sort of thing. What are we going to do when we come to a case where the road cost $136,000 a mile ? Are we going to talk about flavours of corruption then ? Are we going to talk about savours of corruption then ? We are away beyond the region of mere flavours ; surely we have got now into what used to be called by the leader of the Opposition, and using an expression of his, surely we have got now into the essential element of corruption itself, we have got beyond mere suspicion, beyond mere conjecture, beyond mere flavours, we have penetrated into the inner sanctuary of corruption when we reach an expenditure of $136,000 a mile for a road 14 miles long. The amazing thing to me is that any hon. gentleman in this House, or anywhere in this Dominion, who had any connection, direct or remote, with a transaction of that character, should have the hardihood to stand up in Parliament or anywhere else, before any assembly of his fellow men, or his fellow creatures, for that matter, and talk about railway bargains as if he had any right to be heard in connection with such a subject at all. Amazing effrontery is the expression which the leader of the Opposition would use in the case of anybody else ; amazing effrontery is the only proper term that can possibly describe the attitude and conduct of any person, of any hon. gentleman who, having been connected with a transaction of that sort, stands up and seeks to attach to any Government in this country, a flavour, or an odour, or an aroma, or a fragrance of corruption in connection with a transaction so plain, so simple, so obvious as the purchase of a desirable, convenient and absolutely necessary piece of railway for the very moderate sum of $12,000 a mile. I used to read when I was a boy at school, a good many years ago, that all Gaul is divided into three parts. Well, Sir, I have come to the conclusion that that is one of the fictions of the school books, that is one of the things like the story of William Tell, or Hengist and Horsa. I do not believe that the stock of gall was ever divided. I believe it subsists to-day, and has subsisted in undivided and indivisible unity, and that it has been appropriated by that hon. gentleman who would stand up after a record of that sort, and talk about railway transactions, and talk about railway deals, and talk about railway bargains, in respect of a matter so simple, so plain as the purchase of a railway for $12,000 a mile.

Some attempt has been made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) to minify the effect of the comparison in respect to the purchase of the railway from Lévis to Rivière du Loup. What did the hon. gentleman say ? He made various efforts in the course of his cross-examination of Mr. Wainwright before the Drummond County Railway Committee to seek to destroy the value of this comparison with this transaction. What did he say the other day in this House in respect to the matter ? Oh, he said, you must remember that there was the further consideration given that the Grand Trunk Railway Company entered into—I do not know that he used the term obligation, but, at all events, it was part of the consideration that they were not merely to sell this dilapidated road from Lévis to Rivière du Loup, but that there was an understanding that the line of railway would be extended westward to Chicago, and that was the consideration for this high price that was given for this old piece of road. I was anxious to inquire into that subject and find out how much there might be in that statement, and I was careful to read the Act in which the transaction was confirmed by statute. I found no reference to any obligation on the part of the company to extend their road to Chicago. The agreement has been placed in my hands, and I have looked in it for the language of obligation. The agreement in respect to the acquisition of the road is confirmed by an Act of Parliament, and, in looking into that agreement for the purpose of ascertaining whether there was any such obligation incumbent on this company in connection with the transfer of that road, all I find is this very mild, milk and water provision, which is contained in the fifth paragraph of the agreement. When I first read it I thought it could not surely be the language of an agreement. It sounds not like an agreement, but like a report, like a piece of benevolent counsel or advice or something of that sort ; as to an agreement or an obligation there is not a word of the kind :

> Amongst the purposes which the Government consider will promote the interests of the Dominion is the extension, either by the building or purchase of an independent line, or by such other arrangements of a permanent character with other companies as will secure free access to and from Chicago, in the state of Illinois, for the through traffic of the company.

So far, there is no obligation whatever, not the smallest flavour, not the faintest perfume of an obligation about that.

> And the Minister of Railways and Canals may, by authority of the Governor in Council, make advances to the company from the sum agreed to be paid for the said line, at such times and in such amounts as, in his opinion, may be necessary to enable the company to complete the arrangements contemplated in this section.

That is to say that it was desirable that this company should extend its line to Chicago, that the Government had a benevolent wish that the company should construct its road to Chicago, that it would be a pleasant thing to contemplate that it should construct its road to Chicago ; but, as for any contract by or obligation upon the company, as for anything in the nature of a contract or an obligation, nobody will stand up in this House and pretend to say that there is anything of the kind. Besides the company themselves were only too anxious to extend their road to Chicago.

Mr. Wainwright says in his evidence that there was an exceedingly great desire on the part of the Grand Trunk to reach out to Chicago, and the negotiations with the Government were in connection with that in getting money by selling this Rivière du Loup road; this was not a consideration. They were anxious to get money and they came to a benevolent and paternal Government which was willing to give them money and give them far more than their road was worth. The hon. Minister of Railways asked Mr. Wainwright:

Q. Were you anxious to build on to Chicago yourselves?—A. Yes, and we applied to the Government to take this road off our hands, as we were not in funds.

That was a convenient thing for them to do, to unload the road because they were not in funds. They wanted to extend their railway, and they came to this Government and asked the Government to relieve them of their road, and give them something in its place, which was far better, to enable them to carry out their own private schemes in respect to the construction of their road.

But here is something in connection with that bargain which I am amazed that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals should have forgotten. There was a consideration in connection with that transaction. There was really a point in connection with the transfer which was of vast importance, and I want to give the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who was very intimately connected with that matter, the benefit of that consideration. When that transaction was going through this House the hon. leader of the Opposition said—these are his words:

He drew the attention of the then First Minister, the Minister of Public Works, to the importance of securing in the negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway in regard to the Rivière du Loup Railway, bonds by which the Intercolonial would be secured against any desire or interest on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway to divert the trade to Portland. They had provided for that.

This does not give the full effect of the hon. gentleman's utterance, of course. If it had been reported in what my learned and grammatical and logical friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) would call the 'oratio obliqua.' if it had been given in the first person instead of the third person, it would have sounded vastly more impressive. But I am afraid that I lack the lung power and elemental force which would be imparted to these words by the mode of delivery with which we are so familiar from the hon. leader of the Opposition. These were his actual words:

I drew the particular attention of the hon. First Minister and Minister of Public Works to the importance of securing in the negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in regard to the Rivière du Loup line, bonds by which the Intercolonial shall be secured against any desire or interest on the part of the Grand Trunk to divert the trade to Portland. We have provided for that here.

Do not imagine that I suppose that I am doing it in the way the hon. leader of the Opposition would have done it. This is only a pale and imperfect reflection of the manner in which these words were uttered.

Then the late Mr. Mackenzie, who was not an imaginative person, interposed the prosaic remark that he did not understand that it was provided for. Of course, those people who are persistently asking questions are very unhandy people to have around when you are making a rhetorical exhibition. The hon. leader of the Opposition said that they were effectually secured against the contingency to which he had drawn attention. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition is entitled to the credit of having prevented the traffic of the Grand Trunk from being diverted to Portland. That was one of the most important things in the interest of the people of this country; it certainly was of vast importance in the interests of the city of Halifax, in which his supporter (Mr. Borden) and myself have so keen and so strong an interest. It was one of the things that might have been anticipated, when they had parted with the piece of road between Lévis and Rivière du Loup, that there would be a tendency to develop the balance of their traffic, all the traffic they could control in the interests of the city of Portland, and surely this country, surely the city of Halifax, surely the Dominion of Canada, with its national ambitions and aspirations, owes a debt of gratitude which it can never repay, to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) for having taken these bonds, by which he prevented that traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway from ever being diverted to the city of Portland. I say, Sir, it is one of the most splendid monuments to his prescience, to his statesmanlike sagacity, to his patriotism and to the skill with which the leader of the Opposition conducted that negotiation. Age cannot stale nor custom wither the infinite variety—the infinite monotony, I should have said—of the professions and pretensions that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has made. and is making, to statesmanship, sagacity and wisdom.

Let me pass from that. There was a second method that was presented by the Minister of Railways, of arriving at the proper value of this road for the purposes of its being taken over by the Government. I have admitted, at the very outset, and I do admit now, that a series of transactions entered into by a former Administration, is not necessarily a vindication of the transaction entered into by this Administration, and, therefore, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) very properly referred to other transactions, not with the Government at all, but transactions with other railway companies; transactions by which this very Grand Trunk Railway Company itself had become possessed of

lines of railway which they were desirous of acquiring. Mr. Wainwright's evidence gave quite a number of these, and, amongst others, the Beauharnois Junction Railway. I call the attention of the committee particularly to the fact, that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has said, that the Beauharnois Railway was a railway similar to this Drummond County road, and fairly comparable to it in its character and cost of construction. Now, that Beauharnois Junction Railway cost the Grand Trunk Railway Company, not $12,000, but $17,000 a mile. We, therefore, have the admission of the hon. member (Mr. Powell), that a railway similar in its general characteristics to the Drummond County road, cost the Grand Trunk Railway Company—and not so very long ago—$17,000 per mile, against the $12,000 which is the price of the transaction we are now considering. Great efforts were made, in the course of the inquiry before the committee, to destroy the value of this transaction as a test of comparison. My hon friend (Mr. Borden) suggested that it was a bad sort of country this railway went through, but Mr. Wainwright replied: Oh, no; it is a very fine country. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) asked: Any bridges? And Mr. Wainwright replied: Only one important bridge.

Q. (By Mr. Borden.) Does that $17,000 include anything such as rolling stock?—A. (By Mr. Wainwright.) No, sir, it is the cost of the road.
Q. (By Mr Borden.) The permanent work on the road?—A. (By Mr. Wainwright.) Just the permanent work on the road.

Then Mr. Haggart plucked up courage to ask a question. It was the astuteness and acumen of the ex-Minister of Railways; it was not the luminous intellect of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) or of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell); it was the ingenuity and skill of the hon. member of South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that lit upon this suggestion: That it was only from the auditor's books that Mr. Wainwright found out the cost of the road. Mr. Wainwright, of course, did not stand over the work. He did not see every shovelful of earth taken out and every solitary spike driven in; he only knew by general repute or rather from his familiarity with the affairs of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. He knew by the same process of knowledge by which we know nine out of ten things that are worth knowing at all. Ninety-nine things out of a hundred that we know best, we do not know from absolute personal consciousness of the facts. And then, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) suggested that there might be some of this $15,000 paid as a bonus in the purchase of the franchise from the old company, but Mr. Wainwright replied:

No, there was no old company to purchase. The charter was obtained by the Grand Trunk in the name of the Beauharnois Railway.

And then Mr. Borden asked:

Q. Does this $17,000 or $18,000 include the cost of the land?—A. Yes, it includes everything—building, and land damage and all.

So that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) could not get any light from that quarter. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) admitted that the Beauharnois Junction road was similar to the Drummond County, and we, therefore, have his admission that the Grand Trunk Railway paid over $5,000 per mile more for a similar road than the modest and moderate sum at which this Drummond County Railway was purchased by this Government.

I would like to furnish one other test of comparison before we adjourn, as the leader of the Opposition, is not always here, and I want his friends and followers, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) and my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), to know what their leader's views were as to the really proper way of estimating the value of a railroad for the purpose of a transaction like this. There is another method, and, I submit, a method which is perhaps the best of all, namely, to estimate what would be the cost of constructing a similar road, if this road were not there and we were desirous of putting it and found it necessary to have it for the purpose of railway extension there. I say, that is, to my mind, the very best way of arriving at a result, and it is what ought to be absolutely conclusive to my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden) and absolutely conclusive to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who is such an admirer and panegyrist of the leader of the Opposition, and who pronounced a eulogium upon him the other day as to which I do not precisely know in what character it is to go upon the records of the literature of this country. At all events, I say that this ought to be particularly interesting to those hon. gentlemen, and I call attention specially to it. The then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper), when explaining the Rivière du Loup transaction to the House, said that they thought,—the Government thought—this was a governmental pronouncement—"they thought that the fair mode of arriving at the price was to look at what expenditure the Government would be obliged to make, provided that road was not in existence." That is to say, that the proper way of estimating what they ought to give the Grand Trunk Railway for this road from Rivière du Loup to Lévis, was to say in fairness and in honesty: We are desirous of having a road there. If the Grand Trunk Railway were not there we would be compelled to put it there; what is more fair, more just, and more equitable than that we should give to these persons who have put it there, what it would cost us if we ourselves were compelled to build it at our own expense. That is a fair and reasonable

and to my mind a just and equitable way of arriving at the solution of the question. What is the proper price to pay, what was the proper price for the Government of this country to pay for the Drummond County Railway? I know of no other way of getting at that than to take the estimates of engineers as to what would be the cost of constructing a similar road. Now, what are the estimates? There was an estimate given by Mr. Schreiber of $1,365,000 for the road, exclusive of the Nicolet branch, which is also included in this purchase and which he estimated at $170,000; making a gross total estimate of $1,535,000 for this property which the Government has purchased. That was a fair estimate, made by an unbiassed officer, made for the purpose of informing the department of which he was the Deputy Minister, and made, of course, in the interests of the public, in all candour and in all sincerity. There is another estimate which is equally valuable, the estimate made by Mr. McLeod, on whom the hon. member for Westmoreland attempted to cast some sort of slur by saying that Mr. McLeod did not take pains in making that estimate. But his instructions were to take pains to make a correct estimate and do whatever was necessary to inform himself so as to put a proper valuation on the road; and he says himself that he had been over the road from Moose Park to Ste. Rosalie over and over again,—on hand-car, and that he had walked over part of it. I am sure the hon member for Westmoreland must have been mistaken in regard to the evidence of Mr. McLeod. I am sure he must have been confounding it with the evidence of Mr. P. S. Archibald, who did give evidence of the flimsy character which he described, as to the estimated cost and the quality of the road when standing on the car platform, he was being whisked through the country at the rate of 30 or 40 miles an hour—at the expense, I am reminded, of the people of Canada, when the road was covered with snow, and when he discovered a great variety of defects in it. I am sure the hon. member for Westmoreland must have been thinking of the evidence of Mr. Archibald when he characterized in that way the evidence of Mr. McLeod, the engineer who was sent by Mr. Blair to make an estimate of the road, because he has not done justice to Mr. McLeod or to his proceedings. There is one thing to be borne in mind in connection with all these estimates, especially that of Mr. Schreiber, that is, that estimates, I might almost say invariably, are below the actual experience Why, it is almost pathetic to read what the then Minister of Railways had to admit in respect to the estimated cost of the St. Charles Branch as compared with the actual cost. Nothing could better illustrate the old adage that

> Who buys a house already wrought
> Hath many a board and nail for naught.

I suppose it would be safe to say that there was never a case in which the estimate was not below the mark; but I will not make so broad a statement. I can say, however, that in nine cases out of ten you may make up your mind that if a work is estimated to cost $1,900,000 it will cost $2,000,000 before you get through. There is almost a tone of pathos as I have observed in what Sir Charles Tupper said in regard to the cost of that famous St. Charles Branch. Mr. Blake had said some hard things about it in his hard way, and Sir Charles Tupper then said:

> I have already stated that I found myself entirely astray in regard to the estimate made. I took the precaution, before I made my estimate, of applying to the best sources of information within my power. I had the road carefully surveyed; I employed what I supposed to be the most competent persons to make an estimate of what the land damages would be; and my estimate has proved to be entirely fallacious. The land and property were placed at a value which I thought was simply impossible. Every effort was made on the part of the Government to keep the cost at the lowest possible amount.

I say estimates are nearly always fallacious. Hardly ever are they reliable. No man ever built a house who did not find his estimate of its cost very much under the amouut he was obliged to pay to his contractors. So I say, when we take these estimates, it is only right and fair and just that we should take into account the fact that nearly all estimates are below the actual experience. The very best way therefore to find out the cost of this road would be to inquire what it did cost as a matter of absolute fact. As that branch of the matter will occupy a considerable time, and lead me into an analysis of the acute cross-examination of the hon. member for Westmoreland, I hope the House will excuse me from further considering the matter this evening.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the General Trust Corporation of Canada.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 130) respecting the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited).—(Mr. Bain, by Mr. Landerkin.)

PETROLEUM REFINERIES—LICENSE FEES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

That the House do resolve itself, to-morrow, into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :—

"That it is expedient to provide that every company or person engaged in the refining of petroleum in Canada shall pay annually a license fee of one dollar for every refinery in which such business is carried on, such fee to become payable from and after a day to be fixed by the Governor General by proclamation for bringing into operation any Act which provides for the imposing of such license fee."

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move :

That from this date to the end of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to this motion passing, because, of course, we all desire to facilitate the buisness of the House, but the right hon. gentleman will understand that it is very desirable that we should have an opportunity of moving for papers to be brought down, and that they should be brought down as promptly as possible. It would be well to add, after the word "questions" in the motion, the words "unopposed motions," as I think the business of the House will be facilitated in that way. With that understanding I have no objection to the motion passing.

Mr. CASEY. I would remind the House that there are several public Bills in charge of private members which from some reason or other have been delayed from time to time, and this motion if carried in its present shape, would prevent any further discussion of these Bills. I would suggest to the right hon. the leader of the House, to amend the motion by adding that the order of business for Wednesdays should be transferred to the Mondays, after six o'clock, so that public Bills might be proceeded with.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection to that suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey), and indeed that rule has been somewhat followed in former years. As to the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, it does not require a motion, but it may be understood that we will go on with the unopposed motions. With regard to the orders passed by the House I know of nothing that now requires any peculiar celerity, except the Deadman's Island matter, and I think we will have that on Monday.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the Manitoba prosecutions.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well; these two I think we will have on Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion, as amended, will read as follows :—

That from this date to the end of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays, immediately after questions to be put by members, and that Wednesday's Order, under rule 19, be made the Order for Mondays.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—THE HON. MR. COSTIGAN.

Mr. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I feel compelled, in justice to myself, and I might also claim in justice to those whom I may call my friends in the country, though they may be very few, that a certain statement should be made by me—such a statement has been rendered necessary, not only on account of certain newspaper articles attributing to me very improper motives because of my change of seat and change of attitude towards the present leaders of the Opposition in this House. The statement is further necessary on account of the very questionable and improper motives attributed to me, in an interview published in the newspapers from the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I therefore propose, Mr. Speaker, to deal as briefly as possible with this subject, to make some references to a few of the newspaper articles, and to pay more particular attention to the interview I have just mentioned. In order that I may be in accordance with the rules of the House, I will conclude with a motion before resuming my seat.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I find myself occupying a different seat from the one that I occupied since the last general elections. To my mind it requires no very lengthy explanation for my change of attitude towards—not the old Conservative party, that I worked with and worked with so faithfully for so many years; but towards the Conservative party as I find it constructed and led to-day in this House, and in the country consequently. I may take up first, not the most important, but one of the early critics who assigned questionable motives to me for my conduct, and I may say, that it appears to me that one of the principal objects in these attacks made upon me, is to prove, not that I have not reason, not that I have not common intelligence, not

that I have not honour, but to prove that I am actuated by unworthy motives. I shall refer to the conclusion arrived at by what I understand to be the organ of a gentleman elected to this House to represent the independent sentiment of Canada.

First, I thought it was the independent sentiment of Toronto that he expressed. But he takes a broader grasp than that. According to his own speeches he is the representative of the independent sentiment of Canada in federal politics. I refer to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson). In his paper the conclusion is arrived at, very early in the discussion of this question, that I have placed myself in a position to be known now as a man who never opposed a Government or supported an Opposition; that is, that I have been simply actuated by selfish motives, seeking to be with the men who had something to give. Now, I need not go outside of this House to prove that that is not true. The only time the old, real Conservative party of this country were in Opposition since confederation—and I have been here since that time—was from the time Sir John Macdonald resigned in 1873 up to the time he resumed power in 1878; and I pride myself on the fact that I was one of the old guard during that time, with some of the hon. gentlemen I see here, and who in their hearts, I believe, have some sympathy for me. That was the time when I had an opportunity to give proof of my fidelity to the Conservative party, and I gave it, beyond the possibility of dispute and beyond the cavils of the "Evening Telegram" of Toronto. But I question the fair-play of the hon. member for East Toronto in attacking me in the way he does. I do not question his right to attack me on the floors of Parliament. I may not be able to defend myself in as eloquent and as choice language as he can command in attacking me; but I will take my chances. But is it fair that the hon. gentleman should bring to his assistance in attacking me his newspaper? I have no newspaper behind me. I have to depend upon myself and upon the good-will of my friends for my defence. Not only has the hon. gentleman the aid of his literary editor and manager to back up his attacks on me; but he has in his paper a double-barrelled gun. Besides having the advantage of being able to attack me through his literary editor, he has the services of a very distinguished artist, no doubt, for the purpose of belittling and ridiculing, if possible, by means of cartoons published in his paper, any gentleman in this House or out of it whom he chooses to attack. That is not the only advantage he has. By means of that artist he can produce cartoons which cannot hurt, though they may distort the appearance of things, and may leave the impression on the public that the man thus caricatured is a very inferior character, and in that way may prejudice against him the opinion of men who have never seen him. The great advantage that man has is that it is out of my power to retaliate; for there is no artist in Canada or on this continent who could make a cartoon of that hon. gentleman's countenance that would not flatter him. So much, Mr. Speaker, for the "Evening Telegram's" attack, and for the independent member for East Toronto.

Now, I pass on to one more newspaper. There are a great many to which I might refer, but I do not want to trespass on the attention of the House. I will take up a very prominent paper, the "Mail and Empire." That paper revives an old slander which the Toronto "Mail" formerly put forward against me, and the falsity of which has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt. It remained silent for a long time, and I heard no more about it. But now the "Mail and Empire," inspired with about the same amount of friendship for me as the old Toronto "Mail" evinced, reproduces the slander, not through its editorial columns, but through its correspondent in this city. That paper, to explain my position and to show what kind of a character I am, states that away back in 1884, while I was a member of Sir John Macdonald's Government, finding a number of his supporters from the province of Quebec in rebellion against his Government on account of the loan of $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I, as a traitor, took advantage of the discontent of the wing led by the late Sir Adolphe Chapleau, to betray my leader and send in my resignation; but that as soon as I found that these men came back loyally to their old chieftain, I withdrew my resignation and crawled back also. I will not use any words of my own to refute that twice-repeated slander. I will give an authority for which I have the greatest respect, and which I challenge any gentleman in this House or in the country to question. The authority I refer to is that old chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, whose memory is still held dear in this country. I do not know that I need read the whole of it. It will be remembered that at the time referred to I had tendered my resignation. The Hon. Edward Blake insisted on fuller explanations than he had received as to the reasons for my resignation, and the causes for my withdrawal of that resignation. On proceeding with the Order before the House dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway Loan Bill, Mr. Blake renewed his question for fuller explanations of my resignation. Sir John A. Macdonald said:

I am very sorry the hon. gentleman and I cannot agree upon that point. I do not know whether he heard my answer the other night—my statement. I took occasion to state—although I said I would not answer it again, I will repeat what I said—I stated that my hon. friend and colleague had tendered his resignation for

matters personal to himself, but matters not affecting the general policy of the Government, and which had not the most remote connection with the measure in the hands of my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways ; that I refused to present the resignation to His Excellency for his acceptance ; that my hon. friend withdrew his resignation for reasons which I have given, and which are of no use to anybody in the world, and can have no political significance, and can be of no constitutional significance. My hon. friend withdrew his resignation. I was very glad of it, and I hope he may long remain my colleague.

As to the question of my honour and integrity as a man, I place these words before the public as a sufficient answer to the slanderers who are attacking me to-day.

Now, Sir, when asked by a newspaper reporter about my position, as I am naturally pretty candid, I told him at once that he might say that I had severed my connection entirely with the gentlemen who control the Conservative party, that they did not represent the ideas I expected to see them represent and had been accustomed to follow, and in as few words as possible, I wished to have that understood. I do not wish to occupy a questionable position or one of doubt. I find that when the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition was called to this matter his view was, as stated in an interview published in the press :

> This move of Mr. Costigan was not, by any means, unexpected. When Sir Charles Tupper was shown the foregoing statement that I have made, he said : " I am not at all surprised to see the announcement that Mr. Costigan has made, that he now belongs to the Government party. I think that the correspondence read in the House by Dr. Roche discloses fully the humiliating position in which Mr. Costigan has placed himself. The difficulty will be for the Government to defend the means by which they have acquired his support rather than for any person else to explain it. All that I am surprised at is that Mr. Costigan has not sufficient self-respect to leave the front benches of the Conservative party. It is too late for him to raise any question of principle as the ground of separation between himself and the Conservative party had been made. The discussion of the papers brought down by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), moved for by Dr. Roche, will leave no room for doubt in the mind of any person as to how Mr. Costigan's support has been obtained by the party in power. The Government need have no anxiety about his vote so long as they retain power. After what has already taken place between him and the Government, it is clear that the less Mr. Costigan talks about ' independent ' action the better."

Well, the hon. gentleman did not express any surprise at my attitude. I must confess that I was, on the contrary, surprised very much at that statement. Not because of any favours I expected at the hands of that hon. gentleman, not for any kindness, not for any consideration, but in view of the dignity that belongs to the position held, accidentally and temporarily, by the leader of the Opposition, I expected manly treatment. I expected to be treated as an old member of Parliament would, by even that distinguished gentleman. I have not received such treatment. I do not complain as having undergone any serious loss, but I complain of a gross breach of the courtesy that is expected to exist between members of Parliament. Now, Sir, I agree with him in his sentiment that he was not surprised at my change. He knew it was not a change of to-day ; he knew that I had been changed from the time he landed in Canada, not to the rescue of the Conservative party, as in old times he might claim, but to the detriment and ruin of that old party. The day he sailed from England, and especially the day he landed in Canada, the doom of an honest Government and the leadership of an honest man was sealed. The fate of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government was sealed. Sir, he came, and a great deal has been said about the manner of his coming. That, perhaps, I will not touch upon now, because there is a history to the whole of this transaction, a history that will be written, and a history that will form one of the darkest pages that can be written or will be read, so far as all these who were intimately connected with it at that time are concerned. A change of position on my part ! I was in the Government with hon. gentlemen that I see around me here now, under Sir Mackenzie Bowell. I had the support, as an humble member of that Government, of the hon. gentlemen that I see sitting around me here—their honest support, I am glad to say. From my acquaintance with the old Conservative party, no matter where I may sit, no matter what my feelings may be, no matter what defence I may be obliged to make, I will pay tribute to the gentlemen that deserve it ; that grand old party comprises men of honour, integrity and patriotism. But they are not the rulers of the party. It is not the large number that govern and shape the policy of the party, but I was going to say, if you want to know when I changed my politics, I changed them the day that half of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government went out and left him in the lurch, after they had been a party to his calling Parliament together to transact business. My change of front and my justification for it are based on that act, an act that was indefensible. Is there a Conservative on this side who will say I was wrong in standing by my chieftain, and that these gentlemen were right in leaving him in the lurch and betraying him, to use a stronger term ? Not one has said so to the present ; not one will say it here or in the country. If I was right, it is not a great stretch of argument to say that they were wrong. That is sufficient on that point. I wish to be clearly understood, that though deeply wounded, insulted, vilified, feeling strongly, and having the feeling within me that I fear no man or party in self-defence, my only duty is to restrain myself within proper limits, to say nothing unnecessarily offensive to either the individual or the party I have been with, but to confine myself as closely as possible to what may be necessary to rebut the slanders that have been launched against me.

Now, to make my position more plain, I must say this, that I enjoyed the confidence of Sir John Macdonald, of which I shall always be proud, that I enjoyed the confidence of his successors, the Hon. Sir John Abbott, the Hon. Sir John Thompson, and the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell. I do not claim or profess to have enjoyed fully the confidence of the gentleman who succeeded him. Some of the newspapers and some friends attach a great deal of importance to this fact, in order to strengthen the charge that I am so selfish and looking out for personal gain, and that that is my principal object--they say: Oh, yes, you differed with the present wing of the Conservative party when they were false to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, but you went into Sir Charles Tupper's Government and stayed with him as long as he was in power and had favours to bestow. I admit that, to the outside world, to those who do not understand the question, and even to those who had a good opinion of me—and I am happy to say they are numerous in this country, the people who have a fairly good opinion of me and my honesty—that appears difficult to understand. I am not so prominent as many men in public life; I have tried to discharge my duty as a humble representative of a very humble constituency during many years: I have done my duty, to the best of my ability, faithfully. I feel confident that every man who knows me—every impartial man—will give me the credit of a desire to do what is right. The fact then that I joined the Government that was formed under the present leader of the Opposition and that ended so quickly, perhaps requires a little explanation. I did, of course, go into the Government formed by that hon. gentleman. I went into it most reluctantly, however, and my presence in that Cabinet was not proof that I was seeking my own personal advantage or what favours he might have been in a position to bestow. The hon. gentleman knows that about the time—and I knew the time the change would take place as well as he did. I knew the time Sir Mackenzie Bowell would likely tender his resignation and the probable time his successor would be called on to form a Government—at that time some of my personal friends—humble, of course, like myself—were engaged in a libel suit in another county outside of their own, where they were strangers. I felt an interest in them, and they appealed to me to come, and I started at once to stand by my friends. Some persons friendly to me said: But there will be a Government constructed before you come back. I said: I do not care if half a dozen Governments are constructed before I get back. I am not very much interested in the Governments that are being constructed now upon the new basis. I started out, but accidentally it happened that on my way up to the buildings I met the leader of the Opposition. He asked me if it was true that I was going to New Brunswick, and I said it was. He asked me when I would be back, and I told him I expected to be back on Thursday. He said that very likely he might be called upon to form a Government, and that he wished to have me in his Cabinet, but in case I would not get back in time, he wished to have my consent before I started. I thanked him for the compliment that he paid me, as it was my duty to do. But I told him that I would give him my answer finally that evening, that I would call upon him, or, failing that, I would put it in writing. I did put it in writing, and sent it to the hon. gentleman. That document contained the conditions clearly defined under which I agreed to go into his Cabinet, and outside of these, I would not have accepted a position in his Cabinet, which he very well knows. Therefore, with the knowledge that I went into his Cabinet at his request, and that that request, complimentary though it was, was not sufficient to take me into his Cabinet except on the conditions that I laid down in writing, I think, Sir, it comes with bad grace from that hon. gentleman to refer to my conduct, to my motives and to my character in the way he did in that interview that I have just read in the press.

Now, I might call upon the hon. gentleman to deny, or to explain away, or read the letter that I wrote him at that time; I will do neither. The hon. gentleman has —I won't say paid me the compliment, that would be a bad construction—he has singled me out to show that I am not worthy of that courtesy which is extended to any member of this Chamber, and has refused to recognize me. Well, I have slept regularly every night since, thank God. I have taken my regular meals. It pained me, I do confess, if that is any consolation to the hon. gentleman: it wounded my feelings to think that a man in his position, knowing me as he had known me, could think that it was any advantage to him, or that he could suppose that because he ignored me he was thereby destroying my character in the country. I hope I have not committed any crime that would justify any hon. member in this House withholding from me the courtesy that every gentleman is entitled to from his fellow member.

Well, Sir, I have no questions to ask, no favours to expect. I have little more to say, especially of an aggressive character. I will add this, however: I have long felt that the hon. gentleman's reasons for disapproving of my conduct were unworthy of a gentleman holding his position. I have felt all along that there were gentlemen behind him who could not conscientiously endorse those reasons and would not stultify themselves by endorsing them. I appreciate their position. They are silent. I do not quarrel with them. Many of them are friends, have been personal friends, and I do not wish to interrupt the friendly rela-

tions that exist between many of them and myself—there are some gentlemen, of course, to whom this does not apply. But I want this to be clearly understood, that while I refrain from making retaliatory attacks, striking back to-day, from this time forward I shall defend myself. I am a man of peace, I never was a quarrelsome man, but I am not a peace-at-any-price-man ; and the man that follows this up and strikes me, if he does not get blow for blow, it is because old Costigan is getting too old.

I do not feel to-day, though, perhaps, spurred up a little by the unjust attacks made upon me, that I am so far incapacitated as not to be able to give a good account of myself, wherever, whenever, and under whatever circumstances any of these gentlemen —and I allude to the unfriendly ones, of course—choose to attack me. The conditions under which I went into that Government, Mr. Speaker, are contained in a letter dated about the time I refer to, the day I was leaving for New Brunswick. I will read the letter :

Ottawa, 26th April, 1896.

Dear Sir Charles Tupper,—Referring to our conversation yesterday, in which you mentioned that during my absence until Thursday in New Brunswick, you might be called upon to form a Government, and wished to know if I would accept a position in your Cabinet. I have thought the matter over most carefully, and I think it well that I should address you this letter so as to define my position exactly.

I entered Sir John Macdonald's Government in 1882 to render his Government all the support that I could bring as an Irish Catholic representative, believing that in that position I would be able to secure for Irish Catholics a reasonable and legitimate recognition of their rights, but after 14 years under different chiefs of the Conservative party, I am forced to the humiliating admission that I have been unable to secure anything like fair treatment for the Irish Catholic people where their interests were involved, though I am quite sure that few Irish Catholics in Canada believe that I failed for want of pressing, with all possible earnestness, their claims on all occasions. You can therefore easily understand that after 35 years service in politics, I have no great desire to continue the struggle.

There is no evidence there of a greedy desire to get in for the loaves and fishes. I might retort that I know of men who are inordinately greedy.

In view, however, of the principle involved in remedial legislation, to which Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government was pledged, and as to the sincerity of which pledges Sir Mackenzie gave such unquestionable proof, and in view of the fact that your Government is to be formed to carry out the same policy, especially as regards the Manitoba school policy, I feel it my duty to say to you at once that you may count upon my assistance and services, if you require them, as a member of your Government, always presuming that the policy to reintroduce and press through a Remedial Bill at the first session of the new Parliament, will be clearly announced by you on behalf of your Government. I attach all the more importance to this clear announcement of the Government policy on the question of remedial legislation, on account of the difficulties that occurred between Sir Mackenzie Bowell and part of his Cabinet at the beginning of last session, which involved serious delay, but for which our chances in passing remedial legislation would have been much better.

I must also mention that it will be absolutely necessary and in fact consistent with remedial legislation, that the Dominion Lands Act be so amended next session as to enable the Governor General in Council to ensure a fair proportion of the proceeds of the school lands being paid to the separate schools in Manitoba. In view of recent events I would rather not return to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and, as it is one of the most important at your disposal, I am sure you would not find it difficult to offer me the Post Office Department instead.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN COSTIGAN.

I might explain that last paragraph by saying that I did not object to taking the Marine and Fisheries Department because it was not a very important one, for I admit that it is, and I think any gentleman would be complimented who would be put in charge of it. But the hon. gentleman had treated me, not only discourteously, but in the most arbitrary and most unprecedented way the moment that he grasped what he had sought for, a seat in the Cabinet, and I did not care about returning to that department if it could be avoided. These are the conditions under which I went into that Government. I discharged my duties to that Government as faithfully as I could. I was as loyal to that Government as any man in it—more loyal than some, more loyal than some who, immediately after the results of the elections were known, when our Government was defeated, not satisfied with the slaughter that had gone on, with the knifing and betraying one another that had brought about the defeat, started a new crusade to unhorse the gallant gentleman himself. I was the first—at least, I took an early occasion, in my modest way, to counteract that movement, on the ground that they had had enough of that kind of knifing, and that they had better unite their forces, that the hon. gentleman was their legitimate leader, having fought the battles. But I knew that, if they succeeded at the time, that would not have ended the trouble, because the old friends would have been divided on new issues, and it meant the complete disintegration of the Conservative party. I have only one more reference to make, and that is with reference to my pretensions of independence. Well, Sir, after thirty-eight years representing a constituency continuously, as I have, I do feel bound to resent any insinuation, any charge that would imply a want of honour, or honesty, or frankness, in my character. I have been known in my constituency since childhood. I have not been as well known in the country as some of the prominent gentlemen around me ; but, wherever I have been known, I think I can safely say, that I have been known to be a true and faithful

friend and a fair and honourable opponent. These characteristics I have tried to maintain all through life. I have made no fortune in politics ; I have had my difficulties; I have had as hard scratching as any man who works for his day's wages in the field or elsewhere. I started earning my wages as a hired man, and I am not ashamed of it—and I am no better off now than when I started. All I can say is, that, for every day's wages I got, I gave a good, honest day's work in return. My sense of self-respect was questioned, because I continued, for a few days longer than the hon. gentleman thought was consistent with his ideas of respectability and self-respect, to occupy a seat to which I felt I was as fully entitled as the hon. gentleman could possibly feel entitled to the seat he occupies. I felt the necessity, from changed circumstances, of changing my seat just as much as he did. I was as anxious to widen the distance between us as he could possibly be. But I exercised this right that no one will question—that was my seat, and I occupied it, and I simply delayed and suited my own convenience before leaving that seat, to know where I was going to find another one, because I had something to say about that. I made a proposition to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the Whip of the party. I said : I am anxious to get a little further away, and perhaps it would be more in harmony, if the change should take place. I will change with you, if you are ready, and you can move up by promotion. I am sorry the hon. gentleman could not hold that promotion long, but perhaps I had no authority to give it. Now, Sir, with respect to the parting shaft aimed at me by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the less I say about a feeling of independence or independent action, the better ; well, I do not understand that to have any greater weight than an empty threat. I have heard threats made in this House. I have heard boasts made in this House ; I have heard exaggerated statements made in this House, and I am not very much influenced, nor am I very much embarrassed because the hon. gentleman happens to have made that statement. It does not weaken my faith in the possession of a fair amount of independence, of modest, manly independence, that would compare favourably with the independence of the hon. gentleman himself.

I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to another very singular fact. On the question of the Yukon contract, I think it was, I voted square against the Government's proposal. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was a warm supporter of that measure, and not only voted for it, but defended it in a speech. I never heard of any attempt to drum him out, to courtmartial him. The newspapers of the Conservative party, big and little, scrupulous and unscrupulous, principled and unprincipled, respectable and disrespectable, did not join in loud denunciations ; they would not touch that gallant gentleman. They felt keenly the loss of his vote on that important question, but they swallowed the discomfiture very meekly and humbly. On the Drummond County Bill, one of my hon. friends, the son of a distinguished man whom I had the honour of supporting in this Parliament, the member for Compton (Mr. Pope), made a very good speech, for an Opposition member, in support of the measure. While there was a good deal of murmuring in a very quiet, muffled way, I never heard that he was very loudly denounced, or catechised, or called a traitor or a selfish man, nor were all sorts of motives imputed to him. I wondered why this different treatment was meted out to me. I had voted with the Opposition on the important questions. I voted against the Government on the next important question, the proposition to hand over a certain amount of the revenues of the school lands to Manitoba. But the moment I voted against a motion for a judicial inquiry in the Yukon territory, then, Sir, I incurred the bitter and eternal hostility of some leading men of the Conservative party. Well, there was no great necessity for being so emphatic about that denunciation. My judgment was good, if I had no higher motive, for a more stupid piece of party management never was known in the Parliament of Canada. The party had invited an old friend, a personal friend of mine, a respectable man, a man who did credit to the House while he was in it, and would do credit to it if he should return—they had selected and induced this gentleman to run for Brockville as the candidate of the party. If the county was nearly equally divided, with a small majority, such as is often found in the close constituencies in Ontario, the policy of the Opposition upon that motion alone—not the motion for a judicial inquiry itself, but the tone of the discussion, the outrageous charges, the ignoring of personal liberty, the sacrifice of personal character, the failure to recognize the right of defence on the part of these men who were attacked—all this was in itself enough to damn the chances of any man they might name. And did, Sir, my independence was proved on the Yukon measure itself. I gave my opinion somewhat in the line that the hon. leader of the Opposition gave his in interviews I saw in the press. Speaking, so far as the press is concerned, of providing access to that country, I did not make a charge against the Government that they should come to Parliament, but I considered it a case of emergency, and the only question to my mind was as to the merits of the contract itself. As to the principle of making a contract in that hasty and speedy manner to get access to that country, no one, on our side of the House will contend against. The hon. gentleman in his interview, having been over there, being largely interested in min-

ing enterprises with capitalists from England, and having himself favoured that very route from a business point of view, in the interest of the company whose interests he so well and ably managed, I dare say, was glad when he found that the Government was adopting the route he thought the best and the one which might be made accessible much more rapidly than any other. He congratulated the Government upon their policy at once. He did not change his mind when he came to Montreal, but what became of his independence when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), got up and read him a lesson that was cheered and cheered, as he knew it would be, by a number of the important and strong supporters of an hon. gentleman to-day in whom he has no more confidence than I have. His independence weakened a little from that time. Expediency, I dare say, prompted him to change his view considerably on that occasion and to adopt the view and the lesson read to him so successfully by the hon. member who has, at any rate, the reputation of having some weight with the leader of the Opposition and with the party, too, in this House.

One word more, and I am done. As to my change of front, as to my political sympathies, as to my political principles, they are well known to this country. I never went behind the bush, I never gave a doubtful note as to where I stood or what I thought. I would sooner fall, telling candidly the truth, than save myself by squirming or misconstruing facts. I followed the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, and felt and will feel it as long as I live, an honour to have served him faithfully. I followed every successor of his down to the time that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) assumed power. Had the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, or any of these successors I have referred to, remained in power or remained in active politics, on the side of this House that they sat on, whether to your left or to your right, Mr. Speaker, I would have been found sitting with them, as men I could trust and as men whom I felt it an honour to serve under. These days are changed. If Sir Mackenzie Bowell had not been throttled, bullied, betrayed and driven out of the Government, when he had a strong majority at his back, if he were here to-day I would be a friend and supporter, though he might be in the cold shades of Opposition. I do not speak for Sir Mackenzie Bowell, but I speak of him, and I say to-day, that I have the pleasure of this consolation, and it is a consolation, that while these hon. gentlemen are pursuing me in an unworthy manner I feel that I have not lost one tittle of the confidence and esteem of that worthy gentleman. While he goes farther than I am prepared to go and remains identified with the Conservative party for the sake of the old party—I do not speak for him, but I speak of him, and I say that he has as little confidence in the gentlemen with whom I have broken as I have myself. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for having so patiently listened to the few observations I have felt it my duty to offer on this occasion. I have seldom trespassed on the patience of the House, and I feel all the more grateful for the kind attention that the House has given me while making this brief statement. This, I dare say, is the initiation of a debatable question; I have not fired my last shot nor struck my last blow. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you, Sir, and every member of this House, will believe me when I say that I have witnessed the course pursued by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat with the very deepest possible regret. I do not regret his action, Sir, so far as I am personally concerned; I do not regret his action so far as the great party which I have the honour to lead, is concerned, but I do, from the bottom of my heart, deplore the fact of that hon. gentleman occupying the position that he has occupied in this country for so long a time, reaching the position that he has now reached. He says the time has come when he feels it is due to himself and due to the country that he should make a statement. I think he would have consulted his own character and standing and he would have consulted his own honour if he had made that statement long ago. It is the first time in the history of this Parliament, the first time in the history of the great Parliament which it is our pride to follow, the Parliament of England, the first instance in which a Privy Councillor, in which a gentleman occupying the position which he occupies, has voted against his party on a question of the deepest public importance and the gravest party character without one word of explanation, as to why that hon. gentleman himself stood up on the front Opposition bench of this House as an ex-Cabinet Minister and voted against his old colleagues and party. I say, Sir, that the want of courtesy was on the part of the hon. gentleman. He forgot what was due to himself; he forgot what was due to this House, he forgot what was due to the parliamentary system of government when he adopted such a course as that. I witnessed his conduct. I confess, with astonishment, but I held my peace; I said not a word either in this House or out of it, and when parties spoke to me on the subject I rather endeavoured to extenuate the hon. gentleman's conduct. It was when he went to the press of the country, when he went to the Opposition press and declared that his action was based on his desire to break with the leaders of the Conservative party be-

cause their policy had ceased to be Conservative and that he could no longer associate himself with them, that I felt bound to give to the intelligent people of this country that, which you know, and which every hon. gentleman in this House knows was the cause that operated upon the hon. gentleman and led to his defection from the party he had so long been associated with, to his abandonment of that party and to his alliance with their opponents. What was the character of the vote? I need not tell you. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) delivered his speech, but on the 2nd day of April, 1897, that hon. gentleman made a speech that created a great deal of surprise and a great deal of astonishment. It was a speech in which he made the uncalled-for announcement to the House and the country, that he owed nothing to the Conservative party. A man who sat in the councils of that party, a man who had been a member for many long years of every Conservative Government, found it necessary to make a declaration to this House, that he no longer recognized any obligation to the Conservative party, and practically was open to suggestions from hon. gentlemen opposite. No man could read that speech at that time and arrive at any other conclusion. Well, Sir, a very remarkable thing occurred, and that was with reference to a matter which is now receiving the attention of the Public Accounts Committee, and when the dates are examined, it will be found that a grave and important reason will be discovered why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) adopted the course he did. No man sympathizes more deeply than I sympathize with the grave position in which he finds himself; obliged to stand up here and to say to the Government: Do not regard me as an enemy. That was significant. But, Sir, what was the occasion on which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) broke with his party openly in this House and voted against it. It was an occasion which of all others that ever was presented in this House, bound him as a Conservative, bound him by every Conservative tradition, to stand with and by his party. What was the occasion? It was when three continents were ringing with charges of the gravest character affecting the Government of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; three continents ringing with charges of the gravest character that affected the Government of the country—charges more grave than these hon. gentlemen opposite appreciate, but which at no distant date they will appreciate. At that hour the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) voted against a motion to appoint a royal judicial commission to inquire into these charges. And, Sir, when the Government opposite were convicted of nepotism; when they were challenged with having abused their position to promote to office men utterly unfitted for the positions they appointed them to fill; when they were challenged to meet the results of that maladministration, which had caused a scandal widely extended all over Europe, Great Britain, the United States and Australia, as well as Canada, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) came to the front to protect officials who were charged with the gravest and most scandalous dereliction of their official duties; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan), on that occasion, for the first time, allied himself openly in this House with the men who said: We will not permit an investigation into the conduct of officials charged with the gravest official misconduct; we will not do that unless you will allow us to select the wife's uncle of the man held responsible by this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I say the wife's uncle of the man held responsible in this House for all that misconduct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. Shame.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it was a shame. Was there ever a greater scandal than for a Minister of the Crown, charged with a gross dereliction of duty to select a person so closely identified with him and his family, that he could not, unless he were more than human, discharge his duty. It was a shame, and it is a scandal that is clinging to the skirts of this Government, and will cling to them until they adopt a different mode of dealing with this important subject. That was the occasion on which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) deserted his party. I sat here patiently to-day and listened with intense interest to hear him justify the declaration that he gave to the press. It was he who was wanting in courtesy; he was the man who had never approached the party with whom he was associated; never approached the leader who never was wanting in courtesy to him, as he well knows; never approached me, who from the first hour of our association down to the time he (Mr. Costigan) stood up here and took that attitude never was wanting in courtesy to him. Even then I did not resent it. But when he went to the press of the country and declared he was compelled to abandon the Conservative party because the leader of his party was no longer a Conservative, and was no longer a man that he could support; I listened with intense interest to-day to hear him give one word of explanation to the expecting people of this country to justify his conduct. He sat down without touching the subject, because he could not touch it.

Why, Sir, in the letter which he wrote, he admitted that when I invited him to join the Administration I was called upon to form, he gave his adhesion and became a member of my Government, and he has read a paper which he communicated to me announcing the views and principles which he held in regard to that subject. The first statement he makes in that letter is :

> He was forced to the humiliating admission that he had been unable to secure anything like fair treatment for the Irish Catholic people where their interests were involved.

Yet, Sir, he stands up in this House to-day and says, that to this hour he would stand by Sir John Macdonald. And, Sir, if any man was responsible for Irish Catholics not having got that which they were entitled to : if that charge stood against anybody, it stood against the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, who was so long in power. If that charge lay against anybody, it was against the Hon. Sir John Abbott, it was against the Hon. Sir John Thompson, it was against the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell; it was not against me, because I had no opportunity as Premier of showing what I could do for Irish Catholics, nor for any person else, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) knows. He (Mr. Costigan) knows, for he sat side by side in the Canadian Cabinet long enough with me to know, that the first Irish Catholic judge that ever adorned the bench of Nova Scotia was nominated by me. He (Mr. Costigan) knows more. He knows that the first Irish Catholic Governor of that province was nominated by me. He knows that on every occasion, from the first hour of my public life down to the present, no man has shown more readiness than I have to deal with the claims and interests of persons of all classes and of all creeds, without prejudice against any creed, and he knows that whenever they were entitled to promotion, to prominence and distinction, they received it at my hands as far as I was able to give it. What more ? He (Mr. Costigan) said he made stipulations before he entered the Cabinet of which I was Prime Minister. He knew right well that there was no cause for stipulations. He knew right well that at a most important crisis, when the interests of the Roman Catholics were at stake and when that had become a cardinal question ; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) knows, that at the request of Sir Mackenzie Bowell himself—after I refused to listen to any proposal from any source whatever in reference to party matters in this country —he knows that the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell sent for me and invited me to become a member of his Cabinet, and he knows that having done so and having been appointed to the leadership of the Conservative party in this House. I fought, however feebly, that battle ; and he (Mr. Costigan) knows that I fought it with all the ability and all the courage I possessed.

What is the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) now ? Is he carrying out the sentiments embodied in his letter ? Is he carrying out the conditions which he addressed to me, when he deserts the Conservative party, that party which fought and fell with their faces to the foe ; that party which fought the battle of the Roman Catholics of this country—is he carrying out his conditions when he deserts that party to ally himself with the men, to ally himself with the party, to ally himself with the leader who, in order to attain power, struck down the just claims of the Roman Catholic minority when they were pressed in this House by the Conservative party of Canada. He knows that we went to the country, proclaiming with no uncertain sound that if we were returned to power we would bring into this House a measure that would do justice to the Roman Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba. He knows that the right hon. leader of this House himself, when seeking power, declared solemnly to the people of the great province of Quebec that if he obtained power he would go further than I had gone, and give a stronger measure and more complete relief if he did not obtain it by other means. That was the position ; and what does the hon. gentleman do ? He deserts those who have always stood true, in power or out of power, to the cardinal principle of justice to an oppressed minority, and he goes over to the men who have repudiated that principle, and who prevented the minority in Manitoba from obtaining their rights on the last occasion. But, Sir, what more ? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman wanted the Dominion Lands Act amended. Has it been amended ? Has the right hon. leader of this House brought in a measure to amend that Act, and to provide for an equitable distribution of the proceeds of the school lands in Manitoba ? He knows he has not ; and here the hon. gentleman stands, without the shadow of an excuse from his own showing, without being able to raise his finger against one jot or tittle of the policy which I have sustained and which my hon. friends behind me have sustained, and abandons his party because he thinks it is not right to have officials who have disgraced and degraded themselves tried by anybody but dependents or personal connections of the men most interested. I sympathize most deeply with the hon. gentleman. Estranged and separated as we now are, I sympathize with him, because I can imagine the struggle, the innate struggle, which any man of honour or standing or character must undergo, in passing through the terrible ordeal through which that hon. gentleman has been obliged to pass in order to reach his present position, and for objects which I do not think I misconstrue when called upon to meet one of the most coarse invectives with which I have ever been assailed by any public man, in the interview which the hon. gentleman gave to

the "Free Press" of this city, in which he denounced our conduct in pressing for inquiries into official misconduct, and in which he said that we had adopted a brutal course. Sir, I can understand the difficulty of the hon. gentleman; but he forgot himself and he forgot the intelligence of the people of this country when he gave vent to such excuses as those to which I have referred.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to occupy much time on this subject. It is not necessary; but I may say this, that from the hour I landed in Canada down to this hour I challenge the hon. gentleman to name one single act of any description whatever in which I have failed to maintain, as best I could, with what little ability I possess, the best traditions of the Conservative party. Our principles to-day are the principles they have always been. Our policy to-day is the policy that made Canada what it is, and the hon. gentleman knows it. I say, therefore, that I listened in vain for any justification whatever for the course which the hon. gentleman has pursued. With all the want of confidence which he intimates he had in me, the hon. gentleman, as I said before, closed his mouth, as far as the mouth of an honourable man could be closed, against uttering one word to my discredit when he entered the Cabinet of which I was the head, at my invitation, and remained there as long as he was able to do so. What more? The hon. gentleman says that when certain of the gentlemen behind me were caballing to depose me from the leadership of the Conservative party, he was prepared to stand valiantly by my side and defend me against all comers. And yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman takes his seat without uttering one word that can justify an act on his part unparalleled in Canada, and unparalleled in any other country.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to say more than this, that so far as the hon. gentleman's seat is concerned, I did say, and I felt, that the hon. gentleman had made an exhibition that never has been paralleled in this House nor in the House of Commons of England nor in any other place where parliamentary institutions are respected, by voting against his party without one word of explanation. Then, having found that those with whom he was associated overlooked that act, and did not challenge him, he asks, why did we not attack the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) for voting against us on the Yukon question? Why do we not attack gentlemen for voting against us on any question? We do not attack them because under our system of government it is open to men, on whichever side of the House they sit, to differ, and conscientiously differ, from their party on important questions. But on the question which the hon. gentleman selected, there was a deep significance in the position he took that he would leave the Conservative side of the House and go into the ranks of that party who will not permit official misconduct to be properly and thoroughly investigated. I do not intend to follow that matter further at this moment, for very sufficient reasons; but when I do take it up, I will not deal with the hon. gentleman who has been so anxious to place a respectable distance between us, in which desire I sympathize most heartily. This seat, Sir, the seat he occupied in this House, was not his. It was mine. He occupied that seat in virtue of having been a colleague of mine in the late Administration. He was placed there by me, and the moment he was prepared to abandon me and the party and his old associations, he was bound to leave that seat, his occupancy of which prevented that intercommunication between old colleagues which is absolutely necessary; and he was bound to regard the slightest hint that it was only reasonable to place a considerable distance between us in future.

Now, Sir, I have never had in my public life a more painful duty to discharge than that which I have had to discharge to-day. Not because I regret the loss of the hon. gentleman or his defection from the party which I lead. I think we can stand that, and a great deal more; but I am afraid, after the threat that has been held out to me, that I shall have to crave from you, Mr. Speaker, the protection of the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort me to my home, for fear of that condign punishment which the hon. gentleman seems to desire to inflict upon me. An octogenarian, as my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) says—a valetudinarian, as the hon. gentleman says I am—I think I am able to take care of myself even in that conflict. I will not say more. In saying those few words, I have discharged perhaps the most painful duty of my public life, and one I trust I shall never be called on to discharge again during the brief period that remains to me.

Mr. JOHN ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). I have listened with not a little interest, and, I confess, some curiosity, to the statement of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan). The making of such a statement was not unexpected, for his last political move, his desertion of the party with which he has been allied, as he himself states, for thirty-eight years past, demanded some explanation. His flitting from one political side of this House to the other may give joy to hon. gentlemen opposite, yet I have reason to believe that the loss of this side is not looked on as a great Liberal gain. The hon. member for Victoria, N.B., has gone up and down the gamut of his political life, and his explanation embraces not only a criticism regarding his late political friends, but he has also seen fit to draw into the lines of discussion the opinions expressed upon his actions by the newspaper press, and more especially by the Toronto "Evening Telegram." He referred to the editorial opinions expressed by that journal, and was also, good enough to say, that there is no artist with skill enough to

portray my face on paper. But there is no doubt in my mind that the artist makes a dead shot every time he gets his pencil at the face of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must be aware, as a public man, that his acts, whether as a private member or when he was a Minister of the Crown, are fair subjects for newspaper comment; and, from all the hon. gentleman has given us this afternoon as an excuse for his desertion, I am inclined to think that the newspaper press have not dealt unfairly with him. I am not here, however, to justify any comments which may have appeared in the columns of the journal which I have the honour to own. The fact is, that the actions of the hon. gentleman are sufficient justification, not only for what the Toronto "Evening Telegram" has said, but for what it might say. The hon. gentleman need not blame the Conservative party for any wrong he may have suffered at my hands. I accept the fullest responsibility for anything that may have been said, either inside or outside of this House.

The hon. gentleman, in one of the letters he read, has referred to the rights of the Irish race. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) regards himself as a patriot and an ornament to the Irish race. I admire the Irish people; and, because I admire them, I am striving to forget that any section of the Irish people in Canada ever accepted the leadership of the hon. gentleman. I admit that he has many of the good qualities of the Irish race; but he seems to lack that noble virtue of faithfulness in adversity; and when, in the fulness of time—and I hope the time is long, long distant—he is gathered to his fathers, his monument should bear this epitaph: "Here lies an Irishman who was faithful to the Conservative party so long as the Conservative party was on a dividend-paying basis."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) I hope the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) having brought this motion simply to have the opportunity of making the statement he wanted to make, will now withdraw it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I beg leave to ask permission of the House to withdraw my motion.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Before the motion is withdrawn, I beg leave to allude to a hint which was dropped by the hon. leader of the Opposition with reference to the change that has taken place in the general conduct of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) by alluding to a certain inquiry that is going on now before the committee of this House. I shall not enter into any details, which I have not the right to enter into now, but will merely say, that, when the report of that committee is made, it will be found that no unworthy bargain has been made between an honourable man like my hon. friend the member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan), and myself, and it will be found that there is not a shadow of reason whatever to suspect either him or me of having been guilty of a dishonourable bargain.

Motion withdrawn.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

Mr. JOHN ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister and the members of the Government, and every other member of this House, to a very important cablegram that appears in the London "Times" of this morning, and in the London evening papers of this evening. The correspondent, and the cable agent, of the Toronto "Evening Telegram" wires me to this House, as follows:—

> The New York correspondent of the London "Times" cables that the Canadian Government is responsible for delay in settlement of questions before the Anglo-American Commission, and adds commission will probably not meet again. London afternoon papers comment on it. "Globe" regrets prominence given to report. "Pall Mall Gazette" and "St. James' Gazette" attach importance to it.

Since the receipt of that cablegram, I have also another cablegram from the Associated Press in London, which states, that the Foreign Office officials confirm the statement, and says Alaska is the hopeless hitch which precludes an agreement.

I think that this cablegram is so important that the right hon. First Minister, and his colleagues, and this House should be informed of it. If the statement is not correct, the sooner a denial of it is sent across the wires to the newspapers in England the better. I think it is only justice to the Government that I should read this cablegram.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend is aware—if he is not, I think he ought to be aware—that there is nothing new whatever in that statement. The matters referred to the commission, I stated on the floor of this House several times, were all in a fair way of adjustment, when we came to the point that we could not agree on the Alaskan boundary, and, as the commission could not agree on the Alaskan boundary, the British commissioners refused to proceed with any other question. We took the ground that, until the American Government had either agreed to make a settlement of that question or referred it to arbitration, no other question should be dealt with by us. By that ground we stand, and I think that, in so doing, we shall have the support of the country.

POINT JEROME LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the hon. Minis-

ter of Marine and Fisheries, if he has tabled the papers called for by me in connection with the dismissal of the Point Jerome light-house-keeper ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I have not, but will make a note of the question.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL

House again resolved itself into committee to consider a certain resolution respecting the Drummond County Railway.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BENJAMIN RUSSELL (Halifax). Before the committee rose last night, I had dealt with the question of the necessity of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, with the question of the propriety of the mode by which the Government proposed to effect that connection, and with what seemed to me the only substantial question that is in controversy before the House, viz., the fairness and justice of the bargain into which the Government has entered with that road. I had gone on to say that estimating by any transaction of the same kind under any previous Government, the transaction that had been entered into by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in this Government had come out triumphant, that of the transactions of a similar kind entered into by previous Governments in this country, there had been "some thirty, some sixty and some an hundred-fold" more expensive to the country than this particular transaction upon which this Government have entered. I showed that, even comparing that bargain with transactions between private corporations—perhaps a more legitimate basis for comparison for such a purpose as this—the comparison was in favour of this Government. I showed that this bargain was more favourable to the Government than even the Grand Trunk, a private corporation, in dealing with other corporations, had been able to effect in its own interest. And I argued that a fair way of arriving at a conclusion in respect of this matter was not at all the one which has been adopted by my hon. and learned colleague from the city of Halifax (Mr. Borden), or the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), the two gentlemen who with another hon. gentleman signed the minority report of the Drummond County Committee, but that the true criterion was that embodied in a statement made by the present hon. leader of the Opposition when the Lévis and Rivière du Loup contract was before the House. I will read it again :

> We think that a fair mode of arriving at the price is to look at what expenditure the Government would be obliged to make if that road was not in existence.

Now, my hon. friend from Westmoreland differs from that as a proper means of computation. He says you must look at the net earnings of the road, and, having figured out to his own satisfaction that there were no net earnings of this Drummond County road, he reached the conclusion—from such a premise, and with such reasoning, he was really driven to the conclusion—that no value could be attached to the road except, possibly, the value of the rails for old iron, the value of the sleepers for firewood, and the value of the right of way, if it could possibly have had any value at all except as a right of way for a railway. How would that criterion work as a means of judging of the value of the Lévis and Rivière du Loup road ? A computation on that basis, would prove that the Government should not have paid a single cent for that road, that, on the contrary, they should have demanded a bonus from the Grand Trunk when they took the road over, that an annuity should have been paid by the Grand Trunk to the Government for having graciously interposed and relieved them of the burden of running that railway. That is the only possible conclusion that could be justified by the facts and the logic of the hon. member for Westmoreland. But if we wish to make a more complete reductio ad absurdum of that method of arriving at the value of a railway in such a case, let us suppose for a moment that the Intercolonial Railway, built and owned by the Government of this country, had been built by a private corporation, and suppose that it was being run at the expense of that corporation, as it is now being run at the expense of the Government, incurring annual deficits, as hon. gentlemen opposite have told us the Intercolonial Railway does, not paying dividends to its stockholders, not even paying interest upon the capital it had borrowed ; and suppose that the Government had come to the conclusion that it was necessary for public purposes—for the purpose of carrying out some scheme for the nationalization of railways all over the country or of completing a transcontinental railway—to possess themselves of that railway from Montreal to the maritime provinces—under such circumstances, what would be the price we should be called upon to give for the purpose of acquiring that road ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) says that we must look at the net earnings of the road, that we must consider what any person would give for it in the market—valuing the rails, I suppose, as old iron and the sleepers as firewood, and the right of way on the principles I mentioned a moment ago. According to the hon. gentleman we must not take the criterion adopted by the leader of the Opposition when he was conducting the negotiations for the Lévis and Rivière du Loup road, we must not ask what it would cost the Government to build the road. The method suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) was not considered by the present leader of the Opposition a

fair one when he had to consider a similar proposition. The hon. member for Westmoreland would tell us, I suppose, that there were no earnings to the Intercolonial Railway, there was no interest being paid to the bondholders, and, therefore, it was proper that the company owning that road should pay us a bonus to take it off their hands. That, I think, is the conclusion that is arrived at by the logic of the hon. member for Westmoreland, if logic is worth anything, and if "logic is logic."

The hon. gentleman referred also, as a test of valuation, to the option which is alleged to have been given by the owners of the road to Mr. Farwell and assigned by him to Mr. Hugh Ryan. If there were other options than those referred to in the book which embodies the evidence taken before the Drummond County Committee, I am not aware of them, and, therefore, I do not possess the advantage that the hon. gentleman had in discussing matters not in evidence. But I think that, if there were such options, considering the elaborateness of the inquiry and the opportunities afforded those hon. gentlemen to place the facts on record before the committee and so before the House, it was their duty to have made known the facts. I, at all events, am not in a position to deal with any other options than those in the evidence taken before the committee and in report made by the committee. Using that so-called option as a test of the valuation of the road, I contend that the only evidentiary value it has for that purpose is the light in which it was regarded by the gentlemen by whom it was given, Mr. Farwell, Mr. Greenshields and the other parties to the option. If it had happened that Mr. Haggart—I speak of the hon. member as he appeared before the committee—when Minister of Railways and Canals had not happened to be aware of the conditions attached to that option, that does not matter a single pennyworth in this controversy. Even if Mr. Ryan, to whom it was assigned, was not aware of the conditions on which it was given to him and of the arrangements made with regard to profit on the transaction which it was supposed he could consummate with the Government of that day, that has no bearing upon the facts with regard to the option as a test of the value of that road. It is quite true that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said in his evidence before the committee that he had never heard of any proposal for a higher price to be charged for the Drummond County road than the one made in the option of $500,000. He seems to have been—I am taking the impression conveyed by the evidence given before that committee—he seems to have been under the impression that he got notice of that option through Mr. Ives, who was then a member of the Government of that day. Referring to that at page 151 of this report, I wish to call the attention of the House to what was said in respect to that particular subject. The hon. gentleman was asked, after he had given his direct evidence as a witness before the Drummond County committee:

Q. Did Mr. Ives give you any information as to what the road could be bought for?—A. It was just general information.

Q. Do you undertake to swear that he gave you to understand the road could be bought for $500,000?

Now, that is the crucial question in the case in respect to that option, as presented to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. What is his answer?

Oh, I do not think so.

He did not think that Mr. Ives gave him to understand that that road could be bought for $500,000. Well, then, if he was not given to understand that the road could be bought for $500,000, what value to us can this option be as a test of the value of the road? It is only because that road was offered to the hon. gentleman for $500,000 that the facts in connection with that option so-called can have any value whatever.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain what I meant? The option was given to me of the road as far as completed at $500,000. When I was speaking to Mr. Ives I was speaking in that sense. I did not know or say that the road as finished to Chaudière Junction could be got for any such sum.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman will entirely misunderstand me if he supposes that I am saying anything for the purpose of putting him in an awkward position in respect to this matter. I am only referring to these circumstances for the purpose of showing that that $500,000 option so-called, under the circumstances under which it was given, would, with the conditions with which it was clogged, even with the understanding on which it was presented to the hon. gentleman, be of no value whatever such as is sought to be attached to it by the hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Westmoreland, and such as is attempted to be given to it in the minority report, which they sought to have made the report of the majority of the Drummond County Railway Committee. I think that is absolutely conclusive. I repeat that it makes no difference, it would make no difference, even if I had not been able to point to this conclusive evidence given by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in answer to the questions put to him by the chairman of the committee,—even supposing we were not able to bring that in support of the contention that I am making, I say it would make no difference in the world what the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals thought, what Mr. Ryan thought, who was charged to a certain degree with that negotiation, or what any other gentleman thought in reference to that $500,000 option. The

sole question would be: What was the intention of the parties by whom that option was given, by whom that right was conferred, by Mr. Farwell, by Mr. Greenshields and by the associates of these gentlemen. Now, the evidence in regard to that is clear and absolutely incontrovertible, and I do not think there has been any attempt to controvert it; and that is that that so-called option was given with a clear and absolutely distinct understanding on their part that it was to be subject to the condition that there was to be a further dividend altogether outside of and apart from the nominal price of $500,000 mentioned in the option—that there was to be added to that a division of any profits that should happen to be made by Mr. Ryan should he succeed in making a satisfactory bargain with the late Government, as it was supposed he would be able to do, for the sum of $2,500,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Farwell does not state that that was the case with regard to all the shareholders. He states it was the case with himself and some others, but not so far as the rest of the shareholders were concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Be it so; that does not make any essential difference in the matter. Mr. Greenshields and Mr. Farwell absolutely conditioned their option upon there being a partition of any profits that were to be made over and above the amount at which that option nominally stood, and any other theory of that option would be, to my mind, absolutely nonsensical. You will remember that that option was given on July 16th, 1894; that is the evidence. It is admitted in the draft report signed by my hon. friend from Halifax and my hon. friend from Westmoreland, that at that date there was a debt due to the bank of $178,213.65, which represented money that had been invested in that road. The evidence shows conclusively that there had been $400,000 of capital expended upon the construction of the road, that there had been a local government subsidy obtained of $135,666.42, that there had been a federal subsidy also of $41,300, and, I believe, considerably more, but not having been able to obtain the figures, I can only state them up to that amount. So that there had been $755,176.07 actual money value put into that road previous to that date of July 16th, 1894, there being at that time about 82 miles of the road completed, and seven miles of the road under construction, as shown by the minority report signed by the hon. members for Westmoreland and Halifax. It would be ridiculous to suppose that these gentlemen would have been willing to sell that road under these circumstances, with these expenditures upon it, for the sum of $500,000.

As to the $400,000 option, of which mention has been made, I think that can be conclusively disposed of by the statement of Mr. Farwell at page 136 of this evidence, when he was asked by the chairman:

Q. Was there ever any authority given to anybody to sell for $400,000?—A. Never.

Q. You would not have taken it, I presume?—A. Never.

Now I come to the question as to the actual cost, the actual expenditure upon this road. I think that is really the most important inquiry in respect to this matter, that is, the actual sum of money expended by these gentlemen who were engaged in the construction of that road. The direct cost of the road is stated in the direct evidence of the witness that was called on that point, and who would know all about the matter, as he was the book-keeper from beginning to end of the transaction. The cost of that road up to the present time, or I should say 28th February, 1898, was $1,908,271.33. The amount of expenditure up to the 30th June, 1894, was $1,163,970.60. Now, I gather from the evidence of this witness, Mr. Newton, who signed all the cheques himself, together with Mr. Church and Mr. Mitchell, that he always knew of his own knowledge the purposes for which the cheques were signed. The returns show that up to June 30th, 1895, there had been expended upon the road, in round numbers, $1,225,000; and up to 1896, $1,360,000; and up to 1897, $1,500,000. Now, the direct testimony of that witness, Mr. Newton, was subjected to the most rigorous cross-examination by the hon. member for Westmoreland; and I think no person can have noticed the conduct of those cross-examinations by my hon. friend and by my hon. colleague without perceiving that they were very adroitly conducted, and if there was any possibility of weakening the force of the direct statements made by the witnesses in that investigation, I am quite sure that those hon. gentlemen would have been able to accomplish the task. The cross-examination of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) of this particular witness, and his method of cross-examination, in which he sought to trace the progress of the road at successive stages, to search that witness' knowledge from his memory and from the books, so far as he had them there, in respect to the different stages in the progress of the work down to June 30, 1888, to June 30, 1889, and so on to 1897, was most rigorous. He asks him: How do you make it up? He tests him by seeking to discover: Where did you get the money for the purpose of expending it on this road as you allege it was expended up to these dates, and he carries him through from year to year, and if there is any break in his evidence, if there had been any break, the rigorous cross-examination of the hon. member for Westmoreland must have discovered it. I affirm, as a matter of opinion, after reading over the cross-examination as carefully as I am able to read English, that there is no break discoverable, that there is no flaw discovered, that there is not a break in the testimony of that witness Newton, after that most

rigorous method of cross-examination, so adroitly and astutely pursued by the hon. member for Westmoreland. First of all, he takes him down to June 30th, 1888, and he asks, what means had you up to that date; where did you get your money for the purpose of expending it up to that date. The witness goes on to say: We had $40,000 of capital; we borrowed $31,602; we had a subsidy of $15,057, and material was supplied us to the extent of $50,000. That makes up a total of $136,659, which is entirely in accord with the statement that $131,000 had been the cost of the road up to June 30th, 1888. So he goes on in the same way for 1889. I do not know that it is necessary to weary the House with giving all the figures. On the 30th of June, 1890, the amount paid out for building the line was given as $729,314.52, which amount was taken over into the new books of Mr. Newton as secretary of the company. Now, I admit frankly that that would be a point at which I would look for inaccuracies and for fallacies if I myself were conducting an examination of that sort. I would have questioned the witness as to the way in which he made up that $729,314.52, as to which he was not able to give details, and as to which he did not give details before the committee. The hon. member for Westmoreland very properly searched him in reference to that; he cross-examined him in reference to that point, and asked him how he made up the figures, the capital and the resources that entered into that expenditure of $729,314.52, which amount was taken over in the books of the company when Mr. Newton became book-keeper of the company instead of merely book-keeper of the contractors for the road. I shall not say whether the statement I have just made as to the precise nature of the change in Mr. Newton's connection with the business is accurate or whether it is not; it is not essential. The essential point is this, that it was incumbent upon that witness who said that up to this date $729,314.52 had been actually expended upon the road, to show the sources from which that money came. What were the sources and what did he say? He said it was made up of the paid-up stock of Charles Church, $133,400; of William Mitchell, $133,400; of Thomas Fee, $133,300. Then, there was a subsidy from the local government of $135,662.42, a subsidy from the Federal Government of $41,300, and there were the net earnings of the road, which they had been able to apply to the purposes of construction. The hon. member for Westmoreland challenged him on that point, and I admit that he compelled him to strike off some $6,000 or $7,000 from the $19,765 at which he had placed those net earnings. That will not be very essential in the consideration of this matter. However, the circumstance is important as showing the rigour of the cross-examination, and showing that it was so conducted as to give us the assurance that if there really were anything fictitious about this expenditure of $729,314.52, the hon. member for Westmoreland would have discovered it. I say he has only discovered some $6,000 or $7,000. This accounts for $596,827.96 of the $729,314.52 which it is asserted was expended on the road up to that time. Further evidence on that point does not seem to have been given at this stage, but it is not difficult for us to come to the conclusion that the floating debt of the company which at the end of June, 1889, was $65,151.76, had during the course of another year been increased to $132,987, which is all that is required to bring these actual specific items to the sum of $729,314.52, which Mr. Newton says was actually expended on the construction of the road up to some date. I will not say exactly to a day what it is, as it does not seem to be mentioned in the evidence at that stage, but up to a certain date in 1890, when these books were taken over and which sum was given at $729,314.52. Up to that date all the accounts were kept in the firm's books, and Mr. Newton was their book-keeper. Considerable bother was made about the fact there were no books presented to the committee showing the details of that $729,314.52. Whose fault was it that these books were not there? I am sure the chairman of the committee sought every bit of information that could be obtained. I am sure that he was assisted by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) in getting all the information that could be obtained, and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). The chairman of the committee went out of his way to ask all the questions possible for the purpose of discovering where the books were, who was their custodian, where he lived and how he could be brought before the committee. It appears in testimony, as having been brought out by the chairman, that the business had been sold "last fall" to Charles Church and his two sons, that George Church was carrying on the business, and he was the proper person to apply to for these books. Now, mark, Sir, that those hon. members having obtained that distinct and specific information as to the source from which they might derive all possible information as to the details of this $729,314.52, the moment that they discovered exactly and precisely where they could get that information, where they could obtain these books, where they could find the custodian of them, his description and his place of residence, they absolutely lost all interest in the further prosecution of the inquiry. He was never subpœnaed to produce the books, and no further inquiry was made in reference to the matter. Those hon. gentlemen, having at their disposal those ample and effectual means of getting at all the details in respect to that particular expenditure which they professed to

desire, lost all further interest in the matter, and yet, not having prosecuted it to the end, not having gone to the fountainhead, they have the assurance to come before this House and present to this House their own suspicions, their own conjectures and imaginings in respect to that matter, and to ask this House to come to the conclusion that there is something fishy, that there is something rotten which ought not to be sanctioned in respect to the entry of $729,314.52 as to the cost of the construction of that road up to June 30th, 1890.

Now, Sir, as to all further expenditures, Mr. Newton spoke at first hand, when he placed before that committee all the details that it was possible for anybody to ask for in reference to the construction of the road. He gave evidence before the committee which, I believe, would be admissible even in a court of justice, where the rules of evidence are altogether more strict and narrow than they are ever understood to be before committees of this House. Every practising lawyer knows, and every scientific lawyer knows, that the rules of evidence, as administered by the courts of justice, very frequently exclude evidence which, to any intelligent man prosecuting an inquiry for the mere purpose of coming at a right conclusion, would have the highest possible evidentiary value, but which, by virtue of good general principles, are excluded in the courts of justice, but are not excluded in untechnical inquiries, such as was conducted by this Drummond County Committee. I say, that the evidence with regard to what occurred after June, 1890, so far as I am able to form an opinion at this moment, was, every bit of it, evidence which could even have been presented by a witness under all the restrictions and under all the limitations of the administration of justice in a court of law. We have, therefore, thus far come to this result: That it was clearly proved before that committee, as a matter of direct and positive testimony, that there was actually expended on this road by the persons who were interested in it and with whom the Government were seeking to make a bargain—there was actually expended by the persons who built the road and sold it to the Government, the sum which this witness states in his unimpeached evidence, namely, $1,908,271.23. If that statement of Mr. Newton is not a true statement, certainly the members of that committee had ample and abundant opportunity to prove that it was not a correct statement, and, if they left unused the resources by which they could have discovered errors in that statement made by Mr. Newton, as to the actual amount of money expended on that road, they are certainly culpable before this House and before the people of this country for not having unearthed what was wrong in connection with this matter. The members of that committee were certainly culpable, if they did not take pains to exhaust the sources of information that were placed at their disposal in reference to the alleged actual expenditure on this road. We must, therefore, take it as proven, that the sum stated by this witness in his evidence, was the sum that was actually expended upon that road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that really exhausts the question at issue before this committee, and I might very well cease to weary the committee with any further observations, were it not that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) did not content himself with dealing with the question which is really the only question before the House, but proceeded to make observations outside of the resolution, and observations which I feel it to be incumbent upon me to deal with at some slight length. For I fear that, if I failed to make some observations in answer to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden), it might be taken for granted by some stupid people, that those remarks, irrelevant as they were to the subject under discussion, were remarks that could not be satisfactorily refuted. I am not willing to labour under that imputation. I am not willing that the Government of this country should labour under that imputation which my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden) sought to fasten on it. I am not willing that the Minister of Railways should labour under the undeserved imputation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) sought to fasten upon him, of having been guilty of the promotion of sectional interests and provincial interests antagonistic to the province of Nova Scotia and to the city of Halifax, in his administration of the department over which he presides. I do very deeply regret that my hon. and eminent colleague (Mr. Borden) has imported, as I think, unnecessarily, into this discussion, a purely sectional question, a parochial question almost, as to alleged discrimination between the city of Halifax and the city of St. John. I remember reading, with some degree of discomfort—not to use a harsher term—a discussion of that character which took place in this House some years ago, when some question came up as to the city of Halifax and the interests of Halifax as being supposed to be antagonistic to the interests of the city of St. John. I then made a determination in my heart and mind, and came to a resolution by which I shall endeavour to be governed in my treatment of this question to-day, never for a single moment, if it were at all possible, to ask this House or this country to be engaged in the consideration of any such purely parochial question as a supposed rivalry—for I will not admit there is any question of real rivalry—between the city of Halifax and the city of St. John, or any other city on the continent of America. I deplore the fact that my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden) felt himself bound to introduce into the discussion of this matter a question of so sectional and parochial a character as the question of rivalry, if there

be any rivalry, between the city of Halifax and the city of St. John.

An hon. MEMBER. There is no such rivalry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there is not. But if this committee was impressed at all by what my hon. colleague said, he certainly sought to leave the impression—I do not know for what purpose—on the minds of the committee, that, in some way or other, the treatment of Halifax by the present Minister of Railways had been prejudicial to the interests of that city. Now, Sir, I make bold to say, that never was there a Minister of Railways administering the affairs of the Railway Department of this country who held the balance more evenly between those two cities—if there be any antagonism or rivalry between them—than the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) of this Government has held the balance between the city of Halifax and the city of St. John. I go further, and say—and I am sorry, in the interests of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), that I am obliged to say it—that, so far as concerns his own constituents, he has not done to them, thus far, the same justice that he has done to the city of Halifax. What are the facts? Both the city of St. John and the city of Halifax had, in their interests, placed in the Estimates, a year ago I think, a grant for two elevators to be built, one in the city of Halifax and the other in the city of St. John. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says, that the elevator in the city of Halifax is not yet completed. Does he know that the elevator in the city of St. John is not yet begun, or, if it is, it has only been very recently begun? Does he know that the plans for the elevator in the city of St. John were not even put in the hands of the architect until many months after the elevator in the city of Halifax was advancing towards completion? Surely, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) knew that fact, he would not have thought it proper to disguise or conceal it from the committee, when he was seeking to make—for what purpose I do not know—seeking to make the impression I have referred to, with respect to the treatment of Halifax by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), as compared with the treatment of the city of St. John. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) also knows that an elevator had been erected in the city of Halifax some years ago, and that it was destroyed by fire a considerable number of years before the enforced retirement from power of the late Government. He knows that that elevator remained in ruins so long as that Government remained in power, and perhaps he has arrived at the conclusion—any reasonable person would arrive at the conclusion—that, if the Conservative Government had not gone out of power, there would have been no movement whatever made, up to this hour, for the construction of an elevator in the city of Halifax. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) must have a shrewd suspicion that is the fact, and not a mere fiction of the imagination. Then he knows that there was a grant put in the Estimates for some considerable wharf accommodation at the city of Halifax, for a number of years before the late Government went out of power, and it remained unexpended for several years while that Government remained in power, and for the whole balance of their term down to the time that they went out of power, and I am bound to say also for a considerable period after the present Government came into power; because the departmental subordinates of the hon. Minister of Railways had been telling him all along, and never ceased to tell him, that any increased accommodation for the city of Halifax in that respect was not necessary. But the hon. Minister of Railways was open to argument from the members for the city, from the Board of Trade, from persons interested in the affairs of the city, and from my hon. friends the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Militia as representing in this Government the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. Minister of Railways was amenable to argument and when the matter was fairly placed before him he adopted our views and went on with those improvements. They are now approaching completion, and a large expenditure has been made in the city of Halifax, which I make bold to say would not have been made up to this hour if there had not been a change of Administration. I took a little trouble to explain to the people of Halifax who were interested in these matters, in a series of letters which were never answered, which I would hardly accuse my hon. friend of having taken the trouble even to read—I took pains to explain that even in so small a matter as the time-tables and maps published for the Intercolonial Railway, the late Administration did not indicate that there was any way of getting out of Halifax by water to any other part of the continent of America. While it was indicated that you could go from the port of St. John by steamship to any other part of the world, there was not the slightest indication of any steamship line going from Halifax to any other part of the continent of America. Even in so small a matter as that the late Administration was negligent of the interests of our city. But with a change of Administration we have had a change of method. My hon. friend, for the purpose of bolstering up an attack on the Government in relation to the city of Halifax, read a report which appeared in a Halifax newspaper from the hand of George Mitchell, as president of the Board of Trade, and Alexander Stephen as mayor of the city of Halifax. In that report criticisms are offered upon an observation that happened to be made by Mr. Blair as Minister of Railways, in a letter over his hand which

appeared in the same issue of the Halifax "Morning Herald," that of December 7th, 1898. In this letter the hon. Minister made what appears to me to be a fair and reasonable statement, though it is put in large capitals in the letter as printed :

> We are not guaranteeing freight over our line for shipment from any point, not being so situated as to be able to do it. Perhaps later our organization may become sufficiently complete ; but I am inclined to doubt even the probability of this fact.

Now, I cannot see that there is anything so very terrible in this statement. It is a statement that the Government of this country were not prepared to go into the private business of charterers, and were not prepared to guarantee freight at the city of Halifax or at the city of St. John either. One would suppose, from the hon. gentleman's comments, that the hon. Minister of Railways was guaranteeing freight at St. John and refusing to guarantee it at Halifax ; but he was not guaranteeing freight anywhere. Neither was he not sending agents over the country to look out for business in grain carrying for the Intercolonial Railway. Now, I would like to know, in the name of all that is reasonable, what use there would have been in sending agents over western Canada to seek for grain shipments when we had no means of making use of those shipments on the Intercolonial Railway either at Halifax or St. John. I would like to ask my hon. friend, who is a fair-minded man, whose fair-mindedness is only corrupted by his present evil associations, who before he came into this House was one of the fairest-minded men on earth, and who after he leaves it will again be one of the fairest-minded men —I put it to him, whether it would have been sensible, or anything but farcical, for the hon. Minister of Railways to send agents all over this country to seek for shipments of grain at Halifax, when, owing to the negligence, the carelessness—I might say the deliberate and intentional neglect of the late Administration—there were absolutely no terminal facilities at Halifax by which those cargoes could be handled. Surely it would have been one of the most mad speculations that any man could enter upon, one of the things that would have drawn from the hon. leader of the Opposition the most expressive adjectives to be found in the English language. I have no quarrel with what the Board of Trade said, in the sense in which I understand it ; but I want to call my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that that very document from which he read, but which he did not read in full, showed that the whole basis of any hopes on the part of the city of Halifax for getting any trade of this character, and the whole foundation on which they built their claim to any special exertion in this direction on the part of the Minister of Railways was the fact that the road had been connected with the city of Montreal. These are their words :

> During some years past the through ocean traffic of the Intercolonial to and from the west has so dwindled away to practically nothing, that in extending the line to Montreal an entirely new departure on the part of the management was essential to create traffic.

Therefore, the hon. gentleman will perceive that it was solely by virtue of the fact that this Government had taken the practical step of making a connection of the Intercolonial Railway with the city of Montreal, and was making it possible for that railway to command a business in the western part of the country—it was only because of that very achievement, that the Board of Trade of the city of Halifax thought it was at all serviceable for them to ask for any such aggressive and progressive steps as they demanded on the part of the Minister of Railways. I think that disposes very largely of my hon. friend's attack upon the Minister of Railways in relation to his treatment of the city of Halifax. On this point I would only ask my hon. friend's attention to one thing further, that is, to the remarks that were made by the ex-mayor of Halifax at a little social or semi-official function which was held in the city of Halifax a few days ago. These remarks are those of a gentleman who is a highly honoured and distinguished member of the Conservative party in that city, who is a strong supporter of my hon. friend and colleague from Halifax (Mr. Borden), and whose opinions upon commercial subjects have always commanded very great respect in that city. Speaking of the relative treatment of the city of Halifax by the late and the present Administration, ex-Mayor Steven made these remarks :

> That the Government deserved well of the people of Halifax, who have been long humbugged by the promises of Sir Charles Tupper to make Halifax the Liverpool of America.

I am sorry that the "grand old" leader is not present to hear these encomiums passed upon him by his staunch friend and follower in that city.

> But it remained for the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his energetic Minister of Railways to give these trade and terminal facilities which we needed, and to do all that a Government could do to implement the pledges made to Halifax.

My hon. friend made another remark which I am just reminded of by some further expressions in the short extract that I have before me. One would suppose that it was the policy of the present Minister of Railways to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from having access to the city of Halifax. I am afraid my hon. friend can hardly have been serious in supposing that there could have been any such policy pursued or any such views entertained by the hon. Min-

ister. The hon. Minister is as willing and anxious to see the Canadian Pacific Railway running into the city of Halifax, as anybody else can be, but he insists—and we will stand by him in insisting—that if the Canadian Pacific Railway is to acquire rights in respect of the Intercolonial, they shall acquire them on something like fair and reasonable terms. I stand by the Minister of Railways in insisting that the terms upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be allowed to come into Halifax shall be fair and reasonable and proper. I am as anxious as any man can be that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have, on fair terms, ingress into and egress out of the city of Halifax, but I do not think so meanly of my city as to suppose that it is any more important for a Halifax man to get to St. John than it is for a St. John man to get to Halifax. The people of St. John are as anxious that passengers should go to Montreal by way of St. John as the people of Halifax are that they should be able to go that way. There are people in St. John who criticise the Minister of Railways, as some of us in Halifax who do not understand the matter criticise him there, for being too exacting in respect of the terms demanded from the Canadian Pacific Railway. He is right in insisting on fair and reasonable terms, and nothing but these will be insisted on. On fair and equitable terms, I see no reason why connection at Halifax should not be established for the Canadian Pacific Railway; on terms that are not fair and equitable I do not desire that any such connection should be established. But my hon. friend is altogether mistaken if he supposes that there is any connection between the ingress of the Canadian Pacific Railway into the city of Halifax and the export of any freight from the city of Halifax carried over the Canadian Pacific line. If he will ask any of the officials connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am quite certain he will be assured that, so far as he may entertain any supposition in his mind, that by the acquisition of running powers into Halifax or of access under any circumstances into that city, there will be any considerable amount of western freight carried into that city by the Canadian Pacific Railway and thence exported, he is absolutely and entirely mistaken. He will not find one official of the Canadian Pacific Railway or of any other road or any man who knows the first thing about the transportation question, that will give him the slightest hope or encouragement from that quarter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend quite misunderstood what I did say. What I suggested was this, that if the Minister of Railways chose to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John, in order to do which he would have to haul freight 259 miles further than the Canadian Pacific Railway have to haul it, he would be at a disadvantage, and that he would do much better to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Halifax, where, with an additional haulage of only 97 miles he would save 250 miles of an ocean voyage. By going to St. John he has a longer haul than the Canadian Pacific Railway of 259 miles as compared with a longer haul than the Canadian Pacific Railway of 97 miles by going to Halifax, and at the latter port he would save 250 miles of ocean voyage as compared with St. John.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the hon. gentleman's argument to be that there was a better chance of the Intercolonial competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Halifax than at St. John.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly my opinion, and that is the very reason why I was anxious to see the Intercolonial extended to Montreal and facilities afforded at Halifax; and I am confident that when St. John and Halifax are placed on a fair and even keel, as they should be, by the creation of terminal facilities adequate to the trade in both cities, Halifax will be able to capture the traffic. That is why I support the hon. Minister of Railways. I am absolutely confident as to the capacity of the port of Halifax to capture, under fair conditions, the great bulk of the freight that comes over the Intercolonial. No doubt the hon. Minister of Railways has a different opinion. As a loyal citizen of New Brunswick, it is right that he should; but I am satisfied that his opinion will not be verified by the facts. I am satisfied, as a Haligolian and a Nova Scotian, to take my chances. I believe that when the Intercolonial is properly equipped, that when it has the proper kinds of engines, cars, agents, and facilities at both Halifax and St. John, and those two cities are enabled to compete on a fair field, with no favour to either, the natural advantages of Halifax will enable it to capture a large proportion of the trade, which, perhaps now, goes to St. John; but I am not so small-minded as to suppose that there can be room for any unfriendly rivalry or antagonism between the two cities. I am confident that with a properly developed Intercolonial, with proper equipment, with an aggressive and progressive prosecution of the business of the Intercolonial, there will be found abundant business for both Halifax and St. John, and that, in the language of the pulpit, there will be such a blessing poured out upon us that there will not be room to receive it. That is the very reason why I support so ardently the policy of the Minister of Railways in respect to this great question.

I was going on to say that there was a time when it was possible for the Government to secure for the port of Halifax, not only in connection with the Intercolonial, but with the Canadian Pacific Railway, great and signal advantages for that city and for the province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend has not been so close an observer of political

events during the greater part of his life as he has latterly become, and may not remember, though I rather think he will, the agitation that took place in reference to this very question of transportation, a number of years ago, when a certain measure was brought before this House for the bonusing of a short line to Halifax, as we then understood it. But we have been woefully disillusioned since, because the leader of the Opposition told us, the other day, that it was not to the city of Halifax he intended that road to be extended, but to the city of St. John. He never made that observation, I venture to say, in any city in the province of Nova Scotia; he never made that observation in the city of Halifax; he never gave the slightest intimation to anybody that he was advocating a through line from the city of Montreal to the city of St. John, or that he proposed to stop short of the city of Halifax. Far from this; when the Short Line measure was brought down in this Parliament in 1885, as my hon. colleague is probably aware, because it has been brought out in recent controversies in the city of Halifax, Sir Hector Langevin, in introducing the measure for the construction of the line from Montreal to the lower provinces, explained that it was a line for the benefit of Halifax, as much as of St. John, for the benefit of Nova Scotia as much as of New Brunswick. I do not profess to give Sir Hector Langevin's words, remember, but I give the effect of what he said, and I propose to give his words. My hon. friend will remember that there was to be a connecting link, which was called the Harvey and Salisbury branch, which was to make this a through line for the province of Nova Scotia as well as for the province of New Brunswick. This is what Sir Hector Langevin said:

> The Government will have to make an arrangement with the company undertaking the railway, and will take means to secure the completion of that line. I said the other day that we would take special care in the arrangements with the company that that portion of the line to Salisbury would be completed as well as the other portion. That covers the whole ground.

When that statement was made, there were sceptical people in this House, just as there are sceptical people here to-day. The hon. gentleman who then represented Guysborough, on the motion for concurrence in the amendments to the subsidy resolution I suppose it was—moved in amendment:

> That the report be not now considered, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the Bill by providing to make it clear that the section of the line between Harvey, Moncton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with that portion of the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine.

You see that the object of the hon. member was to make sure that the professed policy of the Government of that day should be carried out, and that this Harvey-Salisbury link should be built simultaneously with the line from Montreal to St. John. He was asked, if he would not kindly withdraw his motion. He was told, that it was a wholly needless motion, that the Government had given a clear pledge that the connecting link would be proceeded with, pari passu, with the rest of the road, and that there was no necessity to make such a motion. And one of the gentlemen who then represented Halifax, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, made a pretty speech, indicating how inadvisable it would be to have any reflections cast upon the integrity of the Government or their intentions with respect to the city of Halifax or the province of Nova Scotia. Mr. Kirk went on to say, however, in answer to that suggestion:

> The Minister of Public Works in his speech the other day pledged the Government to secure the building of the road from Mattawamkeag to Salisbury. When the road is built to Mattawamkeag we have connection, but the Short Line is not complete unless it is built to Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury. Unless this section is built the road will be no earthly benefit to the province of Nova Scotia or to the city of Halifax. It may be built, but what we want is that since the Government and Parliament have declared that it shall be built by this company, we want to take care that it shall be built as soon as possible. Therefore, I cannot, at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, withdraw my motion, and I shall have to ask the House to divide on it.

And the House did divide upon the motion of the then hon. member for Guysborough, and his motion was defeated, the Conservative members for the county of Halifax, Messrs. Stairs and Daly, voting for the Government and in favour of defeating Mr. Kirk's motion, which, if carried, would have secured the construction of the Harvey-Salisbury link, by which proposition the city of Halifax might have derived some benefit from the enormous expenditure of the Government in connection with the construction of that short line, and which expenditure, it was explained to the people of Halifax, was made for the purpose of building a short line into Halifax—a statement that has been elaborately, and emphatically, and shamelessly repudiated by the leader of the Opposition within the last ten days. My hon. friend is aware that that connecting link has never been built down to this very hour, but that the Short Line has been built, and that the city of St. John, by means of it, has been able to capture—nobody blames it for that, nobody grudges it that, nobody is jealous of it for that—a very considerable amount of through trade which has been shipped to it over that Short Line; and not a single pound of freight, speaking in the large, certainly no portion worth talking about, has ever been shipped to the city of Halifax over the Canadian Pacific Railway by means of the Short Line and the unconstructed Harvey and Salisbury branch, which the Government pledged themselves

to construct, and by pledging themselves to the construction of which they secured the votes of the two Conservative members for Halifax.

Three or four years afterwards, they found that there was considerable dissatisfaction expressed on account of their transactions with respect to that matter; and, for the purpose of making some sort of show, some sort of pretense, some sort of flourish or demonstration of their interest in the people of Halifax and the province of Nova Scotia, they introduced, in the session of 1889, a resolution to the effect that it was expedient that a railway should be constructed as a Government railway between the point of junction on the New Brunswick Railway, at or near Harvey, in the province of New Brunswick, and the point of junction on the Intercolonial Railway, at or near Salisbury or Moncton, and that the sum of $500,000 be granted toward the construction of the said railway. Now, let us see whether there was any bona fides in that transaction. That session of the House began on January 3rd, 1889, and Parliament was prorogued on the 2nd day of May. This resolution was not introduced until the 22nd day of April, and the Bill was only introduced on the 30th day of April. Can anybody believe that there was any bona fides in a proposition like that, made to this House just two days before prorogation? The Bill came up, and was hustled through this House, and sent to the Senate, where it was absolutely foredoomed to destruction, where, I presume, it was known before it was introduced that it would be destroyed. It was not introduced in the Senate until the 1st day of May, one day before Parliament was prorogued, and it was defeated on the motion of an hon. gentleman who now occupies a high position in the Senate, who was once Speaker of the Senate, Hon. Mr. Miller, a Senator from Nova Scotia, who, doubtless, knew what fate the Government desired to have meted out to that Bill. The Bill was advocated by Sir John Abbott in a speech which was commented upon in the course of the debate, and characterized as what is known, in technical language, as a prevaricating speech, that is, one that is made for the purpose of losing the case which the maker of it is supposed to advocate. It was so commented upon by several hon. Senators. And the Bill thus introduced the day before prorogation, was of course defeated.

The statement has been made in the journal from which my hon. friend draws much of his political inspiration, that the Bill was defeated by the votes of the Reformers in the Senate. I have taken pains, therefore, to find out that among the Senators who voted against the Bill, there were Senators Armand, Bellerose, McCallum, McInnes, Merner, Miller, Perley, Reid, Sullivan and Vidal: and according to the "Parliamentary Companion" of that day, every one of these Senators was a supporter of the Administration of that day, every one of them was ranked as a Liberal-Conservative, and was appointed by the Administration of that day. If these eleven Senators who voted for Senator Miller's amendment, had supported the Government of that day, which on general principles they always did support, if they had not understood thoroughly well that it was not the desire of the Government of that day that that Bill should pass, if they had not thoroughly well understood that it was the intention and desire that that Bill should be introduced and passed in the House of Commons simply to hoodwink the people of the city of Halifax and of the province of Nova Scotia, if, I say, they had voted for that Bill instead of voting against it, that Bill would have been carried by a majority of 22 against 11, instead of being defeated by a majority of two to one.

Mr. GILLIES. How many Liberal Senators voted against that Bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know; I admit that some Liberal Senators voted against it; Mr. Jones and Mr. Kenny both voted for it in this House, and Senator Power in the other Chamber. I did not say that no Liberal Senators voted against it. I said that if these eleven Conservative Senators had stood by the Government, by the professed policy of the Government of which they were professed supporters, that Bill, instead of being defeated in the Senate as it was, would have been carried, and that road would have been built as a Government work. But why imperil the interests of the city of Halifax and of the province of Nova Scotia by asking that an entirely different measure should be put before the country, when you had taken away from the people of Halifax and of Nova Scotia the benefit of the argument they would have been otherwise able to make that the road could have been constructed and ought to have been constructed by the company which built the Short Line Railway as a part of the general scheme which was the professed policy of the Government of that day, and on the subsidy which the House was then prepared to vote for that work?

I think I need not deal any further with any questions relating to discrimination against the city of Halifax by this Government, or with any comparisons as to the treatment of Halifax by this Government and its treatment by their predecessors in office. I think I have demonstrated, in answer to my hon. friend, that so far as Halifax is concerned, its interests are bound up with the Intercolonial Railway, and that the prosperity and progress of the Intercolonial Railway are bound up with the carrying out of the policy of this Government. I believe that in my innermost heart. I be-

lieve that the Intercolonial Railway, built as an artery of commerce between Halifax and the rest of the country, or rather between the lower provinces and the inland provinces of the Dominion, between the seaboard provinces and the other provinces of the Dominion, is going to be what is of vastly greater importance than the mere building up of interprovincial commerce. It is not only an institution for the building up of the commerce of the cities of St. John and Halifax. It is to be what Sir John A. Macdonald proclaimed it to be years ago in this House, with a statesmanlike prescience; it is to be a means of allaying the sectional spirit, especially with respect to Nova Scotia, for the creation of which the hon. leader of the Opposition is more responsible and more culpable than any other man that lives on this earth at this hour. It will operate in the way of creating what is far more important than the commercial intercommunication between various sections of the Dominion, it will produce such a unity of sentiment, and such a unity of feeling as the hon. leader of the Opposition by his proceedings in connection with the consummation of this union rendered absolutely impossible for many long years in the history of this country, and co-operate with the general policy of this Administration in the creation of a truly national spirit throughout the Dominion of Canada.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

I.C.R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

House again resolved itself into committee to consider a certain resolution respecting the Drummond County Railway.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. R. R. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of patience to the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who has spoken at considerable length. I may say that if the Halifax elevator were taken out of his speech and the evidence from the report of the committee, which he read, there would be very little of it left. I can assure hon. gentlemen that I will not talk so long on elevators at any rate, but I will try to come to the point as soon as possible. I am sorry to commence with the complaint that we have not been furnished with proper information in connection with this Drummond County Railway. It is the impression on this side of the House that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is in a position to furnish us with that information, and it is difficult for hon. members to deal with the matter thoroughly without it. My hon. friend (Mr. Russell) says that the Government has made the greatest and best contract that was ever made by a Government in this country in the arrangement made with the Drummond County Railway Co. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to quarrel with the Drummond County Railway. I think we are all in favour of bringing the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal if it is brought in in a reasonable way and without costing the country too much. What we complain of is that the present deal will be too expensive, and we want to know whether the line pays and whether it has paid during the last two years that the Government has been running it. This is information that should be furnished. All we now have, practically, to guide us is the report of the investigating committee. The hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke of railways that cost $17,000 a mile. The Drummond County cost $12,000 a mile, and others, he said, had cost as much as $100,000 a mile. He says that there must be a great deal of corruption in connection with a road that costs $100,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Who says so?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The speaker who preceded me. He thought the corruption must be in proportion to the amount the railway cost, and he appears to think that all railways should cost the same figure. There is a great difference between railways in this country. The hon. member mentioned railways in Cape Breton and other parts of the country. I was in Nova Scotia myself for some years building railways. I know that in some parts of that province railway building is difficult and expensive, while in other parts it is quite easy. Yet the hon. gentleman appears to think that all railways should cost about the same amount. He spoke of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) making a comparison in regard to a road which runs to Beauharnois, and said he compared that road with the Drummond County Railway. He says that that road cost $5,000 per mile more than the Drummond County Railway. The hon. member for Westmoreland did not make any such statement at all. The comparison which he made was with the portion of the road between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie, for which this Government has agreed to pay 5 per cent on one-half at a valuation of $50,000 a mile, and he said this road cost, according to Mr. Wainwright's own statement, $17,000 per mile. The hon. member (Mr. Russell) said, that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), with farsighted sagacity, had accomplished one of

the greatest business transactions that was ever accomplished in this country. If that be so, I am sure the Minister (Mr. Blair) will be quite willing to have the transaction criticised in a fair and reasonable manner, and I propose to deal with the matter in that way. The only record available regarding the Intercolonial Railway this year is a statement showing that there is a deficit of $209,987. Now, compare that deficit with the financial position of the Intercolonial Railway during the last four years of the administration of the Conservative party. In 1892-93 there was a profit on the Intercolonial Railway of $20,181; in 1893-94 there was a profit of $5,832; in 1894-95 there was a profit of $3,815, and for the last year the Conservative party was in power, there was a deficit of $59,187, showing a net deficit in the four year of $29,358. Let us see what the present Government did with the Intercolonial Railway. In the first year of this Liberal Administration there was a deficit of $50,940.65 on the Intercolonial Railway, and last year there was a deficit of $209,987, showing a deficit for the two years of $260,933. If the Drummond County Railway was an advantage to the Intercolonial, then the Intercolonial must be very badly managed, because, notwithstanding the acquisition of the Drummond County line, last year there was a deficit, as I have shown, of $209,987. But there is more than that to be considered in this matter. During the Conservative Administration, there were wooden bridges replaced by steel bridges, and charged to revenue; there were passenger and freight cars purchased, and these were charged to revenue. There were improvements and betterments charged to revenue; and there were new heavy steel rails purchased to replace the light ones, and these were also charged to revenue. But what do we find the present Government doing? Everything in the way of patching up bridges and all betterments were charged to capital account, so as to enable this Government to show no deficit on the working expenses, but, notwithstanding that, they were nearly $210,000 behind last year. Why, if they had made the same charges to revenue account as the Conservative Government did, and charged up the rent paid to the Drummond County and Grand Trunk Railways, the deficit last year on the Intercolonial Railway would have been enormous.

After the Liberal Government came into power, in the latter part of 1896, there was a great deal of talk about the Drummond County Railway, and it was stated in the press of the country, that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was arranging for its purchase. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) deposed before the committee, that he never knew who owned the Drummond County road until some time in January, 1897. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) could not have read the press of the country, and he could not have known what his colleague (Mr. Tarte) was up to, if he did not know who were the owners of that road. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) also told the committee, that he knew nothing of the option for the purchase of this road for $500,000. It is perhaps well to explain something about that option, as it has been largely commented on, and I will read the reference to it, as it appears in the draft report of the committee:—

Under these circumstances, and with a view of effecting a sale of the road, the shareholders of the company, on the 16th of July, 1894, gave to Mr. Farwell the following option:—

"For and in consideration of the sum of one dollar to each of us in hand paid by William Farwell, of Sherbrooke, P.Q.:

"We, and each of us, hereby give to said William Farwell a thirty days' option in which he may pay to us the round sum of $500,000.00, for which sum, if paid within thirty days, we agree to sell, transfer and deliver to him, or his assigns, the Drummond County Railway, both main line, branches, sidings, rights of way, stations, rolling stock, tools, franchises, charters, bonuses, subsidies and appurtenances whatsoever, exactly as the whole property stands and is.

"We undertake to transfer to him the whole capital stock, both issued and unissued, also the whole of the bonds, both issued and unissued, after cancellation, and to deliver the property to him free from all debts, liens, mortgages and encumbrances whatsoever, and to defend him from all claims that may thereafter be preferred arising prior to the transfer.

"We declare that the right of way has been paid for and deeded to the company on the whole line from Ste. Rosalie to Ball's Wharf, and from St. Léonard as far as the track is laid towards Chaudière Junction, with the exception of certain small pieces which we undertake to pay for and cause to be deeded to the company, the whole for and in consideration of the sum of $500,000.

"The whole capital stock authorized is sixty-five hundred (6,500) shares of $100 each.

"The total capital stock issued and delivered by the company is four thousand (4,000) shares of $100 each.

"The total bond issue authorized is one million ($1,000,000) dollars, and the bonds issued and outstanding amount to one million dollars, which is held by the Eastern Townships Bank as security for an advance of one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars ($175,000) or thereabouts.

"The right of way which we will transfer is sixty-six feet over the whole road, with the exception of certain sections, which are only forty feet, say in all about two miles, and also a portion of the right of way is ninety-nine feet, say from six to eight miles.

"Witness our hands in the city of Montreal, this 16th day of July, A.D. 1894.

"(Signed)—	Shares.
"C. Church	601
"G. H Church, per C. C	100
"J. E. Church, per C. C	100
"William Mitchell	800
"James Mitchell	92
"David Mitchell	92
"Thomas D. Fee	800
"J. N. Greenshields	500
"Samuel Newton	93
"W. Watts	322
"William Farwell	500
"Witness: J. G. Glen."	4,000

Then he assigns:

I hereby assign and transfer all my rights to above option of purchase of Drummond County Railway, &c., to Hugh Ryan, contractor, Toronto, Ont.

There can be no doubt this option was granted for $500,000, for it is here on record. Mr. Hugh Ryan, I understand, has stated that the option was a straight option for $500,000. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has stated that Mr. Ryan offered this option to him for $550,000. Mr. Farwell says that Mr. Ryan was to complete the road, and Mr. Farwell and his associates were to get one-third of anything he could get out of it. If he sold the road for $550,000, they would only get one-third of the $50,000. These are the facts of the case, so far as the option is concerned. There was another option given for $400,000, but it is not necessary for me to go into that. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals, in giving evidence before the committee, stated that the distance over the Grand Trunk Railway from a point in Montreal to Lévis was 157·37 miles, the distance by the South Shore line was 159·39 miles, and the distance by the Drummond County road was only 146 miles. Where he gets this 146 miles I cannot understand. The distance from Montreal to Ste. Rosalie is thirty-eight miles, the distance by the main line of the Drummond County Railway is 115½ miles, and from Chaudière to Lévis the distance is nine miles, making the length of this route 162½ miles, or five miles longer than the Grand Trunk, and a little over three miles longer than the South Shore, and 248 miles longer than the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John, N.B. Mr. Schreiber's last estimate on the main line and branch of the Drummond County Railway was $1,535,500. The subsidies amounted to $650,000. I am saying nothing about the $136,000 which I am told was paid to the company, but I have no means of finding out anything about it. The amount expended by the company would thus be $885,144. The subsidies from the province of Quebec and from municipalities amount to $362,420. So that this Government is purchasing this $885,144 which the company have put into the road; also the $362,420 which the Quebec Government and the municipalities have put into it; they are also paying $216,436, making a total of $1,464,000. Then, if you take into account the Dominion subsidies, amounting to $287,936, the Government would be paying $1,751,936, and if they paid the other subsidy of $136,000 they would be paying $1,889,936. But even if they deduct the $136,000 they would be paying $1,751,936. The estimate of Mr. Schreiber, the engineer of the Government, of the cost of this railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Leonard was forty-five and one-half miles at $13,000 per mile, and seventy miles from St. Leonard to Chaudière Bridge at $11,000 per mile, or a cost for the main line of $1,365,000. The second estimate that he has been asked to make amounts to $500 more than that. At these prices, with a reasonable price for the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, you can easily see that the railway would not be a very expensive one. Now, let me read a few sentences from the first agreement which the hon. gentleman entered into:

Her Majesty shall have an undivided half share in the Grand Trunk Railway and property between and including certain points, and use of Victoria Bridge for 99 years. The construction of stations, tracks, approaches and sidings to be made under supervision and subject to approval of Grand Trunk Company's engineer.

You see, everything is in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway engineer for ninety-nine years. This Government, which pays one-half the cost of these terminals, has nothing to say about them. That feature of the arrangement was very well explained last night by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), when he said the country was tied hand and foot to the Grand Trunk for 99 years. The rates and fares are to be those established by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Why, Sir, you cannot make a rate or do anything with your own road for which you have paid so much, without the consent of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. With regard to the time of arrival and departure of trains at Montreal, I do not suppose the Grand Trunk Company would place any unreasonable obstacles in the way; but it is a peculiar bargain to make that we cannot arrive or leave the yards at Montreal except with the approval of the Grand Trunk. Mr. Schreiber's estimate, the Minister of Railways and Canals says, was for the equal use of the terminals.

The Government to pay interest on one-half of any expenditure for improvements, such as double tracks between St. Hyacinthe and St. Lambert, yard at Point St. Charles or St Henri, additional tracks that may be necessary from St. Henri to Bonaventure station, bridges or other expenditures for proper conduct of the business.

I wish to call the attention of the House to this as it is the most foolish and unbusinesslike clause that could be put in any agreement. But let me first draw your attention to the fact that we are to pay five per cent on one-half the cost of all the improvements, such as double tracks, sidings, station houses, branches or anything else that the Grand Trunk Railway may desire to build to carry on their enormous traffic. I put the cost of this down at the very modest estimate of $25,000 a year, over and above what will be necessary as per clause 35 of the second contract. I am now speaking of the first agreement on which the second is an improvement—the agreement that the Senate very properly threw out, in the interests of the country. I estimate that the interest on our share of the cost of these improvements at 5 per cent will average at least $25,000 a year. If they only

spend $50,000 a year for 20 years, the proportion on which we would pay interest would be $500,000, which at 5 per cent would amount to $25,000 per annum, with 79 years to run, during which time the expenditure would no doubt enormously increase. That is the most moderate and reasonable estimate anybody can make under clause 35 of the first contract. I was over a portion of the Grand Trunk from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie a few days ago. On that 38 miles of double tracking, no doubt 80-pound rails would be used to accommodate the heavy traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway. A lighter rail would, no doubt, do for the present traffic over the Intercolonial, but under the circumstances of that first contract 80-pound rails would be required, and the cost of the ties, ballasting sidings, bridges, &c., would be at least $6,000 a mile, or $228,000. The cost of grading for double track, bridges, sidings, &c., over the 38 miles from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal would be at least $10,000 a mile, or $380,000. This would be $608,000, and there cannot be a doubt about it that if this first contract had been carried out, this double track, as Mr. Schreiber intimates in his evidence, would have been built. I was surprised to see such poor station houses and other buildings as there are along that section, and I have no doubt the Grand Trunk Railway would add station houses when laying their double track. The country would therefore have to pay five per cent interest on half this amount of $608,000, or on $304,000 as soon as this double track was built, and half the cost of the stations would probably bring it up to $400,000. My estimate of $25,000 a year under clause 35 of the first contract is a very reasonable one. Besides the improvements already mentioned, there are yard improvements, buildings, sidings, bridges, &c., and before the termination of this contract, we cannot tell but what it may be necessary to spend a large amount of money on the Victoria Bridge. Ninety-nine years is a great length of time for a Government to enter into such an arrangement, when they could do better by building a road and making improvements on lines that are the property of the country.

The hon. Minister of Railways said that the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway was on a basis of $140,000 a year. The arrangement with the Drummond Railway was $70,000 per year and with the Grand Trunk Railway $140,000 a year, or $210,000 per annum, which, capitalized at three per cent, would be $7,000,000. And taking $25,000 as our share of the expenditure between Montreal and Ste. Rosalie, including the terminals, etc., at three per cent, would give $833,300. This would amount to $7,833,300. Although the Government gave the Grand Trunk Railway, a short time before, $300,000 for the improvements and extension of Victoria Bridge, I will not include that in this calculation. I have made my calculations on borrowing money at 3 per cent, which I say is quite sufficient. If the credit of the country is as good now as it was when this Government came into office, after eighteen years of Conservative administration, my statement cannot be doubted. Immediately after they came into office, before they had passed any legislation, or had done anything to entitle them to borrow a dollar, they borrowed money at 2½ per cent, and when discounts and brokerage and other charges are added, the rate was a little less than 2¾ per cent, and that low rate was due to the prestige which this country had acquired under a Conservative Government. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the money could be borrowed by this Government at 3 per cent if their credit is as good now as then.

I shall now deal with the estimate made by the Government engineer. Mr. Schreiber says that the St. Hyacinthe line, Drummond County connection to St. Lambert, 30 miles, cost $1,500,000, on one-half of which we would have to pay interest. This line is estimated to have cost $50,000 per mile, and we are paying five per cent interest based on that valuation, which is a very high one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). What do you say about $50,000 a mile?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). That is Mr. Schreiber's estimate, and I understand that the Government is paying on a basis of a valuation of $50,000 per mile from St. Lambert.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are speaking of the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Yes; I am speaking of the road from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie. I have gone over that road and have made an estimate of the cost, and I intend now to place it on record, that it may be there so that any practical man may go over the road and judge for himself whether I am right or wrong. Before I go into the details of the estimate, I may say that I have never seen a finer country to build a road in. From St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie there are only two little cuts, one of six or seven feet, and a very short one of about three feet. With these exceptions, there is not a rod of it but could be worked with scrapers, the soil being a sandy loam. I venture to say if you call for tenders you will find good men to undertake that work for 12 cents a yard. I am satisfied that it can be sub-let for 10 cents a yard. It is the easiest scraper side work I ever saw. I have estimated it at 18 cents a yard. That, I believe, is ample, and I have talked it over with some of the best contractors in this country. They tell me they are prepared to enter into a contract and put up the necessary deposit inside of ten days, at the estimate I have made, to do this work.

Mr. GIBSON. Did you examine the nature of the soil from Ste. Hyacinthe to Ste. Rosalie ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. What was it ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Sandy loam. There is only a small amount of clearing—only about two miles, and the trees are small poplars. It would not cost more than $5 an acre to clear it. But, for clearing, close-cutting and grubbing, I have allowed $30 an acre for 25 acres ; this would be $750. Grading, including sidings, 16,000 cubic yards—and I am sure there is not that quantity necessary to make a first-class road—at 18 cents a yard, for 30 miles, would be $88,700. I find there is a bridge across the Richelieu River. My hon. friend (Mr. Gibson) is a better authority on bridges, perhaps, than he is on grading. For this bridge there are five piers and two abutments. I estimate the piers to average 37½ feet by 30 feet high, by 8½ feet. This would make 354 cubic yards. Thus, the five piers and two abutments, which I figure all the same—there would be one or two a little deeper, but others not nearly so deep—2,481½ yards, at $20 a yard, $49,630. The superstructure for this bridge, 600 feet, at $45 a lineal foot—100 feet spans—$27,000. This is the only important bridge, and the figures I have given show a total cost for it of $76,630. There is another small stone and iron bridge, which, allowing $20 a yard for masonry and $45 per lineal foot for the superstructure, would cost $29,500. Then there are culverts, cattle-guards and crossings—not very many, owing to the country being so level. I put a very liberal valuation on these when I allow the sum of $25,000. The ties, including sidings, 2,800 ties per mile, at 30 cents, would be $25,200. These ties, you will see, are about 2-feet centres. Now, the steel rails, at 60 pounds to the yard, which makes a good substantial road for the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, including rails for sidings, also fish-plates, spikes, bolts, &c., 127 tons per mile, at $23 per ton, total $87,630. Steel rails were down very low a little while ago, as low, I think, as $17 or $18 per ton. I am told that owing to the combine of Rockefeller and others in the United States, they are somewhat higher, so, as you will see, I base my estimate on $23 per ton. Tracklaying, including sidings and switches, $300 per mile, $9,000. Ballasting, 2,347 cubic yards, at 30 cents, $21,123. Fencing, per mile, 640 rods, at 80 cents, $15,360. Stations, freight sheds, round houses, platforms, signals, &c., $25,000. This may appear small, but I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that anybody going over that piece of road will find the stations of a very inferior character. This is a very liberal estimate for them as they are, and will put in better stations and better buildings generally than are now on the road. Engineering and contingencies, say, $1,000 per mile. There would not be many contingencies, because this work is so easily done, except the one bridge, that there can be nothing unforeseen, and I put such a valuation upon the bridge that contingencies are really not necessary. As to engineering, there are no difficulties in the way to call for much engineering work. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to examine this road for themselves. I invite the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) when he goes that way, to look over the line and see if it is a difficult road to build. For contingencies and engineering, say, $30,000. Thus, we have the total cost of the road, $433,893. The interest on that, at 3 per cent, would be $13,016, while the interest charge which the Government has undertaken to pay, based upon 5 per cent, amounts to $37,500, a difference of $24,484.

Now, Sir, I am prepared to furnish the Government a contractor as good as they can find in this country, who will do this work for $14,463 per mile, instead of $50,000. I am satisfied that any hon. gentleman in this House, no matter what his politics may be, even the Minister himself, if he goes over the line and examines the work, must come to the conclusion that the $37,500 per year that they are paying for that road is a reckless and indefensible waste of public money. At page 11 of this report, I find Mr. Schreiber's estimate of what we ought to pay for the use of the terminals. We have here the value of the terminals at St. Charles and Bonaventure, including the use of the tracks, on the basis of half the value at 5 per cent. Now, it is well known that the country around Montreal is comparatively level, especially at Bonaventure station, St. Henri and Point St. Charles, and it is not expensive to build a road-bed. Four miles of railway, at $80,000 per mile, $320,000. This does not take in any of the buildings, it does not take in any of the sidings, it does not take in the land, the stations, the freight houses or anything of that kind, but just the four miles of track. One-half of that $320,000 is $160,000. They not only pay this enormous amount, three times what they should pay, but they pay double the interest that they could get the money for to build this work themselves. Then there are 10 acres of land (485,100 square feet) for terminals at $2 per foot, which is figured out here at $871,200, but it is a little more, it is about $970,000. The interest on this at 5 per cent is $19,000, more than it would be at 3 per cent, the rate which the Government could borrow the money. Now, they pay for a passenger station, say, $100,000, say one-half, $50,000. Other tracks, four miles at $4,500 per mile, $18,000. This is one-half the cost of the four miles of track. Then there is a freight shed, 500 feet by 50 feet, of brick, on which the Government proportion is $30,000. For the engine-house the Government pays $30,000 ; proportion of workshops, $30,000, and sundries, $50,000. These total up $1,239,200 according to their estimate, and 5 per cent on that sum is $61,960. I see here a

recapitulation by Mr. Schreiber in which he puts this down at $62,500. It would appear that this Government are very liberal to large corporations. At the same time that they were putting this deal through, paying this company three prices, and 5 per cent on that, they passed legislation here to give the depositors in the savings banks only 2½ per cent interest on their money. Farmers, mechanics and labouring men could only get 2½ per cent for the money they loan the Government, but large corporations get 5 per cent.

Mr. Schreiber, the engineer, said that the Victoria Bridge cost $10,000,000. I never heard that sum mentioned before. I have seen a good many cuts and views of that bridge on all of which it was stated that the cost was $7,000,000, and that is a very large sum of money. He says it could be built now for $6,000,000. We have received no information from the Minister as to the number of cars used, and we have to take what we find on record. I find here in the report of the Drummond County Railway Commission a record of the total number of cars in and out of the yard at Point St. Charles and Bonaventure stations on the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway during the months of March and April, 1898. On the Intercolonial Railway there were 4,381, and on the Grand Trunk Railway 99,107. We are supposed to pay for half the terminals. The percentage in favour of the Grand Trunk Railway is 2,263. Yet we pay half, when there is twenty-two and a half times as much traffic on the Grand Trunk Railway as there is on the Intercolonial Railway. Now, for the whole year the number on the Intercolonial Railway is 26.286. At $1.52 per car, that would give $40.000. That is what the Government has paid, I believe; if it is not that, it is more. The Grand Trunk Railway cars for the year numbered 594,642. At the same rate they would amount to $905.641. These two amounts put together would be 15½ per cent on $6,000,000. Payment of this percentage would wipe out $6,000,000 in six years and five months. The same percentage would build a bridge costing $1,400,000 in less than one and one-half years. Yet you see that we pay $40,000 for the use of the bridge, and if the Grand Trunk paid only $40,000, we would pay $1.52 per car or engine, while the Grand Trunk would pay a little less than 6¾ cents. This is one of the best bargains, as the hon. member for Halifax said, that was ever made in this country. If he were speaking from the Grand Trunk standpoint, he might well say so. I find that the Delaware and Hudson road and the Central Vermont have running rights into Montreal. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he has succeeded in getting any proportion of the rates that they are giving to the Grand Trunk Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). They are not running into Montreal.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry).

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Are they not running to the station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have taken the cars of those lines there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You took the Grand Trunk cars. I understood that they had running rights.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). However that may be, it does not make much difference, but I have taken the cars there with the initials of those lines on the cars and engines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only difference it makes is that one statement is accurate and the other is not. That is an important statement.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am willing to take the hon. gentleman's explanation. I asked him for an explanation, and I expected him to cheerfully give that explanation without showing ill-temper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not understand the hon. gentleman was asking me anything. I was correcting him.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I know that it is very difficult to get any information out of the hon. gentleman, and I am not surprised at this. Now, this Government has granted some $300,000 for the enlargement of this bridge across the St. Lawrence. It is fitted for horses and carriages and foot passengers. I am not sure but that provision is made for street-cars also; however, that does not matter very much. It is quite clear that the Government is not getting any proportion of the returns from this traffic. Here is Mr. Schreiber's estimate again, and I give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) credit for the largest estimate he made. He made two estimates, I believe, one under the old Government and one under this Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no difference between them at all.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). There is $500.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not when they refer to the same property. One estimate did not include the Nicolet branch and the other did.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). He put the valuation at $170,000 for the Nicolet branch. The second estimate is $500 more than before on the main line. Well, now we will make some kind of an estimate in regard to this. I am willing to take Mr. Schreiber's larger estimate for the main line 115½ miles amounting to $1,365.500:

115½ miles main line	$1,365,500
Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, 30 miles at $14,463	433,893
Bridge across St. Lawrence and approaches	1,400,000
Total for one road and bridge..	$3,199,393
Add another road from Chaudière to St. Lambert, distinctly separate from the other	1,799,393
For two separate roads and one bridge across the St. Lawrence	$4,998,786
As per first agreement, the amount to be paid and the conditions connected therewith	$7,833,300
Deduct cost of two roads and bridge..	4,998,786
Leaving a balance of	$2,834,514

That is the amount at which this work could have been done. As there may be a question as to the valuation of these bridges, I have a book here containing the transactions of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, and I can give you out of this book the cost of the Coteau bridge and the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge across the St. Lawrence. Here is a statement made at the meeting of the civil engineers by Mr. Mountain, chief engineer of the Canada Atlantic Railway:

Mr. Mountain, in reply, said he had followed the precedent showed him by the other papers, which, with one exception, gave no prices. He considered it a breach of faith with the contractors to do so. He had already given the quantity of masonry and length of superstructure, and he would now say that the total cost of the bridge, as given by the secretary-treasurer of the road, was $1,264,000. He did not feel at liberty to give any further details as to prices without the permission of both the company and the contractors.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What bridge is that?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). That is the Coteau bridge, belonging to the Canada Atlantic. Mr. Peterson, chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, discussing this question, speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, says:

The cost of the bridge was $943,387; and from grade to grade, as per contract plans, $998,412.22.

That is a little less than $1,000,000 for this bridge—the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge across the St. Lawrence. When I said $1,400,000 was my estimate of the cost of the bridge across the St. Lawrence it was a very liberal figure. These bridges have been built for much less.

Now, I am happy to say that there has been an improvement in the second contract as compared with the first, particularly in reference to clause 35 of the first contract. There is no doubt that the rejection of that contract by the Senate has saved the country, at least on that one clause, $500,000, and I think perhaps more, and including the Drummond County Railway there can be no doubt there has been a saving of at least $1,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why not make it $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 when you are about it?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am not making it; you are making it yourself; I am taking it from the records as I find it here in this investigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You do not find that it is increased.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am giving you everything you can desire in regard to the engineer's estimate, and it shows that you have made a very bad bargain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you say that I placed the difference at $500,000 a year?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). On that 5 per cent and on the improvements and betterments. If you smile at that, Sir, it is because you do not understand it. If the Minister (Mr. Blair) had figured up the cost to the country under clause 35 of the first agreement he would have no trouble in finding that the 5 per cent would amount to at least an average of $25,000 a year, and if he had taken the precaution of doing that figuring correctly, before he entered into such a foolish contract, he would have been doing his duty to the country, and the result would likely have deterred him from this outrageous undertaking. I am told, that the Minister of Railways and Canals entered into this arrangement with the Drummond County people before he ever saw their road or before he ever sent a man to inspect it. But it did not matter whether the road was longer or shorter, or cheaper or dearer, he wanted to buy it to help his friends. I shall not refer to any other reasons which may exist as to why that road was purchased by the Government. I am not going to say anything as to how "La Patrie" proved to be a newspaper institution worth two or three hundred thousand dollars in such a miraculous manner; and I am not going to say what interest Mr. Greenshields had in the business. That is well known. Under the present arrangement, taking the Minister's own figures, the Drummond County Railway Company gets $1,600,000, and the Grand Trunk Railway, $140,000 a year, which, capitalized at 3 per cent, gives $4,666,666; and then, there is $6,000 a year for another portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, which represents a capitalization of $200,000, the whole amounting to $6,466,666. I maintain that two separate and distinct roads, from Chaudière to Montreal, and one bridge with approaches

could be built for this sum and leave a balance of $1,467,860 for contingencies, right of way, stations and terminals. Under the estimate I have given, I can find a man within ten days who will make a deposit and build the road for my estimate. Such is the great bargain which the Minister of Railways has made in the interests of the country. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and some of his associates in New Brunswick are experts at building bridges. I do not know that they acquired that knowledge before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) came to Ottawa, but I hope that, when he makes contracts like this for the Dominion Government, he will make them in the interest of the people, and not in the interest of strong corporations that are able to take care of themselves.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The bridge question is a very tender question with your friends in New Brunswick.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). My friends?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they would not thank you for referring to that subject.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The bridge question in New Brunswick is a tender question with your friends, and my political friends down there have made it rather uncomfortable for your friends on that question. However, I hope the Minister (Mr. Blair) will do me the justice of taking a look at the line between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie, and I think he will come to the conclusion, with me, that he has made a very bad bargain. I do not oppose the Intercolonial Railway coming into Montreal, nor do I believe that any man on this side of the House would be opposed to it, but I object to its costing the country too much, and when, as I have shown, we are paying as much for it as two or three roads would cost to build, I think we have every reason to oppose it. If you build that road from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, and build a bridge along with it, it will not cost you more than the estimate I have given, and you have Government lands in Montreal which you can use for terminal facilities. There is no reason why you should not do this and save the country two or three million dollars. But the Government seems bound to squander the money of the people in this matter. The contract they have entered into is an outrage on the rights of the people, and I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and his friends in the Government will reconsider it, and decide to act in the public interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). This subject has been so thoroughly discussed by members on this side of the House, and we have heard so little concerning it from the other side of the House, that it makes it unnecessary for me to say a word upon the subject, were it not that two or three matters have been referred to of which I may be expected to take some notice. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), in making his four hours, or four and a half hours speech——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it was a little short of four hours.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I regard it as an evidence of great ability on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), that, during his speech of a little short of four hours, he talked for about half an hour on the Drummond County Railway, and devoted the rest of the time to somewhat extraneous matters. The object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) seems to be, from the very commencement down to the present hour, to withhold information and to protest his inability to give information. I regret to have to say, that I have never seen the head of any department in this House, when bringing before this House a grave and important question, involving a large expenditure of public money, treat the House—not the Opposition—but treat the House with that sovereign contempt which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has exhibited on this occasion. Does he think he is paying a compliment to his own supporters, in exhibiting them as so plastic in the hands of the Government that they can be made to swallow anything, that they can be made to carry any project the Government submits to them, and to carry it without investigation or examination? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) suppose that he is consulting the dignity of the Government, or his own dignity, in standing up by the hour in this House, presenting his wrong side to the Opposition, and entering into loud conversations with parties around him, while members on this side are dealing with the question in a manner that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) never was able to deal with it, and never could deal with it? My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) last night showed a comprehensive grasp of this whole subject with which the hon. gentleman's puny and infantile efforts contrast in a most remarkable degree. He showed a complete knowledge of the question, a knowledge which it is very unfortunate for the country the hon. Minister of Railways did not possess. And yet, Sir, with a question of that gravity before the House, the hon. gentleman insulted his own supporters as much as the Opposition by lolling around and turning his back on the gentleman who was addressing the Chair, and entering into loud conversation with half a dozen gentlemen around him. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) says the hon. gentleman did not know any better. That is some apology, but it is not one which the hon. gentleman is likely to present to the House. I hope for the future that the hon. gentleman will not present such a stern

front to the Opposition as he has done in the discussion of this question. During some of the addresses which were delivered to this House, some of the ablest that have ever been heard here on any question, the hon. gentleman who has charge of this measure was not here at all, but treated not only his own supporters but every man in the House with sovereign contempt. I say it is a spectacle which I have never witnessed before from any hon. gentleman dealing with a great and important measure, and it is one which I trust I shall never have to refer to in terms of such strong condemnation in the future.

I may say in the outset that I do not attach and never have attached the great importance of bringing the Intercolonial into Montreal that many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House do, and I will state very briefly the reason why. I have never had an illustration given of what the great advantage of that extension was likely to be. I have never heard any sufficient reason to induce me to believe that it was incumbent on the Government to expend an inordinate sum of public money to accomplish that object. Every man in this House and every man in Canada has a deep and vital interest in the adoption of any fair and legitimate means by which the position of the Intercolonial Railway shall be improved, and by which the heavy burden which that great work has been upon the people of this country from its inception down to the present time shall be in any way modified or changed for the better. I admit that at once; and if any gentleman will show me how we are going to change a deficit into a surplus by any means that are fair and legitimate, I am quite prepared to give such a proposition careful consideration. But I will not dwell on that question. It is not vital to our discussion to-night. I will concede, if necessary, for the sake of argument, that it is desirable to bring the Intercolonial into Montreal; but it is only desirable on business principles. A thing may be good, but it may cost too much; and the only object any Government can have in bringing the Intercolonial into Montreal is to improve its position, to increase its paying qualities, and to lighten the burthen of that great and important national work on the taxpayers of this country. That is the position I take, and I think it is one that is unassailable. But, Sir, there is another reason that strikes me as having some force. The hon. gentleman says that I appear as an advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway as against the Intercolonial Railway. He is very much mistaken. He will search my history in vain to find evidence of my holding a retainer on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company such as was presented when he asked the people of this country to pay $2,000,000 more for a work to be constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than they were prepared to perform that work for the Government of which I was a member. Therefore, the less the hon. gentleman says about holding retainers for the Canadian Pacific Railway, the better. But I want to put this to the House as a matter which I think deserves some consideration. The Intercolonial Railway terminated at Rivière du Loup, and by-and-by I will state why it was brought to Point Lévis. When, after years of experience the Government found that one of the great objects of having a great interoceanic line of railway extending from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean had failed in realizing the important point of having ocean termini within Canada that could do the work which the interests of Canada required should be done, the Government turned their attention to the question how they could overcome the difficulty. We found by sad experience that with all the efforts that could be made by any persons charged with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, it was absolutely impossible to take freight to St. John or Halifax or any port within the Dominion, because the Grand Trunk Railway had a line of communication to Portland so much shorter that it was able to cut off the traffic that could otherwise be carried to the sea within the Dominion. Consequently the Intercolonial Railway was proved to be an absolute failure, as to providing a port within the Dominion that should be an efficient winter port for Canada. Now, Sir, what did we do? We acted only after the most careful consideration. It was not hurriedly done. It was not done in the dark. It was not done as this contract was made, without anybody in the House of Commons, or in Canada, except the parties negotiating with each other, knowing anything about it. We made no secret contract. We discussed the question long and fully, and finally we came to the conclusion to ask the authority and approval of Parliament to enable us to remedy that difficulty, and to secure within the Dominion of Canada the ocean termini of the great interoceanic line of railway, both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. How did we do that? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were tempted by a proposal of the Government of Canada, with the authority and approval of Parliament, who voted the money before any negotiations were had, to grant a subsidy of $186,000 a year for twenty years. What does that amount to? It amounts to $2,267,210, capitalized at 3 per cent, given to a private company, given to the Canadian Pacific Railway to induce them to build a line of railway from the port of Montreal to the harbour of St. John. Those were the terms and that was the condition on which they agreed to do it. I have under my hand a copy of the Halifax "Morning Chronicle," which contains an article dealing with this subject, and I will read a single sentence from that very absurd and ridiculous edi-

torial, but in which there is one grain of truth, and that is the paragraph I am going to read, which I happen to know is absolutely true. It is not couched in the most elegant phraseology, and does not exhibit exactly that high type of writing which one would expect from a distinguished law professor, but such as it is, I give it to the House :

> They say there is another phase of the story to be told. The people of Halifax and Nova Scotia do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for the situation which has been created by the folly of the late Government. The Canadian Pacific Railway people did not want to build the Short Line through Maine, but were forced to against their better judgment, and, to use a vulgarism, they have ever since been making periodical visits to the back-yard, where they privately kick themselves.

That is not just the style of communication you would look for from a learned and distinguished law professor, who claims to be a man of high literary attainments ; but vulgar and common place and low as it is, it is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him ? I can hardly suspect that he does not mean by this reference, not altogether complimentary, to make some personal allusion to some member of the House, and I would like to know if there is any distinguished law professor or any law professor at all, in any way connected with the Halifax "Morning Chronicle."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought the hon. gentleman was a distinguished professor of the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not say that I am, but I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But after listening to the hon. gentleman for an hour this afternoon, I came to the conclusion that I must have been misinformed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I knew that the hon. gentleman made altogether too high an estimate of my poor abilities, but all I wish to say is that if he wants to convey the impression to this House that I have any connection in the world with the Halifax "Morning Chronicle," he is absolutely and entirely mistaken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may have been misinformed, but after I was wearied out by the platitudes of the hon. gentleman and his needless going over what had already been said, and better said, by a dozen gentlemen before him, I left the House, but I am told that the hon. gentleman made an elaborate rehash of the "Morning Chronicle" editorials here for my benefit after my back was turned.

Mr. RUSSELL. That does not warrant the hon. gentleman in conveying any impression to this House that I have anything in the world to do with the Halifax "Morning Chronicle," or ever saw or knew anything about the article he has just read. Such an impression is absolutely unfounded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not astonished that he or any gentleman of any standing or character should be ashamed to admit having anything to do with the editorials of the "Morning Chronicle."

Mr. RUSSELL. I think they are excellent editorials, but I only wish to say that it is untrue that I have any connection whatever with the Halifax "Morning Chronicle," and I hope that the hon. gentleman, with his distinguished fairness, will accept my statement. I never saw the paragraph he alluded to, and have not read the "Chronicle," or been able to do so for several weeks, or been a writter for it for the last twenty or thirty years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say frankly to the hon. gentleman that I shall have a better opinion of him in future than I had in the past. He has given evidence of good sense and good taste that I must confess I did not give him credit for ; but I must tell him this, that he has adopted a line in this House in reference to my position and to this question which I shall dispose of, I think, very summarily and thoroughly before I sit down, that led me to suppose that, at all events, it was a case of geat minds jumping together. If what has appeared in the "Chronicle" did not emanate from him, then it was one of these remarkable evidences of great minds thinking together and reaching the same conclusion. I want to put this proposition to this House, as business men. When the Government of Canada induced the Canadian Pacific Railway, by a subsidy of $2,267,210 to furnish that which they found the Intercolonial Railway could not provide, when they induced the Canadian Pacific Railway to build that line of railway from Montreal to Quebec, when we induced that company by that subsidy to provide the means of reaching an ocean winter port in Canada, which we found, after constructing the Intercolonial Railway, we did not possess in consequence of the great distance we had to cover compared to Portland, I ask if there is a fair-minded man in the House that would say that the Government of Canada would be entitled to turn around and build a parallel line. Those who have watched the reports of that company will come to the conclusion that the Halifax "Chronicle" is right when it says that the company had no desire to build that railway, and I am in a position to know—from the best possible authority years ago I learned—that there was no act that the Canadian Pacific Railway had ever been induced to undertake, there was no work they had ever been induced to construct, that they regretted so deeply as that. Those who are familiar with their reports will have no difficulty in discovering that they spent between $13,000,000 and $14,000,000 of their own money in performing that work for Canada. I want to know, then, is there a man in this House will say, without any reference to whether he likes or dislikes the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, that the Government of Canada would be warranted, after having induced that company, by a subsidy voted by this Parliament, of $186,000 a year for twenty years, to turn around and build a parallel line alongside of that for the purpose of taking away its traffic. There is not a man in this House who would not spurn any such idea and brand it as a most dishonest transaction, as between man and man, or between a Government and a company. I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Railways that that does not preclude Canada from engaging in any fair and legitimate means by which the Intercolonial Railway shall secure every pound of traffic and every passenger it can obtain. But I do say that it becomes a very questionable thing whether we should impose an additional debt upon the shoulders of the people of Canada of $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 for the avowed purpose of taking away traffic from the Canadian Pacific Railway over a road that company was induced by Canada to build, and which it has found most unprofitable and regretted very much ever having been induced to undertake.

But I will put all that aside, and will treat this question as if we had a perfectly legitimate ground to enter upon competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway or anybody else. I do not intend to go over the points already touched upon. I should be insulting the intelligence of this House in doing so after such clear, lucid and luminous statements as those made from this side of the House in criticising this measure; for instance, after such a speech as we have heard delivered by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), one of the ablest and most practical men sitting in this House, a gentleman who speaks with knowledge of the value of these works possessed by very few hon. members. I believe that there are gentlemen on the other side of the House who, if they occupied as independent a position as my hon. friend from Glengarry, might make speeches showing, perhaps, equal ability and equal knowledge of the subject. This, however, we cannot hope for. If any gentleman on the other side with equal ability and equal knowledge were to intimate to the occupants of the Treasury benches that in justice to his own character as a man of ability and knowledge on such subjects, he would feel it is his duty to make such a speech, he would be appointed a Governor of one of the provinces within twenty-four hours, or at least he would have the promise of some such office, and would become as dumb as these gentlemen usually do when weighted down with Governorships or judgeships or postmasterships. I take up a point which has not been very fully dealt with by my hon. friends on this side of the House. I put it before the House on a former occasion my view as to what—if it was considered necessary to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal—should have been done. And I leave it to the judgment of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, if they will give it dispassionate consideration for a few moments, whether the proposal I made was not the one best calculated to promote the interests of the whole country while accomplishing the object in view. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, when he decided to carry the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, had three modes opened to him on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. He chose the worst, in my opinion. He had the mode—which any person regarding the case would think the best—of making an arrangement with the Grand Trunk to run over their line. This could be run as a traffic arrangement; or if the hon. Minister is determined to be a great railway magnate and must have absolute ownership, he could have purchased the right of that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway upon infinitely better terms. Mr. Wainwright, the very able and talented gentleman connected with the Grand Trunk, who, perhaps, is able to speak on questions appertaining to the Grand Trunk with as much authority and wisdom as any man in this country, said before the committee that owing to this arrangement the Grand Trunk was obliged to practically abandon that portion of their line from the Chaudière to Ste. Rosalie. If that is the case, can any one doubt that they would have been only too glad to have made arrangements to enable the Intercolonial Railway to enter Montreal on infinitely better terms, with all terminal facilities provided, than by the mode proposed. But there was another mode. There was what is known as the South Shore line. There is a road running through the most populous portion of the country, a road which would give you a large amount of traffic and would have enabled the Intercolonial Railway to get into Montreal upon far better terms than are provided under the plans proposed. More than that, we must not forget that at this moment the Prime Minister stands pledged, as do other hon. gentlemen connected with the South Shore Railway, to come to this House and get from it the subsidies by which that road can be built. And then, in the third place, you have an old, broken-down railway that has been shown by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) to be a miserable, bankrupt concern, that had never earned a penny of net earnings in its history, that commenced nowhere and ran nowhere, and was utterly unadapted for the purpose proposed. This road you will have running between the Grand Trunk on the one side and the South Shore on the other, both competing with it and both in a position to compete successfully. Therefore, I contend that it was infinitely the worst proposition that could be selected. But what I proposed and what the Minister of Railways and Canals has treated with infinite scorn and I draw the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr.

Dobell) to the point—was to secure the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in the heart of the city of Quebec by building a bridge and bringing that road in. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that I said all we would have to do would be to give a million. I say that both Liberal and Conservative parties were pledged, whenever means could be found to accomplish that work by a suitable contribution from other parties, to give liberally from the Dominion treasury to that important work. The Minister says that the Grand Trunk would have treated with contempt any proposition to have a bridge there. I do not think so. Every person knows it would be infinitely preferable for the Grand Trunk to have its terminus in the heart of the old historic city of Quebec rather than at Lévis with no communication, except by water, with the city. The Canadian Pacific Railway would have had a great interest in the construction of the bridge, and I have no hesitation in saying that both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway would have contributed handsomely to the construction of that bridge, because it would give them an outlet connected with the whole of these railways ramifying to large sections of the province of Quebec, from which they are now cut off and with which they have no communication. That is not all. There is the legislature of the province of Quebec, which has always said that it is prepared to join with the Dominion Government and the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway in providing for the construction of that bridge, because it would be an immense thing for the city of Quebec, in fact, for the whole surrounding country, to have such a bridge, which would give access to a large section of country. You have not only the Intercolonial Railway on account of which Parliament would have been justified in giving a million dollars to this scheme to bring the road from Lévis into the city of Quebec by the construction of this bridge. You would have had the Legislature of Quebec, you would have had the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Quebec Central Railway and the Lake St. John Railway, which now runs to the city of Quebec, only too glad to assist and contribute in getting an outlet across that bridge and connection with the surrounding country in every direction, giving an advantage to their traffic and developing that country as nothing else could have done. We remember that, when this Drummond County Railway transaction was proposed, one man in this House immediately started up and said: Are you going to give the go-by to the city of Quebec? Are you not going to contribute to the bridge? He did not get the bridge, but he got the judgeship. He has gone, and we will have other gentlemen now starting up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). You have to appoint judges; you cannot get along in the country without judges.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am inclined to think that what we want just now is a Minister of Railways with more judgment; I think that is a more crying necessity at this moment than even the appointment of more judges. When we are dealing with a question of great magnitude and of vital consequence to the city of Quebec, the contract for the fast line service, a gentleman sitting down in that part of the House, rose up, and, in stentorian tones, told the Government, that, if they believed that any man could be elected in the city of Quebec who would not assist that fast line service, they were greatly mistaken. Well, Sir, he got a judgeship, but he did not get the fast line service. So Mr. Choquette was choked off with a judgeship, but he got no bridge. Now, I want the Minister of Railways and Canals to deal with the position of the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), whose existence is at stake. Does any person suppose that that hon. gentleman will have a ghost of a chance in Quebec to be returned to this House, if that bridge is not built, which he has declared over and over again only requires a million dollars from the Government of this country to make it a complete success? That is the answer that I give to the whole story of the hon. gentleman, that my mode of bringing the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Quebec was illusory. I say that, if, when there, you wanted to carry the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, all you had to do was to say to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company: Take our traffic; allow our trains to run over your line; give us the advantage of your terminals at Montreal, and we will engage to take your trains from St. John to Halifax, and give you the advantage of ours. How did the hon. gentleman meet that? Why, Sir, he met it with a display of absolute ignorance of the whole question of railway transportation and railway arrangements, such as ought to be enough to startle hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, if it did not startle anybody else. Why, he said, it would be a monstrous bargain to carry the freight and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway to pay for that by allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to run from St. John to Halifax, which is a much longer distance. To use his own language, he said it would be a monstrously absurd bargain for the Government. Let me ask the hon. gentleman, whether he has reconsidered that question, after having heard the argument of my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), of my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), and half a dozen other

gentlemen who have dealt with this subject. After he looks in the face what he has paid to the Grand Trunk Railway to get into Montreal, let me ask him, if anything that he could propose to charge for taking traffic across the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax would not be insignificant, compared with the advantage of bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, and as compared with what the hon. gentleman is paying to the Grand Trunk Railway to get in by another route? Why, Sir, to any man who knows anything of railway transportation and terminal facilities, I have only to mention these things to cover the hon. gentleman with ridicule, when he stands up in this House and is impaled, as he has been, by his declaration that it is worth more to take Canadian Pacific Railway trains from St. John to Halifax and give them the advantage of our terminals, than it is to take the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway from the city of Quebec to Montreal, 160 miles shorter though it be, and have all these terminal advantages there for which he is paying such an overwhelming sum. Under these circumstances, I leave the hon. gentleman, and I leave the Government, to settle that question with the deeply-wronged and injured people of the city of Quebec, as well as with the surrounding country. We have a common interest in avoiding hanging around the necks of the people of this country $6,000,000 or $7,000,000. They themselves call it $6,000,000, but the hon. member for Westmoreland has gone one better than I have. I have been called a millionaire on this question, because I have said, that the present terms are a million dollars better than the terms that the hon. gentlemen had rejected by the Senate before. But, Sir, the hon. member for Westmoreland has shown that I had not sufficiently grasped the question. He has gone into the figures, into the details, and, with the most admirable mastery of the whole subject, in the most graphic manner, he has shown us the enormous cost at which this present railway scheme is to be carried out.

Now, I have been a little amazed at listening to the discussion of this question in this House. Does the Minister of Railways and Canals want this contract ratified? I ask that in all seriousness, because I begin to doubt it? Do the Government want this contract ratified, or have they got out of the Drummond County people all they can get, and are they now turning their faces in another direction? What is the meaning of the extraordinary spectacle that we have seen in this House? Every person knows that the Drummond Railway scheme was not ratified because the Senate refused to pass the measure that was sent up to it last year. Every person knows that the object which the Government profess to have in view can only be accomplished in one way, and that is by convincing the Senate that this is a better bargain than that which they rejected. I assume that the Minister of Railways and Canals wants to carry this project. But if so, would he take the ground of stubbornly refusing to admit that the terms of this new arrangement are a dollar better than the arrangement that the Senate rejected? Does he think that such a course will improve the prospect? Suppose he had the candour to admit that which every intelligent person in this country knows, that the terms of this new contract, both with the Grand Trunk Railway and with the Drummond County Railway, are more than a million dollars better——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now making an argument for him. Does he want the Senate to pass it? If he wants the Senate to pass it, he would take this position: The Government maintained two years ago that they had made a good bargain. They maintain that they had made a good bargain, that they had made the very best bargain, both with the Drummond County Railway and with the Grand Trunk Railway, that was possible. That is what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals told us when he brought it down here. If he had had the candour to stand up here, instead of stubbornly refusing to admit that the terms of this bargain are infinitely better than those that the Senate rejected, would he not have been promoting the passage of this measure and removing the obstacles out of the way that blocked the Government on the former occasion? If he had said: While I still stand by the original contract as one that was fair and one that I was prepared to advocate, we could not carry it; it was rejected and, having been rejected, I have used that, I have said to the Drummond County people: You must better your offer; we cannot get it through Parliament, we cannot get through the Senate the proposal, as I have attempted it, and, if you have any desire to have this contract implemented, and if it is to receive the support of Parliament, you will have to better your offer. If the hon. gentleman had used the fact that the Senate had rejected this measure to squeeze the Drummond County people and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and if he had come here and said: I am happy to say that, owing to the rejection of the measure, I am able to present a measure which is a million dollars better than the one the Senate rejected, would that be calculated to get it through Parliament? I think it would. Yet, strange to say, the only arguments addressed on this question, that were calculated to secure the passage of this measure through the Senate, and which were advanced by hon. members on this side of the House, have been stubbornly resisted by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who persist in declaring that this new contract is not a bit better than the old one, and that there is no reason in the world why the Senate should not

throw it out. What is the meaning of their course? Do they want the Senate to throw it out? Is that their object? This would appear to be their desire and their object in taking a course that strikes me as the most illogical and most irrational that any Government could take. I do not believe any hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches; I am sure there is not an hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches, who does not know that this present arrangement, made with the aid of Mr. Harris, a gentleman whom the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals brought to his support in connection with this matter, and a gentleman who has very great knowledge of railway matters and who was called in to assist in these negotiations, is more favourable than the first arrangement. Any man who knows anything of railway questions has only to read the two contracts, the first contract and the last contract, put side by side, to see that the advantages are overwhelmingly on the side of the latter, and that, while the Senate were perfectly justified in rejecting the former measure, they would be perfectly justified in saying: This second contract is so much better that we are prepared to give it our ratification although we rejected the other. Am I addressing myself to intelligent men, or am I not? There is no intelligent man who will not say that the line taken by the Government looks like one of two things. It looks like an attempt to pretend to get this contract ratified when they do not want it ratified, and the other is that the Government desire that the Senate should reject this measure. When this question was before the House on a former occasion I never exchanged one word upon this subject, with any Senator, pro or con, as to what I desired the action of the Senate should be. I never said a single word except on the floor of this House. I have my position here, and I declared the view in which I regarded the transaction, but so far as the Senate was concerned, I felt that it was not my province to say anything; I felt that my position to speak to the Senate is here from my place on the floor of the House of Commons, and that was the only mode that I adopted. I do not intend, I will not, on the present occasion more than on the last, say one single word, but I am amazed when listening to this discussion on the two sides of the House, to find that every argument that could be advanced to obtain the support of the Senate comes from this side of the House while there is a stubborn determination on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite not to admit that this is one jot or tittle better than the first contract which indicates that the Government do not want this measure carried, and that they are really inviting its rejection again. I promised to be very brief, and I must not forget it, but I drew the attention of the House to the remarkable fact that in the four hours' speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals he spent but half an hour in dealing with the Drummond County Railway. His great object seemed to be, and it exhibited a great deal of tact and ability to exemplify the truth of the saying that when you have a bad case in hand, there is nothing like drawing a red herring across the track and leading the hounds as far away as possible from the scent which they have got. Therefore, I find the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals ranging over the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and finally concluding that he could not do a better service to his cause than by dropping down upon your humble servant and showing how he had failed in dealing with railway questions. This was not the question before the House. Conditions have changed; they have relegated me to the cold shades of Opposition, and they have put the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in the position that I formerly occupied, and he will not be able to shelter himself by a comparison with anything that I did. This is an age of progress, it is an age of advancement and the hon. gentleman has greatly the advantage of me because he has all the records of the past to study and learn, and when you have that you can study from two sources; you can be guided by what has been done in the past, and you can use it as a beacon light to help you to avoid the errors that your predecessors may have made. The hon. gentleman took up what was called the Short Line Railway, that is to say, not the present Short Line Railway from Montreal, but he took up the question of the great Short Line Railway, as it was called, which occupied the attention of this House before, and he furbished up and revamped an old slander utterd by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), when I was 3,000 miles away on the other side of the Atlantic, and when he thought he could advance his cause by attacking one who was absent. He took up the statement as to my having been mistaken in the distance that would be saved by building what was not then, but what is now called the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway. What purpose did the hon. gentleman hope to serve? I think there is no other logical inference that the hon. gentleman undertook to show that as I was greatly deceived about the distance that would be saved in the building of that line of railway, the Drummond County scheme must be an excellent one and everybody must swallow it without making a wry face. Let me ask the attention of the committee while I consign that slander to utter oblivion as I have consigned many slanders on former occasions. I came out from England in 1891 to assist the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald in carrying on the campaign of that year, and on that occasion I addressed a large body of people in Windsor, Ont. There I had a pamphlet put in my hands.

This was considered to be such a wonderful card, that the hon. gentleman had had it put in pamphlet form, and some one was good enough to give me a copy, and I gave my answer then as I give it now, and I will repeat it so that it may go on record. I think it is probably the last time the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) will think he is best promoting a measure he has before the House by referring to that. I read from my speech at Windsor, as reported in the "Mail and Empire," February 23rd, 1891:

> I hold in my hand the petition of Mr. Blackman, the president of the Great European Short Line Railway, who came to the Government of Canada with a petition asking for aid to construct the road, and the statement made in that petition was that the construcion of a line of 77 miles would mean the saving which I have referred to. That paper is the original paper now on file in the Department of Railways and Canals in Canada. That was in 1882.

The files of the Department of Railways were then under my hands, as they are now under the hands of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), and by reference to them he will find this identical petition of Mr Blackman. Mark, Sir, this was not a case in which Parliament was asked to build a line of railway, and in which it became important that great accuracy should be had as regards the mileage, but this was a mileage subsidy, and the subsidy would only be paid for the length of miles constructed, so that we were not obliged to give that close and accurate attention to it that we would if we were asking for the construction of a line by the Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does not expect me, when a proposal was made by a company such as that, a company that had Dr. Green, the chairman of the Telegraphic Union, as its president, and had a number of leading men possessing, as we were led to believe, a large amount of capital, asking for permission to construct this line for a subsidy of, I think, $3,200 a mile. Does the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) think it was my duty to get a tape line and to go with my private secretary and measure that road, and ascertain if it was just the distance that Mr. Blackman assured me it was? I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) put a tape line on the Drummond County and measured it before he entered into the contract. That is not my contention of the duty of a Minister of Railways. What did I do? The hon. gentleman will soon see:

> I did not go into the question with as much care as I otherwise would have done, believing that Mr. Blackman and Dr. Green, the president of the Great Union Telegraph Company, of the United States, who were promoting this company, and Mr. Wiman,——

Mr. Wiman is a gentleman that the members on the Treasury benches have heard of before, and he was one of the capitalists largely interested in this road:

> ——before undertaking the building of a line of railway, would have ascertained what was to be accomplished by it. Their statements were accepted by me, but I put the paper in the hands of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, Chief Engineer of Government Railways in Canada, who reported that what Dr. Green and Mr. Blackman had set forth in regard to the distance to be saved would, he also thought, be saved.

Did I do right or did I do wrong? Was I to undertake to decide that question? No, I handed that petition with the statement of the distance that would be saved to the chief engineer, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, the Deputy Minister of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) to-day, who was then the chief engineer of the Government railways. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will find Mr. Schreiber's report on that petition in the files of his department. Mr. Schreiber said:

> The following link in the railway system will, therefore, have to be provided: New Glasgow to Amherst, 77 miles.

That is what the petition said and that is what Mr. Schreiber reported accepting the statement of the petitioners who were asking for mileage subsidy and who would only receive a subsidy for each mile actually built. Mr. Schreiber continued:

> The scheme appears very attractive, and the road would undoubtedly draw a large ocean traffic. It would also, he thinks, secure to the Dominion the control of the highway between the two continents, and contribute to the development of her resources and the promotion of her prosperity.

That is Mr. Schreiber's report, confirming Mr. Blackman's statement in the petition as to the distance saved, and commending the scheme as one which would greatly promote the prosperity of the country. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair); that is my answer to this House, that is my answer to the people of the country, and there is not an intelligent man in the country who will not say that it is not a complete vindication of any charges against me. The statement I made in this House as to that saving of distance was based on the statement of the gentleman who was the chief engineer of railways, and who is to-day Deputy Minister as well as chief engineer. It was to form a great line of communication to the heart of Canada; it would also secure the Dominion the control of the highway between the two continents, contribute to the development of her resources and the promotion of her prosperity. It spoke of the distance to be built from New Glasgow to Amherst, and said it would be 77 miles. Now these were the statements that Mr. Wiman and his friends made. I have given you the report of the Government engineer, bearing out what Mr. Wiman had said, and upon that Parliament was asked for a vote of money and gave a subsidy. I will not take up the time of the committee longer in dealing with this exhumed slander, which has met at my hands to-night just the fate that all these slanders will meet with when they are raked up after being long ago disposed of, by an hon. gen-

tleman who knows so little about the past history of Canada as does the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have endeavoured to follow the hon. gentleman somewhat carefully, and I have not yet gathered that he states that he did not represent to Parliament that the building of his short line would affect a saving of over forty miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is quite so obtuse as he appears to be at this moment. I have told him in terms that any intelligent man can understand, that the statement I made to this House in reference to the distance was based on the report of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, which he laid before me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care what it is based on, I ask did you make the statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that statement I made in Parliament was the statement contained in the report of my chief engineer, and unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) says it was my business to get a tape line and measure the road, that answer ought to be sufficient for him, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) can bring, on a question of that kind, such an authority, he will find I will pay great deference to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you say that the present Deputy Minister, when chief engineer, made a measurement and ascertained the length, and advised you that it was 77 miles shorter?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is really too bad. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) was half as big a fool as that question would indicate, he ought to be turned out of Parliament without a moment's hesitation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is going a little too far.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You quite misunderstood me. I said he is not a fool. I say he is a clever man. I say he is not half as big a fool as he looks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) wants the committee to assume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is a fool.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no. On the contrary, if I could speak French, Mr. Chairman, you would not make that mistake.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not very conversant with the English language, but I think I am conversant enough with it to understand that the expression which has been used is not quite proper.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I assure you I was endeavouring to pay the hon. gentleman a compliment, and endeavouring to relieve him of the impression which the question he asks would naturally leave on both sides of the House. Coming from the seaside, you know, I take a particular interest in the hon. gentleman. I daresay the hon. gentleman remembers very well that Horace Greeley, when editor of the New York "Tribune," wrote an article on the wonderful brain-producing power of fish, showing the reason why men on the seacoast in all countries held their own pretty well with men in the interior. The next morning a tall, slab-sided Yankee came into the office and said, "Mr. Greeley, I have been reading your article on the wonderful brain-producing power of fish; I want to improve my brain power, and I would like to ask you how much fish I would require to use." "Well," said Mr. Greeley, "I think you had better begin with a whale." If it were not unparliamentary, I would recommend the hon. gentleman to begin with a whale."

I now come to the St. Charles branch. Does the hon. gentleman hold me responsible for the St. Charles branch? It was not a thing done in the dark. No secret contract was made with political partisans who were able to contribute handsome party funds to the Government of the day. No person has ever insinuated that. What was done was this. I, as Minister of Railways, asked Parliament if they wished that work to be prosecuted, and I put before Parliament all the information I could get from the Railway Department and from the same gentleman in whom the hon. Minister has such confidence to-day. I had equally great confidence in him then. As engineer of Government railways, he investigated that subject and reported to me what he believed the road could be built for, and I brought all the facts before Parliament, and Parliament voted the money before a blow was struck or anything was done. It turned out that a long section of that line ran along the sea shore, where wharfs had been built, and where arrangements had been made for large shipping enterprises. The result proved what an hon. gentleman read here yesterday from the statement I made to the House, which was perfectly correct—that I was aghast at the expenditure that had been incurred, but it was not an expenditure one dollar of which I could control. The cost of construction itself was infinitely greater than any person supposed it would be, and the land damages were of such a frightful character that I fought them step by step before the arbitrators, before the courts, and finally before the Exchequer Court, and made every effort a man could make to reduce the expenditure down to the lowest dollar. Does the hon. gentleman find in that any justification

for the Drummond Railway bargain? Has it any more to do with it than what is going on in China? The hon. gentleman knows it has not. But he felt that the only chance he had of deluding his own followers into supporting this measure was to draw a red-herring across the scent and draw the hounds away in another direction, and thus prevent them giving to this measure that scrutiny which would have been given if he had been obliged to spend the valuable time he was wasting, in giving the information which this House has a right to demand from any gentleman occupying the position he does to-day.

But the hon. gentleman had something to say on another question, which I confess has perhaps a closer bearing on this measure, that is, the purchase of the Rivière du Loup line. Well, Sir, what was that case? Was it a case in which the Government went to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as he went, and made a contract involving millions, without the knowledge of anybody in this House or in this country? Not at all. My predecessor, the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie came before Parliament and stated the grounds on which he considered it of great importance to Canada that the Intercolonial should be brought from Rivière du Loup to Lévis, a distance of 123 miles. The position was this. That was not a profitable portion of the Grand Trunk Line. The company had allowed it to fall so much into desuetude and so much out of repair that when the Intercolonial Railway was opened to Rivière du Loup the effect of running trains over that portion of the line at the rate of speed that could be obtained on the Intercolonial was that the engines and cars and everything else were damaged and destroyed. Mr. Mackenzie stated that to the House, and the House unanimously authorized him to go ahead and open up negotiations and see what arrangements he could make with the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of having the terminus of the Intercolonial brought to Lévis, where it would have connection with ocean shipping with steamers coming from the mother country and steamers going to all parts of the world. These were the circumstances under which that line was taken over. When we came into office that was the condition of things, and I took up the question with the Grand Trunk Railway. How did I proceed? Did I go and make a bargain, such as the hon. gentleman has made, without an investigation, without consulting my engineer, without obtaining opinion from anybody? Did I make a bargain in the dark for the purchase of that road? Nothing of the kind. In the first place, I got the best terms I could from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and I put them in the hands of Mr. Schreiber, the engineer of Government railways. The hon. gentleman has made a great deal of capital out of the course I pursued. What other course could I pursue? There was no Drummond County Railway, no South Shore, to fall back upon. We must either buy that 123 miles from the Grand Trunk Railway Company or build a new line; there was no alternative. Well, Sir, what did Mr. Schreiber report? I have the statement which I made to the House, and on which I got the authority of the House to make the contract—a contract which has never been called in question in this House down to the time when the hon. gentleman found it much more convenient to talk about these far-away subjects than to throw a little light on the Drummond County Railway transaction, such as this House had a right to expect at his hands. I hold in my hand the statement that I made to the House when I submitted this project and it will be found in the "Hansard" of 1879, May, 13th page 1993:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER said: They thought that a fair mode of arriving at the price was to look at what expenditure the Government would be obliged to make, provided that road was not in existence.

This was not a question of different roads, but of that or nothing.

They addressed themselves to that consideration, and those who looked at the papers would see that the road was obtained from Rivière du Loup to Chaudière Junction, the old iron rails not being purchased, but merely retained until they could relay the road with steel rails very cheaply, at a cost of about $13,000, or a little under, per mile. Mr. Schreiber had examined this road in 1876, and was instructed to give the Government an estimate of what it would cost to build a similar road. Mr. Schreiber came to the conclusion that it would cost $1,859,256 to build the road from Rivière du Loup to Chaudière Junction, 119 miles, in the same condition as the Intercolonial He then estimated the cost of relaying the track with steel rails and putting it in the same condition as the Intercolonial at $356,280, which would leave $1,502,976 as the lowest sum for which they could obtain a road in the same condition as the Intercolonial.

Mr. Schreiber put the amount required to provide steel rails and give us precisely such a road as the Intercolonial Railway at $1,502,976.

The road from Chaudière Junction was a very expensive one. The heavy cuttings and everything else connected with it, would involve a very much greater expenditure than the other portions of the road They required also to have a terminus at Quebec Harbour, and in order to obtain that it was necessary to run up six and a quarter miles from Chaudière Junction to Hadlow, a property on which the Grand Trunk Railway, at this moment, with their wharfs, engine-house, shops, &c., were paying on an assessment of $120,000 a year. The 6¼ miles, with the Hadlow property, furnishing them with an independent means of access to the harbour, were put down at $200,000, which was a very low price, and which brought the total amount, at Mr. Schreiber's estimate, to $1,700,000 for this property as a very low sum at which they could hope to provide it. They, therefore, made a proposition that the highest they could give for the whole of this property was $1,500,000.

The lowest amount for which it could be provided, according to Mr. Schreiber's estimate was $1,700,000, and we made the proposition that the highest we would give for the whole property was $1,500,000, or $200,000 less than the estimate of the very lowest price at which we could do the work ourselves.

The Government deemed, in a matter of such importance, that it would not be unwise to have additional information, and although they had carefully scrutinized and verified Mr. Schrieber's statement, so as to leave no doubt that he had made a low estimate, they sent his report to Mr. Shanly,——

Admittedly the most eminent engineer in Canada and the highest and most distinguished authority in this country.

——with a request that he would favour the Government with his opinion on it. Among the papers submitted,——

We did not treat the House as we are treated on this occasion, when we have had to resort almost to obstruction in order to get any modicum of information at all, but brought everything down and gave the House every means of judging whether we were acting wisely or unwisely, and whether the House would be warranted in supporting the proposition we had submitted.

—would be found a letter from Mr. Shanly, in which he estimated the 119 miles, the property the Government had purchased, exclusive of the old iron rails, at a value of $1,758,000, and Mr. Shanly assured him (Mr. Tupper) in the most emphatic terms, that even with the low price of labour and steel rails, and the favourable time for railway construction, if the ground was clear, he did not believe it was possible to build a road in the same condition for that amount of money. To that he added for the 6¼ miles, with the Hadlow property, $300,000, or a total of $2,100,000, which was the value Mr. Shanly placed upon the property. He had already stated that their offer to the Grand Trunk was $200,000 below Mr. Schreiber's estimate, and $600,000 below Mr. Shanly's estimate.

Can the hon. gentleman find anything there to indicate that everything the Government could do to protect the treasury had not been done? And we purchased that property at $200,000 below Mr. Schreiber's estimate of what it could be built for, and $600,000 below Mr. Shanley's estimate of what he believed it would cost.

On this same subject let me read what Sir Henry Tyler said at a meeting of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in London, and I am quoting from the "Canadian Gazette" of April 16th, 1891. Sir Henry Tyler said:

As regards the sale of the Rivière du Loup line, it was a very old story, but the proprietors would not have imagined from what Sir Charles Tupper had said that the negotiations in regard to this transaction had extended over a period of a year and a half, and with two sets of Governments in Canada. He detailed the circumstances in connection with the sale of this line to the Government, stating that the contract price to the company for its construction, after deducting the Government subvention, was £536,000. All that they could get from the Government for it, however, was £300,000 and the old rails, or less than the value which the engineer of the Government put upon the railway, and very much less than the valuation put upon it by an independent engineer trusted by the Government. They, therefore, considered that they had sold this line at a great loss.

I shall come to that question a little more closely by and by and show the hon. gentleman how entirely astray he is in the strong position he took—or rather the weak and foolish position, but what he thought was a strong one—that such a thing as a Government buying a road from a company and deducting the subsidy never was heard of in the history of the country. Sir Henry Tyler said that we only gave the company half what it cost them to build that road, after deducting the Government subvention.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Do you say that Sir Henry Tyler says you deducted the subsidy from the price you gave?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will read the quotation again, which I have taken from Sir Henry Tyler's report, as published in the "Canadian Gazette" in London at the time, April 16th, 1891:

He detailed the circumstances in connection with the sale of this line to the Government, stating that the contract price to the company for its construction, after deducting the Government subvention, was £536,000.

Did we give him £536,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, you did not give him a great many things, not even the rails and equipment. You did not give them anything, or at least they did not give you.

Mr. FOSTER. Which is it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You did not get the rails from him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman wish to make a little speech? If so, I will take breath.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to your taking breath.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand. I seem unable to penetrate his cranium. I did not know he was a Scotchman and that it required a surgical operation to really reach the hon. gentleman's brain with a joke, but it really looks very like it, and I am beginning to think I shall have to resort to my old profession and perform a trepanning operation on the hon. gentleman in order to reach what he calls his mind.

All that they could get from the Government for it, however, was £300,000 and the old rails, or less than the value which the engineer of the

Government put on the railway, and very much less than the valuation put upon it by an independent engineer trusted by the Government. They, therefore, considered that they had sold this line at a great loss.

There is the denunciation of the president of the Grand Trunk, in complaining of the hard bargain we drove with them. They said we had no regard to what the road had cost them, that we would not consider anything except the very least price at which we could furnish ourselves with a road, if they did not come to terms—and they did.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) allow me to make a suggestion? Would he recall the fact that the point was taken, in the course of that very debate, as to whether that subsidy should not be deducted from the amount payable to the company, and the answer by Mr. Plumb was to the effect, which seems to have been considered conclusive, that the Government had absolutely lost their lien on that subsidy; they should not think of taking it from the company? And that was accepted, apparently, as a solution of that question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) for bringing that question up, because it shows how determined we were to force the Grand Trunk to accept what they considered very hard terms.

Mr. RUSSELL. The determination was not on the side of the Government, but on the Opposition side of the House, and this was the answer given for not deducting the subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) does not appear to know what he is talking about. Does not he know that I have just read the utterance of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, that this road cost £736,000, besides the subsidies? You gave £300,000 for what cost £536,000, after deducting the subsidy. Put that alongside this monstrous proposition, in the defence of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) is using his puny casuistical arguments, contrary, as I believe, to his own judgment. Who could listen to his tone, so feeble that, with all the efforts we made, we could hear but little of what he said, without feeling that he handled his subject with timidity? He seemed to be afraid of his own voice—he seemed to be ashamed. Everybody knows that the hon. gentleman belongs to a profession that is paid day by day to make the worse appear the better reason. I belong to a profession that scorns anything of that kind, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman, as everybody knows, has deserted his profession.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said. I can only say, that, if the hon. gentleman has a case that he thinks will bear investigation, and that he is willing that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House shall hear, I trust he will speak a little louder than in the timid tones he used, as he maundered all over the ground that had been travelled again and again by hon. gentlemen who did know something about the subject. The hon. gentleman showed his ignorance of the question or his inability to answer the overwhelming arguments used on this side. I do not wonder at the moral and physical paralysis the hon. gentleman exhibited, under the circumstances. I can understand his feelings. No doubt, he had been retained by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to come to his rescue, and promised to accept the brief. But I can understand what his feelings must have been, when he listened to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), who in this debate show as giants alongside of pigmies, in the contrast of arguments used by them and the hon. gentleman. But my hon. friend need not be altogether alarmed; I intend to pay a little attention to him before I sit down. It will not be much, but still I can give him a passing notice, if he will possess his soul in patience.

Now, I have shown what our position was. I ask the hon. Minister, and I ask this House and this Government, if they ever heard of a question that runs on all fours with this one we are now discussing? If so, why did not the hon. gentleman touch upon it? Is the hon. gentleman afraid to hear something, or is he afraid that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Is the hon. gentleman addressing himself to me?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am addressing myself to this House on one of the most important questions ever submitted to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But does the hon. gentleman refer to me?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I say, the hon. gentleman would better discharge his duties as a Minister of the Crown, if he would pay more respectful attention to the discussion of this question, which discussion he has treated with contempt such as has never been witnessed in this House from its inception to the present hour. I say it is most offensive, when I am dealing with a question, to interpose in this manner. But he seems to have an inkling of what I refer to, and wished to prevent his colleagues from hearing, for fear they will learn how disingenuous he has been and how unable to deal with this question. I tell him, that there is a case that runs on all fours with this Drummond County Railway story, in which he can compare my action and the action of the Government in which I was

Minister of Railways and Canals, with his own. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of the Eastern Extension Railway purchase by the Conservative Government from the Government of Nova Scotia ? Here was a case exactly parallel with the Drummond County case. Here was a case in which the Government of Canada purchased from the owners a line that had been most heavily subsidized. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have heard of it. If he knew of it, then I ask him, how he dared to say to this House, that there was no record to show that the Government, in purchasing a railway from its owners. had ever deducted the subsidies. Look at the case of the Eastern Extension, and what do you find ? The road was in this condition. Mr. Mackenzie, the former leader of the Government of which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was a member, came to the conclusion, and the sound and wise conclusion, that it would be of great advantage to have the railway extended from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, 80 miles. How did he go about it ? He proposed to this House that they should give the branch from Truro to New Glasgow, which had cost some $2,000,000 or thereabouts, as a free gift. as a subsidy, to the Government in Nova Scotia to enable them to procure the extension of the road from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, about 80 miles. The Government of Nova Scotia, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) well knows, accepted that ; Parliament passed a Bill authorizing this House to give away a property that had cost probably a sum approaching $2,000,000, at least a very large sum of money, to give this to the Government of Nova Scotia to enable them, by using it, to secure the extension of the line. The Government of Nova Scotia, having the 43 miles from Truro to New Glasgow given to them by Act of Parliament as a subsidy to aid in the construction of that road, made a contract with the Eastern Extension Company to take over that road as a part of their own property, to build the road and to complete it to Canso. Difficulties arose between the Government of Nova Scotia and the parties with whom they had contracted, and that matter was ultimately referred to arbitation to see how much money the Government of Nova Scotia should pay to that company to become owners of the road from Truro to the Strait of Canso. Well, what was the decision of that arbitration ? The decision was that they should pay to the parties who then owned the line from Truro to the Strait of Canso, $1,200,000. That road was purchased by the Government of Canada when we arrived at the conclusion that it was in the interests of Nova Scotia and of Canada alike that it should be taken over by the Government of Canada. I negotiated the purchase with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and one of his colleagues, and very sharp gentlemen I found them on that occasion, and very able to take care of the interests of Nova Scotia. We negotiated the sale of that 123 miles of road from Truro to the Strait of Canso. There were 43 miles of admirably completed road in that fine section of country, the best paying portion of the whole Intercolonial Railway from one end of the country to the other. Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman : Did he know anything about that transaction ? Had he ever heard of it ? And if he had heard of it, how dare he stand on the floor of this House and say that there was no such a thing as the Government negotiating the purchase of a road fom the owners. and deducting the subsidy the Government had given. The Government of Nova Scotia did not get one dollar for the 43 miles of splendid road, through a splendid country, the most paying portion of the Intercolonial Railway ; they did not get one dollar out of the Dominion treasury. But they got what they had paid to the contractors in order to take their place and to become owners of the road. I give that to the hon. gentleman as the most complete contradiction that can be given. and I ask him why did he hide that ? Did he know it ? If he did. and concealed it from his colleagues, and concealed it from the gentlemen supporting him in this House, he acted a disingenuous part, and placed himself in the very unenviable position of knowing that fact, so well known in the railway transactions of this county, and yet standing on the floor of this House and there committing himself to the declaration, as will be found in "Hansard," that no such transaction as a purchase by the Government of Canada of a railroad and deducting the subsidy, had ever taken place. I do not require to say one word further on that. When that matter was ratified by the House of Commons, a gentleman estimated the value of the property that had been sacrificed by the Government of Nova Scotia in that transaction, at $4,000,000. The Hon. Mr. Blake, who was then a member of this House, and if not the leader of the Opposition, was a leading member of the Opposition, said that there was no claim for the subsidy, for the value of the property that had been given, and that belonged as much to the province of Nova Scotia as any mile of road between New Glasgow and Canso, and that there was no reason for paying for it, because the arrangement was one that would be most conducive to the interests of Nova Scotia and of Canada alike. The Minister of Railways and Canals, if he will turn to his speech on the "Hansard" of 1899, page 2959, will find that he said this :

> Now, when it is claimed that it would have been proper for this Government to deduct the amount of the subsidies from the purchase price, or to insist that they should be allowed in estimating the value and fixing the purchase price, I am really lost in conjecture as to the ground upon which such a contention can be based.

He was in a state of utter bewilderment as to the ground upon which such a contention could be based. Yet he knew, or he ought

to have known, and if he did know he concealed it, and if he did not know he should be ashamed to admit it, that there stood a transaction exactly parallel with what he had been doing, buying from parties a road heavily subsidized by various Governments and corporations, and giving them not only their own estimate of what the property was worth, but giving in addition all the subsidies out of which the road had been almost entirely constructed and completed.

I now come to a position of a very grave character, because it is one that touches the fitness of the hon. gentleman to hold the office he occupies. The hon. gentleman has told this House that it is impossible, with all the staff that he has, all the engineers, all the accountants, all the clerks at his disposal, to show what is the result of the operations of a leased line of railway. Am I correct in that statement? I am in the judgment of the House when I say that again and again, a dozen times, the hon. gentleman stated to this House that he was utterly incapable of giving us that information. We were told in the other branch of Parliament by a Minister of the Crown that the object of leasing the line, and going on with the work, and getting authority to lease it for a year, was to give conclusive evidence to the House and to the country of the wisdom of the transaction. And, Sir, that was the common sense statement. But I say that that hon. gentleman stands here to-night impaled on the horns of this dilemma. He either stated what he believed was the fact that he was utterly incapable as Minister of Railways, of devising any means by which such information could be furnished to the House, or he has proved himself, in the face of the world and of every man who knows anything of railway transactions in this or any other country, to be totally unfit for the position he occupies. He may take whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases. He has disqualified himself from claiming the confidence or the respectful consideration of any hon. gentleman on either side of the House for what he stated is not a fact. There is not a railway man in Canada but who is doing every day what the hon. gentleman says is utterly impossible. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, every year, where they have leased a line of railway, show exactly how that leased line has affected the operations of the whole Grand Trunk system. I ask the hon. gentleman to bring before this House, I ask him to bring before the Committee on Railways, any man claiming to be an expert, or to have an expert knowledge of railway management in Canada, I care not who he is or what he is, bring him before the Railway Committee and put to him the question: Is it practicable or is it impracticable for a great railway company to know what the operations and the effects of a leased line are? I say he cannot find a man in Canada connected with the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway or any body else who will not say that it is perfectly practicable. Look at the contracts that the Canadian Pacific Railway have had, under which they have agreed with the parties who had constructed a hundred miles of railway to lease that road from them and to give them a certain proportion of the net proceeds on whatever the road produced. How did they find that out? If what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says is true it is impracticable. Then I say it is a delusion. There is no railway expert, there is not a man who knows anything of railway management, in this country, or any other country, who does not know that railway accounts are kept in such a perfectly clear and lucid manner as to make absolutely certain down to the smallest point and to show what every leased line of railway does. Yet we have an hon. gentleman, professing to be the Minister of Railways and Canals and taking the position of a guide and counsellor to hon. gentlemen behind the Treasury benches, who tells us that he does not know any means and that it is utterly impracticable to do that which every railway management in the world, except his own, does every day. I need not waste any more time with that; it is too self-evident a proposition, and I will leave the hon. gentleman to choose whichever end of the dilemma he pleases. When I intimated to the hon. gentleman that there were officials in his own department who could furnish this House with this information if he would allow them to come before it, what did he say? I will not allow them to go before a committee; I will decapitate them very quickly if I find them giving false information. I would not demean myself by putting myself in communication with any official of the Government on that or any other subject. I have no knowledge, no information, no statement from anybody in regard to that question from any person connected with the Railway Department, but I know from my own experience in the department, from the manner in which the books were kept that if the accountants and auditors of the Intercolonial Railway service were put on the stand or brought before a committee they could at once give the information that is wanted. But what is my answer? The hon. gentleman says: I will decapitate the man in my department who will dare to give any such information to this House or to anybody else. This is the mode of terrorism pursued by the hon. gentleman. He will not permit anybody to know anything more, it appears, than he does, and it is a capital crime and will meet with decapitation to have any such knowledge. I do not intend to say a word about this question further than this, that I believe my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) proved to a demonstration to this House that there is not a word of truth or accu-

racy in the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that there was going to be a great surplus on this line. The reason that the hon. gentleman refused to give the House information is that he knows that this information would have condemned him out of his own mouth and he would not have dared to have asked hon. gentlemen behind him to support this proposition. There is no difficulty in a gentleman who manages and manipulates railway undertakings as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals manages and manipulates them, while you give him what he is spending now, $1,000,000 on capital account a year, or more than $2,000,000 within two years—there is no difficulty in manipulating the accounts so as to show pretty much what the hon. gentleman wants to show. The hon. gentleman either suppressed the facts or he was ignorant, and if ignorant, he is incapable, and if incapable, he is unfit for the position he holds. That is the attitude I take on this question. I say it is a very grave one, and I say this House has a right to a little more respectful treatment than that when a question of that gravity is under consideration. Half the time that hon. gentlemen were dealing with this subject in an able and lucid manner the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was not in his place in the House, and if he was present he thought to distract attention by walking around showing his back to the Opposition and engaging in loud conversation with other hon. gentlemen in this House. I may as well tell the hon. gentleman that nothing flatters me like that. When I am attacking the Government, or any member of it, or the head of a department, and he is going about and talking to this and that hon. gentleman, it shows that he is afraid to hear what is being said. The highest compliment he could pay me, when I am addressing this House, is to endeavour to distract the attention of the people around him. He gets between a Minister of the Crown and a gentleman who is next in rank, and I am not sure that he is not very often a great deal above some Ministers of the Crown, and he says: It will never do to let these two gentlemen hear what is being said. Therefore, he attempts to engage their attention and endeavours to draw them away from what is being said. Is he afraid that the whip (Mr. Sutherland) will become the whip on this side of the House if he allows him to hear these statements by those on the Opposition side of the House? I may tell the hon. gentleman that if he is going to carry great measures through this House he will have to treat his own friends with more respect and the Opposition with more respect than he has shown during the course of this most important debate.

Now, Sir, I am happy to say, I am reaching a conclusion. I had no idea of occupying so long a time. I have only a word to say in reference to Mr. Harris, whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) stated he had brought upon the Intercolonial in order to make it a commercial undertaking, a gentleman who was going to put the Intercolonial Railway upon a footing so that it would pay its working expenses and show a handsome surplus. I believe that Mr. Harris is an able man, and I believe there is no question that, in a moment of forgetfulness of what the character of his chief was, he ventured to say to men in Montreal, that, under his reorganization of the tariff of the Intercolonial Railway, he would show half a million dollars a year better than before. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) then found that Mr. Harris knew too much for him, or for some cause or other he sent him about his business, and broke his contract. This is what Mr. Harris put on record:

> According to this statement the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for 1895-96 were $2,957,640. The working expenses were $3,012,000, a difference against the road of about $55,000.

That was under the administration of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart).

> It is estimated the gross earnings for the year after the extension to Montreal will be $3,885,000, and the working expenses $3,363,000. In other words, the gentlemen who are responsible for the management of the Intercolonial, and who have advised me in this regard, estimate that there would be a surplus of $250,000 on the first year's operation of the Intercolonial Railway extended to Montreal. Now, I deduct from the earnings which I have stated, the rental of $210,000, and I get a net surplus of $310,000, or a margin of, say, $300,000 as the result of carrying out his policy of extension.

At the end of four months, on the operation of that road, we have a heavy increase of the deficit, instead of a surplus. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not a gambler, or a betting man, but I would risk anything I can reasonably lay my hands upon, that I could prove before any railway experts that the increased deficit on the Intercolonial road, due to the Drummond County Railway and the contract with the Grand Trunk Railway, has been $300,000 in the first year. While this House votes $1,000,000 a year for capital expenditure, and hands it over to the manipulation of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), I dare say, he will be able to give us a very glowing statement; but stop charging to capital what should be charged to revenue, and you will soon find where the extension into Montreal has landed you.

I promised a little notice of my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). When I listened to him last night, he reminded me of rather an amusing incident that occurred many years ago in the Legislature of Nova Scotia. There was a very portly gentleman, who at that date occupied the position of Attorney General, and there was a little man sitting on the Opposition benches who gave him a great deal of trouble, and made some very sharp and pun-

gent attacks upon him. And the Attorney General rose, and said: "Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of what I once saw, while passing along the country, on a warm summer's day. I saw a magnificent horse in a pasture and a mosquito stinging his little proboscis into him, and causing the horse a great deal of irritation. The noble horse paid very little attention to the mosquito for some time, but by and by he lashed around with his tail, and he dashed out the brains of the mosquito." And the Attorney General of Nova Scotia concluded: "Mr. Speaker, this case cannot be paralleled here to-day, because, unfortuntely, I have not the tail of a horse, and my little friend has not the brains of a mosquito."

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a first-class story, but the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) told it very badly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) would do well to remember, that, while he may be a great professor of law, he has no claims to distinction, when he comes to deal with a question of this kind. I want to give my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) another suggestion for his future guidance. He has, no doubt, read Æsop's Fables, and there is one of them, which, after the exhibition he made of himself last night, it may be opportune to call to his memory. He will remember that a little frog felt disposed to extend his small proportions and attract a great deal of consideration, and, viewing a noble ox in his presence, he endeavoured to inflate himself, so as to rival the ox; but the frog burst, unfortunately for himself, and the consequences were anything but agreeable to the frog. I recommend my hon. friend (Mr. Russell), with all his great ability, with all his legal knowledge, and with all his legal acumen—I recommend him not to attempt the role he took last night, of mimickry, in referring to gentlemen who had the right to expect very different treatment from him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) had something to say about my position in connection with the extension of this line of railway from Montreal to St. John, and he spoke of my having sacrificed the interests of the city of Halifax. I can tell him, that little game has been tried in this House before, and by bigger men than he is, and, Sir, I went down to Halifax and met them in the presence of that intellectual and intelligent constituency, with the result that they have been consigned to merited oblivion. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) has anything to say as to policy with regard to the interest of the city of Halifax, a city to which I have always been so devoted, and for which I have done so much in the past, and expect to do a great deal more in the future; I am ready at a moment's notice to meet him in the presence of the electorate of that magnificent city, and to discuss with him the question, whether he or I has contributed most to the progress and prosperity of Halifax. Sir, when that Short Line Railway was brought before this House, it was based upon the fact that it would bring us near to one of the most important ports in Canada, the port in the best position of any to rival Portland, which was the city we had to compete with. I refer to the port of St. Andrew's. Then, I said: You go on, and you come to the port of St. John, and you there save so much distance, as compared with the Intercolonial Railway; what would be utterly impracticable to do at St. John with the Intercolonial Railway, is practicable to do with the Short Line Railway, and I asked Parliament to give me $186,000 a year for twenty years to carry the road from Montreal to St. John, in order that we might have an ocean freight port there. But what more? Nobody would be idiot enough to carry the line through and to parallel the Intercolonial Railway, but we at once made arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which they reached Halifax in a much shorter time than they possibly could by means of the Intercolonial Railway. And so with the ports of Cape Breton and all the other ports in that part of the country. I am not going to detain the House by giving the figures, although I have them under my hand, to show that that short line of railway shortened the distance and made it practicable to establish an ocean port in our own country. When the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the able management which fortunately for Canada has marked that great enterprise, by arrangements with steamships, found that it was practicable, I never heard anything in my life that gave me greater satisfaction than the statement made to me by Sir William Van Horne that by experiment they had demonstrated that we were able to compete in the city of St. John with the city of Portland, and at the same time obtain much more ready and complete access with the city of Halifax and with the eastern part of Nova Scotia than was practicable by any other means. I say I am prepared to meet my hon. friend on his own ground whenever and wherever he desires I should, in the presence of the intelligent electors of Halifax and the province of Nova Scotia, and let them decide the question as to whether I or he has the strongest claim on the confidence of the people of that country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Chairman, I had not intended taking any part in this debate at this stage, nor do I rise now for any other purpose than to make a few observations on what the hon. gentleman has said concerning what is known as the Eastern Extension Railway of Nova Scotia. I regret that the hon. gentleman referred to that transaction in the terms he did, and endeavoured to obtain from it any argument to assail the position

which my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has taken in regard to the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. A very slight examination of the facts of that case will show that the two transactions are so widely different that there can be no possible comparison between them. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to the facts of the case, which are probably not as familiar to him to-day as they were a few years ago. It is true the Government of Canada, under that transaction, did receive possession of a very valuable railway property, which probably cost between three and four million dollars, for which they paid the province of Nova Scotia the small sum of $1,200,000. The statement which the hon. gentleman made in that respect is substantially correct. But when the hon. gentleman treats it as a matter mutually agreed upon, as a sale that was satisfactory to both parties, I have to remind him that he is entirely mistaken; and I do so with some regret, for this reason, that the difficulty between the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of the Dominion occurred when the hon. gentleman was in England; and I want to do him the justice to say that when he returned to this country, although he adhered to the unjust position which his colleagues had taken, a position which they might not have taken, possibly, if he had been here, yet when we came to deal with matters of detail, he was more generous to the province than his colleagues. But the fact still remains that that was not a voluntary sale, mutually agreed upon and mutually satisfactory, but a forced sale which the Government of Canada carried out by an unjust and tyrannical proceeding towards the province of Nova Scotia. What are the facts? My hon. friend stated that Mr. Mackenzie decided on handing over the Pictou branch to the province. In that he is correct, though the matter had an earlier history. My own recollection tells me that the first proposal to hand over the Pictou branch came from the late Mr. Justice Hugh Macdonald, when sitting in this House as the member for Antigonish. I am speaking from memory, but I think a resolution was moved by Mr. Macdonald, which virtually committed the House to the policy of handing over the Pictou branch of the Intercolonial Railway to the province for the purpose of encouraging railway development eastward, and at the same time another resolution was moved in favour of the Windsor branch of the Intercolonial being handed over for the encouragement of railway extension westward.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And the hon. gentleman will do me the justice of saying that I always heartily supported the proposition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman in that is quite correct.

The Pictou branch is not to be confounded with another railway built later, called the Pictou town branch, which ran from the Pictou branch into the town of Pictou. What was called the Pictou branch began at Truro, an important junction on the Intercolonial Railway, and ran to Pictou harbour, a distance of forty or fifty miles. That line, constructed under the hon. gentleman's own management, cost the magnificent sum of $53,000 per mile. I am speaking from memory, but I am sure that it cost over $50,000 per mile. No doubt, railway building is cheaper now than it was thirty years ago; but, making reasonable allowance for that, you still have the fact that the hon. gentleman built a railway in Nova Scotia which cost $53,000 a mile, and he becomes suddenly alarmed and sees the savor of corruption in these days in the purchase of a railway at a cost of $12,000 a mile. The Pictou branch, by a resolution of this House, subsequently confirmed by legislation in the time of the Mackenzie Government, was assigned to the Government of Nova Scotia or to any company acting in co-operation with that Government, for extension towards the Strait of Canso and afterwards into Cape Breton. By an Act of the Parliament of Canada, that railway was practically deeded to the Government of Nova Scotia, and, subject to certain conditions, became their property. In 1883 the Government of Nova Scotia determined that they would exercise an option which they possessed, and would agree to buy out what was known as the Allan Company, which had contracted for the Eastern Extension Railway, and the Nova Scotia Government would thus stand in the company's place. The chief object was, not merely to take possession of about eighty miles of new railway which was approaching completion, but to get possession of the Pictou branch costing $2,000,000, which the hon. gentleman has correctly said ran through a very profitable section of country. It was granted to them by an Act of this Parliament, and they obtained an Act of the legislature of Nova Scotia authorizing them to take possession. They took authority to issue bonds to pay the Allan Company their outlay, which, by an award of arbitrators, amounted to $1,200,000. Before they paid a penny to the Allan Company, it was indispensable that they should know that they were going to get possession, not only of the new road, but of the Pictou branch. I was one of the delegates sent to Ottawa to make assurance doubly sure—to see that there was no doubt. We brought with us our Act under which we were to acquire the new road. We explained the whole transaction to the Government at Ottawa, and asked them to facilitate the matter by getting His Excellency's assent to the Act immediately. I am glad to say that that assent was given. I discussed the mat-

ter fully with my hon. friend, who was then Minister of Railways and Canals, and he stated that there was no difficulty whatever. He admitted that the Government of Nova Scotia virtually owned the branch at that moment, and were entitled to it, and he stated in the House—I sat in the gallery and heard him make the statement—that in a few days or weeks that property was to be handed over to the Government of Nova Scotia. So we issued our bonds and committed ourselves to the expenditure of $1,200,000 on the faith of that Act of Parliament and the hon. gentleman's pledge that we would get the Pictou branch; but when we had expended our money and demanded the railway, we were refused possession of the property, and no explanation was given to us. That was the position in which the Government of Nova Scotia found themselves. They came up here and they found all sorts of obstructions placed in their way. My hon. friend was in England, and took no part in these transactions; but it became evident that the policy of the Government at Ottawa was to break faith with the Government of Nova Scotia, and not hand over the property. And, Sir, the Government of Nova Scotia were not in a position to go on. They had no means of paying this interest on $1,200,000, unless they got possession of the Pictou branch, and rather than go into an expensive law suit, they came to the conclusion to allow these gentlemen to force us to a sale. The whole correspondence will show that we came here and demanded the Pictou branch. We did not want to sell the road, but the Dominion Government were determined to break faith with the Government of Nova Scotia and embarrass it, and did so to this extent that they forced us to sell to them that road for $1,200,000. When he points to that as a fair sale and compares it with the sale of the Drummond line, I reply that the two transactions are entirely unlike, and that the Government of Nova Scotia have never ceased to complain that that transaction was unjust, and to demand a return of the subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman answer me one short question? Before you came up, did you not send a telegram to inquire if we were prepared to relieve you of the road, and on what terms we would relieve you.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is perfectly correct. When we found that difficulties were being put in our way and that we were not going to get possession of the property for which we had bargained and paid our money, we knew very well that our small provincial government could not fight the Dominion, and we did ask the hon. gentleman on what terms he would relieve us. The hon. gentleman must see that these are the vital points. First, we came, not to sell the railway, but to demand possession of the Pictou branch. They refused at first, without a word of explanation, although the hon. gentleman knows that he had given me the assurance there would be no difficulty whatever. He repeated that statement in the House in 1883, when he moved his railway subsidies. He said that, as a matter of course, that property was to pass into the hands of the provincial government in a short time, but when in his absence—for I must do the hon. gentleman the justice of saying that he was not here at the time—all these difficulties occurred, we did ask the Dominion Government to relieve us, and thought it was far better to take the step we did and pass the property over to the Dominion than engage in a long litigation which would have cost a large amount of money and not benefit anybody. The hon. gentleman must admit that there is no comparison between the two transactions. In the one case you have a sale mutually agreed upon, but in the other you have a forced sale, by which $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 were forced out of the hands of the local government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would not be right to allow the hon. gentleman's statement to pass unchallenged. This thing occurred a long time ago, and I was speaking from memory, and may have to refresh myself by reference to the documents, but my recollection is that the difficulty over the transfer was this. The Dominion Government were perfectly ready to transfer the Pictou branch to the local government, the moment the latter were able to put on rolling stock to equip and run the road; and it was because they were not able to put rolling stock on, and because to hand the road over in that condition would have been to destroy the whole of our communications with the eastern section of the province, we did not hand the road over. There is where the difficulty arose. The hon. gentleman found that his Government had got out of its depth and had undertaken something heavier than it could manage. The road belonged to that Government by Act of Parliament, and nobody could prevent its having it, so that there could be no litigation, and the moment that Government was in a position to operate the road, the Dominion Government was ready to hand it over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is wrong in saying there were difficulties about our operation of the road. There were difficulties at a later stage, but not difficulties about the rolling stock only. After we had arranged with the hon. gentleman, he told me there was no difficulty, and made the statement in the House that the property was to pass to the Government of Nova Scotia, and he has now stated that, by Act of Parliament, it belongs to Nova Scotia. But, in the meantime, we had incurred difficulties in the banks of $1,200,000. Then difficulties arose. In the first place, the Dominion Government refused

without a word of explanation, to hand over the road, and later on, when pressed to give some explanation in order to defend themselves before public opinion, they exacted two conditions which we claimed were utterly unreasonable and unjust. One did relate to the rolling stock. They demanded that we should put a certain amount of rolling stock on the property, and we believed the demand was excessive and that it was made excessive in order to prevent our complying with it. We said that we would refer the matter to independent experts and that any rolling stock which these experts declared was required we would supply, no matter what it cost. The other difficulty was with regard to the tariff rates on coal and freight generally. The Dominion Government made this monstrous demand on the Government of Nova Scotia, that we should accept a tariff for 43 miles of road, at the same rate per ton per mile as they were going to get on the Intercolonial Railway on a run of 700 or 800 miles. The principal of a long and a short haul, which every railway man understands, was not recognized, but we were asked to agree to a tariff on 43 miles of railway on the same mileage basis as they would have on a long run. These conditions were monstrous, and were made so in order that the Government of Nova Scotia would not be able to comply with them, and thus the property would be forced out of our hands.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). In saying that this property had cost $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, did the hon. gentleman refer to the Eastern Extension Railway?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I included both, the Eastern Extension and the Pictou branch. The Pictou branch cost $50,000 per mile for between 40 and 50 miles. It was a very expensive road, and if you add the cost of the Eastern Extension, the two together would amount to about $4,000,000 or $5,000,000.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). There was even more than that. The hon. gentleman gave up on that occasion the right to run over the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to Truro.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We were not buying that.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman on that occasion surrendered a very valuable consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the circumstances I have described.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am not going to make a speech, but will recall to the hon. gentleman's mind certain circumstances. I would like the hon. gentleman to recall that the $1,260,000 which he got for that road was considered by his opponents to be very much in excess of what the company spent on it. That exceeded the actual cost to the country by some $500,000. The company had not expended over $700,000 of their own money in that Eastern Extension Railway, and if the Government of Nova Scotia, under the able management of my hon. friend, chose to pay the Allan Company $500,000 more for that property than it was worth, I do not see exactly how he would expect the Dominion Government to assist him out of that bad bargain by giving him the sum of $500,000 in excess of what the property was worth. If he will recollect the circumstances, he will know that he, in speaking of a forced sale, might very properly have applied that expression to the sale made by the Allan Company to the Nova Scotia Government. That was really a forced sale, because by the bungling and incompetent management of the Government of Nova Scotia, they allowed the time when they could have purchased the road by arbitration, and get it on a true valuation to expire and were compelled to pay the company what they chose to ask.

In reference to another matter, the hon. gentleman who was at one time Provincial Secretary and leader of the Nova Scotia Government repeats that his Government were compelled to sell to the Dominion that property for what the Dominion choose to pay. The hon. gentleman must recollect very well the pitiable terms of appeal in which he asked the Government to take that road off his hands. Can it be possible that that was the same Government that, three years afterwards, undertook the dismemberment of confederation? Could this gentleman who, for $1,200,000, was prepared to place Nova Scotia in the humiliating position in which he did place her, be the same who afterwards became known as the Great Repealer? Can it be that $1,260,000 was the measure of the capacity of that gentleman and the Government of which he was so prominent a member? He underestimates his own strength and his own importance. Why, before he left the Government of Nova Scotia he found himself in a position to handle a debt of $3,000,000, and not of $1,260,000 merely; and if he had remained in power until this time, I have no doubt he would have found himself able to handle a debt of $5,000,000, because every year he was in power he found no difficulty in adding to the debt of that unfortunate province about $200,000 a year, and a much smaller sum than $200,000 would have bought all the rolling stock which the Dominion Government required to be placed on the road. The fact is there never was a more reckless frittering away of the provincial assets placed in the charge of a Government than there was under the mismanagement, the absolute incompetence of the government of Hon. Mr. Fielding. To come at this time of day, or this time of night, and give a garbled and mangled account of these transactions to this House is inexcusable. There was one thing in which I was satisfied with the hon. gentleman's conduct, and that is that he did not blame the leader of the Opposition for having pressed him in this matter. The fact is

that the hon. gentleman did not know where he was. He had bungled from one difficulty into another, and he was glad when the Dominion Government did take this property off his hands. The Government of which not he, but Mr. Pipes was the head, sacrificed the resources and valuable property of Nova Scotia simply, I suppose, because they found themselves in control of property of which they felt themselves utterly incompetent to take charge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not imagine that the House is anxious to go into more details of Nova Scotia politics. But I may say that it seems to be assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite that when there is no argument in support of their view, it is perfectly proper for them to say that somebody on this side is incompetent. The hon. leader of the Opposition spent a considerable portion of his time in speaking of the incompetency of a gentleman like the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), an eminent lawyer, an eminent public man, recognized throughout Nova Scotia and the Dominion as one of the brightest men in our country; and he can find no better argument than to say that that hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about, that he does not speak loud enough, mimicking the tones of his voice and saying he is physically and mentally paralyzed. I am speaking in the hearing of hon. members who heard the hon. gentleman devote a considerable part of the last portion of his speech to ridiculing the hon. member for Halifax. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they will make nothing by treating hon. gentlemen on this side in that way. Now, as to the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), perhaps a sentence or two will be enough as between him and myself. The people of Nova Scotia had an opportunity to measure his competency and mine for several years. When I entered the legislature of Nova Scotia he had just been beaten not in his own county but throughout Nova Scotia. We sat together in the legislature for some years—but not for a very long time. He disappeared from the politics of Nova Scotia. I remained, and in election after election I vindicated my position on these questions to which he has referred; and it was my good fortune to receive, whether I deserved it or not, a large measure of continued support from the electors of the province such as no other Prime Minister in its history had ever received.

An hon. MEMBER. How about Repeal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If hon. gentlemen think they can wound my feelings by reference to confederation, let me assure them that they are vastly mistaken. I am proud of the fact that I was an anti-confederate, and I am not going to apologize for it here or elsewhere. The poverty-stricken party to which the hon. gentleman belonged would have perished off the face of the earth if it had not been for the anti-confederate blood that they got into it to keep it alive. They took in A. W. McLelan, an anti-confederate. He had pictured the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) in the likeness of one who sits in a carriage with a pair of false hands in his lap while his real hands are thrust into the pockets of the unsuspecting passengers beside him. They took in Mr. McLelan, they made him Commissioner of Railways, they made him Senator, they made him Governor. Joe. Howe was an anti-confederate, and they were glad to get him in to bolster up their party. J. S. D. Thompson was an anti-confederate, and they were glad to get him in. The best blood they could get in their councils was anti-confederate blood, and without it, they could not have carried on their party to the present day. I want to say again that if they think they can wound me by any reference to the question of confederation, I reply that I am proud that I opposed confederation. I did so honestly, and I believe that the great mass of the people of Nova Scotia who opposed that measure were quite up to and perhaps above the average of intelligence of the men who advocated it. I do not want to say that there were no able and patriotic men on the Conservative side. An American orator once said that it would not be right to say that every Democrat was a horse thief, but it would be right to say that every horse thief was a Democrat. So, I would say that while it is not true that all the confederates were scallawags, still I feel perfectly safe in saying that all the scallawags in Nova Scotia were confederates in those days. If the men who sit around the hon. gentleman to-day had been in Nova Scotia in those days, they would not have been following the hon. gentleman in his policy of dragooning the province into confederation, but would have been with Howe and other anti-confederates who had the great mass of the people behind him. So, I am not afraid to discuss this question here or elsewhere if it becomes necessary——

Mr. FOSTER. But how about Repeal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What has my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) got to say about it?

Mr. FOSTER. What we want to know is what my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has to say about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have a view of the question of Repeal, and I expressed it and stood up for it; and when there came a time that my people were not prepared to go on with the Repeal movement, I told them that I was not prepared to go on with it. In Nova Scotia we fought out this question. And we had some of these gentlemen come down and ask the

same foolish questions as are asked now. We discussed the question on every hustings in Nova Scotia years ago—many years ago. It was evident that confederation was accepted by the people of Nova Scotia—we were in the union and would remain. Since then, I have been as willing as any to work out the destiny of the country; but so long as heaven spares me I am not going to apologize to anybody for having been an anti-confederate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to add a single word to what the hon. gentleman has said. He has boasted of the sovereignty he exercised in Nova Scotia for a long period. Does he know the reason?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I do. Shall I tell the hon. gentleman?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can tell the hon. gentleman the reason: it was that the best men in Nova Scotia came here to support me. I tell the hon. gentleman, that the reason of his long reign at that time, when, as he said, he had the people of Nova Scotia at his back, and when I had 16 out of 21 members returned to the Dominion Parliament supporting me in this House and supporting the Conservative party, was because the strength and the wealth of intellect of the party in favour of confederation came here, to the higher arena, and left my young friend, as he was at that time, and as he still is, surrounded with a majority of an inferior class of people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to congratulate my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell), who sat in the House with me for some years, as leader of the Opposition. I want to congratulate him on the fact that his leader to-day says, that the reason I succeeded in Nova Scotia for years was, that the Opposition in Nova Scotia had no brains at that time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to ask the Minister of Finance a question with reference to the Eastern Extension. In 1879, when the Holmes-Thompson Government made an agreement with the Allan Company, it was found that there was no proper agreement, so far as the interests of Nova Scotia were concerned, made by the government that preceded the Holmes-Thompson Government, with respect to the building of the Eastern Extension; and, when the Holmes-Thompson Government made an agreement, to which the Allan Company was a party, and the Nova Scotia and Dominion governments were parties, it was provided that the local government should take over the Eastern Extension, and the Pictou branch as well, that had been delivered to the company at a valuation, that valuation not to exceed the actual outlay of the company, whenever the company made default, and in the event of the Nova Scotia Government failing to operate that road satisfactorily, or in the event of the Dominion Government desiring to take it over and operate it in connection with the Intercolonial Railway to the Straits of Canso, they had the option of taking that road over at a valuation not to exceed the cost outside of the subsidies given by the two governments, and it was under that agreement that the Government of Canada took the road over from the Government of Nova Scotia. I ask the Minister of Finance, if those were not the circumstances which led up to taking the road over by the Government of Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is right, excepting in his last sentence. There was an agreement such as he describes, which gave the Government of Nova Scotia, not the Government of Canada, the right to buy out the Allan interest in the way he has described. But that agreement gave no right to the Government of Canada to take possession of that road until the province of Nova Scotia was found to be in default.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is the question: Was the province of Nova Scotia in default, when they were unable to operate that road in accordance with the agreement?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no default. The road was operated; the road was running.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). I desire to say a few words in regard to this Drummond County Railway. What I have to say is very short and very plain. Two years ago, the Government leased that road, and the Senate threw out their agreement on the ground that they did not think that it was going to be a paying road. Then the Government leased it for a while, in order to see whether it would pay or not. Now, in discussing this question, I do not propose to talk about Mr. Wainwright, or Mr. Schreiber, or this man or that. The question is: Will this road be a paying road or will it not? The Government has refused to show us whether it has been a paying road so far, or whether it has not. Let the Government prove that it has been a paying road, and I will vote for it; but, unless the Government proves that, I shall not promise to vote for it. Now, I say, that it is due to contrariness or laziness on the part of the Government that they refuse to give this House a statement of the revenues and expenditures of that road. We have been sent here by the people of this country to represent them; but how can we vote for a thing that we know nothing about? If the Government would give us information on this subject such as they do on other subjects, we should then know where we stand. I think very little of a Government that will keep us ignorant. We demand a statement, and the people of the country will demand it also. I was down at Quebec a few days ago, and saw some as good Liberals as there are in this House, who asked me the same question. I told them, that the Government refused to

give us a statement, and they thought it very strange. Now, some time ago the Minister of Railways and Canals said, that he proposed to buy the road for $1,000,000, but we do not yet know what agreement the Government made with the Grand Trunk Railway for the right of way. It has been said that it was a cheap road; that is true, it is a cheap road. But it does not matter whether it is cheap or expensive, the question is: What is the value of the road? It does not matter whether the Government can buy it for a $10 bill or for $2,000,000, the question is: What is the value of the road? The value of the road is based upon its revenue; that is the case in a nutshell. When you hire men to work for you, you may find that one is worth 50 cents a day, and another is worth $1 a day. Now, I would like to have some one show me where the revenue is to come from. The distance from Montreal to Portland, in the State of Maine, by the Grand Trunk Railway, is 297¼ miles. The distance from Montreal to Halifax by the Drummond County Railway and the Intercolonial is 837 miles. From Montreal to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway the distance is 481 miles. We also know that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are old companies and are well up in their own business. They get to do their business the best men that they can find, and I am told that they pay salaries as high as $25,000 a year. How can the Government of Canada compete with these two railway companies when you have one line from Montreal to the seaboard at Portland, with a mileage of only 297¼ miles, as against 827 miles by the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Halifax? I would like to know how the Government can hope to carry freight or passengers and compete with the Grand Trunk, especially when a politician is placed at the head of the Government railway system? When a man has been elected to Parliament once or twice, he becomes quite a talker. At the time of his career he speaks pretty well, he is able to stand up for his party, and a man who has worked hard for his party is selected to occupy a position at the head of a department or in some other place of responsibility. This is a very poor way of managing any kind of business. If one of these gentlemen went to a farmer and asked for work, the farmer would ask him: What can you do? He would reply: I am a great politician. The farmer would reply: I do not want you at all. Go into the store, the blacksmith shop, the saw-mill, or the woods, and the same thing would take place; yet this great railway must be run by politicians. Politicians are all right in their place, but they are not suited to all conditions. According to the agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company two years ago, the Government was to pay $62,500 a year for the use of the station at Montreal. Well, now, that is an enormous price. We all know that that station is about 110 by 270 feet in dimension, and that it cost about $500,000. Half a million at 4 per cent will give $20,000 a year. We are paying $62,500 a year for the use of that station according to the agreement which I received two years ago. I have no other; hon. gentlemen refused me any other. Any one could afford to build a station at a cost of half a million dollars and lease it for $62,500. About twelve railways come into that station in Montreal, and, if the Grand Trunk Railway Company charges all those railways the same amount that they were to charge the Government, how much will they receive for the use of their station? They will get $750,000 for a station that cost probably half a million dollars. I do not know what the station did actually cost, but I made up my mind that it would cost about half a million, probably less or more. There are hon. gentlemen in this House who know more than I do as to that. The Government was not compelled to lease or buy this Drummond County Railway, and if the price is too high the advice I would give would be to let it alone. We know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are building branch railways and buying railways. If this Drummond County Railway had been a paying road, or if it had been of any use to them they would have bought it long ago. The owners of this road would not have required to have gone to Mr. Greenshields and pay him thousands of dollars to sell the road for them, and probably he is paying somebody else to buy this road. I am told that this road is a very good road, and I will not say anything about that. It does not matter what I say about it, because that will not change the character of the road. But, I will say, that it will never amount to anything as a local road. There are just a few thousands of people along the road, and the best of the timber has been cut away. The farming country is quite poor, and you cannot find any industry along the whole line of the road, except it be at Drummondville, and that is pretty well played out. In a few years you will find that the road does not amount to anything in respect to local traffic. While the Government want to make that road pay they will have to turn around and compete with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and how will they be able to compete when they have a mileage of 837 miles to the seaboard, as against a Grand Trunk mileage of 297 miles. My advice would be to let it alone. Three years ago a great many of the apostles that are here to-day found fault with the Conservative party for building a railway from Halifax to Vancouver. Of course, these hon. gentlemen said that that was entirely wrong. The Conservative party built that road because they had to carry out an agreement

entered into at the time of the entry of British Columbia into our confederation that such a road was to be built, and it had to be built no matter who was in power. Three years ago I heard a great many of these apostles preaching and blaming the Conservative party for building that road. How is it that after blaming the Conservative party they turn around and propose to buy and to build a road ? Why do they not stick to their own policy ? If it was wrong to build or buy railways, why not let that Drummond County Railway remain where it is. If the Government do not buy that road the people using the road will never suffer in consequence of it. That road will be operated, if not by the Government, then by some other company. I would advise the Prime Minister to stick to his word as much as possible, and I might remind him of some of the things he has promised to the city of Quebec. He promised the people of that city, and I will support him in that, to build a bridge, but he has not done so. The present Government is doing the same as the late Government, it is doing that which I never approved of ; it is dredging a channel between Montreal and Quebec, and making a flag station out of Quebec. The Government have sent the steamers to Montreal, and now they are sending the Government railway to Montreal. I am afraid the Minister has no intention of carrying out his promises to the people of Quebec, but I sincerely wish that he will do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to one piece of information which he might afford to the House, and which must be very accessible. Under the third clause of the agreement of 1898 with the Grand Trunk Railway, the cost of maintenance of the Montreal joint section and the Chaudière joint section is to be apportioned. The share of the Intercolonial Railway on the one hand and the Grand Trunk Railway on the other is to be in the proportion which the engine and car mileage of each road bears to the total combined engine and car mileage. By the 33rd clause of the agreement, Her Majesty and the company are to furnish to each other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs, and other returns to be made as under these presents. Therefore, the Minister (Mr. Blair) must have from the Grand Trunk Railway Company returns and information which indicate exactly each month, what the proportion of user, made up in that way, by the Grand Trunk Railway and by the Intercolonial Railway respectively is. I venture to submit that information of that kind will be very useful to the House at some stage of the proceeding. It has not been brought to the attention of the House so far, as I understand, and it will be clear to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that it might at least be useful to some hon. gentlemen in the House for the purpose of making up their minds as to whether the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway was a fair arrangement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) himself, in giving evidence before the committee, stated what is, of course, the case, that the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company is so necessarily connected with the agreement now brought before the House by these resolutions, that the two must be considered together. I would like, therefore, if the hon. gentleman will, before this vote is taken, or before the Bill founded upon this resolution is brought down, be good enough to furnish that information to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There will be no difficulty, I think, in furnishing that information, if the hon. gentleman desires it. Does he desire it for the whole period that the arrangement has been running ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to put the hon. gentleman to any unnecessary trouble, but I thought it was probably easy to furnish it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there will be no difficulty so far as I am aware in furnishing it down to the last date we have received a statement from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It will, I should think, be furnished before the introduction of the Bill or before the Grand Trunk Railway matter is disposed of.

Resolution agreed to on division and reported.

INCORPORATION OF BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

On the Order being called for second reading of Bill (No. 87) respecting the incorporation of Benevolent Societies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). As I before announced, I now beg to move that the Order be dicharged and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

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

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will take up a few minor Bills, and then go into Supply ; but if it were convenient, we will take another stage on this resolution, without debate, by consent, and we could have any debate that was necessary later on.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 27th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INSPECTION OF PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha.

Mr. TAYLOR. Explain.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the handling of petroleum and naphtha by removing some of the present regulations which have given rise to a great many complaints, and which are by many considered tyrannical and useless. Personally, I am not of that opinion, because I think the present inspection protects to a certain degree the user of petroleum against danger, in case the oil has not attained that degree of security which we ascertain by the flash test. This Bill proposes to abolish the most irksome of these regulations. It is now proposed that the inspection of Canadian oil shall be made at the refinery, and then that it may be carried in tank cars to any portion of the Dominion. Up to the present those who bought petroleum were obliged to keep it in large tanks and it was only when it was put in barrels that it was inspected. Under this Bill there will be no necessity to barrel the oil before it is inspected, and this will especially benefit the North-west Territories; places like Medicine Hat and Moose Jaw where the merchants find it difficult to have a sufficient number of barrels on hand for the oil. I have said that the Canadian oil is to be inspected before it leaves the refinery, and with regard to the imported oil it will be inspected before it is allowed to leave the customs, so that in neither case will the oil have to be barrelled before being inspected. Another great inconvenience, which was referred to by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Moore), is the manner in which up to the present it has been compulsory to sell oil by retail in the city and in the country. We must admit that a large tank wagon contains a much greater quantity of oil than these little barrels that we see carried in carts and from which the oil is retailed from door to door. Under this Bill the oil can be sold from tank wagons. I am told that the abolition of the regulation compelling the oil to be barrelled will effect a saving of nearly a cent a gallon. This Bill appears to be a somewhat voluminous Bill, because we have codified all the different Acts relating to the inspection of petroleum, so as to have only one Act. We have also been obliged to have an appendix to the Act of nearly a page and a half, giving a description of the instrument to be employed in testing the oil. This makes the Bill more bulky than it would otherwise be. I may say also that there have been strong representations made to the department upon what was considered the unfairness of allowing the handling of naphtha, gasoline and other inflammable oils in tank wagons when these are Canadian products, and not allowing the same kinds of oils to be imported from abroad in tank cars. We have covered this point by allowing the importation of naphtha, gasoline and benzine in tank cars from abroad. We inspect these, of course; but, owing to the dangerous character of these volatile oils, we have taken the precaution of insisting that when they are taken from the tanks and put in barrels or jars, these barrels or jars shall be coloured red, so that everybody will be informed at once of the dangerous nature of their contents. Gasoline and benzine are actually more dangerous than gunpowder. You can hold a lighted match within an inch of a barrel of gunpowder, if you choose to run the risk, and so long as the blaze does not reach the gunpowder it will not ignite.

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather you held it than I.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would take a mighty small barrel to begin with. But in the department we have made the experiment of taking a few drops of benzine and holding a lighted match within two or three inches of it, and, without heating the liquid, but leaving it at its ordinary temperature, there was an explosion. One can easily understand, therefore, how, in a freight car or store car, if there was leakage from one of these barrels, and the circulation of air was not perfect, the gas would accumulate, and there would be great danger of explosion. Therefore, it has been thought advisable that all the vessels containing these volatile oils should be covered red. There is a new clause requiring each refiner of coal oil to register at the department and pay a fee of $1. I may be asked why we make this charge, as thus far no license fee has been imposed upon the refiners of coal oil; but, as we propose now to inspect the oil at the refineries instead of inspecting it at a point thousands of miles distant from the refinery, it will be easily understood that it will be indispensable that every one of the refiners should report himself to the department, so that our officers should know where to go to test the oil. These are the principal changes made by the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF WHEAT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 132) to amend the General Inspection Act. He said: I will not take up the time of the House by entering into a lengthy explanation at present. I consider this a most important Bill, because it attempts as far as possible to remedy the complaints about the unsatisfactory inspection of wheat, and which culminated towards the end of the last season owing to the way in which some of the wheat was damaged by the rains of the previous fall. Before introducing this Bill, the department gave notice to all the parties who appeared likely to take an interest in the question, and to give a valuable opinion upon it. About a month ago nearly 100 gentlemen, principally from the North-west, but also some representing the Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal, and several millers of Ontario, met together here and had considerable discussion on the subject. The Bill has been drafted by a committee consisting of gentlemen who represent the different interests, including the wheat-growers of the North-west. I am not ready to say that it will give universal satisfaction, as I have already been given to understand that some of the millers of Ontario do not approve of all the provisions of the Bill, though it has been prepared with the greatest care. We have even gone so far as not to leave to the Governor General in Council the right to make regulations under which the inspection shall be carried on; but we have embodied in the Bill all the regulations covering the inspection of wheat. I may say further, that this Bill is intended especially and exclusively to apply to the inspection of wheat in the North-west.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask my hon. friend if he got the memorial of the millers of Ontario issued recently with regard to this Bill?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have received a paper published under the authority of the Dominion Millers' Association, in which this passage occurs:

> I inclose papers which speak for themselves, and regret I cannot send you a copy of the proposed Government regulations, but if they should become law they would mean tremendous loss to Ontario millers. Please write your member at Ottawa, or get somebody who has strong influence to write him, sending him these papers, and urge him to impress on the Government the necessity of doing justice to the milling interests of Ontario.

This Bill appears to be opposed by the Millers' Association, who anticipate that it is going to work injuriously to their industry, and I hope that the hon. gentleman, before he proceeds with the Bill, will give the millers ample time to be heard upon the subject. I hope the hon. gentleman, before he proceeds with the Bill, will give ample time to the millers to present their objections to it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). As I explained a moment ago, the Bill was asked for specially by the North-west—by the farmers, dealers and exporters in the North-west. When we had the meeting to which I have alluded, the millers, as far as I can remember—some of them, at all events—were certainly represented, and it was only lately I got the protest to which my hon. friend has alluded. As he will notice, I took occasion to draw the attention of the House at once to the fact that, very likely, some clauses might not be acceptable to the millers in the North-west. I shall be very glad, however, to consider all sides of the matter and suspend for a short time the passing of the Bill which is now before the House, and with the contents of which every one can make himself familiar.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to a return that has been laid on the Table in compliance with an Order of the House dated 24th April, 1899, calling for copies of all letters, telegrams and communications from Archer Martin, of Victoria, B.C., barrister-at-law, to the Minister of the Interior, or the Deputy Minister, or any officer of the Department of the Interior, relating to the granting or recognition of any permit or authority to take or import liquor into the Yukon district, or relating to the importation of liquor into the Yukon district, and all replies to such letters, telegrams and communications. The return brought down seems to be incomplete. It relates to the correspondence respecting permission given in the case of Pritcher and Lizer and George A. Gardner, but does not refer to a case in regard to which I am personally aware that correspondence took place, the case of Macaulay. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to this, so that he may supplement the return, if it is incomplete, as it seems to be.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the attention of the Government to a return I moved for with regard to the Commercial Telegraph Construction Syndicate. It was called for on the 9th May, and I would like, if possible, to have it brought down at once. The correspondence cannot be very voluminous. There is also another return of great importance which I asked for on the 20th March, with regard to the petition addressed to His Excellency by the members of the Turner Administration of British Columbia. Will the right hon. First Minister see that this is brought down at once?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will.

FRAUDULENT PACKING OF APPLES.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). I have received a letter which I would like to bring before the House, inclosing an article from the Toronto "World," which I think I also ought to read. The letter is as follows :—

My dear Sir,—I have forwarded to-day to your address a copy of the Toronto "World," with an editorial marked. Probably you have seen this editorial ere this reaches you, but, if not, will you kindly allow me to draw your attention to it. You are aware that very few of the farmers of Canada pack their own apples. If the Minister of Agriculture and Professor Robertson do not know this, I think they should be made aware of the fact, and withdraw this charge against the farmers of Canada. There is, no doubt, a large number of barrels of apples improperly packed for the European market, but before making this damaging charge against the farmers of Canada, let us know who packs the apples.

Let me now read just an extract from this editorial :

It's a crime against the country to send to Great Britain fruit that is packed in such a way as to wilfully deceive purchasers in that country. This kind of trickery must be reserved exclusively for us in Canada who live in cities. If our good friend the farmer will persist in doing this kind of thing in Europe, we will have to use some pretty rough language against him, for he is not giving his own country a fair deal. He is at the same time injuring his own prospects. The practice must be stopped, and if it can be done in no other way, the Government must interfere and devise means for this purpose. The Minister of Agriculture and Professor Robertson are authority for these charges of dishonesty against the farmers of Canada. The former states that thousands of fraudulent barrels of Ontario apples were sent to England last year, much to the great disgrace of Canada. Come, now, Mr Farmer, do you want to go to jail ? Hadn't you better join the Church and live a godly life, giving full weight and a just measure ? For the Lord, you know, loves a just balance. So do the people of Great Britain ; so much so that they will pitch you and your apples into the sea if your fraudulent practices are continued.

This refers to a meeting that took place before the Agricultural Committee, where the subject of the packing of apples and their export to the old country was thoroughly discussed. I made the statement there myself, that few of the farmers in western Ontario packed their own apples. Agents come around, and purchase the apples, and then have them packed. In the locality where I live, the farmers only pull the apples, which are then packed under the direction of the agents who buy them. All that the farmer has to do with them, after they are pulled, is to draw the barrels to the railway station. With the packing into the barrels he has nothing to do. I hold, therefore, that it is a slander on the farmers of this country to circulate such a statement. I do not propose to say anything with regard to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is here, and can speak for himself ; but I do not believe that he made any such statement in the committee. I would not consider myself justified, as a representative of the farming community, and especially after receiving this communication from one of the leading farmers in my locality, in allowing the statement to go forth uncontradicted, that the farmers of this country are guilty of the practice charged against them. We have honest and dishonest farmers, just as we have honest and dishonest people in other classes of the country, but in this instance the farmers are not the persons responsible. One thing is undoubted, that the packing of our apples is very much in need of a thorough overhauling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must move the adjournment of the House, if he is going to speak at any further length.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of challenging for a moment the statement as to the extreme honesty of the farmers of Ontario, but I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that you have allowed a long article to be read from a newspaper and a long speech to be made, without raising the question that it was all out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am very sorry to hear criticism volunteered as to my conduct in the Chair by the leader of the Opposition. I cannot quite ignore it. I must say I was expecting every moment that the hon. member who first spoke (Mr. McMillan), who is an old and experienced member of the House, would ask a question of the Government on the point to which he referred. Certainly he should not have made statements at this stage of the proceedings without either moving the adjournment of the House or asking a question of the Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. I certainly apologize for not putting myself in order by concluding with a motion. But I thought my remarks so few that no person would take objection to them. I now move the adjournment of the House in order that any statements may be made that any other hon. gentleman desires to make.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) took his seat without moving the adjournment of the House, and I will conclude with a motion to put myself in order. I am glad the hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the Government, and especially the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), to a statement which is exceedingly unfair to the farming community of this country. The state-

ment was broadly made at the committee to which the hon. gentleman refers, and repeated—I am not sure but that the Minister of Agriculture himself was one of the chief sinners in that respect—that the farmers had been dishonest in the selection and packing of the apples that had been sent abroad. I think it is the experience of every hon. gentleman in this House that in very few cases—in my own experience I know not one case—of a farmer packing the apples. The apples are bought by the shippers and are by them packed and sent away. I think it is well that the attention of the Government should be drawn to this extremely unfair reflection on a class who are not more or less honest than other people, but who do not deserve to be singled out as specially dishonest in a matter affecting a great trade with England. If some system of inspection could be provided, some means devised of heading off those persons who, for mere love of gain, do send a class of goods to the English market that turn out very badly, beyond all doubt it would be a good thing in the public interest. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up, because it offers an opportunity to remove an unfair imputation made against a large class in this country. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I think it would be only fair to myself, as well as to the House to say that the statements made in the article which was read by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) in regard to myself and Prof. Robertson are an entire misrepresentation of anything we said on the occasion referred to. It is true that on a certain occasion I directed Prof. Robertson, one of the officers of my department, to bring up the question of the packing of Canadian apples, because we had found, during last year especially, that great difficulty had arisen in the English market because our apples were not properly packed and had arrived in England in such a condition as had led to accusation even of deliberate fraud by the English importers against the packers and exporters of apples from Canada. On a former occasion, when this question was brought up, some gentlemen thought it was better that the difficulty should be glossed over or suppressed, on the ground that any statement in regard to it might injure the apple trade abroad. That suppression does not seem to have accomplished any good; on the contrary, last season there were the most glaring examples of the export from Canada of badly packed apples—and when I say badly packed, I do not mean that the packages were bad or that the method of handling the apples was bad, but that the people who had packed the apples had deliberately put the good apples at the ends of the barrels and filled the barrels up with trash. I speak strongly, because the specimens that were examined by the agent of my department in England proved conclusively that these accusations against the packers of Canadian apples were true, and I believe that it is better that the people of this country, and those especially who are engaged in this trade, should understand the danger they incur and the difficulty being encountered in consequence of the fact that some people engaged in that trade—not all by any means—have been doing this kind of work. I therefore wished to bring it before the Committee on Agriculture and have it thoroughly ventilated in the country, to see what remedy could be applied and by what means the application of that remedy could best be carried out. As to accusations against the farmers of Canada, I made none, nor did Prof. Robertson. I did not mention farmers or packers, but simply called attention to the fact that people, whether farmers or packers, who had packed applies in this way, had done a great wrong to our country, and had endangered a large trade, which could be built up by honest methods, and which will, I am sure, be built up by honest methods, so as to do a great deal of good in the country. I am satisfied that it is only by the exposure of dishonest methods of this kind that we can bring them to an end, and that any suppression of the facts or any trying to hide the facts will only encourage these dishonest people to continue their practices. Therefore, I wish to bring the matter to the public attention, for I believe that the drawing of public attention to the facts is the best means to suppress dishonesty of this kind. The worse than insinuations that are contained in the article that has been read as to a statement of myself or Prof. Robertson against the reputation of the farmers of Canada are entirely without foundation and untrue. I wished simply to put this matter before the House as I have done.

Mr. GILMOUR. I venture to say that the inference drawn by the "World" is correct on the evidence given before the Agriculture Committee. I would remind the Minister of Agriculture that one of his staff, in dealing with this question, stated that the farmers down in Nova Scotia watched the packer with a gun. What inference could be drawn from that, I would like to know, but that the farmer dictated terms to the packer in the packing of the apples? The "World" is correct in drawing that inference, but the impression that the farmer is responsible is wrong, as a matter of fact. The packer and the farmer are two separate persons. I have sold apples to the packer, but I have shipped more apples than I have sold in that way, and in no case that I have known did the farmer have anything to do with the packing of the apples that the packer sent away. I think it is desirable that improvements should be made in the shipment of apples, but you will need to know who

the parties are who are offending before you can correct the evil.

Mr. SPROULE. So far as the farmers in my part of the country are concerned, they do not usually pack the apples at all. The dealers buy the apples, and the farmers pull them and lay them on the ground at the foot of the tree or in a building where they can be protected from the weather. The packer sends a gang of men, supposed to be experts in the business, who pack the apples, and the farmers draw them to market. If there is any dishonesty it cannot be attributed to the farmer, because he has no say whatever in the selection or packing of the fruit.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I think if this business is to be properly adjusted so as to gain for Canada the credit that she deserves for the exportation of good fruit, the Government should take immediate steps to secure the inspection of all apples exported, or to give an opportunity to parties exporting apples to have them inspected. I do not know whether it would be wise to exclude those who want to export apples without inspection. But I think it is well, in order to put the trade on a proper basis, that immediate steps should be taken to offer the privilege of having apples inspected that are to be exported, and the package branded as inspected by a Government brand. The people of England then would realize that when they bought apples from Canada they would buy apples that had been inspected and branded as of a certain quality, and of a certain kind. If, on the other hand, they choose to buy without any inspection, they would have to run their own risk. But owing to the evident danger of this very important trade, and this growing trade, I think the Government should at once take steps to protect the interest of that trade in Canada, and to secure to the people of England proper value when they invest their money in Canadian fruit, by having it inspected and branded at the point of export. They would then know what they were buying, and in that way you will increase the reputation of Canadian apples, and you cannot do it otherwise. Merely talking about it in this House will not make honest men of dishonest men, or control the men that go round buying apples. I agree with that portion of the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he says that most people sell the product of their orchards, and that packers go around and pack the apples. It is the same in our section of the country. As a rule, the farmers do not do their own packing, but men come along to buy apples, to see what a man has got to sell, and having bought the orchard, they send men there who do the packing themselves. In that case it is unfair to hold farmers responsible when poor apples are put in the centre of the barrel. In order to prevent that wrong, we should place the apple trade on a proper basis, and I do not think that we can do it in any other way than by inspection.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The hon. member from Montreal, St. Lawrence Division (Mr. Penny), has a Bill on the Order paper (No. 55), which I have examined with him. It appears to provide in a certain degree such precautions as will prevent the difficulty complained of. The hon. member is not present at this time in order to describe the precautions that will be taken. I told him that I would gladly incorporate his Bill with our Bill. One of the clauses reads :

> In inspecting a barrel or half-barrel of such fruit, the inspector shall either open one or both ends of the barrel, or loosen one of the staves, or empty the fruit out of the barrel ; in inspecting boxes, he shall open one or more sides, or empty the fruit out of the box ; in inspecting baskets, he shall either inspect the fruit from the top or empty it out

Of course, it is only a certain proportion of the barrels that shall be open.

> The duty of an inspector shall be to inspect not less than ten per cent of each variety of apples, pears or other fruit, &c.

So I think that when this Bill comes before the House and we are in committee upon it, we may consider the precautions suggested, some of which may be incorporated in the General Inspection Act.

Mr. R. R. McLENNAN (Glengarry). A year or two ago, since this Government took office, I brought a Bill before this House for the purpose of branding cheese and butter, and registering the brand with the Dairy Commissioner, so that we would have a record of it the same as you have a record of the registration of a piece of property. This would be kept in a book prepared for that purpose, containing the date and the number of the factory. This system might be extended to those who are packing apples, and who should register themselves as packers. If that were done, then you could place upon the man the responsibility of exporting a bad article to Great Britain. You would then have a record with the Dairy Commissioner of that mark or brand, and number of the article registered. You could then see at once who was guilty of packing and exporting an inferior article. This proposition was submitted to the farmers and to the people who were most interested, and I think about 95 per cent of them, at least 90 per cent, were in favour of such a system as the registration of the date and the number of the factory. If this system were carried out in respect to apples, there is no doubt that there would be no further trouble. It is necessary to establish the name of the exporter, the place where he lives, the date of the export and everything else. But although 95 per cent of the farmers and the people most interested were

in favour of that scheme, the Bill was thrown out, and the consequence is that we are now shipping from the country an inferior article. At present we do not know who is guilty of committing the fraud that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) says has been perpetrated by people in this country to the great injury of the apple trade. We realize that it must be a great injury to this country, and I think it about time that the Minister of Agriculture should say what he proposes to do to prevent that sort of thing. I think it is very much in the interest of this country that he should deal with this matter at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CLANCY. With the permission of the House, I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Government when we are likely to have printed copies of the Report of the Commissioner on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway matter, moved for on Friday, May 19?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot give the information to my hon. friend. I can only say that I will inquiry and see that the thing is expedited.

AMENDMENTS TO INLAND REVENUE ACT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved that Bill (No. 124) to amend the Inland Revenue Act, be read the second time.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 1,

1. The paragraph substituted for paragraph (g) of section 121 of the Inland Revenue Act, chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes, by section 3 of chapter 46 of the statutes of 1891, is hereby amended by striking out the word "one" in the fourteenth line and substituting therefor the word "two."

Mr. FOSTER. What is really done for striking out "one" and substituting "two"?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The clause substitutes the word "two" for the word "one." It means 200 instead of 100, and I may explain what the object of the change is. It refers to chemical stills. The maximum capacity of chemical stills is at present limited to 100 gallons, which has been found too small for the large concerns, such as Parke, Davis & Company, and others, who are manufacturing drugs of different kinds on a large scale for export, and it is proposed to allow stills to be used of the capacity of 200 gallons instead of 100 gallons.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this apply to illicit stills as well as others?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. If they had as great capacity as that we would find it more easy to discover them. They are so small that they can hide them away with greater ease.

On clause 2,

2. Paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 131 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

"(a) Upon the grain used for its production, at the rate of one gallon of proof spirits for every twenty and four-tenths pounds,—or, in a distillery where malt only is used, upon the malt used for its production, at the rate of one gallon of proof spirits for every twenty-four pounds."

Mr. FOSTER. Why does my hon. friend introduce the fraction there?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It has been so fixed by law. We have to assess the distilleries which do not produce one gallon of proof spirits from each 20 4-10ths pounds of the grain used. The distilleries must produce one gallon of spirit for each 20 4-10ths pounds of grain used, and if they produce less than that we assess them on the assumption that by some unfair means a part of the spirit has been unfairly removed from inspection. But there is a distinction between the production of spirits from malted barley and from raw grain. The production from malted barley is less than from raw grain. The sort of whisky produced from grain is called rye; it is produced by a certain process of distillation which is well known. Malt whisky goes by the name of Scotch whisky or Irish whisky, or any other name they choose to give it, and it is manufactured in a different way. It is manufactured in what is called pot-stills.

Mr. FOSTER. Pot-stills?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will not think I am pedantic in making use of all these terms with which I do not claim to be very familiar. Instead of being produced by means of distillation, as is rye whisky, malt whisky is manufactured over a fire in pot-stills. One kind of whisky takes a greater number of pounds of grain than another, and it has been represented that it would not be fair to assess the two products in the same way, because one of them requires 23 pounds of grain for each gallon of spirit produced, while the other one only requires 20 pounds. It is not fair to assess these two productions in the same way, for the three pounds difference multiplied by hundreds and hundreds, would reach a considerable amount.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the hon. gentleman's explanation thoroughly, but I am not sure that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) did, and I think it would be well for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue should be a little more explicit about these pot-stills.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The only way to find out the difference between the two is to taste them, and I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would not do that.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue whether this Act is to have a retrospective effect, whether it is to apply to liquors already manufactured ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. To tell the truth, we have not considered this question. I think it would, perhaps, be well to say that this Act will go into force only on the day of its sanction.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is intended to cover liquors at present in bond, and I thought, perhaps, the wording was not clear enough that it would have a retrospective effect. At least it ought to have.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) suggest that we should make an addition to this by stating that this section will apply to spirits actually in bonded warehouses ?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it ought to. I think, perhaps, the section is intended to be retrospective, and I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is or not.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It might, perhaps, be as well for the committee to rise, and I will examine that point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that clause 3, which we have not yet reached, might be reconsidered and drafted in a different style. For instance, instead of, as it appears there, referring to Acts and subsections as being repealed, it would be well to repeal the clause absolutely, and re-enact a new clause. It will be clearer to have the whole clause struck out and a new one substituted.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is rather a curious anomaly, but, in connection with manufactured tobacco, we have stamps for every fraction of a pound, except one-third of a pound, this third clause is to provide for that, and we will have to get that stamp.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this necessitate the making of a new stamp ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND RIVENUE. Yes, we will have to make a new stamp.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will depend on his own head for these stamps, and not consult the Postmaster General.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is most unjust in the way he alludes in alluding to the postage stamps issued by the Postmaster General. Since my hon. friend introduced the subject, I think it would be well to give him to understand the motto on our postage stamps. We have seen what "Punch" said about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you put what "Punch" said, in the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, but I have here in my pocket the poem from which the quotation is taken, and I will beg leave to refer to it for the information of gentlemen who may not be acquainted with its origin. I think the stamp and the quotation reflect credit on the classical knowledge and artistic taste of my hon. friend the Postmaster General.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will there be a new clause in the Bill embodying that ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. "We hold a vaster empire than has been." I am not a betting man, as the leader of the Opposition said yesterday, speaking of himself, but, nevertheless, I am ready to bet that half of the hon. members opposite do not know where this quotation comes from. I will tell them. I must say, that the hon. the Postmaster General would not tell me where he took it from, but ultimately, after a good deal of trouble, I had the pleasure of discovering where it came from. It is from Sir Lewis Morris' poem.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Louis Davies.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is taken from Sir Lewis Morris' "A Song of Empire," bearing date June 20th, 1887, and occurring in the seventh last line of the poem. Here are two couplets, in which the quotation appears :

> Whoever guides our helm of state,
> Let all men know it, England shall be great—
> We hold a vaster empire than has been—
> Nigh half the race of men is subject to our Queen !

I do not think the hon. the Postmaster General need be ashamed of having given that quotation. He did not give it as a Canadian only, but he gave it as a subject of the British Empire, and, though he belongs to this side of the House, every one will adopt it as a loyal sentiment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

The committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to draw your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, after

having quoted from that public document, has not laid it on the Table.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am just about to lay it on the Table at this moment.

Mr. WALLACE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would print the whole poem on his new inland revenue stamp.

Mr. SPEAKER. We are not considering the Bill at the present time.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BANKING ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 127) to amend "The Bank Act".

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask, whether this Bill has been carefully considered by the Department of Justice in connection with the powers it confers. I am not at all objecting to the Bill; but, of course, it is somewhat an unusual measure, as it deals with the exercise of powers and rights outside of Canada. Has it been carefully considered, as to whether we are going, not only beyond the usual legislation in connection with Canadian banks, but as to what our authority is, so far as outside of Canada is concerned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although there has been no formal reference of the Bill to the Department of Justice, I think the Minister of Justice believes it to be satisfactory. However, in view of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I will have that point submitted to the Department of Justice. Of course, we can grant no power in any other colony. All we can do is to grant power to the bank itself, subject to the first clause, that this can only be done in a colony where the local laws will permit it. But in deference to the hon. gentleman's remark, I will see that it is brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice before the final stage of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not suppose that there would be any serious difficulty with regard to the point suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), for the reason that this Parliament has the right to give to the bank power to carry on business out of Canada, subject, of course, to the laws of any colony where the bank proposes to carry on business; just as the Parliament of Canada or a local legislature could authorize a corporation to carry on business outside of Canada, though that corporation in carrying on business outside of Canada would be subject to the laws of any country in which it saw fit to carry on business, and it would be recognized in a foreign country only by the comity of nations. Nevertheless, it would be recognized, and I do not think Parliament would be exceeding its authority by giving such a corporation power to carry on business in a foreign country.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he is not giving the bank greater power than the country itself possesses; that is to say, the country itself could not issue currency in a foreign country, but you are giving the bank power to do it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not giving the bank any power to issue currency further than it has at present. All we are doing, so far as the bank is concerned, is to say that we have no objection to its issuing this currency. How far it can make that provision useful to itself in another colony is a matter entirely between the bank and that colony, and in regard to that, the bank must be subject to all the laws of the colony. For example, the Bank of Nova Scotia is doing business in the Island of Jamaica. We give it the authority, which it would not otherwise possess, to issue a note for a pound sterling; but when that note goes into Jamaica, it does not become a legal tender there unless it is made such by the laws of that colony. But if the bank issues these notes in Jamaica and the people of the colony have such faith in the bank that they are willing to accept those notes, we have no objection to its doing so, but on the contrary, we have every desire to encourage it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). A corporation has the power which is given to it by the legislature which brings the corporation into existence, that is, this legislature. We give the bank power to issue these notes; but if it does any business in a country outside of Canada, it then becomes subject to the laws of the locality in which it does business. Therefore, it will necessarily exercise the power given to it by the Dominion subject to the laws and regulations of the place where it attempts to exercise that power. This Bill gives the bank the power which it intends to exercise in the locality, and which can only be conferred by us. It seems to me there can be no difficulty about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see no good reason to disagree with the opinions that have been offered. My point was rather—and the Minister of Finance has met it—that in the case of legislation of this character, especially with regard to banks, we should have the advantage of the revision of the whole Bill by the Department

of Justice. The Minister of Finance, I understand, before the Bill takes its final stage, will see that it is examined by that department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be no formal reference of the Bill to the Department of Justice; but I will see that, before the final stage of the Bill is reached, in deference to the hon. gentleman's suggestion, that department is asked to consider it.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the bank to make the usual deposit with the Government here in regard to the circulation in Jamaica?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. And are the other banks subject to the abatement?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general provisions of the Bank Act will apply to all circulation issued in this way.

Bill reported as amended, and amendments concurred in.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

Resolutions respecting the Drummond County Railway reported from Committee of the Whole, read the second time and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to a matter in relation to which I made a statement to the House last evening when the resolutions were under discussion. I referred to an agreement entered into between the Allan Co., the Nova Scotia Government and the Dominion Government twenty years ago with respect to the construction and the operation of the Eastern Extension Railway of Nova Scotia and the taking over of the Truro branch. I asked the Minister of Finance if it was not a fact that that agreement gave authority to the Government of Canada to take over those railways even after the Eastern Extension Railway had been delivered to the Nova Scotia Government. The hon. Finance Minister stated that I was correct except in respect of the last sentence of my statement, and that is the one which applied to the authority of the Dominion Government taking over the road. I had not time to consult the public documents, which were then in the library, and which I sent for, but did not get in time to have the matter brought up before the discussion was completed. I have now that agreement in my hand, and I find that the statement that I made last night is sustained by the terms of that agreement. Before that agreement was entered into, I might say that another agreement existed previous to that between the Government of Nova Scotia and the Allan Company for the construction of a road known as the Eastern Extension; and when the Holmes-Thompson Government of Nova Scotia came into power in 1878 they found that the Allan Company were in difficulties with the previous Government with respect to carrying on the work of building the railway. They found that the agreement, under which that work was carried on, was not such as gave to the province of Nova Scotia that security for the construction and operation of the road which to them seemed necessary, and they took advantage of that fact to go before the Government of Canada to renew their negotiations for the further carrying on of that work and the further protection of the interests of Nova Scotia in its construction and operation. A new agreement was entered into on the 1st of February, 1879, and from one of its clauses I will read an extract which sustains the point I have just stated with regard to the necessity for making a new agreement:

An Act to incorporate——

Referring to the Act under which the work was being done previously.

An Act to incorporate the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company—and doubts have arisen as to the validity of the incorporation of the said company, and the acts done by it as a corporation, and it has been agreed that the Government of Nova Scotia shall confer with the company in procuring the declaratory legislation, confirming their proceedings for incorporation, and all acts done as such corporation,——

Then I find that the first clause proceeds as follows:—

The Government of the Dominion will recommend the passage of an Act by the Parliament of Canada at the aproaching session of said Parliament, repealing the said Act, 40th Vic., chap. 46, and providing in effect that as security for the purposes aforesaid, the Pictou and Truro Branch Railway, including sufficient land for the purposes thereof, and the stations and buildings thereon, necessary for the use of the railway, but without any of the rolling stock therein referred to as the "Pictou Branch" shall be retained by the Dominion Government until the said Eastern Extension Railway to the Strait of Canso and the steam ferry across the strait are completed, equipped and established in accordance with the existing contract, or any modification thereof that may be agreed to by the company and the said Nova Scotia Government, to the satisfaction of the Nova Scotia Government; and further providing that upon such completion the absolute right of property in the said Pictou Branch shall be conveyed to the company on the following terms:—

I might say, before reading further, that the previous agreement provided—speaking from memory, and I think my recollection is exact—for a transfer of the Pictou branch, as soon as $400,000 was expended by the company in the construction of the road. The people of Nova Scotia looked upon this secu-

rity as insufficient, and the facts, as they appear at this particular period when this agreement was entered into, justify that apprehension on their part. That is why the Government of the day saw proper to further secure the interests of Nova Scotia in the matter. The agreement provides further:

(a) That the company, after the completion of the said railway to the Strait of Canso and the establishment of said ferry, shall efficiently and continuously operate the said two lines of railway and the ferry at the Strait of Canso, to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia in Council, at a fair and reasonable tariff of charges, which shall be made and established by the said company, subject to the approval of the Government of Nova Scotia, and which shall only be altered or amended with the assent and approval of the said Government of Nova Scotia, and any difference of opinion as to any item of the tariff to be so agreed to, shall be submitted to the Minister of Public Works of the Dominion as the referee, whose decision shall be final and binding on both parties.

(b) That in the event of the said existing contract, with any modification thereof that may be agreed to by the company and the Nova Scotia Government not being performed to the satisfaction of such Government, and the said Eastern Extension Railway and ferry not being completed, equipped and established in accordance with said contract, or in the event of the failure of the company for a period of three months to operate the said railways and ferry efficiently and continuously, to wit, by running at least one passenger train over the whole line each way daily except Sundays, and such freight trains as may be sufficient for the conveyance of the freight offered for carriage, and the ferry in such a manner as to connect with passenger trains, the two lines of railway, including the ferry, shall become the property of the Nova Scotia Government, free from any incumbrance of any kind whatsoever created by the company (the power of the company to create incumbrances to be made subject to this agreement), the said period of three months to commence and be computed from the date at which the Nova Scotia Government shall cause to be served on the said company, in the manner provided by the eighteenth section of the said Act, 39th Vic., chap. 74, a notice claiming that the said railways and ferries, or one or either of them, or said ferry, are not or is not being efficiently and continuously operated as aforesaid: the said Minister of Public Works to be the referee in case of a dispute between the company and the Nova Scotia Government, as to forfeiture having been incurred.

Now, a forfeiture was incurred by the company, and the Nova Scotia Government took over the road from the company at a valuation of $1,200,000 or thereabouts.

(c) That in the event of the said two lines of railway and ferry becoming the property of the Nova Scotia Government under the preceding subclause, before the said Eastern Extension Railway and ferry are completed, equipped and established, the said last named railway and ferry shall, with all reasonable despatch, be completed, equipped and established by the Nova Scotia Government, and the said two lines and ferry shall be thereafter efficiently and continuously operated by the Nova Scotia Government to the satisfaction of the Governor General of the Dominion in Council at a fair and reasonable tariff of charges, which shall be made and established by the Nova Scotia Government, subject to the approval of the Government of the Dominion, and which shall only be altered or amended with the assent and approval of the said last named Government.

(d) That in the event of the failure of the Nova Scotia Government to complete, equip and establish the said Eastern Extension Railway and ferry with all reasonable despatch, as above provided for, or in the event of their failure for a period of three months to operate the said railway and ferry efficiently and continuously, to wit, by running at least one passenger train over the whole line each way daily, except Sundays, and such freight trains as may be sufficient for the conveyance of the freight offered for carriage, and the ferry in such a manner as to connect with the passenger trains, the two lines of railway, including the ferry, shall become the property of the Government of the Dominion, free from any incumbrance of any kind whatsoever created thereon, either by the company or by the Government of Nova Scotia (the power of the company and the Government of Nova Scotia, respectively, to create incumbrances to be made subject to this agreement), the said period of three months to commence and be computed from the date at which the Government of the Dominion shall give to the Provincial Secretary of the Nova Scotia Government a notice claiming that the said railways and ferry, or one or either of them, or said ferry, are not or is not being efficiently and continuously operated as aforesaid; any dispute between the two Governments as to forfeiture having been incurred to be decided by arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, that is the clause in the agreement under which the Government of Canada had the authority to take over that road; and it is the clause under which they exercised that authority. There is this difference, that, as far as I know, the Government of Canada did not voluntarily take advantage of the power vested in them by the agreement in calling the attention of the Nova Scotia Government to their making default in not sufficiently equipping that railway for the traffic offering, and also completing and operating the ferry across the Strait of Canso. Now, before the Government of the Dominion took advantage of the power granted them by this agreement, the Government of Nova Scotia found themselves in this difficulty—that they were unable to secure, I understand, the financial means by which they could equip and operate that road or complete the ferry across the Strait of Canso. In their necessity, they came to the Government of Canada and asked that Government to relieve them from their distressed position with regard to the road. That is my understanding of it, and I think that is the understanding of the whole country, so far as they are conversant with the facts. I was a member of the Government of Nova Scotia when this agreement was entered into. Last night I was depending upon my recollection of what took place. The Minister of Finance should have been more familiar with the question than he appeared to be last night,

because for a long time subsequent to the time when I ceased to be a member of the Nova Scotia Government, the hon. gentleman was in negotiation with the Government of Canada with regard to these transactions. Now, there is another point in this matter referred to by the Minister of Finance last night, and that was the difficulty that he discovered in carrying out his negotiations with the Government of the day on that occasion. The Government of Canada was aware—as the people of Nova Scotia were aware—that the Government of Nova Scotia had paid the Allan Company a great deal more for that road than what in the judgment of the people, and especially in the judgment of experienced people, was a proper sum to pay. And if my memory serves me right, an investigation took place in the legislature of Nova Scotia at a subsequent period, about the year 1884 or 1885, which revealed the fact that a large amount of money had been paid to the Allan Company over and above what it was understood the Government of Nova Scotia had authority to pay, the Government having authority, in the event of their taking over the road, to pay the actual outlay of that company over and above the subsidies which were given by the two Governments. I think that investigation revealed the fact that no less than $400,000 was paid to that company by the Nova Scotia Government over and above what that company were entitled to. This statement I make from my recollection of what took place at the time. I have not gone into an examination of the documents, but I am willing to be corrected if the Minister of Finance can show that I am astray in my recollection of what the investigation revealed. I am sure that he cannot now dispute the point which I raised last night, and that is more particularly the fact that the Government of Canada had authority by this agreement to take over this road from the Government of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry I cannot admit much more than that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) has read, no doubt correctly, from an agreement which appears in the blue-book. When the hon. gentleman last night made reference to an agreement, asking me whether it did not give the Government of Canada power to acquire the road, I said : Not unless the Government of Nova Scotia proved to be in default. That was the point.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) excuse me. I said in my statement that the Government of Nova Scotia gave evidence that they were in default, that the Dominion Government did not take advantage of the clause before the Nova Scotia Government admitted that they were in default.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is labouring under an entire delusion. Not only was no default admitted, but it was not even alleged. In all the discussions I had the pleasure of having with the Ministers at Ottawa at that time, there was no allegation of that kind. The hon. gentleman says now that the Government of Canada took possession of that property under the clause in that agreement to which he has referred. I beg to tell him that he is entirely mistaken. The Government of Canada did not take over that road under that clause. They took it over under a very different procedure ; and in all the discussions I had the privilege of having with the Ministers of the Government, no such ground was taken as the hon. gentleman now advances. He said that the Government of Nova Scotia were in difficulties and came to the Government of Canada and asked to be relieved. That statement has been made two or three times, and so I feel bound to explain what the cause of those difficulties was. I am sorry thus to go into the details of Nova Scotia politics. I realize that hon. members are not very deeply interested in them. So fully have I realized this that I have declined, on more than one occasion, to follow hon. gentlemen who have made statements with which I could not agree, because I felt that the House did not care to hear the matters discussed. When the Government of Nova Scotia went into the money markets to raise money for the purchase of that property, they did experience difficulties. And why ? Because, in a great transaction which had taken place between a Government of the province of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) was a Minister without portfolio, a great transaction with the banking house of Baring Brothers in London, there were records of the transaction which were not to be found in the offices of the Government, and concerning which the incoming Government had no information. When a member of the incoming Government went to England, he found himself face to face with the complaint on the part of the representatives of the house of Baring Brothers that there was a breach of faith on the part of the Government of Nova Scotia in its dealings with that firm. And when the member of the Government declared that there was no such breach of faith, an extraordinary thing happened. They brought out of the pigeon-holes of that firm an agreement with the Government of Nova Scotia, a copy of which had never been put upon the public records of the province and of which we knew nothing, a cablegram sent by the Prime Minister to Baring Brothers which formed an essential part of the transaction but which the incoming Government of Nova Scotia were not permitted to know about until it was thus taken from the pigeon-holes of the banking house. In the face of such a transaction as that, the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, who had gone to London, came back and said : I will not attempt to press a financial transaction in London with that great banking firm charging us with a breach of faith. In

consequence of that, we were delayed in raising money, there were difficulties, and if any distress occurred, as the hon. gentleman says, it was distress arising entirely out of that important transaction. One point more. My hon. friend says that the Government of Nova Scotia paid too much for this road, and the Dominion Government knew they paid too much, and that was an element entering into the transaction. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. In all the discussions that took place at Ottawa, no shadow of complaint of that sort was ever made. He will search the public records in vain to find that any member of the Government at Ottawa, conducting that negotiation, ever questioned the fairness of the amount that was paid. And how could it be questioned if it was established by arbitrators after a sworn investigation, and the arbitration stands on record? But whether the amount was sufficient or insufficient, I tell the hon. gentleman that in the discussion that took place at Ottawa it was never alleged on behalf of the Dominion Government that the price paid to the Allan Company was too much.

Mr. HAGGART. Before this Bill takes another stage, I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he would be kind enough to bring down certain documents which I will mention to him. First, I would like the map that is attached to the agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway in 1898. The hon. Minister is aware that there is a map of that sort. We have never seen the map; I would like to see it, or a tracing of it, a copy of it. I would like to see the agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in 1890, about the same time as the agreement that was entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway in reference to the user of the Intercolonial Railway, and the interchange of traffic.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I do not carry in my mind that there was any agreement made in 1890 with the Grand Trunk Railway. I think that the only agreement which was existing and made previously to the one entered into by me, was made in 1879 or 1880. I know of none between those dates.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you an agreement with respect to the interchange of traffic?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You refer to the one of 1879?

Mr. HAGGART. Whatever date it was, or a later one, if you have a later one, with the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have none.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I want to know the amount which was paid to the Drummond Railway under the Subsidy Act, since the agreement was made with them in 1897.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have stated to the hon. gentleman that it was about $126,000, that is my memory. But I will bring in an exact statement.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, I want from the hon. gentleman the amount of money that was expended by the Government, or by the company, under the last agreement with the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Expended on the Drummond County road since it was leased?

Mr. HAGGART. Since it was leased.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All right, you may have it.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, I want from the hon. gentleman the percentage of the total user, of the total amount for maintenance and wages on the Chaudière branch. I see by the Auditor General's Report that besides the amount we have in the form of income on the Grand Trunk Railway, we pay according to user on the Chaudière branch. I want to know what our percentage is with regard to the other, and what is the total amount of expenditure on the Grand Trunk Railway terminals in Montreal. Give us the percentage that we have to pay on the total amount. I see in the Auditor General's Report that we pay $11,000 or $13,000 for the user, and I want to know what percentage that is of the whole expenditure by the Grand Trunk Railway, the Intercolonial Railway and other roads.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The fifth item I have here is the amount paid to Grand Trunk Railway Company for user of the different sections of the road and of the terminals.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, and of the amount paid. We have that in the Public Accounts, at least to the end of 1898. I want to find out what is our percentage of the total amount, what proportion it bears to the full amount charged.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our traffic amounts to about 5 per cent, if that is what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. POWELL. It is the wheelage.

Mr. HAGGART. On the wheelage or user basis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As to the map referred to by the hon. gentleman, he will recollect it was produced before the committee at the time of the investigation. It is rather an important and valuable paper, because it forms

part of our contract, and shows on the face of it just what terminals are included in the arrangement which was entered into between the Government and the company. I think it would hardly be possible for me, within a reasonable time, to get a tracing of that, because it is not only a map, but it is quite a series of plans, and they are large and cumbersome. When I produced it before the committee it was for the purpose of inspection by the members of the committee, that they might see just what we were doing. I do not think it would be well to bring that original map here and have it left in the House. It is too valuable and important, it is the only map we have. If the hon. gentleman will suggest any way by which I can abstract from it what he desires, and if it can be done expeditiously, I would be glad to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. The common practice is to lay it on the Table, no matter how valuable the document may be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, I must decline to bring that map and lay it on the Table of the House. I have no objection to affording the hon. gentleman every opportunity of looking at it, or any other hon. gentleman who wishes to see it. But I do hold the opinion that it is altogether too valuable and important a paper to allow it to remain here permanently, or to remain out of the proper custody in the department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never heard such an objection made before. The more valuable the paper, the more important and necessary it is for us to see it. It is not injured by being in charge of the officers of the House. There is not the slightest danger of anything happening to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will take the time which may be necessary to procure as expeditiously as possible a tracing of these maps and bring it here, then it is no matter what becomes of it. But I must say to the House that it would not be wise or prudent for me to bring down an original document of such importance and have it left here outside of the proper custody.

Mr. HAGGART. A tracing is sufficient. But it is a new doctrine that an original document cannot be laid on the Table of the House. I never heard of the objection being taken before.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend forgets one thing. This map is attached to the contract, and my hon. friend surely does not expect that the contract should be taken out of the hands of the proper custodian and brought into the House where it may be mislaid or accidentally destroyed. This is a contract which belongs to the Grand Trunk Railway Company as well as ourselves, and that makes a great difference.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard before an objection made to lay on the Table of the House any contract that has ever been made.

Mr. POWELL. So far as the tracing is concerned. I think it would be ample, provided the portions were coloured.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The colouring is a vital part of the whole matter, and it will not be of any use, unless the tracing can be coloured.

Mr. POWELL. I thought your remark was simply as to the tracing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The tracing can be coloured.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE TRACKMEN'S STRIKE ON G. T. R.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I deem it to be my duty to draw the attention of the Government, and especially of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), to a condition of things which exists on the Grand Trunk Railway system, due to the strike that has taken place of the trackmen in the employ of that company. It seems to me that it is not out of place that a matter of such importance should be brought to the attention of Parliament. I would not like anything I may say to prejudice the case either of the company or the men. The demands which have been made by the men, however, seem to me to be reasonable demands—to be demands, at any rate, that are worthy of the consideration of the management of the road; but, from what I have been able to glean from the reports of the proceedings, as between the men and the company, there does not seem to be any likelihood of an amicable settlement being reached, at all events in the near future. The company owe something to the men, but they owe something also to the travelling public. There is a danger that the strike may spread, as a result of the determination of the company not to treat with the men, to other classes of the operatives, and I think it is the duty of the Government, at the earliest possible moment, to interfere, as far as it can and may interfere, and endeavour by all reasonable means to try and secure an amicable settlement as between the men and the company. The statement of the men is to the effect, that they are paid $1 for each day they are employed in the company's service; that

some 2 or 3 cents are taken from that $1, and that the net result to them of the day's labour, sometimes exceeding ten, eleven and twelve hours, is 97 cents. I have no hesitation in saying, and I take the responsibility of saying it, that any white man in Canada who is compelled to work outdoors in all seasons for from ten to twelve hours a day, is not overpaid, but that he is underpaid, when he only receives 97 cents for his services. In view of the obligations o these great carrying companies to the country, and in view of the fact that the lives and property of the people of Canada may be placed in jeopardy by this strike, should this strike, unfortunately, continue and not be settled amicably at the earliest possible moment, I think the Government should interfere in this matter. The representatives of the company, if they are correctly reported, have intimated to the representatives of the trackmen, that it is not possible for them to consider their demands for recognition and for a higher wage, in view of the fact that the financial arrangements they have made to carry on the company's business will preclude them from giving the trackmen any additional wages. It seems to me that this is not enough, that it is not a perfectly satisfactory answer to these men. These men have the right, as Canadians, to receive reasonable and fair treatment from their employers, and, if they can establish the fact that they are compelled to work ten, eleven, thirteen, and sometimes fifteen and eighteen hours, as I am advised, a day, and only receive for that a miserable pittance of 97 cents, the sooner that condition of things is put a stop to, as far as it is in the power of the Government to do so, the better it will be for all concerned, and for the fame of this country. I hope that the Government will exercise its undoubted influence, as mediators between the company and the men, and endeavour, at once, to put a stop to this unfortunate condition of things, and interfere, as far as they can, to secure amelioration of the condition of these workmen. I have taken the earliest opportunity of bringing this matter before the House, because I think it is one of the greatest importance to the people of Canada, and, so far as I have heard yet, the claims of the men have not received that consideration that I believe they are justly entitled to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have followed the newspaper reports that have been published from day to day in respect to the difficulty which the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) refers to. But I must confess that, so far as I am individually concerned, I have not been able to form any opinion as to the side of the controversy upon which the right inclines. I may agree, and I do not know but what I do agree, with what the hon. gentleman has said, as to the low wage many of the employees of our railways are receiving, having regard, perhaps, particularly to the long hours which they are required to work. But I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that, in a large measure, this question is a question of supply and demand. One might sympathize—I might, as a member of the Government, sympathize, and do sympathize, to the utmost degree, with the men in that struggle, and yet it would not follow that any duty devolved upon me, as the head of the Railway Department, to intervene between the parties. There is certainly no duty devolving under any statute of which I have any knowledge. I do not think the Railway Department is charged with the responsibility of settling these difficulties, and I may say, right here, that I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, if he thinks that any good end would be served by the early intervention of any outside authority in a struggle of this kind. I believe that it is possible that a stage might be reached, after these people on each side have endeavoured to come together themselves, when such intermediaries as they might choose to call in might be useful. Possibly, a stage might be reached in which, if it were the desire of both parties, that some independent individual authority should take the matter up and try to get the parties together, a useful purpose might be served by acting upon such a suggestion, but until the persons engaged in the struggle themselves are willing to either call in or refer their difficulties to the arbitrament of some outside authority, I cannot think that it would be wise, or prudent, or that it would be attended with good results, for any person else to interfere. Not only that, but one who would thus gratuitously offer his services would not be likely to find his offer appreciated by either party to the struggle.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I agree very much with what has fallen from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, as to the absolute difficulty there is, under the circumstances, in the way of the Government offering any active interference in this matter. But I may say, that on several occasions, where conflicts between the employers and employed occurred in England, the Government, when they felt the gravity of the case warranted it, proposed to the parties that a member of the Government most familiar with the subject should be charged with the duty of acting as arbitrator between the parties. The moral influence that the Government possesses is such as to make it very difficult for either one party or the other in such a case to refuse. Therefore, I think the Government would be quite right in giving this question their attention and watching the condition of the proceedings, so as to intervene in that way, if the occasion seems to demand it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I hope I may be permitted to add, in reference to what the hon.

gentleman has just stated, that I have followed the difficulties in England sufficiently closely to know, that the Government in England has not thought it would be prudent to offer their services, until they had reason to believe from what they heard from the parties engaged in the controversy, that their offer would be appreciated. I very well recollect that the last difficulty was solved through the intervention of the Home Secretary, and I am very clear in my recollection that he did not intervene until it was suggested to him by the parties themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) allow me to point out, that it is only by the unanimous consent of the House that he can make another speech.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not making another speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we are all anxious to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair).

Mr. SPEAKER. It is out of my hands, of course; it rests with the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when I rose I asked permission of the House to say a word or two. I do, however, very gladly say, that if it shall transpire that any intervention on the part of the Government, or of any officer of my department, or of myself, is likely to be attended with good results, I will be happy indeed to render any assistance in my power to bring about an end to this very unfortunate and very unpleasant difficulty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If my memory is not in fault there is a special provision in English law under which a board of arbitration sits in connection with the Board of Trade.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). A board of conciliation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is provided for in the law, I think, that there shall be a board of conciliation, or something of that kind.

Mr. N. C. WALLACE (West York). That has reference to other matters. It is an extraordinary position for the Minister (Mr. Blair) to take, that at this stage he would not be justified in interfering. There is undoubtedly a great loss to the community when 1,800 men are out on strike and not getting wages and work. A still more important matter is, however, that the safety of the travelling public depends upon the maintenance of the road in good order and repair, and with these men on strike and none in their places, there is the greatest danger to those who travel. Yet, in the face of all this, the Minister says that this matter must go on indefinitely.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember to have said that.

Mr. WALLACE. Perhaps he did not say that, but he said until a further stage is reached, which clearly means some indefinite time in the future; while in the meantime the men are impoverished and the road is dangerous to the travelling community. The opportune time for interference by the Government is now, and not when some disaster has happened. I remember that a few years ago, Lord Rosebery interfered effectively in a strike where the public interest and safety were not in such danger as they are in Canada to-day. It is the duty of the Government to attempt, at any rate, to settle this difficulty and to see that justice is done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was not Lord Rosebery chosen as intermediary by both parties?

Mr. WALLACE. He offered his services first.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and was accepted by both parties.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there anything wrong in the Minister offering his services at this stage?

Mr. WALLACE. Here are 1,800 men who have served the company faithfully in arduous work, and in this prosperous season when other men are getting increased remuneration, it is a scandal and a disgrace that this railroad company should pay them an insufficient remuneration for the skilful labour which they are performing and have acquired after years of service; remuneration less than other railway companies are paying their men.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think the experience of the past justifies me in saying that whenever a strike occurs, the sympathy of the public generally goes to the employees, rather than to the employers. However, it does not follow that a strike is always well-founded and that there is cause for it. For my part, I quite agree with the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), that it would be quite improper for the Government to interfere at this early stage. We hardly know yet what is the subject of this controversy; we have not heard the statements of the men and of the employers; that will come out gradually. But as events go on, if unfortunately that strike is not settled between employees and employers, then it may be advisable for some one to interfere. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) knows as well as any one else, that the Government has no more power to interfere in this matter

than he himself has. The only power that the Government has over any one in this matter is, that the Government perhaps could bring the prestige of its authority to interfere on behalf of the justice of the case. With regard to the precedent in England, my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is altogether astray. It is within our memory, that twelve months have not yet elapsed since the strike of the engineers took place, which lasted for a whole season or more. Two years have not elapsed since the strike of the colliers in Wales, which lasted for more than a year. Those strikes took place in England, and though the strikes of the engineers was one of the most damaging to the public at large, still the British Government never interfered in any way. The British Government, for reasons of their own, thought they were not justified in taking any action in this matter though it took place at their very doors. That shows that in a question of that kind, we have to move with some prudence. I again repeat, that at this moment if the Government were to interfere they would take a serious responsibility upon themselves. The time may come, perhaps, when it will be found by the men and by the employers that they cannot come to an agreement, and then some one in authority may deem it advisable to interfere. However, the strike has not yet lasted eight days, and I have not given up hope—a hope which I think will be shared by everybody—that there is still a probability that the strike may be settled by the employers and the employees themselves. If that, unfortunately, should prove not to be the case, then the reasons advanced by my hon. friend may suggest themselves to us all. Perhaps it would be then advisable not to allow the road to be without its ordinary repairs and attendance, but I again suggest that in a matter of this kind it is the part of prudence to deal very cautiously and not hastily.

SUPPLY—THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter of some importance.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to the fact that he has spoken on the motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to speak on a different subject from that which we have been discussing.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is that I do leave the Chair. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has already spoken on that motion, and without the consent of the House he cannot again speak.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will give the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) a unanimous consent.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is in the same position as was the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) a few moments ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have only to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no desire to interfere with the business of the House; but, although you are technically correct, I would like, with the common consent of the House, to make a few remarks on an entirely different subject. I refer to the position of the Anglo-American Commission, which occupied some six months not very long ago in discussing questions of very great importance to Canada, and which was adjourned ostensibly with the purpose of reassembling on the 2nd day of August, to take up again matters which it had been discussing, and which we all recognize as matters of very great moment. It may be said that I took the position that the commission ought not to have been adjourned, but that when the United States commissioners took so very extraordinary a position in regard to the Alaskan boundary, the British commissioners, instead of consenting to an adjournment, would have been warranted in declining to continue the negotiations.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me one moment? I can see an obvious difficulty in his going on at the present stage, which is not regular, as other hon. members who have already spoken on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, will probably desire to speak again. Therefore, I would suggest to the hon. member that some hon. member move the adjournment of the House, and then the debate on this subject will be open, and it will be quite regular for everybody to speak.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged, Mr. Speaker, for your suggestion, because, as you say, it removes any semblance of irregularity, and I was only proceeding to deal with this question with the unanimous consent of the House. I may say that the statement made to the House yesterday by the right hon. First Minister removes a good deal of the difficulty that I had felt in regard to the action of the commission in adjourning until the 2nd day of August. I think it was the first time that the right hon. leader of the House stated so clearly—and I was very glad to hear it—the position which the British commissioners adopted on that occasion. In the official communication that was given to the public by the respective leaders of the plenipotentiaries on both sides, it was stated that a difficulty had occurred, which

was remitted for the consideration of the British and American Governments, in regard to the Alaskan boundary; but it was not stated in that communication, so far as my memory serves me, that the reassembling of the commission depended upon that question being removed from the arena of discussion by the diplomatic action of the two Governments. The statement made to the House yesterday by the right hon. First Minister was.

> We took the ground that until the American Government had either agreed to make a settlement of that question or referred it to arbitration, no other question should be dealt with by us.

So that practically that came very near to the position which I had claimed the British plenipotentiaries were bound to take; that was, in consequence of the determination expressed by the American Government as to the only terms on which they would have the Alaskan question referred to arbitration, to insist that there should be, not an adjournment, but an abandonment. Now, the statement made by my right hon. friend—and I was glad to hear it—practically amounts to the position that there would be no reassembling of the commission unless by diplomatic arrangement that question were removed; and my right hon. friend went on to say that that position, which they had taken on that occasion, they adhered to now; and I was very glad to learn that that was the case. I need not tell the House that from the inception of this question, I have treated it as a question above and beyond party, and I have treated it from that attitude down to the present moment, notwithstanding what some hon. gentlemen might regard as my rather severe strictures in regard to the action of the Canadian section of that commission. I am in a position to show that the attitude I have taken from the outset towards this commission has been that I would be a party to nothing that would weaken in the slightest degree the hands of the British commissioners in dealing with questions of such vital importance to Canada; and that attitude has been maintained by me up to the present moment. Now, I read with great satisfaction this morning that the peace commission now assembled at the Hague has made a great advance—that it has practically agreed to a proposal of the British representative, Sir Julian Pauncefote, that a board of international arbitration shall be established for the purpose of dealing with questions that may arise in controversy between any two nations. I regard that announcement as entirely changing the aspect of that which only yesterday was looked upon as practically hopeless—that any valuable result was to come from that great commission; and as affording good reason to believe that at a very early day a measure of very great importance will be arranged by that commission, under which questions of international difficulty shall be referred to a board of international arbitrators. The United States of America and Great Britain being prominent parties in that commission at the Hague, if they become, as there is every reason to believe they will become, parties to such an arrangement as is proposed by Sir Julian Pauncefote, it will be most unreasonable to suppose that the American commissioners could for a single moment continue to interpose any serious obstacle to such an arbitration as the British commissioners proposed at the late negotiations for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary. I will assume, therefore, that at this moment we are in a position to look hopefully forward to the reassembling of the Anglo-American Commission on the 2nd day of August; and so it appears to me, owing to the circumstances to which I have referred, that this question presents itself in an entirely new light. Now, my attention was called, as I have no doubt that of the right hon. leader of the House was called, to an article in the New York "Sun," of May 14th, in which a rather extraordinary position was taken. This paper says that the difficulty is not with Sir Wilfrid Laurier or with the Liberal commissioners or with the Liberal Government; that they are disposed to make such concessions and such friendly arrangements with the United States as would lead to a complete solution of all the questions in controversy between the two countries; that, in fact, just as the First Minister stated to us here yesterday: "The matters referred to the commission, as I have stated on the floor of the House several times, were all in a fair way of adjustment when we came to the obstruction of the Alaskan boundary." The "Sun" newspaper not only says that they were all in a fair way of adjustment, but took the ground that the United States cannot persist in insisting on any unreasonable terms for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary, such as have caused the interruption of the proceedings, but would be bound to waive the very strong position that they took on that question, and that, therefore, everything is in a very hopeful position, with one exception, and that is that I am the criminal, that I am the great obstructor, and that my right hon. friend and his colleagues would be quite prepared to make fair and reasonable concessions to and an arrangement with the United States—and the "Sun" goes on to specify all the questions and to say that it sees no difficulty in our having common mining laws, common alien laws, in arranging a fair measure of reciprocity, in reducing or removing the duties on lumber, and a number of other things, which are specifically stated—were it not for the obstructive attitude adopted by the Conservative party, which embarrasses the Government in dealing with these questions. But for this, the "Sun" says, there is every

reason to believe that upon the reassembling of this commission every pressing question, which every one, to whatever party he may belong, agrees it is most desirable should be settled and adjusted on a fair and reasonable basis, would be so settled at an early day. I may be reminded that I have taken a rather strong attitude on the floor of this House in dealing with this question, but I think that those who will remember what I said or will run their eye over the statement I made, will discover this fact, which stands, I think, very much in antagonism with the charge made in this paper, because it will be found, if the commission were to assemble to-morrow, that there is no means that the British commissioners could take more effective with the United States or better calculated to promote a friendly arrangement of all these matters than to present the statement I have made with regard to this question on the floor of this House. Take, for instance, the prominent statement that Canada occupies a position which renders her absolutely independent of the United States, that although it is most desirable that these questions should be settled on a fair and satisfactory basis, such, fortunately for us, is our position, that we are not, in any degree, dependent, or in a position that compels us to make any undue concessions to our great neighbours to the south. I do not think that that is calculated to weaken the hands of the commission. On the contrary, the strongest card they have to play, the most effective means they have of obtaining fair consideration from the United States is to show them that, however desirable it is to have these matters arranged on a friendly and satisfactory basis, we are fortunately in a position to protect our own interests, in case of failure to do so, and in many respects, perhaps, to improve them as compared with what would result from any arrangements we might make. Take the question of the power that this House has already given this Government to impose an export duty on pulp wood, logs and nickel matte. Why, the astute diplomatists of the United States know perfectly well that at this moment they are enjoying a great monopoly in paper manufacture for the world, or a very large portion of it, and that nothing would be so destructive of that position as the adoption of a policy by Canada that would cut off the supply of pulp wood, upon which that great manufacture depends; and it follows, as a matter consequent upon such action, that you would to a large extent by such a policy transfer the manufacture of paper from the United States to Canada, because the supply upon which the Americans depend for their own raw material abounds in profusion in Canada, and our great water-power and all the facilities for manufacture and ocean communication, and everything of that kind which we enjoy, give us an enormous advantage. Take also the question of mining rights, Canada has obtained such a position in reference to mineral production as to make it of infinitely greater importance to the United States to-day to come into Canada and to have the advantage of mining in Canada than for us to have the corresponding privilege of mining in the United States, and there is, therefore, every reason to believe that, with this matter fairly and fully stated, the United States would find it is greatly to their interest to assimilate the mining laws of the two countries and give to every Canadian in the United States those advantages which Canada has freely given to the citizens of the United States in Canada. So with reference to all these questions. Take the question of nickel matte. It is known that the great fleet of the United States has been armour-plated by our nickel steel, the nickel for which is furnished exclusively, or almost exclusively, from the Sudbury nickel mines. Look at this question from whatever point of view you may, and you will see that the attitude I have taken in this House, that we are absolutely independent of the United States, and the attitude I took of grounding our arms and doing nothing that would in the least degree interfere with the British commissioners while engaged in these negotiations, show, not that the Conservative party is obstructive, but that we have taken the position best calculated to strengthen the hands of the British commissioners when that work is resumed.

My object in drawing the attention of my right hon. friend and the Government to this question at present, I will briefly state. I propose to meet my hon. friend with a flag of truce. Now that the hopes, which yesterday seemed to be of the most slender description, but which to-day, in the light of what I have mentioned, are much brighter, now that there is a prospect of this commission resuming its negotiations on the 2nd of August, with the favourable prospect of bringing them to a satisfactory termination, and that the ground, as I understand from the statement of my right hon. friend, taken by the British commissioners is that this boundary question should be referred to such an international commission as the British commissioners propose, and these other matters on which, as my right hon. friend says great progress has been made, exclusively dealt with, I propose to suggest a means by which my right hon. friend will be left more free to proceed with the work of the commission. I still hold the opinion I expressed at the outset, that the negotiations by this commission constitute a subject above and beyond party.

And the Conservative party in Canada will be prepared now, as they were then, to do everything that is possible to strengthen the hands of the British—which practically means the Canadian—commissioners, because these are eminently Canadian questions. I, therefore, suggest to my hon. friend that, under these circumstances, he should withdraw the Redistribution Bill, have it published for the information of the

country, and allow the business of the session to be promptly closed by disposing of all the other questions that are before us, in order that the Government may give that care and that attention to these important matters that is absolutely necessary they should give, and may furnish themselves with the most minute information to strengthen the case with which they are charged. They have had the experience of six months' negotiations, which must be most valuable to them, and, having that experience, they know exactly the kind of information they need, and the best course to pursue in order to present the British or Canadian side of this case to the commission in the most effective way. My right hon. friend knows that this House was called at a most inconvenient season of the year. He knows the sacrifice it is to members on both sides to spend the summer in attending Parliament, even in so charming a place as the city of Ottawa, which is, even on the Opposition side of the House, a little warmer than most people would care about in June or July. It is provided in the Bill which the right hon. gentleman has introduced, that it shall not come into operation until the dissolution of this Parliament. The necessity for that dissolution will not arise for some time, certainly is not pressing. Of course, I do not expect a statement from my right hon. friend to-day as to the suggestion I have made. This is a matter upon which he would, naturally, confer with his colleagues.

But I would ask him to consider my suggestion. I felt that it was my duty, under the circumstances and in the light of what has transpired yesterday and to-day, to state that, in my judgment, the interests of Canada would be consulted by withdrawing this measure, which is of a character to compel us to remain here for a very long period at this most inconvenient and most unfavourable season, and enable the business of the House to be closed and the Government to address themselves to these questions in such a manner that, on the reassembling of the commission on the 2nd of August, they would be in the best possible position to do everything that could be done in support of Canadian interests. One other point before I sit down. I am sure that my right hon. friend will say that I have not been fairly represented in this article. It says, that the modus vivendi which was proposed by the United States, would have been at once accepted by Canada, but for the fear that the Conservative party, and especially that I myself, would take an attitude of strong hostility. My right hon. friend will vindicate me, at all events, on that point, because he did me the honour to consult me in reference to what the Canadian Government proposed, when, as he knows, I gave him at once the assurance of my hearty support of the Government in the attitude they had assumed. I mention that because it is put forward in this article, as one of the difficulties the Government had in dealing with these questions. I felt it right that I should draw the attention of my right hon. friend and the Government to this matter, and I hope they will receive these suggestions in the spirit in which they are offered, and will give them that consideration to which they may be fairly entitled.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, may be pardoned, I am sure, some feeling of satisfaction at the words that have just been spoken by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper). The wisdom of the course which I took in the month of February, in not breaking off suddenly the negotiations of the Anglo-American Commission, has been fully vindicated by what the hon. gentleman has just said. If I were allowed to refer to a past debate, I might call the attention of the House to the fact that, in the debate on the Address, my hon. friend took a very different position, and stated that, the moment we could not come to an agreement with our fellow-commissioners representing the United States, we should have broken off negotiations and come home. We thought that this course was not the course which should be followed under the circumstances.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But that is practically what you did, judging from your statements in the House yesterday. You said, you would not go on with the negotiations until the other question was removed.

The PRIME MINISTER. When we left, we referred the question of the Alaska boundary to our respective governments. We stated then to the world, that it would be useless to reassemble unless this matter had been disposed of. I stated at the time to my hon. friend, and to the House on more than one occasion, that the matter had been referred to the respective governments, American and British, and that we were to reassemble on the 2nd of August. But what would have been the use of reassembling on the 2nd of August, or at any other time, if the very questions on which we had not been able to agree, were then to be found in the same position as before? We would not proceed with the other matters, pending that consideration, but we hoped that, when we assembled again on the 2nd of August, the British and the American Governments, by their respective authorities, would have been able to perform what we had not been able to perform, that is to say, settle the question of the Alaska boundary. We thought that, of all the measures that had been referred to us, the most important. We might have gone on with some other questions, but, pending that, we thought it would not be advisable, in the best interest of Canada, to proceed with other questions. If that question could have been settled, one way or the other, we

could have proceeded with other questions, giving more or receiving more, as the question was settled one way or the other. There were only two ways of settling it. One was by compromise. We did not agree as to the location of the boundary, which had been defined by the treaty of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia. We, representing Great Britain, and the Americans, representing Russia, did not agree as to the location of the boundary on the ground. We claimed that the boundary passed at one point, while the Americans contended that it passed at another. If we could compromise the question, I say, without hesitation, the manner in which we settled it would be of material aid in the solution of other questions before us, by giving more and accepting less, or by receiving more and giving less. But, if we cannot come to an understanding upon that question, the question ought to be referred to arbitration. We cannot, of course, force our fellow-commissioners to come to an understanding with us. But there is one thing that must be done—if we cannot come to an understanding, the matter should be referred to arbitration. When it is referred to arbitration, it is then out of the way, and we can resume our sittings and go on with the other questions. I shall regret very much, if the matter has to be referred to arbitration, instead of our reaching a compromise. I should prefer to have a fair and honourable compromise by which both parties would relinquish claims in order to have an amicable settlement of the question. And, if we can have an amicable settlement, the hon. gentleman will agree, we would be in a position to give and take in other questions more, better than we would be otherwise. But, if it must be settled by arbitration, then, when it is referred to arbitration, we shall be free to take up other questions. As to the other questions before us, I can repeat what I stated yesterday, and what I have said several times before. By the way, I do not agree with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that I spoke more clearly yesterday than before. It seems to me, and I place myself in the judgment of the House in so saying, that what I said yesterday I have stated twice or three times already on different occasions during the present session. Having taken that ground, I may proceed to say that if this matter of the Alaskan boundary is removed from the questions entrusted to the commission, and if we resume our negotiations upon the other matters still remaining open, and there are some of great moment, I say frankly that while I do not expect that we can settle them all, perhaps, as I would like them to be settled myself, to the extreme limit of our rights and pretensions. I have hopes that we can settle the most, if not all, of those questions in an honourable and satisfactory manner to both countries. I do not expect that we can get all that we are contending for, and I am sure the American authorities cannot get all they are contending for; but I expect that we can make an honourable settlement, such a settlement as will intensify the good feeling which now prevails between Great Britain and the United States. Now I can acquit my hon. friend altogether from the aspersions made upon him by the editor of the "Sun." I can say that anything that he has done or has not done, had nothing to do with the non-success of the negotiations. But I must take exception, at all events, to the suggestion which he made to us. I do not believe that either in the future or in the past any policy of retaliation towards the United States would have had any effect, or will have any effect, in settling our difficulties with them. I am quite as much in earnest as my hon. friend himself in this respect, that we must stand upon our rights and upon our dignity, but standing upon our rights and upon our dignity does not call upon us to enter upon a policy of hostility to the United States. Even though the United States sometimes try our patience very much, even though they sometimes more than try our patience, still I think it would be the part of wisdom in us under such circumstances to continue to be patient, and not to allow ourselves to be moved by any sentiment of irritation. If we resume our negotiations, as I believe we shall, I think we are in a fair way of making a treaty which can be settled in a very few days.

Now, my hon. friend led up to a conclusion for which I must say I was not prepared. He made these international negotiations a basis upon which to ask us to withdraw the Redistribution Bill. Well, the ground is a broad one for such a request. For the present I must say that I am not prepared to withdraw the Redistribution Bill. I am quite prepared to consider his suggestion; I owe that to him, occupying the position which he does in this House; I owe it to him to place the matter before my colleagues and before my party, and we will give it the best consideration. But if we are to spend the summer in Ottawa, I do not think that it will be in the legitimate discussion of the Redistribution Bill. If we are to have a legitimate discussion of the Redistribution Bill it will not at all involve us in remaining here during the months of July or August, or any part of the summer. We can dispose of the Redistribution Bill in a short time if it is approached on both sides with a view of making it a fair measure, and I think it is drawn upon a fair basis. I do not pretend that all its details are perfect; I do not know that we may not be able to make some improvement in it, and to that end we will listen to the suggestions which are made to us. All this is a matter for consideration

in the committee. But I say that the measure, as it has been proposed, is one which is fair in its terms, and which ought to win the commendation of both sides of the House. I do not see why, if that measure were to receive a fair criticism, it should not be disposed of in a few days. But the hon. gentleman has made me a suggestion which, I repeat, coming from one having the authority which he has in this House, an authority resting not only upon his official position but upon his long experience and long service in Parliament—a suggestion which I intend for my part to treat with great respect, and I shall ask my friends as well to give it their best consideration. But more than this I know my hon. friend does not expect me to say to-day.

Mr. PRIOR asked leave to withdraw his motion to adjourn.

Motion withdrawn.

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring a matter to the attention of the House of considerable moment. I am sorry the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not here, because it refers to the Yukon. But as it is a matter that I know he will have to bring before the Council, if he has not already done so, every Minister present is interested in it. I refer to the liquor permits that have been issued by Mr. Ogilvie. It seems that that gentleman, since he has been in charge of the Yukon district, has issued several permits to take liquor into that country. Whether he was authorized to do so, I cannot say. I presume he must have been acting under general instructions, or perhaps, he has had special instructions. But as a matter of fact, some of those permits that he has given have been disallowed by the Government since they were issued. Now, that has been a cause of great hardship to several gentlemen who, relying on the permits already issued by Mr. Ogilvie, purchased a large amount of liquors to be taken into that country. One case in particular that has been brought to my attention, was the case of Mr. H. C. Macaulay, who was in Dawson and obtained a permit from Mr. Ogilvie to take in a certain quantity of liquor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). How much ?

Mr. PRIOR. I cannot say how much the permit was for, but I can tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he immediately came down to the coast and purchased two car-loads of beer and 200 cases of beer. Now these two car-loads of beer were ordered, so I am informed, six weeks before the disallowance of these permits, and they were put into storage and have been there ever since. He did not want to ship them just at that time. No doubt he did not think that a few weeks made any difference about the permit. The 200 cases that he bought were shipped from Victoria, B.C., on the 4th of April, and arrived at Lake Bennett before the Government disallowed the permits, so that they were pretty well on the way. The two car-loads of beer have been paid for, and they are now in a warehouse at considerable expense to the parties. Of course he and his partners in the business are very anxious to know whether these permits are going to be disallowed only temporarily, or whether they can look forward to losing the sale of their goods. It seems to me that if Mr. Ogilvie was authorized to issue those permits the Government surely should allow men who bought liquor before the disallowance, or before they knew the permits were disallowed, either to take it in, or give them some compensation for the loss they will sustain. I have brought this matter before the House once, and to the attention of the Minister of the Interior two or three times, and he promised to have it settled as soon as possible, but up to the present time nothing has been done in regard to it. I do sincerely trust that the Government will take this matter into consideration and give a ruling on this question, so that gentlemen who have invested large sums of money will know exactly how they stand and what they should do. I would like also to call the attention of the Government to a statement which was made to me in regard to the brewing of beer in the Yukon. I am informed that there is a brewery running in Dawson City and disposing of beer. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue informs me that he does not think there is such a thing. My correspondent who knows the country well, and who has been there time and time again, tells me that there is a brewery, that it is brewing beer and paying no revenue to the country. It is very unfair to many gentlemen who have applied for licenses to brew beer and who have been refused. I only draw the attention of the Government to this condition of things ; I do not know whether it is correct or not, but my correspondent is a man of integrity and a man who is well known. If it is not so, there is no harm done in my mentioning it ; if it is so, I think the Government should take some action in regard to the matter.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Speaker, I received a number of applications for brewing beer in the Atlin district.

Mr. PRIOR. This is in the Yukon district, not the Atlin district.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I know, but I merely want to explain. The

Atlin district is partly situated in British Columbia and partly in the Yukon territory. I felt that as long as the Government had not adopted a policy for the granting of licenses in the Yukon country I did not feel justified in granting these particular licenses, because I knew they would be employed in the Yukon country as well as in the Atlin district. When I heard that there was a gentleman moving in that direction of Atlin Lake with material for the erection of a brewery, I applied to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and asked him to notify the Mounted Police to seize the brewing material entering that country until the Government have decided upon a policy in relation to brewing and distilling in the Yukon district. I am intensely surprised to hear that there is actually a brewery working in the Yukon, at Dawson City. I think that the hon. Minister of the Interior, who is not here at present, will be able to give further information on that subject.

Mr. PRIOR. I think it would be a great deal better to allow breweries in that country, and to have good beer for the miners, instead of that terrible whisky that is going in there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose that the hon. Minister of the Interior will be able to give us some information on Monday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can give the information my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) has asked for in regard to Macaulay, or any other party that he has referred to. My hon. friend stated that if permits had been issued to take liquor into the Yukon territory it must have been under the authority of this Government. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; the authority under which permits were issued in the Yukon was that of one or two ordinances issued by the commissioner of the Yukon under the advice of his council. These ordinances we have disallowed, and, of course, this disallowance having taken place, all the parties must abide by the consequences. We thought, after due consideration, that it would not be well for us to allow liquor to go into the Yukon in such quantities as was allowed by Commissioner Ogilvie and his council, and therefore we disallowed these ordinances. I think both the ordinances and the disallowance have been placed on the Table of the House, and therefore the parties who have been given any of these permits must take the consequences.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have looked into this point very carefully, and I do not know whether it was considered by the hon. Minister of the Interior and the Government. This particular ordinance of the 7th of December was disallowed on the 13th of April. In the meanwhile some parties had shipped and some had bought their materials and were ready to send them into the Yukon territory, but they did not get that far. Although the ordinance of the 7th of December has been disallowed, it is not followed by the consequences that my right hon. friend mentions. A discrimination has been made, not in favour of any particular individual, but in favour of all those who happened to have shipped under that ordinance, and the point which the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) refers to, is that if the Government is exercising that power it should exercise it fairly. They have approved, practically, of what the legal executive have done in regard to some of these individuals.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must remind my hon. friend that the order of disallowance was telegraphed to our officers, and it has acted mechanically. The same rule must apply in this matter as in any other. The disallowance took effect from the time of its being made. The moment the order of disallowance was passed a telegram was sent to the officers of the Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the instructions to the officers were to permit all liquors shipped prior to that date to enter the Yukon, so that there was a discrimination.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think so.

YUKON MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand mail matter that I registered and posted on the 12th of the present month, and which was addressed to Dawson City. It was returned to me yesterday by one of the clerks of the post office here, having come to the dead letter office with the explanation that no mail matter of this kind would be forwarded by the authorities to the Yukon district. He also told me that they had no instructions to that effect in the post office here. I want to understand if it is a fact that mail matter of that kind, which only contains papers, is not permitted to go into the Yukon, and if so, why the officers of this House, in charge of the post office, have no instructions to that effect. This went as far as Victoria, B.C., was returned from there to the dead letter office here, was opened and returned to me yesterday. I presume that many other people are in the same position, and perhaps they are in a worse position because they may not be able to get their mail matter back. I may have had an advantage in being here and of having registered this matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might refer to a case down home that was called to my attention, in which a brother-in-law of mine sent a parcel prepaid, and which was returned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The mail service through the winter, to the Yukon, is conducted by dog train and is one of very exceptional difficulties. I need not go into details, because hon. gentlemen have some idea of the physical difficulties involved in that service. It is not possible to carry on that service during the winter by any known agency except dog trains, and each sleigh is only capable of carrying a certain quantity. After the most careful inquiry, and the best arrangements, the most that we can place on a sleigh is 700 pounds, and even that is regarded as a somewhat excessive load for a strong team of dogs. The equipment consists of five dogs to each sleigh. The expense is very considerable in itself, and with such a service it is not possible to provide for other than letter mails. There is no service, throughout the winter, to the Yukon, conducted by Canada or the United States, except for letter mails, and if this is not a letter it does not go as letter mail matter. We have no way of carrying it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has any notice that no newspapers could be sent to the Yukon been given, because, it appears to me that if the Post Office Department gave instructions that nothing but letters would be carried, they were bound at once to publish far and wide the statement that nothing but letters would go.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not seen it stated in the press myself, that none but letters were to be carried. Whether there was any formal advertisement placed in the newspapers or not, I do not know, but, because I say that, it does not follow that it was not done. I cannot take charge of the whole executive portion of the Post Office Department.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said that mail matter was carried by dog train, but he does not inform the House whether he has let a contract, or whether this is done by the Mounted Police. By whom is this service performed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The mail service during last winter was performed under an arrangement made between the Post Office Department and the Mounted Police, by which the Mounted Police performed the service. I did not think it safe to entrust it to private contractors for fear that they would not have the facilities for maintaining the service efficiently.

Mr. WALLACE. How is the service performed now ? The hon. Minister said that was last winter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was a contract let by public tender for the carriage of the mails from the opening of navigation for a certain term—I do not remember the length of it, but, at all events, it covers the present coming season of navigation. That means as soon as the rivers are navigable. Arrangements have been made and contracts entered into for a weekly service between Dawson City and Lake Bennett during the season of navigation.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that mean that newspapers will be carried now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The summer contract does not limit it to letter mails.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why does this matter now come back ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose that navigation has not opened yet. I do not think that the waters are navigable yet.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this can be mailed yet, or are we to understand that no such matter as this can be mailed. This was mailed on the 12th of this month.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think navigation is opened yet. It can go during the period of navigation, but we cannot carry it during the winter period.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should like to ask the hon. Postmaster General to explain why his own officials are not notified of this. He seems to think that the public can read this in the newspapers. If the public believed everything they saw in the newspapers about the Yukon, I think that the hon. Postmaster General, and some of his colleagues, would not be very well pleased ; but so far as the mail service is concerned, it is apparently considered quite enough that the hon. gentleman has seen this in the newspapers. I regard it as significant that the officers of this House have not been instructed by the Postmaster General. If the public know of this regulation, his own officials do not seem to know of it, and I do not exactly understand how he can expect that the general public of this country, who are entitled to be notified, could be aware of it when his own paid officials do not seem to know anything of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, you have in your hands a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply. I beg to withdraw such motion.

Motion withdrawn.

COMMISSIONER OGILVIE'S REPORT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if Mr. Ogilvie's report, which it was announced in the papers had arrived at Victoria a week ago, has yet been received, and, if so, whether it will be promptly laid on the Table of the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that the report

has yet been received. I will inquire of the hon. Minister of the Interior and give an answer on Monday.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 29th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT OF THE YUKON INQUIRY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I wish to advise the House that I have received the report of Mr. Ogilvie of the inquiry which he has conducted under the commission issued to him with respect to the charges of irregularities in the Yukon district. A copy of the report will be laid on the Table of the House to-morrow afternoon, and the evidence will be copied as rapidly as possible and laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton) asked:

What commanding officer recommended the admission for instruction at the military school at Fredericton, N.B., of the following persons from the county of Cape Breton:—Archibald J. McDougall, Dan J. McDougall, Hugh P. McKinnon and Francis H. McKenzie? To what volunteer companies did they belong and how long have they been members of such company?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Commanding officer of the 94th Battalion. 2. To No. 3 and 4 companies, 94th Battalion (as stated at the time by the officers commanding those companies). 3. It is not known how long they have belonged.

SURVEY OF TIDES AND CURRENTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (by Sir Charles Tupper) asked:

Have parties purporting to be practical seamen, captains of steamers, &c, or any of them (and if so, what names) petitioned the Government or any department thereof asking for a survey of the tides and currents in Canadian waters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Yes. In 1889 petitions so signed were forwarded to the department by Prof. Johnson. The names are very numerous and will be given at once in response to any return moved for, or I will give the hon. member a copy when made for his information.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (by Sir Charles Tupper) asked:

1. Have any of the captains of the Allan Steamship Line stated to the hon. the Minister of Marine that they attach no value whatsoever to the tidal survey?
2. If so, what are their names?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. Captain More of the "California."

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE INSPECTION.

Mr. ROBERTSON (by Mr. Sproule) asked:

1. What is the regulation in regard to inspecting the Royal Military College annually by a board of visitors? Has this regulation been carried out? If not, why not?
2. Why have the names of the members of the board been omitted from the Militia List?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. The regulation is as follows:—

An independent inspection by a board of visitors appointed by the Governor in Council, and reporting to the Minister of Militia, will be made once a year. Such board will not be a permanent body, but will consist of five members, of whom three shall be members of the militia staff, not less than two to retire annually.

Inspections have been made only in the years 1881, 1889 and 1895. Annual inspections have never been considered necessary. 2. There is no regulation requiring such publication of the names of the members of the board.

RICHELIEU RIVER BUOYS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. How many contracts for new buoys for the Richelieu River have been awarded since two years?
2. To whom were said contracts awarded?
3. Of what material were said buoys to be made?
4. What was the number of buoys ordered, and the price per buoy?
5. Were tenders for such buoys publicly called for through the newspapers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. One contract for district between Sorel and Chambly, and one contract between St. Johns and Rouse's Point. 2. A. E. Beauchemin, Sorel, district between Sorel and Chambly; and B. V. Naylor, between St. Johns and Rouse's Point. 3. Of cedar spars. 4. Twenty-eight buoys between Sorel and Chambly; contract price for making new buoys, placing, maintaining and taking up, and storing is $250 per annum. Between

St. Johns and Rouse's Point the contract price for the same kind of work is $150 per annum. There were formerly eleven buoys, but this spring eight new spar buoys with mooring stones, chains and shackles were added at 10 cents each; the whole nineteen buoys to be maintained hereafter at $150 per annum. 5. Tenders were invited publicly by post-bill sent from Ottawa and posted in conspicuous places for Sorel and Chambly district. The contract for the other district was renewed with B. V. Naylor, contractor for many years.

SUPERANNUATION OF ALEXANDER WALMSLEY.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Why was Mr. Alexander Walmsley, of St. Johns, P.Q., formerly British mail clerk, superannuated?
2. Did Mr. Walmsley ask to be retained in active service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Walmsley was superannuated because the office he held, that of British mail clerk, was abolished.

THE SONGHEES, B. C., INDIANS.

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Earle) asked:

1. Has the Government arrived at any settlement with the Provincial Government with regard to the removal of the Indians from the Songhees Indian Reserve at Victoria, B.C.?
2. Has a satisfactory arrangement been arrived at as to the ultimate ownership of said reserve, in the event of the removal of the Indians?
3. Has the Provincial Government of British Columbia now in power ever asked for any steps to be taken looking for a settlement of the above questions?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. No. 2. No. 3. Yes.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE FOR VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Earle) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to grant a subsidy to encourage some small steamer to run regularly on the east coast of Vancouver Island, carrying mails, passengers and freight, and calling at all the inhabited islands en route?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). A petition has recently been received, asking for the establishment of a mail service. It is at present under consideration.

THE TWO-CENT STAMPED ENVELOPES.

Mr. QUINN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Is it true, as stated in the press, that a number of two-cent stamped envelopes were printed in a purple colour by mistake and were recalled from circulation after distribution to various post offices?
2. How many of these were printed?
3. Were any recalled envelopes destroyed because the impressed stamps were printed in the wrong colour?
4. If not destroyed, what was done with them?
5. Has the Government taken any steps to ascertain the truth of charges made in the press that Government officials have secured a large stock of these purple envelopes and are making them the object of a speculation for their personal profit?
6. Is it the intention to print any two-cent envelopes in a purple colour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). It is not true that there was any mistake in the printing in purple of two-cent stamped envelopes, or that any purple-stamped envelopes were recalled from circulation after distribution amongst the various post offices. No such envelopes were recalled, and accordingly none were destroyed, nor were any of the embossed stamps printed in a wrong colour. All the purple colour two-cent stamped envelopes were issued in the ordinary course of business to the post offices, and so far as this department is aware went into the hands of the general public. The department has no information as to whether or not any quantity of such envelopes were purchased by Government officials. If the hon. gentleman is aware of any Government official having improperly possessed himself of any such envelopes, and will communicate such information to the department, the fullest inquiry will be made into the matter. It is not the intention of the Government to print any two-cent envelopes in a purple colour.

Mr. BERGERON. The second question is not answered yet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I practically answered the same question some time ago, and I am sure in that reply the information desired will be found. If not, I will furnish the information later.

MAJOR WALSH'S REPORTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. How many, if any, reports did Major Walsh make under the following paragraph of Order in Council of 17th August, 1897: "He should make a full report to him, the Minister, by each mail upon all matters affecting his office and the administration of the various departments of the Government in territory under his control"?
2. If he made any such reports, how many have been laid on the Table of this House?
3. If there are any such reports not brought down, when will they be laid on the Table of this House?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply I beg to say: 1. Major Walsh made eight reports. 2. Six. 3. Two reports not brought down will be included in the return ordered by the House in April,

1899. and will be prepared as soon as possible.

Mr. OGILVIE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Had Mr. Ogilvie, the Commissioner of the Yukon, any connection with the British Canadian Goldfields of the Klondike, Limited?
2. If so, what was it?
3. If so, when did he cease to have any connection with the said company?
4. Is the Government aware that the prospectus of the company refers to Mr. Ogilvie as asserting: "That to his personal knowledge there is at least £20,000,000 worth of gold in sight," and that he wrote to the founders of the company that he had furnished them with a private map on which he had marked places not yet taken up where he knows gold to exist, and advised "that claims upon them be staked for the company as soon as possible," while he had also privately indicated the location of other unclaimed mineral deposits?
5. Is the Government aware that this prospectus states that the company proposes that "an exploration party shall be despatched to certain districts with regard to which Mr. Ogilvie has given the founders exclusive information, and to there secure possession of the most desirable properties already indicated by him"?
6. Has the Government any information as to the authority of the company making such reference to Mr. Ogilvie, or has it any explanation to give?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply I beg to say: 1. No. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1. 4. Yes. 5. Yes. 6. Upon the facts referred to coming to the attention of the Government the statements which concerned Mr. Ogilvie were reported to him and an explanation was asked for. A copy of Mr. Ogilvie's reply is herewith laid upon the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. That ought to go in the "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It is too long to go into the "Hansard."

Mr. FOSTER. It must go in the "Hansard."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that should be read and not laid on the Table. It ought to go into "Hansard" as a reply to the question. I would ask the hon. Minister of the Interior to read the paper instead of leaving it on the Table.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman objects to its being laid on the Table or desires to have it in any other form, he will have to move for a return.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. The hon. Minister has answered part of the question verbally and laid the balance on the Table. We are entitled to have his whole reply in "Hansard," and it is not open for him to say that the part not replied to should be moved for as a return.

Mr. SIFTON.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The rule is well laid down by the Minister who gives the answer, because he gives the answer according to his own discretion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister may refuse to give an answer if he chooses, but he has not refused. He has given the answer, but not in the proper way. He has given part verbally and part to be laid on the Table. That at once interferes with the custom invariably followed of having the complete answer entered in "Hansard." As the matter stands now, the whole question is answered, but not in the way the House invariably has required hitherto.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I shall go on the ruling of the Speaker. My interpretation of the rule is that the Minister who answers a question answers it according to his own discretion or judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the question is entirely one of order. There is another point involved, and that is the point whether the House shall have the answer it desires to have. What objection is there to have that question answered and the whole answer put in the pages of "Hansard"? There cannot be any, but the hon. Minister says the only alternative is: If you do not like your porridge as I put it before you, move for an order of the House, and you may have it in a month or two.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He will lay it on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he says if you do not take it that way, you must move for a return. You may appeal to the Speaker on a question of abstract order as to what a Minister may or may not do, but I do not think any such question arises in this matter. Here is a Minister who pretends to give an answer to a fair question put to him, but he reads three-fourths of his answer and then throws a paper on the Table and says that is the remainder. The answer is incomplete. Surely there is no reason for his not giving the whole answer in the usual way. It would not take my hon. friend five minutes to read it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not quite think this is a question of order or one that ought to raise any difficulty between the two sides of the House. The report which the Minister is willing to lay on the Table covers eleven pages of closely typewritten paper. The hon. Minister might very well have said that he had the paper and would produce it on a return being moved for, but he went further and said he would lay it on the Table without a motion, so that, I think, if the House will allow me, I will put the motion, though, of course, the paper will not then go on "Hansard."

Mr. FOSTER. That is where we want it.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it comes to that, I think the matter is in the discretion of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). May I be allowed to explain? I gave the answer in the way I did, because I thought that would be the most satisfactory way. If I had made a short extract or reference to this letter from Mr. Ogilvie, that would not have been satisfactory, and the hon. gentleman could have asked for the whole letter and asked me to lay it on the Table. Instead of waiting for any motion or request, I said that I had Mr. Ogilvie's explanation in a document, which I would lay on the Table. If the hon. gentleman objects to my laying the paper on the Table, he can move for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine the House can get the answer and get it in the "Hansard," and I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am greatly surprised that any gentleman on the Treasury benches should take such an unworthy mode as this in order to evade his plain duty. Every one knows that the ordinary means of getting information is to put questions on the Notice paper, which the Minister may answer or not as he chooses. If he chooses to take the responsibility of refusing to answer, then the House will judge why he refuses to answer; but when he consents to answer, he is bound, by the invariable practice of the House, to give his answer in complete form so that it may go in "Hansard," and not give it partly verbally and partly by a document which he lays on the Table. If the course adopted by the hon. Minister of the Interior on this occasion is allowed to pass unchallenged, we shall have a new practice introduced into this House, by which Ministers can evade giving that information to the House which the House and the public are accustomed to receive and entitled to receive.

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman wants to decline to give an answer, it is very convenient for him to bring forward a long paper, like this, and refuse to read it in his place. There is no objection to a Minister of the Crown using as much time as he needs in giving an answer, provided it is all relevant to the question that is put. The question has been asked here:

Has the Government any information as to the authority of the company making such reference to Mr. Ogilvie, or has it any explanation to give?

It is very easy to state an answer to that question, and say: Yes, we have information, and we propose to give it—and then state briefly to the House what that information is, in order that the parties who read the "Hansard" and the press reports of discussions that take place in this House, may have an opportunity in connection with the question asked, to know what the answer is. But the hon. Minister proposes to adopt a novel proceeding, by which the answer to a plain question which he has undertaken to answer, and which he admits, therefore, there is no difficulty in answering, is not shown in connection with the question. He says, in effect: I lay this upon the Table of the House, but, if you want it brought down, you have got to move a resolution and give me a month before I bring it down, if you will not take it as I give to you here, I will take it back, and you shall not have it for a month. Or, perhaps, he might promise to bring it down next session, and then, as hon. gentlemen too often do, forget to bring it down. This action of the hon. Minister should be marked, and marked at once, by the disapproval of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite need to be taught, as they are now being taught, that they cannot evade a plain duty by taking a course of that kind and changing at pleasure the precedents and practice that have invariably been followed ever since I had the honour of having a seat in this House down to the present time. The answer is laid on the Table of this House, and we can only get it upon "Hansard" in connection with this proceeding by the very inconvenient course of reading it, a course to which the Opposition are compelled to resort. But, fortunately, the rules of Parliament do provide a means by which such evasions—for I cannot characterize it otherwise—can be met and defeated, as they will be met and defeated in this case.

Dawson, February 14, 1899.

The Hon. Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

Immediately on my arrival in London in March last, I met Mr. J. B. Roche, M.P. (in fact, it was through him that I visited the old country). He evinced great interest in the Yukon and its resources, and we had many discussions together. He intended organizing a company to operate in that region, and asked me if I would assist him in his purpose. I replied that I would be very glad to do anything to assist in the development of the region with which I had been so much associated during the past eleven years. He introduced me to several gentlemen who were interested in it, and anxious to organize the company, among whom was a Mr. Bernard Malloy, also M.P., a lawyer by profession, but more or less associated with mining in Africa, and who had also visited Australia. This gentleman I found to be very interesting. He had considerable knowledge of scientific mining, geology and chemistry, and was the originator and inventor of several useful inventions in connection with mining.

The question of the formation of a company was often discussed, and, being anxious to see British capital invested in that region, I lent my aid as far as lay in my power to the advancement of this project,——

He was unlike my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who, when this matter was brought up, of obtaining British capital for conducting mining operations in Canada, told an assembly of people in Wales, whom he was addressing, that he was very much of Mark Twain's opinion—that a mine meant a hole in the ground and a liar, and he would ad-

vise the people to keep their money in their pockets——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I never made such a statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is true, that the hon. gentleman, when collared by Col. Domville, within a short time after that, changed his opinion, and wrote a letter, over his own signature, recommending the public to trust their money to Col. Domville. And I may say that a suit is now going on, a very important suit, in which the defence of the parties was, that they were misled by statements of Ministers of the Crown to invest their money in this enterprise.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the hon. gentleman's (Sir Charles Tupper's) attention to the fact that the motion to adjourn is for a specific purpose, and——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not departed from that.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say, that, in my judgment, the hon. gentleman, while reading the paper, is within his rights, but while carrying on a discussion on various subjects, is out of order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And perhaps the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will allow me to follow him in his excursion. I never made such a statement as he attributes to me—advising people not to put their money in the Yukon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I can do is to bring forward the statement, as published in the report of the hon. gentleman's speech in Wales, and allow the public to judge whether his statement——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Prudence is one thing; taking the hon. gentleman's statement is another.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not deny the other.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What other?

Mr. FOSTER. As to the other company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman gave a letter, over his own signature, advising people that Col. Domville was a gentleman of great opportunities of carrying out an undertaking, and that he would be able to obtain the assistance of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Had the ear of the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He has done it before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, he has done it before. I have great respect for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I think I am complying with your ruling exactly. The question now before us is, the answer of the Minister of the Interior, and I find a statement made in it that requires just such comment as I have made upon it in reference to the conduct of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say, I have cautioned the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). I cannot allow any such comments later on in his speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall wait until you take a course that is calculated to interfere with free discussion in this House, Mr. Speaker, and then I will appeal to the House on the question. Notwithstanding the large majority of hon. gentlemen on the other side, I believe there will be a disposition to protect the rights of members——

Mr. SPEAKER. Another thing—I cannot permit any hon. member in this House to threaten the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know whether you call it threatening the Chair, for an hon. member to say he has a right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair. If that is threatening the Chair, I have yet to learn——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not what I complain of. What I complain of is, that the hon. gentleman said I did not allow free discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) said that, and I will not permit it to be said by anybody.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are mistaken, Mr. Speaker. I made no such statement, and "Hansard," when it comes to be read to-morrow, will show that you are mistaken in saying I made such a statement. I had no intention of making such a statement, and I think "Hansard" will show that I did not make it. I should be very sorry to make it.

Now, to proceed:

I lent my aid as far as lay in my power to the advancement of this project,——

Unlike my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies), when in Wales.

——always stipulating that the company should be established on a good sound financial basis before entering into business, a feature not too common in the establishment of such companies—the promotion of the interests of the founders or promoters generally being primary.

These gentlemen agreed heartily with me in my ideas and professed themselves eager to embark in a scheme laid down on the lines on which I proposed, that is, a genuine enterprise in which the originators and investors themselves would receive no pay until the profits were drawn from the investment.

This was agreed to, and I professed my willingness to aid them in every way consistent with

the duties required of me in any official position which might be given me in that region by the Canadian Government.

While the organization of the company was being discussed and the probable nature of its operations defined, I was often discussing with Mr. Malloy the peculiar conditions existing in the Yukon region, to which the ordinary mining methods were not well adapted. New methods would be outlined by us. He would work out the details, and at our next meeting this would be discussed and amended until we both arrived at an idea which we thought would produce the best possible results in the development of our Canadian gold fields.

Prominent among the suggestions discussed was that of quartz-milling, or extracting gold from the numerous deposits of low-grade ore which were known to exist in that region. Of some of these I gave the location and extent; at the same time, mentioning that many of them had already been located, giving the name of the locator, and what appeared to me to be the best way of securing control of these locations, or at least an interest in them. I further intimated in what parts of the country it was likely similar lodes would be found, and marked on the map as nearly as I could the sites of those which had already been located and recorded, as well as the regions where I felt confident others would be discovered. This subject was very much discussed, and the cheapest and most working appliances adapted to the working of the country were developed to what seemed to us to be a workable perfection.

I need not enlarge on the conditions that appeared to me to require a revolution in quartz-mining machinery—that is, the extreme cold and scarcity of water; for, time and again, in my lectures concerning that region, as well as in newspaper interviews, and the "Yukon Official Guide," I have laid stress on these points.

With Mr. Roche, and Mr. Malloy, too, I discussed often and fully the difficulties attending placer mining prospecting. These I have so frequently spoken of, I need simply to refer to them here. I proposed to this company improved appliances for placer mining prospecting—which were fully discussed, criticised and accepted—which may be described as an adaptation of the diamond drill.

In connection with this idea Mr. Roche and myself visited a drill factory in London and gave the manufacturer the ideas we had developed in our various discussions. He entered into the project with some zeal, and Mr. Roche there and then ordered several of the machines.

These machines, in my opinion, will revolutionize placer mining in this country, but, as they are the property of Mr. Roche, I do not care to describe them in detail. Nevertheless, I feel sure that that gentleman would not object to my giving the ideas the widest publicity, nor would he hesitate to give me all due credit for my share in the development of the machine.

Mark, Mr. Speaker, these parties are getting instructions and advice and information of an official of this Government that would enable them to take out patents and make profits out of other people:

Places where good placer diggings were likely to be found were pointed out and marked by me on a map.

Assistance that is not very usual, I imagine, to be given by officials of the Government to parties except when called upon.

At that time I had every hope that this company would begin operations early in the past year, and assured them of my active sympathy and assistance in as far as was compatible with whatever official standing I might have in the country.

The development of coal I particularly urged upon these gentlemen, realizing it to be absolutely necessary that something be done in that direction as speedily as possible. This, as I have frequently stated, was because of the comparatively slender timber resources of the Yukon valley, and my expectation that so many steamers would be plying in the river soon, that it was the only fuel, as it would be only a few seasons until we would be compelled to import lumber into the Yukon.

Particular stress was laid on this industry in the Yukon, with the result that Mr. Roche made application to the Minister of the Interior for a coal claim in a locality where I had reason to believe it would be found. I told him in general terms where the coal was found, and in doing this I was giving away no secret, for in my lectures and newspaper interviews, the "Klondike Official Guide," and reports to the Government, I have pointed out quite as distinctly (and was pleased to be able to do so), the abundance of coal that lay in close proximity to where our richest deposits of gold are.

The reason that I gave this information to these gentlemen was because I believed then that they were embarking on an enterprise that would add greatly to the advancement and rapid development of our country.

As regards the exclusiveness of this information, I would say that I gave the same information generally in every lecture which I delivered in both Canada and the old country; and if there be any exclusiveness in it at all it was confined to such points as these gentlemen intended to made——

"Made" the word is; it is intended "to make," I suppose.

——use of on the lines which I had myself laid down, and because no others had proposed to embark in an enterprise of this character.

I think I can claim truthfully that during my stay in the old country I was interviewed by thousands interested in mining in the Yukon—by people who were anxious to know the true value of property to which they had already a title, or which was offered to them for sale, or referring to assets of a company in which they held stock, or in which they proposed to purchase stock.

These gentlemen alone, of all who consulted me at that time, had no interests in the Yukon country, and were anxious to know the best fields for operations. Hence the reason for their acquiring this information and my desire to assist them.

Mr. Roche at that time offered me a much more lucrative position, as a member of his company, than that I now occupy as Commissioner of the Yukon territory.

That is a very important statement, Mr. Speaker, because it shows that the information given to certain capitalists who professed to go into mining in the Yukon district, was of such a valuable character that they offered the gentleman who gave them that information a higher salary than he now receives as Commissioner of the Dominion. I think that is a point well worthy of the attention and accentuation of hon. gentlemen opposite.

This I declined to accept, giving him as my reason that I had received similar and better offers from other parties, and had pledged myself that if I did not remain in the Government service I would accept one of such offers; and that I believed that I could do better service to my country by remaining in the Government employ than accepting a position, however remunerative, with any company, as in the latter case my labours would be confined to a smaller field, and in the former a very wide one; and my ambition was to assist to the fullest extent of my powers in the development of that rich region, the Yukon and the Dominion of Canada generally.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say "hear, hear," also. I was in London when this occurred, and I am in a position to say, in the presence of this House, that that company could not have been floated except for the statement that they had secured the able assistance and co-operation of Mr. Ogilvie, and his influence with the Government.

Mr. Roche then asked me if I would be able to undertake, while in the Government service, the supervision of their operations, for which I would, if I wished, receive a salary. This I stated at once would be impossible, and then and there made it clear that while I was willing to aid them in every way compatible with any public duties I might assume, it would simply be as a public official warmly interested in the development of the country, and that I could not and would not accept remuneration for any advice or assistance rendered them or any other company or individual who might apply to me for such information.

I was then asked to formulate a scheme or plan of operations for them, which I did on the assumption that the work would be begun forthwith, and this scheme appears as a letter accompanying the prospectus of the company, addressed —although it then had no name or existence— to the founders of the "British Canadian Gold Fields of the Klondike, Limited."

Does the hon. gentleman say "hear, hear," to that? Does he say that capitalists competing in gold mining operations in the Klondike are entitled to a letter from a gentleman who had held such a high position, and who declined to go into it because he was going back into the service of Canada? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he thinks that is a perfectly legitimate operation? Why, it is as bad as some of the transactions that have taken place in connection with loan companies in Canada.

This letter I kept no copy of, but believe it a true copy, and that it contains essentially what I wrote at that time, except two or three geographical errors, which arose through ignorance in the proofreader, but do not affect the general nature of the facts therein set forth. Mr. Roche further asked me to what extent I would allow my name to be used in the prospectus. I suggested that he should draw up one on those general lines and I would amend it. This was done, and the prospectus was amended by me, still under the impression that operations would be begun during the season of 1898.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I do not see what that has to do with it. It does not vitally affect the question of a prospectus being brought out under the authority of a high official of this Government, who pledges his assistance in that capacity and his influence with the Government of the country.

This document was initialled by me, and, as I kept no copy of it I am not in a position to contradict any part of it as not having been approved by me at that time, and believe it to be correct.

Up to date I have had several letters from Mr. Roche, informing me that the company had been organized, but that sickness had prevented him from visiting the Yukon territory. In a letter which he wrote to me from Vancouver in October, 1898, he informed me that he had arrived there with several of the prospecting drills referred to, but was not in sufficiently good health to enter the country himself, and that he would endeavour to forward one of the drills to me to be tested.

I think Mr. Roche was bound, in common justice, as he got this patent from the brains of Mr. Ogilvie, to give Mr. Ogilvie, as I trust he did, a very handsome percentage of the value of the patent whatever it might be.

I regret exceedingly that he did not succeed in accomplishing this, since, if it had reached me, I would (with the aid of four men, all that are required to work it) have made a thorough examination of its merits, and, I believe, have revealed some interesting features in connection with the auriferous deposits here as well as the bed-rock also.

Since that date Mr. Roche has written again, informing me that they had become possessed of a charter to construct a telegraph line from Skagway to Dawson, and again asked for my advice as to the best method of construction. This I was glad to give, and trust that the ideas transmitted to him will assist him in successfully completing that important undertaking at a very early date.

I wonder if he had seen the fact announced that the Government, having brought out and assisted in the organization of a telegraph company, and a large number of capitalists having put their money into that undertaking in good faith on the assurance of fair-play, woke up one fine morning and found that the Government had swept them all aside and declared that they were going to do the work themselves.

I may say that a telegraph to the Yukon was one of the features discussed in London by us, and it was then determined to take it up.

I may say here, parenthetically, that while in London I was equally interested in a scheme which originated in the city of Montreal for the cheap thawing of the eternally frozen auriferous gravels in the Yukon country, and took quite as active an interest in furthering that as I did any of the methods of operation suggested in connection with Mr. Roche's company, if not more. To the gentlemen who represented that interest in London I also promised every assistance in my power compatible with my official position, and I only regret that the scheme is at present in abeyance. I referred to this scheme also in all my lectures and public utterances, and in that way have endeavoured to interest the

public in it. The proposition is an electrical one, and I believe would, applied on an extensive scale, completely revolutionize the working of the lower grade of gravel of this country. In this case also, I advised the promoters how to make application for, and where to seek for a location best suited for the beginning of their work, going so far as to write out for them necessary description.

I was also much interested in dredging, and discussed at length with gentlemen from both Canada and the United States, the applicability of known dredges to the conditions existing in the Yukon region.

I attended meetings of capitalists with these gentlemen, addressed the meetings at length on the conditions here existing, and what we considered the prospects for the dredging industry, discussing also what we thought to be the most desirable appliances for that purpose. Again, to these gentlemen, also, I promised every aid in the way of advice compatible with any official position which I might afterwards assume in the Yukon. Since my advent here I am pleased to have been able to furnish them information which I hope will prove useful and encourage operations in that field.

For all this advice and assistance to be given I have been offered nothing, accepted nothing, and would not accept it if it were offered. I have no interest other than that of a Canadian, anxious for the good of the country, in any company, investment or business concern of any kind directly or indirectly, nor do I expect to have any. Neither will I allow any one to hold such interest for me while in the service of the Government.

Permit me again to say emphatically that I have no interest in any part or parcel of the Yukon territory other than an ardent desire to see it developed on lines adequate with its great merits, and thus to enrich and increase the value of the land of my birth.

The one small interest I had in the Yukon before assuming my present position, acquired in an open and legitimate way, I have, since my arriving here, almost given away in order that I might be perfectly free and untrammelled in my official position as long as it is entrusted to me.

Before closing, I might say that I regret that the British Canadian Gold Fields Company, Limited, did not succeed in beginning operations in the Yukon this year, as I would have been delighted to assist them on the lines outlined in our discussions in London, knowing that in doing so I would be very materially advancing the development of the wealth of this region.

This information was exclusive in so far as the methods and appliances proposed differed from those now in vogue. As to imparting special information to them, I may say that the same information had been pretty generally given in my lectures and other public utterances.

I have since my arrival at Dawson, discussed with scientific miners here vast projects on new lines, and have been glad to assist them in every way in my power, always being determined that while I remain Commissioner of the Yukon territory, or in any other official capacity, my salary and allowances will be my sole and only source of revenue.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) WM. OGILVIE,

Commissioner.

I regret that the unusual course pursued by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) should have imposed upon me the imperative duty of assisting him to answer this question that has been asked, and the only comment that I will make upon this matter is, that while there can be no possible objection to Mr. Ogilvie or any other gentleman, holding a similar position, giving any general information, any general advice, or any general assistance to the public, I think it would be found an extremely inconvenient procedure, however honest—and I will not challenge it for a single moment—Mr. Ogilvie may be, to allow the prospectus of a particular body of capitalists to be brought out embodying a letter from Mr. Ogilvie pledging them every assistance and every support he can give them himself professionally and as an officer of the Government. That will be found to be a very inconvenient matter, and will only raise the protests of competitors, because there are many millions of British capital at this moment invested in kindred enterprises connected with the development of the Yukon, and it will expose Mr. Ogilvie, as commissioner, or any other gentleman occupying that position, to the very invidious statement that all capitalists do not enjoy the same advantages as this company, brought out professedly under his auspices and, possibly, upon information which he furnished to them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in regard to the matter to which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has spoken of, at some length, while reading Mr. Ogilvie's letter, that Mr. Ogilvie's letter, so far as he is concerned, being before the House, speaks for itself. So far as the Government is concerned, I desire to say that it was first brought to my knowledge by telegraph—some time, I think, after Mr. Ogilvie left for the Yukon district, last summer, that the prospectus of this company, referred to, had been published in some one of the London papers. I immediately caused instructions to be sent to the High Commissioner's office, which resulted in Mr. Colmer, the chief clerk in the High Commissioner's office in London, writing a letter to the London press—I am not sure at this moment to which paper it was addressed—I think it was the London "Times"—stating that it was contrary to the desire of the Government that any officer of the Government, engaged in the administration of the Yukon, should have any special relations with any particular company. This was somewhat resented by the company, but the position was maintained by the department. When the papers came from the High Commissioner's office, showing exactly what had happened, they were sent to Mr. Ogilvie, he was asked for an explanation, and this letter is his reply. Lately the matter has again been before me upon correspondence from the company. This company claims, according to my recollection—I will bring the papers down and lay them on the

Table of the House as soon as possible—this company claims that it was important to them that they should have the special advice and assistance of Mr. Ogilvie, and upon that I ruled that it was altogether incompatible with Mr. Ogilvie's position that he should have any special relations with any individual or company. I desire that the House should be aware of the position the Government has taken in connection with this matter. I have necessarily referred to the correspondence in connection with it, and that correspondence I will lay on the Table of the House as soon as it can be prepared, perhaps to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the correspondence will include a copy of the letter embodied in the prospectus.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will have the whole correspondence prepared as soon as possible. It will be laid on the Table of the House to-morrow or as soon as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. A good deal of it bears on the point of that letter, and, as my hon. friend says, I think the trouble lies in his having anything to do with the company when it was floated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My attention was called to this matter by an article in the "Mining and Engineering Journal," a very high class English publication, animadverting upon the extraordinary course that had been taken by Mr. Ogilvie. That article was written as soon as this prospectus appeared, and listening to the explanation of Mr. Ogilvie, which I doubt not is a frank statement, it appears that where he has undoubtedly erred, and merited much of the censure of this journal, is in giving such special information of a character so as to warrant that company in making the statement which forms part of the 4th clause of the question which I put to the Minister (Mr. Sifton):

"That to his personal knowledge there is at least £20,000,000 worth of gold in sight," and that he wrote to the founders of the company that he had furnished them with a private map on which he had marked places not yet taken up, where he knew gold to exist, and advised "that claims upon them be staked for the company as soon as possible," while he had also privately indicated the location of other unclaimed mineral deposits.

That seems to be confirmed in every particular, word for word, by Mr. Ogilvie's statement, where he goes on to say: That he had supplied such general information as he gave to those parties, by means of lectures to the public, but he fails to say what his practice was in dealing with other parties privately, and undertaking the very dangerous responsibility of marking off maps, as he explains in his letter he did, or giving private information of a special character. He himself seems to draw a distinction in that letter between general information such as was contained in his public statements, and special information which was contained in this private interview, and confined, so far as he explained, to one single company. Therefore, in my opinion, the comment of the "Engineering and Mining Journal" was warranted, and the Minister (Mr. Sifton) himself from his statement, seems to share the views of that paper, and to deprecate such a practice on the part of any officer of this Government having special and valuable information; such information as he should impart to the world at once, either by means of lectures which the department approves, or by means of official reports brought down under the authority of the department.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Lest an attempt should be made to make an improper use of this incident, it is well we should understand the position with regard to asking and answering questions. At the commencement of this Parliament, and for the convenience of those who felt disposed to put questions, Mr. Speaker made a rule, that the questions should be numbered and put by the hon. member from his seat, and since then the question has been called by number and not read out. If you turn to page 2900 of "Hansard" you will find, page after page, of long questions put by the member, who simply says: I beg to put the question standing in my name: and although the question is not read it is copied into "Hansard."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And so it ought.

Mr. McMULLEN. Very well. If a member can put a question and have it printed in "Hansard" without being read, I would like to know why the answer cannot be put in "Hansard" without being read?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The question is printed on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the rule applies one way it certainly should apply the other. The hon. gentlemen opposite brought this upon themselves through their own fault. If no technical objection had been raised by them, the answer given by the Minister would have got into "Hansard."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) was put to the trouble of reading the entire answer, and we should have a distinct understanding now as to what the rule should be in future.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot allow this incident to pass without protesting against the abuse

of the privileges of this House, which is evidenced by the motion now in your hands, Mr. Speaker. There was not the shadow of a reason for moving the adjournment of the House on this occasion, and if we have learned anything to-day, for my part I have learned, that it is no use to extend courtesy to hon. gentlemen on the other side. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) was not bound to bring down any papers to-day. He was asked simply to give an answer, and it would have been within his privilege if he had given simply an extract from the statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But he did not.

The PRIME MINISTER. Instead of doing this, the Minister gave the very best answer possible, for he laid on the Table of the House the papers which constituted a full answer. This proceeding of the Minister was intended to give the most valuable and available information in his power, and instead of it being received with courtesy by gentlemen opposite, it was received as if the Minister had something to conceal. What had he to conceal? The personality of Mr. Ogilvie is not in question to-day, and I think all that was said by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) in the way of comment on Mr. Ogilvie was quite out of place. The conduct of Mr. Ogilvie may be discussed at a future time, if hon. gentlemen opposite think there is any occasion for it; but at present we were simply discussing a question of parliamentary procedure, and my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) went out of his way to abuse my hon. friend the Minister (Mr. Sifton), and went out of his way to place the Opposition in the humiliating position they occupy in regard to this matter. We shall know henceforth, that it will be better, in our relations with gentlemen opposite, to keep strictly within the rules.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The right hon. the Premier is taking a high and mighty course, but it is only on a par with what the rest of the Ministers are doing. They think when a question is asked in this House that they can dismiss it in a flippant tone, or give no answer, or give an evasive answer if they desire. But, Mr. Speaker, the country is watching these gentlemen opposite. We are the mouthpieces of the people of Canada, and we are asking these questions because the people cannot come here and catechise the Government. And, Sir, when the Prime Minister gets up and says that in future he will do as he pleases, we challenge him. We have duties to perform here——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And rights.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and rights; and we shall discharge our duties and exercise our rights, and no threat will deter us, even though it comes from the Prime Minister. The question asked was:

> Has the Government any information as to the authority of the company making such reference to Mr. Ogilvie, or has it any explanation to give?

Does the Government think that in refusing to answer that question, and throwing the papers upon the Table, that they are doing a compliment to us? Do they think it is right to put the papers on in that way in giving an answer, when that answer would not appear in "Hansard"? If it did appear in "Hansard" it would satisfy the members on this side of the House, but it would not appear in "Hansard."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would not appear in "Hansard," nor anywhere else.

Mr. WALLACE. It would not appear in "Hansard," nor anywhere else. All we asked was that the answer should be put in such a way as it would appear on the pages of "Hansard." But what does the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) say, preceding the statement of the Prime Minister: If you do not like my throwing it on the Table of the House, then you can ask for a return. Do not we know from the experience of the past three years, that asking for returns in this House has become a complete farce. We are confronted to-day with three months of the session, and yet many of the papers that were asked for last year —not that were asked for this session—have never yet been laid on the Table of this House I should not say these returns were asked for, but I should say that Parliament ordered they should be brought down, and yet this Government has not the slightest respect for the commands of Parliament. They go along at their sweet will, and the Prime Minister tells us that they will do more of that in the future. When an Order of this House is passed, when Parliament commands its servants, the Ministers—for that is the true relations the Ministers bear to Parliament, although these gentlemen opposite do not realize it—when Parliament commands that certain papers be produced, the Ministers have no right to quibble or delay, but should at once produce these papers. Documents ordered by the House last year are not down yet, and some of them have been brought down piecemeal, so that we do not know whence they come or where they go.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the question of bringing papers under an Order for a return does not arise on this motion.

Mr. WALLACE. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is a very pertinent question. I am replying to the statement made by the First Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question which, I understand, is being discussed now, is anything which arises out of this question No. 20 on the paper, and the action of the Gov-

ernment in the way they chose to deal with it.

Mr. WALLACE. And the statement of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement of the Prime Minister, that the Government would use their discretion hereafter, was, I understand, in relation to questions, and not in relation to Orders for returns. The question, whether a return has been brought down, is an entirely different question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will you allow me to say, Mr. Speaker, that what I understood the Prime Minister to say was not in regard to the question, but in regard to courtesy.

The PRIME MINISTER. And I think it was quite in order, and quite appropriate, too.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question of courtesy, I fancy, in this debate must have reference to the matter before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Speaking to the point of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have decided the point of order, and it cannot be discussed now.

Mr. WALLACE. But I suppose the Speaker would desire to receive further information on the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The Speaker cannot allow perpetual discussion on a point of order after his decision has been given on that point.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask, whether a decision of the Speaker on an important point will be given before it is discussed ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was a discussion on the point, and I gave my decision.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The discussion had not ended.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion cannot go on for ever. I gave my decision——

Mr. WALLACE. Without discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I gave my decision, after a certain amount of discussion had taken place on the point, and nobody had wished to discuss it further. I have given my decision, and, rightly or wrongly, I adhere to that decision.

Mr. COCHRANE. Amen.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I was going to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), when you got up and stated, that you thought I should confine my remarks to a certain direction. I am now going to refer to the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington, unless you declare that statement to be out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member understands perfectly well that I could not do that, and I do not.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Wellington said it opened up the whole question as to what should be put in "Hansard," and as to what should not be put in "Hansard".

The PRIME MINISTER. On questions.

Mr. SPEAKER. On questions.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and what information could be given. I said the information the Minister placed on the Table had been put in the way the hon. member for North Wellington said it should be, that is, that the question itself not being read in the House, if the answer to that question was not read in the House, but placed on the Table, with the understanding that it should be printed in "Hansard," that would be completely satisfactory to the members on this side of the House, and would give the information to the public which it was desirable the public should have. But I can only repeat further, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a matter of courtesy—it is not a matter that these gentlemen on the ministerial benches can either give or withhold information. If they withhold the information that is asked for in questions that are relevant, on matters of public importance, then they have to take the responsibility of refusing to answer those questions. Then, Sir, we can also find other means, legitimate and proper means, of getting the information which has been denied by the Ministers ; and they will find that they have made a great mistake in withholding that information which Parliament is entitled to receive. I was going on further, when you called my attention to the fact that I should not wander from a particular question. So far as I understand the motion made by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), it was, that the House adjourn. If you rule that, on a motion for the House to adjourn, a member must discuss only one question, then, of course, I shall not refer to matters with regard to returns. Is that your ruling, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member wishes my ruling, I may say, that I have stated to the House several times my view of the motion to adjourn. There are three kinds of motion to adjourn the House : I mean to say, that they have three different effects. One is a motion to adjourn the House made while a debate is going on. That is in order to give a member who has already spoken in that debate, or any other member, an opportunity to speak again on the subject under discussion. Another kind of motion to adjourn the House is the motion that is made by the Government to close the sitting of the House. That is really not a debatable motion. The other kind of motion is such a one as has just been made by

the hon. member for York, N.B., that is, a substantive motion to adjourn the House in the interval of the proceedings, which motion may be moved by an hon. member in order to bring up a particular important or unimportant public question.

Mr. WALLACE. But he does not mention the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. In his speech he mentions what it is; and, while everybody may participate in the discussion, speaking once, and the mover speaking twice, as it is a substantive motion, the discussion must be confined to the purpose for which the motion was brought up. In that respect it differs entirely from a discussion which may take place on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, when each member of the House may bring up a different public question. For that reason, I hold that the subject of discussion under the present motion to adjourn the House must be confined to the point involved in that motion—that is, to the point as to how questions are to be answered, not as to how returns are to be brought down.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), in making his motion to adjourn the House, did not give a single reason why he wanted the House to adjourn; so that your ruling, as last stated, does not apply.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has questioned the accuracy of my statement. As I understand it, the hon. member for York, N.B., said: "We shall find a way of discussing this question now," and got up and moved the adjournment of the House; and then the hon. leader of the Opposition proceeded upon this line. The hon. member will, therefore, please confine himself to the question under discussion.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had said all I desire to say on the question of the remarks made by the right hon. First Minister, and I shall probably have occasion to make some further remarks on the production of those papers which you have decided it is not in order to discuss on the motion now before the Chair.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in regard to the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington. I understand that some years ago you yourself, Mr. Speaker, laid it down, that it would be judicious for the member in whose name a question stood, to refer to the number of the question, and ask an answer to the question standing in his name—that that would be equivalent to his reading the question. That was done, I understand, for the purpose of saving time. Notwithstanding the rule we have always adhered to in this House, that anything not read in the House should go on "Hansard," we decided that questions, though not read, should go on, for the purpose of making "Hansard" intelligible. That was my understanding why this departure from the rule was adopted in the case of questions. Therefore, I do not think the contention of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) holds good.

With regard to the statement of the right hon. the First Minister that because the Minister of the Interior proposed to answer the question in the way he did, we were assuming that he had something to keep back, that does not follow at all. All we desire is to have the full answer in "Hansard," and if this document be not read, but simply laid on the Table, the complete answer will not appear in "Hansard." There would be, therefore, no record of it which we could turn up at any time when desired. That was the only object we had in view. We desire to have both the answer and the reply in full in "Hansard," where they can be easily referred to, and it was for that purpose we moved the adjournment of the House.

It is very important that, as far as possible, we should have courteous replies to questions put in this House. I do not wish to be understood as implying that replies are not courteous, but I scarcely think that the statement of the right hon. First Minister was in strict consonance with his usual courtesy, when he said that if we were not inclined to accept the answers as given, he would not be disposed to observe the course usually followed by the Government in such matters. I think he must have made this outbreak in a moment of weakness possibly, or of temper, and I hardly think that on sober second thought he would be disposed to carry out his threat. The rule reads as follows:—

> Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs, and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such members may be concerned; but, in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same, and in answering any such question, a member is not to debate the matter to which the same refers.

I respectfully submit that the rule laid down giving the right to put a question, carries with it the implication that at least a fair reply should be given. It does not seem to me that, under the rule, it is optional, as a matter of right, to a Minister whether he shall answer or not a question. If the question is a proper one, and that is to be decided by the Speaker, the member putting it is entitled to a reasonable reply from any Minister of the Crown or any other member to whom the question is put. The rule carries the implication just as much as does the rule of law that when a statute pro-

vides that a thing shall be done on a certain day, it carries the implication that the thing may not be done on any other day. When this question was put, it was asked for the purpose of getting information, and I assume that the question was a reasonable and proper one, because it was not ruled out of order. The Minister, therefore, ought to give the information. I am not imputing any blame to him for the way in which he desired to reply, but what I do complain of is that he refused, when requested by us, to give his reply in the usual manner, so that it might appear in full on "Hansard." The essence of the rule is that when a question is put and replied to, the full reply should be given to the House and put on record, and therefore there can be no ground for complaint when we desire to have as complete an answer as possible.

That being the case, although it is a very awkward and roundabout way to get the information on "Hansard," I do not see any other way in which that could be accomplished except the one taken of moving the adjournment of the House. If there were any other way, the one we took might be open to objection; but in my opinion, we took the only way open to us of getting the answer on "Hansard," and the desirability of having the answer on "Hansard," so that we might have the question and answer on record together, is our justification for the course we have taken.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). If I understood the right hon. First Minister rightly, he spoke, in his opening remarks, of the course taken by this side as being somewhat of an abuse of the privileges of Parliament or the ordinary procedure of Parliament. Later on I understood you, Mr. Speaker, to have decided that the member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), in moving to adjourn the House, took the means recognized as strictly parliamentary and correct. If that be the case, I think the First Minister should certainly qualify the remarks he made, or withdraw them. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York acted strictly within parliamentary usage in the motion he made, and I am sure there was no intention on the part of any hon. member on this side to abuse the privileges or procedure of Parliament. It would seem also, from the statement just made by so experienced a member as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that no other method was open to those who wished to have that particular answer in such form as would entitle it to receive a place in the pages of "Hansard," so that I think the strictures of the right hon. Minister were somewhat out of place.

THE YUKON INVESTIGATION.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Mr. SPROULE.

1. Has any official or unofficial or other communication been received by the Government from Mr. Ogilvie respecting the commission of inquiry?
2. If so, what is its purport?
3. Will the hon. the Minister of the Interior lay upon the Table of the House that portion of the private letter from Mr. Ogilvie referring to the subject to which the Minister alluded on 15th May, 1899, in the House of Commons?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. The report has been received. 3. Inasmuch as the remarks in reference to the subject are intermingled with references of an unofficial and private character, it is not considered proper to lay a copy of them upon the Table of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has not replied to the second part of the question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have said that a report has been received which indicates that it is a report from Mr. Ogilvie. The hon. gentleman does not expect me to read the report.

WM. BEAUMONT, OF COWICHAN.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. Was William Beaumont, Esq., of Cowichan district, British Columbia, the postmaster at Maple Bay at the time British Columbia entered confederation?
2. Was any salary due him as such postmaster by the Colony of British Columbia when it entered confederation?
3. Did the Dominion assume the liability?
4. Has Mr. Beaumont filed a claim with the Postmaster General for such salary?
5. If so, has the claim been investigated, and with what result?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Wm. Beaumont was not postmaster when British Columbia entered confederation, there being no regular post office at Maple Bay at that date. There was, therefore, no salary due to him at the date in question. No liability existed in this case. Mr. Beaumont has on different occasions applied to be paid for services rendered by him prior to confederation for voluntary distribution of mail matter to settlers of Maple Bay from his store there before the establishment of the regular post office. The matter has been investigated many times within the last twenty years, and the claim disallowed on the ground that there was no liability on the part of the Dominion Government.

DREDGING THE RIVER SYDENHAM.

Mr. CLANCY asked:

How much has been spent in dredging the River Sydenham since the year 1896?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The Minister of Public Works has sent me the answer to this question. The expenditure for dredging the River Sydenham from 1896 to date is $1,649.25.

SALARIES, BRITISH COLUMBIA LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. McINNES asked:

Is the Minister of Marine considering a readjustment of the salaries paid in the lighthouse service in British Columbia?

If so, when is it expected the changes will take effect?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). A report is being prepared by the Deputy Minister of the duties and services performed by the lighthouse keepers in British Columbia, together with the salaries paid to each of them. Until the report is received and considered it is impossible to say whether there will be any changes.

OYSTER BEDS, OYSTER BAY, B.C.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. Is the Government aware that the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company claims the oyster beds at Oyster Bay under and by virtue of letters patent from the Dominion, and that the said company has interfered with and damaged oyster beds cultivated by lessees of the Dominion?

2. Have the respective rights of the said company and of the lessees of the oyster beds been investigated?

3. If so, what are their respective rights in the oyster beds?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2 and 3. The claims referred to in the question were submitted by the Department of Marine to the Department of Justice, with a request for their opinion as to their validity. A written opinion has been received, a copy of which I will be glad to give to the hon. gentleman if he so desires, or if he prefers to move for the correspondence, it will be promptly brought down.

Mr. PRIOR. What is the purport of it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not wish to state the purport of a legal opinion which is qualified a good deal throughout. The hon. gentleman knows how difficult it would be to summarize such a document. I prefer that the opinion should be moved for and brought down.

GEORGE PEPIN, EMPLOYEE CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Has George Pepin, employed on the Chambly Canal, been accused of keeping a general store, contrary to the rules and regulations of the Department of Railways and Canals?

2. Is the Government aware that during the inquiry held in regard to the management of said canal, George Pepin admitted under oath that he did own and manage a general store?

3. What steps do the Government intend taking in this matter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. George Pepin, employed on the Chambly Canal, has been accused of keeping a general store, contrary to the rules and regulations of the department. 2. The Government is aware that Mr. Pepin, during the inquiry held in regard to the management of the said canal, admitted under oath that he did own and manage a general store. 3. The Government have informed him that he must choose between his office on the canal staff and the keeping of a general store; that is to say, if he elects to keep his store, he must resign his position on the canal staff, or vice versa.

TIDAL LANDS BELOW STEVESTON, B.C.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Under whose control (Federal Government or Local) are the 37·29 acres of foreshore and tidal lands, situated west of and immediately adjoining section 9, range 7 west, block 3 north, N.W.D., about two miles below Steveston, British Columbia?

2. Was an application made to the Department of the Interior, or to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in 1892, for a lease of these lands, and if so, to which department was the application made?

3. Was application to either department, as aforesaid, made in 1896, and if so, to which and by whom?

4. Were other applications subsequently made, and if so, by whom?

5. If applications were made in any of the above years to either of said departments, what was the reply?

6. If any communication to any one has been made by either of the above departments on this subject, what is the purport of the last?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The department of the Interior have furnished me with the information so far as it is able to give it. I am not able to answer the question to-day. It is a rather complicated matter, and I wish to find out how far the foreshore to which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) refers is part of the harbour.

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR AND MR. FAWCETT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Has the hon. the Minister of the Interior consulted Mr. Fawcett, as promised on 19th April last ("Hansard," page 1879)? If so, what is the result?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Yes. Mr. Fawcett states that Mr. Wade did not advise him respecting the recording of mining claims or duties of his office.

LETTERS REFERRED TO BY THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Does the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries intend to lay upon the Table of the House

of Commons the "large number of letters" referred to by him in debate on 14th April, 1899 ("Hansard," page 1642) ?

2. If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The letters referred to by me in the debate of 14th April last were personal and private. Not being public documents, it is not my intention to lay them on the Table of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why did you refer to them, then ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had a right to refer to them.

MR. J. W. WILLISON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Is J. W. Willison, Crown timber agent in Yukon district, mentioned on page H—26, Public Accounts, a brother of the J. S. Willison, Esq., editor of the Toronto "Globe" newspaper ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). No.

MR. PHILIP WALSH.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What relation, if any, to Major Walsh, is Phil. Walsh, mentioned in Public Accounts, H—26, as timber agent in Yukon territory, at $100 a month ?

2. Is he still in the employ of the Government? If not, when did he leave the Government service ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Philip Walsh is a brother of Major Walsh. 2. No. He left the Government service on the 31st August, 1898.

EXTENSION OF FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to extend the franking privilege to members of the local legislatures of Canada on legislative reports during the recess of the respective legislatures ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The Postmaster General has no power to extend the franking privilege. That is entirely regulated by the Post Office Act.

MAILS FROM RAILWAY STATION TO LANG POST OFFICE.

Mr. LANG (by Mr. Somerville) asked :

1. Have the Government called for tenders for carrying the mails from the railway station to Lang post office ?
2. If so, how many tenders were received ?
3. What was the amount of each tender ?
4. To whom was the contract awarded ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes, the Government has called for tenders for carrying the mails from the railway station to Lang post office. 2. Three. 3. Andrew Colville, $63 per annum ; Adam Johnston, $64 per annum ; Robert Speirs, $69 per annum. 4. Andrew Colville.

MAILS FROM HAVELOCK TO OAK LAKE POST OFFICE.

Mr. LANG (by Mr. Somerville) asked :

1. Have the Government asked for tenders for carrying the mails from Havelock to Oak Lake post office ?
2. If so, who were the tenderers ?
3. What was the amount of each tender ?
4. To whom was the contract awarded ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes, the Government have asked for tenders for carrying the mails from Havelock to Oak Lake Post Office. 2. Samuel Hubble and Robert McCutcheon. 3. Samuel Hubble, $60 per annum, and Robert McCutcheon, $65 per annum. 4. Samuel Hubble.

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Has any promise been given, directly or indirectly, by any member of the Government of Canada to the Canada Eastern Railway Company, or to any person connected therewith or interested therein, or to any person on the behalf thereof, looking towards the purchase of that railway for the use of the Government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No promise has been made or given by or on behalf of the Government, either directly or indirectly, to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway. In answer to addresses which have been presented to me, both publicly and privately, by Boards of Trade and municipal bodies in New Brunswick, urging the taking over of the Canada Eastern Railway in the interest of the public and of the Government railway, I have stated publicly and privately that while not authorized to speak for the Government or otherwise than for myself individually, I had come to the conclusion that I would personally favour the Government ownership of that railway if the same could be had upon proper terms, and that upon an opportune occasion I would take up the subject with my colleagues and submit the same for their consideration. I have not made any further or other promise or statement than the above to any one connected with or interested in the Canada Eastern Railway.

POSTMASTER OF GALT, ONT.

Mr. BENNETT (by Mr. McCleary) asked :

1. Who is the present postmaster at Galt, Ont.?
2. When was he appointed ?
3. What is his salary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Wm. S. Turnbull is postmaster of Galt, Ont. 2. He was appointed on the 1st of March, 1899. 3. He is allowed the usual percentage, which varies with the revenue of the office.

POST OFFICES, INVERNESS COUNTY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Has the Government changed the location of the post office at Strathlorn, in the county of Inverness? If so, why?

(a) Has A. D. McLean, the former postmaster at Strathlorn, been removed from office? If so, for what reason?

(b) Was the reason for his removal, if any, communicated to Mr. McLean before his removal?

(c) Were there any charges of official wrongdoing made against the said A. D. McLean as postmaster? If so, what were the charges, and by whom made?

(d) Who is appointed postmaster at Strathlorn as successor to A. D. McLean? On whose application was the new appointment made?

(e) Has the Government established a new post office called the "Willow Bank" post office, in the district of Strathlorn, in Inverness County? If so, why?

(f) Who is the postmaster at Willow Bank, and on whose application has he been appointed?

(g) Is the Government aware that the new post office at Willow Bank and the Strathlorn office are within three-quarters of a mile of each other on the same road—the road leading from Mabou to Margaree? What salary attaches to each of these offices? Will each of them be a money order office?

(h) Did the people of Strathlorn, or any of them, by petition or otherwise, ask for the establishment of the Willow Bank post office, or for the removal from office of A. D. McLean, the former postmaster at Strathlorn? If so, who asked?

(i) Is the Government aware that the new post office called Willow Bank, is also within one mile of the Glenville post office on the same road—the road leading from Mabou to Margaree?

(j) Has John N. McLellan, postmaster at Deepdale, in the district of Strathlorn, Inverness County, been recently removed from office? If so, for what reason?

(k) Was the reason for his removal from office, if any, communicated by the Government to Mr. McLellan before his removal?

(l) Were there any charges of official wrongdoing made against the said John N. McLellan as postmaster? If so, what were the charges, and by whom made?

(m) Who is appointed as successor to the said John N. McLellan as postmaster, and on whose application was the new appointment made?

(n) Did the people of Strathlorn, or any of them, by petition or otherwise, ask the Government to remove John N. McLellan from the office of postmaster? If so, who asked?

(o) On whose recommendation did the Government remove from office as postmasters A. D. McLean and John N. McLellan, the postmasters referred to? How long has each of them been a postmaster? Were they honest and efficient postmasters?

(p) Has the Government removed, or is it the intention to remove from office, Walter McDonald, Esq., postmaster of Glendyer, Mabou? If so, for what reason?

(q) Has any reason been communicated by the Government to Mr. McDonald?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes. To obviate the existing overlapping of two mail services over the one route, and to accommodate the neighbouring coal mining village as well as the greater number of the people of Strathlorn. (a) Yes; because the post office was removed. (b) No. (c) No. (d) William D. Lawrence. The Postmaster General assuming full responsibility for his appointment. (e) Yes. To accommodate the public in that locality. (f) Duncan McLean, Esq. The Postmaster General assumed full responsibility for his appointment. (g) The Government is not aware that those offices are within three-quarters of a mile of one another. (h) The people's representative in Parliament asked for the establishment of the office.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What salary attaches to each of the offices in (d)? That is not answered. And will each of them be a money order office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The salary will be whatever is the usual salary under such circumstances.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but I do not know that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It always depends upon the revenue, which is a fluctuating amount. There is a minimum salary of $10 to each post office, and if the revenue of the office in course of time justifies an increase, it will be made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will each of them be a money order office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If there is any public interest to be served by a money order office being established in connection with any of them, such office will be established.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But they are not now established?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think there are any at this moment. (i) The Government is not aware if such is the case. (j) No. (k) No. (l) No. (m) No one. (n) No. (o) Mr. McLean was removed, because of the change of the location of the office, on the recommendation of Mr. McLennan, M.P. for the riding. Mr. McLean was in the service from 1874. (p) Mr. McDonald has not been removed. The department is not aware of there being any intention to remove him.

PERSONS IN QUARANTINE SERVICE.

Mr. MONTAGUE (by Mr. Haggart) asked:

What persons are now engaged in the quarantine service of the Government, and what is the amount of salary in each case?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). G. E. Martineau, M.D., $2,000; F. Montizambert, M.D., $4,000; N. E. MacKay, M.D., $1,000; G. Carleton Jones, $800; Jos. Himmelman, $1 per day; Rev. C. Underwood, $100; Rev. E. Roy, $100; Wm. Sutherland, $300; J. E. March, M.D., $1,400; Thomas McGowan, $300; J. Macdonald, M. D., $400; P. Conroy, M.D., $400; M. Henry, $300; H. W. Mutch, $150; H. Rindress, M. D., $1,200; D. J. McIsaac, $400; A. T. Watt, M.D., $2,500; R. L. Fraser, $200; L. McKechnie, M.D., $400; A. C. Smith, M.D., $1,600; Rev. J. A. Babineau, $200.

YULE BRIDGE, RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Have the arbitrators on the value of the Yule Bridge over the Richelieu River at Chambly made their report to the Government?
2. If the report has been made, what does the Government intend doing about it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The arbitrators in this case made an award amounting to $36,810.82 to be paid to the Yule Estate for this bridge. The Deputy Minister of Justice applied for a reduction of award, as in 1845 the bridge cost about $30,000, contending that bridge was not worth more now than in 1845. Mr. Walter Shanley who gave evidence for Yule Estate, made affidavit that bridge would cost more to construct now than then. Case is in abeyance; it now rests with Yule heirs to apply for judgment when the Minister of Justice will decide whether it is best to appeal the case or pay the judgment.

FRANK GOSSELIN.

Mr. STENSON (by Mr. Flint) asked:

1. Is Frank Gosselin, who was employed as locomotive fireman on the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Rivière du Loup, from 1880 to 1882, when he was promoted to the position of engineer, an employee of that railway now?
2. If not, when did he leave that employment?
3. In what way did he leave? Did he resign, or was he dismissed?
4. If dismissed, for what cause, on whose report, and by whom was his dismissal recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. No, Mr. Frank Gosselin is not now an employee of the Intercolonial Railway. 2. He left the service in August, 1889. 3. He left of his own accord. 4. He was not dismissed.

PUBLIC WORKS AT BELŒIL.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Are the wharf and ice breakers on the Richelieu River, at Belœil, completed?
2. What is the total cost of the same?
3. What was the estimate of the total cost of these works as executed?
4. What was the estimate of the cost of these works by Mr. Coste, chief engineer under the late Government?
5. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the wharf on the lawer or north side of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge, and if so, why?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. Yes. 2. $15,650.13. 13. There is no estimate on record in the department as to the probable cost of the works as executed. 4. There is no record in the department of any estimate having been made by Mr. Coste of the probable cost of the work. 5. The matter is under consideration. I may state that the intention was at first to build a pile structure, and tenders were called for the work. The contract was let to Mr. Beaulieu, of Quebec, before this Government took office. Owing, however, to the nature of the bottom, piles could not be driven and crib-work had to be resorted to. No new tenders were called, and the work was done by day's labour.

VICTORIA HARBOUR, B. C.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Has Mr. Roy, the resident engineer in British Columbia, made any report during the last eighteen months as to the state of Victoria Harbour? If so, what is its purport? Has he reported that the bar at the mouth of the harbour is silting up?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). There is no report in the Department of Public Works from Mr. Roy, as to the state of Victoria Harbour during the last eighteen months.

IMPORTATION OF PLATES AND DIES BY BANK NOTE COMPANIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved for:

Return showing in detail all dies, plates or other parts, wholly or partially engraved, entered or imported by or for the use of the American Bank Note Company, to be used in the making of bank notes, postage stamps, postal notes and inland revenue stamps for the Government, with the valuation and amount of duty charged and collected.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I do not know how far I will be able to obtain the information that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asks for, and I simply desire to mention that before the Order goes.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as it can be obtained.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he would have any objection to adding to this motion, after the words "American Bank Note Company," the words, "and the British American Bank Note Company"?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. The only thing I would like to say is this: I hope

the placing of those words there, which will make the return go back twenty or thirty years, will not have the effect of keeping my information back, because that materially alters the ground to be gone over, in fact, I am not sure but that it will go back over forty-five years. He might bring down my section first, and let the other come in afterwards.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All right.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will take a good while to prepare the information anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. Postmaster General wishes to keep back the information I desire, so that the hon. Minister of Customs will understand that, and bring it down in sections.

Motion agreed to.

GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia) moved :

That it appears from year to year the unsatisfactory state of grain standards has been formally brought before this House and before the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that the following resolutions have been passed unanimously by the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange :—

(1) Resolved that this Exchange request the chairman of the Western Grain Standard Board to ask permission of the Minister of Inland Revenue to call together the western members of this board to discuss the advisability of having inspectors grade on the word and meaning of the Inspector's Act, and that the Standard Board from year to year define such commercial grades as may be found necessary.

(2) Whereas, the evils resulting from the mixing of Manitoba grain at Fort William and other terminal elevators are most injuriously affecting the reputation of Manitoba grain in the European markets ; and whereas, the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange is most desirous of restoring the reputation of Manitoba grain to its former high standing, that this exchange hereby expresses its positive conviction that no mixing of grain should be permitted in terminal elevators, and also that no mixing of grain should be permitted in a cargo shipment unless the inspection certificate issued therefor shall have written across the face a statement defining the various grades entering into its consumption.

(3) And further be it resolved, that this exchange memorialize the Department of Inland Revenue to secure the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary for the carrying into effect and enforcement of the principle above enunciated.

In view of the foregoing resolutions, it is the opinion of this House that immediate action is demanded on the part of the Government to secure for the wheat of the west that premier position in the estimation of the world to which by its unrivalled excellence it is entitled.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I beg, in the first place, to thank the leader of the House for allowing my motion to stand during my enforced absence from the House. In 1874, the General Inspection Act was passed, providing, among other things, for the inspection of wheat, and, under the Revised Statutes of 1886, that Act was re-enacted, and there provision was made also for the inspection of wheat. In 1887 the North-west Territories obtained representation in this House, and shortly after we came down here, a deputation, led by the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, waited on the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan), who was then the Minister of Inland Revenue. The result of that interview was, that legislation was passed in 1889 which provided that a Standard Board should be brought into existence for the purpose of forming standards for the wheat west of Lake Superior ; and the grade fixed by that board was to govern the inspection in all parts of Canada in regard to wheat grown west of Lake Superior. Subsequently to that, representations were made to the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, that, owing to the vast extent of territory on which the wheat was grown, the differences of climate and the differences of conditions, that at times it was exceedingly difficult to bring the wheat within the category of definite standards, and that, in that way, wrong was done to the producers—not only the producers suffered, but the handlers as well—especially was it impressed on us that the producers suffered. As a consequence of the representations that were made at that time to the Minister of Inland Revenue, an Act was passed in 1891, and the 4th subsection of section 3 provided that, if a considerable proportion of the crop of any year had marked characteristics which would exclude it from the given standard—to the prejudice of the producer—from the grade to which it properly belonged, the examiner might establish a special grade, and choose a sample of such a grade to be the sample therefor. In other words, it is provided that he should make a commercial grade. That legislation was passed as far back as 1891. It was hoped that a provision would be made, that, if wheat fell just below the standard to which, at a glance, it might properly belong, that those who had the grading of the wheat, instead of throwing it to the next standard, would make a commercial grade, and thus, probably, get for the farmer a cent less per bushel than the better grade, to which, but for some slight defect, it might have been entitled. However, for some reason that I cannot understand, that does not seem to have been done. Notwithstanding that in 1892, in 55 and 56 Victoria, that clause was re-enacted, emphatically showing that the Parliament of Canada set store by the provision ; as I say, for some reason that I cannot understand, that does not seem to have been acted upon, and for some time there has been considerable dissatisfaction amongst the producers, dissatisfaction amongst the dealers, dissatisfaction amongst the millers, dissatisfaction all around, with

the system that prevails at present. From the point of view of the producer, from the national point of view, from the point of view of the general wheat trade of Canada, and from the point of view of the English buyer, on all grounds, it is desirable that the Government should turn its attention to this important question. And, now that it has been again and again before this House, and before successive Ministers of Inland Revenue, I trust that the Government will at last find a solution for the very serious grievances and difficulties which exist. I will say this: I look forward with a good deal of hope to its being done, because I am fully aware that there never has been a Minister of Inland Revenue who came to this question with more zeal and more desire to solve all the difficulties in the way that now exist, in the interest of the North-west Territories, than the present Minister of Inland Revenue. How is it that the present state of things affects the producer? Men who are farmers, men who are handlers of grain, men who are millers, testify, that the producer is, by the present system, placed in a very unsatisfactory position. For instance, suppose a producer has a large quantity of grain which just grades off from No. 1, at the present time, according to the testimony of competent persons, instead of having the advantage which he would have if he took his wheat to Minneapolis or Duluth, of being able to sell it by sample, he has to trust to persons who may be interested in dealing with it in a way foreign to the direct interest of the producer, and may have to be content with having his wheat graded No. 2, and taking the price of No. 2 wheat. The statement is made by competent men occupying high positions in Winnipeg, that as much as 5 cents a bushel has been lost to the producer under the present system. But if only 1 or 2 or 3 cents a bushel are lost, that is sufficiently serious. Then, there is another great drawback in the present system. Under it the wheat goes to Fort William, and it may be a considerable time before the man who has shipped it gets his return and knows how his wheat has been graded: and he has no redress whatever; whereas, if we had such a system as we are told exists in Duluth, the producer could send his wheat, say to Winnipeg, and when he found it graded off from the standard to which he thought it rightly belonged, instead of being forced to accept an inferior grading and a lower price than the wheat was worth, he could have his wheat sold by sample, and get every cent of its value. There is another serious aspect. At Fort William and at other points where there are terminal elevators, what do we find done? The wheat of the North-west and the wheat of Manitoba, the finest wheat in the world, is mixed with inferior wheat, and we are assured on good authority that inspectors have actually graded the same wheat higher for the English market than they have graded it for the Ontario market. That is to say, wheat which they would only grade No. 2 for the Ontario millers, they will grade No. 1 for the English market. The result of that is that in England, where the wheat of the North-west, as you know from universal testimony, should stand at the very top of the ladder, is at present at a discount as compared with the same grade from Duluth. What is the reason? Is it because our wheat is inferior? No, but because the mixer has mixed inferior grades with the superior grade for his own purposes, not in the interest of Canada, very much against the interest of the English millers, and of course foreign to the interest of the North-west Territories. Now, I want to give some statistics to illustrate how the producer suffers. In Duluth and Minneapolis they have, what it is very desirable we should have a re-inspection if necessary; and the result in Minneapolis, for the year ended 31st August, 1898, out of 9,005 cars which were re-inspected, in the case of only 4,885 cars the original inspection was sustained, in the case of 3,853 it was raised, and in the case of 294 it was lowered. Again, in Duluth, the number of cars re-inspected was 5,956; the number in which the grade was sustained was 3,422; the number in which the grade was raised was 2,491, and the number in which the grade was lowered was only 43. Now, the motion which I have put on the paper embodies a resolution passed by the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange. After its adoption of that resolution, early in April, the Grain Standard Board came together and passed resolutions, the first of which aims, as one of the members of that board has declared, at practically doing away with the board. All persons interested in this matter, whether inside or outside the board, are unanimous in desiring that there should be, not a varying standard, but permanent standards for certain grades. The following is the first declaration adopted by the Standard Board:

> We believed, says that board, that by the present unsatisfactory system of inspection and handling of the grain of this country, the commercial value and general reputation of our wheat has been injuriously affected both at home and abroad.
>
> Be it resolved, that in the opinion of this board, steps should at once be taken and all legitimate means used to restore and maintain the high standard and character which rightfully belongs to the hard wheat grown in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Then, there is a resolution, as follows:—

> Resolved, that this Standard Board approves of the policy of permanent and uniform grades for extra Manitoba Hard, Nos. 1 and 2 Hard and Nos. 1 and 2 Northern, in respect of which the inspectors should be instructed to inspect according to the wording and meaning of the Act.

I think that I shall consult the interests of the case and the time and convenience of

the House, if I read the resolutions passed by that Board, and then make some comment. The next resolution is as follows :—

Moved by Mr. W. W. B. Underhill, and seconded by Mr. Chas. Castle : Resolved, that this board heartily concurs in the resolution passed by the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange on the 15th of March, 1899, viz., that the evils resulting from the mixing of Manitoba grain at Fort William and other terminal elevators are most injuriously affecting the reputation of Manitoba grain in the European markets. And further be it resolved, that this board hereby expresses its positive conviction that no mixing of wheat should be permitted in a cargo or shipment unless the inspection certificate issued therefor have written across its face a statement defining the various grades entering into its composition, and no mixed cargo shall carry a straight grade certificate.

That is a very strong condemnation of that system of mixing grain to which I have referred. Then comes this resolution :

Resolved, that when the inspectors are called on to inspect grain shipped from what are called mixing elevators, they shall be governed in their inspection of such grain by the general standard of grades enforced at the public warehouses, and no grain will be allowed to pass inspection that is not fully up to the general standard quality of the different grades coming out from the regular bins of the public warehouses, provided that grain may be cleaned only (not mixed) under the supervision of an inspector or his deputy, at any elevator, without coming under the above regulations.

Then comes the final resolution :

That this board is convinced that the time has now arrived when it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the producer and grain interests generally, that all grain grown in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, passing Winnipeg and Fort William or south or east thereof, be inspected at Winnipeg and houses at Fort William, or rather eastern elevators on Winnipeg inspection.

Thus you have four principles that it is desired to see carried out. You have the principle of a permanent standard; the principle that grain shall be taken as nearly pure as possible to Europe ; the principle of final inspection at Winnipeg ; the disposal, wherever necessary, by the purchaser of his wheat by sample.

Subsequently, some time, I think, about the 18th April, a deputation, consisting of members of the Western Standard Board, gentlemen from the Winnipeg Exchange, Winnipeg Board of Trade, from boards of trade throughout Ontario, from the Board of Trade of Montreal, and the Board of Trade, I think, of Fort William—and Mr. King and Mr. Gibbs, from Fort William, were present —waited, accompanied, I think, by all the North-west and Manitoba members, on the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and this very remarkable thing happened, that these gentlemen, representing various interests, representing, as in the case of Mr. Castle, the producers ; as in the case of others, the handlers of grain ; as in the case of others, the millers of Ontario—all coincided pretty well in condemning the present system.

There was some slight difference of opinion as to the solution of the difficulty, but it was so slight that I think we may say there was a general consensus of opinion that it was desirable that henceforth the wheat of the North-west and Manitoba should be inspected under the Act, that a permanent standard should be devised, subject to any slight variations that would necessarily take place, in consequence of mutations in the character of the cereal, from year to year, but that, still, there would be the certainty that would be found by reason of definite provisions in the Act. And there was also—although, of course, men like, Mr. King, whose interests were in Fort William, would not agree to that—a general opinion that the inspection should be made at Winnipeg. I think there was the unanimous, or practically unanimous, opinion that our grain should go into the hands of the English buyer in as pure a state as possible, and as nearly as possible as it leaves the farmers' hands, having regard to the fact that, of course, we postulate that it should be clean. I think that I shall probably consult brevity, if I give a few of the opinions that were uttered by these responsible gentlemen. What is asked, said one, is the adoption of the principle followed at Duluth. It is said that at four or five different points the grain is inspected, one inspector being pitted against another, and, in order to get rid of that, what is proposed ? It is proposed that there should be only the final inspection at Winnipeg. I think it is Mr. Bell, whom I know, and who could speak with authority, said :

If a car, for instance, misses grading, that wheat is worth more than the minimum, but the purchaser cannot get it because it is in Fort William before the result of the inspection is known.

By this system——

That is the system that is now advocated—

——he could go into the market and get every cent that is in his wheat.

And he goes on to make this remarkable statement :

The market reports show that a car has gone marked No. 1 Northern or No. 1 Hard, and just missed the grade, and was sold for much less than the regular grade. The present system is most unsatisfactory from every point, but especially from that of the producer.

Mr. Spink says, and he speaks with a great deal of authority :

Every single year you have been above the wording of the Act, and if the inspectors had been able to grade down, they could have had 5 cents a bushel more for the wheat.

"They"—I suppose, referring to the producer. And what that points to is this—

that practically the standard of the Grain Standard Board has over-ridden the Act of Parliament, and what is now desired is that henceforth the grading be under the Act. Again, one of the parties said:

When the standard admits of low grade, you help the mixer.

Now, Sir, on Saturday the hon. Minister brought in a Bill dealing with this question. I understand that the hon. gentleman did not explain his Bill on Saturday, when he introduced it, so we do not know what it provides. But I hope, and, indeed, I am inclined to believe, that it will be found that the hon. Minister is seeking to solve the difficulties and problems that I have referred to and in the direction I have suggested. The motion standing in my name was originally placed on the paper as long ago as March 21st. I had hoped to move it long since, but an accident has kept me out of the House, and I have been unable to move it, but I am inclined to believe, and I hope, that the Bill that my hon. friend brought in on Saturday will go in the grooves I have ventured to indicate. I beg to move this resolution, seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before that motion passes, I wish to say that I have a memorial from the millers in my section of the country desiring that certain amendments be made in the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue; but as that Bill will shortly be before us, I think it better to reserve what I have to say until that time, so that we might endeavour, as far as possible, to get such amendments made as will meet their wishes in the matter.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL (Kent). I understand that the question that has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is in connection with the subject of the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) on Saturday. I have not had an opportunity to examine the Bill very closely, but I understand that it will remedy many of the grievances complained of. I must say that in my experience there is great need of a Bill of this kind. In the interest of Manitoba and also in the interest of the farmers of Ontario, a very radical change should be made, not only in the manner of inspecting the grain, but also in the system of inspection. First, I think it is a great injury to the farmers of Manitoba that there should be any mixing of grain at all. I think that that should be clearly and distinctly prohibited by the Minister of Inland Revenue. If there is any mixing allowed, it should be only on the distinct understanding that the certificate of the inspector shall clearly indicate that the cargo or car or whatever it may be is composed of mixed grain. But I believe it would be better for all concerned if there were no mixing at all. Moreover, I think that the way we pay our inspectors is a very serious injury not only to the farmers of Ontario, but to the farmers of Manitoba as well. I do not think our inspectors should be allowed a commission or fee of so much a car for inspecting the grain, but that the inspectors should be paid a salary. Give them a reasonable and sufficient salary and let them inspect all the grain that is presented to them. As it is now, I know that it is quite an inducement to the inspectors to pass the grain. We have an inspector at Montreal, an inspector at Kingston, an inspector at Toronto, an inspector at Fort William, and so on. Now, in the year 1897 we had a very poor crop of wheat in Ontario. Owing to the wet weather, it was sprouted and grown and in very bad condition. A great deal of that wheat was exported to the old country, and I know, as a matter of fact, that there was wheat exported from the province of Ontario carrying the inspector's certificate as No. 2 red, that should have been graded No. 4 or rejected. The excuse was that the inspector at one place said: If I do not pass it as No. 2 red, the inspector at another place will, and I will lose my fees and commission on the inspection. They knew that the wheat was going for export, and so many of the inspectors passed it as No. 2 or No. 3 red, knowing at the time that it was not that grade. A case came under my own observation where I bought two or three cars of wheat at Toronto. When the wheat came to me I had it inspected, and I found it was not No. 2 Red; but in calling up the man from whom I purchased it he told me I was mistaken, that he had his certificate that it was No. 2 Red wheat. I said it was impossible, that no man who would look at that wheat would pass it as No. 2, but would make it about No. 4. Afterwards I found he had obtained his certificate from the inspector on the understanding that the wheat was going to be exported, and when he found it was not going for export, the inspector went and took up the certificate and gave him another. Now, I think we should remove inducements from these men to pass grain that is not thoroughly up to the standard; and to that end the Government should take this matter into their own hands and appoint these men by salary, giving them a reasonable and sufficient salary, and compelling them to make returns to the Government of all the wheat they inspect. Who knows to-day what the inspector at Port Arthur is getting? I have heard it estimated that he gets $15,000 to $20,000 a year. I do not know how that is, he does not make any returns to the Government. Why should he not make returns to the Government? Why should he be compelled to levy a tax upon every car of grain that comes from the North-west? He should be

put on a reasonable salary, the inspection fees should be reduced one-half what they are to-day, exclusive of all expenses. Our inspectors at Toronto and Montreal, I think, do not make returns to the Government. We do not know how much they do. I say that this system should be changed entirely, and I hope that in the Bill the Minister is bringing in, he is taking steps to change that system, and to place all our inspectors on a reasonable salary. Let them make monthly or half yearly returns to the Government so that we may know just what they are doing. Then you will have a supervision over them, and see whether they are performing the duties allotted to them. I think the matter is a very important one, and I am glad that it has come before the House. I am sure that it will receive the commendation, not only of the people of the North-west, but of the people of Ontario and all those who are interested in cereals grown in Canada. I think if these two steps are taken, namely, to abolish the mixing of grain altogether, and to place our inspectors upon a salary, compelling them to make returns half yearly to the Government, we will have a very much more satisfactory state of affairs in Canada than we have had in the past.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I think, perhaps, the hon. members who represent the North-west would like to take part in the consideration of this question, but I understand they are reserving themselves till the Bill introduced last Saturday next comes before the House. The Bill has not yet been distributed, and it is very difficult for them to follow exactly its details from any explanations I may give. At all events, I am in a position to say now to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who introduced this motion, that I hope when he has had time to look over the Bill, he will be satisfied with it.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not distributed yet; I could not get it to-day.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope he will be satisfied upon seeing it that we have earnestly attempted to carry out a great many of the principles which he considers indispensable in order to protect the grain-growers of the North-west, and also the purchaser, the shipper and the miller, as well as the purchaser on the other side. I may take this occasion of remarking, before discussing the resolution itself, that it is with the greatest pleasure I see that the hon. member for Assiniboia is able once more to resume his work in the House, and I am very glad that the accident that befell him has not had any more serious results. Now, I will take up seriatim the different paragraphs in this resolution. I notice first that my hon. friend alludes to the unanimous vote of the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange which runs nearly on a parallel line with the resolutions passed by the Winnipeg Board of Trade. The first clause of his resolution:

> That it appears from year to year the unsatisfactory state of grain standards has been formally brought before this House and before the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that the following resolutions have been passed unanimously by the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange:—
>
> (1) Resolved, that this exchange request the chairman of the Western Grain Standard Board to ask permission of the Minister of Inland Revenue to call together the western members of this board to discuss the advisability of having inspectors grade on the word and meaning of the Inspector's Act, and that the standard board from year to year define such commercial grades as may be found necessary.

My hon. friend alluded a moment ago to the composition of that large meeting of gentlemen interested in this question, that took place in the Railway Committee Room where, I think, nearly every interest was represented. There were at least 80 gentlemen, representing all the various interests; at all events, I made it a point to invite representatives from one end of the Dominion to the other, of the principle interests which I thought ought to be represented. At this moment, as every one of my colleagues knows, we are too often called upon to hear only one side of a question in the deputations that generally come to Ottawa in order to lay before the members of the Cabinet questions in which those deputations are interested. We generally find that there is only one side of the question presented at a time. Therefore, I thought it was of the utmost importance, if this meeting was to be of any value, that we should try and get every shade of interest represented. I think we did so, and I hope that the result of this meeting, and of the Bill that has been prepared in order to carry out the views of this meeting, will show that no interest has been seriously injured. Now the first item is in connection with the Standard Board. It will be remembered by my hon. friend who introduced this motion, that when we organized the Standard Board on a large scale in the fall of 1897, an attempt was made to represent all the different interests, and to give a preponderating influence to the farmers, that is to say, to the producers. To that end, out of the 16 members on that Standard Board, there were eight farmers, which we considered a sufficient number to look after the producing interest. The other eight members were subdivided among the different interests, which were more or less hostile to one another. There was the dealer's interest, the shippers' interest, and the millers' interest; therefore, no one could say for a moment that the producers' interest was not the predominant one in the organization of that board. Although we did what we could with that Standard Board, the result evidently was not a satisfactory one. A similar

scheme had been abandoned long before by our neighbours at Duluth, at Minneapolis, and elsewhere, as having proved completely abortive on account of the standard varying every year. So we have adopted the views enunciated by the Winnipeg Produce and Grain Exchange, and by my hon. friend in his motion, as will be seen in the appendix of the Bill which I hope will be in the hands of hon. members this afternoon. One of the clauses says:

Inspectors are to be required and instructed on and after the coming into force of these regulations to grade to the Act all grades defined therein.

So far as the inspector grades No. 1 or No. 2 straight, the intention of the Bill is to have them graded to the Act, or, in other words, according to the meaning of the Act. This point is perfectly well understood, and, I think, it will give satisfaction to all parties concerned. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) alluded, his resolution alluded, and the remarks of the numerous gentlemen who took part in that meeting the other day, alluded to these inferior qualities of grain which could not come within the meaning of the Act, and be graded according to it. As my hon. friend will see in the appendix which will form part of this Bill, we are providing for this.

Should the climatic or other conditions result in the production of a considerable proportion of grain not capable of being included in the classification provided in the Act, the Western Grain Standard Board shall be convened——

So that under this we might still appeal to the interference of the Western Grain Standard Board not to grade as No. 1 and No. 2, grain which has suffered in this way. In that case:

——the Western Grain Standard Board shall be convened for the selection of commercial grades and samples whenever the Chief Inspector shall notify the chairman of said Standard Board that such a course is necessary, and the inspectors shall grade all classes of grains which cannot be graded to the Act, in accordance with the commercial samples so selected by the board.

So that by this means we are providing against the danger of the loss which has hitherto been incurred and which, as my hon. friend stated a moment ago, amounted, in some cases, to as much as 5 cents a bushel, will be as much as possible removed, and there will be a fair valuation of the grain which cannot come under No. 1 and No. 2, and it will come under these commercial grades, graded by the Western Grain Standard Board. In that respect we have a provision to meet the complaint, the justice of which I have admitted, that has been made. As I was saying a moment ago, the high grades, Nos. 1 and 2, are not to be judged any more by the standards which we have made every year, by which the quality of grain has varied continually, making it impossible to have a fair and reasonable continuation of our grades. This sets aside the practice hitherto followed of fixing a standard for extra No. 1 and No. 2, and sending that abroad. We have recommended the practice which is now followed at Duluth, Minneapolis and other places in the United States, namely:

On or after the 1st day of November each year, or such prior date as the Chief Inspector may deem such a course to be practicable, inspectors shall furnish on demand samples of grains of any grade, such samples being equal to the average of the grain of each such grade inspected by the inspector at Winnipeg.

Under this, instead of adopting a standard which must change every year, in future the inspectors are going to grade according to quality. Extra quality must weigh so many pounds to the bushel, and must contain such a percentage of the grain to which that quality applies. For instance, No. 1 must weigh say 60 pounds, or No. 2 58 pounds to the bushel, and have 75 per cent or 66 per cent of the quality of grain applying to that standard. It is just as possible to judge grain in this way as it is for a culler to cull deals. He need not see the deals and he need not carry the deals around. He has his regulations, which say that No. 1 pine deals are allowed so many knots of such a size. In exactly the same way as the culler need not carry the deals around on his shoulder, but need only carry the statute in his pocket, the inspector of wheat will be enabled to grade wheat according to the regulations. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), in continuing his remarks, alluded to the mixing of grain, and my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), made the same remark, and referred to the great danger and damage resulting from mixing. I think the gentlemen from Ontario, especially those who represent the milling interests ought to be—I was going to say grateful, but I will not say that—ought to be satisfied with the efforts we have made in order to prevent them being the victims of that habit of mixing grain before it is delivered to them. It will be a protection to them as well as to the importers in England, who purchase our grain, to have a provision incorporated in the Bill preventing that mixing of grain:

Should wheat of different grades be loaded together in the same compartment of any vessel, at any point within the jurisdiction of the inspectors of the Manitoba inspection district, a certificate shall be issued for such mixed cargo, which certificate shall have written across its face a statement of the quantities of each grade entering into the composition of such mixed cargo, but no certificate for a straight grade shall be issued for any such mixed cargo.

In future, I think it ought to be a great comfort and satisfaction to the millers, as much as to the purchasers of grain in Europe, to know that no certificate for straight grade shall be issued for any such mixed cargo, and that they will know exactly what kind

of grain they are receiving, in what proportion they receive it, whether there is one-half or three-quarters of one quality and the balance of another quality. I think it should be a source of great satisfaction to eastern men, as well as men on the other side of the Atlantic, to know that this provision is made.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the inspection was subject to the jurisdiction of the inspectors of the Manitoba district at Winnipeg. How far does that district extend eastward ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The district will extend as far as Lake Superior.

Mr. SPROULE. Mixing might take place outside of that district without such a certificate being given. Does it include Fort William ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Fort William is included in that district. I intended to allude to that in a moment. I, perhaps, should have explained it sufficiently at the beginning, and it will appear evident by a cursory view of the Bill, that the district of Winnipeg extends from Lake Superior to the west, so that Port Arthur and Fort William will be included in that district, and this requirement as to the proportion of each quality of grain will prevail there. That, I think, ought to give satisfaction to the eastern men, who will know exactly in every bushel of grain they will receive—which is grain grown west of Lake Superior—what portion of each grain is included.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose grain were shipped to the elevator at Owen Sound, for instance, and two different qualities mixed there, and sold to the Ontario millers ; this regulation will not apply in that case. I know there is a great deal of complaint at times that it is mixed somewhere, and, while this Bill would provide for a certificate of inspection, showing the percentage of each kind of grain, if it came from Fort William or Port Arthur, it would not apply to the elevator at Owen Sound, if the qualities were put together there.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When I said that the eastern men ought to feel satisfied at the attempts made to put in their hands such grain as they will know exactly what they receive, when the grain has been loaded and shipped at Fort William, with a certificate showing, bushel for bushel, in what it consists, I am not ready to say how far it would be possible to follow the grain afterwards. This regulation ought to apply, and, if the Bill does not make it clearly apply to such places as Owen Sound, I think it would be our duty to take care that it does apply. In other words, I consider that this Bill will be very far from being perfect—in any case, we cannot expect that it will be entirely perfect—it will be far from what it is intended to be, if we do not make every effort to try and render justice, not only to the producer, but to the consumer. It is one of these questions in which I acknowledge my want of experience, and I will be only too glad to obtain every help possible from any hon. gentleman who is kind enough to offer suggestions.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Bertram.)

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

THE NISBET ACADEMY OF PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. DAVIS moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 10) respecting the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John). While I am not opposing this Bill, I desire to call attention to what it contains. There was a sum of $8,000 subscribed by persons in different parts of the country for this Nisbet Academy, which was founded at Prince Albert for the purpose of stimulating education in the North-west. After a time the academy was burned, and $7,000 or $8,000 of accrued money remained in the hands of the committee or the association or the trustees of the academy. The reasons set forth in the petition for the Bill are that the academy was burned, and further that the North-west Territories had established a system of education which of itself was sufficiently good, and therefore the reason no longer existed why this academy should be maintained. Therefore, it is proposed to take this money and devote it to the purposes of the Presbyterian denomination, the local church getting one-fifth and four-fifths going to the general funds of the church. All I wish to say is that I think that money which has been given for the purpose of education should be held sacred for that purpose, and should not be devoted to the purposes of a religious denomination. If the system of education for which this academy was founded has been superseded by the general educational system of the Territories, the money might very well be given to the general educational funds of the Territories; but if that be not done, then I think the money should go to educational purposes within the church itself—for example, to assist poor young men who

desire to gain a higher education within the Presbyterian body. Of course, all the authorities of the church have agreed to the proposed disposition of this money, and I would not like to set up my idea of what is honest and fair, against the will of the Presbyterian Church in the North-west. But it seems to me that there ought to be a public opinion against giving to a church for purely denominational purposes moneys which ought to be held sacred for the purposes of education.

Mr. THOMAS BAIN (South Wentworth). Perhaps one word of explanation, from what I know personally of the circumstances of this case may throw a little light upon the question. Many years ago this educational institution was started in Prince Albert on property that belonged to the foreign mission committee of the Presbyterian Church. The academy was started under the auspices of that church; and, while the subscriptions were taken for an academy at Prince Albert, they were collected from members of that church, and the supervision and general management of the academy were under the control of the Presbyterian denomination. Some hon. members may recollect that at that early day an Indian mission was started in the same locality in charge of the Rev. Mr. Nisbet. After it had gone on for a certain period, the establishment was unfortunately burned out. The conditions had changed from that early day, and there was no disposition to rebuild the academy and start the establishment again. A general system of education had come into existence in the interim, and the necessity for this original provision was not so much felt. About ten years ago the academy was burned, and since then there has been no attempt made to rebuild the institution. It was felt by those who were interested that the money lying in the hands of the trustees was accomplishing no good purpose, and the subscriptions had been given mostly in small sums and from widely scattered localities, in addition to what was given in the neighbourhood.

Mr. HUGHES. Who are the trustees?

Mr. BAIN. I cannot recollect, but I think they were gentlemen on the spot, appointed by the church. But I was pointing to the original situation, outside of that. It was felt that it was no use having the money lying idle under these conditions. The first subscription lists were lost, the local interest in the matter had died away, and, after a considerable discussion in the church courts, this arrangement was finally come to. It was advertised in the locality, so that every one interested was aware of the fact, and there has been no opposition to the proposed distribution of the funds.

It was felt that the next best thing to do, in the interest of the church and the people of the North-west, was, after giving a portion of the funds to aid the church in Prince Albert, to use the rest for the general purpose of the church in the North-west, by handing it over to the committee that had been aiding the construction of manses and the building of churches in other localities. It is under these circumstances that they come to the House and ask us to pass this measure. I may say, that, from the first, the contributions to the fund were under the control of the Presbyterian Church; so that it is hardly correct to say, that this is diverting money from a public purpose to that of a private body or particular church; but it is one of those occasions on which, I think, it is infinitely better for all parties that they should give up the use of this money, instead of expending it in establishing an educational institution which probably, after a few years, will result in failure and be of no possible utility. The committee, therefore, felt, after the evidence was tendered to them, that the best and wisest thing to do was to accede to the request, and close the matter finally.

Mr. HENDERSON. I feel somewhat interested in this Bill, inasmuch as the Rev. John Nisbet, who was, no doubt, the founder of this congregation at Prince Albert, came originally from the county I have the honour to represent, where he was well known and highly esteemed. It seems to me that this money was subscribed for the purpose of establishing Presbyterianism in the district of Prince Albert, and I can hardly come to the conclusion that there is any right in taking this money which was intended for the purpose of propagating Presbyterianism in that section, and handing it over to another body, to the people of Manitoba or all over the Territory, for purposes for which the money certainly originally was never intended. It seems to me that no better monument could be erected to the memory of Mr. Nisbet, who was instrumental, in the first place, in having this money raised, than to leave it where it is, and allow it to be used by the people of Prince Albert, to whom it belonged—if it belongs to anybody—as it was originally subscribed for their benefit. I think we should leave it for the purpose of aiding them in church construction and for church purposes, in the particular locality for which it was originally intended.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the General Trust Corporation of Canada.—(Mr. McMullen.)

REDISTRIBUTION BILL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, if he has given consideration

to the suggestion which I ventured to make, with regard to the progress of public business, in relation to the commission.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have given, and my colleagues also, attention to the suggestion made by my hon. friend the other day, and will be prepared to make an announcement to-morrow.

MR. COSTIGAN'S SEAT.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call attention to the statement made in "United Canada," to the following effect:

Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin, M.P., made application to the Speaker for a seat in the House of Commons, on the front row, among the Conservative leaders, which has long been occupied by the Hon. John Costigan.

I need hardly say, that I have made no application to you, Mr. Speaker, for that seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can entirely confirm the statement of the hon. member, because I have nothing to do with the distribution of seats, and the hon. member did not apply to me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as I am concerned, I have never heard any suggestion from the hon. gentleman with regard to the subject until this moment.

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to say a few words with regard to a matter that is of paramount importance to my constituents, and in fact to everybody on the Pacific coast, as it is of interest to the whole of Canada. That is, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the Government to an article appearing in the "Gazette," and, in fact, in all the other papers, in regard to a statement, from American sources, as to the Alaska boundary. In the course of a long article, it is stated that the American Ambassador and Lord Salisbury have been negotiating in regard to this matter. The article goes on:

Just as the acceptance was about to be given the officials here were surprised to have presented what they regard as an extraordinary condition, which Canada imposed in connection with the submission of the question to arbitration. This condition was that, in any event, Canada should have Pyramid Harbour and a strip of territory on the Lynn Canal, without reference to the general conclusions reached by the tribunal of arbitration. This port and the strip of territory on the coast would have carried also the back country leading to the interior.

It goes on to say, that this has caused surprise and indignation amongst the officials at Washington, and

It was decided not to accept this condition, and a peremptory refusal was given to the proposition.

The article then proceeds:

The series of conferences held here between Sir Julian Pauncefote and Lord Salisbury and Mr. Choate has ended in the adoption by the Foreign Office of the Ottawa proposals and the complete arrest of negotiations for the re-assembling of the Joint High Commission.

It also states:

Canadian statesmen are disappointed over the results of this preferential tariff scheme and jealous of the increased influence and popularity of America in the mother country, and are bent upon holding the balance of power in international negotiations, even if various vexatious questions remain unsettled. This is a phase of the present deadlock which the English press does not consider. Americans need to understand it in order to place the responsibility for the possible failure of the Anglo-American Commission where it belongs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not ask the House to allow me to take up its time, if this was not a matter of such great and general interest. Anybody can see that this article is from American sources. This boundary question is one which is very vital indeed to the business men in Victoria and Vancouver, because there is an immense business done between the Alaska district, the Yukon district and the cities on the coast.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) is going to make a speech, I suppose he will move a motion. But, of course, if he only desires to put a question——

Mr. PRIOR. I am not going to make a speech, but I will conclude with a motion. Although the people of the Pacific coast are very anxious indeed to have a settlement of this question, still, they are in hopes that the Government will stand up for all the rights of Canada, as, no doubt, they will. I am sure it will give great pleasure to everybody in Canada, if the right hon. First Minister can give us the assurance that the face that this paper puts on the question is not the right one, and that the contention of the Americans is not the correct one. If the right hon. gentleman can enlighten us as to what the Canadian contention is as to this boundary, I am sure everybody will be glad to hear him. I do not know whether this is asking too much, but my excuse is the great importance of the subject.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, of course I have, like everybody else, noticed the series of articles and correspondences that have appeared of late days in the American press. I believe I am not saying too much, when I say, that there is an evident attempt on the part of somebody to create the impression that Canada has taken a very unfair position in regard to the settlement of the Alaska boundary. It has been suggested in some quarters that the authorities in Washington must, in some degree, be responsible for such a statement appearing so frequently, so repeatedly in the American press. I am

quite sure that the American authorities in Washington are free from blame in this matter. I am sure they cannot, in any way, have authorized or sanctioned any such expression of opinion appearing in the press, for the very simple reason that the American authorities know perfectly well in what position the question stands at the present time. I have only to repeat that the position to-day, on the 29th of May, is exactly what it was when the commission adjourned in the month of February last. There has been no change, and, so far as this Government is concerned, there will be no change. My hon. friend (Mr. Prior) asks me to state what is the contention maintained by the Government of Canada, or the commissioners of Canada, with regard to the Alaska boundary. I am not in a position at this moment to give any information on this point. I may say, that I hope—without making any promise, or even undertaking to anticipate coming events—I hope that, perhaps, the negotiations of the commission upon this subject may be laid before Parliament during the present session. As I say, I make no promise upon this point. I hope that, before we separate, we shall be able to lay before Parliament the exact condition of things, that is to say, the statement of the views maintained before the commission, and of the point on which we disagreed. While I cannot say what was the position maintained by Canada upon this question, still I may, without revealing any secret, say, that it is well known by everybody who has given any attention to the study of the question of the boundary, that the boundary is defined by the treaty made between Great Britain and Russia in 1825. According to our construction of the treaty—according to the construction that has been maintained all along—the boundary line should follow the crest of the mountains nearest to the coast, passing over bays, and creeks, and inlets, which are territorial waters. The contention maintained by the American authorities all along is, that the boundary line should be run so as to place in American territory the strip of territory which is given to Russia by the treaty of 1825, beyond and above all head waters. That was the contention, I may say, which was maintained all along by both parties; and it may be assumed, without doing violence to any understanding, that this was the position maintained by the British commissioners. The contentions of both parties were so far apart that I shall not surprise any one, if I state that it was difficult to come to an understanding. Nor shall I surprise any one, if I state that we endeavoured on both sides —both American commissioners and Canadian commissioners—to reach a settlement by a fair compromise. After we had negotiated on this basis for a long time, we came to the conclusion that even a compromise could not be reached upon that question:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

and, having reached that conclusion, that it was not possible by the commission to effect a settlement of this question, by giving and taking, or by reconciling either party to the views of the other, we came to the conclusion that the only thing to be done was to have the question referred to arbitration. We proposed, and the statement was made when we adjourned—that is to say, the British commissioners proposed—that the arbitration should be held on the lines of the Venezuela precedent. That position was ours, and it was not coupled with any other condition. The only proposition which we made was, that the matter should be referred to arbitration, and that the arbitration should proceed exactly on all fours with the lines of the Venezuela precedent. All statements made that this was coupled with any other condition, are absolutely erroneous. This is the set statement of the case that I have to make at this moment. I hope I have made it sufficiently clear to have it understood by everybody in this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure that the House is greatly obliged to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for having gone as far as he could properly go, under the circumstances, in giving a brief explanation of the present position of this question.

One of the greatest difficulties, I suppose, that was encountered at the outset was the determination of the meaning of the term coast, or lisière. The United States authorities contended that ten leagues from the coast counted from the upper waters or the inlets, whereas the British authorities have undoubtedly always contended that the term coast meant the general line of the coast without reference to the inlets. This has really been the great bone of contention between the two parties; therefore, it appeared to me that, if a reasonable arrangement could not be obtained by compromise, as my hon. friend says, a rational solution of the question might be found by referring it to an international arbitration of such a character as would command the respect and confidence of both the great countries interested. It occurred to me that, inasmuch as the continued procrastination and postponement of a settlement of this question might involve somewhat serious consequences, if we adopt the proposal that was made by the British plenipotentiaries, that the Venezuelan reference should be the one followed. My right hon. friend is no doubt aware that Great Britain yielded two very important points after the contention that was first made, by agreeing that she would surrender any portion of the Venezuelan territory that could not be shown to have been in the possession of Great Britain for over fifty years. Therefore, the question of the time when this controversy should be settled would become very important, because the settlement of some

portions of this disputed territory by Russia or by the United States has been pending for a considerable time, and if indefinitely postponed, and if the terms of the reference that was adopted regarding the Venezuelan boundary were selected, the question of a fifty years' occupation might become a very essential one so far as British and Canadian interests are concerned.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY LANDS.

Order called for:

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Casey: "That the Order for House in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 24) an Act concerning drainage on and over the property of railway companies, be discharged and the Bill be referred to a special committee"; and the proposed motion of Mr. Blair in amendment thereto.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to withdraw his amendment to Mr. Casey's motion to refer Bill (No. 24) to a Select Committee.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved in amendment to the motion of Mr. Casey to refer Bill (No. 24) to the Select Committee, that all the words after "Messrs." in said motion, and so far as the word "power" be struck out, and the following words be inserted therefor: Messrs. Casey, Monk, Maclean, McGregor and Craig.

Motion agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 41) in further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act (Mr. Bertram).

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

House resumed:

Further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Rutherford: "That the public interest demands that the railway companies of Canada should at the earliest possible moment be brought under the control of a Board of Railway Commissioners, clothed with full power to enforce the provisions of the Railway Act and to prescribe and enforce the observance of such regulations as may be necessary in the public interest.

Mr. H. BOSTOCK (Yale and Cariboo). This motion is one that very largely interests the constituency which I have the honour to represent at the present time. The question of the better control of the railway interests of this country is one that is taking a strong hold on the people of this country from the fact that they find that these railways now have a great deal of power in their hands, and they consider that the railway companies are not always in the habit of exercising that power in the interests of the public. They think that greater control might well be exercised by the Government over the railways of this country for the benefit of the people. There is a widespread feeling throughout the country, and especially in the west, that the rates which are charged by these railway companies, are, in a large number of instances, unfairly discriminatory in the interest of central points where there is competition between railways, and that they are greatly to the detriment of points on the mainland of the country, where they have no competition and where they are not likely to have competition for a long time to come. For the purpose of making this point plainer to the House I will refer to a statement I have received from the Board of Trade of one of the central points in my constituency. They point out that they are very much handicapped in their business on account of the way that rates on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway are fixed. For instance, take a point like Kamloops, which is situated practically in the centre of the mainland in British Columbia; they consider that it should be a point from which a considerable distributing business should be done, and they find that in this matter of freight rates they are handicapped in shipping goods from Kamloops to other points from the fact that the rates that are charged by the railway company are detrimental to their interests. In the case of goods shipped from the east to Kamloops, the traders of Kamloops pay higher rates than the traders at a point such as Vancouver. The rate on goods from the east to Kamloops, under the tariff at present in force, is $4.32 per 100 pounds, whereas, the coast towns are charged $3.25 per 100 pounds. This is just one instance that has occurred in this matter, and I do not wish to detain the House by quoting a large number of instances, because it would only be a repetition of the same sort of thing. An instance such as that shows that there is certainly discrimination against a town on the main line of the railway at a non-competing point as against a town at a competing point, notwithstanding the fact that these goods that are sent out to Vancouver are carried past this town of Kamloops, and that they are carried some 200 miles further than they would be carried to Kamloops. Also, in shipping from that town to another town on the main line, the traders of Kamloops find that they are handicapped because the traders of the coast are able to get, on the whole, a better rate to other points over the line than they are able to get. In shipping from a point like Kamloops to points in the Kootenay district, they also find that they cannot get as good rates. They find that they cannot get as good rates from Kamloops to Kaslo, in the Kootenay, as the people of Calgary are getting at the present

time, although the distance is very much less from Kamloops to Kaslo than from Calgary to Kaslo. The fact of the rates being arranged in this way prevents the people of Kamloops from entering into trade in the Kootenay as they wish to do and as they are entitled to do. I do not propose to trouble the House by going into a long list of statements such as I have here, but, I mention this matter to show, from one point of view, the necessity at the present time, of appointing a commission, such as is called for in this resolution, for the purpose of going into this matter, and taking evidence to see whether something cannot be done, in the interest of the people of the country, to help them in their business, and to try and bring pressure on the railway company so that they will take a more lenient and more favourable view of this question of freight rates and help in the building up and development of the interior portion of our country. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is a serious matter, in the interest of this country, when the mainland portions of the country are not going ahead as they ought to do, and one of the main reasons why they are prevented from developing the interior as they should do, is this question of freight rates. If they had competition between railways they would be able to ship their goods in a great deal better than they can at the present time, and consequently, the country would be developed very much quicker and we should have a larger population in these towns. We see that very clearly in the development that took place in the Kootenay, as soon as we obtained competing lines. We found out that the points where two railways came into competition, immediately became the centres and commenced to build up very much faster than other points where they were simply dependent upon the one railway. Under the Railway Traffic Association the railways were forced, in fact to make competing points of these places, and they gave to places such as Nelson, Rossland and Trail a much lower rate than could be obtained by places on the line of railway where they had not the same facilities for carriage. The town of Nelson has gone ahead very much faster than a town such as Revelstoke. As a natural point of distribution Revelstoke is as well situated as Nelson and the people settling in Revelstoke would naturally consider that they had great natural advantages for the distribution of goods in the mining country to the south of them, but they found that owing to the conditions under the railway system as it is working at present, Revelstoke could, in no way, compete with Nelson, from the fact that the railways gave a competing rate to Nelson, while to Revelstoke, being in the hands of one railway they did not get as good a rate, although very often, the great bulk of goods that go to Nelson are carried through Revelstoke. Inasmuch as we might say that the whole province of British Columbia is practically in the hands of one railway, this is a very serious matter in the interest of the whole country, and it is one that demands the attention of this House and calls for the immediate appointment of a Board of Railway Commissioners, such as is asked for in this resolution. There are also a number of other matters which require to be dealt with, and which could be very much better dealt with by a railway commission than by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The advantage of a railway commission would be that the commissioners would be able, when necessary to travel through the country to visit the different points, and to examine into the issues arising between two different railways or between the public and a railway company. The commissioners would be able to make their examination on the spot, and it is needless to say that the present Railway Committee of the Privy Council are precluded from doing that owing to the large amount of other work they have to cope with. For that reason also, I think the appointment of a railway commission would be of very great benefit to the country. On account of the large amount of work which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council have to do at the present time they are not in a position to see that the railway laws at present on the statute-book are properly complied with by the railway companies, and I think if it were carefully looked into it would be found that the railway companies do not comply with the Railway Act quite as strictly as they ought to do. A little attention paid to this matter would be found to be very beneficial in the interests of the general public. It is, of course, a very difficult thing to get the people in any community to take up a matter as against a railway company and it is not at all a difficult thing for a railway company to sow dissensions amongst the people if they should come together and form a combination for the purpose of promoting their rights and interests as opposed to those of the railway company. A railway commission endowned with proper powers could do a great deal in the public interest to see that the Railway Act is properly enforced and complied with by the companies. It is of no use having on the statute-books a law passed in the interests of the whole country and allow it to remain as a dead letter; the railway companies practically setting it more or less at defiance.

Again, we have had discussions in the Railway Committee of the House with regard to the question of the location of stations, and the route of lines of railway in the part of British Columbia I represent. A railway commission could better look into these matters, and decide as to the location of lines and stations in any case where the interests of the railway company may apparently conflict with the interests of the general public. There is no doubt that occasions arise when a railway company has the power to inflict very great hardship on the general public, simply by the location of its line, and

it very often becomes a matter of investigation to see whether it is absolutely essential for a railway company to build its line in the exact location which it has been laid out. It is a serious matter that it should be in the power of a railway company in locating a line; to practically as has been done heretofore, compel people to tear down their houses and fences and to move, perhaps a mile or two, in order to be within touch of the railway station. In the west that has been a real grievance in times past and we have not been able to bring these matters before this House or before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in the manner we should like. I also would wish that this railway commission should eventually consider the question of the desirability of the Government taking possession of our Canadian railways. This I know is a question involving a very large amount of money, and a great deal of serious consideration as to the best method of accomplishing it. I find, however, that people of different classes and people whose experience has been so far apart, as men who are the presidents of the great railway systems of the United States and the leaders of the social movement there, have both practically come to the same conclusion—although of course from a different process of reasoning. The belief of men like C. P. Huntingdon, who has wide railway experience is that eventually the railway systems of the United States must come into the hands of either one or two large companies. Mr. Huntingdon arrives at that conclusion by a method of reasoning by which he shows that this result would conduce to railways being worked more economically in the interest of all concerned. He naturally concludes that this should be done by forming an immense company and not by means of Government ownership. On the other hand, Mr. Powderly and others who have considered this question from a totally different point of view, have come to the conclusion that in the interest of the people of a country like the United States, it would be very much better that the railways should be owned and operated by the Government. If we may take the experience of the Australasian colonies, we find that the railways, run as they are there by the Government in the interest of the public, are able to afford to the people very much wider advantages in some ways, than the railways on this continent, controlled as they are by private corporations. It stands to reason, that when you have a railway operated by the Government it is operated in the interests of the whole people, and where you have it operated by a company the company and the directors of that company have to take into consideration the dividends which they shall pay their shareholders, and a number of other matters which are not altogether in the interests of the general public.

They have to deal practically with diversified interests and to make them coincide as nearly as they possibly can. Then, we have the experience of countries in Europe, such as Germany. In Germany they have dealt with this question from an entirely different point of view. The railways there were taken charge of by the Government on account of the military policy of the country, because it was deemed advisable from a strategic point of view that the railways should be kept entirely in the hands of the Government. Consequently, in Germany the railways are all operated by the Government, who have used them very largely to encourage the trade and commerce of the country. The German Government have dealt with the question of railway rates in such a way as very largely to benefit the traders and shippers of the country, and to help them to establish trade relations with other countries, by placing the rates at a very low figure. In this way they have brought the German trader into keen competition with the traders of England and other parts of the world in a way that would not otherwise have been possible. At the same time, the German railways have not been found to be a burden on the people, because the revenue they have received has amounted to a considerable sum every year. Then the Government has fixed the rates on an intelligible basis which the people of the country can understand. It is almost impossible for any ordinary individual to understand the principle on which a railway company fixes the rates in almost any case. The boards of railway officials who arrange the rates do not seem to be guided by any intelligible principles that the ordinary individual can understand; but where the railways are run by the Government, as they are in Germany, we find that the rates are founded on intelligible principles, and are estimated, not on what the traffic will bear, but on a general principle that enables the people of the country to understand the basis on which they are fixed, and consequently assists them in making their calculations in regard to their business generally. For these reasons, I hope that the effect of the resolution which we are now considering will be that the Government will take this question of the appointment of a board of railway commissioners into their immediate consideration, and that we shall have a board appointed in this country that will be clothed with the necessary powers for dealing with this question and for exercising such a control over the railways in the country that we shall be able to get this question of rates more satisfactorily settled in the interests of the people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances I would not object to joining the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) in carrying a vote of want of confidence in the Government, which this undoubtedly is; but the case is too serious for that, and I am afraid that I shall be compelled to withhold my support from the hon. member. I rather rise

for the purpose of moving the adjournment of this debate until we shall be able to secure the attendance in this House of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). I think the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo is taking a very unfair advantage of the Government in making such a motion as this in the absence of the gentleman who has charge of the Railway Department, and who will be best able to protect the interests of the Government against this attempt.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I might interrupt the hon. gentleman to say that this is not my motion. I am only speaking to a motion moved by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, if the hon. gentleman repudiates this motion, of course, it will not be necessary for me to take up the time of the House at any great length. But I may say for his information as he is a young member of this House, that a number of young members of this House have attempted this same thing before; and I have always found that after they have been in this House for some time, and have become thoroughly acquainted with the public business of the country and its railway interests, they have finally arrived at the conclusion that the country has a much better protection in the Government of the country than they would have under a railway commission. The most effective system of government of any country is a system of responsibility; and just in proportion as you divest the Government of the day of responsibility, and put the obligations of government upon gentlemen who are not on the Treasury benches and are not in a position to be held directly responsible to the people, you weaken the control of the people without effecting any good. I have for many long years had an opportunity of seeing the present mode of managing this subject, that is, by a reference to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, who are directly responsible to Parliament and consequently to the people: and I do not believe that the substitution of an independent railway commission, however, wisely and judiciously they might be chosen, would have the effect of increasing the public control over the railway corporations, or protecting the public to a greater extent than is the case under the present system. It is a very rare thing indeed to have the deliberate decision of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council challenged by any person in this House or out of it, in regard to one of the most difficult questions which it is possible for a Government to be called upon to deal with. Therefore, I think it would be very unwise hastily to change a system which has worked well for the system proposed by this resolution, and put out on an unknown sea. There is another, and I think a sufficient reason, why I think we should not unduly interfere with railway management in this country. We are here half a continent, running parallel along a line of 3,000 miles with the great republic to the south, and having on both sides of the line great and varied railway interests. I am inclined to think that the operations of a railway commission might unduly hamper Canadian lines in that which is most important to Canada and Canadians of all parties and classes, that is, the ability to compete, in the most complete and efficient manner, with rival lines in the United States. That, I think, is a subject that would have to be very carefully considered before taking such a very strong step as this. Therefore, I am inclined, reluctant, as I am, to give any support to this Government, to believe it is my duty to support the Government against this declaration of want of confidence in it by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bostock), and who endeavoured to show, as far as he is able, that they are unworthy of the confidence of this House and the country and ought to be displaced and superceded by an independent railway commission.

Now, the hon. gentleman says that one of the important functions of this railway commission would be the location of railway lines, that is to say, that a body of independent commissioners would be better qualified to locate a line of railway than the capitalists who find the money to build it. I do not agree with him in that opinion. I believe that the parties who find the money to build a line of railway have the greatest and deepest interest possible in the selection of the best line. Why, their whole future, the success of their enterprise, all depends upon their wisdom in the selection of the best practicable line, the one that will give the best convenience to the people themselves. If any one is interested in locating a railway so as to subserve the very largest portion of the population through which that railway runs, it certainly is the railway company, because the success of all the operations of that company depends upon the wisdom with which their line is located, and if that selection be interfered with by irresponsible parties, you may prevent a wise investment of capital and defeat the object of that investment by making unremunerative that which would be otherwise remunerative. That is another reason why I cannot join the hon. gentleman in his vote of want of confidence.

Then he objects to the tyrannical power of railway corporations to expropriate private property. Well, I have had some little experience, and so have had a good many other gentlemen in this House, in that matter, and my own opinion is very much the reverse. Instead of feeling that the interests of private property owners, whose buildings or farms may be expropriated, is in-

jured by the present law, my experience is that they manage, under its operation, to get paid generally two or three times the entire value of everything the railway takes from them; and, therefore, I think my hon. friend will have to find some stronger ground for the establishment of a railway commission.

But I find that the hon. gentleman, not content with a railway commission, wants to revolutionize the whole railway system of Canada. What is the revolution he proposes? Why, it is that the Government of Canada should become the owners and proprietors, not only of the Drummond County Railway, but of the whole of the railways in Canada. I may tell the hon. gentleman that Canada has had some little experience in that matter, and that at this moment we are paying over $2,000,000 interest on the capital invested in the railways that already belong to us. We have expended about $58,000,000 of capital in the construction of Government railways, which do not return one farthing to the Government of interest on the money invested. Does any person propose that we should extend that operation and become the owners, not only of $58,000,000 of railway property which we have now, but of $941,000,000, which is the paid up capital of the railways now in operation in Canada? The people of the country who have freight to be carried manage, under the system of Government railways, to get that work done at a nominal rate, and does the hon. gentleman think that we would improve our position by extending our investment from $58,000,000, on which we are now paying at least 3 per cent interest, and on which we did pay double that amount for a considerable period, all of which has been absorbed, by loading the Government of this country with about $1,000,000,000 debt, for that it would be in a very short time, as it is $941,000,000 now. If we were to attempt to buy up all these railways, we would have to expend over $1,000,000,000, and if the hon. gentleman would apply the same result to that whole railway system that the country is enjoying in the railway property we have now, we should find ourselves with a burden of interest to pay on railways, without any return, of something like $28,000,000 per annum.

I do not think it is very likely that the hon. gentleman, with all his eloquence and examination of this important subject, will convince this House that it would be a wise step for Canada to undertake the ownership of all the lines of railways in this country.

The country is best served by the competition of large companies and varied railway interests throughout the country, supported by the Government, who are always, when new lines are required, whichever side is in power, prepared to subsidize these new lines to assist in opening up a new section of the country, and in that way help to provide for the bringing in of capital to these enterprises. I speak from the experience of having had these Government railways under my charge for several years, and speaking from that experience, I must say that private companies are infinitely better qualified to manage these railways, both in the interests of the country and of the railway enterprises themselves, than the Government is. Every one knows, who has given the subject any attention, that a private corporation, free from that control that must always act upon a Government in such matters, construct railways infinitely cheaper than a Government can. In the next place, it is perfectly well known that when you come to railway extension, you would be in no end of difficulty if the hon. gentleman's scheme were adopted. I often sympathize with the Government of the day in the difficulties it has now to contend with, but would sympathize much more deeply if they were responsible for the construction of railway lines out of the public exchequer, because we would have every member of this House drawing in one direction and another to obtain railway extension at the public cost. The position of the Government would not be an enviable one.

Then, when you come to the management of railways, it is absolutely impossible, in the nature of things, that a Government railway can be managed in Canada by the Government of the day with the same economy and success and the same regard for the interests of the people as the same railway could be managed by a private corporation. A private corporation is not in a position to be coerced and pressed by gentlemen to have their friends and relatives appointed in connection with the railway management; and they are in a position, when the services of parties in their employ are not of a kind calculated to benefit the enterprise, much more freely to get rid of them than can a Government management who have gentlemen sitting behind them the relatives and friends of these employees. It is extremely difficult for the Government, under these circumstances, to deal with employees as their judgment of the public interest would dictate. I hope that the House will not hastily rush into the proposition of the hon. gentleman, and involve this country in an expenditure of a thousand million dollars for the purpose of acquiring all the railways of the country and undertaking their management. I am inclined to think that they have sufficient difficulty in conducting public affairs as they are, without resorting to that. After careful examination of this question year by year for more than twenty years, this House has steadily refused to lend itself to this proposition to appoint an independent railway commission, which will relieve the Government of the duty that devolves upon

it, which duty they have discharged faithfully and well, to interpose persons who are not acting under the same responsibility and whose judgment I do not believe would be as conducive to the public interest as that of the Government of the day, whoever may compose that Government. I think, therefore, that the House would be wise in adopting the same course on the present occasion as on past occasions and moving the adjournment of the debate, at all events until the Government has the presence here of the member of the Cabinet who is primarily charged with the control of railway affairs.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I think I may be excused, as a member of the Opposition, if I do not feel myself bound for once, to follow my leader in coming to the aid of the Government. The speech of my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Bostock) had the defect of a dual defence. His course in supporting a motion which, if it means anything, means taking the responsibility out of the hands of the Government, by proposing to buy up the railways of Canada and put them into the hands of the Government, has led the distinguished leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) to devote a considerable portion of his speech to discussing the relative advantages of private ownership and Government ownership of railways. Now, Sir, there cannot be the least doubt, a priori, and as the result of an exhaustive inquiry, that there can be no comparison between the cheapness and economy of managing a railway by a Government department and managing it by private parties. Because, as my hon. friend who has just addressed the House has indicated, the department is pressed by members of Parliament, pressed by all sorts of interests, to manage these railways not directly in the interests of the community, but partly in the interests of the community and partly in the interests of party, whereas the private owners of a railway only consider what is best to enable them to manage that railway in the most efficient and most economical way. But, Sir, that question does not, I apprehend, come up here unless in a way which is of advantage to the motion before the House. The motion before the House, as I gather, is actually to take away from the department, from the Government, those disadvantages that the distinguished leader of the Opposition has pointed out. Because, if you have a railway commission, and that commission be appointed by the Government and given power from the Government under an Act that would make it as independent of the Government of the day as is the Auditor General, it is manifest that that railway commission would not be open to the suspicion that at this moment attaches, apparently to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, nor would it be open to the pressure which is now put upon the Department of Railways. And I may say here, Mr. Speaker, that I do not see, I never could see, any reason why it would not be possible, in a democratic community like this, to form a commission that should be removed from all the temptations, all the pressure of party and all the pressure of voters and able to devote itself to the management of the railways of the country with just as single an eye to efficiency and to economy as Sir William Van Horne and Mr. Shaughnessey give to the management of their own lines. I agree, however, with my hon. leader that this motion sounds as a motion of want of confidence in the Government, because I cannot forget that the right hon. Premier prior to his having the cares of the Government of Canada on his shoulders, declared in a central town of the North-west Territories that one of the things that was absolutely necessary to be dealt with was the oppressive freight rates that the people of the North-west had to bear. And only the other day the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who is, I suppose, our representative in the Cabinet, speaking in a city of Ontario, said that at the present minute 10 per cent more is charged to the Manitoba and North-west farmer than is charged to the farmer below the line. And yet, Sir, here is the position we are in: Although the Minister of the Interior tells us that the farmers of the North-west and Manitoba are charged 10 per cent more than is the farmer below the line, and though he says something must be done, yet the only thing we have is amateur movements like this which have just as much effect upon practical legislation as the insects upon the body of a swallow have upon the curve of its flight. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a reproach on the Government of my right hon. friend that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) brings forward a motion like this, which is supported by one western member after another, but in which the Ministry, one of whom should have a measure dealing with the matter, seem to take no interest.

As the leader of the Opposition points out, here is a railway motion of the first consequence, and the Minister of Railways and Canals is not in his seat, showing that the Minister who is directly responsible for questions such as this motion deals with, regards this motion as academic, amateurish, of no practical effect. The people of Manitoba and the North-west should not be placed in a position where a Government that is in its fourth session, and near the completion of its third year, a Government that has promised them, both by resolution, by speech and by propagandist pamphlets, relief in regard to freight rates—I say those people should not find themselves at this hour in the face of that declaration from their own Minister in the Cabinet, making a confession almost of incompetence.

At the present time the western farmer has to pay 10 per cent more than the farmer below the line. Something must be done, and the only something that is done is an academic motion like this, proposed by one of the supporters of the Minister of the Interior in this House. Sir, I must say that I know nothing so calculated to impress the farmers of that region with the conviction that this Government has not their interests at heart, as the spectacle that we have here to-night; the Minister of Railways and Canals out of his seat, my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) moving this motion, my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Bostock) supporting it in the way he has done, the Minister of the Interior not here to help him, and the Government listening in a languid manner, hoping as soon as possible to get this troublesome question off the tapis.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I think it is uncalled for on the part of the leader of the Opposition to read a lecture to the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), because that hon. gentleman has seen fit to discuss a question in this House that directly interests the people of his constituency, and also the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Now, the hon. gentleman has told us that young members who have come into this House have been in the habit of bringing legislation like this before the House of Commons time and again. But he went further and told us that after they had sat in this House for several years they seemed to lose their enthusiasm. I would infer that he means that after they had sat in this House for many years, they must have come under the influence of these great railway corporations which have been spoken about this evening. I think it is only right that any member who represents a constituency in any part of the country should discuss a question of this kind, and I think they may do so without expressing want of confidence in the Government. Now, the hon. gentleman wound up his speech by saying that he hoped this House was not going to vote a thousand million dollars to buy up the railroads of the country. In reading this motion I find in it nothing at all about buying up the railroads of the country. The motion proposes that we shall appoint a railway commission to deal with disputes, and freight rates, and anything else that may come before them. He says that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is a very efficient body, and I agree with the hon. gentleman that they are. But I would like to draw his attention to the fact that they are a very busy body of men, and they cannot be expected to deal with all the minor details which would come before a railway commission, if such a commission were appointed. Now, we know that this country is developing very rapidly, the population is increasing by leaps and bounds, and transportation companies are being formed in every direction. It is impossible for the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, no matter how efficient they are, to deal with all such matters, so I think it is high time that a commission was appointed to deal with all these questions that are arising. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said, the people of Manitoba and the North-west suffer more from discrimination in freight rates than the people of any other portion of this country, there is no doubt about that. We are paying, and paying through the nose, for everything we get from the railway corporations in the west. Although those corporations have been subsidized by large tracts of land and large amounts of money from the public chest, there is nobody at the present time to see that they treat the people as they ought to be treated. Now, I do not think that such a commission can be called an experiment. Railway commissions have worked successfully in the United States, and have worked in the interests of the people, they have a successful railway commission in England, and I think we could not be going far astray if we appointed a similar commission in this country. I say that to-day we are in this country practically at the mercy of these great railroad corporations. They are enabled to manipulate the freight rates back and forth in such a way that the ordinary layman cannot at all understand what they are doing; for that reason the members from the west who have been looking into this matter, and whose constituents have suffered, think it time to bring it before the House. Take the question that was brought up this session by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). For two years now he has brought legislation before this House to relieve the farmers of the west from the injustice they have been suffering. No longer ago than last year that hon. member showed, in relation to a matter that he brought before this House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had entered into an unrighteous bargain with a lot of gentlemen in Manitoba for the purpose of giving them a preference; in other words, these gentlemen were to build certain elevators at certain points on the railroad, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would take no grain from any farmer's wagon, or from any flat warehouse, but only from these elevators. It has been pointed out that under the Railway Act the railways were obliged, as common carriers, to take the produce of any farmer presented to them at any time. That has been brought to their attention, and of course the company has had to take back water. Now, if there had been a railway commission in this country there would have been no necessity for my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to bring that question before the House, be-

cause the railway commission would have dealt with it at once. There are other questions he has brought up this year in connection with elevators, that a railway commission could have dealt with and with which this House would not have been troubled.

Now, who should compose this railway commission? I think that we should have three commissioners, and they should be among the very best men that we can find in the Dominion of Canada, men who have a great deal of experience in their own lines. I think we should appoint a business man, we should appoint a gentleman who has had a great deal of experience with railway companies, schedules, tariffs, and all that sort of thing; and then we should appoint a first-class lawyer who would be able to advise and assist his colleagues in legal questions. In order to get gentlemen of that character we should have to pay them well, because they would be able to earn, in the fields from which we would take them, probably, $5,000 to $8,000 a year. You could not get good men to act on a commission of this kind unless you were prepared to pay them salaries as high as that. I may mention another point which I hope will prove satisfactory to the leader of the Opposition. I claim that if men of this kind were appointed it would be necessary that they should be put altogether outside of politics, if they were to perform their duties efficiently. I would suggest that although they would have to be appointed by the Government of the day, after they were appointed, they should be like the Auditor General and not removable by any Government, because if you did not leave them wholly independent, they would be of very little use to the people of this country. Now, a word in reference to discrimination and freight rates in the North-west Territories. I know there are some who contend that such a commission would not be in a position to interfere with the main line of a great national highway like the Canadian Pacific Railway, because, under a regulation made by the late Government, I believe the companies are free to exercise their own judgment of the amount of money, call it blood money if you like, that they may take from the settlers of the North-west Territories. But the branch lines were not built in that way. These branch lines were built by the assistance, as the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has pointed out, of the public, given by this House, and I submit that they should be, and that they are, under the control of the Government. If there was a railway commission appointed that could look into these matters, and which would have jurisdiction, it would be able to secure redress for the people. These branch lines were built as feeders to the main line; that is how they should be considered by the railway companies. The railway companies should look to the amount of traffic coming from these branch lines as an addition to the traffic of the main line. The people in the west and in other portions of the country should not be called upon to pay higher rates on the branch lines as on the main line. I have here a sample case of the arrangement of a railway tariff, which I will give as an illustration. We will take the question of the transportation of coal oil. The distance from Petrolea, in Ontario, to Winnipeg is some 1,400 miles. We find that railway corporation carrying coal oil from Petrolea to Winnipeg for 61 cents per 100 pounds. From Winnipeg to Prince Albert the distance is only 600 miles, yet that railway corporation charges 64 cents for carrying that coal oil from Winnipeg to Prince Albert—64 cents for carrying coal oil 600 miles, when they carry it 1,400 miles, in a part of the country where there is competition, for 61 cents. There is another view of this question. If you add together the two local rates, from Petrolea to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg to Prince Albert, you find that they are less than the through rate from Petrolea to Prince Albert; so that it would pay a merchant in business to buy his coal oil in Petrolea, ship it to Winnipeg, unload it at Winnipeg, load it again, and ship it to Prince Albert. It is high time that something was done, that these railway corporations shall be brought to book about this matter. I do not propose to take up any more of the time of the House. I am glad that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) has brought this motion before the House. I think it is a proper motion, notwithstanding all that the hon. leader of the Opposition has said about it. I think that every hon. member from the west, or from any other portion of this country, has a right to express his views on such a motion, without being taken to task by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I may say, that I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Macdonald.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I find that this question has been repeatedly before this House, and perhaps it may be well that I should jog the memory of the hon. leader of the Opposition by reading to him what the late Hon. Sir John Thompson said on this question, when it was brought before the House by the late lamented member for North Simcoe, Mr. McCarthy, who brought a Bill before this House for this very purpose. He had frequently had the question before the House. Sir John Thompson said:

> I, therefore, state on behalf of my colleagues and of the Government, that in view of the information which has already been gathered upon this subject, the correspondence which has taken place, and the changes which have been proposed in the countries to which I have referred, it is the intention of the Government during the recess to give this matter a thorough investigation by the appointment of a commission to inquire

into the whole subject, and ascertain the interests and the views of all classes in the community affected by it. The result, I trust, will be fully reported to this House at the ensuing session, so that the House, before the expiration of this Parliament, may deal definitely with the whole question.

So it is not a question of yesterday; it has been a question of long standing, and, although the Government, in 1886, ten years ago, agreed, when that question was brought before the House by the late member for North Simcoe, to appoint a commission and thoroughly investigate the subject, and report to the House at the next session, with the view of dealing with the whole question, it dropped there: a commission never was appointed, and there never was anything more done.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, just one word in regard to this question from the stand-point more particularly of the question as a business proposal. Are the disputes between individuals and between localities, or the grievances in regard to freight rates or the tariff of rates to be disposed of by the Government, or are they to be disposed of by a commission? We have had instances occurring this session, and prior to it, of the power of railways in regard to politicians. We know that railways run through pretty nearly all the constituencies that are represented here. I do not mean to say, that that fact, of necessity, deprives any hon. member of his independence; but would it not relieve the doubt in that regard which exists in the minds of any individuals or of any particular locality, who may have grievances, if those grievances were to be tried and disposed of by an independent commission? The only question, then, to be considered is: Would that commission be strong enough and capable to cope with all the difficulties? Without doubt, a railway commission has been most satisfactory in England; without doubt, railway commissions have been most satisfactory in the States of the Union. Why would they not be satisfactory here? We know the enormous mileage of railways, as compared with the population of this country. Railway corporations are almost all-powerful in this country, by reason of the very fact that they employ so many men, as compared with the population; so that they must have a greater percentage of control in this country than perhaps in any other country in the world. If that is so, for the purpose of putting a quietus to the disquiet that exists, why should not the Government consider the advisability of a commission being appointed? I think the people will feel that it is to be regretted that the commission proposed by Sir John Thompson in 1886, and which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has called attention to, was not appointed, and the result made known to the people of this country and to the members of this House, because we would then be better able to judge as to whether it is advisable that a commission should be appointed or not. I may say, frankly, that I am in favour of a commission myself, but the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has told us, that this is a position which all youthful members take in this House, and that, after they have been here a few years, they become wiser and do not uphold such views. That may be so. If I am spared by my constituents to remain here any length of time, I may become wiser, my views may change, and I will not be afraid to change them; but I am here to represent the views of my constituents, according to my best judgment, and it seems to me that, in this country particularly, in view of all that has taken place in the railway committee of this House, a grievance exists on the part of the people of the North-west in regard to railways. I am not saying whether these grievances are just or not, whether these railways are treating these people as they should be treated or not, or whether there is unfair discrimination as against individuals or localities. One must realize that an individual who is not an expert, cannot make up his mind as to whether these grievances are right or not, unless he hears evidence in regard to them. I do not suppose that there are many hon. members in this House who understand the question of the difference between long and short hauls, and the different percentage of charges which should be charged for long and short hauls by these railways; they are most intricate questions, I know, because I have had some experience in trying to solve them.

This, therefore, is a still greater reason why a commission should be appointed which should take evidence upon these questions, and which could adjust these grievances in a fair and impartial manner without having regard to any political influence or to any lobbying of any kind. We find—be it to the discredit of the railways or not—that no sooner is an important railway Bill before this House than the railway magnates are here; even if it be only a private Bill affecting railway interests, that seems to be the practice. I am not saying they are doing anything they should not do; but take a small locality which has been unfairly discriminated against, and which is asking for that which they think should be righted; and we find in every case that the enormous power of the railway is opposed to the weak power of the locality. If that is fair it is all right; but if it is not fair it is all wrong. Having regard to these important questions, they ought in my humble judgment, be removed from the political arena and be disposed of by a fair and impartial commission. This is purely a business proposal. We have courts of justice to settle differences between individuals and to decide what damages shall be paid to a man if his cattle be killed,

or if a railway company expropriates his land, and why not have a similar court of justice or board of arbitrators or a railway commission to decide the differences between localities and corporations, between individual interests and the railway interests? It is only fair it seems to me that this should be done. It is right, in my mind that the Government should be relieved of an enormous amount of work which can only be of a political nature because while the Government is here to legislate for the country's benefit when they sit as judges they also sit as politicians, and they cannot separate the one from the other. I do not charge the Government with yielding improperly in any instance. But, of course, I am youthful, and perhaps as I grow older I may be able to divide myself into a judge on one day and a politician on the next; or a judge one hour and a politician the next hour. But if a railway corporation comes asking for something that is detrimental to a locality then the politicians have to sit as judges, and it must be difficult nay, impossible, for them to separate themselves from the political aspect of the case. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council have done their work well, I am free to admit, but it seems to me that greater will be the feeling of respect, greater will be the feeling of the people that justice is being done, when they have an impartial commission rather than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which must find it hard, I submit with all respect to the Government, to separate itself for the time being from being a body of politicians.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker I wish to express my satisfaction at this motion being brought before the House for discussion; not so much because I see in the wording of the motion, a final cure for all the difficulties we labour under in Canada with regard to railways, but because I see in the bringing forward of such a motion and in its wording, possibly the beginning of such a cure; not by any means the end. I fear that however well a railway commission may be composed, or however well it may be empowered, there are still difficulties in the adjustment of dealings between the people of the country and the railway companies which are beyond the reach of any commission. There are difficulties which arise at the very beginning; which arise and necessarily must arise in the legislation passed by this House, and when they have been allowed to have their origin in legislation here they cannot be dealt with by a railway commission. However, in so far as the appointment of a railway commission would be the beginning of a dealing with this subject; in so far as this motion brings this question up for discussion in Parliament at this time; I am glad of the opportunity of raising my voice and I hope of casting my vote in favour of it.

The conditions existing in Canada have been alluded to as being paralleled in the United States. It has been said that they have a similar railway question there, and a railway commission to deal with that question. But I would like to say, that if the United States have a railway question, Canada's railway question is ten times more serious than that which exists in the United States; because, while we have a country as large as the United States, and a population almost infinitesimally smaller, we have only two, or we will say three, railway companies in this country that give us any competition whatever; and in by far the greatest area of the country, and in that part which contains by far the greatest possibilities for the future, there is only one railway company—and, apparently, only the possibility of there being one. Therefore, while the United States, by reason of their situation and by reason of their conditions, have unlimited opportunities of railway competition; we in Canada have not—nor is there in sight—anything which might be called real competition in railways. As the matter stands at present and as far as we can see in the future we are limited to a practical railway monopoly in this country. It is not a question of detail, it is not a question of small matters with us; it is a question simply: Whether the railroads are going to run this country or whether the country is going to run the railroads. That is the real question, and I put it in these words for the purpose of conveying my idea, that this motion, good so far as it goes, is only the beginning and not the end of the solution of the railway problem.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not in any way feel called upon to express gratitude to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) for the assistance he claims to have given the Government against this attack—or what he was pleased to call an attack—upon the Government. It is not an attack upon the Government; neither is it a vote of want of confidence. This motion which is now before us is simply an invitation to the House to consider one of the numerous problems which we have to deal with concerning railway transportation. But my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is so pugnacious that the moment he does not speak and some one else does, he sees in it an attack upon the Government; and his spirit is so contrary that even though he thinks it is a motion of want of confidence in the Government he comes to the rescue of the Government. But there is no occasion for a fight on this motion; there is occasion only for an exchange of views upon a very important subject. I must express the gratification I experience upon this occasion—something which does not very often take place on the floor of this House—in that I can agree with a great deal that has been said by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I agree with him that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has been a very efficient

body and has given as a rule complete satisfaction in its decisions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. The decisions of that committee have, I think, been marked by wisdom, and I am not aware, as my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is not aware, that any one of its decisions has ever been challenged. But my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper is aware—at all events, every one else is aware—that while the action of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has been generally acceptable, there has been a want felt all through the community that there was a class of public grievances which could not be reached by that committee. First of all, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is an expensive body ; that is to say, litigation—if I can use the word—is a very expensive process before that committee. There may arise in a certain part of this vast Dominion, say in the North-west Territories or in British Columbia, a conflict between a railway company and the public. It may be a conflict between the railway company and a town which has been sidetracked by the railway company ; or it may be simply an occasion of difference between an individual trader or importer and the railway company. It may be that this individual feels that he has been discriminated against—that a more favourable rate has been given to his rival in business than to himself. There might be a remedy found for his grievances if he appeared before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council ; but he may live thousands of miles from that body, and he may not have the means to follow up his claim. He feels that there should be in this country a tribunal before which he could go, and which would not be at a great distance, but a tribunal which would come to him and hear his grievance. Complaints of this kind are pretty general all over the country, and I cannot, for my part, see why we cannot do in this country what has been done in other countries, notably in England—I cannot see why we should not have a railway commission to deal with this numerous class of grievances on the part of the general public. I think we can agree with that. At all events, I express the views of the Government when I say that we think there are many sorts of grievances which could be effectively dealt with only by a railway commission. But the trouble and labour and difficulty of framing a law which would constitute such a court makes the question a very embarrassing one, and I shall not surprise my hon. friends behind me, especially my hon. friends from the North-west Territories and the province of Manitoba, when I say that this is a question which up to the present time we have not been able to grapple with in such a way as to be in a position to present a Bill this session. But the matter is engaging the attention of the Government. I claim that we have done something already for the people of the North-west. I remember very well the occasion referred to a moment ago by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), for the question of freight rates is one that has engaged the attention of the Government, and I think we have done a great deal already to redeem the promise we made. My hon. friend will not deny that in the very first year after we assumed control of the Administration, we obtained from the one great transportation company in the North-west Territories, that is to say, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a notable reduction in its freight rates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And without a commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. And without a commission. But whilst we have obtained that much, I must tell my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that we do not think that we have exhausted our efforts on behalf of the people of the North-west. On the contrary, we think there is a great deal yet to be done in that respect, and we think that one thing that can be done in order to solve the problem is to do just what is asked by this resolution. But I would ask my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), the mover of this resolution, not to press it to-day, but to confide in the good-will and good intentions of the Government and allow the matter to rest for the present where it is, and consent to the adjournment of the debate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I understand that references have been made to myself and to the fact that I have been absent from the House during the larger portion of this discussion. I need not say, Mr. Speaker, to the gentlemen who are interested in this question, and who have been discussing it, that my absence has been under circumstances which I could not possibly avoid. I had not anticipated that this resolution would be reached to-night, and I made engagements which it was quite impossible for me to forego, and which compelled me to be absent ; therefore, I have not had the opportunity of hearing what hon. gentlemen have been saying on this question. I have not risen, Mr. Speaker, with a view of discussing the resolution at all or of indicating any individual opinion upon it. The House has heard from the First Minister upon the subject, and I would only supplement what he has stated by adding that the mattter has not been overlooked by me, but I have been giving a good deal of attention to it. I have already in the department a Bill which has been prepared for the purpose of establishing a commission ; but I can state to my hon. friends who are anxious that this matter should be pressed forward as rapidly and as effectively

as possible, that I am not satisfied with the character of the Bill. I am not assured that, as framed, it is likely to be workable. Its proper consideration is a question of time. It involves a great many intricate problems, and it is not in such shape that even if we had time, and we were not pressed with other business which has been prepared and is now before the House, I would feel like recommending it to my colleagues as it stands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask my hon. friend if this is a Bill prepared by the Government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, prepared for the Government. I have had the benefit of the advice and services of a gentleman whom I employed for the purpose, under an authority which I had from Parliament last session. The work which he has done has been very well done indeed; but the Bill is not as it stands at present in such shape that I would feel justified, as the Minister chiefly responsible for it, in recommending it favourably to my colleagues. I would like to add before I sit down that there is one thing which our friends who have been chiefly discussing this matter to-night have not had fully in their minds. The grievances they desire to see remedied are grievances that pertain very largely to the question of rates, and these grievances arise more particularly in connection with one great railroad system; we all know that that railroad, under the law, is practically free from control by Parliament in any shape or form as respects its rates. Until certain conditions which have been provided by the statute are realized, and until certain events occur, no such ample authority as Parliament would require to exercise in order to provide a remedy such as the people desire would be within our means. In addition to all the ordinary difficulties which surround the efficient solution of this question, we have in Canada a great railroad system which traverses that particular portion of the continent which our friends from the North-west represent, and which is absolutely above and beyond the reach of this Parliament, at all events for the time being, so far as the regulation or reduction of its freight rates is concerned.

Motion for adjournment of debate agreed to.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. PENNY moved second reading of Bill (No. 55) further to amend the General Inspection Act. He said: The grocers and fruit dealers of Montreal find that a great deal of fruit comes into the city, not only in bad order, but not exactly what the fruit is represented to be in a great many instances, as is found after opening the packages. Consequently they have asked me to introduce this Bill, so as to have an inspector appointed and every one protected, not only the dealers, but also the consumers. I am told that the wholesale dealers and auctioneers are also in favour of this measure. There is no commodity in which there is more room for fraud than fruit. I see that on Saturday last an hon. member made some remarks about the inspection of fruit, which I was very glad to note because it shows that interest is being taken in the question.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose there is no objection to the Bill going into committee, but I desire to point out that it provides that apples shall be put in certain packages in all cases. If he were to confine his Bill to fruit for export, I would see no objection to it; but as it now stands, any person taking a barrel of apples to the smallest village, would be subject to a fine, if the package were not according to the regulations of this Bill. I do not object to the measure on other grounds, but wish to point out that the hon. gentleman would have to modify it very much before he can expect the assent of the House to it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I need not say that I am in accord with the hon. gentleman, but as I have introduced a measure dealing with the General Inspection Act, I would ask him to wait until that measure is dealt with in committee, and then we could incorporate in it what portions of his Bill the committee will think fit to adopt.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SMALL FRUIT PACKAGES.

Mr. PENNY moved second reading of Bill (No. 56) to define the size of small fruit packages. He said: The fruit dealers of Montreal have found that packages containing small fruits are not of uniform size, which gives rise to a great many complaints. But in the case of this Bill, as in the other, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has asked me to bring it up for second reading, and then when we come to discuss it in Committee of the Whole, I shall make some alterations so as to bring the sizes of the boxes into conformity with a standard measure, and add this Bill as an amendment to Bill respecting weights and measures, to be introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

Mr. HAGGART. What will be the business of the Government to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps a few minor Bills, but at all events the Drummond Bill.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all reports of any survey held during 1897 and 1898 of Neufrage Pond, King's County, Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Macdonald, King's.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers, petitions, &c., in conncetion with the resignation of Dr. Morris as postmaster at Dundas, Prince Edward Island, and the appointment of his successor and persons applying for the position (Mr. Macdonald, King's.)

Copy of reports of annual regimental meetings of the 8th Hussars for each year from 1888 to 1898, inclusive, as furnished to the Department of Militia.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, applications, correspondence, papers, plans, &c., in the Departments of Interior and Marine and Fisheries respecting 37·29 acres or thereabouts of foreshore and tidal lands about two miles below Steveston, B.C., situate west and immediately adjoining section 9, range 7 west, block 3 North, N.W.D.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all tenders opened on the 14th day of May, 1897, for works on the Farran's Point Canal, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended, also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of all claims presented to the Government for lands purchased or expropriated for the construction or connected with the operation of the St. Charles Branch of the Intercolonial Railway; also a statement showing the amount of each claim, the names of those whose claims have been settled for land purchased or expropriated, and 2. For land and other damages, and the names and amounts of claimants whose claims are still unpaid, and the bills presented for legal or other expenses and the amount paid to each person or firm.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing: (a.) The superannuations made in the Department of Agriculture from 30th June, 1896, to 30th April, 1899, in both the inside and outside services. (b.) The retiring allowances in each case. (c.) The manner in which the vacancies thus created have been filled, with names of persons appointed to such vacancies and amounts of salary in each case.—(Mr. Montague.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence in reference to the dismissal of Christopher Walker, postmaster of Ailsa Craig, Ont., with copies of charges, if any, made against such officer and report of any investigation held.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government or any member thereof, or any person or official in behalf of the same, and the Canada Eastern Railway Company, or any person in behalf thereof, and of any reports and papers in connection with any proposal to purchase for the Government the said railway.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and reports that have passed between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government of British Columbia, or any person or persons acting on their behalf, in regard to the Songhees Indian Reserve at Victoria, B.C., since June 1st, 1897.—(Mr. Prior.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company and the Department of Public Works during the last six months.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Copies of all Orders in Council and correspondence connected with and relating to the offer of the Government of British Columbia, made in 1899, respecting the Pacific Cable.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and reports between the Departments of Militia and Defence and Justice or their agents, and the following claimants for compensation and damages in respect of the erection of fortifications at Macaulay Point. B.C., viz.:—Fred Fell, J. Jardine, W. F. Bullen, R. W. Reford, Henry Moss, William Moss, J. G. Tiarks, Charles Kent, Thornton Fell, Andreas Keating (B. L. Ker), Hans Ogilvy Price, H. F. Bishop, S. J. Pitts, and any others that may have presented claims in regard to same.—(Mr. Prior.)

Copy of the report of W. H. Lynch, referred to by the hon. the Minister of the Interior ("Hansard," page 1848, April 19th, 1899).—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 30th May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TENDERS FOR MILITIA CLOTHING.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) moved:

That copies of all tenders issued by the Department of Militia and Defence since 1896 for the clothing of the militia of Canada be forthwith produced for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the second report of the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

TEMPERANCE ACT OF 1864

Mr. COWAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 134) to amend the Temperance Act of 1864. He said: Under the Temperance Act of 1864, commonly known to-day as the Dunkin Act, any township or municipality having that Act in force which desires to repeal the same, must have an open vote, recorded in one poll in the centre of the township, one day's voting being allowed for each 400 voters on the list. In the south riding of the county of Essex there is a municipality which has this Act in force and desires to repeal the same. In order to do it, they are compelled to resort to the cumbersome machinery of 1864. It is for the purpose of bringing this under the ballot system and to have the election held in the same manner as municipal elections are held both in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec that this amendment is introduced.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I ask leave to lay on the Table copy of correspondence between John R. Barrett, district inspector of Inland Revenue, Collector H. A. Costigan and the department relative to the receipt of $93.20 by Collector Costigan from Virden and not deposited at the proper time. This return is presented in anticipation of a motion being passed by the House, as it certainly will be for these papers. I have already laid before the committee a duplicate of these papers, so as to place it at once in possession of the whole case.

Mr. SPEAKER. These papers will be laid on the Table as a supplementary return, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think it was on Friday last that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), reviewing the business of the House, suggested to me that it would be advisable, under the circumstances in which we now are and in view of the lateness of the season, to proceed no further this session with the consideration of the Redistribution Bill. My colleagues and myself were bound to give to the views set forth by my hon. friend careful consideration, with a view to meeting his wishes, if possible ; but I must say that, having given to his suggestion the best attention we could, we have come to the conclusion that there is no reason really why we should not proceed with the Bill this session.

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) whether he has been able to look into the question of return in regard to the letters and telegrams connected with the permission for the entry of liquors into the Yukon territory given to Archer Martin, of Victoria. This is a subject that I brought to his attention the other day, the papers in regard to the Macaulay application not having been brought down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I gave instructions to have search made to ascertain if there were any papers such as the hon. gentleman referred to. Up to to-day at twelve o'clock no papers showing any correspondence or telegrams between the department or myself or any person in the department and Mr. Martin in regard to the permit to Mr. Macaulay have been found. I have given instructions to have a further and more careful search made in case such papers may be there, although not yet found. There has been some correspondence in regard to Mr. Macaulay, but not with Mr. Martin. If the hon. gentleman wants that correspondence, I shall be happy to let him have it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not particularly want that correspondence, but I would not object to it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) understands that I refer to telegrams or letters from Archer Martin or the firm of Martin & Langley. I suppose the Minister would not confine the search to communications from Archer Martin, but would extend it to those from Martin & Langley.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The instructions I gave were to look for correspondence from Archer Martin. There may be correspondence from the firm which would probably be overlooked in such a search. I understand that the firm name is Martin & Langley. I will have a search made for correspondence in that name.

ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MANITOBA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask if the hon. First Minister has been able to make good his undertaking to have the papers in regard to the Manitoba prosecutions for alleged election frauds brought down ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The promise has been made good, as our promises always are.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the papers have been brought down ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly. They were brought down yesterday.

THE YUKON INVESTIGATION.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I move for leave to lay on the Table of the House copy of an Order in Council of the 7th October, 1898, providing for the appointment of Mr. William Ogilvie as commissioner under the provisions of chapter 114, Revised Statutes of Canada, to investigate the charges and complaints referred to in said Order in Council ; copy of the commission issued under the great seal of Canada appointing Mr. Ogilvie such commissioner ; copy of his report of the 27th April, 1899, and copies of the three public notices referred to in such report and attached thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if this is the report of Mr. Ogilvie's official inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. With the consent of the House, I would like to move that the rule be suspended, and that these papers be printed at once.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT.

Mr. WILSON. May I ask when I may expect the papers in regard to the dismissal of the postmaster at Bath, Ont? Some time ago a promise was made that the papers would be brought down soon.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will call the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter.

SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to an item which I find in a journal published in my county with reference to the running of Intercolonial trains. The article reads as follows:—

Tha luchd-riaghlaidh an rathaid-iaruinn air a dhol gu bristeadh na Sabaid. Feasgar na Sabaid s'a chaidh, dh' fhalbh train a Sidni air son an luchd-turuis a thainig air a Bhruce oidhche Shathurna a thoirt gu Truro, agus an t-Sabaid roimhe sin dh' fhalbh train guail. Tha an t-am stad a chur air an obair ud, air neo cha'n fhada bios latha fois aig an luchd-obrach idir.

I would like the Minister of Railways and Canals to explain that matter, how it is that trains have been permitted to run under these conditions. For the information and instruction of the hon. Minister of Railways as well as for the edification of the hon. member for North Norfolk I will give the translation, which is as follows:—

The railway management have gone into breaking the Sabbath. On the afternoon of the last Sabbath a train left Sydney for Truro with the passengers who arrived Saturday night by the Bruce. On the Sunday previous a coal train left. It is time to put a stop to this work, otherwise in a short time the labouring people will have no day of rest.

I would like the Minister of Railways and Canals to explain to the House how it is that trains are permitted to leave the Sydney station on Sunday. I cannot see any reason why a train should leave on that particular Sunday with the passengers who arrived by the Bruce on the Saturday night previous. They could have connected with the passenger train going west from Halifax, at Truro, at ten o'clock or thereabouts on Monday morning, by leaving about midnight on Sunday night. I can understand that there may be a reason for these trains running in the daytime, instead of running at night.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not make a speech.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am asking the Minister to explain why this is done, and he should know the reason. The track on that section is not in as good a condition as it ought to be, and the reason is, that a number of skilled workmen were turned off the track and unskilled men were put in their place, men who were not fit to put that track in order, and the train people know this.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask the Government when I may expect some returns that have been asked for brought down, namely: first, concerning proposed branch railway from Southport and Murray Harbour, and other proposed railways in Prince Edward Island; second, concerning delegation from Prince Edward Island, consisting of the Attorney General and Hon. Messrs. Richards and Rogers, in March last; third, regarding the change in carrying mails for Prince Edward Island between the Intercolonial Railway and Sackville; fourth, expenditure in regard to reconstruction of China Point pier in Prince Edward Island; also, expenditures on piers and wharfs not of Dominion importance, for the years 1896-97 and 1897-98, and seizing of traps and ropes belonging to Benj. Sampton & Co., of Belle River in Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). If my hon. friend will kindly send me over a memo. of the returns that relate to the Island, I will have them brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I am sorry the hon. gentleman is asking what my officers tell me is next to impossible to furnish. He asks me for a return of expenditures on wharfs that are not public property all over Canada. Those of my hon. friends who have been Ministers know that it would be very difficult indeed to ascertain the expenditures that have been made occasionally by other Governments on works that are not the property of the Government. I may say, that the Deputy Minister of Public Works, to whose attention I called this matter a few days ago, told me that it would take months and months to make the report that the hon. gentleman is asking for. But, if he will be kind enough to call at my office, he will be accorded every facility to look into the books to find what he wants. If he will come to-morrow, I will be glad to show him all the books we have.

Mr. MARTIN. This motion was agreed to last session, and the hon. gentleman told me then that it would take a fortnight or so to make this return. It only covers two or three years. The hon. gentleman told me last session when I applied for an expenditure on the Belle River breakwater in Prince Edward Island, that there were no expenditures on piers or wharfs which had not

been assumed by Canada; that he himself had never made any such expenditures. He says now, that those expenditures cover so much ground that the department cannot tell us what they are. I do not think that is fair to this House. It is very important that this House should know what expenditures are made on wharfs over which the Dominion has control. It is also necessary that this House should be placed in possession of information of every amount that is spent from year to year on wharfs and piers over which the Government have no control. If this expenditure is so large that the Public Works Department cannot tabulate it in one year. I think it is a serious matter that this House should inquire into carefully. Of course, I am powerless in the hands of the Government; but I think the House and the country is entitled to this information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may be permitted to add, that, as the hon. gentleman knows, I have not been very well during the last month, and some matters may have escaped my attention. The last time my hon. friend called my attention to this matter, I asked my Deputy Minister to look into it, and he told me what I have just said. But, after the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friend, I will again look into this matter, and if, as he says, the return only covers two years, I think it can be brought down.

SUNDAY LABOUR IN THE PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. GUILLET. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, if it is true, that men are employed in the Printing Bureau on Sunday; in other words, if that Bureau is in operation on Sunday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I never heard of it up to the present moment.

Mr. GUILLET. Will you stop it, if it is true?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is easy to find out.

THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. WILLIAM McCLEARY (Welland). I desire to call the attention of the leader of the Government to a circumstance calling for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law. Members of the House are aware that attention has been called to this Act on account of a strike going on in the city of Hamilton at the present time among the garment makers, in consequence of which Calder & Co. have imported a number of workingmen to take the place of the men who have gone on strike because they have not received sufficient wages. On the other hand I have understood from the newspapers, as well as from correspondents, that the Government has taken the position that the Alien Labour Law should be allowed to remain in abeyance until the commission closed at Washington; neither Government enforcing it. But, only last Saturday, a young man named Hunt was deported across the river by Mr. DeBarry, simply because he was going to visit his uncle at Cleveland. He was a bricklayer; it was feared that he was seeking work, and he was sent back. Now, it will be apparent to the right hon. leader of the Government and to the House as well, that, if the United States are not going to keep their end of the bargain, if there was an agreement reached in that regard, certainly, our Government should enforce the Alien Labour Law, such as we have on the statute-books in regard to the importation of aliens who are brought in to take the places of Canadian workmen. I was expecting that some hon. gentleman representing Hamilton would have called the attention of the Government to this fact, but I deemed it my duty, as I live in the neighbourhood, to call the attention of the Government to that matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) that whilst we were in Washington, last winter, there was then a very arbitrary enforcement of the Alien Labour Law by some agents of the American Government, in fact, that a commercial traveller had been sent back to Canada under the pretense that in the prosecution of his business he was violating the Alien Labour Law. Under representations made, formally, to the authorities at Washington, it was informally agreed that the practice of enforcing the law should be, as far as possible, discontinued on both sides of the line pending an arrangement by the commission. I may say that that understanding was purely informal; we could not do anything which would have been absolutely binding, but it was well understood on both sides that we should discourage, as far as possible, the enforcement of that law. My attention has been called, within a day or two, to the violation of the Act by the agent named by my hon. friend, Mr. DeBarry, of Buffalo. I caused inquiries to be made, and I am engaged now in exchanging communications with some gentleman in authority at Washington upon this subject. I believe that the reports have been very much exaggerated, and even the fact to which my hon. friend has just alluded, seems to be a confirmation of the exaggeration of these reports. My hon. friend has said that a young man has been sent back by Mr. DeBarry because he was visiting his uncle, and because of the fear that, perhaps, he was going to the United States to work. This is a violation of the Alien Labour Law of the United States; the Alien Labour Law of the United States does not contemplate that a man can be turned back from American soil because he is visiting relatives. The

law only provides that it shall be applied when there is anybody going to work in the United States under contract, and, if a case of that kind has arisen, the person responsible was not proceeding according to law. A similar case has been brought to my attention. I have written to my informant to send me particulars under affidavit so that I may make due complaint to the American authorities that their officer not only enforces the law, but is abusing his privilege to prosecute citizens of Canada who happen to be visiting in the United States. Anybody treated in this way might have his remedy at law in such a case. The question is engaging the attention of the Government at this very moment.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 124) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that when this Bill to amend the Inland Revenue law was introduced the other day, the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) called attention to clause 2, which says:

(a) Upon the grain used for its production, at the rate of one gallon of proof spirits for every twenty and four-tenths pounds,—or, in a distillery where malt only is used, upon the malt used for its production, at the rate of one gallon of proof spirits for every twenty-four pounds.

I explained to the committee the distinction we are making between the two different modes of distilling whisky. I explained why, in one case, the assessed amount should be less than in the other case, or rather, why a larger allowance should be made in one case than in another, and the hon. member for Lanark asked me if I did not consider it fair to apply it, as much as possible, to the past as well as to the future, so as to repair any injustice that may have been done up to this time. I will now suggest to the committee the addition to the section of the following provision:—

The provision of this section shall apply to all transactions since the first day of July, 1898.

It is impossible for us to go any further, because the day of settlement is the first day of the fiscal year. I hope this decision will be found satisfactory to my hon. friend, and to all those who suffered by the mode adopted up to this time in regard to the amount of grain allowed.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. Minister give a reason why it should not apply to all liquors in bond?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is no complaint and no reason to change the mode of assessment in both cases. There are two modes of distillation; one requires a larger amount of grain in order to produce the same effect than the other does. The assessment that requires the smaller amount of grain has not given rise to any complaint, and in the other case, where the assessment works unfavourably, the provision we are making will remove the complaint as much as possible.

Mr. HAGGART. I am speaking entirely of malt liquors that the hon. Minister intends to apply this Bill to. He says that, at the end of the fiscal year, there is an assessment made, but the money is not paid. It is only an estimate, and why the reduction should not apply to all liquors in bond is something I cannot understand.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The reduction is only asked for in regard to one kind of liquor.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that perfectly well. Why should it not apply to all malt liquors in bond? You only make it apply to July, 1898. The distiller has to keep liquors in bond two years before he can sell them. Some liquors are kept in bond eight or ten years, and while the provision, perhaps, is a just one, this clause does not apply to all liquors in bond, but only to malt liquors.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Hitherto, on both kinds of whisky produced under different formulas, we assessed the same amount. If they did not produce one gallon of spirits for every 20 4-10ths pounds of grain they were assessed for whatever might be wanting in the number of gallons at the rate of 20 4-10ths pounds per gallon. We found out that there is a mode of distilling which could not produce a gallon of spirits for 20 4-10ths pounds of grain. It is impossible for them, and they are always in arrears, and we are always obliged to assess them at the end of the year. It is to render justice to them that we are asking that instead of assessing them, if they do not produce one gallon for each twenty and one-tenth pounds, we only claim from them one gallon for each twenty-four pounds. It is only for a special kind of distillery that we are trying to remedy whatever hardship they are labouring under. I am willing to go back until the beginning of the current year, which is now nearly over, to give them the benefit of this law, but as we have assessed them for the last year, and closed up their accounts, I do not think it would be judicious to apply the law to that period.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the Minister that there is a distinction made between two kinds of manufactured liquor, one from raw grain and the other from malt. Distillation from malt requires a larger quantity than from raw grain; but no malt or other distillery can sell any liquor until it is two years old. It is true the amount is assessed at the end

of every year, but the distiller does not sell, and there is no money paid into the Inland Revenue Department. If the manufacturers for the last ten years back could not make the quantity of liquor out of the amount of malt provided, and if the department finds that they are entitled to this act of justice, why do they not make it apply to all liquors in bond ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is impossible for me to understand why I should apply it to all liquors in bond, when it is intended to apply to only one particular kind of liquor.

Mr. HAGGART. I have made it clear. I think, that my argument applies to one particular liquor, namely, that manufactured out of malt. You can only sell that liquor after it is two years in bond. And, if it is just to apply the law for one year, it appears to me that it would be just to apply it to all liquors in bond. If the principle of the Bill is to apply to 1898, why should it not apply to all malt liquors that are now in bond ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We are trying as much as possible to relieve that industry ; we are coming to the help of that industry, but why we should now upset all our books and all our assessments I cannot understand. I think there is most certainly a proof of liberality in applying the Bill to the current year, and I was in hopes my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) would be satisfied with that.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, I will be satisfied if you insist upon it.

Section as amended agreed to.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made a suggestion the other day, that this whole clause should be redrafted. I thought before looking at the old clause that a very good suggestion, but as I am only substituting one word for another, it would cause a good deal of trouble if we reproduced this whole clause, which is more than half a page in length.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I had no particular knowledge of this class of legislation, but I made an appeal to the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) or any representative of the law department of the Government, regarding the convenience of reproducing the whole amended clause in a case of this kind. When these amendments are being made, it is very inconvenient to have to refer to changes of a word in the third or fourth line, and so on, and I thought it would be more convenient if the clause were reproduced.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This amendment is merely to meet what appears to be the result of forgetfulness in this case. For although it provides for nearly every fraction of a pound, it does not provide for one-third of a pound. We have been requested by several of the tobacco manufacturers to provide third of a pound stamps, and we do so in this Bill.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION OF PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière)—read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2, subsection (h),

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is a new clause, intended to meet the new order of things which we are attempting to introduce, and by which we hope to remove a great many of the hardships of which those who deal in petroleum as well as those who import it, especially people in the North-west, complain so seriously, and I must say with a good deal of reason. Instead of requiring the petroleum imported in tank wagons to be barrelled as hitherto, and only inspecting it when it is barrelled, we shall hereafter inspect the petroleum at the refinery or the custom-house, and then there will be no necessity for the petroleum to be barrelled. In order to inspect it at the different refineries, we must know where the refineries are, and make arrangements for bringing every one of the refineries under the control of the department. This is the purpose of this new clause.

On section 22,

Mr. FOSTER. That is a tyrannical clause. Any person is liable under it who may have only half a pound in his possession, and who may have bought it innocently.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is considered as smuggled oil. This would only apply to smuggled oil.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the man to know whether it is smuggled or not ?

On section 29,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I find that this clause is rather extravagantly severe, because there are many cases where the party found in possession of the oil, not being smuggled oil or anything of the kind, may be only guilty of neglect and nothing more. So I move that the last words " one hundred dollars " be struck out and the following be substituted :—" a pen-

alty of not less than ten or more than one hundred dollars."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that every company or person engaged in the refining of petroleum in Canada shall pay annually a license fee of one dollar for every refinery in which such business is carried on, such fee to become payable from and after a day to be fixed by the Governor General by proclamation for bringing into operation any Act which provides for the imposing of such license fee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We propose that a fee should be imposed in order to enable us to keep track of the different refiners and manufacturers; and it is thought that the nominal fee of $1 will be sufficient.

The committee rose and reported resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask, before proceeding further, if this is not a matter of taxation, and, therefore, requiring to be introduced by authority of His Excellency the Governor General ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I understand that the Minister of Finance gave notice that he had the consent of His Excellency the Governor General.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 128) to amend the Weights and Measures Act—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière)—read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue whether the provisions of this Bill are to apply entirely to fruit for export, or if they are to apply generally ? It is very material, I think, that the Bill should be considerably altered if it does not apply exclusively to fruit packed for export.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend will see that in the second section of the Bill, its operation is confined only to those who offer or expose apples for sale or for exportation.

Mr. CLANCY. As the Bill now stands, any person offering a barrel of apples for sale other than in accordance with the provision of this Bill, would be subject to the penalties prescribed. If it is only intended to apply to apples packed for export, the Bill should be made more clear. It would apply to a man offering a barrel of apples for sale at a local auction.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may be allowed to explain the reasons why it was thought necessary to introduce this change. It is thought necessary to specify the size of the barrel so as to put an end to the complaints that have been made, especially in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not touch the point to which we refer. The hon. gentleman is making parties who transgress this Act subject to certain penalties. Well, we say that if these penalties are only attached to parties who pack apples in a certain way for exportation, this first clause ought to be amended.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I thought that before dealing with that part of the Bill which provides for penalties, I would explain the reasons why we are dealing with the size of the barrel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We are perfectly willing to take the reasons for granted. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) suggested that this was an exceedingly severe penalty to place upon a man who happened to pack a barrel of apples contrary to the provisions of this statute, for his own use, for instance, or for sale at the local market. If an ordinary man who packs apples had that statute under his eyes, he would be afraid to pack apples at all, unless he had a veneer barrel or something of that kind.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The intention of the Bill is to prevent fraud, which has been complained of for a long time. If my hon. friend does not object to the description, and to the slight change that is made in the form of the barrel, we will come now to the penalty and its application. The penalty is much less than that provided against any other fraudulent dealer, because it is only 25 cents a barrel. It is a moral penalty rather than a material one. But I think the penalty ought to apply, not only to those who pack for exportation in a fraudulent manner in barrels smaller than those of the size fixed by law, but it ought to apply to all those who pack barrels for disposal in this country as well as for exportation. The fraud is the same in either case, and ought to be punished in the same manner.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether, in the statute that was amended, these words appear "cylindrical veneer barrels"?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is this veneer barrel ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Cylindrical veneer barrels are only now coming into use in Nova Scotia. The Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) is, perhaps, better acquainted with these barrels than I am, and, perhaps, he will explain what they are. I have not seen these cylindrical barrels, but I have been told how they are manufactured.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where does the veneer come in ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Veneer is one of those words, the application of which it is difficult to account for, in this case. But it is a word used among coopers.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has got some friend behind him who has a cylindrical veneer barrel that he wants to unload on the farmers of this country. I have no hesitation in saying that I dissent entirely from the proposition the hon. gentleman has made that every person who wants to sell to his nearest neighbour, or take into town, a barrel of apples, must take either a cylindrical veneer barrel or suffer the penalty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). There is an alternative—" or in good and strong barrels of seasoned wood."

Mr. CLANCY. But it must be of a certain size. The barrel is to be a barrel of apples packed in Canada for sale :

> All apples packed in Canada for sale by the barrel shall be packed either in cylindrical veneer barrels having an inside diameter of eighteen inches and one-third, and twenty-seven inches from head to head inside measure, or in good and strong barrels of seasoned wood twenty-seven inches between the heads, inside measure, and having a head diameter of seventeen inches and a middle diameter of nineteen inches, and such last-named barrels shall be sufficiently hooped, with a lining-hoop within the chimes, the whole well secured with nails.

It means that every barrel of apples brought into every city, town and hamlet in this country will have to be made of that fashion, or the packer will be subject to penalty. If the hon. gentleman proposes loading such conditions on the people of this country, they will very properly resent it. I think it is unfair and uncalled for. My hon. friend may have some person behind him urging him on, but that person represents but a very small section of the people of this country. I do not know why the farmers should be harassed with such regulations. If it is desired to protect the export trade that is a very proper thing to do, and if the hon. gentleman means that and means no more let him make that plain ; let him strike out the words " for sale " in the first section, and that will meet it, and, in the second subsection, let him strike out the words "or exposes for sale," because the first section will cover it entirely. If my hon. friend adheres to the statement he made a moment ago that a barrel of apples, to be sold, is to be subject to any such regulations I hope the House will not assent to any such arbitrary measurements.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that the hon. Minister says that this only applies to apples for exportation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; if I may be allowed to explain the law, today, that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) complains of, has been such a hardship that it is hardly enforced now.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, then, it is time my hon. friend should get rid of it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If my hon. friend wants to get rid of it he had better try to get rid of it. The only part I wish to improve in the law, as it is now, is in reference to the size of the barrel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. genman ought to drop that veneer.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am sorry that I cannot drop the veneer. What I am willing to drop, in order to make this Bill exactly on the same lines as the previous Bill, only changing the size of the barrel so as to make it entirely fair to all parties, is, in the second subsection, the words " every person who offers or exposes for sale, or who packs for exportation." I am ready to take the law as it is now. The law as it is now says that :

> Every person who offers or exposes apples for sale by the barrel otherwise than in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, shall be liable to a penalty of 25 cents for each barrel of apples so offered or exposed for sale.

My hon. friend speaks as if a hardship would be imposed by adopting this Bill. The only purpose is to make the size of the barrel so regular that there will be no cause of complaint resulting from the use of smaller barrels. The law as it is now gives the distance between these heads and says that the heads shall be from 16½ inches to 17 inches in diameter, but these heads can be made as thick as you like, and this Bill proposes to prevent fraud by saying the distance that there shall be between the heads.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman please read section 18, which it is proposed to repeat, so as to see what is to be substituted.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have read section 18. In regard to these words " for exportation," I do not see why they should have been added. I do not know why we should make an exception, and I will propose that these words " for exportation " should be struck out, and by comparison with the old clause it will be seen that the only difference we make is to provide that

the construction of the barrel shall be of such a nature as to make it uniform in any case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. "Cylindrical veneer" is not in the old section.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, I have had a calculation made as to the contents of such a veneered barrel, as the one my hon. friend finds so objectionable, and I find in one case they are 7,128 cubic inches, and in another 7,125 cubic inches, so that there is only a difference between the two barrels of 3 cubic inches. Will my hon. friend, who represents so many of these apple packers in New Brunswick, stand up and defend veneer barrels?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue ought to do one of two things: he ought either to drop the "cylindrical veneer barrels," which is included in the Bill he is introducing, or explain to us what it means. He says he does not know. I am anxious to know, I do not know, and I say that the House is entitled to an explanation when a new term is introduced in a Bill for the purpose of preventing frauds. The hon. gentleman has either to drop it or explain or get some person else to explain it so that we will understand it. This is a Bill which is to be carried into law, and a penalty for fraud is to be imposed, and under these circumstances it is not unreasonable that he should be asked to make the members of the House of Commons understand the meaning of the terms he employs. It is to be put in operation all over the country wherever fruit is grown. I would like to say a word or two, as I am on my feet, on the subject itself. I quite appreciate the effort the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is making to prevent fraud, but I do not see the necessity, or the great importance of preventing fraud in reference to the trade in Canada. I am able to say from experience that there is not a question that could engage the attention of this House that is more important to Canada, than the prevention of fraud in the exports of Canada. I may say that when I was High Commissioner for Canada at London, hay went up to £10 a ton, and opened a field for export from Canada to Great Britain that was of the utmost value to this country. Having studied the subject thoroughly, I came to the conclusion that, whenever hay rose to over £5 a ton, which it does very frequently, it can be exported profitably from Canada to Great Britain. Every person knows the enormous facilities that this country possesses for the export of hay. It was proved to a demonstration by parties who fed Canadian hay to horses, persons who kept five or six hundred horses, and who made an experiment—there was a great prejudice against Canadian hay because it was said that it was too coarse—which completely dispelled that supposition. The parties who fed this Canadian hay to hundreds of horses—one of the persons, I remember, had at that time 600 horses—fed Canadian hay for a month and fed hay procured in Great Britain for another month. This gentleman that I refer to gave a certificate, and made a declaration that he could keep his horses in infinitely better condition on Canadian hay than on the hay produced in Great Britain, and at a very much smaller cost. The condition of the horses was better and the cost was very much less. That trade, which rapidly assumed great proportions, was destroyed by parties in Canada, who, instead of keeping up the character of Canadian hay, shipped stuff that was not fit for shipment. Consequently, persons who were induced, under the high reputation that Canadian hay acquired, to order hundreds of thousands of tons of it, found that a great mass of it was totally unfit for consumption. The grossest frauds were resorted to, and anything which the Minister of Inland Revenue, or the Government, can devise to prevent frauds of that kind in connection with goods exported from Canada to Great Britain, deserves the most attentive consideration of this House. Whether it be apples, or hay, or any other commodity, the only means by which fraud can be guarded against is by having an inspection of the exports leaving this country, and an inspection which shall be as cheap and effective as possible. Canadian apples have carried off the gold medal in London at great exhibitions, in competition with apples from all parts of the world, and there is no doubt that, if we can prevent fraud, we can extend the export of fruit from Canada to Great Britain to almost any extent you like. But, when Canadian apples attain a high character, and people are anxious to obtain them, if it be found that there are good apples on the top and bottom of the barrels, and inferior apples in the middle, our trade will be destroyed. I believe that this measure, which imposes a penalty for fraud in that direction, is a very important one. However, I am inclined to think it is being pushed a little too far, when it is made to apply, not only to apples for export, but apples which are sold in the neighbouring town or village.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the Minister of Inland Revenue to say, that these persons could not sell apples anywhere without being liable to a penalty, and that is the objection which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) took. In my opinion, the penalty for fraud should apply to that which is offered for export, and not to these transactions which take place in the neighbouring towns.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There seems to be a great deal of misapprehension

about the effect and the object of this Bill. In order that we may understand the object of the Minister of Inland Revenue, let us see what the law is, as it now stands. Section 18 provides :

All apples packed in Canada for sale by the barrel shall be packed in good and strong barrels of seasoned wood, made as nearly cylindrical as may be, the staves of such barrels shall be twenty-seven inches in length from croe to croe, with heads from sixteen and one-half to seventeen inches in diameter, and such barrels shall be sufficiently hooped, with a lining-hoop within the chimes, the whole well secured by nails.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does "from croe to croe" mean ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The little curve that rounds around the staves into which the head of the barrel is inserted. Now, the change which we make by this Bill is :

All apples packed in Canada for sale by the barrel shall be packed——

Thus far, the words are the same as in the old Act, and here is the change to which I draw the attention of the leader of the Opposition, because, I think, there is no one in the House who does not agree absolutely with all that has been said with reference to the necessity for seeing that exports from Canada are equal to the staple article in the country. Here is the change :

——shall be packed either in cylindrical veneer barrels having an inside diameter of eighteen inches and one-third, and twenty-seven inches from head to head, inside measure,——

That is the first change. What is a cylindrical veneered barrel ? A veneered barrel is a veneered piece of wood put in the form of a barrel. What is a veneered piece of wood? Two pieces of wood put together, the grain of one running one way, and the grain of the other running another way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Wait a moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You are all wrong.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Veneered wood means, necessarily, a veneer of one kind of wood applied to another.

An hon. MEMBER. Look in the dictionary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not at all necessary to look at the dictionary for that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Ask the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A cylindrical veneered barrel means a cylindrical barrel of veneered wood. Any one will understand that two sorts of wood running together, the grain of one running in one direction, and the grain of the other running in another, will give you a piece of wood with a greater resistance than if the grains of both woods ran in the same direction. Now, the balance of the section provides for barrels the same as are now used, and leaves the law absolutely the same as it exists at present, except that the barrel now used is to be measured under a different system. The system of measurement which is to be applied, as provided by this Bill, would enable a more accurate estimate to be made of the contents of the barrel. For instance, here is what the section says :

——or in good and strong barrels of seasoned wood, twenty-seven inches between the heads, inside measure, and having a head diameter of seventeen inches and a middle diameter of nineteen inches, and such last-named barrel shall be sufficiently hooped, with a lining-hoop within the chimes, the whole well secured by nails.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That does not differ from the old law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is absolutely the same as the old law, except in respect to the mode of measurement, which is to be different.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears to be the same as the old law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a little difference, because of the thickness of the barrel head. If you eliminate from this section of the Bill a reference to the veneered barrel, you have the old law, as it has been in force for twelve or fourteen years. Whatever may be the character of the veneered barrel—and there seems to be some difference of opinion as to it—I understand it is used in some sections of the country ; and it is simply required that that barrel shall have certain dimensions. I do not see any great difficulty about that. Some of my learned friends on the other side objected to the penalty clause ; but that clause is simply a re-enactment of the law as we have had it in existence for fourteen years. Now, another change is the addition of the words : "Or who packs for exportation." The existing law applied only to apples offered for sale in Canada, and the effect of this change is to meet with the views of the leader of the Opposition, and to protect our apple trade, when these apples are exported. This change provided for in the Bill protects the foreigner who buys our apples, in the same way as the local buyer is protected.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do I understand that the barrel, as provided for under the section of that Bill, is the same size as provided for under the existing law ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, about the same.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not understand the hon. leader of the Opposition to refer to the size of the barrel at all. I admit that the size of the barrel is important ;

all barrels should be uniform in size; but it is much more important that there should be a uniform quality in the apples inside the barrel. It is in this respect that I understand our apples are losing their hold on the British market. When the consumer buys a barrel of Canadian apples, he assumes that they are a first-class article all through: but when he opens the barrel he finds a few good apples on the top and a few on the bottom, while all in the middle are inferior. Now, I object to the newspapers giving currency to the statement that it is the farmers of this country who are to blame for this state of things. I want to tell this House, and the country through this House, that there is hardly a barrel of apples intended for Great Britain that is packed by a farmer. The dealers come to the farmers and buy the apples in the orchards and pack them themselves. There is hardly a barrel of apples in the country packed by a farmer, and I repudiate the circulation by the newspapers of the false impression that the farmers of Canada are cheating the consumers of Great Britain. The farmers have no more to do with the packing of the apples than they would have if they did not raise the apples at all. I want to correct the impression that has gone abroad that the farmers of the country are responsible for the fraud which is perpetrated on the British consumers. I can tell you where this clause may have a serious effect. An apple buyer comes to me and buys my apples for a lump sum, and he asks me to deliver them at Brighton or Colborne, my nearest market. I put them up in the barrels as he directs me; and the question is whether under this clause I would be liable to the penalty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think anybody in this House is prepared to dispute anything my hon. friend has said in reference to the honesty of the Canadian farmer; but I think that is beside the present question. I quite agree with what he says with reference to the necessity for the proper packing and inspection of apples: and if he refers to the General Inspection Act, he will find that the law since 1890 has provided for the difficulty he now speaks of. We proceed, by this Bill, to provide for the new difficulty. The second section is absolutely the old law as it has been in force for the last twelve or fourteen years, with the exception that the provision which now applies to apples put up for sale in this country is made to extend to apples packed for exportation. That is the only change, and in view of what has fallen from the leader of the Opposition, it seems to me there cannot be any dispute as to the necessity for that change.

Mr. MILLS. In addition to the objections which have been already offered to the Bill, I would urge this one. It seems there is to be a drastic change in the size of the barrel, which will particularly affect barrels made in the province of Nova Scotia; so that if this Bill becomes law, it will put the coopers in the country to a great disadvantage.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will my hon. friend take the Bill, and point out in what respect a change in the size of the barrel is made?

Mr. MILLS. In the law as it is now, I understand that there must be twenty-seven inches between croe and croe, whereas the Bill makes the space twenty-seven inches on the inside. Even that is quite a little difference. It is sufficient, at all events, to change the construction of the stuff which the coopers have already got out. Then, there is also a change with reference to the bilge of the barrel, making the barrel a great deal larger.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. MILLS. Excuse me. The old law, if I remember correctly, provides that the diameter of the barrel shall be seventeen inches at its wider part to sixteen and a half inches, whereas the Bill makes it seventeen inches at the head and nineteen inches at the middle. Of course, I am not an expert in these matters, but I represent a constituency which is intensely interested in this subject. I have sent copies of this Bill to the coopers, asking them to give me their opinion of it, and I would like the hon. Minister to postpone the Bill for a short time until I can have an opportunity of ascertaining the opinion of these men. I do not wish to offer a factious opposition to the Bill at all. I make this suggestion in all good faith.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue has stated that I have had some communication with him in reference to this matter. That is quite true. In fact, some years ago, when the late Sir John Thompson was Premier, I brought this matter up in this House at the request of the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia; and this Bill, I understand, is word for word what was adopted at a large meeting of the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia, and approved of by several meetings of farmers held at different points in the western part of Nova Scotia. The objection which my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has raised is, I think, entitled to some consideration. No doubt, there are a great many men engaged in the manufacture of barrels in western Nova Scotia. Thousands and hundreds of thousands are made every year, and if the Bill becomes law, I think it might be provided that it should come into force at some future fixed date, which would enable the manufaturers to dispose of the stock which they may have on hand. I do not think, however, that there is at

present any large stock on hand. I understand the hon. leader of the Opposition to refer to quite a different matter. This is an amendment to the Weights and Measures Act, and the hon. gentleman referred to the Inspection Act. I quite agree in all the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the very great importance of having our exports go on the foreign markets in good condition, and I also agree with my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) that the farmers are not always by any means responsible for the bad packing. The same thing occurred in my own province which he says takes place in his county. The farmers sell the whole orchard, on the tree, and the purchaser sends in his men who pick the apples and pack them. I think it would be well for the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) to consider seriously the question of amending the Inspection Act in such a way as to cover all important exports such as apples.

Something has been said with regard to the new style of barrel referred to here. I regret that I am not able to explain minutely what sort of a barrel this is, but that does not seem of much importance because the alternative is permitted and there is no attempt to force anybody to use the veneer barrel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the veneer barrel?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understand that a new process has been discovered by which the round log is taken and, as it were, peeled, and instead of having a number of staves, as in the ordinary barrel, there is simply one stave and the barrel is absolutely cylindrical—the same size at the head as all the way through; and a very careful calculation has been made, according to which the contents of this cylindrical barrel are absolutely the same as those of an ordinary barrel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where are they made?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman, but I believe they are made in Ontario and other places.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there a patent out?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know. I can only repeat that the Fruit Growers Association of Nova Scotia, one of the oldest and most important horticultural organizations in the country, approves of this Bill, and no doubt would not have given it their approval without very carefully looking into the question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then this cylindrical barrel has some other material put on the outside?

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not understand that that is necessarily the case. The packer, by this Bill, is left open to buy any barrel he chooses and not compelled to use the veneer barrel. I only wish to say in conclusion that I think it is important that the words "or who pack for exportation" should be retained in the Bill. I think it is important that we should adopt a uniform package for all the fruit sent out of Canada, and that is the object of the introduction of this measure. There can be no hardship in defining the size of barrels which shall be used in the home and the foreign market. It would certainly be a great convenience if one uniform size should be adopted, both for sale on the home market and export.

Mr. CRAIG. I merely rise to endorse the suggestion made by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). I do not profess to know very much about this matter myself, but in my constituency there are large shippers of apples and men who make barrels as well; and as the Bill was only read the first time on the 25th May, it would be well for the Minister of Inland Revenue to postpone further consideration until we have time to get word from those interested. I am very anxious to know the views of my constituents with regard to this measure, and I would urge the hon. Minister to give the necessary time to obtain these views.

Mr. HENDERSON. I trust that in the meantime the hon. Minister will consider seriously the question as to whether this Bill should apply to any but apples for export. I am quite sure it will create a very great deal of disturbance in the country if the Bill is made to apply to all apples packed for local sale. In my own section, a large number of sugar barrels are used in the packing of apples for the local market. These are larger than the apple barrel, and under the present Bill a penalty could be imposed on the farmer using such larger barrels.

There is no grievance alleged on the part of the local trade, and I am quite sure the hon. Minister will find that he will meet with the approval of the people generally if he makes no attempt to interfere with the trade of the country, as it has been carried on heretofore, and simply make this Bill apply to apples for export.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That would be changing the law.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the law should be changed for it is now a dead letter. The hon. Minister will meet with the approval of farmers generally if he would amend the law so as to make it in accord with the custom of trade in the country. There is no need whatever to define the size of an apple barrel used in the home trade. I trust that further time will be given to the con-

sideration of this Bill, as I would like to hear from some of my constituents and know what the desire of the people is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the attention of the Solicitor General might be directed to the last line of clause 18.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of this Bill or the old one?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of the present proposed Bill. There is a provision that the barrel shall be provided with "chimes," I think we should regulate the quality of the "chimes," if it be necessary to deal with them at all. I am under the impression that the word intended is the word "chines."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) has probably copied too closely the legislation we have had in force for the last 14 years.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I can explain to my hon. friend what the chime is, if he desires information.

Mr. MOORE. I had something to say on this subject, but the hon. gentleman on my right (Mr. Henderson) has stolen all my thunder. The main objection to this Bill is one that he has placed before the House more forcibly than I could. In the province of Quebec very few apples are sold for export. Still, many farmers are raising apples in that country. They put them in barrels such as they can buy, flour barrels and so on, and take them into the towns and sell them. I understand that this law provides that if a farmer offers apples in a barrel not of the prescribed size, he will be liable to a penalty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That has been the law for the last 14 years.

Mr. SCRIVER. But the law has not been enforced.

Mr. MOORE. But you propose to make a law now that will impose a penalty in such a case. Even if a farmer sells a barrel of apples to his neighbour, he is liable to a penalty, as I understand it, if the barrel is not of the prescribed size. If I am wrong I would like to be corrected. I understand the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) to say that there would be no harm in prescribing a barrel of uniform size in which apples are to be sold for domestic use as well as for export. I do not see any particular objection to a fixed size of barrels for apples packed for export. After what we have heard from the Minister of Agriculture in the Agriculture Committee, that the farmers have been dishonestly packing apples to send to the foreign markets, it would, perhaps, be better that the Government should look to the inside of the barrel than to the form of the barrel. I was surprised, for my part, to find the farmers of our country accused of being so dishonest. If they were packing apples as they have been accused of doing, I think it would be well for the Government to look into the inside of the barrel and leave the rest alone, except, possibly, in the case of apples packed for the English market.

Mr. HEYD. I do not see why there should be a single voice raised in opposition to this Bill. The Bill must strike any one familiar with the apple trade as exactly what the country has been wanting. It is evident that many of those who have spoken on the subject of this Bill are not familiar with the subject or with the difficulties the Bill is intended to reach. It is certainly desirable to have a standard measurement so that a person when buying a hundred or a thousand barrels of apples may know exactly what he is going to get. Now, what is the actual practice? When we buy apples for export, it is understood by the people in the trade that a barrel shall contain so much. They are generally understood to contain about two bushels and three pecks. But outside of the export trade there are thousands of barrels of apples sold in this country, the barrels being bought by farmers from the grocers—sugar barrels, flour barrels, starch barrels—containing all the way from two and three-quarters to four bushels, all sold under the generic name of a barrel of apples. A farmer goes into a store and buys, probably, a hundred sugar barrels, packs them with apples, and brings them in and sells them as barrels of apples. I understand the object of the Bill is, as the hon. Minister tells us, to provide that when one is buying a thousand barrels of apples he may understand them to be of a specific size. We have had similar legislation to this in operation for 14 years. I have seen thousands of barrels of apples in the place I came from, containing three bushels and a half, and I never knew a man to be fined for giving three bushels and a half when he was bound only to give two bushels and three-quarters under the terms of his agreement. I think it desirable that we should have it so arranged that exporters of apples and those who sell apples may know that they are not bound to give three bushels and a half or more instead of two bushels and three-quarters in selling a barrel of apples. It may be that the Opposition, for the purpose of having a little fun, criticise this measure this afternoon; but it is not in the interest of exporters or farmers that it has not been well understood that two bushels and three pecks of apples make a barrel. I trust the Bill will pass. There is nothing of an objectionable character in it that has not existed for 14 years, and I defy any man to say that under that law a farmer has been fined for giving three and a half bushels instead of two bushels and three-quarters.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is evident from the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) who has just sat down that there is a job in this Bill for somebody. In the first place, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Sir

Henri Joly de Lotbinière) if the cylindrical barrel measuring 18½ inches by 27 inches will contain the same quantity as the other barrel measuring 27 inches between the head by 17 inches head diameter and 19 inches middle diameter ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I explained that one will contain 7,128 cubic inches and the other 7,125 cubic inches. In other words, there is a difference of three cubic inches between the two, and it is impossible to come nearer.

Mr. TAYLOR. You find mentioned in this Bill two classes of barrels, one cylindrical—made in the shape of a cheese box—the same size from top to bottom—and the other of the ordinary size. It looks as if some friend of the hon. Minister invented a barrel of this cylindrical kind. It is provided that apples must be packed either in a barrel of that kind or in one 27 inches between the heads with a head diameter of 17 inches and a middle diameter of 19 inches. If it has a middle diameter of 18½ inches, it cannot be used. No cooper can make barrels exactly 19 inches in the centre. If the hon. Minister will provide that a barrel of apples shall contain so many cubic inches or so many bushels, there will be some sense in that. In my part of the country, seven-eighths of the apples are sold in Kingston and Brockville and other nearby markets. The apples are put up in flour barrels or sugar barrels, varying somewhat in size, but none measuring less than two and a quarter bushels. I do not know what the barrels provided for in this Bill will contain, but it is evident that the apples that are sent for export will go in these cylindrical barrels, made, no doubt, by some friend who has the ear of the hon. Minister. Now, in answer to what the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) has said, I may point out that the exporters have this matter in their own hands. The farmers do not export a barrel of apples. The exporters can supply any barrels they like. They buy the apples from the farmers at so much a bushel and pick them and pack them themselves ; and they, not the farmers, provide the barrels. If there is fraud, as my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) contends, in putting large apples on the bottom and on the top, no doubt our English friends have found it out, and the farmers of this country have got the blame for it—through the Committee on Agriculture, who brought out the fact, and gave it to the world, some days ago. The fact is, that the packing, in 99 cases out of 100 is done by the packers and exporters themselves. But it is evident that this Bill is intended to benefit some man who has patented a barrel made in the form of a cheese-box, who has got the ear of the Minister, and has had a Bill introduced here to force the sale of his barrels in this country. It would be all right, if the Minister would introduce a Bill saying, that a barrel of apples should contain two bushels and three pecks, or three bushels, let it be square, round, or any other shape, of whatever material they like, and that it must contain a certain quantity of apples ; then, if these conditions are not fulfilled, let the packer, or the farmer, be liable to a penalty. But it is absurd to say, that a farmer cannot sell a barrel of apples, unless they are packed in these cylindrical barrels, or a barrel that must be 19 inches at the bilge, because no cooper can make all barrels of exactly the same measurement at the bilge. It will not be the same on every barrel. Therefore, he forces everybody to buy this patent barrel to help some one introduce it on the market.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The statement of the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, is not correct. From one-third to one-half of the apples exported from Nova Scotia every year are exported directly by the farmers. The farmers there are wealthier than those of Ontario, and know how to raise apples. The consequence is, that the farmers themselves export the apples, and the names of the farmers who export apples from that valley are better known in London than the packers that have been spoken of. The province of Nova Scotia is the one of all others where the people know best how to raise apples, and where they do raise the best apples.

Mr. COCHRANE. What nonsense that is.

Mr. McDOUGALL. With regard to the veneer barrels, I have seen different kinds of them, and I have handled them myself. A veneer barrel is made by putting two plies of wood together. The outside is precisely like a cheese-box ; the inside is made up as the staves of an ordinary barrel are made now, only that it consists of one piece of wood, instead of several pieces. That makes up the barrel. It cannot be made in any other way than of the same size from top to bottom. Veneer is one piece inside and one piece outside, only that they are put in opposite directions. The outside is in the position of a hoop on an ordinary barrel, and the inside is in the position of the staves in an ordinary barrel, thus they are in opposite directions. And instead of having the croes to hold the head and the bottom, there is a hoop put inside, and the bottom and head are put on to that, and another hoop is put on the outside. That is the way the barrels are made up. These barrels are now used in packing nails ; I believe their manufacture is confined to the United States ; I am not aware of any being made in Canada. They are used for packing soda, in some instances, and nails. I have seen them years ago, containing granulated cornmeal manufactured in the United States. I may say, with regard to the shape of the barrel, that I think it would be preferable not to make it with the bilge for packing fruit. When you stow a lot of barrels having a bilge, you are liable to press

down the staves of which the barrel is made up, on the bilge, and in that way bruise the fruit, because you have a vacant space between the ends of the upper barrel and the lower barrel. If you want to stow a number of barrels, with the cylindrical veneer barrel, you have the full length of one barrel resting on the other, with the two ends lodging evenly, and the wood which is on end forming the head of the barrel, is stronger than the bilge of the barrel, when you have the weight of several resting on each other. That is my understanding of the advantage in using a veneer barrel, when the two plies of wood are put together in the way I have described. If they are put together in any other way, and a split took place in the material of the barrel, the split would continue to the end of the wood, whereas, if the split took place in the outside ply of the veneer barrel, it is met on the inside by the wood being in the opposite direction.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would ask my hon. friends to allow me five minutes to explain the purpose of this Bill. Anybody who will examine the law, as it stands to-day, will see that there is complete uncertainty in regard to the size of the barrel, and it is to dissipate this uncertainty that the present Bill has been introduced. The old law, as it now stands, reads :

The staves of such barrels shall be twenty-seven inches in length from croe to croe.

Well, the croe is the groove in which the head of the barrel is placed. But there is nothing now to show what the thickness of the head shall be. A man who wants to cheat can make that head an inch thick.

Mr. MILLS. Usually, there is quite a bulge in that head.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The present amendment simply states that between the two heads there shall be 27 inches. The old law says there shall be 27 inches between the two croes, but it does not say how thick the head shall be. If the head is 1 inch thick at each end, you will see at once there are 2 inches lost on the whole length of the barrel. Now, let me say, that the very description of the barrel in the old law is of such a nature that it is impossible to say that it is positive.

The staves of such barrels shall be twenty-seven inches in length from croe to croe, with heads from sixteen and one-half to seventeen inches in diameter.

My hon. friend said, a moment ago, that we were increasing the diameter of the barrel. We are not increasing the diameter of the barrel. The present amendment says, that the head of the barrel shall be 17 inches in diameter, whereas the old law says, that it shall be between 16½ and 17 inches. Well, I am adopting the entire measure, instead of the fractional measure, saying 17 inches, instead of 16½. Then, again, there is no precise shape of the bilge prescribed for the old barrel : you might make the old barrel nearly perpendicular, if you liked. We try to dissipate that uncertainty by saying, that the bilge shall be 19 inches in diameter. I hope, from these explanations, my hon. friend will see that there is a purpose, at all events, in the introduction of this Bill, that we are trying to remove the uncertainty that exists in each of these respects, so that in future it will be perfectly clear what the size of the barrel must be. Now, as to the veneer barrel. In a barrel with staves, which I may take for an explanation, it has been calculated with the greatest care that there are only 3 cubic inches difference between a veneer barrel and a barrel with staves, such as we now wish to define. I will not to take up any more time of the committee, but I hope I have said enough, at all events, to satisfy my hon. friends that the reason for introducing this Bill is not to favour the manufacturing of veneer barrels, nor has it any purpose of that kind. They are already manufactured; I have myself got barrels made of veneer. The Bill is to put an end to all complaints as to the real contents of the barrel. By looking at the first line, it will be seen that the time when this law comes into force has been left in blank, so as to give fair-play to every one, to the coopers, to those who have a collection of these barrels on hand, and, if the Bill is passed, the date when it becomes law may be put as remote as they like, providing it becomes law within a reasonable time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the veneered barrel being made in Canada now ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Certainly it is made in Canada. I have some veneered barrels.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It appears to me that the statute which the hon. gentleman is introducing is really a law against being thick-headed. I think we should withdraw our opposition to this clause at once.

Mr. CLANCY. Since the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has consented to allow the Bill to stand, as I understand he has ?——

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to ask him to consider, in the meantime, the possibility of amending section 18. It has been stated that this is practically the old law. Now, I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the old law is a dead letter, because it is not practicable. Nobody pretends to conform to the law as it now stands, and therefore it is no excuse to argue, in this case, that we are simply following the old law. I think the hon. gentleman will see that it is time the old

law was repealed, or at all events, that we might repeal that part of it so far as it refers to apples packed entirely for local, or what we call domestic use. I hope the hon. gentleman will repeal a law that is so obnoxious, and that would so restrain trade if it were put into operation. I would suggest that we repeal that part of section 18 which compels farmers to have barrels of a certain size in which to pack apples for domestic use. I was about to say, if I can make myself heard in the midst of the din here, caused by hon. gentlemen talking at the top of their voices, that I am sure the practice has shown that the present law is a dead letter, that it would restrain trade, and that it would be impossible to carry it out for the reasons that have been stated, so far as it relates to domestic sale or the sale of apples for home consumption. Farmers get all kinds of barrels; they get sugar barrels at a small cost, and the purchaser of the apples has the profit of the barrel and of the apples afterwards. The same applies to flour barrels. If this section were enforced there is not a farmer in the country who is not already liable. I am not going to question the propriety of enforcing section 18 so far as it relates to the export trade of Canada. There is a general consensus of opinion that we cannot take too much care in regard to our export trade, and that, although we may adopt statutory regulations that appear harsh, they are tending in the right direction. But it is not an answer to say that this has been the law. This is a bad and useless law, so far as it relates to domestic sale, that has never come into operation, and if it had there would have been such an outcry that it would have been repealed long ago. I have no doubt that this is one of those laws that have got upon the statute-book by accident. I appeal to the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to say if that Act were carried out every farmer in the country would not be liable, because it is a law with which he cannot profitably conform. So, I hope the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue will consider this matter, and will be prepared to repeal that law so far as it relates to the home trade.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Before the committee rises, I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to another matter which may be regulated under the Bill now before the committee. Last year, unfortunately, whether in this House or in the Senate, a serious blunder was committed in amending the Act in regard to the weight of a bushel of lime, in providing that a bushel of lime shall weigh eighty pounds. The hon. Minister tells me that he does not know how that word "eighty" came into the statute, whether it was in this House or in the Senate.

Mr. CLANCY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In the Senate, of course; that is an argument to reform the Senate.

Mr. HENDERSON. Whether it was in the Senate or in this House, it is altogether erroneous. The men handling that article cannot possibly comply with that provision which says that a bushel of lime shall weigh eighty pounds, because it does not weigh eighty pounds to the bushel. They are forced to adopt the expedient, in dealing in lime, of selling it by the hundredweight instead of selling it in the usual way, by the bushel, in order to avoid the penalty if they sold a bushel of lime weighing seventy pounds instead of eighty pounds. I understand the hon. Minister would be prepared, when we go into committee again, to propose the necessary amendment to substitute "seventy" for "eighty," so as to correct the blunder of a year ago. I have prepared an amendment, which I may read:

That section 16 of such Act be amended by striking out the word "eighty" in the sixth line thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "seventy."

This would accomplish the whole purpose. If the hon. Minister would prefer leaving it until we go into committee again, I am satisfied, but I hope he will have an amendment prepared that will meet the case.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will be prepared, when the Bill comes before the committee again, to show, in the most conclusive manner, that by doing so we will be doing an act which will meet with the general approval and with the requirements of the trade. I hope my hon. friend will be prepared to prove that it will be an advantage to adopt what he proposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Personally, I am prepared to do that, because I know a good deal about the matter, being interested in the sale of thousands of cars in a year of this article. I know what I am talking about, and possibly I could not get any stronger evidence than what I could give myself. However, I have no doubt I can obtain information from the association which handles a large amount of this article in Ontario, probably three-fourths of the whole output, which will certify to the fact that seventy pounds is the proper weight of a bushel of lime, and that eighty pounds is altogether out of the question.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in Bill (No. 122), which reads as follows:—

The Weights and Measures Act, chap. 104 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby amended by adding the following section thereto immediately after section 18:—

"18a. Unless otherwise specially agreed upon between the buyer and seller, eggs shall be sold by weight, and the weight equivalent to a dozen shall be one pound and one-half."

In a conversation that I had with the hon. Minister he thought it would be better for me to bring in a Bill and bring it before the House. The egg question is a growing question in Canada to-day. There has been a very great change in this trade during the last eight or nine years, as the following table will show :—

EXPORT OF CANADIAN EGGS.

To Great Britain—

Year.	Dozens.	Value.
1888	2,378	$ 262
1889	98	18
1892	3,987,655	592,218
1896	5,585,725	704,768
1897	6,939,496	923,965
1898	10,280,466	1,244,051

To United States—

Year.	Dozens.	Value.
1888	14,147,739	2,119,588
1889	14,011,011	2,156,725
1892	3,918,015	494,409
1896	894,989	97,309
1897	479,258	47,623
1898	38,643	5,029

The market we at one time enjoyed for eggs in the United States, we never can have again because of the changed conditions of that market. I have here a statement which shows the price of eggs in the different years from 1891 to 1898, during the month of March, in Toronto as compared with the price in New York. That statement will show that the Toronto market is now as good as the New York market. It is as follows :—

	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898
	c.	c.	c.	c.	c.	c.	c.	c.
Toronto ..	16	14	17	16	15	16	11	10
New York.	24½	14½	18	14½	12	11½	10½	10

During the year 1897 there were over one million dozen of eggs shipped from the United States to the British market, and I believe there was a larger quantity exported last year. Sir, the egg industry is an industry that requires to be fostered. That is why I have introduced the measure which stands in my name. Between the dealers in Canada and the dealers in the old country, there is often dispute in respect to what the standard of a dozen of eggs shall be. I met last spring a gentleman from England who is a large dealer in eggs, and he said it would be a great benefit if we had a law in Canada defining the standard dozen. Some people thought that we would need a law to define the standard as between buyers and sellers in Canada ; but others thought that would be too rapid a change. I have adopted the principle in this Bill of making a regulation as between buyers and sellers living at distances apart in this country. This egg trade is a trade that can be fostered to a great extent, and I believe we should do something which would enable our farmers to improve the quality of their poultry, because we generally find that the large chickens lay the best eggs. If the provision in my Bill is adopted, it will encourage the farmers to raise a better quality of poultry which will produce a better quality of eggs. I believe the day is fast approaching when eggs will be sold by weight instead of by the dozen. It is unfair that a farmer who raises eggs seven of which will make a pound, should only receive the same price for a dozen as the farmer who sells at nine eggs to the pound. I believe that a dozen of eggs will weigh a pound and a half, and make that as the standard weight. I would ask the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) if he will incorporate this provision in his Bill to amend the Weights and Measures Act ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will be glad to consider it, and to take the opinion of the House on the matter. For my part, I must say that there is a great deal in what the hon. member (Mr. McMillan) states. But of course the Bill is in the hands of the House, and I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) will be able to convince the House that his views are right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sure the House will be pleased with the sympathetic smile with which the Minister turned to the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), but he will be still more deeply interested in that smile had it not been for the manner in which the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) represented the Minister's position on this question. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) said he had consulted the Minister (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) as to whether this Bill should be introduced, and the Minister feeling that he might hatch trouble for himself by introducing the Bill, gently asked the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) to introduce it. But the Minister now says that instead of adopting the measure he will give it his serious consideration. The Minister will, to use the suggestion of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), incubate upon the question, and after a while lay his opinions before the House. It is not at all my suggestion that the Minister wished to sit upon the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). I rose for the purpose of joining in the note of congratulation that was sounded by the hon. member for South Huron upon the wonderful extent which the egg trade between Canada and Great Britain has grown, and I could not help thinking, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) was expressing in jubilant notes the facts in regard to that trade, nor could I forget that during a previous debate in this House a gentleman occupying the most important place here, thought it an evidence of Canada's prosperity to mention the fact that the egg trade between Canada and Great Britain had grown to immense proportions. Nor, Sir, could I forget the jeers,

and the sneers, and the laughter, and the general fun-making that was indulged in by the Liberal Opposition some time ago, when the present hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), then Finance Minister, seriously proposed to this House that there was an opening for a splendid trade in eggs between Canada and Great Britain. And, Sir, the suggestion of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) as to cultivating the English market, laid the foundation well indeed, of the trade of which these hon. gentlemen opposite boast at the present time.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to say that it was I myself who brought in this Bill. After I brought in the Bill I consulted the Minister of Inland Revenue in reference to it, but it was not at his suggestion it was brought in.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is the fact.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it due to the National Policy that eggs commanded a higher price in Toronto than they did in New York during the several years the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) quoted ?

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has the National Policy on the brain, and I rather think it interferes with his sleep.

The committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved second reading of Bill (No. 133) to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the position that this question is in. We have had a long and somewhat animated discussion on this measure ; but it is only one-half of the transaction. The hon. gentleman has resolutions on the paper, which you and he will agree with me have to be proceeded with before the second reading of this Bill takes place—resolutions in regard to the contract made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which are an essential part of this measure ; and we would be in a very extraordinary position if this Bill should pass the House, and the House should then not agree to those resolutions which are an absolutely component part of the arrangement. Therefore, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, in order to put this matter legitimately and fairly before the House, that the second reading of this Bill should not be proceeded with until the resolutions with reference to the other component part of the measure have been carried. When those resolutions have passed the House, we shall then be in a position to pass this Bill or any measure to carry out this portion of the arrangement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Speaker, I confess that it had not occurred to me that there was any serious objection from any point of view to our proceeding with some further stages in the matter of this Drummond County arrangement. It must be pretty well recognized on all sides, and I think my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will himself concede, that there has been no attempt to impose any restriction whatever upon the discussion of the Grand Trunk feature of the arrangement during the progress of the resolutions in respect of the Drummond County Railway. There has been no objection to a reference to the existing contracts. Everybody has discussed both with the utmost freedom, and I think my hon. friend will not suggest that there has been any absence of information either as to one agreement or the other. Now, I take it that the present motion is largely a formal one. The House has already passed upon the principle of the measure in adopting the resolutions in committee, and these resolutions have been concurred in by the House ; I am sure, therefore, that my hon. friend will not, on reflection, think it desirable to further delay the present motion. If my hon. friend particularly desired it, I would have no objection at all to consider whether the third reading of the Bill might not stand until we had the Grand Trunk matter before the Committee of the Whole. I think that would probably meet his views. One or the other must, of course, pass first ; we cannot have them both passed together. They are old subjects, they have been pretty thoroughly discussed, and I would suggest to my hon. friend whether his object could not be as well accomplished by allowing the matter to remain in suspense after the second reading, and before the Bill gets its third reading.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend will find that his acceptance of the suggestion will tend really to bring about what he desires, which is the passage of his measures as quickly as possible. I have felt all along, while this discussion has been going on, that we had really only half, and the least important half, of what is a very large and very important transaction. This is not a matter which we can enter into to-day and get rid of to-morrow. If we enter into it now, it remains with us for three generations. One may say that it is an absolute transaction which it will be almost impossible ever to have reviewed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the case with nearly all our legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend himself will admit that he ought not, for his own sake, and the Government ought not as a Government, to press the matter without the fullest discussion and the fullest information; and I have felt all along, from the time the discussion commenced, that we were discussing simply one-half of the measure. We are here discussing the Drummond County road, which is a part of the transaction, and as it stands to-day the least important part. I have not the least hesitation in saying that I consider the proposed arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway far more objectionable in its present condition than the arrangement with regard to the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must say that one would not have suspected that in the discussion in times past.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how my hon. friend would draw his inference, or how his suspicion would work out in his own mind: but that is what I feel now. Although my hon. friend has not acknowledged it to the House, I think he himself knows, and I imagine that none of his followers, and certainly no one on this side of the House, is unaware, that the Drummond County portion of the transaction is radically different from what it was before. There is no doubt about that. I do not think there is any use of hon. gentlemen opposite trying to blink it, or hide behind the assertion that they are only proposing to do now what they proposed in 1897. They are doing a very different thing in regard to the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think assertion on one side is really as good as assertion on the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I take issue with my hon. friend as to that. The two assertions will be weighed by people outside, and they will conclude, not from a simple assertion itself, but from the facts and circumstances, and the reasons by which the two assertions are backed. However, that is my statement, and I have no hesitation in making it, that the Drummond County arrangement is radically different from what it was in 1897.

The PRIME MINISTER Worse or better?

Mr. FOSTER. It will be a good deal as hon. gentlemen look at it. If they have, as they appear to have, very little regard for economy, very little regard for the taxpayer, perhaps they would say it did not matter much that in the present arrangement as compared with the arrangement of 1897, something more than half a million dollars had been saved in the Drummond County part of the transaction alone.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friends think that economy practised to the tune of about one-third of the purchase price of the Drummond County Railway, that one-third being over half a million dollars, is a betterment, as my hon. friend the right hon. leader of the Government evidently does, I would like to have my right hon. friend reconcile this position with the fact that in 1897 he backed up his Minister of Railways in a proposal to give $2,000,000 of the people's money for a piece of road which he is now getting for $1,600,000, with a large betterment put upon the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not a bit.

Mr. FOSTER. With a larger betterment put upon the road under the present conditions than were put upon it under the previous conditions, because a larger amount of money had to be expended upon the road. Therefore, I come back to the original position, that the Drummond County portion of this whole matter is in a far different position from what it was in 1897.

When I come to the Grand Trunk Railway end of the arrangement, that is most objectionable. I have not heard a single business reason given by any gentleman on that side as to why, when you get to Ste. Rosalie and want to go to the city of Montreal, you should pay the immense sums you are to pay in order to get there, and then pay your share of maintenance and user besides. Absolutely no business reason has been given; and I venture to say you cannot take any class of business men in any city of the Dominion who would consent to put that bald proposition as a business proposition. The arguments used on this side were arguments addressed to the good business sense of the House. The Minister of Railways has not answered, neither has any man on that side answered or even attempted to answer them. Why, for instance, when my hon. friend is at Ste. Rosalie, within some thirty miles of Montreal, does he propose to give $37,500 per year for the simple right to travel along the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway? What reason in the world was there why the Minister of Railways, when he made a fair valuation—we will say, for argument's sake—of the worth of the thing, should take Canada's credit and say: True, Canada stands on the basis of credit on the money markets of the world of 2¾ per cent, but when we gave you to the last penny—yes, and far more than what we get is worth—instead of paying you on that basis, we pay you as though Canada could not get money at less than 5 per cent per annum? What right had the Minister of Railways to mulct the Dominion for 999 years into paying on what, for argument's sake, we might take as a fair valuation, 5 per cent per annum, to the Grand Trunk Railway. There was no reason, and the very men who promised to do

that went to London and got three millions for the needs of this country at 2¾ per cent, all costs and charges taken in.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General says not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I beg your pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the man next to him.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Excuse me, the "gentleman" next to him says no.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we will have to take the hon. gentleman's assertion.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I should think——

Mr. FOSTER. If this irresponsible gentleman is going to break into a business argument, I will have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What is the business argument?

Mr. FOSTER. I am addressing myself to a gentleman who has not shown any great capacity as a business man, but I prefer addressing myself to him than to the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the business head you have, and would not take it as a gift.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has a better appreciation of his powers now than perhaps he had when he first came to the House, but I think he would conform better to the rules of the House and the decency of debate, if, when I am attempting to express my ideas, he would not keep muttering or murmuring in reply. If he has anything to say, let him stand on his feet and say it, and I shall give place to him for a time.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Then sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) says he knows he has not the ability some others in this House have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that, although I might have.

Mr. FOSTER. What did my hon. friend say?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you do not remember, I am not going to furnish you with my recollection.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is very inconsiderate. When I ask him to assist me as best he can, he abruptly refuses to give me any aid at all. However, all we can do is our duty, and I must still try and address a business argument to my hon. friend opposite.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Is my hon. friend speaking on the second reading?

An hon. MEMBER. He does not know.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to address an argument to this House to show why we should take the most important part of the measure and discuss it, and bring it 'pari passu' with the other, or at least before we pass the other out of the scope of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the leader of the Opposition, who made the appeal, is not satisfied with the suggestion I made, I have no desire to press the matter unduly. I thought I had made a suggestion that would be accepted; but if not accepted, I am willing that the second reading should stand until the other question is completed.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend has acceded to that, and as no doubt the leader of the Opposition will speak on the subject, I shall not continue my remarks further, except to point out some things which I think we ought to have. I think we ought to have the original of the Grand Trunk contract laid on the Table and the plans which show the connections for which we are paying, and paying heavily. Up to this period in the debate, we have not had a single plan of the original contract in either of these cases, and I think that is unprecedented when discussing a matter involving nearly $7,000,000 of a permanent addition to the burdens of the country. We ought to have those before us, so that we may look into them before being called on to pass the measure. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be strong, but they should not, on account of their strength, refuse us all the information we need.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am extremely glad the Minister of Railways has consented to the suggestion made, and made without the slightest idea of obstructing progress or the business of the House. I thought it really conduced to the progress and would place everything in a much more regular shape, as the two things must go 'pari passu.' It is better for another reason. I quite admit that the discussion has almost entirely covered that branch of the question as well as the resolutions passed. Having had the discussion, we would proceed much more rapidly and in a businesslike way by having the resolutions brought forward, carried, and then taking the second reading.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps I might be allowed to refer to the request of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). I understood him to say that the original of the contract with the Grand Trunk Railway should be brought down. Now, I do not understand why the

hon. gentleman should make such a request. It cannot be possible that hon. gentlemen would suppose that we would bring as a copy of that document something that is not a copy. Nor do I think that the verification of the execution of that document can be a matter of the slightest moment to hon. gentlemen opposite. I, therefore, am unable to see why such a request is made. I do feel that it is an entirely unusual course to adopt in Parliament. But yet so anxious am I to avoid the possibility of being thought to withhold any document that any hon. gentleman wants to see, that I will be content to do this—I do not suppose that every gentleman on the other side of the House wishes to have this original document in his hands; I suppose that if the hon. gentlemen who are immediately in front of me are shown the original document and have an opportunity of examining it, that will be sufficient. They will return it to me so that I can restore it to the files and the record room and a copy will suffice to be laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will bring the original paper and show them to the two gentlemen opposite, and to any other gentlemen who wish to see them.

Mr. FOSTER. The usual course, I may say, would be to bring down the originals—we do not want to purloin them—and lay them on the Table so that we can look at them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not usual to bring the original document——

Mr. FOSTER. We fought that question out here before, and we got the original document, what happened? My hon. friend knows quite well. He thought there was no mistake then; he was positive that the copy shown us was correct, and it was not until he got the original and brought it down that we found he was mistaken and that the copy we were discussing was not a true copy. Now, it has always been usual, for the sake of certainty—it is usual and it is always best—that the original document itself should be where it may be seen. After that, a copy may be used for all practical purposes of the session. I would recall that incident to my hon. friend's attention, and I would remind him of the debate we had and the statement made by probably the best parliamentarian in the House and the oldest, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who without any grudging or denial said we had a right to these documents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He did not say that. It is not the usual course.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that when my hon. friend thinks it over he will remember that that is what the hon. Minister said. At any rate the "Hansard" will show.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do remember what he said.

Mr. HAGGART. I hope the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) will bring down all the information I asked for which he promised before the second reading of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already given the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) one assurance. I do not suppose he wants another; that will not strengthen it.

Mr. HAGGART. No; but the hon. gentleman moved the second reading, and I went to the Clerk and found that there was not a single document with him that I required.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You did not ask to have them here before the second reading. I could not get the plans you asked for here for several days.

Motion for second reading withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the Bill be placed on the Orders for second reading to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

CONSOLIDATION OF ACTS—QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would be glad if the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) would give a brief explanation of what his proposition is.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Bill is a consolidation of the Acts now in force relating to the Quebec Harbour Commission.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps it would be a good plan, if this is only a Bill to consolidate, if it is a long Bill to go into committee and the Solicitor General can then explain what clauses have been changed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have made a brief synopsis which I may read, if hon. members of the House will bear with me, showing in brief the purport and object of consolidation and showing the nature and object of the one amendment that is made by this Bill in the existing law. This I can probably more conveniently do in committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I presume, Mr. Chairman, that it is unnecessary for me to trace the history of the Quebec Harbour Commission from 1805 when the Trinity House of Quebec was established. For the purpose of this committee, it will be sufficient if I give a synopsis of the Bill introduced and point out the one important respect in which it is an amendment of the existing law. I begin with the definitions in the Bill. The port of Quebec and the Harbour of Quebec have been more accurately defined than in the existing Act. The composition of the corporation, which is next dealt with, remains unaltered. Various provisions respecting the election of commissioners have been amended so as to make the elections less costly. Then, as to officers and employees provision is made for allowing the corporation to remunerate the commissioners, their powers to do so being doubtful. They have exercised these powers for many years, however. Provision is made, as in the case of the Montreal Harbour Acts, to allow the pilotage powers and the judicial powers to be delegated to the three commissioners. Under the present law the whole board deals with all matters affecting the pilots. Under this Bill it will be optional for the commission to delegate its powers in this respect to three commissioners.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is new.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. As to the officers, the only change is that at present the Governor General has the approval of the appointment of the secretary-treasurer, and this appointment is now left entirely to the commissioners. Then as to general powers. The powers of the corporation to extend and improve the harbour and its accommodations are defined to include the construction of docks, &c., warehouses and elevators, and it is given power to own and operate all kinds of machinery and for the purpose of increasing the usefulness of the harbour or facilitating traffic therein. It is also given power to load and unload vehicles and to receive and store goods, and for these purposes to own and acquire warehouses, &c., and to contract for the exercise of such powers on its behalf. It is also given power to construct lines of railway on its property and to enter into agreements with railway companies as to the operating of these lines and the facilitating of traffic. The next is as to pilotage, and this is of a good deal of importance to persons interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence. All the laws on this subject which, in the old Act, were mixed up with the powers of the Harbour Commission, I have put in a Pilotage Act which deals with all matters affecting pilots. This is eliminated from this Bill. There is a material change effected in that respect. Under the Pilotage Act the commissioners will fix the standard for qualification for pilots, instead of its being fixed by the Act 12th Victoria, chap. 114. In view of the changes that have taken place in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, it is almost intolerable that for the qualification of pilots, we should still have to appeal to an Act passed so long ago as 12 Victoria. One can scarcely imagine how that has been allowed to continue to the present day.

By-laws.

As to the amendments under the powers to make by-laws, the following are the principal ones :—

Obstructions to Navigation.

The prevention and removal of these within the harbour of Quebec is left to the commissioners to regulate by by-law, but so as not to interfere with the powers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, nor with the provisions of "The Wrecks and Salvage Act."

Disposal of Property Found.

The present complicated and obscure provisions of law contained in several statutes are now to be regulated by by-law.

Control of Ice in Quebec Harbour.

Following out chap. 77 of 1885, the commissioners are given full control over the ice.

Explosives.

The regulation and control of the landing and shipping of gunpowder is now extended to all explosives and inflammable substances, and made to cover the storage thereof, and all precautions are to be observed.

Use of Whistles, Bells, &c.

Powers are given to regulate by by-law all apparatus for signalling by sound.

Machinery.

Powers are given to regulate all machinery and appliances used for loading and unloading vessels, to regulate the railway traffic on the wharfs, to maintain order and prevent theft, to enforce the lawful direction of the officers of the corporation.

Reverting to matters to be regulated directly by the Act, and not by by-law, the following may be noted :—

Harbour Rates.

Instead of the present statutory tariff, which is not easily kept adapted to the rapidly changing circumstances of modern commerce, provision is made, as in the case of the Montreal Harbour, that the corporation may levy such harbour rates as are approved of by the Governor in Council.

These are the financial clauses, to which I beg to draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite. They have been submitted to the Deputy Minister of Finance and I have his approval of these clauses.

Advances by the Government.

No change has been made from the provisions of the present Acts. The balance which the Governor in Council may arrange and advance to the corporation has been stated in the Bill. The figures, as furnished by the Department of Finance, are $362,197.58.

Bond-issuing Powers.

There is no change here, the provisions of the present Act being merely consolidated and made

to apply to the balance now issuable under 61 Vic., chap. 48, viz., $200,000.

Special Judicial Powers.

The corporation now exercises the special judicial jurisdiction of the Trinity House of Quebec. As in the case of the Montreal Harbour Acts, the antiquated, cumbrous and defective procedure sections of 12 Vic., c. 114, are replaced by the procedure under part 58 of the "Criminal Code."

Annual Report.

The time for furnishing this is extended from seven days to twenty-one days after January 1st.

On section 4,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are two changes here which I ought to explain. In the paragraphs "b," "c" and "d," the word "vessel" has been extended so as to include dredge, elevator and scows. We have also defined the word "raft".

On section 5,

Mr. FOSTER. How many miles is that, each way?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. About 138, from the parish of Deschambault to the island of St. Barnabé.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is more than that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under the old definition, it was absolutely impossible to ascertain where the dividing line was between the port of Montreal and the port of Quebec, and we have here defined it to start from the Roman Catholic church in the parish of Deschambault, in the county of Portneuf.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does the hon. gentleman think that a line from the Roman Catholic church, in the parish of Deschambault, is a good definition? The site of the church may be changed; it may burn down in a few years, and a new one may be built somewhere else.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think we can take a better landmark than that. If my hon. friend can suggest any landmark of a more permanent character, I would like him to do so. I think, in the way of a landmark, it will be impossible to get anything better than this suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. All right; so long as it is there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, but the site remains.

Mr. IVES. What will be the effect of extending the harbour so far down the river?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will find that the harbour is very much restricted in the next clause.

On section 6,

Mr. IVES. Is there any change in the limits of the harbour?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no change except that it is more accurately defined. There is absolutely no extension of the limits of the harbour, but this is the description of the harbour which has been furnished by the Harbour Commissioners, and which we think is more correct than the description under the old statute. There is a change I would like to make in paragraph "a". With the permission of the committee, I would like to strike out the following words after the word "immovables":—"situate within the limits of the city of Quebec, as defined for municipal purposes by the third and fourth sections of the Act of the former province of Canada, 29th Victoria (1865), chapter 57." The intention is to strike this out, so as to make the definition cover the wharfs as far as the Island of Orleans.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 7,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The words "of the corporation," in the 27th line, should be struck out.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8, subsection 2,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a clause which has been suggested by the Montreal Bill. When their Bill was consolidated in 1894, the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal thought it was wise to have such a clause, and we have incorporated it in this Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Why do you not put in here a provision for the resignation of other members of the board? It is thought fit to put a provision in for the resignation of elected members of the board; why not extend it to those appointed by the Government?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not necessary; the appointment is by the Governor in Council. It is necessary that he should notify his resignation to the body to which he is elected, but in the case suggested, he is not elected. The very moment he ceases to be commissioner, he notifies his resignation to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council appoints his succesor.

On section 9, subsection 4,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Subsection 4 is new, though I do not know that it is of very great importance.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does this shorten the term of those who are elected now?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. There is absolutely no alteration in the clause, except in subsection 4.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I understand the hon. gentleman to say, that those elected by the

shipping interests and the Board of Trade will not have their terms of office shortened by this section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No; that is quite right.

On section 10,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a change in subsection 3 to extend the time for filling a vacancy from fourteen days, which the old law provided, to thirty days.

On section 12, subsection 2,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is new, providing for the giving of notice of a meeting, and I think it is a very wise provision.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How is the meeting convened now?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is convened by the secretary without notice.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There was surely some provision, for I used to see the advertisement in the newspapers of Quebec. However, it is a good provision, if it did not exist before.

On subsection 4,

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is there any change in this?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. The words "payable by and" are the words inserted.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the reason of the change? You want people to vote who are not strictly qualified?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is to provide that the person voting must not only have paid, but be a member of the shipping interest, and thus be a person interested.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot see the reason for putting in "payable by." You are fixing the qualification of a voter, and you say that a man shall have a vote if he pays dues. You do not intend to give him a vote unless he has paid dues, do you?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, what is the use of also saying "payable by"? Do you suppose that anybody would pay harbour dues for the sake of getting a vote?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is all—just to cover that point.

Mr. FOSTER. How could he pay the dues if he was not entitled to pay? Who would take them if they were not due? Has any officer of the Government a right to take John Jones's money unless he is a member of the shipping interest of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It is only put in from an abundance of caution.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Mr. FOSTER. But it seems that the abundance of caution is absurd.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Are there any instances in which a man who was not a member of the shipping interest paid dues and thereby became a voter?

Mr. DOBELL. I have never heard of one yet.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then, what is the use of putting it in?

Mr. DOBELL. It is simply a legal precaution suggested by our legal adviser, and the hon. member should be able to appreciate why that is done.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If I were able to appreciate it, the Solicitor General should be much more able.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I shall have to take advantage of the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to say that this is probably a precaution put in by a resident of the city of Quebec who knows the peculiarities of the city of Quebec—such peculiarities as were referred to in Committee of Supply when my hon. friend tried to excuse the loose way of getting supplies for the city of Quebec when the strict rule was applied to other places by saying "Quebec is Quebec," you know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I borrowed the remark from you or from somebody else on the other side. Do not give me credit for that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite willing to omit the words "payable by and." I do not think they can have any effect. Perhaps I ought to state to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), that these clauses are not peculiar to this Bill. These two clauses are taken out of the Montreal Bill, so that it must not be said that there is anything peculiar to Quebec so far as this matter is concerned; that is for the benefit of all concerned.

On section 13,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We change that, by extending the date from fourteen days after the occurrence of the vacancy, to one month after the last date for holding the election. Under the present Act the Governor in Council has power to appoint a new commissioner in the place of an elected member, whereas under this Bill we have transferred that power back to the electing body.

On section 14,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The members of the Trinity House in Quebec were required to take an oath before entering on their duties, and the Harbour Commissioners

were also required to take the oath for the performance of the duties formerly filled by the late Trinity House. The change in this section is to make the oath applicable to all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no provision as to the officer before whom this oath is to be taken.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This clause is taken exactly from the old Act.

On section 15,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a change in this clause. The corporation has at the present time undoubtedly the right to remunerate the chairman of the board, and they undoubtedly have the right to remunerate the Superintendent of Pilots who sits as a member of the board. They have gone on paying allowances to the different members of the board for each sitting, and it has been considered they had the power to do so under the law. Some doubt has arisen as to that, and in order to eliminate the doubt the section is drawn as it is now.

Mr. FOSTER. What has the chairman heretofore been paid ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Two thousand dollars a year, I think.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This provision involves a question that comes up in connection with the various pilot boards.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. One of the members of the Quebec Harbour Board tells me that although they have the power to pay a salary not exceeding $2,000 to the chairman, at the present time, he does not accept more than $1,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to the question of legality in connection with this remuneration, it has come up in connection with other pilot boards in the various provinces, and I do not think any legislation such as this has been passed to clear the matter up. In other boards they pay themselves what they call expenses, which is practically a remuneration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has been stopped.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that has been stopped, but if this provision in the Bill be correct, and I am in favour of it myself, it should be extended to the similar bodies throughout the country—though not in this Bill, of course.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That was the old Trinity House practice, and when the Harbour Commission of Quebec superseded the Trinity House, and took over the powers and responsibilities of it, they took over also the privilege of paying themselves, and the question arose whether they had the power to do that. At any rate I thought it better to remove any doubt in this Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that it is worth looking into that question, in view of the general consensus of opinion here that this is a proper provision, and that these men who give their time to the consideration of important questions should be paid for it.

Mr. ELLIS. The only question now is as to whether there is any limit to the amount which the commissioners may vote themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. You fix the maximum limit to be paid to the chairman, but you do not apparently fix any limit to the amount which the commissioners may vote themselves.

Mr. DOBELL. I can speak for the practice. It has never exceeded $5 a sitting, and we have one sitting a week. Sometimes, but very seldom, we may have two sittings.

Mr. FOSTER. But that does not meet the objection which I have raised. If there is no limit fixed they might vote themselves an exorbitant salary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Section 27 provides that none of these by-laws shall become effective until approved by the Governor in Council.

On section 16,

Mr. CASGRAIN. There are some very important changes in this clause. Under it the powers of the corporation, as pilotage authority, may be delegated to any three commissioners. Formerly, I believe, the commission sat as a full court. Again, by subsection 3, the judical powers of the corporation may be delegated to any three commissioners, exclusive of the chairman of the corporation of pilots for and below the harbour of Quebec. My learned friend knows that the Quebec Harbour Commission is the judicial authority which tries the pilots on charges of dereliction of duty or in the case of accidents. I think it would be a mistake to limit the number of the commissioners for the trial of such cases to three. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the present commissioners, especially my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) ; but it must be admitted that there are gentlemen on the board, as there always have been, who probably know no more about navigation than I do, and that is not much. For instance, if the judicial power were delegated to Mr. Laliberté, the chairman, who is a furrier, and to Mr. Rioux, who is a grocer, and another gentleman, who is a merchant in St. Roch or the lower town, and who cannot know much about naviga-

tion, it would hardly be contended that they would constitute a board qualified to try the very difficult and important questions that might arise in connection with accidents. The decisions which these gentlemen might render might be of the greatest importance to the pilots concerned. A pilot might be deprived of his branch for ever, and of his means of livelihood. It, therefore, seems to me that, as this tribunal is vested with very great powers, we ought not to decrease its numbers. Amongst other powers, this board has the power of deciding whether or not a pilot shall continue to exercise his functions, which is, of course, a very important question to the pilot, and, if this board should not do its duty properly—and we must suppose that sometimes such a case may occur—this man may be deprived of his means of earning a livelihood. I would like the hon. Solicitor General, or the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), to tell us what are the reasons why this power is given the Harbour Commissioners to delegate their judicial authority to three members.

Mr. DOBELL. These pilot cases are very lengthy, and take up a great deal of time, and this section only provides that the judicial powers of the corporation may be delegated to any three commissioners. It thus leaves it optional with the commission to try any case with a full board or delegate its power to three. There are generally three members of the commission competent to try such cases, and, inasmuch as the chairman of the pilot board is also one of the judges, I do not think that the apprehensions of my hon. friend are well founded.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The only reason the hon. gentleman gives for the change is that these cases take up too much time, and, therefore, all the commissioners should not be called on to try them. But, when any question affecting trade or navigation comes before the board, and in which the commissioners are interested as business men, they do not fail to attend. My hon. friend should take into consideration the fact that the trial of a pilot is of even greater interest to the pilot concerned than questions affecting business interests are to the members of the board. If five members of the board are required to decide in the case of any question affecting the shipping interest and trade, a fortiori, the same number should be required to try a case much more vital to the pilot concerned. I would suggest that five should be the quorum, instead of three.

Mr. DOBELL. I might point to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as an analogous case. That committee tries most important questions, and yet three members of it are considered sufficient. It must be remembered that there are sometimes two or three cases affecting pilots before the commission in the course of a week, which take up a great deal of time. It seems to me that three members of the board, with the chairman of the corporation of pilots, ought to be ample for the trial of such cases.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I believe that the quorum of the Railway Committee is seven, and not three, and I have never seen only three sit on a case, except by consent. We must also bear in mind that the Railway Committee is composed of members of the Cabinet, the leaders of Parliament, who are supposed to be most versed in all the questions that come up before that committee. Whereas, upon this harbour board, there are some gentlemen who know nothing about navigation, whose only navigation consists in crossing between Quebec and Lévis. Some of them, I believe, cannot cross between a United States port and Liverpool just now, but, of course, that does not affect the question we are discussing. I would again call attention to the great difference, as regards qualifications, between the gentlemen on the Railway Committee and the gentlemen on the harbour commission. There is also the extreme importance it is to the pilots to have gentlemen who, if not trained judicially, are at least qualified from another standpoint, that is, from their knowledge of ships and navigation. And if it is within the power of the commission to appoint three of their number, we may have men there trying pilots, who may be deprived by the decisions given of the means of earning their livelihood, who certainly are not competent to deal with such cases. Another objection is that the third clause says that power may be delegated to three commissioners, but the chairman of the corporation of pilots shall be a member of the board also. That would be four members of the board. Suppose then you have the board evenly divided. That is an inconvenience. Now, it seems to me, in view of all these questions and of the fact that no reason has been given except the saving of time, that the law should be allowed to stand as it is to-day.

Mr. DOBELL. This clause has probably been copied, like many others from the laws relating to pilots in the harbour of Montreal. I do not regard it as a matter of great importance.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the hon. gentleman represented a constituency in which there were about 100 pilots, he would see great importance in it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) knows that there is safety in numbers sometimes. I would rather go before a tribunal composed of five men than before one composed of three. I would rather go before a jury of twelve than a jury of six.

Mr. FRANCOIS ARTHUR MARCOTTE (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important question, and do not see why the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) should not give it the attention it deserves. The interests of an important class of the community are at stake here. In the case of accidents, the

pilots are tried by men who know nothing about pilotage. Now, in my opinion, five members of the board would not be too ample for the trial of these cases. The pilots have already suffered hardships; the judgments rendered by the commissioners have not always proved satisfactory to the pilots. That is the reason why I am in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who does not want to limit the number of the commissioners for the trial of such cases to three, but proposes that five should be the quorum.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it may be well to consider whether three is not too small a number out of nine. If the commissioners happen to get their best qualified men, probably the three men would be quite as efficient as five men, some of whom were not very well up in the subject. But there is another point of view which might be taken into consideration, and that is the satisfaction which a board like that ought to give to the pilots themselves in the adjudication of their grievances and difficulties. It seems to me that the great and important body of men who may have to come before this tribunal would feel a greater confidence, would feel that they were more considered and that their interests would be better guarded if they could appeal to five out of a commission of nine, instead of three. I do not see that this is any hardship upon the commissioners. You are paying your commissioners now, and they will, no doubt, get a fair salary in remuneration for the trouble they take. The commissioners may be looked to to see to that. It is different from taking a fee: it is both a remuneration for their services and a claim upon their services; and I think it is not too much to ask that five should be upon this board.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I can quite understand how my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) regards this matter. As to the cases tried before this board, I must confess that I have had some experience of cases before the harbour board, and have always thought it an anomaly—I say this with due deference to the legal attainments of my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)—that these trials should take place before the commissioners when we have the Admiralty Court, to which, it seems to me, these cases could be better referred. Regarding it from the abstract legal standpoint, it seems to me that we should have a much more competent tribunal if these cases were referred to the admiralty judge, who would have acting with him as assessors, the head of the corporation of pilots and a delegate of the harbour board to assist him with their technical knowledge. Unfortunately, the practice has been contrary to that, and these important cases have been tried before the harbour board. This law provides that in certain cases which are left entirely to the discretion of the board, they may delegate the exercise of their judicial powers to three members of the board, which three members of the board must be assisted by the president of the Corporation of Pilots. There is a difference with reference to the pilotage authority and the judicial power. The hon. member for Montmorency pointed out a moment ago that there would be four members including the head of the pilot board.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you only need to give one more.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now, let us see what has been the practice and experience of the past. In Montreal, for instance, the harbour board may delegate their powers to three members of the board. That law was passed in 1894, and it has been found to operate beneficially, that is to say, it saves the time of the members of the harbour board and it does not appear that any complaint has been made against the law. And so, we shall have the same powers to delegate to three members of the board in Quebec, and they must sit with the head of the corporation of pilots. Thus you have a security, so far as the pilots are concerned.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The president of the pilots is always considered the advocate of the pilots, and, unfortunately, his authority with the board does not go very far.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He has a vote.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, but that is all. My experience is that he is hardly ever listened to. And though I may have a good deal of confidence in the harbour board, whenever a pilot comes before the harbour board he is, from the moment he is accused, considered guilty, and has to prove his innocence. Contrary to the ordinary rule of British law, that a man is considered innocent until he is proved guilty, the pilot is considered guilty and has to clear himself. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) as a favour, to name the members of the board. I know Mr. Laliberte. Mr. Rioux, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), Mr. Sharples, Mr. Arcand, Mr. Chabot——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All, with two exceptions, perfectly conversant with this work.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not know about that. I do not know that Mr. Chabot and Mr. Arcand are.

Mr. DOBELL. No one can be more conversant with these affairs than Mr. Chabot.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How can he be so conversant with these affairs? He was manager of the Quebec and Lévis Ferry Company, and at another time he was manager of the St. Lawrence Navigation Company. He was also, at one time, manager of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. But he was manager of the business affairs of the company and did not navigate the boats.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He owned vessels.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Take, for instance, my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell); he is more often in Ottawa than in Quebec. Mr. Macpherson is absent from Quebec very often, so that in a great many instances you will have a court trying these pilots composed of only Messrs. Laliberté, Rioux and Chabot. It seems to me that if the quorum of the harbour board is fixed at five for the ordinary administration of the affairs of the corporation, for the simple routine work, a quorum for a judicial trial of this kind should also be five. Why bring it down to three? Vast powers are conferred upon this board, they may deprive a pilot of his branch for ever. The young man, for instance, of twenty-five or thirty years of age who has passed nine or ten years in apprenticeship, who begins his life as a pilot, and through accident, when he is twenty-six or twenty-seven, may find himself deprived of his branch for ever, and thus nine or twelve years are totally lost to him. It seems to me this is a far more important question than the details of the administration of the Quebec Harbour Trust, where a quorum of five is required. The only reason given for reducing the quorum to three is the convenience of the commissioners; we are told they are very busy. If they are too busy, they should not accept the position. How many trials do you suppose have taken place during the last year, for instance? I venture to say not more than ten. In the preceding years, when I was in Quebec, there were not ten a year. I say that on so important a question as this the inconvenience of the commissioners should not be a reason for reducing the quorum from five to three. I appeal to the sense of justice in this matter of my hon. friend. These men are a very respectable set of men, there is no finer set of men in the country than the pilots below the harbour of Quebec. I would ask my hon. friend the Solicitor General to assist me in prevailing upon the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) to ask the commissioners to endure the inconvenience which may be caused to them by sitting five or six times or even ten times, during the season of navigation.

Mr. DOBELL. I would call my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that these trials may take place within only forty-eight hours' notice. The captain and the pilot must be on hand for the trial within forty-eight hours' notice. It would be difficult to get five gentlemen together within forty-eight hours to devote four, or five, or six hours, to the trial of a pilot. If three men are able to try a case in Montreal, I claim, that three Quebecers are equally able to try a case in Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The questions coming up in Quebec are much more important than the questions that come before the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. DOBELL. The quorum is not limited to three men, it only says that three "may" act. If the case is of great importance, you will find that every man will be present who can possibly do so, and will devote all the time that is required.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to point out to the Solicitor General that clause 2 declares that the powers of the corporation as a pilotage authority may be delegated to three certain commissioners, and that under clause 3 the judicial powers of the corporation may be delegated to a different class. Do not the powers of the corporation as a pilotage authority include their judicial powers? If so, it seems to me you have some conflict between subsection 2 and subsection 3. Under subsection 2, you include judicial powers which may be delegated to a different class of persons from those to whom they are delegated, or may be delegated under subsection 3. There is another thing I would like to point out with regard to clause 3. The meaning which the Solicitor General puts upon it is one which I certainly did not see when I read it. He says he means to include the chairman of the corporation of pilots with the commissioners to whom judicial power is delegated. Well, the word "exclusively" does not seem to be a very apt word for that purpose. I think we should have some such expression as "together with."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the object of the clause was, on the contrary, to exclude him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I accept the view of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the view which I have endeavoured to express. Now, the powers of the corporation as a pilotage authority include their judicial powers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They include a great deal more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But you see the powers of the corporation as a pilotage authority may be delegated to a certain class of persons under subsection 2. Then, you say the judicial powers which are included in what you have already delegated, may be delegated to another class of persons. It seems to me that the two clauses conflict with each other.

Mr. DOBELL. I think the first clause merely applies to the trial of pilots as to their efficiency, their age, capabilities, &c.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Under the heading of "pilotage authority" you say the pilotage

authority for the harbour of Quebec shall be the Harbour Commissioners. Then, the powers are given, amongst others, examining powers as to their qualification. The words "pilotage authority" here would seem to include powers which are given in paragraph 3.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are frequently called upon to exercise wide judicial powers, independently altogether of their powers as pilotage authorities. They are called upon at times to deal with persons for infractions of the by-laws, for instance, to send a man to jail for trespassing on the wharfs. If the hon. gentleman will refer to that part of the Act under the heading "pilotage authority," he will see that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and myself are right in this.

Mr. DOBELL. That applied to the duties executed years ago by the Trinity House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I know very well what my hon. friend means, what he intends to convey to the House, but our contention is that those clauses, as drafted, do not have the meaning he wishes to convey, because the powers of the pilotage authority under the old statute are all those powers which were given to the Harbour Commissioners, the examination of pilots and the exercise of judicial powers also. The second subsection says that the powers of the corporation generally and the third subsection that the judicial powers of the corporation may be delegated to any three commissioners exclusively. What judicial powers? In other words, what is the distinction between the powers conferred by this second clause and powers conferred by the third clause.

Mr. DOBELL. There is a wide distinction. In the one case the powers of the corporation are the powers of a pilotage authority which may be delegated to these commissioners. Then in subsection 3 the judicial powers of the corporation, not of the pilots, may also be delegated to any three commissioners. The two are quite distinct and cover quite different cases.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Now we have an example of the fact that there are harbour commissioners, who, although they are well disposed, sometimes do not understand points of law which are raised before their august presence. Of course the hon. Solicitor General is responsible for the wording of the section, and his attention has been called to the matter. By reading the Act he will find that we are right. However, I will go back to the other point in regard to the court that is to try the pilots. Is the court to be composed of four members? We have only asked for one more member. There are nine members altogether; we are only asking for one more on the committee who will try the pilots. Another grave objection to this is that it is a shifting board. Any three members of the commission may be appointed for one trial and any three for another trial. That is another objection which it would be well to solve before we leave it. The board is composed now of four members. All we ask for is another member.

Mr. DOBELL. When clause 41 is reached my hon. friend will get a fuller explanation. Clause 41 describes exactly what is meant by subsection 3.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it would be well if the hon. Solicitor General would pass this clause over—there are a great many others—because the points raised are technical, and it is difficult for the Solicitor General to give his attention, at the moment, to a clause like that. While I think the point is well taken and that the hon. Solicitor General, upon consideration, will change subsections 2 and 3, the members of the committee are so far apart that perhaps it would be well to let them stand and take up other clauses.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite willing to do that. But I will say that there is a broad distinction between the powers exercised by the commissioners acting as a pilotage authority and exercising judicial powers. As a pilotage authority they are called upon to exercise certain duties and rights in so far as the Pilotage Act is concerned. The judicial authority which they are called upon to exercise involves the exercise of much larger and entirely different powers. When you come to see the section which has reference to the exercise of judicial powers you will see that the judicial powers exercised under this Pilotage Act are a small proportion of the powers they are called upon to discharge. I am quite willing that we should go through the Bill, because I am satisfied that when hon. members have become familiar with all the details and when they come back to this clause they will be willing to allow it to go in its present wording. I have a grave objection, after a Bill has been drafted by an expert draughtsman to change its phraseology. I think that members of this House are about as well able to draft a Bill as to paint a picture.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was my reason for suggesting to the Solicitor General the propriety of allowing this clause to stand so that he might reconsider it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand from the hon. Solicitor General that this section was copied from the Montreal Act which has been in force since 1894, and which confers the same powers on the Montreal Harbour Board that it is proposed to confer upon

the Quebec Harbour Board. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) is concerned that the pilots shall get justice. I do not think that he need concern himself about that, because I never knew a case in which a pilot has been punished.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Oh, yes, there are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Pilots do not get punished; the difficulty is to get a conviction at all. If you have a quorum of the whole board, and if they are convicted by the board the Court of Queen's Bench will review the whole proceedings by certiorari. I rose, however, for the purpose of stating what I understood to be the meaning of the clause as drafted. The general powers of the corporation are delegated to three commissioners; no power was delegated to the pilot board. There is no doubt that the powers of the corporation may be delegated under subsection 3 to any three commissioners.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Five commissioners are a quorum.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The powers of the corporation may be delegated to any three commissioners.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That includes judicial powers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That relates to general powers and it would include judicial powers as well. The only doubt I had was as to the meaning of subsection 3, and while it seems plain that the commissioners have the power under subsection 2 to delegate their general powers to three commissioners of whom the Chairman of the Corporation of Pilots below Quebec shall be one, there is the power under subsection 3 to delegate their judicial powers to three commissioners absolutely, excluding the Pilot Commissioner from being one of them. He must be one when they exercise their general powers, but he would not be one of them when they come to exercise their judicial powers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would be absolutely preposterous to allow the sub-committee to be composed so as to exclude the chairman of the pilots from this board, because that is the whole reason for putting him on the board, that is exercising the pilotage authority. If you are going to give judicial powers to this sub-committee, excluding from this sub-committee the chairman of the pilots he would cease to have any utility on the board at all. I think we had better keep that clause in its present form, and when we have got through the Bill consider it again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to make the difficulty I have clear to the Solicitor General, because, however eminent the gentleman may be who has drafted this Bill, still I want to understand it. The pilotage authority, under the provisions of the Pilotage Act, has undoubtedly judicial powers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Limited.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That may be. Under the provisions of section 41 of this Act, this corporation has certain special judicial powers, but those judicial powers include the powers under the Pilotage Act. The point I make about the drafting of this clause is, that subsection 2 seems to me to clearly include the judicial powers which every pilotage authority has under the provisions of the Pilotage Act. Now, subsection 3 may mean one of two things. It may include all the powers which this corporation has, including the authority which it possesses as the pilotage authority under the Pilotage Act; or it may mean only the judicial powers conferred by this Act, in addition to the powers which are conferred by the Pilotage Act. If it means either the one or the other, it seems to me that this clause requires amendement. If subsection 3 includes the judicial powers under the Pilotage Act, then I cannot help thinking that it is in conflict with subsection 2, which clearly, by its terms, includes the same thing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think that is right. I will remedy it by inserting the word "other" before "judicial powers," in paragraph 3.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I suggested.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Subsection 2 gives them the power as pilotage authority, and the other judicial powers they have, irrespective of their powers as pilotage authority are exercised under subsection 3. If we say, in that subsection, the "other" judicial powers of the corporation may be delegated, &c., I think that meets the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is the number of commissioners to remain at three under subsection 2?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. That rule has worked very satisfactorily in Montreal, and I do not see why we should make any difference.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In that case, the pilots would be tried by two members of the harbour board, and, in addition, the chairman of the corporation of pilots. I do not think that is right, and I move that subsection 2 be struck out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It worked well in Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, I do not think it is right.

Amendment (Mr. Casgrain) negatived on division.

On section 18,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the same as the clause which is being amended ? The language seems a little peculiar :

Any commissioner who owns property which the corporation propose to acquire shall ipso facto cease to be a commissioner.

That seems a remarkable provision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was practically the same thing in the old Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The majority could put out an undesirable colleague at any time by proposing to buy his property.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not say it would happen, but considerable inconvenience would result from the fact that a man might be elected on the board and then arrange, after his election, to have his property secured for harbour purposes. Such things as that might possibly occur.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The evil should, of course, be guarded against. There are a great many municipal Acts, for instance, in which precautions are taken, but it was the extraordinary proposition involved in this particular phraseology that struck one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For example, if the corporation proposed to acquire any property, any member having an interest in that property would cease to be a member of the board. Then the corporation might change its mind, and not acquire the property at all, and appoint somebody else.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not feel like withdrawing the provision myself. This is the law that has been in force, with a slight amendment, and I do not see anything wrong in it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is very stringent.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is, but I am not sure that it is too stringent. The very moment it is intended and proposed that the corporation should acquire a property, the person beneficially interested in the property ceases to be in a position to influence the corporation, which I think is a good thing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He need not cease to influence them. The usual provision is that any one interested in a proposition of that kind should not vote upon it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Suppose there is a very good man on the board who is interested in a piece of property which the board chooses to purchase without his influencing them in any way. Simply because that is the case, he ceases to be a member of the board. Why not adopt the common law rule, under which a municipal counsellor, for instance, does not vote on any question in which he has a personal interest, but does not cease to be a member of the council ? Why is this made more stringent than the common law ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Technically, purchasing the property would not deprive him of his position, while the proposal to acquire it would deprive him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly, the phraseology is vague and indefinite, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries suggests, and for that reason I think difficulties will arise under it.

Section agreed to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is a deep-water lock ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is understood to be a lot where there is deep water at all stages of the tide as distinguished from lots that are dry when the tide goes out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is desirable to distinguish between the power of disposal as regards these two kinds of locks.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These deep-water locks are held by patent from the Crown and are a matter over which the Federal Parliament have authority as regulating navigation. In that respect, they would be distinguished from ordinary beach locks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does it mean the land below low water mark ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the clause which is in the old Act.

On section 22,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is entirely new as far as Quebec is concerned, but a reproduction of the Montreal statute, except as regards the street railway, which is inserted in the Quebec Act. Immigrants landing at Quebec, land at the Princess Louise embankment, and it will be a great convenience if we have street cars running out to the immigrant sheds to convey these people to the different railway stations.

On section 26, subsection 7,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is this provision new ?

Mr. DOBELL. I may explain that it is to give power to prevent the cutting of ice anywhere near where a sewer is discharged. That is the only object.

On section 26, subsection 17,

Mr. CASGRAIN. I understand the Solicitor General to say, that the Pilotage Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 86, or chapter 80 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, is not amended.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then, it appears to me that the district over which the Harbour Commissioners have authority is not the same as that defined in one of the first sections of this Bill, fixing the limits of the port of Quebec. Under section 4 of chapter 80, R. C. S., the Pilotage Act, it was provided that:

The Quebec Harbour Commissioners shall be the pilotage authority of the pilotage district of Quebec, comprising the River St. Lawrence from the basin of Portneuf, inclusively, to an imaginary line drawn from the eastern anchorage ground under Cape Columbia,——

And so on. Now, the clause of this Bill defines the port of Quebec as:

——the River St. Lawrence and the shores thereof, to high-water mark, between a line drawn from the Roman Catholic Church of the parish of Deschambault——

And so on. So, the Harbour Commissioners, as a pilotage authority, will have power over a certain extent of territory which is not defined in this Act, but is defined in the Pilotage Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think they will have, as pilotage authority, power only over the port of Quebec assigned to them by this statute. I do not see how they could have powers beyond.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is a matter in which the responsibility rests upon the Solicitor General, of course. Still, it seems to me that, with these two Acts standing, there will be a conflict of authority. The Bill defines the port of Quebec, over which the board, as pilotage authority, would have control; but, when it comes to authorize these judicial functions, for instance in the trial of pilots, we have to refer to the 4th section of chapter 80 to see over which district the commission has power.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) to say the powers of the Harbour Commissioners might be limited——

Mr. CASGRAIN. They might be limited, or they might be extended; I do not know as to that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend to say, that it may be necessary, in consequence of this clearer definition of the port of Quebec, to amend the Pilotage Act. I think there is a great deal of force in that; that is a point which we must consider.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like to draw attention to the introductory words of this section 20: "The corporation may from time to time make by-laws not contrary to law nor to the provisions of this Act," and so on. And their powers include the establishment of "rules and regulations for navigation within the limits of the port of Quebec." This covers a distance of 150 or 160 miles. Although they are prohibited from passing any regulations contrary to the law, they might pass regulations inconsistent with the law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That does not come into force until it is approved by the Governor General; so, your officers will watch that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, it could be checked by refusing to give assent to the by-law altogether. But, to make assurance doubly sure, I move that the section be amended so as to read: "make by-laws not contrary to or inconsistent with the law," &c. They must not interfere with the Admiralty regulations, for instance, as to the number of lights. While not providing for the removal of any of the lights that a vessel is to carry, they might add a separate light. They might do many things inconsistent with the law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You might as well prohibit them from passing by-laws altogether.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend sees there is a certain part which prescribes in great detail the course which vessels must pursue in meeting each other, or overtaking each other, in fog or storms, what lights they must carry. They get power by that subsection to establish rules and regulations for navigation in the broadest term within the limits of their authority, for 150 or 170 miles, provided that such rules and regulations be not contrary to law. But I want to provide that they shall not be inconsistent with the law either; for I can conceive a regulation which is not absolutely contrary to law but would be inconsistent with it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Think of a concrete case where a regulation would not be contrary to law but still inconsistent with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I can conceive of a number of cases which would not be actually contrary to law but would be inconsistent with it. The law may say that you shall have three lights in certain circumstances, they might add an additional one, that would not be contrary to law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the law says there shall be three lights shown in a certain way, and if they show a fourth light, that would be most dangerous.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is essential that they should not make any by-law regulating navigation generally within the precincts of their port, 150 or 160 miles, which would be inconsistent with the general admiralty regulations.

I think the whole committee will agree with that. They should not make regulations either contrary to or inconsistent with the law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If my hon. friend wishes we will put in the words "inconsistent with."

On section 28,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Section 28 is really a by-law, and by following 27 instead of preceding it, these rates that are approved by the Governor in Council do not require to be published, and there is not, therefore, any notice given, as notice is given of all the other by-laws. Following that section 27, it is taken out of the ordinary run of by-laws, and, therefore, the rates do not require to be published.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I make a difference between the tariff of the harbour rates and the ordinary by-law which would be for the regulation of the harbour generally, this is simply a tariff of rates connected with the internal management and control of the property of the corporation, and it must be controlled by the Governor General in Council. The only difference is that with reference to publication. I do not see that any harm can result in one way or another from the publication or the non-publication.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It struck me there was, perhaps, a good deal in having that by-law published, or that proposal fixing the rates. It is so in nearly every other case that I can think of. In the ordinary administration under a department any rates that are imposed inspection fees, &c., should be published in the "Gazette," as a matter of course, so that notice may be given to the parties concerned as to what the officers are warranted in demanding.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As a matter of business it would be the duty, or interest, of the corporation to have these published, and if my hon. and learned friend proposes an amendment we will be agreeable to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. I am not pressing the point. I was not aware whether under the old law there was this provision.

On section 29.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would suggest that in the second line after the word "by" the following words be inserted: "or under" so that it will read:

The valuation of goods on which ad valorem rates are imposed by or under this Act, &c.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 33,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As the chairman read it the last part of the first clause did not seem to read rightly:

To the same extent and in the same manner as if the said sections had been passed with express reference to the harbour of Quebec instead of with reference to railways and the corporation were thereinafter referred to instead of the railway company.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There should be a comma after the word railways.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There should be after the word "railways" the words "and as if" the corporation were therein referred to, &c.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will accept that.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 36,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This clause seems to restrict the payment of any moneys by the corporation, to the particular matters mentioned in the subsections. Might there not be other cases in which it would be proper for the corporation to pay money?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These are preferential charges.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the clause says "the lawful charges upon the revenue of the corporation arising from all sources whatsoever shall be as follows, and shall be paid in the following order."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Read subsection 6.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That has only reference to bonds or debentures.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These are amounts which are chargeable to the revenue in the order fixed by the statute; but as a corporation, surely they would be liable to pay other claims.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How would you recover the money? My hon. friend the Solicitor General may remember a case in Quebec arising out of the following circumstances: The Harbour Commissioners allowed a wreck to sink at one of the wharfs, and a boat coming into the dock struck this wreck and was damaged. An action was taken against the Harbour Commissioners for damages, and Mr. Justice Casault held that the action should be dismissed, because, amongst other reasons, there was no fund from which any money could be paid, and no money could be recovered from the corporation, except for the specific purposes stated in the Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) may have looked at that case more recently than I, but my recollection is that the case went off on the point that the Harbour Commissioners were

not responsible for the wreck at the place where it was found.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There were two grounds for dismissal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I take it that the corporation having the power to contract, would necessarily be liable for any obligations which might occur as an incident to the power to contract. All this statute means is, that certain claims are to be privileged and paid by preference in the order of priority as fixed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be as my hon. friend suggests, but I think it is not very clear, and I suggest there should be a further subsection providing that other liabilities of the corporation should be paid.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If my hon. friends think that the corporation is not liable to pay its just debts, I am willing to amend the clause in that direction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There might be something more than debts. For example, suppose the corporation exercised some of the powers conferred by this Act, or by by-laws passed without justification, so as to render themselves liable to an action for damages. It seems to me such a thing is conceivable. I am not familiar with the law of Quebec, but in our province that would not be an action arising out of a contract, but out of tort.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may say that I am taking the words of the law as we now have it; but I can appreciate the fact that when you come to examine all the statutes that have been passed in reference to this commission, a great deal may require amendment, and I am not wedded to any form of expression. If there remains any doubt on the part of my hon. friend. I am willing to drop the clause and draft a new one to be inserted on the third reading.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I take it that under this section the only charges that can be paid out of revenue are the charges mentioned in that section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We might add another section saying that all other liabilities of the corporation should be a charge on the revenues.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 38,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it intended under subsection 3 to cut out the seamen's liens for wages?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think that is the effect of the provision.

On subsection 4, of section 38,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Solicitor General think that would be a wise provision.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not discuss the wisdom of it. It is not a great hardship to the mariner in any case, because the rates cannot be heavy. I do not entertain the slightest doubt that no magistrate has jurisdiction to sell a ship. You may go before a magistrate, if the amount is not very high, and get a judgment, and then the magistrate issues a warrant of execution, but before you can sell the ship you must get authority from the Court of Admiralty.

On subsection 6,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This subsection gives the rights conferred by section 38 a duration of one year, which seems to me a long time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will see that, under the circumstances, that cannot be avoided. A vessel, for instance, comes into port in the month of August, and after she sails, is not likely to return until the next year. That is the existing law.

On subsection 6,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under the British Merchants Shipping Act, the wages of seamen have a prior lien, so that this would not apply to British ships. Would it not be better to have the regulations so framed that Canadian, British and foreign ships should be in exactly the same position?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That seems impossible with the Merchants Shipping Act standing in your face.

On section 40,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We find here minute provisions made with regard to the authority granted to bailiffs and so on, but there is nothing I can see under which a man can give bail and get a proper release.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All that could be done would be to apply to the court of competent jurisdiction for a warrant, and when it issues, the party would have to appear and would be subject to the ordinary procedure of the court. There is no court that I know of that would not grant a release on proper bonds being given.

On section 46,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) never saw this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is that in the existing law?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, it is in the Montreal Harbour Act, it is in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, and what objection can there be to it here?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it must have been put in some of these old Acts before the Audit Act was passed. There is no need of it here. We have it in the General Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What objection can there be to it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The objection is that you are creating a precedent for every other corporation asking us for similar legislation, whereas now you have general powers which are fully ample for all possible purposes in the Audit Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is this objection, that the promoters of this Bill will say: You gave this privilege to the Harbour of Montreal, why do not you give it to Quebec? You gave it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, a private corporation, why do not you give it to a public corporation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This clause simply empowers the Government to give it to them if they call for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is power in the Audit Act, what object is there in putting it in here?

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the use of this section?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If they import machinery or any articles of merchandise for the use of the corporation, the Governor in Council may remit the duties thereon. The Montreal Harbour Bill provides that the Governor in Council may waive or remit all duties of customs on any articles of merchandise imported by the corporation for its use. I find that clause has been in existence since 18 Victoria.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is about time it should be repealed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it is in the Montreal Act, it would be difficult to refuse it here. At the same time, I would not like it to be understood that the passage of this clause implies any obligation whatever to exercise it. I think the Audit Act is quite as broad as this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where this provision is in the Special Act as well as in the General Act, it is very difficult to refuse the remission when they make application for the purposes of the corporation. I think if the Montreal corporation has had it the Quebec corporation ought to have it too. I am with the Solicitor General on that question, and I am against the rest of the Cabinet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) on this question. I cannot see any reason why a provision of this kind should be inserted in an Act relating to a private corporation if it is covered by a general Act. It gives the corporation a certain standing to have this, a certain status, if you have this provision in its charter. While the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says this is not to be a precedent, nevertheless we see that the case of Montreal is being used now as a precedent. The next time this matter comes up we will have two precedents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It seems to me this provision is really harmless, however, I will not insist upon it. But I shall have trouble in explaining to my people in Quebec how it is that we refused this clause to them while we give it to Montreal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Tell them you have some wicked partners.

Section 46 struck out.

On section 43,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to add the words "or the service of the Dominion of Canada," for I am not quite sure whether vessels in the employment of the Dominion of Canada would be held to be within the meaning of these words "In Her Majesty's service."

On section 43,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Had you not better make a distinction? The distinction between "Her Majesty" and "the Dominion of Canada" is rather too sharp.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Vessels in the Dominion of Canada are registered in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And they are always referred to as being in the service of the Government of Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If they make an exception in favour of Her Majesty's ships, I want the same exception in favour of the Canadian Government vessels. I would move the addition of the words after "service" of "or of the Government of Canada."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) what business the Government proposes to take up to-morrow and the order of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. First, some small Bills, and then we will go into Supply.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 31st May, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DIES FOR POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. How many different dies for postage stamps were ordered by the present Government?
2. Where were said dies made?
3. How much did each die cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). No dies for postage stamps have been ordered by the present Government. The Post Office Department has given orders to the contractors for postage stamps. This involves the contractors preparing the necessary dies, and they state that the orders for postage stamps so given required four original dies. The price paid for postage stamps covers the cost of the dies. These dies, the contractors state, were prepared partly in New York and partly in Ottawa.

SHERIFF OF YUKON TERRITORY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Referring to the Return to the Address of the House of Commons, 15th May, 1899, relating to the appointment of a sheriff for Yukon territory:

(a) Was a bond given by the sheriff?
(b) Was an oath taken by the sheriff referred to?
(c) Who was clerk of the court while Mr. Wade was out of the Yukon district and before Mr. Girouard was appointed?
(d) Did Mr. Snell act as clerk of the court for any period, and if so, what period?
(e) If Mr. Snell so acted, under what authority did he act?
(f) If he acted, was a commission issued to him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). (a) No. (b) No information in the department. (c) H. A. Bliss. (d), (e), (f) No information in the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The only question answered, then, is subsection (a).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Subsections (a) and (c).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has no objection, the rest of the questions might stand, because I fancy the rest of that information might be obtained.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not in the department. That is the reason I was delayed in giving the answer. Though not strictly in order, I may be allowed to say for the information of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that I went to the deputy and asked him if there was no further information, and he told me there was none in the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not in the head office, perhaps, but these officers are under the Government, and for that reason I suggest that the question be allowed to stand.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To communicate with them?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

SALE OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY BINDER TWINE.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. McDougall) asked:

What are the names and post office addresses of the leading dealers throughout the Dominion to whom circulars were sent inviting them to tender for the output of the binder twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary between the 1st day of July, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The following are the firms to whom circulars were sent:—Wood, Vallance & Co., Hamilton; Hobbs Hardware Co., London, Ont.; John Hallam, Toronto; Rice, Lewis & Co., Toronto; H. Mocers, Kingston; Dalton & Strange, Kingston; J. H. Ashdown & Co., Winnipeg; Coll Bros., St. John, N.B.; Farmer's Binder Twine and Agriculture Implement Manufacturing Co., Brantford; Charles Braithwaite, Portage la Prairie; James Elder, Virden, Man.; H. N. Bate & Sons, Ottawa.

LITTLE RIVER, BREAKWATER.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

Is it the intention of the Government during the present session to make provision for the construction of a breakwater at or near Little River, on the south-western coast of Richmond County, Nova Scotia?

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

STEPHEN McNEILL, OF BEAVER COVE.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

Why is a yearly rental of one dollar exacted of Stephen McNeil, Esq., of Beaver Cove, Cape Breton, by the Railway Department for the use of a space of 25 feet of land at the rear of his dwelling, when this space was given him absolutely at the time the right of way was settled for between himself and the arbitrators?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). When the right of way was settled for under a decision of the

Exchequer Court, and the sum of $1,009.19 was paid (said sum including interest and costs). Stephen McNeil, by deed dated December 4th, 1889, No. 10360, granted and conveyed certain lands at Beaver Cove, C.B., to the Crown. This deed does not contain any reservation or mention of any space being reserved from said grant. The information with regard to the lease has not yet been received from Moncton.

Mr. GILLIES. If I am perfectly in order, I would like to intimate to the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) that the fence is exactly in the line as agreed upon between the referees to whom the Exchequer Court judges referred the matter and Mr. McNeil.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) that discussion is out of order at this stage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will make a memorandum of it.

Mr. GILLIES. I will send the hon. Minister a memorandum on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is by far the best way.

CANADIAN GENERAL SERVICE MEDAL.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. Craig) asked:

1. Was a recommendation made by the Militia Department, or by any officer thereof, as to who should receive the Canadian general service medal?
2. If so, what were the terms of such recommendation, and at what date was it published?
3. Did the Militia Department ask that a separate ribbon be issued with the said medal, or suggest that the North-west ribbon should be used therefor? If not, by whom was the suggestion made?
4. Have any further steps been taken by the department to obtain another ribbon, and if so, at what date?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Yes. 2. The terms are fully set forth in a special general order, second paragraph, 7th June, 1898, published in the "Canada Gazette." 3. The War Office directed the details of the ribbon, as already stated in my answer to a question on the 17th instant. The suggestion was made by the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for War, Lord Lansdowne. 4. Yes, on 27th May, 1899.

CONSTRUCTION OF CARS FOR I.C.R.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What company or firm in the United States of America are building cars of any form or description for the Intercolonial Railway of Canada?
2. Were the contracts given by tender?
3. If so, to whom were tenders sent, and from whom were they received?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There are no companies or firms in the United States building any cars for the Intercolonial Railway.

DISMISSAL OF EDWARD DAVIS, SLIDE MASTER AT COULONGE.

Mr. POUPORE (by Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. Has Edward Davis, slide master at Coulonge, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason was he dismissed?
3. Upon whose recommendation was such dismissal made?
4. Was an investigation held, and by whom was it made?
5. Has one John Mullen been appointed slide master at Coulonge to fill the vacancy caused by the dismissal of Edward Davis? If so, by whom was his appointment recommended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. In the interest of the public service. 3. Under the responsibility of the Minister. 4. No. 5. Yes. Appointment made on the recommendation of persons in whom the Minister has full confidence.

TRIAL OF COULOMBE AND OTHERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Was the trial of one Coulombe and others, accused of smuggling spirituous liquors, held at the criminal assizes of Quebec at the last term of the Court of Queen's Bench, or at the preceding term?
2. If not, why not?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The answer to question No. 1 is that the trial was not proceeded with for the very good reason that the appellants abandoned their appeals.

THE QUEEN vs. COULOMBE AND OTHERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to enforce the conviction pronounced in the case the Queen vs. Coulombe and others by Mr. Justice Chauveau at Quebec?
2. Have any steps been taken to enforce such conviction?
3. If not, why not?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The answer is, yes.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved:

That the House do, on to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to confirm the following leasing agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and Her Majesty in the interest of Canada, for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal.

This Agreement, made this first day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight: Between the Grand Trunk Railway Co. of Canada, hereinafter called "the Company," of the first part, and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented herein by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada, who is herein referred to as "the Minister," Her Majesty so represented being hereinafter called or referred to as "Her Majesty," of the second part.

Whereas Her Majesty proposes extending the Intercolonial Railway, a Government railway of Canada, from Chaudière Junction, in the province of Quebec, to the city of Montreal, in said province, with termini in that city;

And whereas Her Majesty has made arrangements with the Drummond County Railway Company for the lease of all its railway now completed or hereafter to be completed between Chaudière Junction and Ste. Rosalie, in the said province of Quebec;

And whereas for the purpose of carrying out the said extension the said company is willing that, for the conducting of the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, Her Majesty shall have an undivided one-half share or leasehold interest in the company's railway and property between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert station at the eastern end of the Victoria Bridge, together with the use of the company's railway and property between and including Ste. Rosalie and Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, the use of the Victoria Bridge across the River St. Lawrence and of the terminals and connections hereinafter more particularly described, together with an undivided one-half interest in and use of the bridge across the Chaudière River, and of so much of the tracks and line of the said company in connection therewith as are hereinafter described, all of which right, title, property, interest and user shall be used, enjoyed and exercised to the same extent as if the said railway and property were owned by Her Majesty, in the manner and upon the terms and conditions herein contained;

And whereas this agreement has been executed by the parties hereto, subject to confirmation by Act of Parliament as hereinafter provided, and also by the shareholders of said company;

And whereas by order of the Governor General in Council, dated the twenty-fourth day of March, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, authority is given to the Minister, subject to the sanction of Parliament, to enter into a contract with the company for the acquisition of the above rights and interests;

Now this indenture witnesseth that the expression "Montreal Joint Section," wherever used in this indenture shall mean the company's line and connections at Ste. Rosalie, and the whole line and branches and appurtenances hereby demised from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and the Victoria Bridge, together with the terminals at Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and at Point St. Charles, St. Henri and between Point St. Charles and the Bonaventure station, and also with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Jacques Cartier Junction; and the expression "Chaudière Joint Section," shall mean the Chaudière Bridge and connections, except when the meaning shall conflict with the context or otherwise plainly expressed terms of the clause in which the same is used. That the said company, in consideration of the rents, covenants, conditions and agreements hereinafter contained and reserved, hath given, granted, demised and leased, and by these presents doth give, grant, demise and lease unto Her Majesty, her successors and assigns all an undivided one-half share interest, right and title to all the company's line of railway, road-bed and property from and including Ste. Rosalie station in the county of Bagot, in the province of Quebec, to the Victoria Bridge, and also the undivided one-half right, share, title or interest in the company's line of railway from a point on the western side of the Chaudière Bridge at the proposed junction of the Drummond County Railway with the company's line, and including the Chaudière Bridge and to and including the switch at the easterly side of the Chaudière Curve station, being the same rights and privileges agreed to be leased to the Drummond County Railway by the company, with the full and unlimited right and privileges such as the company itself enjoys of running the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains of the said Intercolonial Railway, either separately or combined, and as frequently and at such times as its business and traffic may require, and in both directions, over any and every portion of the said company's railway between and including the said points aforesaid, and the use of the Victoria Bridge across the River St. Lawrence as it at present exists, or as it may at any time during the subsistence of this lease be improved, re-constructed, enlarged or extended, and over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria Bridge and into the Bonaventure station, in the city of Montreal and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the company hereinbefore more particularly described, together with the full and unlimited right and privilege of having the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway done in and about the stations and premises of the said company, upon any portions of the company's line hereinbefore described, and of the terminals and connections hereinbefore mentioned, and all intermediate stations and premises of the company, and in and about and upon all stations, tracks, and sidings, branches or extensions belonging to or leased by the company or connected with the tracks of the company, together with the full and unlimited right in Her Majesty of constructing stations, tracks, branches and sidings, and connecting said tracks, branches and sidings with the main branch and leased lines of the company at any point or points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, on the terms and conditions hereinafter contained, for the term of ninety-nine years from and after the first day of March, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, with the right of renewal as hereinafter provided. The construction of such stations, tracks, branches and sidings, with the main branch and leased lines of the company as herein provided for, shall, however, be made under the supervision and subject to the approval of the Chief Engineer of the company, which right of approval shall be reasonably exercised.

The above joint sections are all as shown on the plan annexed hereto, the portion of the Montreal section from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert station being shown in red; and from St. Lambert station to Bonaventure station, and intermediate connections, and Jacques Cartier Junction, being shown in green; the Chaudière section being shown in red; signed in duplicate by the respective Chief Engineers of each of the parties hereto, and which is hereby made part and parcel of this agreement.

To have and to hold said rights and privileges unto Her Majesty, her successors and assigns from and after the first day of March, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, for the term of ninety-nine years, yielding and paying therefor to the said company, its successors and assigns, a yearly rental of one hundred and forty thousand dollars

($140,000), such rent to be payable in equal sums monthly, that is to say, eleven thousand six hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-six cents ($11,666.66) on the first week day of every month in each year, or a proportionate sum for any fractional part of a month, the first payment to be made on the first week day of the month next following the day on which Her Majesty goes into possession of the said leased lines and property and begins to run trains over the same.

And these presents are made upon and subject to the provisions and conditions hereinafter expressed and contained for the due performance and observance of all of which, on the part of each of them to be done and performed, Her Majesty and the company bind themselves and each of them respectively, their successors and assigns, that is to say:

First.—That Her Majesty shall and will during the continuance of this lease or any renewal thereof, pay to the company the rent hereby reserved in the manner at the times hereinbefore mentioned without any deduction whatsoever, save for the reasons and on account of the happening of any or either contingency or contingencies hereinafter mentioned.

Second.—That the company shall and will keep up and maintain at all times in good repair and in a thorough efficient working condition the whole of the railway tracks, bridges, switches, sidings, signals, buildings of all kinds, platforms, water-tanks, water supplies, telegraph lines and appliances, fences, crossings and all other appurtenances and appliances belonging to the company's railway between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, and of the terminals and connections herein described and between the Chaudière Bridge and connections, the right and privilege of using which is included in this demise.

Third.—That Her Majesty shall and will pay to the company a share of the cost of maintenance of the Montreal Joint Section and the Chaudière Joint Section, including tracks, bridges, switches, sidings, signals, appliances of all kinds, platforms, water-tanks, water supplies, fuel stations, fences, crossings, and all other appurtenances and appliances used by it jointly with the company, and upon the two joint sections it has the right and privilege of usage included in this demise; such share of the cost of maintenance of each joint section to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains made over each of the above-mentioned joint sections bears to the total combined engine and car mileage running over each of the above-mentioned joint sections during each month; every engine, passenger and freight car counting each as one car; but, notwithstanding anything herein mentioned, the cost of maintenance of the Victoria Bridge shall not include the cost of maintaining any part or portion thereof except the tracks which shall be used by the Intercolonial Railway and the company, and for that class of railway purpose, which cost of maintenance shall be apportioned as aforesaid.

Fourth.—That Her Majesty shall have the right for all purposes of business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, under the reasonable rules and regulations of the company, to the full and unlimited use and the full and unlimited access thereto, as the same is or may be enjoyed by the company itself, of, to and from all engine-houses, car-houses and sheds, fuel sheds, water tanks, station houses, depots, freight and ticket offices, warehouses, freight sheds, baggage rooms, dining-rooms, and all furniture and fittings appertaining thereto; all weighing scales and baggage and freight trucks; all tracks, sidings, branches or extensions either belonging to or leased by the company at Montreal, including the terminals and other connections of the company at Point St. Charles and intermediate points between Point St. Charles and Bonaventure station, and of the connections with other railways as hereinbefore specified as the same now exists or as they may hereafter be built, rebuilt or improved upon terms as herein specified.

Fifth.—That if any of the said buildings or accommodations or facilities or anything appertaining thereto be destroyed by fire or other casualty, either in whole or in part, Her Majesty shall have no claim against the company for damages on account of loss of accommodation, but Her Majesty shall have, free of any other charge than the aforementioned rental, a proportionate share of such accommodation as the company may be able to provide for the use of its business and traffic and of the new accommodation so soon as the same may be provided, and reconstruction of such buildings and accommodations shall be proceeded with by the company at its own cost with all reasonable despatch.

Sixth.—In all cases of collision between the trains of the parties hereto, the party whose officers, employees or trains are at fault, and are or shall be found to have been the occasion of the collision shall be held responsible to the other party for all damages done or resulting from such collision, and in case the proper officers of the two parties hereto cannot agree as to which of the parties was at fault and was the cause of the collision or as to the amount of damage done, then the questions arising in respect thereto shall be referred to arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided for the settlement of differences and disputes as to the other questions, and each of the parties hereto who shall be found responsible under this clause or under clauses similar thereto shall indemnify the other and hold such other harmless and defend the other from and against all claims, costs and proceedings resulting from or growing out of such default on their part, and the party so adjudged liable to pay the other any damages in respect thereof shall abide by and perform the award of the arbitrators, and such award shall in all cases be final and terminate the controversy between the parties.

Seventh.—In case of injury to persons or property not in transit by the trains of either party hereto, or of damage by fire caused by the operation of the trains upon the said joint sections or upon lands adjoining the same, the claims arising shall be adjusted and settled by the proper officers of the company, and in payment thereof the party in fault shall pay the full amount of liability; provided, however, that in the event of its being impossible, for want of evidence, to fix the liability on one of the parties hereto, the amount of liability, including costs, shall be borne by the two parties in the proportion of the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains made over the said joint sections at the point where the injury occurred during the current month in which the damage or injury happened bears to the total combined engine and car mileage made over the said joint sections. In case of injury occurring to persons or property on the trains of either party the proper officer of the party on whose train the said injury occurred shall settle the same as in all cases of settlement under this clause. The release executed shall be made to include and free and discharge both the parties hereto from all and further liability to the claimant.

Any loss or damage to person or property on the trains of either of the parties hereto which

may be caused in any manner whatever by the negligence or the fault of any person or persons in the joint employ of the parties hereto while in the working of said railway hereby dismissed or the terminals thereof, shall be paid by the party upon whose train such loss or damage occurs and such party shall save the other harmless and indemnify the other from all claims, costs, or proceedings for or in respect to such loss or damage.

Eighth.—The superintendent, operators, despatchers, agents, and all others employed upon the repairs and maintenance, and in the operation of the said joint sections, though paid by the Grand Trunk Railway in the first place shall be considered as, and are, in fact, in the joint employ of the parties hereto in reference to any question of liability of either party hereto to the other party for their negligence, and in reference to any and all other questions; and they shall render to each party such services as they may be called upon to render within the scope of their position or employment, and shall be subject to dismissal if they decline, neglect or refuse to render such assistance and service to either party hereto as such employees are usually called upon to render.

Each of the parties hereto assume all responsibility for the accidents or casualties upon, or to its own trains, and to its passengers, freight and employees, by reason of any imperfection of the track, or misplacement of switches by its own employee or a joint employee or strangers, or for damages for stock killed, or injury that may occur to persons walking upon the track or at highway crossings (if any liability therefor), or from any other cause (aside from or except collision, in any form, with the trains of the other party, or negligence of an exclusive employee of the other party) and no such accident or casualty shall give either party the right of action or claim against the other party, it being the intention and design that each party shall be responsible for is own trains, for the conduct of its own and joint employees as respects such trains, freight, passenger and employees, and generally, except when the other party or its employees are at fault.

Ninth.—That the company shall and will furnish free from any other charge than the aforementioned rental at stations and sidings between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal and terminals and yards aforesaid, standing room for the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway and for other rolling stock which may be brought by the trains of the Intercolonial Railway to such stations and sidings.

Tenth.—That the parties hereto shall enjoy in all respects equal rights to the said tracks, buildings and improvements used in common unless wherein restricted in this lease, and the trains of Her Majesty shall in every respect be treated by the officers, agents and employees of the company, as trains of a similar class of the company, and the higher class trains shall have equal preference over trains of the lower class belonging to either of the parties, and Her Majesty shall have a perfect right to run all classes of trains, passenger, mixed, freight and other trains over the said joint sections, subject only to the restrictions and regulations prescribed and provided for in this lease. In case of doubt between the trains of the company and Her Majesty of the same class, under the established rules the trains of the company shall have the preference. The main tracks are as far as practicable to be kept unobstructed for the use of both of the parties hereto.

Eleventh.—In preparing the time-tables the company shall and will, as regards the trains of the Intercolonial Railway, arrange the time of arrivals and departure from all stations between, and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, and the speed of the said trains, in accordance with the reasonable request of the Intercolonial Railway officials, made from time to time.

Twelfth.—That the station masters, freight agents, ticket agents and baggage masters of the company on the said joint sections shall, as far as the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, to all intents and purposes, but subject to the payment of a share of their wages as hereinafter provided, be the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and shall from time to time, in regard to such business, report directly to and receive and carry out the instructions of the proper officials of the Intercolonial Railway.

Thirteenth.—That the company shall and will cause the station masters, freight agents, ticket agents and other joint employees at all stations between, and including, Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, to be strictly neutral as between the Intercolonial Railway and the company, and to waybill freight and sell tickets by whichever of these routes may be indicated or desired by shippers or passengers, and the Intercolonial Railway may put up signs to be suitably located by the superintendent of the company in each or any station on the joint section indicating that the said stations are Intercolonial Railway ticket offices.

Fourteenth.—That all business and traffic secured by agents of the Intercolonial Railway, or carried in its trains, shall be the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway.

Fifteenth.—That the Intercolonial Railway shall have the right to carry in and on its through trains traffic to and from and between all points on the line of railway extending from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, both inclusive, and in the conducting of its business between and including these stations shall have the right of conducting this business in as full and complete a manner as the company itself. That the rates and fares charged between points on the Montreal joint section shall be the same as those established by the company.

Sixteenth.—That the Intercolonial Railway shall have the right to carry, in and on its through trains to and from all points on the line of railway between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, all traffic coming from or intended for Montreal, or coming from or intended for any point on the Island of Montreal, or coming from or intended for any and all other points, and to enjoy the same rights and privileges in regard to such business as the company itself has and enjoys in similar business from and to such above-mentioned points, except as herein restricted.

(a.) The words "through trains" in the second line of this sixteenth clause and in the second line of the preceding fifteenth clause shall mean and include all trains of the Intercolonial Railway running between Montreal and Ste. Rosalie or points beyond in either direction.

Seventeenth.—That all moneys collected in the vehicles and trains of the Intercolonial Railway at any and all points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal shall belong to and be deemed to have been earned by Her Majesty, and the company shall not be entitled to receive any portion thereof; and that all moneys collected and received by the station masters and any and all other persons who may from time to time be authorized or instructed by the proper officials of the Intercolonial Railway to collect and receive money between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal for Intercolonial Railway business and traffic, including among other things car rental,

storage in freight in cars and storage of goods in the company's warehouses and freight sheds, or collected and received for any other business in any way connected with the Intercolonial Railway, belongs to Her Majesty and shall be deposited in bank to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, or remitted to the cashier of the Intercolonial Railway, or otherwise deposited of as the Minister may from time to time direct.

Eighteenth.—That local tickets issued by either of the parties hereto for passage between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, or any intermediate station, shall be accepted on all trains of either party hereto between said points, and the party who issued the tickets shall, on presentation of the ticket so used and collected, pay to the party who carried the passenger the full amount received for the said ticket.

Nineteenth.—That Her Majesty shall pay to the company a share of the salaries and wages of the undermentioned persons at stations on the said joint sections and terminals for their services in connection with Intercolonial Railway business and traffic, when such services are rendered, as follows :—

Train despatchers, station masters, telegraph operators, in the proportion that the number of Intercolonial Railway trains using the premises hereby demised bears to the total number of trains using the said premises ; ticket agents, baggage masters, baggage porters and policemen, in the proportion that the number of Intercolonial Railway passenger trains using the premises hereby demised bear to the total number of passenger trains using the same ; freight agents, freight clerks, freight checkers, freight porters and watchmen, in the proportion that the tonnage of the Intercolonial Railway freight handled by porters bears to the total tonnage handled by all porters on said premises ; also, such proportionate part of the salaries of the superintendent, train master, road master and resident engineer, as the mileage of the joint sections bears to the total mileage of road under jurisdiction of the officials named, and said proportionate part shall be divided between the parties hereto, in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains made over the said joint sections, bears to the total combined engine and car mileage made over the joint sections, and also a share of the cost of running, shunting and switching engines, and of the wages of yardmasters, shunters, switchmen and car checkers at each station between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, and the terminals, junctions and connections aforesaid and the Chaudière joint section, in the proportion that the number of cars and engines arriving and departing from the station used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway bears to the whole number of cars and engines arriving and departing therefrom. Her Majesty shall also have the right and privilege free of any other charge than the wheelage proportion hereinbefore provided of having her cars loaded or empty taken by the company to the company's junctions with connecting lines, factories, warehouses and works which may be provided with standing accommodation from the tracks of the company at Montreal, including Point St. Charles, St. Henri and intermediate points, and Bonaventure station, and the connections or junctions of other railways with the company's line, and over and upon the said joint sections as hereinbefore specified.

Twentieth.—That the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains in connection with the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway shall be exclusively by officials and employees of the Intercolonial Railway, who, while on the railway and premises of the company on the said joint sections shall be subject to the reasonable rules and regulations of the company and the directions of the officials of the company so far only as the movements of the engines, vehicles and trains are concerned.

That Her Majesty shall and will be responsible for any mileage on foreign cars carried over the joint sections by the Intercolonial Railway trains, which shall for the purpose of calculating the mileage charges be the cars of the Intercolonial Railway.

Twenty-first.—That the company shall and will house the engines of the Intercolonial Railway, and shall and will, if required, turn and clean them and fit them for the road, and supply them with fuel and water and small stores at all points, connections, junctions and terminals, as aforesaid, where it performs such services for any of its own engines, and Her Majesty shall pay to the company the actual cost to the company of the labour and material used therein and therefor, provided that Her Majesty may, at any point or at all points on the premises above mentioned, or at any time or times, perform the whole or any portion of the above services with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and with the supplies thereof without being liable to any charge therefor by the company.

Twenty-second.—That the company shall and will, if required to do so, at any or all stations on said joint sections, clean the passenger train cars used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, and heat and supply them with water, ice, fuel and small stores, and Her Majesty shall pay to the company the cost to the company of material, labour and stores used in such services, provided that Her Majesty may, at any point or points on the premises above mentionned of the company, and at any time or times, perform the whole or any portion of the above services with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and heat and supply said cars with water, ice, fuel and small stores at Her own cost without being liable to any charge therefor by the company.

Twenty-third.—That the company shall and will, from time to time when requested to do so by the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, make temporary repairs upon the engines and other rolling stock used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, such repairs to be made promptly with all reasonable despatch, and Her Majesty shall pay the company the actual cost to the company of the labour and materials used in such repairs.

Twenty-fourth.—That the company shall and will carry passengers on through tickets, and freight on through way-bills, from and to points on its railway and leased and controlled lines to and from points on the Intercolonial Railway and its leased and connecting lines, so as to avoid re-ticketing and re-way-billing.

Twenty-fifth.—That Her Majesty shall at her own cost supply all stationery, forms and tickets required for Intercolonial Railway business at all points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal.

Twenty-sixth.—That all rates and fares shall be divided on the basis of mileage, except where such division would act unfairly by reason of one line of railway having a largely preponderating mileage, in which case the division of rates and fares shall be settled on a fair and equitable basis by mutual agreement, and, in default of agreement, by arbitration as hereinafter provided.

Twenty-seventh.—That the company shall and will at its own cost, at all times, keep on sale, at all stations and agencies of its railway and of

its controlled and leased lines of railway, an adequate supply of tickets for all points of the Intercolonial Railway, its leased lines and its connections, reading "Over the Intercolonial Railway via Montreal," and the baggage of passengers using any such tickets shall be checked through to its destination over the Intercolonial Railway via Montreal.

Twenty-eighth.—That the company agrees upon the application of the General Passenger Agent of the Intercolonial Railway to place and keep for sale and sell at all stations and agencies on its railway, and leased and controlled lines of railway, and tickets that may be asked for reading to points on the Intercolonial Railway, including the joint sections and its connecting lines of the Intercolonial Railway via Montreal, and to treat such business with all fairness and impartiality.

Twenty-ninth.—That Her Majesty shall have the same privilege of displaying advertisements of the Intercolonial route at all stations of the company as the company itself has, and the Intercolonial Railway route and its connections with the company's railway shall be shown in all the published time tables of the company.

Thirtieth.—That all rents, revenues, benefits and receipts now accruing from any other company to the company by reason of the user of the line between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert or the exercise of any running power, privilege or rights therein, or which may hereafter accrue from any such grant or user shall enure to the joint benefit of Her Majesty and the company, share and share alike, and said benefits and receipts shall be accounted for by the parties hereto when the accounting shall take place from time to time between them. As to the other portions of the company's line herein demised the company hereby reserves to itself all revenues from any source whatever arising from the use thereof.

Thirty-first.—That Her Majesty shall have and enjoy for the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway of every kind whatsoever the same rights and facilities and in as full a manner at and within the terminal and other premises of the company at Montreal, at the terminals at Point St. Charles and intermediate points, as hereinbefore mentioned, and all the approaches and tracks, as the Company now has or at any time may hereafter have and enjoy for its own business and traffic.

Thirty-second.—That the company shall supply for the sole use of Her Majesty, if and when requested, a suitable ticket office in the Bonaventure station, or wherever the main depot of the company may in future be situated in Montreal, as accessible and in every way as convenient as the company's own ticket office in the said Bonaventure station or main depot at Montreal, for the sale of tickets, to be provided and maintained by Her Majesty at her own expense, in which event the Intercolonial Railway shall not be liable to share the expense of maintaining the company's ticket office or paying any of the salaries of the employees therein.

Thirty-third.—That Her Majesty and the company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and the checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs and other returns to be made as under these presents, and Her Majesty and the company mutually agree to give the necessary facilities, including access to the books and papers to the auditors of the Intercolonial Railway and of the company respectively to enable them to verify the accounts under this agreement.

That all traffic balances, charges and shares of cost, and other returns to be made under these presents, shall be made monthly, and Her Majesty and the company mutually agree to promptly audit and pay each to the other each month the total amount chargeable against the other for the month immediately preceding.

Thirty-fourth.—That Her Majesty shall not be responsible for the acts or defaults of the servants of the company, or for the deficiency or otherwise of the company's machinery or appliances, and the company shall not be responsible for the acts or defaults of the servants of Her Majesty or for the deficiency of the machinery or appliances of the Intercolonial Railway.

Thirty-fifth.—That if at any time hereafter the business or traffic shall in the opinion of the parties hereto necessitate or warrant the laying of double tracks between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, or that additional siding accommodation should be conisdered necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the joint business, the company will lay such tracks or make such improvements, and Her Majesty shall have the full and unlimited use of all or any of such works in the same manner and to the same extent as if the said work had been included in the premises hereby leased, the right, use or privilege in which are hereby demised; and if Her Majesty should determine to use any such works or improvements, and the Minister should so declare, such work and improvements are hereby understood and agreed to form part of the leased premises; and the proportion of the actual cost of such work and improvements to be borne by Her Majesty shall be ascertained by calculating interest at the rate of four (4) per centum per annum upon the amount of such actual cost; and Her Majesty shall pay the proportion of such interest which the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway for the year preceding, over such portion of the company's line upon which such improvements have been made, bears to the total combined engine and car mileage upon such portion; Her Majesty, however, shall have the option of paying such share so ascertained in cash.

Thirty-sixth.—That the company will and does hereby covenant with Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, that it has, subject to existing encumbrances, the right to demise and lease the rights and privileges hereby demised and every part thereof.

Thirty-seventh.—That if it should be found in practice that any right or interest of either party has not been fully protected or provided for by this agreement in accordance with the true object and intent thereof, then both parties shall negotiate and agree upon in an equitable manner a new and other clause to provide for such omission, and each party shall give and execute to the other any and all further documents in writing that may from time to time be required for the better securing of which of their rights and privileges under the said contract and for the better carrying out thereof.

Thirty-eighth.—That the company shall and will, if during the term of this lease Her Majesty well and faithfully performs all the covenants and agreements herein undertaken by Her Majesty to be performed, at the expiration of this lease, on request by the Minister, execute and deliver to Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, a renewal of said lease for a second term of ninety-nine years, and shall at the expiration of said second term, upon like faithful performance on the part of Her Majesty, make, execute and deliver a further renewal for a third term of ninety-nine years, and so on for ever, with the same covenants and conditions as are contained herein, subject to such limitations and modifica-

tions as may be mutually agreed upon between the parties or settled by arbitration according to the terms of this agreement.

Thirty-ninth.—That these presents are subject to the confirmation thereof by the Parliament of Canada and by the shareholders of the company.

Fortieth.—In consideration of the rents and covenants herein reserved and contained, Her Majesty represented by the General Traffic Manager of the Intercolonial Railway of the one part, and the company by its General Traffic Manager of the other part, have entered into a mutual traffic arrangement in writing of even date herewith, which traffic arrangement is hereby declared, covenanted and agreed to be and form a part of and be supplemental to this contract, and shall be read herewith and shall be binding upon all parties hereto during the continuance of this leasing contract, except so far as the same may be altered with the mutual consent of Her Majesty and the company. When and if the traffic arrangement shall be so altered from time to time such amended supplemental contract shall be substituted for the supplemental traffic contract of this date.

Forty-first.—That in order to facilitate and develop the business of the Intercolonial Railway and the company, every effort shall be made to cause close and suitable train connections to be made at Montreal between the trains of the company west of Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway.

Forty-second.—That through rates and fares shall be agreed upon and made from time to time for traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway, including the lines hereby demised, and all points on the company's railway, including all lines leased by them, and such rates and fares shall, as regards traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway, and to and from all points on the company's lines and leased lines, be divided on the basis of mileage, except where such division would act unfairly by reason of one line of railway having a largely preponderating mileage, in which case the division of rates and fares shall be settled on a reasonable and equitable basis by mutual agreement, and in default of agreement, by arbitration as herein provided.

Forty-third.—That as regards traffic shipped to and from Europe and the British Isles through Halifax, St. John, or such other port as may hereafter be selected, per Intercolonial Railway, the rates of the company for the carriage of such traffic west of Montreal shall not be higher per passenger per mile, and per ton of freight per mile, than the amount per passenger per mile and per ton of freight per mile charged by the company on similar classes or descriptions of traffic carried by it for others to and from the same places, and intended for or coming from the same place in Europe or the British Isles. In ascertaining such rates of freight, all drawbacks or deductions allowed are to be taken off before fixing the rates.

Forty-fourth.—That the forms of all through bills of lading, also the forms of receipts for goods passing over the said lines respectively, shall be such as from time to time are agreed upon by the officials of the parties hereto, or in default of agreement, settled by arbitration.

Forty-fifth.—Her Majesty shall have the right to deduct from the rentals herein agreed to be paid to the company any sum or sums of money which may hereafter become due by the company to Her Majesty, and for the payment of which the company is in default.

Forty-sixth.—That, should any difficulty arise between Her Majesty and the company under any clause of this agreement, or respecting the carrying out of the same according to its true intent and meaning, such differences shall from time to time, as the same may arise, be referred to the award and determination of three arbitrators, one of whom shall be nominated by the Minister, one by the company, and the third by the two so nominated; provided always, that if either party should for one month after notice that the other has nominated its arbitrator, omit or refuse to make a nomination, or if the two nominated should refuse or omit to nominate the third, then the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, or, in his absence or refusal or inability to act, the Senior Puisné Judge present in Ottawa and willing to act, may, on the application of either party on notice to the other, nominate the required arbitrator.

Forty-seventh.—In case of the death or refusal to act of any arbitrator, or if for any cause the office of any arbitrator becomes vacant, his successor shall be nominated in the same manner as is provided for his appointment in the first instance, unless the parties otherwise agree, and in case such successor be not nominated by the party entitled to nominate him, within one month after the happening of the vacancy, and after receiving notice requiring him to make such nomination, then the said Chief Justice, under the circumstances aforesaid, or the Senior Puisne Judge willing to act, may, on the application of either party, nominate such successor.

Forty-eighth.—The arbitrators so chosen shall, within one month after the last appointment, proceed to determine the matters referred, and they, or a majority of them, shall make and publish their award within one month thereafter, or within such further time as they shall in writing appoint, such extension of time to be made by a majority of the arbitrators, and the award of a majority of them shall be final.

Forty-ninth.—Nothing herein contained shall in any way merge or affect the claims or rights of Her Majesty, if any such there be, as they now exist against the company or the property of the company, other than that which is the subject-matter of this agreement.

Fiftieth.—Clause 20 of the agreement between the company and the Intercolonial Railway, dated 17th July, 1879, is rescinded during the life of this agreement and all other clauses of said agreement inconsistent herewith.

In witness whereof these presents (in quadruplicate) have been signed by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals, pursuant to Order in Council, dated the 24th March, A.D. 1897, and the seal of the Department of Railways and Canals has been hereto affixed, and the company has hereto affixed its corporate seal and these presents have been signed by the General Manager of the company, the day and year first above written.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA

By

(Sgd.) CHAS. M. HAYS,
General Manager.

Witness to the execution by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

(Sgd.) R. P. LOGAN.

(Sgd) ANDW. G. BLAIR,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

(Sgd.) L. K. JONES,
Secretary.

Witness to the execution by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and by the Secretary.

(Sgd.) J. E. CURRIER.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF TURNER ADMINISTRATION, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laid on the Table of the House a return to an Address dated May 1st, 1899, for copies of all petitions addressed to His Excellency the Governor General by members of the Turner Administration in the province of British Columbia respecting the conduct of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of that province, together with all papers and correspondence on the same.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

That the rule be suspended and that the papers laid on the Table of the House by the right hon. Prime Minister touching the proceedings in British Columbia respecting the dismissal of the Turner Administration, be printed.

Motion agreed to.

PROSPECTUS OF THE BRITISH-CANADIAN GOLD FIELDS COMPANY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved :

For leave to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the prospectus of the British-Canadian Gold Fields Company, and the correspondence and other papers on file in the Department of the Interior, respecting the alleged connection of Mr. William Ogilvie with that company.

Motion agreed to.

STANLEY PARK AND DEADMAN'S ISLAND.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden) laid on the Table of the House a return to an Address dated May 1st, 1899, for copies of all Orders in Council and papers respecting Stanley Park and Deadman's Island, Vancouver, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR moved :

That the rule be suspended, and that the papers brought down by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, referring to Stanley Park and Deadman's Island, be printed.

Motion agreed to.

ARRIVAL AT AND DEPARTURE FROM YUKON OF MR. JUSTICE MAGUIRE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) if he has yet heard from Judge Maguire. In regard to the question I asked as to when Judge Maguire arrived and when he left the judicial district of the Yukon, the hon. Minister said, on the 17th of May : "I shall give instructions to have a telegram sent to Judge Maguire." I would like to ask if he has yet heard from Judge Maguire.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I directed a telegram to be sent on that day and I called the attention of the Deputy Minister this morning, who promised to look up and see if any reply has been received. He is to let me know ; I can let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow what the result is.

REGULATIONS RESPECTING LOBSTER FISHERIES.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to a question asked by the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) several weeks ago, as to what he proposes to do with the regulations respecting the fishing of lobster. The lobster season is advanced now, and the people engaged in the industry are anxious to know what the extent of the season is going to be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I have already, this session, made two statements respecting this matter. I said distinctly that it is not the intention of the department to recommend to the Government the introduction of new regulations this year, that the lobster fishery would be carried on under the old regulations, and, in addition to that, as the commissioners had recommended an extension of time in certain localities, the probabilities were that these extensions, to some extent, if not to the whole extent recommended, would be granted this present year. I also stated that the old regulation respecting size limit, which had been recommended by the commissioners to be reduced, would not be strictly enforced beyond the limit that they recommended. Instructions have been sent to the inspectors to that effect.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We quite understand that the regulations in regard to the size cannot be put into operation this year, but what the fishermen are anxious to know is as to what time they will be permitted to fish. Will they be permitted to fish during the period for which they fished last year or for a further period ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They will be permitted, certainly, to fish for the period that they fished for last year, and, in all human probability, during a part at least of the further period that the commissioners recommended the season should be extended in certain localities, and the only point in debate is as to whether it shall be for the whole period of that extension this year.

THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. J. ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I

have a matter to which I desire to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister and the members of the Government, in connection with the enforcing of the Alien Labour Law in this country. I desire also to ask a question of the right hon. gentleman, and to say a few words, and in order to put myself in order, I will conclude with a resolution. I would like to ask the First Minister whether he proposes to have the Alien Labour Law enforced as regards the importation of aliens from the United States to take the place of the striking trackmen on the Grand Trunk Railway. This matter is one of great importance at this juncture to the labour interests of this country. Within the last half hour I have been placed in possession of an important telegram from Buffalo, which is none less than an interview with Mr. Inspector DeBarry, who, as the representative of the American Government, speaks undoubtedly with authority, and his words, I am sure, will be listened to with interest by members of this House, more particularly by members of the Government. Mr. DeBarry, in this interview, held within the past two hours, is reported to have said :

Inspector DeBarry was asked to-day concerning the rumours in Canada that the Alien Labour Law has been suspended. He stated most emphatically that the law was still in force, and that, so far as he knew, there had been no talk of suspending it.

"I have heard the rumour from several sources," he said, "but there is not the slightest truth in it. The law has not been suspended, and will not be suspended. It could not be suspended, except by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and the signature of the President. I do not know that there has been any talk of such a move in this country, and presume that the rumour started from the statement of some one in Canada who might be interested in getting labourers over here to work. I understand from the labour people of this city that a Bill is now being prepared and will be sent to Congressman Alexander for introduction next session, making even more stringent the Alien Contract Labour Law."

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the First Minister yesterday shows that the understanding arrived at at Washington has not the same effect on both sides of the line. An understanding which restrains the agents of the Canadian Minister of Justice and does not restrain Mr. Inspector DeBarry, is not what Canadians have a right to expect from this Government. The Minister of Justice leaves the door wide open to alien labourers who are brought in to take the place of the Grand Trunk Railway striking trackmen, but the door at Buffalo will remain shut tight against Canadian labourers who might be brought in to take the place of striking grain handlers. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), who, I am glad to see in his place, suggested the other night that these trackmen would have to abide by the law of supply and demand. Well, I suppose that we all have to abide by that law to some extent ; but I do think that this Government should take some steps to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway from supplying this demand for cheap labour by the importation of foreigners and aliens. I am informed that the Grand Trunk Railway is bringing in foreigners to take the place of these striking Canadian trackmen, who are forced to strike by reason of the starvation wages paid by the Grand Trunk Railway ; for I think that 70, 80 and 90 cents a day is not enough to keep body and soul together, let alone for a man to keep himself, his wife and his children. I understand that the Alien Labour Law cannot be used to protect Canadian workingmen on account of the continued existence of the joint high commission. All I can say is that Inspector De Barry at Buffalo, has not the same amount of respect for the joint high commission that the Minister of Justice and his colleagues in the Canadian Government have. I am informed, on very good authority, that during the present strike of the grain-handlers in Buffalo, Mr. W. J. O'Connor, who is the boss contractor, was notified by DeBarry that he would be liable to a penalty of $1,000 a day if he attempted to bring in alien labourers. It is strange that the United States does not suspend this Alien Law against labour from Canada for the reason which the Minister of Justice urges as an excuse for suspending the Alien Law against labour from the United States. It seems to me that the authorities of the United States go right on protecting workingmen just as if the joint high commission had never been called into being. It is strange that the Government of Canada cannot enforce this law in the interests of justice and fair-play. I would not hesitate to speak out against these strikers if they were in the wrong, but if ever a strike was justified, this strike is justified, for the reason that it is impossible for these workingmen to live at the miserly wages paid by the Grand Trunk Railway. In my judgment, the Government of this country has no right to play into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway by suspending the Alien Labour Law in Canada, while the American labour law remains in full force at Buffalo and other places on the frontier. I do not believe that the United States would be irritated if this Government should step in to prevent this country from being flooded with foreign labourers. The men whom the Grand Trunk Railway are importing are not native Americans, and there is no large force of public opinion in the United States which would utter one word of protest if the Government of this country had only the courage to do what is right in this matter. I move that the House adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must at once express my great

regret, when a matter of such importance as the strike on the Grand Trunk Railway is going on, and when everybody who speaks in this House should be careful not to speak in terms that will inflame passion, that the hon. member from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) should have thought fit to use such language as we have just heard. If the hon. gentleman had listened to the voice of fair-play and justice at this time, he would have refrained from using such language as he has just uttered. I may tell him that my sympathies are just as strong as his can be in favour of the men who at the present time are on strike. But, Sir, I would be sorry to prejudge that case without waiting until we have heard from the other side. There must be another side to this case, as there is to every other case; but the hon. gentleman pronounces himself immediately in favour of the men without having heard at all from the Grand Trunk Railway. In matters of this kind, we know that everybody's sympathies always go naturally to the employee. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to tell me at this moment that he is ready to pass sentence and to condemn the Grand Trunk Railway, without having heard their defence? If he is prepared to do that, I am not. For my part, I think that before we intervene we should allow the Grand Trunk Railway to say something for themselves. Let me go further. I believe that the hon. gentleman is over-zealous in this matter, that he is not so much actuated with sympathy for the Grand Trunk Railway men who are on strike as he is with a desire to create some political capital at the expense of the Government. If the hon. gentleman had been desirous of promoting the interests of the striking trackmen, he would have refrained from inflaming passion as he does at the present moment; he would have waited until he had heard what the Grand Trunk Railway had to say. When the whole matter has been laid before the public, and when we have had a demand from the men to put the Alien Labour Law into force, and if we then fail to do so, we will be open to the criticism of the hon. gentleman. But it seems to me that he would have consulted his own position in this House if, before blaming the Government, he had ascertained whether a demand had come to us from the men who are on strike to put the Alien Labour Law into force. Now, I say that, speaking on this, the last day of May, between three and four o'clock in the afternoon, to my knowledge, no demand has been made upon the Government to enforce the Alien Labour Law by the men who are on strike. No demand has been made, and, if no demand has been made, what has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) to say? Would it not be better for him to ascertain, first, whether any demand has been made upon us. I may be in error; perhaps something has come to the Department of Justice, but I do not think I am in error, and I believe that no demand has been made. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) is simply over-reaching himself, for the purpose, not of favouring the interests of the men whom he pretends to serve, but simply to gratify his own political spite.

Now, with regard to the law itself; let me say to the hon. gentleman, that I repeat to-day what I said yesterday: We have not an official understanding with the American authorities, that the Alien Labour Law is to be suspended. The hon. gentleman knows, as I know, that a law cannot be suspended except by the authority that enacted it. But the authorities which have the power to put the law in force, can exercise that power with severity or with leniency, and that was the understanding we had. Moreover, I am bold to say at this moment that along the 3,000 miles of boundary between Canada and the United States, there is only one spot where the American Alien Labour Law is being enforced, and that is at the city of Buffalo. Everywhere else the Alien Labour Law of the United States is not being enforced. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) knows, and, if he does not know it, he ought to know it, that to-day, and every day, in the town of Windsor, there are at least 300 men going to work in Detroit from that town. There the law is not enforced, and, Sir, if we are to enforce the law without respect to the private understanding that has been arrived at, we will have a serious condition of things in this country, for all these Canadians who now find a living in the city of Detroit, will have to remain on the Canadian side of the frontier and lose their work. The case mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) is not the only one we have to think over in connection with this subject. We have to take into consideration, not only the condition of one class of the community, but the condition of all classes; and, when we are endeavouring to have a better understanding between the two countries, when the men who are engaged in these negotiations at the present time are doing their best to have this very obnoxious law removed, it is not a time to inflame passion, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) would have us do. As I said yesterday, I beg to repeat to-day: At this moment the matter is engaging the attention of the Government, and we are applying ourselves to it. I repeat that, when the trackmen choose to come to us and make their complaint, we shall hear that complaint, and give it every possible consideration and attention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I cannot congratulate the leader of the House upon the deliverance which he has just made. That right hon. gentleman has not done himself justice. He is a great master of form, but, when he loses his temper, he

loses his form and presents himself in a light that does not add to the dignity of the position he occupies. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), as was his right, as a member of this House, asked the attention of the Government to a very important subject, and he drew the attention of the First Minister to the fact that yesterday, on the floor of this House, the right hon. gentleman stated that an agreement practically had been entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, that, pending the negotiations of the plenipotentiaries representing Great Britain and the United States, the Alien Labour Law should be suspended. My hon. friend (Mr. Ross Robertson) also drew the attention of the First Minister to the fact that, at this very important crisis, he (Mr. Ross Robertson) had information that a gentleman in the United States held that it was not in the power of the Government of the United States to suspend the Labour Laws without an Act of Congress and the signature of the President; and that this gentleman was, consequently, enforcing the Alien Labour Law against Canadians. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) also pointed out, in a very temperate manner, that this being the condition of things, a large number of labourers were to be imported from the United States into Canada to take the place of Canadian workmen. The right hon. gentleman, in answer to this, got into a temper, and violated one of the first rules of debate by imputing motives to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson). Does the right hon. gentleman not know that even a Prime Minister of Canada is not permitted to impute motives on the floor of this House? The hon. gentleman from Toronto had as much right to make this statement of his views and opinions as any other hon. gentleman in this House, and he had a right to urge upon the Government the course that, in his judgment, he thought ought be pursued. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) did not speak in the interests of the strikers, or in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway Company merely, but he spoke on the broader question, as to whether the Alien Labour Law was to be suspended in Canada, and not suspended in the United States of America. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) only did justice to himself, to his constituents, and to this House, when he drew the attention of the First Minister to the fact that this was, apparently, a one-sided arrangement, by which no labour could be sent from Canada into the United States, while labour could come freely from the United States into Canada. The Government of Canada, it appeared, were prepared to observe the arrangement that had been entered into, while there was no corresponding evidence of such a policy on the part of the United States authorities. I see no cause for heat; I see no cause for the violent temper which the First Minister exhibited. I am afraid there is something outside which we have not seen, which ruffled the temper of my right hon. friend, or else he would not approach a pure business question, a question of first-rate importance to this country, in the spirit in which he did approach it. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) only discharged his duty in presenting this question to the House, and his remarks demand the careful consideration of the Government, unless the Government intend to become active participators in this unhappy controversy which we all deplore, and which is going on between a great railway corporation and a number of its employees. This requires the most careful and prudent consideration on the part of the Government, and, instead of doing anything which would appear like their taking a part directly with one side or the other to the controversy, they should see that the laws are maintained and equal justice meted out to Canadians in the United States, as is meted out in Canada to aliens—this in the face of a law on our statute-book, which, if enforced, would prevent aliens coming in here. I can quite see the reasonableness of the Government of the United States and of the Government of Canada doing all they possibly can to remove every source of irritation between the two countries, pending these negotiations; but I think the Government of Canada should take care that this should not be a one-sided arrangement, and that, while they, in good faith, are observing the understanding, the United States should be required to observe it also. The statement is made here, that again and again since this commission has been sitting, the United States of America had exercised the right which, under the laws of their country, they are enabled to exercise, of preventing Canadian labour entering their country, and this is a question which deserves the calm and serious consideration of the Canadian Government.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, living as I do on the line of the Grand Trunk Railway, and being largely interested in that road, as well as in the welfare of the men working on that road, I understood the right hon. the Premier, in reply to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), to say that he had heard the men's side of the case, but that he had not heard the other side, and there was another side to it. Now, I want to inform the right hon. Premier that this strike has been on now for ten days, and I want to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), who ought to know something about railways, if any member of the Government does, whether he thinks it is safe for passengers to travel over a line of railway running for ten days without a man on the track? Her Majesty's mails are

carried on that railway, and where the mails go passengers expect that their lives are safe. Just at the time this strike was inaugurated a change was made on the line of the Grand Trunk system; engines of double the weight of those previously used being introduced. Formerly the engines weighed from 65 to 70 tons. To-day several weigh from 110 to 120 tons light, and when loaded with coal and water they run up to 140 or 150 tons. These engines will haul a train of from 45 to 60 cars, and from 30 to 40 trains a day run over the track. On Monday, when I came down, I was informed that there was not a man on the track from Toronto to Montreal, or perhaps from Sarnia to Portland; yet there were passenger trains running at the rate of 50 or 60 miles an hour, and heavy freight trains following. I want to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) whether it is not time to ask the Grand Trunk Railway Company to show their side of the case, and to say to them: "We send our mails over your road, and we invite passengers to travel by it, and we want to know whether the public are safe in travelling over your railway." In an accident occurs, I will lay the blame largely at the door of this Government for not taking some action in this matter. On Sunday at Mallorytown, a rail was found which had not a spike from one end to the other, and the fish-plates were loosened.

An hon. MEMBER. Who loosened them?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know; but I know that the men are not interfering with the track. The conductor had to stop his train and go and get a hammer and spike down the rail before the engine could go over it. Is that a safe state of affairs? The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) the other day drew the attention of the First Minister to the question of the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law, and I understand that there is a deputation from Hamilton in the gallery to-day asking the Government to enforce that law. I am not taking sides either with the men or the company; but I say that the Government, having heard the men, ought to ask the Grand Trunk Railway Company to report to them whether the lives of passengers and property are safe on their railway. I ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to say whether he would consider the Intercolonial Railway would be safe in running for ten days without a sectionman on the track. The Grand Trunk Railway Company are so careful that every Sunday they detail a man to go over every section of the track regularly all the year round to see that no spikes or nuts have become loosened by the passing of trains over it on the Sabbath day; and here we are ten days, with trains running and engines of double capacity, and not a man on the line from one end to the other to look after the condition of the track. All along the track you will see ties distributed that should be put in this spring. After the recent heavy rains the road-bed must becoming more or less out of order, the ties becoming soft, and it is important that the road-bed should be made as safe as possible. I think it is time the Government should interfere in this matter, and I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) whether he thinks a railroad, with 40 trains a day running over it, is safe without having a man to inspect the track?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman appeals to me, and he asks me a question, I presume with the expectation that I will give him a reply. I should be very glad to do so, if I thought in any answer I could make, I would be able to cover the ground adequately or do so with a knowledge of the facts as they exist. The hon. gentleman assumes that the Grand Trunk Railway, from Sarnia to Portland possibly, has at the present moment, and has had since this strike commenced, no men upon it to afford any protection to the trains passing over it or to the public who use the line. Now, I cannot accept the hon. gentleman's statement as to that as a statement of fact. I think the hon. gentleman must be quite unwarranted in making that statement. I do not believe, because he passed along the track on a train, and did not see any sectionmen, that he can justly conclude that there was no man looking after the road or watching it or giving any attention or care to it. On the contrary, I would rather assume that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, with its enormous interests involved, with its great property, and with public life in its care, would scarcely undertake to run its trains for a period of ten days without taking any precaution, or without having done what it deemed to be sufficient in order to protect its property and the lives of the people travelling over its road. I would rather be inclined to think that, and I am the more justified in thinking it because I am told that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has men carefully going over its line. It has not, of course, its usual complement of men. It has not the regularly employed sectionmen; but it has men who are able to give such an inspection to the road as to afford a satisfactory and adequate assurance that its trains may run over the line without danger to public life or to its own property. The hon. gentleman says that if any accident does happen, however, he is going to hold this Government responsible for the results. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would just ascertain, before he jumps to a conclusion of that kind—a grave and serious conclusion to arrive at, a conclusion which would involve the charge of manslaughter against the officers of the Government or the

Government as a whole if any life were sacrificed—just what means and power the Government have to put an end to this strike, and to declare either that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall pay the men what they ask, or that the men shall accept exactly what the Grand Trunk Railway Company chooses to offer them, and immediately resume their employment. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if he can do so, to give the House some little idea of the grounds on which he bases the conclusion that this Government has the power, and has failed to exercise that power. I am not aware myself of any direction in which I could look to find any authority, statutory or otherwise, to enable me to exercise the power which the hon. gentleman assumes that I possess, and which he says this Government ought to exercise. I do not deny that the question of this strike is one of very grave and serious interest, not to the Government alone, but to everybody who is at all interested in the safety and security of the travelling public; but after you have come to that conclusion, you have not got very far, and I am not able to see any direction in which I can, by any other mode than merely communicating with the Grand Trunk people, lend any assistance at the present juncture towards bringing about a settlement of this serious difficulty. If there were any means of doing it, I need not say to this House that not only myself but every member of the Government would be instantly alive to the importance of bringing a settlement about. We do not require to be nagged on by gentlemen in Opposition; we do not require that the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) should tell us we ought to do this. It might fairly and reasonably be taken for granted that if there is any way in which we can be satisfied that we can effectively interfere in this trouble we will be only too anxious to do it. I can say for myself that I would only be too anxious to do it. I have received no appeal of any kind or description from the trackmen to interfere or from the Grand Trunk Railway. I have not been invited, except by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to interfere, and I do not know how it would be possible for me to interfere with any effect at all at present, or how I could communicate other than in a mere friendly and amicable way with the different people concerned in that controversy, and say to them: You ought to bring this controversy to an end. But they know that already; I cannot tell them more than they already know; and I have not any power to do any more than I have done. There is really no use in hon. gentlemen taking up a matter of such seriousness and gravity and trying to make political capital out of it when there is no direction in which they can point, possibly, for us to act, in which we have not acted; and there are no members more desirous than the members of the Government to see this trouble brought speedily to a termination.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). In looking around for a reason to account for the exceeding warmth with which the right hon. Prime Minister and one of his chief lieutenants have replied to my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), it seems to me that, perhaps, that warmth arises from the fact that these gentlemen find themselves in somewhat of a hole in connection with this matter. They have very loudly called for complaints to be made by the trackmen, but the right hon. gentleman has prevented any appeal being made by the trackmen or anybody else in connection with the importation of alien labour, by reason of the policy which the right hon. gentleman has announced to this House several times this session. Again, this afternoon he told the House that he had made an arrangement at Washington, by which, practically, the operation of the Canadian Alien Labour Law is suspended, and has admitted that he is carrying out that arrangement, so that it is perfectly clear he does not intend, for the time being at least, to prevent the importation of alien labour into Canada. Undoubtedly, that is the reason why the hon. gentleman, in the face of these two great strikes, finds himself in rather a difficult place, and so, instead of answering in reason and good temper, he adopts, practically, the course of scolding my hon. friend from East Toronto, an example which is followed by the Minister of Railways, who, with a great deal of heat, answered the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in very much the same vein.

I may say, too, that the policy of the Government has not only been announced in this House, but also by means of a communication from the Minister of Justice of Canada, who speaks particularly upon this matter for the Government, because it is one that comes within his duties as Minister of Justice, and after that policy had been given to the country, after the explicit statement from the Minister of Justice of Canada, that no man who is opposed to the importation of alien labour need apply to this Government, the right hon. gentleman, with that splendid effect which he has upon his followers behind him, rises and boldly challenges the member for East Toronto to say what complaint has been made to this Government. He asks this question after this Government has given notice to the public that no complaint need be made, because of this arrangement between it and the members of the commission at Washington. It appears to me that the right hon. gentleman, though, perhaps, not intending it, is trifling with the House and evading the question entirely raised by the hon. member for East Toronto.

Let us have a straight declaration from the right hon. gentleman. If complaints are

made and if it can be shown that, upon a large scale, and to the serious detriment of Canadian citizens and labourers, alien labourers are being imported into Canada, will the right hon. Prime Minister stand by that tentative arrangement which he made at Washington and turn a deaf ear to the appeals which may be made in Canada ? Let him answer that question instead of scolding the hon. member for East Toronto for bringing up this question of exceedingly vital importance to many industrious men and their families who are citizens of Canada.

Mr. IVES. I only rise to protest against the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Railways, that the Government is entirely powerless except to mediate. I do not mean to say that such a case has arisen as would justify the Government in interfering and interfering effectively, but I do say that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) is entirely wrong when he says that the Government are powerless, and there is nothing in the world they can do, no matter what may happen between the men and the Grand Trunk Railway, or what may hereafter be the condition of a track of the Grand Trunk Railway and its fitness to carry people without danger to their lives. The hon. Minister surely knows that no new railway can be opened for business, carry a passenger or sell a ticket, until it has been inspected by the Government officer and received the permission of the Government to carry passengers. He also knows that if a railway company has been given a license to carry passengers, the Government may, because of the unsafe conditions of its business or road-bed, absolutely close that railway and prevent its doing its business altogether. I do not care what railway it may be or how perfect its road-bed may be or how safe, if it gets into a difficulty with its men and its track is interfered with and becomes unsafe, and the lives of Her Majesty's loyal subjects are in danger, the Government are not powerless, as the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) says they are; and if he does not know, he had better consult his chief engineer, who will tell him how the Government may interfere and prevent the Grand Trunk Railway selling a ticket in Canada at all. More than that. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) whom I do not see here for the moment can bring a very strong argument to bear on the Grand Trunk if the road becomes unsafe for Her Majesty's mails. He can cancel their contract, and stop their carriage of the mails, if he finds that the road is unsafe, so that the Government are not in that powerless position described by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). The hon. leader of the Opposition seems to find a great deal of fault with the leader of the Government because the right hon. First Minister expressed his regret that the hon. member for East Toronto should have brought up this matter, as the course he followed was calculated to do some harm in the country. The ex-Minister, the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) has, no doubt, scolded the hon. member (Mr. Ross Robertson) much more strongly than the leader of the Government has. As he has pointed out, there is no occasion, under the present circumstances, why the Government should take action.

Mr. IVES. I did not say the case had arisen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You said distinctly, if I understood you aright, that no case had arisen in which the Government should interfere.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In any case, I think it is much to be regretted that matters of this kind should be so lightly brought up in this House. My hon. friend from East Toronto evidently held a brief from the Yankee inspector, DeBarry, of Buffalo. He read what DeBarry had sent him about the Alien Labour Law, and its enforcement, and what he was going to do; but the hon. gentleman did not lay before this House the complaint of a single Canadian, either as to entering Buffalo seeking employment, or any other. There was not a single complaint from any workman of Canada, or from any Canadian citizen; but the hon. gentleman has presented this statement of the views of this Yankee inspector as to to the Alien Labour Law being still in force.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. When Canadians do complain, they cannot get redress.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is another unsupported statement made by the hon. gentleman. What I complain of is, that a gentleman holding the position he does, a member of this House representing an important constituency, should take the position he has taken, when he has done nothing himself to bring about some settlement between the Grand Trunk and their men. If the hon. gentleman had been sincere in his desire to assist the workingmen who are protesting against the wages they receive, he might have done something to bring about a settlement of the dispute. He might have used his influence with the city council; he might have sought the assistance of others. I would appeal to the House if I am not right, when I say, that the hon. gentleman made not one common-sense suggestion as to how this matter should be dealt with. His whole desire appeared to be to attack the Government, to make some cheap political capital out of this matter, to gain some cheap notoriety, regardless of the fact that there are very grave interests involved in this matter at the present time. This is a serious matter, that should not be brought up and dealt with as lightly as it has been by the hon. gentleman to-day, and as it was by his

colleague (Mr. Clarke) the other day, trying to arouse passion, to create sentiment and sympathy that may work great injury to this country. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), a gentleman of long parliamentary experience, himself an ex-Minister of Railways, though he defended the hon. member for East Toronto to some extent, did not make one suggestion as to how the matter was to be dealt with. But I know that, though he may differ from this side in politics, he has the interest of the people too much at heart to ever attempt to use, like—yes, I will say, like a demagogue—a case of this kind, where so much injury to the public interests might be the result. He was dealing with this question in a serious manner. If he were to-day in the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, he would expect the co-operation of his colleagues on both sides. I merely arose to express my great regret that the hon. gentleman from East Toronto should have procured an opinion from a Yankee inspector, and made that the ground for bringing up in the House a matter of this kind, to arouse public opinion, and not to benefit the men who think that they are not being fairly dealt with by the Grand Trunk. I do not believe that one man on either side of the House will say, that he is more anxious that these men should receive all that they are entitled to, than are members who sit on the side opposite to him. The Government and the leader of the Government are as anxious as any others can be to do everything that is possible to be done to assist any Canadian citizen who may be unjustly dealt with. But there are great interests involved, and it is most unfortunate that, for purely political purposes, matters should be brought up so lightly that may have results the end of which we cannot foresee.

Mr. WILLIAM McCLEARY (Welland). It is a matter of surprise to me that, whenever the question of the enforcement or non-enforcement of the Alien Labour Law is brought up in this House, it should irritate, as it does, the Government and their supporters. We are supposed to have an Alien Labour Law on our statute-books, in fact and in word the same as the Alien Labour Law of the United States; and why we, on this side, should be accused of ulterior motives, whenever we ask the Government, why they are not looking after the interests of the people of this country in regard to the enforcement of that law, is something that calls for explanation. I should think it would be the absolute duty of members on both sides of this House to protect the honour and integrity of this country, rather than to show a disposition to cringe before and bow down to the dictates of a foreign power. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) speaks of the Opposition bringing this up in a nagging way. I can tell the hon. gentleman, that it was only because the members on this side of the House insisted that something should be done in this regard, that we have what we have. I do not see any necessity for the expression used by the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he spoke of our inflaming passions and prejudices when matters of this kind are brought to the attention of Parliament or of the people. We only want our Government to look after the interests of the artisans of this country and of our citizens generally, as the authorities in the United States look after the interests of their people. Yesterday, I referred to a strike that was going on in the city of Hamilton among employees of the Calder Company. Now, I have before me a telegram that was sent to the mayor of that city which shows the attitude of the Government in regard to the question of the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law. It appears that the employers imported a number of persons from the other side to take the places of the strikers. The mayor of Hamilton, who, I understand, is in this city to-day regarding this very same matter, put himself in communication with the Minister of Justice, asking for protection for the men who had gone out on strike, and asking that the law should be enforced. Well, Sir, here is the reply:

> The Attorney General is not at liberty to give his assent to the prosecution for the infraction of the Alien Labour Law to which you refer, an understanding having been reached last summer by the international commissioners that the Alien Labour Law, until the negotiations were concluded, should remain in abeyance in Canada in respect to persons coming from the United States, and in the United States in respect to persons going thither from Canada. Until it is shown that this understanding is not observed by the United States officers, no action can be taken here.
>
> (Sgd.) DAVID MILLS.

Now, this is the attitude our Government take in that regard. The Minister of Justice says, that no interference must be asked, and our law must not be enforced. But in this very same paper we have a statement—which is backed up by the telegram read by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson)—as to what DeBarry has been doing. Let me read the article, which the House may have seen, with regard to the sending back by DeBarry of a young Canadian who had gone across the river:

> Buffalo, N.Y., May 28.—John R. DeBarry, immigration inspector, escorted George Hunt, a Canadian bricklayer, to the International Bridge yesterday morning, and saw him safely on the train bound for the Queen's Dominion. Hunt arrived in Buffalo early Saturday morning, and carried a kit of tools. He was promptly held up by the customs men and turned over to Inspector DeBarry. Hunt told the inspector that he had been invited to visit his uncle, a bricklayer, in Cleveland.
>
> "What do you need tools for, if you are just going to visit you uncle?" asked Inspector DeBarry.

"Oh, I thought I might do a little work to pay expenses," replied Hunt.

"Well," said Mr. DeBarry, "I consider that a violation of the Alien Labour Law; you will have to go back to Canada."

Now, that is the way Mr. DeBarry looked at the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What paper is that?

Mr. McCLEARY. It is in the Hamilton "Spectator" of May 29th, and you will see it in the daily papers of the 27th or 28th; it is dated at Buffalo, May 28th.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Did the hon. gentleman not see that that was denied as a mere mythical statement?

Mr. McCLEARY. I did not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You had better consult the papers more carefully.

Mr. McCLEARY. I do not believe it has been authoritatively denied. I live too near the international line not to know what is going on in this regard. It is not the first instance, it is not the second instance, it is only one of hundreds that we do not know of, and this accidentally came to light. I was going to say that this is the way the United States Government authorities abide by the agreement that the Prime Minister says was entered into at Washington to suspend the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law. Now, under these conditions, why should not the Minister of Justice come to the aid and assistance of our own men in the city of Hamilton as against the labour imported to compete with them? I say it is unfair, it is a disgraceful thing for the Government of this country to fail to protect our own interests when we have to stand such insults from men like DeBarry from day to day, who insults our people, and we have to submit to it. I think we ought to be a little bigger in our own estimation, and we ought to carry out in its entirety the Alien Labour Law we have on the statute-book.

Mr. A. T. WOOD (Hamilton). The citizens of Hamilton, I think, have great reason to be grateful to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) for the care and interest he takes in the management of the affairs of that city. This is the second time within twenty-four hours that he has got up to vindicate the rights of the people of Hamilton. I should suppose, there being two members representing Hamilton in this House, that they would be quite capable of looking after the interests of that city. Now, this matter has not escaped the attention of my colleague and myself. On several occasions we have brought to the attention of the Government questions relating to the Alien Labour Law, and we were so well satisfied with the position of the Government in this matter that we were willing to leave it in their hands without resorting to enforced agitation. We are quite satisfied that the Government will consult the interests of the country as well if we leave them alone, as they will by hearing it constantly dinned into their ears by those hon. gentlemen opposite for political effect. I am quite satisfied that our hon. friend from Welland (Mr. McCleary), who lives very close to the border, has no reason to find fault with anything that is being done along the border. But some people have been imported into Hamilton, and of course he makes that a ground of attack upon the Government for not taking care of the interests of the people of Hamilton. Now, Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Hamilton has taken this matter in hand, and the members for Hamilton and the people of Hamilton themselves are quite satisfied that he will look after their interests just as well as the member for Welland can possibly do, and I think a good deal better. The mayor has communicated with us in reference to this matter, we are well aware of the action he has taken, and we endorse it. I am satisfied that the political capital that hon. gentlemen opposite seek to make out of this question will not amount to much. Of course, I am very sorry to know that Mr. Calder has had to import people from New York into Hamilton in consequence of this strike; but from what I know of the mayor, I think that matter will be settled in the course of a very few days. The people of Hamilton and the strikers of Hamilton are reasonable people, and when they know that the Government have taken every means to bring about a fair and reasonable adjustment of this difficulty, they are not going to put any obstacle in the way of that adjustment. I, for one, am perfectly satisfied to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, knowing that they are the proper parties to see that protection is given to Canadian labourers. I am sorry that there has been a strike by the Grand Trunk Railway trackmen. I know that these men who live in my own city are first-class citizens, and I regret very much that they have had to take this step. But I am satisfied that at a very early day the management of the Grand Trunk Railway, in their own interests, as well as in the interests of the public, will come to an amicable settlement with their employees; and I think they will be able to make a far better settlement than can be done by outside agitators trying to force the hands of the Government. I am satisfied that the Government have taken the right course in this matter, in leaving it in the hands of the parties interested until they are requested, either by the strikers or by the Grand Trunk Railway people to intervene, and if they do intervene, they will do it in the interests of all concerned.

Mr. G. H. BERTRAM (Centre Toronto). I desire to say a word or two in connection

with the question which has been brought to the notice of the House by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson). I am inclined to think that there is too much of a tendency in this House, if I may be allowed to say so, to agitate certain questions and to bring forward certain ideas with reference to some very difficult questions, at a time when premature agitation is one of the worst possible ways that can be adopted to bring about a settlement. No one will deny that in this country, and in all countries, strikes are one of the most difficult questions that we have to deal with at any time; and when any one outside of the employers and employees undertake to express an opinion on a question of that kind, he should see that he is in possession of all the facts on both sides before he undertakes to express such opinion, otherwise he will be apt to do an injustice to either one side or the other. Now, I have had some experience in matters of this kind, because it is only within the last few weeks that a serious strike took place in the city of Toronto, among the moulders in the iron foundries. A strike is now going on in Montreal; I have been written to with reference to that strike by the employers of labour in Montreal, and I have been doing all I possibly can, by correspondence, to bring about a better condition of things there.

It is to be remembered that the question which has been brought before the House is a complicated one. On the one side you are dealing with the position the Government should take with reference to the Alien Labour Law, and you are also dealing with a strike between the Grand Trunk Railway and its employees. Now, premature action on the part of a Government, or on the part of an individual, sometimes does a great deal of harm. I have no hesitation in saying, that in all matters of this kind, the sympathy of the general public is generally with the men. My experience is that if you meet the men frankly and fairly and deal with these questions frankly and fairly, you will never have any trouble in getting them settled, and I earnestly hope that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will meet these men in a more frank manner than they have done, and have this question settled. In a strike that took place in Toronto, the other day, I was waited upon by a body of men composed of a representative from the United States as well as members of a Canadian committee, and when I was dealing with the matter, I found a good deal of feeling in connection with it. My effort in connection with the matter was to try to get rid of all feeling and bring my best judgment to bear on the question with these men. I took advantage of the opportunity of meeting the workmen in their own lodge room, and I discussed freely and frankly with them the whole question, and there was no difficulty in settling the matter, and the men went to work next morning without a murmur. What Parliament should do is to see that nothing is done to create any feeling between employers and employees, because the moment you create any feeling, by partisan appeals such as were made by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) and other hon. gentlemen, you are doing a great deal of harm. Whether the statement published in the newspapers is true or not, I cannot tell, but, if it is true, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are hiring men to do a certain class of work for less than a dollar a day, I think the pay is too low. I think the company should pay more, but we are not going to do any good creating any ill-feeling or excitement at the present time. The alien labour question is a most difficult one to deal with. I believe that the Canadian Alien Labour Law and the American Alien Labour Law are a disgrace to both countries. I believe these laws are contrary to the spirit of good legislation, and I shall be only too glad if the efforts of the International Commission, in the direction of trying to do away with that law, on both sides of the line, are successful. It has been stated by the right hon. leader of the Government that there has been an understanding—a tacit understanding—that that law should not be enforced pending the international negotiations, and I think, on the whole, it has not been enforced. There has been some difficulty always at Buffalo. There seems to be a hot-headed American there who is trying to make trouble between the two countries, but, outside of Buffalo, it does not appear to have been enforced. If we cannot get the Alien Labour Law of the United States abolished, then, I say, we will require to have a stringent and strong Canadian Alien Labour Law, because if they are determined to enforce that kind of legislation against us we will be compelled to enforce similar legislation against them. But I believe, that the tendency of members of this House to take sides in a strike when it occurs is doing something that is unwise and which does not reflect credit upon themselves. During these last few days the same question has been put to the leader of the Government over and over again, in reference to the Alien Labour Law and the Grand Trunk strike. I do not say for one moment they are brought forward for the purpose of making political capital out of them, but, it seems to me, I repeat, that these questions are being discussed before we are in possession of the facts, and, therefore, I think the House should frown down these continued attempts and should seek to bring its judgment to bear rather than its feelings on the matter. Until the International Commission has finally disposed of its work and disposed of the Alien Labour Law, I think we should try to get along without enforcing it on either side of the line. I understand from the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Government, that the Government is in correspondence with Washington, I suppose, to

know whether the Alien Labour Law is being enforced by the United States, and if the Government ascertains, that, notwithstanding the understanding arrived at, they are enforcing that Alien Labour Law, Canada will be required to take some action without waiting for the International Commission to conclude its work, but, in the meantime, I think there should be some confidence displayed in the Government. The members of the Opposition are not the only men who are thinking about this question. I believe the Government is just as strongly interested in the Alien Labour Law and is doing what it can in the interest of the Canadian workingman as any hon. member of this House. As far as the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned, I am sure the Government will be only too glad to employ its best offices to bring an end to that unfortunate strike, because, if it is not brought to an end soon, something will have to be done to bring it to an end. I do not think that a great deal will be accomplished by continuing a discussion of this kind in this House.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that with a great many of the general observations made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) every hon. member of this House will agree, but I was rather surprised to find that, in attacking the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) for taking sides with the men and calling him a partisan, he showed that he was a partisan himself. All that the hon. member for East Toronto said about this question, and the question he brought up was not the question of the strike of the trackmen, but the question of the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law—all that the hon. member said was that he thought the wages were too low, if they were below $1 a day. The hon. member for Centre Toronto took the same ground himself, and how could he accuse the hon. member for East Toronto of partisanship for saying that which he himself said, is something I cannot understand. We all agree that these strikes are difficult matters to settle. I am not going to say anything about the present strike of the trackmen of the Grand Trunk Railway, except that I hope the Grand Trunk will soon see their way clear to give these men some increase in their wages. I hope the strike will soon be settled in the interest of all concerned. The point I wish to say a word or two about is in regard to the Alien Labour Law. The Alien Labour Law was passed after a promise, made by the right hon. Prime Minister, that if the United States did not modify their law after he had made representations to them, then a law would be passed by this House exactly similar to theirs. That promise was not carried out, because our law is not similar to theirs. Their law really enforces itself; our law has to be put in force by the Government. I may say, and this is principally why I am speaking in regard to this matter, that I supported the Government in making our law as it is. But, I think, there are occasions on which the Government should feel bound to enforce this law or notify the parties that it will be enforced, and one of these occasions exists to-day. Why is the law not enforced? The reply given is that the people of the United States have suspended the operation of their law, but we know that their law is enforced in some places. It is enforced in places other than Buffalo. I think I heard of men being turned back at Detroit when they were going into the United States to work. The reason for the non-enforcement of our law, which is given, is that an agreement was made between the Governments of the two countries that, while these negotiations were going on, this matter should be suspended. It is an interesting question to ask with whom was that agreement made. Was that agreement made by our Government with the Government of the United States? If that is so, I think the least our Government can do is to represent to the Government of the United States that, while our Government are keeping our part of the bargain, the United States are not keeping theirs. I wish to say, in regard to the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister that there has been no demand made for the enforcement of that law by the trackmen of the Grand Trunk, that I think there has been a demand made in this House. The trackmen of the Grand Trunk Railway look to their representatives in this House to represent them in this matter. I know that, because, when I was at Port Hope, a few days ago, I saw several of these men at the station there, and they told me that this matter should be brought up in the House, so that the answer given that no demand has been made by these men falls to the ground. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who is not here now, brought this matter to the attention of the Government and made a demand on them. I want to say, Sir, that if there ever was a time when this law should be enforced, that time is the present. If it is the fact, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company intend to bring into Canada, Italians to take the place of these strikers, then the Government should at once make it known that they will, under such conditions, enforce the provisions of this Alien Labour Law and not allow these men to enter our country. In saying this, I do not take sides either in favour of the men or in favour of the Grand Trunk Railway Company; but if the Grand Trunk Railway is allowed, while this law is upon the statute-book, to bring in Italians from the States to take the place of Canadian workingmen, then I do say that the Government is taking the side of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. At this juncture, the Government should realize that this law is upon the statute-book for a certain purpose, and I do not think the American commissioners should take any offence, in a

special case of this kind, if our Government let it be known that the Grand Trunk Railway could not import Italians or others to take the place of the strikers, and that they would see that the provisions of the Act are put in operation for this particular occasion I do not think any one could object to that, and I believe that if the Government took that course, the trackmen would realize that the Government was giving them fair-play.

Mr. WM. McGREGOR (North Essex). Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the differences which have arisen between the trackmen and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I have lived along that line for at least forty years, and I know a large number of the gentlemen who are in charge of this work, and knowing them, I feel satisfied that the day is not far distant when they will settle this trouble. The Grand Trunk Railway has been properly organized and the work is being properly carried on, and I know the workmen well, and I feel satisfied they will do what is right. I believe that both sides are anxious to have an end to this controversy. Now, as to the Alien Labour Law, it ill-becomes gentlemen opposite to make so great ado about this matter. For ten years the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) rose in his place every session, and demanded that an Alien Labour Law should be passed, but he walked out of the House at the end of each session without any legislation being enacted by his Conservative friends, and it was not until this Government came into power that an Alien Labour Act was passed. It is true, that it may be said, that the law is not now enforced, but the right hon. the leader of the House has given a good reason why the law is not in force to-day. And if the trackmen on the Grand Trunk Railway are being injured by Americans coming in here, we feel satisfied that the Government will enforce the labour law to its full extent. In the city of Windsor, which I have the honour to represent, we have at least six or seven hundred persons passing from one side to the other daily, and yet we have no trouble as to the labour question. Our young ladies go over to Detroit to work as typewriters, our young men go over to work as mechanics and storekeepers, and that occurs not only in the city of Windsor, but in the town of Walkerville, where two or three hundred cross daily, and in the town of Sandwich where the people move backward and forward across the boundary line as they think fit, and are not interfered with. If that labour law were enforced rigidly, it would make quite a difference to us, because a very large number of families would have to remove from the Canadian side and reside on the American side of the line. It is true, that some residents on the United States side, would have to come and live in Canada, but at present we are part and parcel of each other's country, and we live as amicably and freely together as any close neighbours could live. I feel satisfied that it is better for the Government to allow the Alien Labour Law to remain as it is, if there is any possibility in the near future of having a settlement between Canada and the American republic. I feel also, that we will not have to appeal to Parliament for a settlement of the difficulties between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the trackmen, because I believe that an arrangement will soon be arrived at by which justice will be done to the workmen.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). This is the tenth session that I have had the honour of sitting in this House, and I believe that during each of these sessions of this Parliament, I have heard the Alien Labour Law discussed. I have heard my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) taunted by hon. gentlemen in this House because he did not press his Alien Labour Bill, but so far as I am a judge of the conduct of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) he did press his Bill on every occasion, to the extent that was justified under the rules of the House. It must be remembered that both the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, as well as several of their followers on both sides were in those days strongly opposed to that measure becoming law. Let me say at the outset that I am opposed to the class of legislation under which an Alien Labour Law comes. I believe it is wrong legislation for the United States to enact, and I believe it is wrong legislation for Canada to enact. In the early stages of the introduction of that Bill this Parliament was justified in not passing legislation of the kind, but within the last few years, owing to the conduct of the United States and their officers this Parliament should have placed an Act on the statute-books of Canada, similar to the Act passed by the United States of America, and when the United States signified their willingness not to enforce the law, then let the Parliament of Canada, or the Government of Canada, not enforce the Canadian Alien Labour Law. That is the stand I take with reference to that question.

I have something to say now with respect to the Grand Trunk strike, and its connection with the Alien Labour Law. Some hon. gentlemen in this House say that it is merely a question between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and their employees, but I look upon it from a broader standpoint. I say, Sir, that every Canadian citizen who rides on the Grand Trunk Railway is interested in this question. It is not merely a question between the Grand Trunk Railway and their employees as to wages, but it is a question which concerns the safety of the lives of all who travel on Grand Trunk Railway trains. As a practical railway man, I must say that to my mind there is no employee on the railway who has more respon-

sible duties to discharge than the man who looks after the track. Every engineer who runs his train on the road has his life placed in the hands of the trackmen. Every curve on the line requires to be examined closely each day, the track is liable to spread if it is not looked after, and if it does spread and a passenger train leaves the track, the lives and limbs of the travelling public are in danger. It is, therefore, not merely a question of what wages shall be paid to the trackmen, but a question of much greater concern. When my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) says that we are not justified in bringing up this question in the House he is quite astray. It is our duty as representatives of the people of Canada to bring to the attention of the Government, the necessity of interfering in a matter of this kind when it involves the lives of the public generally. I therefore say that something should be done by the Government, in view of the fact that I am credibly informed that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have refused to treat with these men, have refused to enter into an arbitration, or to negotiate. If that be the fact, then it is the duty of the Government to interfere in the matter, and to say: that the public interest is at stake, that the lives of our citizens are at stake, and to make the demand on the railway company, we shall enter into an arbitration as to the cause of the difficulties between you and your employees.

My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) said it was a premature agitation. Has my hon. friend lived so long in this country without knowing, as a large employer of labour himself, that 98 cents a day is insufficient for the livelihood of any workingman? Does he not know that this agitation has been going on for years, and that, at last, after trying every other means in their power, the men have been compelled to strike in order to get an increase of pay? Therefore, I say, that a member of this House is doing no more than his duty, when he rises in his place and calls the attention of the Government to this very important question. I have nothing to say against the Grand Trunk Railway Company. There is very much to be said in its favour. I believe the management is doing everything in its power to put that road on a paying basis. But, to my mind, it is false economy to interfere with the very foundation of the road or to refuse to deal with the men, and thus to leave the road-bed in a dangerous condition, causing traffic to leave the railway which may never come back to it. I say, if it is true, as represented by the public press of this country, that there is scarcely a man to be found examining the track between Montreal and Toronto, it is the duty of this Parliament to see that the Grand Trunk Company do place men on the road to see that the track is in proper condition. With regard to importing Italians to do the work, I say this work requires skilled men, men who have had experience on the track for years, and I would do all in my power to compel the Grand Trunk Company to put skilled, and not unskilled, labour on the track. If no action is taken by the Government at an early day, I think there is, perhaps, a section in the Railway Act which might be invoked to bring the Railway Department into the matter. I understand that section 205 provides that, where an engine, a railway track, bridges, cars, or anything of that description, is not in a proper state of repair, any person, on finding that to be the case, has only to notify the Department of Railways and Canals, and it will be the duty of that department to send an engineer to examine what is complained of; and, if it is found, upon such an examination, that any of the works of the Grand Trunk Railway are not in a proper state of repair, the Railway Department may compel the company to put them in a proper state of repair. It seems to me, in view of the attitude of the Government, and the stand taken by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that this is the only course the employees can take in order to bring this Government to understand the real condition of affairs.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted, in explanation, and in reply to the question put to me by the right hon. First Minister, which I did not catch at the time of speaking, to say, that the agents of the Grand Trunk striking trackmen have been doing their best for some days past to get hold of the Government agent in Toronto to place their case before him; but, every time they go to his office, they are told that he is out of town, and the last reply they got was, that he was in Muskoka, fishing. If the Government are powerless to do anything in this matter, why do they not refer it to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). He made the tariff, and why not let him settle this strike?

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, during this discussion, great sympathy has been expressed for the men engaged in this strike. My opinion is that men engaged in a struggle of this kind want more than cold sympathy. For my part, I cannot agree with what has been said on this side of the House, that the Government should not interfere or offer their services. I have had some experience, in my short lifetime, with labour troubles, and I cannot agree with the statement that has been made here to-day, that a third party is not appreciated in these struggles. I believe there are certain times in labour struggles when only a third party can be of assistance. When men and their employers get so estranged that they refuse to treat with each other, it is only a third party who can intervene and bring the trouble to a settlement. This may be an impracticable sug-

gestion of mine ; but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the Minister of Railways of Canada to-day—it will do no harm, at any rate—to offer his services as a mediator between the great Grand Trunk system, which has received immense subsidies from this country, and these men who are endeavouring to get their rights. Somebody has said to-day, that we have not got the facts before us. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that Canadian men, men of our own nationality, are asked to work, and support their wives and families on 97 cents a day, is a sufficient reason, to my mind, why interference should take place at the earliest possible moment. We are sending immigration agents to every part of the wide world, inviting men to come to Canada. Do you think they will come when they see in the papers of their country that 1,800 or 2,000 men of a great railway system in Canada are out of work and striking—for what ? To get over 97 cents a day. A fine immigration advertisement that must be for Canada in the countries of Europe I think, therefore, it is the duty of the Minister of Railways, in the interest of Canada, in the interest of those men who are fighting for justice for themselves and their families, to offer his services as mediator. As I said before, if it does no good, it cannot possibly do any harm. There must be danger to-day in travelling over the Grand Trunk Railway system ; it may be small or great, but there is certainly danger, and, therefore the Minister of Railways should offer his services, and endeavour to put an end to this disgraceful condition of affairs—that, in the last year of the nineteenth century, this Canada of ours, this growing country, which we claim to be prosperous from one end to the other, which has an immense surplus, should have within its borders men by the thousands who are compelled to strike because they are only paid the mean, insignificant, indecent salary of 97 cents a day.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 127) to amend the Bank Act—(Mr. Fielding)—read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved third reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend and consolidate the Act relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I beg to move that this Bill be not now read the third time, but be sent back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it, by substituting for subsection 2 of section 16, the following :—

The powers of the corporation as pilotage authority may be delegated to any five commissioners, of whom the chairman of the corporation of pilots for and below the harbour of Quebec shall be one.

Those who were in the House last evening, when this Bill was discussed, are familiar with the question I have now the honour of bringing up the second time before the House. The law relating to the harbour commission, as it stood before, constituted the board of harbour commissioners for the harbour of Quebec a judicial tribunal to try pilots who had infringed the by-laws of the corporation or the commissioners, or who by some fault of theirs had caused accidents to happen to vessels of which they were in charge. The harbour commission of Quebec is composed of nine members, five of whom are appointed by the Government and four elected by the shipping interest and the board of trade of Quebec City. When pilots were brought up before the board for trial, five members, under the law now sought to be changed, constituted the court, and a less number could not sit. The change provided by this measure is that the powers of the corporation, as pilotage authority, may be delegated to any three commissioners, of whom the chairman of the corporation of pilots for and below the harbour of Quebec shall be one. So that, according to the Bill before the House, this court would be composed of three members only.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the important powers vested in the harbour commission, sitting as a court, for the trial of pilots. These pilots for and below the harbour of Quebec, have to serve a long period of apprenticeship—an apprenticeship of nine years—and by a law passed in recent years, that term is made much longer, because no man can now become a pilot before the number is reduced from the present number down to 120, I believe. So that some of these men have been in apprenticeship of nine, ten, and even fifteen years. They are a first-rate set of men. There are no better pilots in Canada, and probably not on the continent of America. This board has the power of depriving a pilot of his branch or license, and thus depriving him for ever of his means of earning a livelihood. It will therefore be seen that the powers vested in this board, as a judicial tribunal, are very great. Not only can it fine a pilot, but in some cases can send him to jail, and in others deprive him of his license or branch. I have no quarrel with the board as at present composed, as I said last night. The gentlemen who constitute it are as good as the average members of harbour commissioners throughout Canada no doubt, but I would call attention to the fact that they are not trained in the science of navigation. For instance, the chairman, Mr. Laliberté, a very worthy citizen, is a furrier. Then, again,

Mr. Arcand, is a broker, and Mr. Rioux is a grocer, and Mr. Chabot, I believe, is now the manager of a small line of steamers; so that, apart from those who represent the shipping interest, and have more or less knowledge of the rules of navigation, such as Mr. Macpherson, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), and Mr. Carbray, really the board is composed of men who, when they sit in judgment on a pilot, are not proficient in the matters upon which they are called to adjudicate. There is safety in numbers. If the board is composed of at least five as a quorum, as under the present law, the pilot accused has a chance of having somebody upon the board who knows something about navigation, and can give him not only a fair and impartial trial, but a trial in which the knowledge of the gentlemen on the board who know something of navigation, will be brought to bear and be of great assistance. But the Bill proposes that the quorum of this judicial tribunal, having the great powers I have mentioned, will be reduced to three. No reason has been given for the change, except that it is inconvenient for the members of the board to come so often to the meetings. I venture to state, without fear of contradiction, that there are not more than ten trials of pilots every year, and it seems to me, therefore, that the members of the commission have not very good reason for asking that this change be made. Again, it must be remembered that the harbour commissioners do not give their services for nothing. It is true that the fees they receive are not very great, but still the emoluments and the honour of the position are sufficient inducement to make the position very freely sought after. So that, seeing the great interest which the pilots have at stake, seeing that their means of living for all time to come is at stake, and, on the other hand, taking into account the slight inconvenience that the members of the commission will be put to by having to sit on pilotage cases, five or six or even ten times, during the season of navigation, it seems to me the House should easily come to the conclusion that there is not sufficient reason for reducing the quorum to three.

I would also call attention to this fact, that the law fixes the quorum of the commission for ordinary routine work at five. So that petty office work or any small matter of administration of the affairs of the corporation or any minor question of routine, cannot be settled unless five members of the commission are present. But when these men are brought before the board to be tried, when they are to appear before a judicial tribunal which can condemn them to a fine or imprisonment, or deprive them of their license, that is of the right to follow their occupation, then the quorum is reduced to three. It seems to me that the amendment which I have offered is one that should commend itself to the fair-mindedness and spirit of justice of every member of this Chamber.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Under the law as it now stands, the corporation is composed of nine commissioners, exclusive of the superintendent of the corporations of pilots, who is brought in when the commissioners exercise the powers conferred upon them as a pilotage authority. Under the law as it stood formerly, five members of the harbour commission constituted a quorum for all the purposes of the commission. That law remains. But it is provided here that, for certain cases where commissioners exercise judicial powers conferred upon the board, it shall be optional with the board to delegate to three members the exercise of those powers. But this does not preclude all the members sitting if the board so decide. This is an optional power given to the harbour commissioners, which they may exercise or not as they please. I would like to call your attention to the fact that a similar law was enacted in 1894 for the benefit of the Montreal Harbour Board, where there are many more complaints with regard to pilots than they have in Quebec, and I have not heard of any complaint as to the operation of that law of 1894. I can see no good reason why a law which is found to work so satisfactorily in the case of Montreal should not be applied to Quebec.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to the law of 1894, I may say a word, because I had some responsibility in connection with the matter at that time. I am heartily in accord with the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), notwithstanding that the Bill of 1894 was in my hands containing the provision to which the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) refers. The subject was not debated nor was the point taken which has been taken by the hon. member for Montmorency. It does seem to me that the pilots have a right to ask through that hon. gentleman for this consideration at the hands of Parliament. There cannot be a more important matter dealt with by the quorum which, as the hon. gentleman says, is fixed at five, than the question whether a man is to be permitted to follow his profession as a pilot or not, whether he is to be suspended or whether his right to act as a pilot is to be taken away altogether. We cannot judge as to the effect of the law of 1894 merely by the absence of complaints as to the quorum. There are complaints as to the treatment of pilots. These men might not know that it would be an improvement of their fortunes and conditions to be placed under the control of five instead of under the control of three men. They might not appreciate the advantage it would be to them to have the ordinary quorum deal with their cases instead of the small number

of three. But that they do complain of the treatment they receive there can be no question. They are forced, from time to time, to carry these matters into the courts at great expense. Even in Montreal, the district to which the hon. gentleman refers, where there is a small quorum, there are very great complaints indeed. I do not know enough of these complaints to judge between the pilots on the one hand and the gentlemen three, or five, as the case may be, who investigated their particular cases. Considering the importance of the subject of this motion, affecting as it does the very livelihood of these men, and knowing the great influence and power of the men who often call their conduct in question, the least we can do is to prevent the ordinary quorum being cut down when the board sit in trial or hold a court on such questions as this. For that reason, I am in favour of the amendment, and would be very glad to see the Act of 1894 amended in the same direction, so the pilots under the Montreal board should have the same rights when they are practically put upon trial.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Casgrain:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bell (Pictou),
Bergeron,
Borden (Halifax),
Casgrain,
Clancy,
Craig,
Dugas,
Earle,
Ferguson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Gillies,
Gilmour,
Guillet,
Hale,
Henderson,
Ingram,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Kloepfer,
LaRivière,
Macdonald (King's),
MacLaren,
McCleary,
McDougall,
McInerney,
Marcotte,
Martin,
Monk,
Powell,
Prior,
Quinn,
Reid,
Robertson,
Roche,
Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Tyrwhitt, and
Wilson.—40.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain,
Bazinet,
Beausoleil,
Belcourt,
Bell (Prince, East),
Bertram,
Bethune,
Blair,
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Brodeur,
Bruneau,
Burnett,
Campbell,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Copp,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Davis,
Dechene,
Demers,
Domville,
Ellis,
Erb,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Gauvreau,
Godbout,
Heyd,
Johnston,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Landerkin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Legris,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Livingston,
Logan,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell,
Mackie,
McClure,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McHugh,
McInnes,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
Malouin,
Marcil,
Martineau,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Mignault,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Pettet,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Ross,
Russell,
Rutherford,
Scriver,
Semple,
Sifton,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte, and
Wood.—80.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION OF PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA.

Resolution providing for the payment of a license fee by every company or person engaged in the refining of petroleum in Canada, was read the first and second time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the said resolution be referred to the Committee of the Whole upon Bill (No. 131) respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha.

Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière).

AMENDMENT TO ADULTERATION ACT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved that Bill (No. 123) further to amend the Adulteration Act, be read the second time.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into committee on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This Bill was prepared at the request of some medical gentlemen, and I would ask the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Roddick) to explain to the committee the reasons of the amendment.

Mr. T. G. RODDICK (St. Antoine, Montreal). I may say, that the object of this Bill is to establish a uniform

standard for the preparation of drugs. So far, no uniformity has existed. Several have been in existence in this country, have been tolerated, as it were—the British Pharmacopœia, the United States Pharmacopœia, the Le Codex Medicamentarius, and others. So that mistakes have been constantly made, some of them serious, from the fact that all drugs are not made from the same material, are not made of the same strength, and are not made of the same quality of material. I may explain by saying that some of the most poisonous drugs are prepared from the leaves of plants, some from the roots of plants, and some of them have different qualities. Some of them are prepared with alcohol of varying degrees of strength. The House, therefore, can understand that medical men especially are constantly in difficulty with regard to their prescriptions, and druggists themselves are often unable to know exactly what a doctor means, when he prescribes certain drugs. As an illustration, I might mention that the very important drug, aconite, has, in the British Pharmacopœia a strength equal to 5 per cent of the tincture of aconite, while, in the United States Pharmacopœia, it has a strength of 35 per cent. You see, therefore, how mistakes can be made. A medical man prescribes for a patient in Ottawa, or in Montreal, where the British Pharmacopœia is usually employed by druggists and by the manufacturers of drugs. He then goes to some distant part of this Dominion, New Brunswick, for instance, or on the border of the United States, or some part of Ontario, where druggists have clients from across the border, and where, for many reasons, they prefer to use the United States Pharmacopœia. The prescription is made up in Montreal, for instance, where the British Pharmacopœia is employed; but, when this patient wishes to get it filled in some other place, where the United States Pharmacopœia is employed, he has his prescription made up seven times the strength that the doctor originally intended, of this poisonous drug, aconite. That gives you some idea of the difficulty the profession has to contend with. Besides that, we find, as I said before, that some of the preparations are made from leaves, and some from roots, and the strength of the extract from the leaves and the extract from the roots are very different. Besides that, many of the preparations are prepared with a large quantity of alcohol by the British Pharmacopœia, and with a small quantity of alcohol by the United States Pharmacopœia. The British Pharmacopœia preparation extracts a number of alkaloids and other ingredients which the other does not. So, altogether, we would like, if possible, that some standard should be established. Now, this is an opportune time, because a new edition of the British Pharmacopœia is just coming out. It has been very carefully prepared by the best men in England, and Scotland, and Ireland, and is undoubtedly the best book on the subject extant. The Medical Association, at its last meeting, in Quebec, last year, decided that the Government should be approached on this subject, with the view of making the British Pharmacopœia the standard, so that, when drugs are prescribed, it shall be understood by everybody, by druggists and by doctors, that the British Pharmacopœia is meant, and that, when any other preparation of any other pharmacopœia is meant, it should be specified: you ask for the United States Pharmacopœia, or the Codex, or you name whatever one you prefer. This, of course, is not intended to interfere, particularly with the business of men on the border. The idea is simply to have this uniform standard, and it is also going to be a very great service to the Department of Inland Revenue. The officials of that department will be able to detect fraudulent preparations, and will have a standard to go by, so that the whole thing will be very much simplified. I have nothing further to add to the explanation. I should be very glad to answer any question that may be asked respecting the subject.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are some small changes to be made in the Bill, and, perhaps, my hon. friend who has just explained the purpose of the Bill would like to stand near the chairman so that we can look over these changes together and see that they agree with the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. IVES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue if he has received any representations in regard to the Bill since it was introduced?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. IVES. What will be the effect of it as to preparations that are already in stock? Is it rendered criminal to use American preparations that are now kept in stock by druggists?

Mr. RODDICK. I do not know whether I quite understand the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. IVES. What I was saying was this: Of course, drug stores are more or less stocked with manufactured medicines and preparations. I have not studied the Bill very carefully, but what I wish to know is whether these preparations will be rendered useless by the passage of this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick), who so clearly explained the purpose of the Bill, caught the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Ives) who is addressing him. It is an extremely difficult thing for an hon. gentleman to get the idea of a person, who is addressing him, if some person sitting near him is engaging him in conversation. I am afraid that my hon. friend from Montreal was prevented

from hearing the question asked. The question asked is, whether, under this Bill preparations that are not designated by this Bill, would be prevented from being used. As I understand it from the very lucid explanation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick), who has explained this Bill, it is simply this, that the British Pharmacopœia, which is now about to be published, is to be regarded as the standard, and that, if any other prescription from the United States Pharmacopœia or the Codex, or any other authority is used, except the British Pharmacopœia, the party prescribing must indicate, on the prescription, that the term used applies to the Pharmacopœia of the United States or to the Codex, or to whatever it may be. Inasmuch as a drug, designated by these different pharmacopœias are of altogether different strengths, unless this is done and the prescription is assumed to be under the British Pharmacopœia, very serious consequences might result from the greater strength of the preparations, as indicated by any other pharmacopœia, and to avoid that danger, any stock of the various druggists may be used, just as at present, only that the party prescribing will be required to indicate in his prescription it is not according to the British Pharmacopœia, but according to the United States Pharmacopœia, or the one that is named. I understand this is to be the case, and, if so, it will entirely remove any objection that my hon. friend has raised of interfering with the drugs and the different prescriptions now in the possession of various druggists.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Evidently the hon. leader of the Opposition cannot forgive me for having brought one of his friends (Mr. Roddick) to this side of the House. I declare that my motives were perfectly innocent. The conversation that I was carrying on with that hon. gentleman, and in regard to which the hon. leader of the Opposition took occasion to scold me, benevolently, was not in reference to the trip of my hon. friend to California, which, I am glad to see, has so much benefited him, but it was in answer to the question of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives).

Mr. MONTAGUE. I listened with very great pleasure to the explanation of the Bill which was given by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), who, by reason of his connection with the profession, understands thoroughly what is meant in this regard. But, I am quite convinced that this Bill does not carry out the idea that was given in this explanation by the hon. member for Montreal. More than that, I am quite convinced that the answer given by the hon. leader of the Opposition to the question of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, is not at all final, as, I think, the hon. gentleman will see, as regards the sale of articles which have been manufactured up to the present time, and which might be offered for sale. What does this Bill do? This Bill declares that anything is an adulteration except that which is prepared on certain lines and offered for sale under certain labels. I think the hon. Minister will agree with me that if an article of tincture had been prepared under the United States Pharmacopœia and was offered for sale in Canada, if this Bill passed, it would be declared an adulteration.

The parties exposing it for sale would be liable for punishment under this Act. That is the point I think is included in the Bill. I do not think the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), or the Minister, intends that, but I think it is a fact, and if I am right in my supposition I submit that would be a hardship. I quite concur in the sentiments which have been expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick). The profession have had a good deal of trouble—perhaps more in the province of Quebec than in the province of Ontario, because while they have three pharmacopœias in the province of Quebec, we have only two in the province of Ontario that are at all in use. I quite agree in the desire of the profession to have a remedy applied, but I think this Bill does not apply a remedy, and while it does not apply a remedy it brings more hardship in the direction indicated by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives).

Mr. RODDICK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) is probably not aware that this movement commenced in his own province of Ontario, and the following is an extract from the Pharmacy Act of Ontario passed last session:—

> All compounds named in the British Pharmacopœia, shall be prepared according to the formula directed in the latest edition published "by authority," unless the College of Physicians and Surgeons of this province select another standard, or unless the label distinctly shows that the compound is prepared according to another formula.

That is the beginning of action on the part of the pharmacists in the Dominion, and we thought it better we should establish a standard here. It will not come into operation immediately, and I do not think any one is going to stop it. The amount of drugs in stock will not be so great as to last over a few months, and within a few months the whole thing will become uniform and work harmoniously. The druggists may still make up prescriptions according to the United States Pharmacopœia, but these must be specially labelled, and the officers of the Minister of Inland Revenue wil know exactly what they are when they reach them. A doctor who prescribes from the United States Pharmacopœia or Codex has got to mention it. For instance, if he is prescribing tincture of aconite, he writes "tincture aconite U.S.P.," or otherwise it will be from the British Pharmacopœia. I do not think there will be any difficulty in the way of the operation of this Bill. Instead of mak-

ing a separate Bill, it was thought desirable to bring it in as an amendment to the Adulteration Act, so as to cause the least trouble possible, and at the same time reach the profession and the pharmacists just as effectually.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I find on reading down in another clause of the Bill, that I was rather misled in my opinion. I think perhaps there will be no difficulty.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I was about to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) to that point. I understand that the standard under which all preparations will be made will be the British Pharmacopœia, and that unless it is otherwise labelled, the druggist's order is supposed to be of the standard set forth in that pharmacopœia. If the article so ordered is not made out under that standard, then it must be labelled as belonging to the standard from which it has been taken. If it is taken from the United States Pharmacopœia, of course it must be so labelled. If it is not labelled then it is taken for granted that it is composed upon the British Pharmacopœia.

Mr. RODDICK. That is it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I wish to add the words "latest edition of the" before the words "British Pharmacopœia."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think perhaps that may lead to a good deal of trouble.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Medical men are bound to know the latest edition.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With all due respect to the Minister's opinion, I do not think that druggists through the country buy this British Pharmacopœia every year. It is only published every five or six years I understand. but the hon. gentleman knows that for a poor man it is quite an expensive work. Could not the hon. gentleman say the British Pharmacopœia of 1899 ?

Mr. RODDICK. If you put in the date you will have to change the Act every time a new edition of the Pharmacopœia is edited.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think it is better to leave it the way I put it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If a man does not have the latest edition he is subject to a penalty, if you insert these words.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We can take out the provision with reference to the latest edition, and make it the edition of 1899.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not think the date should be put in. If that were done it would subject those concerned to penalties much quicker than if you leave in the words "last edition."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your idea would be to make him use the last edition of which he was aware ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). He might do that very well, and perhaps that is the practice, but I do not like to cast that aspersion upon him.

Mr. RODDICK. I really do not see what objection there is to making it the last edition. It is very cheap, costing only $3.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I certainly agree with the introducer of this Bill. The Bill, as it stands, states the case better than the amendment suggested by my hon. friend across the House, that is, that the latest edition of the pharmacopœia should be the standard in use. The standard of 1899 might in five years be considered a very old one. The science of medicine is a very progressive one, and five years make a considerable difference. I, therefore, think the wording of the Bill as it stands should be accepted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I still think this is going to subject a number of druggists to very great hardship.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Davis.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Canadian Power Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Power Company of Niagara Falls.—(Mr. Bertram.)

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Bedlington and Nelson Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

THE ADULTERATION ACT.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 123) further to amend the Adulteration Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

On subsection 1 of section 1.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had an opportunity, after the committee rose, of talking this matter over with Dr. Roddick and some other gentlemen connected with the medical profession, and we came to the conclusion—and I promised, as Dr. Roddick was about to leave, that I would mention it to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue—that it was better to say the edition of the British Pharmacopœia of 1898, which is the last edition. If you use the words "the latest edition," the moment another edition is published in London, the parties would be absolutely acting illegally here before they could obtain a copy of that edition; and as new editions are only brought out after the lapse of five or ten years, when another edition comes out, the Act may be amended in the same way.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think the amendment is a good one.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—LAKE ERIE ENTRANCE TO WELLAND CANAL.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved that the House resolve itself in Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to take advantage of the opportunity to call the attention of the Government to a matter which has more particular reference to the Department of Railways and Canals. I am sorry that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is not here; but I received a note from him saying that he was unavoidably detained. As I desire to have the matter before him and before the members of the Government prior to the consideration of the Estimates, I shall say what I have to say with the hope that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will glance at it and consider it when he comes to deal with the question to which it refers. What I have to say refers particularly to the Welland Canal and the proposed expenditure of a large sum of money in connection with the harbour, which is at the entrance of that canal at Port Colborne. Representations have been made to the Minister by a strong deputation which came from the village of Port Colborne and the county of Welland, as well as by a very excellent speech which was delivered by the member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) the other day, calling for the expenditure of a large sum of money for the purpose of deepening the harbour and of constructing there a basin such as is required by the trade of the lakes. I am sure the House will believe me, Sir, that it is in no narrow spirit that I bring forward for the consideration of the Minister of Railways and Canals the matter to which I now refer, and which is of a great deal of importance to a part of the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House. When public money is to be spent, we are glad, I fancy, if needs of the public service can be well served, to have that money spent in the constituency which we each individually represent in this House. But I am bound to say that this is not a matter arising from the mere question of the expenditure of money in a locality. I do not desire to look at it at all in that way; nor do I believe that the gentlemen who are now moving in the matter locally take so narrow a view of the position as one to which I have just referred. What we are anxious, I am sure, upon that side and upon this, is to see that what money is spent in the public service, and especially in connection with the matter of our waterways and the means of transportation, shall be spent in such a way as will give the greatest possible advantage with the least possible drain upon the public treasury.

It is pretty late in the day, I imagine, to say that a mistake was made in locating the lake harbour in the Welland Canal and in locating the line in the canal itself. And yet, I think I am within the judgment of men who have paid the best and most intelligent attention to that subject, and within the judgment of the very best lake captains and mariners, when I say that a mistake was made, and that instead of the Welland Canal being made along the line that it follows and having its lake port at Port Colborne as it has, that lake port might better have been established at another point and the line traversed by the Welland Canal might have been, with greater advantage and with greater economy to the country, established over another line. In the first place, Sir, the cost of the construction of the Welland Canal over the present route was a great deal more than it would have been over another route which might have been selected, by reason of the fact that it went through a section of country where very costly rock cutting and excavating was required, whereas another route might have been selected where there was no rock cutting at all. In the second place, I think the location was wrong by reason of the fact—of course, I am expressing the opinion of experts, because I do not pretend to any expert knowledge of the case myself—that the point which was selected for the Lake Erie entrance of the canal had no natural advantages whatever as a harbour, whereas, there was a port not far distant from the point at which the canal now touches Lake Erie which might have been made, with very little cost, a very excellent harbour, indeed. In justification of that statement, I need go no further than the speech of my hon. friend for Welland, who, the other day, in asking for the expenditure of a large sum of money at Port Colborne for the improvement of the harbour, stated very freely and very candidly to the House that Port Colborne was not a natural

harbour at all. And what is the request now? After a large sum of money has been spent there, there is a request for the expenditure of a sum which, I think, will, in the end, amount to nearly a million dollars, for the construction of an efficient entrance, for blasting out the rock bottom of the harbour and for the construction of a basin which will accommodate the vessels which reach that port.

Well, Sir, this all results from the mistake which was made of selecting a point as a natural harbour which was not a natural harbour at all. It is worth while to inquire, just when we are on the eve of making greater expenditures, whether, if the expenditures which are now asked are made, the harbour will meet the requirements of a harbour for such a situation. Now, while Port Colborne, as I have stated, and as the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), if I understood his speech correctly, stated, is not a natural harbour, 15 miles from Port Colborne there is a natural harbour, namely the harbour of Port Maitland, which, I am bound to say, is in the county of Haldimand and Monck, but which fact will not, I hope, prejudice its fair consideration by the Government of the day. The advantages of Port Maitland harbour are these: Port Maitland is situated at the mouth of the Grand River which at that point enters into Lake Erie; it is in consequence a natural land-locked harbour. It is always open two or three weeks earlier than Port Colborne. The lake bottom of the entrance is of sand and gravel, and consequently there would be no necessity whatever for blasting, as there is in Port Colborne. There is a natural depth of water there of about 22 feet; there are no accumulations of any kind, nor have there been any, to disturb the free entry of ships to that harbour. Already, at a very large expense, two long piers, some 1,500 feet in length, have been constructed, and between those two piers there is an ample entrance of 225 feet at their points, widening out to a space of some 500 yards of clear water harbour within the piers, affording, as I think the Government will find if they care to ask the opinions of navigators and of mariners, the very best harbour to be found upon the north shore of Lake Erie. In addition to that, for some five miles up the river there is a depth of from 20 to 25 feet of water, thus affording additional accommodation to shipping if there was too much to occupy the harbour to which I have referred. Now, Sir, the argument made by those who are advocating the expenditure at Port Colborne is a suggestion, and it is a suggestion that we offer, that by the expenditure of a large sum of money, large lake boats will be enabled to enter the harbour at Port Colborne and transfer to smaller craft. That can be done already at Port Maitland without the expenditure of a single cent. But those who are acquainted with the locality say to me: Well, would you construct a new canal from Port Maitland to the Welland Canal? In answer to that I say: Not at all, because already a canal is constructed from Port Maitland to the Welland Canal. Hon. gentlemen who have followed the history of the Welland Canal, know that when it was constructed the water for that canal was supplied by the Grand River. The Grand River was dammed at a point about six miles from Port Maitland. The feeder of the Welland Canal, through which all the water which originally supplied the canal came from the Grand River to the main body of the canal, is constructed from that dam to Welland Junction, some 20 miles distant. In its course it passes by Port Maitland about three-quarters, or, perhaps, less than three-quarters of a mile from the port, and there is a short slip from Port Maitland to the main line of the feeder. Now, in order to utilize the port at Maitland for all the purposes of a harbour and lake entrance for the Welland Canal and a lake entrance, all that is necessary is to expend a sum of money which I am told—and the hon. gentleman will be able to discover whether my information is correct—will be materially less than will be required for the mere improvement of the harbour at Port Colborne, in deepening the slip from Port Maitland to the main line of the feeder, and the feeder from its connection with that slip to the junction of the feeder with the main line of the canal at Welland Junction. This is not costly work, there being no rock cutting whatever. I am bringing these facts before the Government before it is finally decided to spend a large sum of money at the other point, because I think that in all fairness we may ask the Department of Railways and Canals, by means of its engineers, to compare the two schemes; and if the scheme of deepening the Port Colborne harbour is found to be the more advantageous, not more costly, to construct a permanent work—in other words, if the public interest will best be served by that plan—then I would say by all means spend the money at Port Colborne. But if, upon the other hand, as I think it may be shown, at Port Maitland with the expenditure of less money a more permanent work will be constructed, and a harbour provided which will be safer, of easier access and more popular among shipping men of the lakes, then I respectfully submit that the Government ought seriously to consider the question of following the suggestion which I have made in this connection. I do not expect any definite answer from the department, but what I was anxious to do, as I stated in the beginning, was, before the subject was finally disposed of by the Department of Railways and Canals, to ask them to have the two routes thoroughly investigated, to have a report of the engineers upon the practicability of the Port Maitland and feeder route

before them, in order to decide intelligently upon the subject.

Mr. WILLIAM McCLEARY (Welland). I want to say just a few words with reference to the observations made by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague). In the first place, no one ever expected or dreamt that Port Maitland had any claim to be a port for the reception of vessels until it was discovered by the hon. gentleman since the matter has been called to the attention of the public by the general knowledge that the transportation question was receiving some attention at the hands of the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was a port long before Port Colborne was ever thought of.

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes, and there are ports that are in oblivion now that were ports before Port Maitland was discovered. The hon. gentleman asks for this expenditure, because, as he says, it will be less expensive to build a line of canal 20 miles long—because that is what the length will be—than it would be to build a breakwater at Port Colborne, deepening the harbour from its present depth of 15 feet to a depth of 20 feet. He contends that it will be cheaper to do this than to do what I have latterly referred to. My hon. friend has very astutely told us that we have a canal built from the Welland Canal going to Port Maitland, but he does not tell you what kind of a canal it is. That formerly did do some service to the old Welland Canal as the feeder by which the water from the Grand River came down to the Welland Canal. But as he knows, and as his friends know very well, it is a little ditch that carries scows and rafts down occasionally; possibly it it may carry a scow drawing four or five feet, it may be six feet deep in some places, and its width may be 30 or 40 feet in some places. So you see, Mr. Speaker, exactly what work would have to be done in order to give us a canal of say 300 feet wide or 250 feet wide, with a depth of 14 feet. The work we have to do at Port Colborne is so small, in this case, that there is no comparison between the two. It is too late in the day for my hon. friend to tell us that the Government have made a mistake in placing Port Colborne at the head of deep water navigation, because our money is already spent. We have fourteen feet of water at Port Colborne, and we take broad ground, not the narrow constituent ground, because we represent certain municipalities or certain constituencies that we ought to have some money spent there. That is not a broad ground at all. We take the ground we have taken because we have spent $24,000,000 or $25,000,000 in the Welland Canal; we cannot afford to let that go to waste or to imperil it. But, by the expenditure of this money I referred to a few days ago, at Port Colborne, we will have a system of navigation all the way to Montreal when the lower canals are completed. I, of course, admire the frankness of my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) in stating his case to the House, that inasmuch as Port Maitland is in his constituency——

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not put it on that ground.

Mr. McCLEARY. Maybe I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but we are looking at it from the broader ground that Canada has invested her money at Port Colborne, and that by spending a few thousand dollars there we would do all that is needful. While I would not like the Government not to listen to the hon. gentleman, or to entertain the statement that he has made to-night, still I think they have no other alternative than, instead of changing the policy which has been laid down by the different Governments to make Port Colborne the harbour and port of deep water navigation for the trade of the west.

RESPONSIBILITY OF MINISTERS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am rather glad that the responsibility does not rest upon me of deciding between my two hon. friends. Both have made unanswerable cases in support of their particular views. I may say that I rise for the purpose of asking the assent of the House to a resolution, which, I believe, will commend itself equally to both sides of the House. I do not intend, so plain and obvious is the case, to occupy the time of the House or delay the consideration of the Estimates for any length of time. The reason for asking my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to accept this resolution is that it is not offered in any other spirit than with the view of placing on record the opinion of this House, irrespective of party, a principle that we all recognize as lying at the very foundation of parliamentary government, and that is the principle of the responsibility which devolves upon Ministers of the Crown, the duty and responsibility which they cannot evade and which, if they did attempt to evade in any way, would greatly undermine the value of that system of parliamentary government that we now enjoy. I will not say more than to read the resolution, because, as I said before, I expect my right hon. friend, to whom I handed a copy some time ago, to give his ready assent to it, and allow it to be made a record as a matter in which members of both sides of this House will agree. The resolution is as follows:—

This House is of opinion that it is required by our parliamentary system that every branch of the public service should be represented directly or indirectly in the Houses of Parliament; and this House is further of the opinion that the political heads who perform their duty

are themselves solely responsible for every act of administration down to the minutest details of official routine. This House is further of the opinion that the Ministers of the Crown having entire control over the public departments, they are bound to assume responsibility for every official act.

This House is further of the opinion that Ministers of the Crown should not permit blame to be imputed to any subordinate for the manner in which the business of the country is transacted, except only in cases of personal misconduct, for which the political heads have the remedy in their own hands. If Ministers find that the permanent officers of the department do not work well under them, then it is their duty to devise some remedy for this inconvenience, but the responsibility should not be divided, it should be imposed only upon those who are able to answer for themselves in the Houses of Parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I noticed with very great pleasure, if not with surprise, that when my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has a sound proposition to offer to the House he can do it in a very few words. When my hon. friend has one of those terrible propositions to make—I do not say it with any reproach—he is very long, no doubt, in the effort to convince himself more than to convince the House. On this occasion I can find no fault with the proposition which my hon. friend has just laid down; in fact, it is the A B C of parliamentary government. We could not be expected to offer any more opposition to this motion than if my hon. friend had offered to put on record in this House that we believed in the Ten Commandments. I do not see any more reason for one than for the other. I cannot see what was the reason the hon. leader of the Opposition could possibly have in moving that resolution unless it be that in future the Opposition intend to live up to the doctrines which are there laid down. We do not at all, in any way, on this side of the House, intend to repudiate the responsibility which is ours, of being accountable to the House, not only for our own conduct, but for the conduct of those that are under us. We have officers dispersed all over this large country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific; they discharge certain duties entrusted to them by law, by the constitution, by the Administration, by the Government. If they have discharged these duties in a way which does not seem to be in consonance with the principles of sound administration and the matter is brought to our attention, we are responsible, we have to take the responsibility of investigating the matter. If we find that they are right we must support them, but if we find that they are wrong, then we must take another course, and perhaps, a more severe course. So far, there can be no difference of opinion. But I call the attention of my hon. friend, and of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to this paragraph in this resolution, just placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker:

This House is further of the opinion that Ministers of the Crown should not permit blame to be imputed to any subordinate for the manner in which the business of the country is transacted, except only in cases of personal misconduct.

It is in the recollection of the House, that early during this session my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) attempted to hold the Government responsible for misconduct—I will not say misconduct, but alleged misconduct—on the part of an officer of the Government. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) attempted to hold the Government responsible for alleged misconduct on the part of Major Walsh, when he was administrator of the Yukon. Now, according to the principle which is laid down at the present time, how could the Government be responsible for the charges that were brought against Major Walsh? They were charges of personal misconduct, and so, I have in this resolution, out of the mouth of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), the strongest condemnation which can be followed against the course followed on that occasion by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) charged Major Walsh, not with dereliction of the duties of his office, but with personal misconduct; accused him of drunkenness, and accused him of associating with women of a certain character. Surely, the Government cannot be held responsible for that. That was a charge of personal misconduct, if ever there was a charge of personal misconduct; and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) attempted then to fasten the blame of such conduct upon the Government. We have to-day, however, out of the mouth of the leader of the Opposition, the statement that in no case is the Government to be responsible for acts of personal misconduct by its officers. But there is another reason why the charges made against Major Walsh were absolutely without warrant, were absolutely without excuse, were—I cannot use any other words than that they were conceived in absolute wanton malice. Even if Major Walsh had been guilty of all that he was charged with, what was the Government to do against Major Walsh, who was no longer in the service of the Government? I can well imagine that, if one of our officials, during office hours, disgraces himself in any way, or has been guilty of conduct openly disreputable, and if we kept him in office, we would be responsible. But Major Walsh was no longer in the service of the Government, and even if every charge made against Major Walsh was true—it was not true, and no man now believes it. Perhaps it might be believed in certain places where Major Walsh is not known, but everywhere

that Major Walsh was known, the charges were discarded with contempt, and no place more than in the town of Brockville, where Major Walsh lived.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does he regard the vote of every person who voted for the Conservative candidate as a vote believing and declaring that the charges against Major Walsh were true ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I regard the vote as——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If not, then the statement the right hon. gentleman has made is worthless.

The PRIME MINISTER. I regard the Liberal vote that was given in Brockville by Conservatives who left the Conservative party, as a vindication of the character of Major Walsh ; and all the more so, that the gentleman who openly charged Major Walsh on the floor of this House, had not the courage to repeat the accusation in the constituency of Brockville. For my part, I have no objection that the doctrine of responsibility should be applied to this Government ; and, for our part, we shall not attempt to do what was done three, or four, or five years ago, in the Curran Bridge matter, when the Minister in charge of the department at that time washed his hands out of it, and said : It was not my fault, but the fault of my officers ; I have nothing to do with it. But, Sir, the Minister was responsible. The works were within a few hours of Ottawa ; everything that passed there must have been under his notice ; he was responsible, but he shirked the responsibility. This Government has no intention of acting in that way. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to the last paragraph of his motion, and I respectfully call the attention of the whole House to it, because it may be instructive. It reads as follows :—

If Ministers find that a permanent officer of the department does not work well under them, then it is their duty to devise some remedy for this inconvenience.

Very well, if Ministers find that some permanent officers of the Government do not work well under them, then the Ministers have the duty laid upon them to devise the means to prevent that inconvenience, and, when we find officers who do not work well under us, I know of no better method or means which can be devised to put an end to that inconvenience, than by dismissing the offending officers. Now, I do not know that that method will commend itself to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), for I have never before heard him express himself in that way. We have been forced, upon other occasions, to dismiss officers who did not work well under us, and for that we have received a great deal of obloquy from the hon. gentleman. Here is our vindication now in this motion, and with all my heart I accept the motion of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been called into this debate rather summarily by the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. I perhaps may express my surprise that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was permitted to charge a member of this House with wanton malice in regard to remarks he had made when exercising his right in debate. The right hon. gentleman charged me with having been actuated with wanton malice.

Mr. SPEAKER. If these words were used by the right hon. the leader of the House, I did not notice them, as I was engaged otherwise. I am sure the right hon. gentleman did not mean them in an offensive sense.

The PRIME MINISTER. What I said was this : I said, it was impossible to conceive any other motive than wanton malice. If that be not parliamentary, I shall bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and apologize ; but I have to add, that it is impossible to characterize the conduct of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in parliamentary language.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). For a gentleman whose chief reputation in the country, in political life, has been due to his manners, that is rather an extraordinary apology. But, from the observations he has made to-day, I take it that the right hon. gentleman is not yet out of the temper which he exhibited, not only this afternoon, but on several occasions recently when public affairs were being discussed. To come at once to the observations of the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in regard to myself, I am amazed that he should make such a statement in reference to the charges I preferred against Major Walsh, and which I certainly in more solemn form, at an early day, will again prefer in no unmistakable language. Though I might have been more specific, I do not think any member of this House could have taken greater pains than I did to show that, in charging Major Walsh with drunkenness and immorality, I did not charge these offences against Major Walsh as merely acts of misconduct, wholly apart and disassociated from the high position which he held under the sign manual of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, and as a representative of Canadian authority in the Yukon ; I took pains to state that the information upon which I made that charge, and which I shall make again, when the opportunity occurs, was because, in connection with his drunkenness and immorality, the public business of that district was adversely affected. I will not,

however, be drawn into a debate at this moment on that question. But the right hon. gentleman will have to deal with that and with the question of responsibility in another form than he supposes this afternoon. The right hon. gentleman should not have been so excited, if this resolution was harmless, requiring no argument, and was only equivalent to a motion laying down the proposition that the Ten Commandments should be approved of. Has he forgotten the spirit in which the Conservative Administration received a self-evident proposition at the hands of his colleague (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1892, when that hon. gentleman brought up the subject as to the duty, as to the powers, as to the rights of the Public Accounts Committee? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), exercising his rights and discharging his duty, brought forward a proposition familiar to all students of parliamentary government, and the leader of the Government of that day courteously and quickly adopted that proposition. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) had a reason for bringing this self-evident proposition to the attention of this Parliament—and what was it? It was, that he imagined, as he stated in this House—though explanations were offered—that there was a disposition on the part of the majority of the Public Accounts Committee to circumscribe and restrict the powers of that committee in regard to its inquisitorial functions.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) well recollects the incident; and what have we seen this session in Committee of Supply? The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is here; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is here, and behind them is the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell); and in discussing the Public Accounts submitted with the approval of this Government, and laid on the Table of the House, and in criticising the manner in which the people's money has been expended, the excuse these hon. gentlemen attempted to suggest—and their language is reported—was that these expenditures were made under a certain officer; and then a little conversation took place across the House, which, I suppose, is in "Hansard" too: "Let me see, who was that officer? Yes, Mr. So-and-so, at Halifax, or Mr. So-and-so, elsewhere, a Tory appointment, a Conservative officer; let us look into the conduct of that officer; let us see whether he is careless, extravagant, or worse; we must take pains to look into these matters." And the suggestion was ever and again, not that the Ministers were there to justify the expenditure which they had made through their officers, or to answer here, which is the proper place for them to answer, as to why those expenditures had been made, but to suggest that if anything extravagant or improper had been done, it was done by some officer unauthorized, whose conduct must be inquired into. Now, the propositions contained in this resolution, to which the right hon. gentleman must, of course, subscribe, which he could not controvert, against which he could not bring any decent parliamentary authority in Great Britain or elsewhere, involve the very opposite position to that taken by his colleagues on one or two occasions this session. They involve entire responsibility for all acts done by officers who are permitted now to retain and hold the confidence of the Government; and in reference to the suggestion more than once thrown across the House, I, as a Conservative, cannot appreciate the force of it. Whether an official be a Conservative or a Liberal, no matter what his political antecedents may have been, he is an officer of the Government, and must answer to the Government as such, and the Government must answer to Parliament for all the acts of which they approve, and they approve of all acts they have not themselves taken any means to investigate or consider and deal with before bringing down the result of those acts for the approval of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman also went to the Curran Bridge for an example or illustration, and in that case he seemed to think there was a position taken by members on this side of the House inconsistent with the present position. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a very clear recollection of all that occurred in that case, and the contrast between it and the case of the Yukon officials referred to by the right hon. gentleman is marked; because the late Government, while they were being harassed and attacked and criticised, were dealing with that matter, and were prosecuting the parties in any way directly or indirectly charged with offences. They had put the matter in the hands of counsel, and all the law officers in the service of the Government, with general instructions to investigate and follow out each case to the bitter end. The right hon. gentleman knows that the Government in that matter was not derelict in its duty, and, consequently, could not be placed in a position inconsistent with the principles of this resolution. Now, contrast that with the language to which I have referred, and the position taken by the Minister this session, in regard to officers who happened to be charged wih certain duties, and the mentioning of the names of the officers. One officer at Halifax, Mr. Parsons, was named more than once, and the suggestion as to when he was appointed and what his political predilections were was quite frequently the subject of debate. I hold under my hand authorities to show that the language of this resolution is almost a copy of language used by Mr. Disraeli on one occasion, and by Mr. Gladstone on another, both of those authorities insisting that a Minister who appreciates his responsibility to Parliament will refrain from introducing an official's name in debate in connection with a matter on which the Government are being pressed and are on trial; and the Government are on trial dur-

ing the whole session in Supply for their acts and conduct in connection with the expenditures of the previous year. For instance, Mr. Disraeli, speaking in 1869, said :

I think nothing more unfair, even if guided by the head of a department, to introduce his name in defence or vindication of any decision you have made on your own entire responsibility.

And Mr. Gladstone, in 1861, said :

It was observed, in the course of the recent debate, by the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli), and, I think, with general truth, that it is not desirable to bring any of the permanent civil servants of the Crown before the House, and that the Minister ought to take entire responsibility.

Again, an eminent member of the House of Commons in England, Sir Charles Wood, laid down, without contradiction by any one :

The duty of the House of Commons is to hold those responsible who are the Ministers of the Crown.

And it was only to-day, in another place, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was endeavouring to fasten the responsibility of dereliction of duty upon an officer who turned out to be sick in bed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, I suppose, is referring to the proceedings of a committee ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. Minister of Marine would deny my statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I prefer that we should discuss it in the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It illustrates that while the Prime Minister to-night—and I am very glad to see him do it—acknowledges that this resolution involves the very A B C of responsible government, the incidents that have occurred this session make it necessary to reaffirm what are the A B C principles of responsible government.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Care of sick seamen in the Marine Hospital and other hospitals in the maritime provinces	$35,000
Shipwrecked and distressed seamen....	3,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. Minister any of the papers prepared in connection with the return I asked for some time ago, and which the hon. gentleman promised me. I refer to the papers in connection with the dismissal of Mr. Russell, steamboat inspector.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I received my hon. friend's memorandum and sent to the deputy at once asking that as soon as any of the papers were prepared to send them up immediately, that I might lay them on the Table.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In connection with this estimate, I would like the item of steamboat inspection to stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection. Of course, I have some supplementaries that will cover the whole ground.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have a particular reason in connection with the Yukon district, and I want as much information as I can obtain from the department. If the return in the matter of Russell is voluminous, would the hon. Minister expedite the preparation of what he has, and bring down first a return proper, and then a supplementary return.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will do that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many hospitals are in charge of the department now ? We began some years ago doing away with these institutions as much as possible, and making other arrangements,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend will see all the details on pages 13 and 14 of the departmental report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What arrangement is there in Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no change whatever. The seamen are cared for at the Jeffrey Hale and Hotel Dieu Hospitals, and 90 cents a day is charged for each seaman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Also at Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and at St. John the same. The marine hospital has been closed at St. John for years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has anything been done with that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No, I think about six years ago, when the hon. gentleman was head of the department, he called for tenders to sell this building, but no tenders were forthcoming, and the hospital has remained a bill of expense to the Government ever since. Two years ago, we again called for tenders and were again unsuccessful, and the agents reported last winter that something had to be done, because the stone fence around the grounds was falling down

and the hospital itself was falling into decay and likely to be indicted as a nuisance by the city authorities. I had estimates of the cost of repairing it prepared, but they were very large, and I called for tenders. I was in hopes, from information I had from my hon. friend who represents the city, that the school board would have been induced to purchase the building, but it appears that one of their schools at Indian Town was burnt down, and they wired us that the cost of putting the hospital in repair for school purposes was so heavy that they did not think they would tender. To-morrow is the last day for receiving tenders, but within the last twenty-four hours I have received notice from the city of St. John that a wealthy gentleman there, Mr. Turnbull, is prepared to invest in trustees the sum of $100,000 for the purpose of maintaining a hospital for incurables, and they suggest that if no offer can be obtained for this building, we should accept a nominal sum and give it to this trust. That matter would have to come up for consideration. It is a very valuable property in a sense, but costs a great deal of money to maintain, and if this gentleman is prepared to give $100,000 to establish a hospital for incurables, I am not sure but that the best thing we could do would be to donate this property to the trustees.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the present arrangements at Chicoutimi ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hospital there received six seamen last year, and was paid $237. The building was once owned by the Government, but was sold to the nuns, who treat the seamen on a per capita allowance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The building was held in a peculiar way, and the work done partly on property belonging to the nuns. Has the Minister made any change in the condition that existed when he came in ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that the interest of the Government in the property, which was of a peculiar character, has been sold out to the nuns since 1886. I think it is $3,000 to $4,000 we obtained for our interest. The building is now owned by the nuns, and they are carrying on the treatment of the sailors on the same terms as before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under what authority did the hon. gentleman sell the building ? It is usual to ask Parliament for authority to sell real estate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware that any special authority was obtained. The matter was referred to Council, and the Council reported in favour of selling.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to know the date of the transaction and under what authority the hon. gentleman acted ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was in 1897 or 1898. There must be some authority, as it passed through the Department of Justice. It was done in the regular way.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister with regard to an expenditure I find under the head of Sydney hospital, recorded at page K—78 of the Auditor General's Report. There is a charge of $59.50 for 1,400 feet of flooring. What kind of flooring was that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information. If he desires to know exactly, he should move for the vouchers in the Public Accounts Committee and have them brought down.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am still without some papers I moved for last year. There might be little good in moving.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I speak of moving in the Public Accounts Committee. The vouchers can be had at once.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me that this is an enormous price to pay. The hon. Minister could not have put in better than common hardwood flooring of birch or maple, and he could buy it for far less than this price which is at the rate of about $40 a thousand. An oak flooring could be put in at this price, and surely the hon. Minister or whoever has charge of the work would not put material of that kind in an old wreck of a hospital.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to know what arrangement differing from the old arrangements are made in the Island of Cape Breton in regard to the attendance on sick mariners ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware of any change whatever.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no new hospital ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there had been, I am sure I would remember it, and I am not aware of any.

Shipwrecked and distressed seamen.... $3,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is usually correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government touching the relief of distressed

Canadians. At one time that duty was discharged in the Marine Department in connection with this subject of shipwrecked and distressed seamen, though not out of this particular vote. Is the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) aware what arrangements obtain in regard to the relief of distressed Canadians abroad who are not seamen, but who are relieved by British consuls?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That does not come out of this vote. We pay a certain amount to the Imperial Board of Trade for the expenses of relieving distressed Canadian seamen, and we spend a portion of the vote ourselves.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But at one time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had referred to him vouchers that were transmitted by the Imperial Government—the Board of Trade generally—regarding cases where consuls had disbursed money to relieve distressed Canadians who were not seamen. These payments were generally made out of the vote for unforeseen expenses. What I wish to know is what policy the Government have now in relation to this matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter has not come before us. I have not been asked to pronounce upon the question, and have no applications

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. These applications are dealt with outside of the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have not come before me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the Brazil case come before the hon. gentleman?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not before my department There was special vote taken in the Brazil case.

Steamboat inspection	$27,200
Inspection of Dominion steamers and fog alarms	1,300

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We had better let the smaller of these items stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Very well.

Fisheries—	
Salaries and disbursements, and of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians	$70,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Minister please tell us how he proposes to divide that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman sees there a reduction of $25,000 as compared with last year. That arises out of the fact that we are passing through an empirical stage. The matter is not yet settled. The Privy Council's decision resulted in the Ontario government taking hold of their fisheries and administering them. As a consequence, the minor local officers that we had appointed in the province of Ontario are now being appointed and paid by the provincial government of Ontario and not by us. The same argument applies to a large extent to the province of Quebec—entirely to that province, except so far as the sea coasts are concerned. We maintain the steamer "Petrel" in the waters of Lake Huron and Lake Erie for the purpose of protecting these fisheries against the encroachments or inroads of the Americans. We maintained three inspectors in the province of Ontario; that province has been divided into three inspectoral districts, and we have three inspectors there whose duty it is to travel over the old overseers' districts and report weekly to the department how the regulations of the department are being carried out. One of these inspectors was an officer taken from my own department, Mr. Cunningham. I simply added $100 to his existing salary, and gave him that portion of Ontario which is called Eastern Ontario. The old inspector for the whole province was retained in what is known as Western Ontario, and we have appointed a new inspector for the district of Parry Sound and Muskoka, and the district of North Algoma, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Dyment). Mr. Sheppard remains for western Ontario. He was formerly inspector for the whole province. His duties are to travel from district to district continuously and report weekly to the department how the regulations are being observed. It may be that if we find that the regulations are not being observed and that the fisheries are being destroyed, the very serious question will confront the department whether we should not be obliged to pay for the protection of the fisheries, even although we do not get any receipts at all. That will be a very broad question which we will have to determine after we have the facts before us. I am just baldly stating the facts as they are now. Then, in the district of Quebec we have two inspectors appointed.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the officer for Algoma?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Duncan is his name.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no such man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has only been appointed after the decision of the Privy Council. The one man who was inspector for the province of Ontario before is retained now for western Ontario.

Mr. INGRAM. Was it Inspector Kerr who had the western district?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was no such person as Inspector Kerr. There were overseers who were subordinates of the inspector. The inspector had jurisdiction over the whole province, and under him were the overseers who had jurisdiction corresponding to some extent to counties. Every one of these overseers was removed.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that Mr. Kerr was the inspector for the western district, and all the overseers were under him. He travelled from Hamilton to Windsor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is wrong. There was only one inspector for the province of Ontario, Mr. Sheppard. There was a large number of overseers, and a still larger number of guardians. The guardians simply had charge of a little local river. When the change was made, all the overseers and guardians were relieved from office, and we retained in the province of Ontario but three inspectors, one of them the old inspector, Mr. Sheppard, whose duties, instead of extending over the whole province, were confined to western Ontario; a new man, Mr. Cunningham, was appointed from the department here, and had charge of eastern Ontario; and Mr. Duncan took charge of what is called the Algoma and Parry Sound district.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman know how many of the old overseers that were in the employ of the Dominion Government are now in the employ of the Ontario Government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no idea of that at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am told the most of them are; I think my hon. friend is wrong, but I express no judgment because I do not know. Then, in the province of Quebec the same principle was adopted so far as its inland waters are concerned. We appointed two inspectors, one for the eastern end, Dr. Lavoie, and Mr. Beliveau, from the department here, who had $100 increase made to his salary, and who inspects all the western part of Quebec, or that portion which is washed by the sea. That stands in the same position as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. A question arose with respect to the sea coast which does not arise with respect to the territorial waters of the province. The question is simply whether the sea coast is part of the territorial waters of the province or not. I have had that matter remitted to the Department of Justice some time ago. I have received a partial opinion from the Minister on this very important question. He and his deputy and the Solicitor General and myself had a consultation upon it, and the matter is still under consideration. I have had interviews with the Premiers of all the maritime provinces and Quebec, and the result was that most of them have agreed that we should submit a case to the courts to determine this point: Do the fisheries surrounding the sea coasts pass to the provinces in the same way that the fisheries of the lakes pass to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. POPE. Did Quebec agree to that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Quebec has not yet agreed to it, but I am in hopes that it will. It is not ten days ago since I had a consultation with Mr. Marchand upon it. Now, the principle on which I understand the Privy Council to have proceeded was that, inasmuch as the province owned the property, the ownership of the property carried with it rights to the ownership of the fisheries. The question comes up, of course: Do they own the sea coast below the low water mark? If they do own that in the same sense that they own the lakes, it may well be that the fisheries may pass from us as they have passed from us in the lakes. It is all a matter for future decision.

Mr. POPE. What arrangement was made about the management of those fisheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as the management is concerned, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have allowed the management to remain in our own hands just as it did last year, and I am right in the crux of a negotiation with the province of Quebec for the purpose of making some arrangement with respect to the north shore of the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, and I have not yet absolutely concluded it. Therefore, until that question is decided, the fishery officers of the maritime provinces and that portion of Quebec which is maritime, will not be dismissed. I certainly do not propose to surrender any jurisdiction over those portions until the courts tell me that I am wrong. Therefore I thought, without being able to make a very close estimate, I could very well reduce this by $25,000. The fishery officers of Ontario and Quebec being dismissed, we may not require more than $70,000 instead of $90,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The questions which the hon. gentleman has gone over are very interesting. We have spent some $20,000 in Ontario last year out of this vote. The Estimates have always been prepared by the provinces, and were given in detail. They used to be taken to Council, of course, in that form; that is, the departmental form, for convenience. Those were lumped in this printed book a few years ago. What I want to get at is the estimate of province by province.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do not make them up province by province. When I came to make my estimate this year I sat down with Commissioner Prince and went over the cases of

each of the officials in Ontario whom we have dismissed, and each of the officials in Quebec that were dismissed, and in that way we made this estimate, making allowance for the 25 inspectors that have been appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I assume that the Minister prepares his estimates with regard to the possible expenditure he may have to make. Now, Ontario has to be dealt with, and he has to consider, before submitting a vote to his colleagues, his requirements for Ontario in order to reach a conclusion how much he will require for the other service in Ontario the coming year. What I want to know is what the hon. gentleman will require for Ontario.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell you right off-hand. I had the figures in my hand, when I made the Estimates. We saw what the cost of the retention of all the officials in Ontario was; we deducted that, and then added the sum for the three inspectors. Then, we had Quebec. We took the cost of all the officials of that province, and added the cost of the two inspectors, and that gave us the amount we could save.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to resist the introduction of that very objectionable and dangerous principle. The hon. gentleman will remember how closely I was held, and, I think, properly—the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) will recollect how he always insisted on my handing across the House the items of that $30,000, or, as it was then, $40,000, for lighthouses. This is the same principle exactly; there can be no dispute about that. The danger would be obvious in regard to taking a bulk vote for lighthouses, in not knowing what the expenditure of the department is intended to be. When this bulk vote was changed, it was always with the understanding that, on request, items would be given to the committee, and the committee would never be asked to vote $70,000 without any explanation from the Minister as to how the amount was reached as to the requirements of the service, province by province. If the hon. Minister is unable to say how this has been apportioned, he is unable to press this item; he is unable to ask the committee to take for granted that he has made a wise and prudent disposal of that amount. Our time is wasted, if we are supposed to take all these things for granted and assume that his discretion has been properly exercised. We are entitled to have proof of this fact. The Minister says: We reach that amount by making a deduction of what we required for Ontario.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman could not have listened to what I said. I said, that all the officials in Ontario had been dismissed, and I reduced the amount by the amount of their salaries and travelling expenses; that I had appointed three inspectors, and that I had to apply for the payment of these three inspectors in Ontario; so that the entire money vote of last year for Ontario is not required now, but we only ask for the salaries and travelling expenses of these three inspectors. Of course, we keep the "Petrel"; but she is provided for in another vote. In Quebec we did the same thing, as far as that part of the province is concerned which has not a shore on the seacoast. All the officials have been dismissed, and that means a deduction of $25,000. In all other respects the vote is exactly as it was before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is apportioned for Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot say. I never heard that question put before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It used to be put in the Estimates themselves.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Never in my time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I told the hon. gentleman frankly that it was changed in my time, but, when I was asked to read out the lighthouse division, I did so, and I gave the manner in which I reached the bulk sums. That was a change made in my day, simply to save print, and to save time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman never read the names of the officers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They were always reached in that way. It is absurd to suppose that this amount should be taken in any other way. It is in the power of the Minister to absolutely ignore the claims of some of the different provinces.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think so, because there is no doubt about it. If the Minister states in the House, while probably it would not affect the legal view, that certain amounts are apportioned for certain provinces, he could not depart from that during the fiscal year, nevertheless, that $70,000 vote, under the explanation he now gives, the Minister might spend in any one of the provinces he likes. Under the old arrangement this could not be. If, during the consideration of the Estimates, a Minister of the Crown made a statement, though, as a matter of law, probably he would not be restricted, still, as a matter of honour, he would be obliged to adhere to his statement. I will not agree to that vote passing in its present form, without the explanation that the Minister ought to give to

show how he has reached the amount he is asking.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I told the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know what the hon. gentlman's explanation is. I know that he says he has abolished the officers in Ontario, and that he has cut down the work to three officers there, and that these arrangements are going on. But, nevertheless, he has made an estimate of what he will require out of that $70,000 for Ontario, and he has made an estimate of what he will require for Quebec. We cannot discuss the thing intelligently, unless we know the manner in which this money is to be distributed. We want to know whether it is to be used in a narrow or sectional sense. We want to see how it is to be apportioned among the provinces, so as to see whether his conclusions are wise. The representatives of British Columbia, of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick want to see whether, in these items, he has enough money for what they know to be the requirements in connection of the supervision and control of the fisheries of those provinces. He says, that in Nova Scotia matters stand as they stood before, that the administration of the fisheries, the supervision, appointment and dismissal of officers is the same as before. We want to know what amount of money he is going to spend in the discharge of this business. The hon. gentleman spent last year in Nova Scotia $21,683.91. Is the hon. gentleman going to reduce that vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. I think I told the hon. gentleman expressly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well ; the reduction will not be in that vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, let us take New Brunswick, $17,663.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not expect that it will be under $17,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We may be pretty sure that Prince Edward Island will not be reduced from the figure of last year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it is likely : $7,000, in round numbers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Six or seven thousand dollars, in round numbers. Then, in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know of no reason for any change there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is for Lake Winnipeg, I suppose—$1,200.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, Lake Winnipeg, and the next lake to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman going to get along with $1,200, with the possiblity of a local election coming on in that province ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, we are not going to do anything for local elections.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the North-west Territories we spent last year $2,324. Is the hon. gentleman going to cut that down ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will not exceed $3,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not larger ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There will be some increase, but not large, because a special vote will be taken for whatever purposes we specially propose there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If that be so, how is the hon. gentleman able to cut the vote down by $25,000, because in Ontario he only expended $19,239, or $20,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is right.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman going to cut down Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Between Ontario and Quebec we cut it down $25,000, and the reason I did not cut it down more is that I have to still retain my officers on the sea-coast of Quebec. Mr. Prince and I tried to figure it out as closely as possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Out of the vote of $30,000 last year there is to be $25,000 deducted, and that leaves only $5,000 for Ontario and Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has Quebec agreed finally to take over the charge of the inland fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And has the Federal Government already withdrawn its officers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, from the 1st of May of this year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman's construction of the decision of the Privy Council that he is not responsible in regard to Quebec?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I do not go that far. The very fact that I have retained inspectors whose duties are to travel around and report weekly to me how the regulations are observed, and how the provincial government carry them out, proves that I do not take that position. It may well be that the result of this experiment may be entirely unsatisfactory, and I may have to come to the House and say that although we got no revenue, it still may be our national duty —but I do not want to commit myself; I want to await events and see what the change is going to bring about. If I see it is going to result in the destruction of our fisheries, I certainly would have no hesitation in asking my colleagues to consent to my asking money from the House to protect them; because I consider that these fisheries are an important national industry. It seems to me that at present, when Ontario, especially, was so anxious to get possession of the income derived from these fisheries, that she should also bear her proper share in the protection of these fisheries, and she is doing it. Whether that will be effective or not, remains to be seen, but I am taking what I consider prudent precautions to have reports made weekly to me as to the effect of the provincial officers' action.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman say what his system of supervision is, because if he waited until bad management and poor guardianship had worked an injury to the fisheries, it would be impossible to restore them to anything like their old condition. Though the Federal Government did make a better effort than any local government could possibly make, yet they fell short of doing all that was desirable to maintain the wealth of our fisheries, because public opinion never seems to properly support either the local or federal authority in fisheries regulations.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a tremendous complaint when the fisheries are gone, and a charge against the Government of the day for not having properly looked after them. How does the Minister propose to conduct this inspection so as to acquaint himself the moment an injury is threatened by the absence of proper precaution.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was in communication for a long time with the premiers of the two larger provinces, and with the officers specially charged by them with the protection of the fisheries, and I recognize that they appreciate fully the importance of the work they took in hand. They were aware they are taking large responsibilities; they were aware they would have large receipts, and they gave me the assurance that they would appoint local officers (similar to those I had previously appointed) to see that the regulations were enforced. I have no reason to doubt but that they will carry out loyally and effectively the intimation they gave me in that respect. We appoint these three inspectors—of course, I have my own two officers here—to travel through each overseer's district, and to report to us if the local officers are enforcing the regulations, as the Dominion officers used to do. They can keep in touch with the manner in which these officers are doing their duty almost as effectively as if these officers were directly appointed by us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot understand how the Minister can do anything effective with $5,000, in the way of general supervision over the immense fisheries districts of Ontario and Quebec. His officers here will, of course, have to travel and charge their expenses to this vote, and those two men cannot during the fishing season cover a very large proportion of that immense territory.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have to cut the vote down pretty closely.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I wish to understand from the Minister of Marine a little more clearly the nature of the decision in the fisheries case. As I understand it, the Privy Council decided that the foreshores were the property of the provinces before confederation, and that they were not parted with by the provinces at confederation. The foreshores, therefore, belong to the provinces, and the fisheries that are over the foreshores within the three-mile limit also belong to the provinces. I understand that there is a dictum of the Privy Council to that effect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) must not start out with wrong premises. There is no decision of the Privy Council that the foreshores extend to the three-mile limit. The question which will be argued will be, whether the foreshores extend beyond low water mark.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Whatever shape it takes, the question the people of Prince Edward Island are interested in is, whether, as a province, we are entitled to our share of the fishery award.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We cannot discuss that here.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I do not wish to discuss the question now, but my hon. friend (Sir Louis H. Davies) has suggested that some means are being taken to determine the exact position of the matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There will be means taken.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis H. Davies) said there had been some reference of this matter to the Department of Justice. So far as I can judge, that will not help us to come to a conclusion, because we may get the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and be just as much in the dark as ever.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Yes, so far as an ultimate and satisfactory decision on this matter is concerned. There was a proposition which I think was a fair one, to refer this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the one that is being considered now; we are trying to arrive at a case.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I wish to know whether there is a prospect of the matter being referred, at an early date, to the Supreme Court, for its adjudication.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope there is a reasonable prospect. The Ministers from New Brunswick were here last week, and we propose to send a draft case for their consideration in a short time.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I understand, then, that there is a definite intention on the part of the Government to submit the matter to the Supreme Court for its decision?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If we can get the provinces to agree to a case, it certainly will be done. If they will not agree to a case, we cannot submit it.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) The three provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does not the province of British Columbia come into that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It certainly does.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Have you had any communication from the Government there in regard to it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That will take in the estuary of the Fraser River, and others?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, the same question will necessarily arise.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it not singular that you have had no communication as yet?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have just exercised the same jurisdiction as before, and no one seems to object.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say whether Mr. Webster has still any connection with the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. None whatever.

Mr. INGRAM. Then will the hon. gentleman say how the Ontario government are carrying on the fisheries? Will he say whether they have reported to him up to the present, and whether they are carrying them on lines similar to those of the Dominion Government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, we have reports from time to time, and they are carrying them on presumably on the same lines as we did. Whether the results will be as effective or not, I am not in a position to-day to state.

Mr. INGRAM. Under the administration of the late Government, speaking of my own locality, the question of the party politics of those who were granted licenses was not considered at all. But since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, I think some attention is being paid to party, and I fear that now that the fisheries are under the Ontario government, still more attention will be paid to party. I would be sorry if that were the case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be sorry, too.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the inspectors reported anything of that character?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing at all of that kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to ask about the British Columbia fishery regulations. There was a great deal of discussion and excitement going on in connection with that question in the province. I know something of the difficulties of solving questions of that kind. In 1894, I think it was, we reached a scheme which, while not wholly acceptable, seemed to be more acceptable than any other system that had been adopted, and I was sorry to find this year that everything was as bad as it was at the time when I was Minister of Marine in regard to dissatisfaction on the

part of the fishermen. I would like the Minister of Marine to tell the committee just what he did in connection with that subject, how the matter stands at present, and how far he has been able to meet the wishes of the two sections, for unfortunately, speaking generally, there were two sections, that is, the fishermen and the canners.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The question is a very reasonable one, and I will endeavour to tell the hon. gentleman how the matter stands. Shortly after I came into the department, I paid a visit to the province to see for myself how things were, and I had long interviews between the canners on one side and the fishermen on the other. The fishermen had grievances which they thought were substantial. They thought the regulations did not deal even-handed justice to them, and that under those regulations as they stood, the canners had them in the hollow of their hand, and they prayed that those regulations might be changed in such a way that they would have what they called at least fair-play. I gave as much attention to their representations as I could, and when I returned, I found that the time which I had at my disposal, only about a fortnight, to look into the question, was not sufficient to enable me to sit in judgment between those two great classes—the canners, with all the capital they had invested, on one side, and the fishermen, who were there in hundreds, on the other side; the one class representing capital and the other representing labour. I knew it would require a good deal of consideration before one could come to anything like a just conclusion; and, after returning here and talking the matter over with Mr. Commissioner Prince, I decided that the proper course would be for me to send out that gentleman, who was a specialist, who had been brought to this country because he had a special knowledge of the fisheries, and whose life had been devoted to the study of them, to spend two or three months on the spot. I gave him his instructions; I produced all the memorials I had received from the fishermen on the one side and from the canners engaged in the fisheries on the other; I explained as well as I could the difference between the two classes; and I told him to go out and stay there long enough to study the question, and then to come back and make a report to me as to how he thought the regulations should be amended. He did so, and when his report was made, I was rather startled at its drastic character. It did not quite commend itself to my mind, but bearing in mind that he had a greater knowledge of the matter than I had, and had spent three months in studying it, I said: "I will accept your recommendations for the time being, and we will publish them as new regulations, and submit them to the people interested. There will be plenty of time to receive criticisms from both sides, and plenty of time, if these criticisms are effective, for me to change my mind and amend the regulations."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Were these published before the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Order in Council was passed nine months before the regulations were to come into operation. We published the new regulations suggested by Mr. Prince as regulations to come into force some nine or ten months afterwards. In the meantime, and during those nine or ten months, we received communications from interested parties, and as the time drew near when the regulations were to come into force those representations became stronger and stronger, and the situation became a grave one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have heard that the replies were strong, too.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think those sent by me were rather judicial in tone. I recognized that I was not in a position to dictate or to form a judgment on the one side or the other. I felt that both parties had rights, and the regulations did not go far enough to please the men, and went too far to please the canners. The result was that, after giving a great deal of personal study to the matter, I came to the conclusion that the regulations were too drastic. The points were these: The men complained that the fishing season was compressed into a very few weeks, and that in those few weeks the local fishermen, who were compelled to be idle for many months, had the opportunity of making their money out of the fisheries taken from them by foreigners who came across the line for the few weeks that the fish lasted, in thousands; for there are 5,000 men employed during the weeks that the salmon run, while the local fishermen number only 700 or 800, and they said: "These foreigners come and take the bread out of our mouths, and wages are cut down to nothing." The canner says that here are not enough fishermen to supply them with the necessary labour, and that if we exclude fishermen from the United States, the 700 or 1,000 men on the spot would demand double or treble wages and ruin the whole business. I thought, that a compromise could be reached. Under the regulations suggested by Mr. Prince, and approved by me, no man could go into a fishing boat unless he had a license, and in order to get a license he had to register on or before a certain day, which was anterior to the time the salmon began to run. This was for the purpose of seeing that none should register but a resident, because a

floating population would not come over 300 or 400 miles simply to register in anticipation of the fishing season. I, therefore, altered the regulations and retained the principle of registration, but provided that it would not be necessary for the rowers to be registered fishermen. Each boat contains two men, one a rower and one fisherman, and the compromise amounts to this, that the fisherman is bound to register but not the rower, and the fisherman has to register before the 1st of July. I have not heard anything in the nature of complaints since the new regulations came into force.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. Minister would do well to reconsider the position altogether.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will allow me; I omitted to mention an important point, and that is that the new regulations should not apply to Indians.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The difficulties arise from the fact that pressure is brought upon the Minister from the labouring element, on the one side, and the employers on the other, and he is assuming a responsibility with which, I think, he ought not to have anything to do. I am certain that the department cannot deal satisfactorily with the question of regulations when attempting to reconcile views put forward by these two opposing sources. No matter what the merits on either side, the question resolves itself into one of demand and supply, with which the department ought to have nothing to do.

I sympathise very much, of course, with bona fide fishermen, and I know how much regard ought to be paid to them, but in dealing with fishery regulations, you are not dealing with the men. The hon. Minister does not pretend that it is any of his business to adjust the difficulties between the employers and their employees. His business is to protect the fisheries, which are now in a prime condition, but require a great deal of supervision to be kept free from danger of injury.

The canneries on that river are of very different proportions. There are canneries on a very large scale and others on a much inferior scale, and the regulations do not discriminate between the two.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). They never did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but that now becomes a very important question when the number of licenses is reduced to ten. The vast majority of the boats belong to the canners and the canneries, of course, are theirs also, and the limit of ten puts the canners in this position. These licenses are not transferable, and when a licensed man is put in a boat and then falls ill, the canner has no means of replacing him, when he has received his full number of licenses. Thus, the head of a large cannery in which an enormous amount of capital is invested, is apt to find himself in an awkward position if any of his ten men who have licenses happens to fall ill, because these licenses are not transferable. I have not had the opportunity of reading the regulations, but would ask the hon. Minister if it is the case that a canner could not replace any one of his licensed fishermen that fell ill?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is correct. The hon. gentleman sees that although they used to get twenty-five licenses, they now only get ten. That was one of the compromises between the men and the canners. The men said it was outrageous that a cannery should get twenty-five licenses, and Mr. Prince reported that it was fair they should get about ten. Having sent a man of Mr. Prince's experience to investigate, and having his report, I did not like going against it. And I thought it fair that it should have a trial this year. There is nothing to prevent these men buying these fish from the boats there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But they should not be driven to buy fish in that way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You must remember the peculiar position in which the seven hundred to a thousand local fishermen stand in relation to the vast number of men who come from the United States. They say that these men come up and take the bread out of their mouths unless some protection is given. Having fished their own rivers and made five or six weeks pay, they come over to our side and sweep up the aftermath in British Columbia. Of course, the matter cannot be changed now; the regulations are passed and have been accepted with more or less satisfaction—in some cases less and not more—by the canners and the men. We shall have this season's experience to go by. I did the best I could, following, to a large extent, Prof. Prince's recommendations and modifying them with the practical common sense which I profess to have and the personal knowledge of the local circumstances I acquired while I was out there. I really think that the conditions now are pretty fair.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is, I think, in the unfortunate position of having dealt with this matter on the ground of what he thought was fair between the fishermen and their employers. I say that is a false position for him to be in. Prof. Prince is an expert on fisheries; and if he reported that the fisheries in the Fraser River were in such a condition that the licenses for these people who have invested their means in expensive outfits, boats and gear should be reduced to prevent the overfishing of the

river, we could understand the soundness of the Minister's position. But the hon. Minister refers to Prof. Prince in a matter where his opinion as an expert in fisheries is no better than that of any ordinary man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Except that he gained local knowledge from living on the spot a long time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister says he has done what is fair. I do not think that that is the way to approach this question. The canners have gone out on those rivers to develop an industry, and dealing with canners or any other men in that position, very strong reason indeed must be given for interfering with them. And the Fisheries Department is not warranted in interfering with them except on one ground, and that is that the interference is necessary in order to protect the fisheries, not to protect the fishermen. The Minister is not charged with the responsibility of protecting the fishermen in that respect. Let me set this forth in a way that I think will appeal to the hon. Minister. When this case of the fisheries was being argued before the Privy Council, the point was pressed where the distinction came in between the right of the federal authority to regulate and for that purpose to license the right of the local authority. When the opinion was expressed by one of the judges that the power of licensing in the inland fisheries, for instance, was in the local authority, it was suggested that it was a very awkward condition of things, because the federal authority having the right to control the fisheries by right of regulation, it might supplant the local authority altogether. It was urged, therefore, that the powers should be decided to be either in one place or the other, either federal or local. In their reasons for their judgment, the Privy Council, as the hon. Minister will remember dealt with that. I cannot, of course, give the exact language offhand; but they say practically—I think the hon. Minister will corroborate my recollection—that this is a matter of honour after all, that the court would not assume that the federal authority would take advantage of their position to do indirectly anything of that kind, but would only restrict the licenses or deal with them for the express purpose of regulating the fishery and no other. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) will give his loyal support to every line of that decision. The Federal Government were parties to the case, and the Minister and Parliament are bound loyally to carry out the decisions. In view of that decision, has he the right indirectly, and under cover of the fishery regulation, to adjust differences between the fishermen and their employees and to say: While it is not necessary to do this to protect the fisheries, I do it as a matter of fairness towards these men and to bring about a proper relation between the employer and the employed. I think the question involved is whether the fisheries require this regulation. The reason given for this regulation by the Minister is that to reduce the licenses to ten would be to treat the fishermen fairly. But the Minister will not pretend, and Professor Prince will not pretend, in view of all we now know of the fisheries, that to protect or improve the fisheries it was found necessary to reduce the number of licenses from twenty to ten. And if that cannot be said, it seems to me there is no justification for this regulation. I think the hon. Minister is misinformed, if he is under the impression that this reduction has been generally accepted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I say that there is a general agreement to give it a trial this season.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I should be very glad if the hon. gentleman was able to say with certainty that there was a general agreement. It seems to me that there is a very hard feeling on the subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think there is.

Mr. G. R. MAXWELL (Burrard). I think I can claim to know something about this matter perhaps a good deal more than the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who has just sat down, because of his short acquaintance with British Columbia. We had the hon. gentleman as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I cannot congratulate him on his success in the management of this business. If there was anything during his time which required to be looked into, it was the condition of our fisheries in British Columbia. I can say there was the deepest and most general dissatisfaction with regard to the way that department was governed, so far as the British Columbia fisheries were concerned. It seems to me a very peculiar position for the hon. gentleman to take to say, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has no right to take cognizance of the difficulties that may exist between the cannery men and the fishermen on the Fraser River. We have had the doctrine proclaimed this afternoon, that it is the right and the duty of the Government to interfere with a particular matter that is now engaging the attention of the country. The Government has been pressed to interfere in a quarrel between capital and labour. Now, in a very material sense, I hold that it is the duty of the Minister to see that the men who are gaining their livelihood out of the fisheries in British Columbia shall at least have a chance of making as much as they can out of their business, the same as workingmen engaged in any other business. The

fishermen of British Columbia have always held, and I sympathize with them, that the cannery men have no right to have a license at all. Why should they have a license? By what right can a cannery man say, that he ought to receive 20 licenses, or even 10 licenses, from the Fisheries Department? As the fishermen look at it, they say, that these 20 licenses give each cannery man so much control over the labouring man. They can dispense, to that degree at least, with their services. The fishermen hold, and I hold with them, that the position they are put in by the cannery men is most unfair. I say, the cannery men ought to go into the labour market and find their labour in the same way as any other business man does. As the Minister has pointed out, there are hundreds of fishermen on that river, and the cannery men can go to these fishermen and get all the fish they want. They have no right, so far as I can see, to have these licenses given to them at all, and I think the Minister went a great way in trying to conciliate the cannery men, when he gave them 10 licenses instead of going the length that I believe the fishermen wanted him to go, of taking all their licenses away from them. Now, my hon. friend opposes the reduction of these licenses. Evidently, he has got a brief from the cannery men. But I can say, that he does not represent the views of the great majority of the men on the Fraser River, and I hold that we have just as much right to consider the interests of the fishermen as we have to consider the interests of the cannery men. When we consider the position in which the fishermen are placed in competition for the necessaries of life, I think the Minister has taken a very wise precaution in giving them this chance at least, that he compels the cannery men to take more fish from the fishermen than they have been in the habit of doing in the past. The hon. gentleman mentions the case of a fisherman falling sick, and that brings us back to the old point. It may happen that fishermen may fall sick, that is one of the possibilities in every business. If an employer of labour employs a man, and he gets sick, the employer goes and looks for some one else. The cannery men must do the same. If one of their men falls sick, there are hundreds of other men ready to take his place. I can say, that the present regulations we have got are the best that we have ever had in British Columbia. While there may be a little dissatisfaction on the part of some cannery men with regard to licenses and one or two other points, a great many of them are perfectly satisfied with the regulations. So far as the fishermen are concerned, they are perfectly satisfied that this is the only genuine attempt that has ever been made by any Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see that they have justice in this business.

Mr. MAXWELL.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I do not propose to pay much notice to the personal observations of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell). I suppose he has his own reasons for flying at me in the manner and spirit which he displays tonight. However, he does not hurt any one: if it pleases him, it does not hurt any one else. I happened to have been present when this subject was discussed with some of his leading constituents, and on that occasion the hon. gentleman was in a different frame of mind regarding me, and thanked me—I supposed at that time he was sincere—for the spirit in which I approached the subject, and for my references to him. That was in his constituency, where we both live. So the hon. gentleman, for some reason I can guess at, has changed his kindly tone. But whether his tone is kindly or ferocious, it makes about the same impression on my mind. His suggestion that I hold a brief for the cannery men hardly merits contempt, let alone denial. I certainly do not think that he holds a brief from any one, as he understands so little of this subject. He has made strong general assertions. We are not here to discuss the conditions that did obtain; we are discussing the conditions that now exist. The hon. gentleman will not gain much by going back to old scores. That reminds me that the right hon. leader of this Government made some large promises in regard to these unpopular regulations. It was the custom, when the Grit caravan invaded that province, to anathematize the regulations and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the line the right hon. gentleman took then was, that all these regulations ought to go by the board, that they were unduly unfair to these captains of industry and these fishermen. But lo and behold, when the right hon. gentleman got into power, the first thing he saw was a bigger hornets' nest around the ears of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries than ever gathered around mine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You had a pretty hot time of it, too.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes; and the hon. member for Burrard, if he had a spark of ordinary fairness in his composition, would have remembered that I reminded those men then, who were in a very angry frame of mind, considering these regulations, of the great difficulties of dealing with that subject; and I also mentioned that I felt sure, knowing what I did of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he had not personally drawn some of those regulations, that they could not have received his very careful attention. The member for Burrard will recollect, that tonight the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rather corroborates that inference. He adopted, apparently, the drafting of Mr.

Prince, and in that respect there has been a great improvement in the regulations. The hon. member for Burrard may think that he will get a little political strength out of this matter, and we all know that he needs it. To set up as a great defender of the labouring interest is, of course, a popular line to take. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) will admit, I am sure, that to-night I did not take the side of either labour or capital. If I was able to make myself understood, the argument I used was, that considerations of capital and labour should be absent in dealing with the fishery regulations on a certain river. That was my position, and anything that has been said by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) has, I submit, not weakened that position at all. If we were discussing the question of capital and labour, all these elements might be very pertinent; but there is no reason for the reduction of these 20 licenses that appertains to the fisheries. The condition of the fisheries does not warrant the reduction of these licenses.

Mr. MAXWELL. What is the reason that they have these licenses at all?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The idea of the license system on the Fraser, as elsewhere, is that it is desirable to keep within hand the fishing on that river, lest, from promiscuous fishing, the river should be overfished. And the same system that obtains elsewhere, where you adopt that license system, obtains on the Fraser. You make regulations limiting the number of licenses on the ground that the condition of the fishery, though good, would be impaired unless you limited the fishing on the river. When the department found these canners with their men, and considered how many canners there were, it apportioned a certain number of licenses—I forget what the old apportionment was. There was always more or less of a disagreement between the canners and the department in regard to the allotment. It was never wholly satisfactory, and it never can be, probably. I do not think any Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who does his duty fearlessly can be popular with the canners or with the fishermen. It is a pretty hard thing to do in this country. I have told the hon. gentleman how the license system came about, and now I say there is no reason to reduce the number of licenses, so far as the fishery is concerned.

Mr. MAXWELL. If these were all the licenses we gave out there might be something in the hon. gentleman's contention, but when you have 2,000 men carrying around these licenses the condition does not warrant giving these licenses to the canners.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a different question, and that is a question, I say, that does not concern the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That is just why I differ from the present order of things. I say the present order of things is being based on what is fair or what is unfair, on ideas of fairness. My point is that the Minister has no information that the condition of the Fraser River requires further restrictions than those which existed before in regard to the license system, and that there is no reason to reduce the number of licenses. As I understand it, no one pressed the Minister to refuse these licenses to the fishermen. I understand that no one in British Columbia asked that.

Mr. MAXWELL. No. Here is the point that every fair-minded man will recognize: it is the right of the fishermen to get employment on the river. If you give the fisherman that right, if you give him a license, why should he not have the full advantage of his labour on the river just as any other workman who is engaged in the different mechanical trades would have. By giving these cannery men these twenty licenses, you deprive the fishermen of so much of his labour.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Again, I refuse, as I must be consistent; I must refuse to enter into that discussion. My whole argument centres in this, that whatever you may look upon as good or bad, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has nothing to do with the consideration of that kind. All he has to consider is how many licenses the river will stand. I say that no one has complained.

Mr. MAXWELL. If it is a question as to how many licenses the river will stand, the hon. gentleman has no right to ask that licenses be issued to a particular number of canners.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but there are so many canners there; they had a right to so many licenses. I say that the department has not to deal with the reduction or the increase of these licenses on any other ground than the condition that the fisheries warrant.

Mr. MAXWELL. That is right enough.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister cannot settle a question like this; he cannot issue licenses to one and refuse them to another, and stand between capital and labour. My point is not altogether technical. It is strictly substantial, and it is based upon what the Fishery Act contemplates. I have never argued that fishermen should not be given licenses, or that licenses should be taken away from fishermen, and I have never heard any one argue so in the province of British Columbia or in this House, but there is no ground under the Fishery Act for refusing licenses to these canners, and I must say that as between them it does seem to me a very difficult thing to justify, not merely the re-

duction from twenty to ten licenses, but these men own boats and expensive equipments, and not even to discriminate between the large establishment and the very small establishment, the one-horse establishment and the first-class establishment, is something I cannot understand. To put it plainly this making a drastic rule seems to have in it not merely the element of unfairness, but the element of some laziness.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I see that the Minister is reducing this vote by $25,000. That applies altogether to Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. And some portion of Quebec. I understand it is chiefly on account of the dismissals of the officers that have been employed in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw attention to the unfair treatment that has been given these dismissed fishery officers. The hon. Minister stated that on account of this Privy Council decision the department ceased to exercise control over the fishery interests of Ontario. I do not know when the decision of the Privy Council came to hand, but I know that the Minister issued a circular on the 1st day of January, mailed it to these officers, some of whom, I know, did not receive notice until the 5th of January that they were dismissed on the 1st of January. They served four or five days without having received notice that they were dismissed. They were dismissed peremptorily without notice. I think this was an injustice to these officials ; they should have received at least three months' notice that they were going to be dismissed, instead of being dismissed before they received the notice. The decision of the department surely was not come to on the day that circular was sent out, the 1st of January, but these officers, who had given faithful service to the country, were simply thrown out after receiving a circular stating that they were dismissed from the 1st of January. They should at least be paid a quarter's salary for the time that some of them devoted their services to their country. I put the question on the Order paper if it was the intention of the Minister to deal fairly with these men, and his answer was "No." He says to-day that this change is only an experiment, and that the officers were all re-employed by the Ontario Government. As a matter of fact, they have nearly all been dismissed and not one out of a hundred has been employed by the Ontario Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must be wrong.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not wrong. I know the Minister can take the list of names in my county, and out of a large number of them he cannot find a man that has been appointed by the Ontario Government. They appointed a Mr. Judd, who was simply a political agent for that county. The Minister says that he is only giving this a trial, but if he comes to reappoint the officers he will not reappoint the old officers, but will work in another batch of political agents. Under the late Administration, Mr. Sheppard had charge of all Ontario ; and, of course, as Mr. Sheppard is a strong partisan of the Liberals he has been retained, and he has got two more political agents to help him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I always understood he was a strong partisan of yours.

Mr. BENNETT. Ask the Postmaster General about that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I believe I was urged to dismiss him because he was a strong Conservative partisan.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Sheppard was appointed by the late Conservative Government, but when that Government found efficient men they appointed them without paying any attention to their political partisanship.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Sheppard is, and has been for years, an offensive partisan of hon. gentlemen opposite, as I know very well. Before this vote is reduced $25,000, I want the Minister to promise me that those dismissed officials who discharged their duty some time before they received notice of their dismissal, shall be paid at least the quarter's salary they are entitled to, and if this vote is not sufficient for that, then I want the Minister to promise me that he will bring an extra amount down in the Supplementary Estimates. No man in Canada would treat his servant as this Government has treated these officials. It is an outrage and ought to be resented by every hon. member in this House, irrespective of party politics. Our Canadian citizens should be treated fairly, more especially by a Government claiming to be a Liberal Government.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Would the Minister be kind enough to inform me who is performing the services formerly performed by Mr. Quinan, an overseer, whom he dismissed, in my county, two years ago ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) know the name ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid I cannot tell you, but I will be very happy to get the information and send it to you.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I gave the Minister an opportunity to give me the information a year ago, but he dodged in every possible way when I tried to get it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I make that charge. I asked for a return of the names of the different parties who were dismissed from the fishery service in my county, and the names of those appointed in their places, and I have not got that return yet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I gave the information last year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg your pardon, I did not get it yet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no reason in the world why the hon. gentleman should not get the information.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the hon. Minister refuse to give it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly not. Does my hon. friend imagine that I can carry in my head the names of all the fishery officers in the Dominion ? If he wants the information I will have it ready for him any time he asks for it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will refresh the memory of the Minister to see if he can show me how that service is attended to now. When he dismissed Mr. Quinan he appointed in his place a man named Joseph McPherson——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And you said you did not know the name ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Exercise a little patience. I have not told my story yet. Since then Mr. McPherson has been given a position in the Department of Customs, to which he was appointed last fall. Now, I want to know who is performing the duties that were performed by this man when he was fishery overseer in the southern part of the county of Cape Breton. He was then a resident of the northern part, though he was ordered to do the service in the southern part. But he is now tied down to the important position of collector of customs at North Sydney. Is there any one appointed in his stead to perform the fishery service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was the collector of bounty cheques, I think.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have no doubt he did collect a good many of them in his business, if reports are true. I want to know whether that position is filled by the appointment of another person, or whether that gentleman is acting in the double capacity of customs collector at the port of North Sydney, and overseer of the fisheries in the southern part of the county ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should think he could not possibly act in the dual capacity.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not supose he could.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. He may have received his cheques before.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, because up to the time I left home, no cheques were paid for fish bounties, and he had his appointment five or six months before this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will give the hon. gentleman the name on concurrence.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. gentleman tell me who is performing the service which was performed by Alexander McDonald of East Bay ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; I cannot carry all these names in my head.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There were only three overseers in the county, and all were dismissed. Surely the hon. gentleman can give the names.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot remember. I will give the hon. gentleman the name if he will call at the department, or I will bring it here.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I find that John A. Fraser, of Baddeck, had $119.30 for travelling expenses, while the salary he received was only $19.83.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is quite probable. A man receives a small salary and does a large amount of travelling, and he gets his travelling expenses according to his mileage.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. gentleman tell me where that gentleman travels to ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Over the district he is appointed to.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is not so large that he should draw that much.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These accounts are all audited by gentlemen who are well qualified to audit them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I find at page K—86, that a guardian named John MacNeil, who has charge of a stream, gets $54, whereas under the old regime the guardian who had

charge of it never received more than $25 and that man was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not the same district.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I know the district very well.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The boundaries of the districts were all altered there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the hon. gentleman thinks his memory is good in that respect, I differ from him. That district is Bonne Acadie. There is only one stream, and the distance to be travelled by an overseer is only about two miles, or at the longest three miles. The man appointed in place of the previous overseer, who was dismissed, is nearly 80 years of age, a man who can scarcely see the stream, let alone walk along it or see any wrong-doing on it. But the hon. gentleman sees fit to pay him $54 for 13 weeks. I would like to have some explanation as to what caused that increase of pay.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you think $54 for 13½ weeks is too much?

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is not the position. I contend that he should not be paid more than his predecessor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have found officers who did nothing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He had no more efficient man in the service than the man who was dismissed. He was dismissed because he was a Conservative, and the other man was put in his place because he was a Liberal, though he is incapable of doing the work; he is not even able to sign his name. The man who was dismissed never committed any act for which the hon. Minister would be justified in dismissing him from the service. He always did his duty faithfully, as the inspector will report. I understand that he was dismissed without reference to the inspector.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). This amounts to 60 cents a day. Does the hon. gentleman object to pay that much?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No man on that service has ever been expected to go over the ground and spend from morning till night at the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. The other man did it for $25, and you are giving this man $54.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The country could get the service of the other man for $25. Perhaps he would go over the stream once a week, and you can get hundreds of people to do the work for the same sum that was paid to him.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) seems to think that 60 cents a day is a very small wage indeed; but I would like to remind that hon. gentleman and the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) that they have many men in their employ doing work from day to day throughout the country, and providing a horse and rig for the purpose, who are not receiving more than 50 cents a day.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did they tender for it?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the case is quite the same; but I simply mention that to show that even under the present Administration there are men who are working for a great deal smaller wages than are paid by the Grand Trunk Railway to their trackmen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that there has been a change in the Island of Prince Edward. The old system there was to pay the wardens and fishery guardians, and I would like the Minister to explain what the change is that he has introduced.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no change except that an overseer was appointed for Queen's County, who takes charge specially of the lobster business, and who goes out in a tug-boat and prevents illicit fishing. The overseer is W. C. Hopkirk, appointed by me at $500 a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What instructions were given him with regard to the employment of vessels?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He gets special instructions in each case. He telegraphs where he can get a boat at such a rate for a certain time, and then gets instructions whether to hire it or not. I found I could not suppress the illegal fishing around the coasts without employing tug-boats—one for Prince Edward Island, one on the north coast of New Brunswick, two along the coast of Nova Scotia. I then found I had to pay so much for the hire of these boats that last year we built a small one down in Hawkesbury.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did it cost?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know, but a very small sum.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not charged.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may be that it is not in

the accounts of this year, for it may not have been finished until after July. It was given on contract, and built by the famous boat builder at Fort Hawkesbury, Mr. Emery.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who has charge of that boat ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One of the captains in the fishery protection service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was it charged to that vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and not to this vote, because it is on the protection service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are the other boats charged to this vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, to the fishery protection service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a boat chartered for a few weeks, as long as it was necessary to prevent poaching and illicit lobster fishing. There was another boat, which Inspector Chapman was authorized to hire by the day to suppress illicit fishing on the north coast of New Brunswick. Last year we built this boat, and all this is charged to fishery protection service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must be wrong with regard to all these boats being charged to that vote, because we have the "Fred. M. Batt" charged to the vote for Prince Edward Island, page K—90, 44 days, $880 ; provisions for ships, $70.19 ; total, $950.19. It is the appearance of an item like that which requires some explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may have been paid out of that vote, but is used for suppression of illicit lobster fishing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On what system is the hon. gentleman going ? Take the large vote of $100,000 ; primarily that vote was charged with the protection simply of the coast fisheries against poachers within the three-mile limit. Is the hon. gentleman using indiscriminately these votes for instance, supplementing what is short on his Prince Edward Island appropriation, which he stated to-night to be about $7,000, by charging tugs that are used on the coast of the island to the fishery protection service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That $7,000 embraced the expenses of that tug.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has said that he allowed the different officers to employ tugs occasionally, some on the island and some on the north shore of New Brunswick, and then he built one last year, and he said those would appear in the fishery protection account.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought they were all charged there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This one the hon. gentleman intended to take out of the fishery protection vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What distinction does he draw between the purchase of these two boats ? Instead of voting $70,000, is he treating it as though he would take, for instance, $170,000 on the two votes ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, the one is entirely distinct from the other. This is supposed to be inland entirely, but it appears that $950 are paid out of that for that tug. But it is not so, as a rule, and is not intended to be so. The tug boats are employed as subsidiary to the work done by the protection cruiser.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has Mr. Hopkirk to do with the coast fishery ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is a fishery officer and has plenty of time to give to this work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is he under Captain Spain ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is not in the fishery protection service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but he is put on board as a fishery officer, and would have perhaps a boatswain in charge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does he go up the rivers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, simply along the coast. It is part of the fisheries protection service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And ought not to be in this vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Ought properly to be in the fisheries protection vote. I do not see how it came here.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is this the boat that was employed in connection with the oyster beds in Bras d'Or Lake, a small vessel from Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It might be.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is this officer empowered to hire a steamer at what he thinks proper ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, he telegraphs or writes the department that he can get a boat at such a price for so many days, and, if deemed advisable, he is authorized by special instructions to employ the boat.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is this item of $42.75 for office furniture ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is for the inspectors' office in Charlottetown.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Minister furnishing this office for the first time ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that the "Petrel" is in Lake Erie, and that it has captured something in the neighbourhood of 73 American nets placed in Canadian waters. Has this Government control of the nets that are seized and have to be disposed of, or is that in the hands of the Ontario Government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That matter is in the hands of this Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) propounded a question to my hon. friend as to whether he thought 60 cents a day would be too much for this officer. Now, I would like to call his attention to the salaries that were paid to the officers in my county by the late Government, which he used to call an extravagant Government, and ask him to figure out how much a day these figures represent. First, we have Mr. Nassau Acton, of Gananoque, whose salary is $77.08 ; Samuel Boddy, of Athens, salary $50 a year ; Captain Davis, of Gananoque, salary, $50 a year. Then, there is Mr. Greer—his name appears as Green in the Auditor General's Report—his salary is $40 a year, travel $12 ; Wm. Hicks, salary $62.50, travel, $100 ; Geo. Jeacle, one of the very best officers in the Dominion, salary, $125, travel, $85.75 ; John Moorehead, of Longpoint, salary, $40, travel, $13.50 ; Robert Poole, of Poole's Resort, salary $50, travel, $13.50 ; and J. G. Wallace, of Ivy Lea, sdlary $4.16, travel, $2.50.

Mr. GIBSON. Salary, $4.16 a year ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes ; Mr. Wallace was a lighthouse keeper, and was appointed fishery officer and given this nominal sum to look after that part of the St. Lawrence at the Fiddler's Elbow. These are the gentlemen residing in my county who were all dismissed by the circular dated 1st January, and received by them between the 3rd and 6th of January. The hon. Minister has not said whether he intends to deal fairly with these men and pay them a quarter's salary. I want to ask the Minister of Customs, who is so expert at figures, what is the difference between employing this old blind man who has been referred to at $80 to patrol a river in Nova Scotia and the $25 which was paid by the former Government for the same service? And I would like to ask him if he thinks the salaries paid in my own county to these officers from $4.16 to $125 too much for efficient and faithful service. When they were dismissed they had already entered upon a quarter, and in any case, as they were employed by the year, they should have at least three months' notice.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the Minister to say that nets seized on Lake Erie are under the control of this Government. For the sake of information, I would like to ask who controls the size of mesh in nets used for fishing in that lake ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The Dominion Government controls that. All regulations respecting the time and methods of fishing and the engines to be used in fishing are controlled by the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. Minister is mistaken in regard to the way these accounts are kept. When he says that these tugs are charged to the fisheries protection service. A list of these vessels appears at K—92 of the Auditor General's Report. I find here the "Aberdeen," charged $26,050.31 ; the "Acadia," $18,355,-90 ; the "Constance," $16,826.45 ; the "Curlew," $9,864.01 ; the "Dolphin," $4,093.94 ; the "Kingfisher," $6,198.10 ; the "La Canadienne," $13,781.53 ; the "Osprey," $7,476.18 ; the "Petrel," $11,061.49 ; the "Stanley," $2,580.28 ; the "Victoria,"—and this is the one I shall particularly refer to—$4,544.91 ; the "Vigilant," $9.80. Then there is the fisheries intelligence bureau, $2,305.73, and general account, $7,209.42. Now, the "Victoria" is the only vessel that would at all answer the description of the vessel chartered for that purpose. That vessel was chartered at the rate of $300 a month, from Mr. Hood, of Shelburne, and $1,279 was paid. That is not the vessel the hon. gentleman had in mind. Then we take the general account and all these items, bringing us, I think, over the ordinary fisheries vote, which is $130,000. So, the hon. gentleman will see there does not appear to be one single item for a tug service. Surely the hon. Minister must be misinformed. The hon. gentleman told the committee that his idea was that these tugs had been charged to the fisheries protection service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I supposed so. These tugs were not employed until after the 15th of July, when the season expired. They were not employed in the year you spoke of.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, the hon. gentleman is not referring to the fiscal year expiring last July.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The tugs that were employed last summer would not be in these accounts at all. The only boat I know of that was charged here, in Prince Edward Island, was charged to the other account.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The question is, upon what vote are these tugs charged up? The Minister thought they were charged in the fishery protective service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are not charged to the other, as I say; but it does not matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a charge in Ontario for "tug hire, T. H. Elliott, Sault Ste. Marie".

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is for inland purposes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the Quebec items there is another charge for a tug. In Prince Edward Island you have tug hire there. The hon. gentleman has used up over $100,000 for fishery protection service. Can he state definitely what the system is?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The system is to pay it out of the fishery protection service, and I assume that was done last year; it is part of the fishery protection. It is charged out of the fishery protection money, and that is why I ask for an increase this year from $95,000 to $100,000. The memorandum says, that this addition of $5,000 is to cover the expenses of the extra boats required for the protection of the lobster fisheries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will it be irregular in future to charge these tugs that are employed to the ordinary fishery votes for the provinces?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it would be irregular. It could only be done in special circumstances. I do not think there are other tugs which are in the fishery votes. You have picked out Elliott. He may be going from one part of his district to another in a tugboat, and for that he would charge. He has an immense coast; he may go 100 miles. If he charters a tug for the purposes of protecting the fisheries, it might go to fisheries protection. You cannot divide it as finely as that.

Mr. BENNETT. Some time ago, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked a question relative to a sale of the steamer called the "Dolphin," which had been in the ownership of the Government, and the Minister stated that the sale had been made without tender, for $700. Can he inform us as to the circumstances under which the sale was made, and why public competition was not invited?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The boat was entirely useless. I did not expect to get rid of her at all. My officers said they could not sell her, and I offered her to the Ontario Government for $600. They sent a man to inspect her, and told me they would not take her at all. I then had an offer made by somebody in the locality, that they would give $700, and Captain Spain said: If you can get $700, close the bargain quicker than chain lightning, and I closed for it as quick as the telegraph could send a message back. I understood afterwards that the gentlemen who bought the boat, rued their bargain and tried to get out of it. I do not think my hon. friend, or anybody else, could say, that the boat was worth more than that. She had been offered in previous years for $500. She was originally a police boat in Quebec.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). It is quite evident that the Minister has been imposed upon by somebody in the sale of this boat. The boat is not at all of the class which he speaks of.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, all the officers of my department must have made false reports.

Mr. BENNETT. She was used on the Georgian Bay, where pretty high seas run, and carried a captain and crew of eight men.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We spent $2,000 in repairing her to enable her to go out last season.

Mr. BENNETT. That goes to prove that a gross sacrifice was being made, when so much money was being spent upon her. I know something of the dealings of the Ontario Government in that neighbourhood, and they will have forty friends who would be very anxious to rent tugs to the department. The Minister, in reply to the question on the 19th of April, gave this answer to the hon. member for East Grey. That there had been spent on this boat, in 1895-96, $414; in 1896-97, $346; in 1897-98, $335. That totalled about $1,100. I have looked in the Auditor General's Report of the preceding year, and find no less a sum than $857 was spent in repairs; in all, about $2,000 have been spent on this boat in repairs. The boat was a very fine boat. The hon. gentleman says, that one of his officers advised him to jump at the chance of selling her for $700. Well, his officer may be entitled to his judgment, but I think the boat could have been sold for twice that amount, had she been offered at public competition. I can tell the Minister that the man who purchased the boat had no use for her. He is not in the fishing business; he simply bought the boat as a speculation. There was a great deal of disgust around Owen Sound, as I have been informed, not only among Conservatives, but Liberals, that this Mr. Harrison, who is

well known, I have no doubt, by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) as a prominent Liberal, had been given this very decided snap on this valuable boat for $700. The hon. gentleman consented to the sale of that valuable boat for $700.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Thirty-eight years old.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. Minister that so much of the boat as was below the water line would be as good as the day it was placed in commission. I can tell him further, that $2,000 had been spent in repairs in the last three or four years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Spain and Captain McElhinney advised me to sell it; that it would be a good bargain for the department. The Deputy Minister also advised me to sell the thing.

Mr. BENNETT. The boat was sold to Mr. Harrison, a prominent Liberal in Owen Sound, who was very much mixed up in the by-elections there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had no idea what his politics were.

Mr. BENNETT. I think there must have been some pressing request made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody interfered in the matter at all. He wrote a letter. I submitted it to Captain Spain and Captain McElhinney, and they said it was more than the boat was worth. It is more than the Ontario government would give.

Mr. BENNETT. We can understand why the Ontario government would not buy the boat, because it was their policy to provide for their own friends there. No less than $2,000 had been spent on that boat four years before in repairs. She was a fit boat to ply from the Sault and over the waters of the Georgian Bay at the worst season of the year, in the fall, when the worst storms are to be expected. The Minister knew that she was a sea-worthy boat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had a prickling conscience for sending her out at all, because I had been warned, more than once, that we were running great risks in allowing that boat to go out in the Georgian Bay.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Minister had such qualms of conscience about having her employed in the public service where was his conscience when he sold here to an innocent purchaser?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I knew he would have to spend a great deal of money on repairs before he could make her sea-worthy.

Mr. BENNETT. This boat had been employed in the patrol service on the Georgian Bay and on the upper lakes. I know the boat well, and considering that $2,000 were spent on her in repairs it is nothing short of a scandal that she was sold to this man. I will accept the Minister's statement about the matter, but I believe he was imposed on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All the officers of my department must have been imposed on. They told me that if I was going to send her out this year I would have to spend a large amount of money on her in repairs.

Mr. BENNETT. What has become of all these repairs that cost $2,000 in three or four years before?

Mr. MORRISON. Can the hon. gentleman tell me what the dimensions of the boat are?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I think the boat was from 80 to 90 feet in length.

Mr. MORRISON. What tonnage?

Mr. BENNETT. I could not say as to the tonnage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think my hon. friend is wrong as to the length of her.

Mr. BENNETT. I think I am within the mark.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. She is perhaps not 90 feet, but she is more than 40 or 45 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. I have some idea of the value of tugs of this class. There is an idea on the Bay that this matter was not straight and above board. It was a matter of comment afterwards in the Owen Sound papers. When the Minister received an offer of $700 for that boat he knew that he was dealing with something tangible, something of value. He must have known that he had something to sell. If he had to place some buoys and the work did not cost more than $150 or $200 it would not be done without calling for tenders. I would like to ask the Minister if that is not the practice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a general rule tenders are called for.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister admits that if there were some buoys to be placed on the bay or the lake for which the expenditure would be $100 or $150, for the year, he is such a stickler for propriety and straightforward dealing that tenders must be called for, yet, when it comes to selling a vessel to a party friend for $700 he thinks no tenders should be called for. I know a great many pledges were made in Owen Sound, amongst others, to have a post office erected and dry dock built, and these pledges remain unfulfilled. Mr. Harrison, I am assured, was one

of the most prominent politicians in Owen Sound and one of the most deeply concerned in that famous by-election carried on there. He was in the foremost of the van. Although he was not in this business at all, and although he had no earthly use for this vessel but simply bought her as a matter of speculation and he had so much of a party pull with this Government that he could make an underhand offer to buy a boat for the sum of $700 which, if public tenders had been invited, or if she had been offered at auction would easily have brought $1,500.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman tell me whether, if a speculator has bought this boat, he has sold her and at what price ?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know whether Mr. Harrison has sold the boat or not, and I do not care. I do say that Harrison had no earthly business with the boat, and that he bought her simply as a speculation. The transaction casts some suspicion on the department which sold this boat at such a figure.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no suspicion at all. I offered here to Mr. Hardy. I asked him if he would take her, and he told me that he would go back and consult with his colleagues. Captain Spain and Captain McElhinney said that she was not worth $700, and I wrote and said that I would sell her for $600. They would not buy her at that. After that I got this offer of $100 more than I had offered her for, and I closed with it.

Mr. BENNETT. If this boat had deteriorated so much in price, how is it that the Minister said that in 1893 the department was offered $700 for her ? The Minister answering a question asked by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that in 1893 the boat was offered for sale for $700.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same sum we got for her in 1898.

Mr. BENNETT. And in the meantime $2,000 was expended on her in repairs. Have any other boats been sold by the department since the hon. gentleman became Minister ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I acquit the Minister of any complicity in wrong-doing, because I think he was imposed upon, but I submit that, if he calls for tenders for a buoy service at $50 a year, then, when he has a valuable craft to dispose of, with a man running after him offering him $700 for it, it is a business proposition that he should call for tenders for that. If he was offered say, $2,000 for a high-class vessel, like the "Bayfield," would he sell that vessel without tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the "Bayfield" is as old as the vessel that was sold.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She is a much better vessel. This vessel was offered by my predecessor for $700 ; it was then, on the advice of my nautical adviser, offered for $600, and then I got an offer of $700.

Mr. BENNETT. Since that offer of $700, $2,000 has been expended on her.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And six or seven years have elapsed.

Mr. BENNETT. The men on the shores of the Georgian Bay who are the best judges of the seaworthiness of that boat, were never afraid to venture out to sea on her in tempestuous weather, in the months of November and December. But, at the request of a party friend, the Minister sold that boat for $700, without asking for tenders. If the Minister is going to do that, he had better drop tenders altogether and give contracts to party friends who make the price in advance.

Mr. J. GILLIES (Richmond). Does the Minister remember dismissing an officer in my county named Lenoir ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Yes, the papers were brought down last year.

Mr. GILLIES. They were not brought down here, although I asked for them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were brought down in answer to a motion in the Senate.

Mr. GILLIES. I went to the Senate last year, and I could not get them, and I asked for them here, and could not get them either.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not my fault, for I brought them down.

Mr. GILLIES. I asked for the papers last year because I had reason to know that Mr. Lenoir had been improperly and unjustifiably dismissed. I knew him officially since the first day he was appointed, and that was before I came to Parliament at all, and I know that he did his duty well.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was not the official report.

Mr. GILLIES. The Minister has no official report reflecting on Mr. Lenoir, and the Minister admitted to me, last year, that he had no report from Mr. Bertram, the fishery inspector, against Mr. Lenoir. Mr. Lenoir

was under the jurisdiction of Mr. Bertram, and, if any report would come to the Minister, it would come from Mr. Bertram. But Mr. Bertram never reported adversely on Mr. Lenoir. Mr. Lenoir could only be dismissed officially on the official representation of Mr. Bertram, but the latter never reported against him. Will the Minister bring down these papers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I delivered them last year, in answer to Mr. Miller's motion in the Senate, but I will have them copied again.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Bertram is an excellent officer, and he would at once report if Mr. Lenoir, were incompetent ; but he did not do so, and so I want to know why this gentleman was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are very few papers about it, and I will have them copied and brought down. He is one of the officers reported by Commissioner Prince as not being a good officer.

Mr. GILLIES. Professor Prince could not so report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the use of saying that, when I tell the hon. gentleman he did? When you get the report, you will be in a position to discuss it.

Mr. GILLIES. I am in a position to discuss it now, because there is no report, and the hon. gentleman knows it. The Minister knows as well as I do that there is no report from Mr. Bertram complaining of the efficiency of Mr. Lenoir.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say there was.

Mr. GILLIES. How can Prof. Prince report to the Minister unless he has a compiaint from the overseer of the district, Mr. Bertram ? The Minister will search in vain for a report from any of the officers of his department complaining of the inefficiency of Mr. Lenoir. If the Minister will bring down these papers to-morrow, I will quit that part of my complaint just now. There is something else in this connection which I would like the Minister to explain. In looking over into the Auditor General's Report for this year, I find that D. R. Boyle, who was appointed in place of Mr. Lenoir as fishery overseer for the district of Isle Madame, was paid last year $336.12, whereas Mr. Lenoir was paid, in 1895-96, $125 of salary and $69.25 for travelling expenses, or a total of $194.25 ; and the year before the amount paid was just about the same. I find that Mr. Boyle was paid last year $213.12 for travelling expense. He was also paid $23 for rent of rooms for paying bounty claims, while Mr. Lenoir, during the whole currency of the time he was in office, was never paid a cent for such things. There was an increase to that one person alone of $141.87 in one year. I want the Minister to tell me—and I am entitled to the information, because this is in my constituency—what is the cause of this difference in payment for exactly the same work for travelling over precisely the same territory.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has put the question and given the answer himself. These fishery officers are paid just the same salary, and they are paid so much for travelling expenses. Rightly or wrongly, Mr. Lenoir was reported to me as not being an efficient officer. This new man travelled more, he swore to his bill, he had it audited, and got it paid in the usual way. How can I go round and test for myself whether all these fishery officers did the travelling for which they charge ? Does the hon. gentleman say that he did not do the travelling ?

Mr. GILLIES. It strikes me as very peculiar that one officer should be paid so much more for travelling over precisely the same territory.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One did it efficiently, I suppose, and the other did it inefficiently.

Mr. GILLIES. Does the Minister undertake to say that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know anything about it. By your own reading one travelled more than the other.

Mr. GILLIES. The Minister should immediately have inquired into the cause of this great increase in one year. The same question applies in the adjoining district the district from St. Peter's Canal down to the eastern end of the county, over which Mr. Brymer presides. His predecessor was Mr. Murchison, who died before the late Government went out, and before his successor was appointed. I find that Mr. Murchison's salary was $125 and his travelling expenses $113, whereas his successor was paid $125 of salary and $205.96 for travelling expenses as well as $14.50 for rent, for which his predecessor was not paid a farthing. That is, Brymer was paid $106.50 a year more than his predecessor, Murchison, for doing exactly the same work and travelling over the same territory. This is an extraordinary way to practise economy. When these charges come in, the Minister should have some system of investigating them and satisfying himself that the work was actually done, and he should require some very satisfactory explanation to show why the travelling expenses so greatly increased.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the department issues instructions to the different overseers as to how much they should charge the department for horse-hire, horse

feed, meals and all that sort of thing. I would like to ask the Minister if the same system of rates applies to overseers all over the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know of no difference.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely the department issues a circular to these overseers informing them the rates they should charge the department, and that circular goes to every overseer in the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT. A few years ago while the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a case which largely concerned the interests of the fishermen in the Georgian Bay came before his notice. I refer to what was known as the Noble Bros. case. It attracted a great deal of attention among the fishermen on the lakes, as well as in the public press, and it was made the occasion of an attack on the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this House. Noble Bros. were a very influential firm, and they were very prominent Liberals in the district of Algoma. The then Minister justified the course he had taken, I understood, on the ground that the inspector, Mr. Elliott, had justified to the Minister his action in making the seizures. The seizures were rather serious, involving a considerable number of sailing craft, and some two or three tugs. This matter of the Noble Brothers caused so much agitation, not only in this House, but in the press, that the Minister—I will not say in dedeference to the comments made, but more probably in a spirit of fair play to the firm of Noble Bros.—caused an investigation to be had, before which Mr. B. B. Osler appeared for the firm ; and I think the report was of such a nature that the Minister felt justified in doing what he had done. After that there was a change, the hon. member for Victoria N. B. (Mr. Costigan) succeeding the previous Minister. Mr. Costigan, while not admitting that the department had been in the wrong, took a bond, and the boats were delivered over to Messrs. Noble Bros. I wish to learn first, whether any action has been taken by the hon. Minister since he has been in charge ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing has been done at all, and the matter remains just as it was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let us vote all this except one item, it being understood that on that one item we shall be at liberty to discuss all the others.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the Minister arrived at any decision with regard to Noble Bros. ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. GILLIES. I wish to bring to the Minister's notice the fact that on the 19th of this month I drew his attention to the order for some papers in connection with the dismissal of a lighthouse keeper at Point Jerome.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are being copied.

Mr. GILLIES. They are very short and should have been here by this. I asked for them twelve days ago, and they were promised for last Thursday. Will the hon. gentleman touch up his officer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will touch him up.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. Minister charge his memory with respect to the legal expenses in connection with item 208 ?

The committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. TAYLOR. When may I expect the papers with reference to the dismissal of Mr. Lake, postmaster at Morton ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will make inquiry and tell the hon. gentleman during the sitting to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What will be the Government business to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Grand Trunk and Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 1st June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MANITOBA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved :

That the papers covered by the return to an order of this House dated 30th March, 1898, for copies of all correspondence, &c., in connection with the question arising out of the Dominion elections, 1896, in the province of Manitoba, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

He said: I will say in regard to this, that the return is very meagre; and I would ask the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the subject of a further or supplementary return in this connection, because there are no papers in this return relating to anything else than some observations connected with the taxation. The Orders in Council, for instance, are not included, nor are the letters that have been produced from official sources in the Public Accounts Committee, that is, correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The evidence that was reported last session shows that there was considerable correspondence on this subject. This return begins and ends with a few memoranda in regard to taxation.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that a good many of these papers are already before the Public Accounts Committee. Is that the case?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some were, but the evidence there refers to further correspondence, and also Orders in Council.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have since learned that a good many of these papers are with the Auditor General at this moment. I will inquire about it.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 135) to amend the Militia Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I did not propose, Mr. Speaker, on the introduction of the Bill to go thoroughly into the subject, more especially as I now await papers passed by the House and to be brought down from the department, which I have no doubt will be down in a day or two, perhaps to-day. Until these are in my possession I am hardly in a position to explain the Bill as well as I could on the second reading. It is a very simple Bill, very short, and yet it contains a great deal. It provides for the amendment of the 4th section of the Militia Act, as there is some doubt about the relative position of the Minister and the General. I propose to set that at rest. The second section asks to relieve the disability of one of our own people, commanding our own forces, paid by our own people, and manned by our own people. If this will satisfy my hon. friends, I would ask the privilege, on the second reading of the Bill, to go into full particulars and give my views on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

DISMISSAL OF PREVENTIVE OFFICER CURLESS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has Mr. Charles H. Curless, chief preventive officer of inland revenue and special preventive officer of customs at Grand Falls, N.B., been dismissed?
2. If dismissed, for what cause, on whose report and by whom was his dismissal recommended?
3. Was there an investigation held?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. In so far as Mr. Curless is connected with the Inland Revenue Department his services have been dispensed with. 2. He was not performing any duties and the department did not consider his services necessary. 3. There was no investigation held, because from the records of the department it was apparent that he was doing no work to entitle him to a salary.

DISMISSAL OF STATION AGENT ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AT TRACADIE.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked:

1. When was Mr. Frank A. Gillis, formerly station agent on the Intercolonial Railway at Tracadie, N.S., removed from that station?
2. By whom was such removal recommended, and on what ground was it made?
3. Who was appointed to succeed Mr. Gillis as station agent at Tracadie?
4. By whom was Mr. Gillis's successor recommended, and has he since been dismissed from the service?
5. If dismissed, what was the cause of his dismissal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. Frank A. Gillis was transferred from Tracadie station to Denmark station on the 16th March, 1898. 2. His transfer was made on responsibility of department. 3. Daniel R. McDonnell was appointed to succeed Gillis as station agent at Tracadie. 4. McDonnell was appointed in the usual manner. He has since been dismissed from the service. 5. He was dismissed because he was short in his cash.

BUOY SERVICE IN ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. When did the contract of John McCarthy, of Annapolis Royal, for maintaining the buoy service in the Annapolis and Digby basin, expire?
2. Did said McCarthy do any work in taking care of said bucys after his contract expired?
3. Has he been paid for said work? If not, why not?
4. Were tenders asked for this service during the present year, and when?
5. Who tendered and what was the amount of each tender?

6. Who has the contract now, and for how long and how much ?
7. Are the duties and work to be done under the present contract the same as required by said McCarthy's contract ?
8. What is the difference, if any, except the amount and name of the contractor ?
9. When were the said buoys first placed in position by the present contractor ?
10. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries been notified that any of the said buoys are not in proper position ? If so, what buoys ?
11. Has the said department been notified that the Black Point can buoy in said basin is missing altogether ?
12. If lost, who makes good the loss ?
13. Who are the bondsmen of the present contractor ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. 25th of January, 1899. 2. The department is not aware that Mr. McCarthy did any work in taking care of the buoys after his contract terminated. 3. No. No report was received from the harbour master that any work was done. 4. Yes. A post bill inviting tenders was issued 3rd March, 1899, inviting tenders up to 1st April, 1899. 5. Thelbert Rice, $185 per annum ; Willard H. Anderson, $295 per annum ; W. W. Hayden, $295 per annum ; John McCarthy, $300 per annum ; John W. Snow, $300 per annum ; Daniel Parker, $455 per annum. 6. Thelbert Rice for three years, at $185 per annum. 7. Yes. 8. No difference in contract. 9. The exact date was not reported, but the buoys were handed over to the new contractor about the 20th April. Owing to the bad condition in which the former contractor left them, the new contractor was compelled to supply new chains and moorings at his own expense, which delayed the placing of the buoys in position. 10. One buoy lost. 11. Yes. Black Point buoy was a wooden-can buoy, very much worm-eaten, and it is supposed was sunk. 12. The contractor, if the department decides to replace it by the same kind of buoy. If an iron buoy is used, the department will supply the buoy, the contractor the moorings. A temporary buoy has been placed in the meantime. 13. W. W. Wade, merchant, Bear River ; Edward E. Rice, broker, Bear River.

C. P. R. SPECIAL MILEAGE TARIFF ON HAY, STRAW AND GRAIN.

Mr. MACLEAN (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

Has the special mileage tariff on hay, straw and grain, B. No. 307, at present in force on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, been approved of by the Governor in Council and published in the "Canada Gazette," as required by section 227 of the Railway Act ? If so, in what number of the "Gazette" has said tariff been published ? If not, is it the intention of the Government to require the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to comply with said section as regards said tariff ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The special mileage tariff on hay, straw and grain, B. No. 307 of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has not been approved by the Governor in Council. It is only the maximum rates that are approved by the Governor in Council, based on approved classification.

NEW FISH HATCHERIES ON THE FRASER AND SKEENA RIVERS.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is it the intention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of erecting new fish hatcheries on the Fraser and Skeena Rivers ?
2. If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Until the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, I cannot give the information asked for.

FORESHORE AND TIDAL LANDS BELOW STEVESTON, B.C.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Under whose control (Federal Government or local) are the 37·29 acres of foreshore and tidal lands situated west of and immediately adjoining section 9, range 7 west, block 3 north, N.W.D., about two miles below Steveston, B.C. ?
2. Was an application made to the Department of the Interior, or to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in 1892, for a lease of these lands, and if so, to which department was the application made ?
3. Was application to either department, as aforesaid, made in 1896, and if so, to which and by whom ?
4. Were other applications subsequently made, and if so, by whom ?
5. If applications were made in any of the above years to either of said departments, what was the reply ?
6. If any communication to any one has been made by either of the above departments on this subject, what is the purport of the last ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The lands being situate in the public harbour of New Westminster, are now under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. New Westminster was established under the Harbour Masters Act, by Order in Council of the 23rd January, 1892. 3. Applications were made to the Department of the Interior in 1892, for the lease of these lands by W. H. Squair, 14th October, 1892. 3. On the 23rd May, 1896, an application was made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by Bell Irving & Co.—Anglo-British Packing Company—for the grant of the land referred to, and this application was referred to the Department of the Interior. 4. Yes, an application to the Department of the Interior by W. H. Steves, on the 16th June, 1897. On the 13th May, 1899, an application was received from H. Bell Irving & Co., for the Anglo-British Packing Com-

pany, referring to an application made to the Department of the Interior in 1892 and in 1896, and stating that the provincial government had granted a lease of the land to Mr. Frank Burnett, and protesting against such grant. We know nothing of said lease being granted. 5. The papers in regard to several applications were transferred on the 25th and 31st ultimo, from the Department of the Interior to this department and no action has been taken in regard to any of them. It would appear, however, that the Department of the Interior recommended to Council a grant of the land in question to Mr. Thomas Watts on the 5th May, 1896, but as Mr. Watts had not complied with the terms of the purchase, the sale was not made. 6. On the 3rd May, 1899, Mr. Bell Irving was informed by the Deputy Minister of the Interior that the papers relating to his and other claims for foreshore on Lulu Island had been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. No action has been taken by this department as yet in regard to Mr. Bell Irving's claim or that of any other.

POSTMASTER OF LEVIS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Has P. A. Bourget, postmaster of Lévis, been granted an increase of $50 in his salary?
2. If so, was the said increase based on a report on the revenue from his office?
3. What is the amount of revenue on which the said increase was based?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. P. A. Bourget is not postmaster of Lévis, nor has any increase of salary been granted to the postmaster of Lévis. There is an A. Bourget, postmaster of Lauzon in the county of Lévis, but his salary has not been increased.

POSTMASTER OF METABETCHOUAN.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Was Jean alias Johnny Gauthier, the present postmaster of Metabetchouan (St. Jérôme, in the county of Chicoutimi), postmaster of the same place in 1893, or at any time?
2. Was he dismissed, and if so, for what reasons?
3. Was there an inquiry which resulted unfavourably to him, and why?
4. Was his dismissal based on political reasons, or for shortcomings in the discharge of his duties?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes; Mr. Jean Gauthier was postmaster of Metabetchouan from March, 1890, to January, 1894. 2. Mr. Gauthier was removed from the postmastership of Metabetchouan on the ground of negligence in the performance of his duties. 3. The inspector reported that the postmaster did not give proper attention to the duties of his office. 4. The records of the department indicate that the postmaster was removed for the reasons above stated.

PROSECUTION OF P. C. DUPUIS, OF CHAMBORD.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Has P. C. Dupuis, of Chambord, in the county of Chicoutimi, been prosecuted, since 1896, for selling liquor to Indians?
2. If so, what fine was he condemned to pay?
3. Did the Government grant a remission or suspend the payment thereof, and at whose request?
4. Did the said Dupuis finally pay up; and if so, what amount as fine and what amount as costs?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. $75 and $11.10 costs. 3. Representations were made by the member for the district in favour of Mr. Dupuis; action was stayed to admit of my going into the matter, and, after giving it consideration, I directed that in so far as the Department of Indian Affairs was concerned the law should be allowed to take its course. And the local agent was so instructed. 4. Yes; $75 fine and $11.10 costs.

DR. FLUHMAN, PHYSICIAN TO INDIANS OF POINTE BLEUE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Whether Dr. Fluhman, of Roberval, was in the service of the Government before June, 1896, as physician to the Indians of Pointe Bleue?
2. If so, did he resign in favour of Dr. Constantin, or was he dismissed?
3. In the latter case, for what reasons, and on whose recommendation?
4. Were petitions presented to the Government asking for the said dismissal?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. He did not resign, nor has he been dismissed. 3. Answered by No. 2. 4. No.

ROBERVAL DREDGE—CONTRACT FOR LUMBER.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Whether the timber for building barges to accompany the Roberval dredge was prepared by day's work or by contract?
2. If by contract, were tenders invited?
3. What prices, per running foot or otherwise, were paid for the said timber, and how much for the whole?
4. Who secured the contract, and on whose recommendation?
5. What sums have been paid to one W. Donahue, of Roberval, in connection with the preparation of the said timber?
6. Is the Government aware that Donahue contracted for the said timber at 10 cents per foot, with one Larouche, of Kenogami, and that the contract has been cancelled because the said Larouche is a Conservative?
7. Was the Government consulted in the matter, and if so, was it on this suggestion that the Larouche contract was set aside?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. By contract. 2. Yes. 3. $20 per thousand feet, B.M.—$920.06. 4. Mr.

Donahue. 5. None yet. 6. No. The Government is not aware that any contract for timber has been awarded at 10 cents per foot by Mr. Donahue. The department has been informed that the timber supplied by Donahue has been condemned, because it was not suitable, and not because Larouche is a Conservative, as there is good reason to believe that there are no more Conservatives in sympathy with the Opposition in the district of Saguenay. 7. The Government was not consulted, the resident engineer using his own discretion.

RIVIERE LA PIPE WHARF—COUNTY OF CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Whether one Gédéon Boivin furnished stone for the construction of the wharf at Rivière La Pipe, in the county of Chicoutimi, and if so, to what amount ?
2. Is the Government aware that the said Boivin had hauled stone to the value of $75 or thereabouts, and that the wharf superintendent, Pednault, has refused to allow him more than the small amount which was paid him ?
3. Is the Government aware that this has been done under pretext that the said Boivin is a Conservative ?
4. Would the Government be disposed to help the said Boivin in investigating this matter, and to pay him the amount to which he is really entitled ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The name of Gédéon Boivin does not appear on any of the accounts yet transmitted to the department for this work.

REPORT.

Report of the Canadian Archives.—(Mr. Fisher.)

DOMINION LAND SURVEYORS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I trust I may be permitted to take a moment's time to make an appeal to the Minister of the Interior in regard to a case of hardship in connection with a candidate at a recent examination for Dominion Land Surveyors. This gentleman has written me a letter, which I will hand over to the Minister, or read it, whichever he desires. This candidate was a witness in a suit in which I was engaged, and we subpœnaed him as a witness at the time he was intending to go up for an examination that was held at Victoria in the month of February. As he desired to go to the examination, he intimated that he could not attend the court, and an application was made for a bench warrant, and his attendance was secured, much to his own disadvantage. He now writes the letter, in which he makes an appeal to have his papers examined. He afterwards got back in time to go through the examination, and, supposing that there would be a result with the other papers by this time, he made certain contracts for surveys, one in connection with lands in the railway belt ; but he now finds that there is a possibility that his papers may not be passed upon until the regular meeting of the board, some time in August. That would cause serious loss to this man, as he explains, and perhaps the Minister of the Interior will give this matter his immediate consideration, if I send the letter across the House, instead of reading it. This gentleman states the facts in the letter, and I can personally vouch for them, so far as they relate to the reason why he did not attend on the first day of the examination.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Very well.

JUDGE MAGUIRE.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the question asked by the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I beg to say, that Judge Maguire arrived at Dawson on the 26th February, 1898, and left there on the 16th of August, 1898.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution declaring it expedient to confirm a certain leasing agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and Her Majesty, in the interest of Canada, for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Chairman, the committee will remember, at least those who were present when I presented my statement in connection with the Drummond County Railway will remember, that I almost entirely, if not quite, abstained from making any reference whatever to the Grand Trunk branch of the Montreal extension arrangement. I did so because I felt that, while the general policy of the extension to Montreal would necessarily embrace the consideration of this question, it did not appear at all necessary that I should confuse them in the minds of the committee, since it became necessary that they should be dealt with separately by the House. I did, however, make what might perhaps be called one digression, for I referred at that time to a contract that had been entered into between the Railway Department of the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I did so because I was of the opinion that that matter was germane to the whole sub-

ject of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, because I thought there was a misapprehension in the minds of members of Parliament and in the country at large with respect to the exact terms of that agreement, and because I felt—and it was the opinion of the officers and managers of the railway—that the Intercolonial had been, in a measure, at all events, handicapped in its operation by virtue of that contract. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), when he addressed the committee, seemed to consider that he was called upon to challenge the accuracy of the statement which I made in that connection. He seemed to think that he was sufficiently informed upon the subject to deny practically what I said, and in fact to put before the House a distinct challenge of my statement. Lest there should be any impression upon the minds of hon. members by reason of my hon. friend having been for many years head of the Railway Department of the Government, that he had some knowledge of the subject whereon he spoke, and that, therefore, I must have necessarily been in error, I shall occupy a few moments of the time of the committee in putting this question before it again, and in showing that my hon. friend was not well advised when he undertook to challenge the statement I made, I think, that he might as well have assumed that I would not have been likely to make a statement to Parliament so clearly and explicitly as I had done unless I knew something of the subject with which I was dealing. My hon. friend did not scruple to deny in toto what I said in that connection. He said there was no such contract in the terms I alleged. He said the Intercolonial Railway was not hampered or handicapped in any respect, because there was no agreement of neutrality, as between the Government on the one hand and the company on the other, which would have restrained in the remotest degree the freest action of the department in respect to the user of its own line for the carriage of its traffic. I stated that not only was that the fact, but that the department had acted on the interpretation which I had given to the contract, the only interpretation of which it was susceptible, and that the hon. gentleman himself had given instructions to his officers requiring them to see that this neutrality clause in the contract was faithfully observed by the agents and employees of the Government. On the challenge of the hon. gentleman, I fortified that by the statement that my chief engineer had informed me that such was the case, and that by the direction of the Minister he had so instructed the general manager of the railway. My hon. friend leaves me no alternative but to prove my position. I do not say that at this stage it is distinctly germane to the question before us; but the hon. gentleman has chosen to put his knowledge, his experience, his acquaintance with the workings of the department during the years that he was in it, against the statements I made; and I do not think he can complain, nor will the committee deem it amiss, if I devote a few minutes to proving what is capable of the clearest and amplest demonstration, that the hon. gentleman was not really aware, or if he was he has actually forgotten, what took place in his own department in this connection. Let us see what the contract says:

> If the Government or any railway competing with the Canadian Pacific via Point Lévis or Chaudière Junction shall likewise establish such agencies at the same points, the conditions as to neutrality shall be observed by the station agents, local ticket and freight agents of the Intercolonial Railway at such stations.

That is the concluding portion of the 19th clause of the contract, and follows the general clause under which the Government bound itself that it would require of its officers the observance of the strictest neutrality between the Grand Trunk Railway, which took up our traffic at Lévis, and our own railway, which carried it to Lévis, on the one hand, and the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John, on the other. I maintain, as was judged by the officers of the department, by the Department of Justice and by the hon. gentleman himself, as I shall show, that there is only one interpretation of which this section is susceptible, that is, that as between the Government railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as related to the carriage of its freight by the long haul and its delivery at Lévis, the officers and agents of the Government were not to be free to send business along the Intercolonial, but were to submit to the keen competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway as against the Intercolonial system. To show that there can be no question in the mind of any lawyer as to what that means, I will show you how it was interpreted in the department. I made a statement the other day, with regard to what my deputy stated to me of the conduct of the department on the subject, and I will read a memorandum which the chief engineer has placed in my hands, with permission to read it to the committee. It is to the following effect:

MEMO. FOR MINISTER

> In reply to your inquiry, as to whether, or not, instructions were issued, in accordance with the terms of the traffic agreement, dated 1st July, 1890, between Her Majesty and the Canadian Pacific Railway for traffic on the line of the Interlonial Railway east of St. John (as described in said document), for the station agents or local ticket and freight agents at stations to be strictly neutral as between the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John, N.B., and the other lines competing with it, I may say I personally directed the chief superintendent, now the general manager of the Canadian Government Railways, on many occasions (as complaints were from time to time received from the Canadian Pacific Railway officers) to instruct the station agents, local ticket and freight agents to be strictly neutral, and that if he found them disregarding these orders to dismiss them, and to inform them that if they failed to so act they would be dismissed, and he, over and over again, reported to me he had

done so, and that he believed they were acting up to the instructions.

C. SCHREIBER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me, because it is very important that this should be clearly understood. I did not catch, in anything the hon. gentleman has read as to the agreement, anything that affects the Intercolonial Railway. As I understood it, the clause as read—I may have misunderstood it—states that employees must observe actual neutrality between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway or any other lines of railway competing with each other. I do not see anything in that to prevent the officers of the Intercolonial Railway doing anything they could for Intercolonial Railway traffic; but they were to observe absolute neutrality as between other competing companies, which appears to me to be all right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to give the hon. gentleman credit for not understanding the agreement as I put it to the committee; but he will pardon me for saying that none are so blind as those who will not see.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. I have every desire to see, and I shall be only too glad if he will point out the clause in the contract which states that the Intercolonial agents are precluded from taking anything they can procure in the way of traffic for their own railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If, to use the homely phrase, my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience, I will afford him the completest and amplest testimony of the truth of what I state. I see the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) smiling, as much as to say, that that does not establish anything. I will give my hon. friend, before I get through, so much proof, that I think he will not venture to affirm in this House that the statement I am now presenting to the committee admits of a shadow of doubt. I have gone over a portion of this contract, and since the hon. leader of the Opposition does not understand the effect, I shall endeavour to make it clear. The 17th clause of the agreement is as follows:—

The traffic affected by this agreement shall be handled by the Government without discrimination or preference, and the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway engaged in the conduct of this traffic shall be given facilities equal to those accorded to the agents of the other companies doing business on this line.

Clause 18th, gives the basis of the neutrality arrangement:

The Minister of Railways and Canals shall use every endeavour to cause the station agents or local ticket and freight agents at stations on the line of the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John, excepting St. John, except as hereinafter provided, to be strictly neutral as between the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John, N.B., and other lines competing with it, and to way-bill freight and sell tickets by such of these routes as may be indicated by shippers or passengers.

My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) is hanging his contention on the mere shade of a shadow, the use of the words "other lines competing with it." What are the other lines competing with it—with the Canadian Pacific Railway, mark you, not the Intercolonial Railway. What is the other line competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway from St. John east? Why, the Intercolonial Railway itself all the way to Lévis. It amazes me. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that the Intercolonial Railway had no interest in carrying all the traffic which originated upon the territory drained by the Intercolonial Railway to Lévis rather than deliver it at St. John? Was there no interest that they should get within 130 miles of Montreal, or 160 miles, as it might be, rather than 500? And when, on the running of passenger and freight trains to this point, at least so far as passengers were concerned, we could carry every passenger that would offer without adding to the cost of operating the road, will any one pretend that it was not of vital interest to the Intercolonial Railway to carry all the passengers and traffic it could secure which originate in its own territory? Was it not of interest that the Intercolonial Railway or the country should get the benefit of this traffic? I will show that the interpretation is not mine simply, but the interpretation of the hon. gentleman himself. Is he going to tell me that he was a perfect nonentity in his department and did not know what his officers were doing? Is it to be assumed that my hon. friend was a nonentity—I believe he was far from being that—though I do not believe he took very much interest in the Intercolonial Railway or cared very much about it, except in so far as the final results might not be any more unfavourable than possible. I am told that when he travelled over the Intercolonial Railway, which he did twice, on a tour of inspection, he went at the rate of 60 miles an hour, and when some one remonstrated with him, and said: "That is not the way to go over the Intercolonial Railway and see the people and inquire into their difficulties," he replied that he had been strongly advised by Mr. Shaughnessy that that was the proper way to inspect a railway. This, of course, is only what I have been told.

An hon. MEMBER. By a reporter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But lest it should appear that my hon. friend was simply a wooden head in this whole connection and did not give directions, you may take the statement of Mr. Schreiber, who has written this addition to the memo. I have been reading from: "I will add that in doing so I was acting under instructions from the Minister of Railways and Canals."

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman would read the orders, it would be more convenient than giving the certificate of the deputy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend will not be so impatient, I am going to do him ample justice. I am not going to conceal any evidence, but to give him all the circulars and documents that bear on the question, so far as I am able to find them.

Mr. FOSTER. What subject is my hon. friend debating now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is one subject that I could very properly debate and enlarge upon with a great deal of advantage to my hon. friend, and that is the impertinent interruptions which the hon. member is so fond of making.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend has chosen to denominate the interruption an impertinent one, I call your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that we have moved into committee to discuss an agreement made between this Government on behalf of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and my hon. friend seems to have been devoting his time, so far, to carrying on an old debate in which the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway of many years ago and the Intercolonial Railway was the subject. It seems to me, therefore, that it is not impertinent but very pertinent to ask if the hon. gentleman is speaking to the question before the committee or not.

Mr. HAGGART. Let him go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not give my hon. friend credit for putting the question seriously.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know whether my hon. friend thinks still it was an impertinent interruption.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I rise to a point of order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say it in any offensive sense, but because my hon. friend smiled when he put the question, it seemed to me his intention was rather to throw me off, but if not, I will withdraw the imputation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand by the discussion, that the hon. Minister is giving an illustration of the clauses of the contract between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend has called for circulars. Well, I will give him circulars. I will give him a circular of the 5th January, 1891, No. 373, and a copy of which I think has already been furnished, and if not, can be furnished to my hon. friend. This emanates from the general freight office at Moncton :

To Agents :

The attention of agents is called to the last clause in Circular No. 226.

The notice then goes on to say :

It is desirable, as far as practicable, to get shippers to specify the route by which the goods are to be forwarded. More particularly does this apply on shipments to common points reached by the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway, and when no route is given to competing points——

That is to say, when the shipper does not indicate the particular route he wants the goods to go by.

——the traffic must be equally divided between the two companies, as the Intercolonial Railway desires to deal equitably.

No discrimination must be made under any circumstances. I say that is distinctly against the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, because you are dividing a portion of the business which would probably be yours, particularly when the goods were not routed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. To divide those shipments between the two seems to me an extraordinary course and to be putting a prejudicial interpretation upon the contract even worse than the interpretation put upon it by the department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I still call my hon. friend's (Mr. Blair's) attention to one point, if he will allow me. I am most anxious to understand this matter clearly, and also that the House should understand it. the very terms he has used, as to the care that officials must take, show that they were enjoined to neutrality, not as between the Intercolonial Railway, or the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, but as between the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk. I do not find a word in what the hon. gentleman has stated contrary to that idea. I shall be very glad to have a copy of the contract, so that I may go over it, which I have not yet had an opportunity to do. I am anxious to understand the matter, but I do not see in what the hon. gentleman has stated anything affecting the officials and the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway otherwise than as preserving neutrality between the two great companies that were using the line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) surely will see that the fact of establishing such a neutrality, of enjoining such discrimination, or want of discrimination, whichever you call it, meant to paralyse

more than half the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway. It is true, that the name of the Grand Trunk is mentioned, but that is the way that the Canadian Pacific Railway itself would put it. They would say: If you haul goods over your line to Lévis, you necessarily deliver them to the Grand Trunk, which is a rival of ours, and so you are discriminating against us. You ought to deliver an equal share to us at St. John. But, by doing so, your haul over the Intercolonial Railway was 250 miles, instead of 800 miles or more. The Intercolonial Railway did not extend beyond Lévis. But that was no destination, either for passengers or freight, and the only connection it had at the time was the Grand Trunk. So, if we hauled goods over our own line, we necessarily delivered them to another railway, and that railway the Grand Trunk. So, it was practically and necessarily a discrimination against our own railway, when half of the goods that were not routed—and you can imagine that great proportion of them would be routed by the Canadian Pacific Railway—must be carried over the short haul and delivered to the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John, and not taken the long haul and delivered to the Grand Trunk at Lévis.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the date of that circular?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is dated 5th January, 1891.

Mr. GIBSON. Who signed it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. George Taylor, general freight agent, and it is issued from the general freight office.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was the Minister then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say who was Minister then. I presume it was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), or Sir Mackenzie Bowell), who was acting Minister for a time. I now refer to circular 331, addressed to station-masters and ticket agents at stations on the Intercolonial Railway from Cold Brook to Moncton and all stations east of Moncton. Cold Brook is the nearest station to St. John. Clause 2 of this circular says: "You are to be strictly neutral as between the two routes." What are the two routes? The first clause will show you, which is as follows:—"Fares shall be at all times the same via St. John and via Lévis." How could anything be more explicit than that? It means: You are not to interest yourself; you are not to canvass; you are not to try to get business via Lévis, though it is ever so much more profitable to your own road. You are to live up to your agreement, one clause of which bound you to the strictest neutrality between the Grand Trunk on the one side and the Canadian Pacific on the other. We come now to the 1st June, 1892—circular No. 442. Now, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) stated, the other day, that there was a contention made by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they were entitled to the strictest neutrality over the Intercolonial Railway line, but that contention was referred to the Department of Justice, and Sir John Thompson expressed an opinion against the Canadian Pacific. My hon. friend will not deny that I am correct in stating his contention. But he is quite mistaken in this, as he was in the other. What did occur is this: After the contract was made between the Canadian Pacific and the Intercolonial, the Cape Breton line was completed, and, I think, perhaps the Oxford branch was completed, but I am not sure about that. At all events, the contention of the Canadian Pacific Railway people was, as shown by their letters, which were legion, that this traffic agreement of neutrality strictly bound the Intercolonial Railway, not only as to the main line, not only as to the lines constructed when the agreement was made, but as to all subsequently acquired lines. They contended that the Intercolonial Railway was bound as to the Cape Breton and Oxford branches, and even including the Prince Edward Island Railway, which is no part, really, of the Intercolonial Railway. That question was referred to the Department of Justice, and upon that question the Department of Justice expressed the opinion that the compact of neutrality was strictly confined to the main line and its connections prior to this time.

Mr. HAGGART. I went further, if the hon. gentleman will excuse me. I was aware the contract did not apply to these lines; but what I was speaking of was an opinion of Sir John Thompson as to the main agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) certainly stated, if I understood him—and I think he admitted that I stated it correctly—that Sir John Thompson's opinion was, that the contract of neutrality was not susceptible of the interpretation I put upon it, binding our employees against canvassing for business over the line to Lévis.

Mr. HAGGART. Those are nearly the words I used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to show the hon. gentleman was in error in that, entirely in error. Sir John Thompson's opinion never covered that question; it only covered the limited question I have put as to whether the contract did apply to the lines of the Intercolonial subsequently acquired or put into operation

Mr. HAGGART. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I

knew there was an opinion of that kind in reference to the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton lines. I am talking now about another opinion, as to what our duties were under the contract in reference to canvassing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What did the hon. gentleman say the opinion was ?

Mr. HAGGART. It was, that it did not prevent the employees of the Intercolonial Railway looking after the business for the long haul of our road, that is, to Lévis.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only tell my hon. friend that, after the most careful inquiries in the department, no such opinion has been produced. Nor has it been stated to me that there is such an opinion. I feel confident that no such opinion has ever been given. The only opinion given is the one I have stated already. And it seems impossible that the opinion the hon. gentleman speaks of could have been given, because, if it had been given, if the Department of Railways and Canals had Sir John Thompson's opinion that the contract did not restrict the freedom of action of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, as far as the canvassing for business to Lévis was concerned, upon what pretext could the gentlemen who were administering the Department of Railways and Canals for all these years permit the officers to be subjected to this control ? And what, then, is the explanation of these circulars ? Down until the date that the contract expired, after the expiry of the notice, the officials and employees of the Intercolonial Railway held themselves compelled, in obedience to the terms of that contract, not to canvass for business, and they had no alternative, as I take it, but to carry it out clearly in its terms. Now, I was going to refer to the circular, No. 442, which issued on the 1st of June, 1892, issued, as I understand it, in consequence of the opinion which was given by Sir John Thompson, who, I presume, was then Minister of Justice. Mark you, this is to the ticket agents, and is headed :

Oxford to Brown's Point, and east of New Glasgow to Sydney and North Sydney, inclusive, and all the Intercolonial Railway outside ticket agents.

As to all the inside ticket agents, this circular did not apply.

Agents at stations on the sections of the line above named, and all the outside ticket agents of this railway must clearly understand that they are expected to use their best endeavours to induce business via Montreal and all western points in Canada and the United States to go by our main line, or leave this route.

Now, to whom was this notice directed ? Not to the agents all over the Intercolonial Railway, not to the agents on the line from St. John to Moncton, and from Moncton east to Halifax, but only to those agents who lie off the main line, on the New Glasgow line, on the Cape Breton line. To the former the ban was removed, they were to have freedom of action, but as to all the other employees on all the rest of the Intercolonial Railway, it is abundantly clear that the injunction that they should stay their action and observe the implicit instructions which they had received from the head office on pain of dismissal, stood as strong and as clear as ever. Now, let me look at some more of the papers in this connection. Here is a copy of a letter which appears to have been written, and which was written, by the Deputy Minister to Mr. Pottinger, the chief engineer. It is dated the 28th of November, but the year is not quite clear. I think it must have been 1890. This is the first letter of the collection which I have here. He says :

Mr. Van Horne repeated the charge to the Minister upon the occasion of his recent visit to Ottawa, that Mr. Busby, I think he said, or perhaps he may have said, some officer acting under his direct orders, had boarded the Canadian Pacific Railway train at Moncton and canvassed passengers holding tickets by the St. John Short Line route, to surrender their tickets and take tickets by the Intercolonial Railway, Chaudière route, and that he had so changed the tickets of a number of passengers. I distinctly stated I did not believe a word of it, and that when making such charges he had better accompany them with the proof. Sir John added: " Prove the charge, and the employee, let him be of high or low degree, shall be dismissed."

Mr. HAGGART. Why should he not be dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be all right, I suppose, for the Canadian Pacific Railway if they could get on our train and persuade our passengers to surrender their tickets and take in exchange tickets to go over the Canadian Pacific Railway ; that would be all right, but it would be all wrong for our people to do it.

Mr. Van Horne then says : " I have it from an office of high grade at Moncton, and if I divulge his name Mr. Schreiber will probably dismiss him, as, of course, it was not honourable of him to tell me, and no doubt he was faithless to his employers ; but I can and will produce the proof independent of him. You will, therefore, see the matter has not ended. I am thoroughly relying on your and Mr. Busby's assurance that nothing of the kind occurred in the stand that I have taken.

The next letter is dated April 1st, 1891, addressed by Mr. Pottinger to Mr. Schreiber :

I send you herewith a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Shaughnessy by Mr. D. McNicoll, the general passenger agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with reference to discrimination by the Intercolonial Railway between the Short Line and via Quebec. * * * Please make a full report to me at once upon this matter. If the statements made by Mr. D. McNicoll are correct, it is very evident there will have to be some change made in connection with our general passenger agent's office. I have repeatedly in-

formed you that the Government will not submit to any discrimination against the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John.

Yet the hon. gentleman tells me that the pistol was never held to the head of any employee of the Intercolonial Railway. Then, I find, on June 18th, 1892, a letter to Mr. Pottinger from Mr. Schreiber:

I am instructed by the hon. Minister to direct you to grant the Canadian Pacific Railway Company single fare rates for the double journey via St. John on their weekly excursion tickets for the Manitoba and North-west, irrespective of their making a similar through rate via Quebec for these trains.

Passing over our own road again at the instance and demand of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Extract from a letter dated February 8th, 1893, from Mr. Schreiber to Mr. Pottinger:

However unpalatable it may be to us, we must respect the agreement.

Extract from a letter dated February 27th, 1893, from Mr. Pottinger to Mr. J. J. Wallace:

There should be no obstacle put in the way of the Canadian Pacific Railway doing business there, and Mr. McDonald should bear in mind that he has to be neutral as between the Chaudière and St. John routes under the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I think my hon. friend was Minister at that time.

Extract from a letter from Mr. J. M. Lyons to D. Pottinger, dated Moncton, 19th April, 1893:

I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway representatives make it a canvass to threaten our agents that unless business goes via St. John such agents will suffer when the Canadian Pacific Railway own the Intercolonial Railway. That the practice of making threats is a fact there is no doubt. I have been "held by the throat" (figuratively speaking) by Mr. McNicoll and Mr. McPherson, and threatened, because I would not concede to certain demands. Our agents have been tampered with and made disloyal, and one of the results that Mr. McNicoll threatens me on information, said to be unfavourable towards me, furnished by Intercolonial Railway agents.

Then, this is the official clause:

If we make an effort within the lines of the agreement to secure a share of the traffic that is legitimately Intercolonial Railway, he suggests that his company ignore the agreement, and would have it understood that he lives up to it, while, if we simply allow him to have it all his own way, we are styled "old women."

Extract from a letter of Mr. John M. Lyons to Mr. Pottinger, dated Moncton, October 11th, 1893:

My people are not doing anything at the time.

That is replying to the charge that they were doing something wrong.

They have their instructions on this point, namely, that they must not interfere with passengers ticketed via St. John, and observe the same. We are frequently placed in very uncomfortable positions in following the instructions of the department, that Intercolonial Railway issue of tickets cannot be exchanged at Moncton.

I have an extract of a letter dated at Ottawa, the 27th of October, 1893, from Mr. Schreiber to Mr. Pottinger:

In reply, I desire to say that the traffic agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must be carefully and fully respected. Outside this agreement, the traffic will be conducted by you as you deem best in the interests of the Government railways,——

They are not to consider what is in the interest of the Government railways, because that was in accordance with the contract, but I think it throws some light upon the interpretation which I have been putting on this contract.

——always bearing in mind that a fight probably means retaliation. If you wade into the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they will no doubt wade into you. However, it is thought that it would be only a reasonable and friendly act that traffic via St. John for United States points in the west and north-west, or in Manitoba and the Canadian North-west, should be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Minister would hardly countenance any other action.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend subscribes to that; of course he would. The friendship of the Canadian Pacific Railway is a much more impelling motive than the friendship of the Intercolonial Railway.

Extracts from a letter dated 27th of November, 1893, from Mr. John M. Lyons to Mr. Pottinger:

I also attach a letter of explanation from MacKeen, Intercolonial Railway agent, wherein he emphatically denies this charge made against him, and expresses the opinion that owing to his efforts in behalf of the long haul to Lévis as against the St. John route, an impression has been formed that he worked in the interest of the Chicago route. He shows that out of 18 tickets he issued to Pacific coast points 13 were via St. John and the Canadian Pacific Railway. MacKeen has not pleased the Canadian Pacific Railway because of his active canvass for the Intercolonial long haul as against very strong competition.

If we have to stand this discrimination against the Intercolonial Railway long haul, we should withdraw from agents on commission our issue of tickets via St. John to points in competition with our Lévis route.

It is going to be great up-hill work to compete with the route via St. John, if we must not advise passengers in re Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway connections via our long haul.

It is going to be up-hill work if you are not at liberty to tell a passenger you have a very good line via Lévis. I think, Mr. Chairman, I have pretty nearly enough evidence to satisfy the committee as to the proposition which I started to establish. There is only one other letter which I will read, and it is from Mr. Shaughnessy to Mr. Pottinger, dated October, 1896:

I have no doubt that freight which shippers definitely consign via Canadian Pacific is being sent that way, but if all unconsigned goods are sent via Intercolonial and Lévis, the neutrality clause is being violated. An agent is certainly not "strictly neutral" who sends all goods via one road, unless they are specifically consigned via the other. To be "strictly neutral" he should divide the unconsigned traffic as evenly as possible between the two roads. Will you please give instructions accordingly. In case, however, that you do not concur in our views as to what the agreement means, I am so confident of the correctness of our interpretation of the agreement that I am quite willing to submit the question to the Railway Department at Ottawa, and, if necessary, to the Department of Justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was it sent to the Department of Justice to see whether the contention was a correct one or not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; this letter was written to Mr. Pottinger.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the answer sent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no answer to that. I think, while it has taken very much more time than I intended to have devoted to the subject, it has not been time altogether ill-spent, because it has enabled me to establish, I think, the entire correctness of the interpretation I had put upon this contract. More than that, it has established the view which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) himself and his department, continuously and uninterruptedly, placed upon that contract, so far as it related to the rivalry between the Intercolonial Railway and its Lévis connection on the one hand, and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other. Let me say a word here, if I am not transgressing the rule, as to some comments made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) upon this transaction in the course of his remarks the other evening. That hon. gentleman spoke of me as having claimed that I had dealt with the Intercolonial question in a very masterly manner, and that I had also claimed credit for myself for having reduced the expenditure upon the road. The hon. gentleman went on to add that I had no warrant for making any such claim. I would be glad, if the hon. gentleman has occasion to speak during this debate, if he would kindly point to the occasion when I claimed for myself that I had managed the Intercolonial Railway in a masterly manner, or if he would kindly also point to the occasion that I said that the results which had been attained on the Intercolonial Railway had been due to my having made any reduction in the ordinary expenditures, or that I claimed to have practiced any very marked economy. I do not think I made any or either of these claims. I do not say that I might not have made them, but I have not made them up to the present day, so far as my recollection serves me. Even if it were so, my modesty would not permit to have suggested that I had handled the Intercolonial Railway in a masterly manner. I have done nothing down to this moment of the kind. I have simply pointed to results: I have endeavoured to indicate what could be brought about if certain things were done, and as to whether they were masterly or not, my hon. friend is the only one who has thought that that interpretation might properly be put upon them. The hon. gentleman furthermore stated that for every dollar earned upon the Intercolonial Railway I had expended $1.32. The hon. gentleman did not make this appear. I would ask him, having made that specific statement, that he would seize the opportunity, before this debate is over, to show us how and by what means that proposition is capable of being established. I know the success with which the hon. gentleman can manipulate figures. I have heard him manipulating figures for many years. He sat opposite to me in the provincial parliament, for a long while, and his greatest success was in manipulating figures, which never proved anything, and which never led to results. The hon. gentleman's figures in this connection are very much the same, and I think he will experience some little difficulty in pointing out how he reaches the result which he said should be properly arrived at, when he made that statement. If any hon. gentleman cares to look at the Railway Report, under statement No. 6, pages 52 and 54, he will find what the operating charges per train mile on the Intercolonial Railway are. They will be found to be 94 cents per train mile. He will find that, compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they are somewhat larger. The Canadian Pacific Railway operating expenses were 84·94 cents, the Grand Trunk 71·09 cents, Canada Atlantic 95·11 cents, Canada Southern 98·07 cents. But if you go to earnings, you will find that the earnings of the Intercolonial have been only 76·97 cents per train mile; Canadian Pacific Railway, 140·45 cents; Grand Trunk, 101·65 cents. It is not true that while the earnings have been increasing the expenses have been growing. That would lead to a different result from that which I am able to establish, and which, I think, I have already established to the satisfaction of Parliament.

Mr. POWELL. Would my hon. friend like an answer now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I would be very glad to afford the hon. gentleman an opportunity later.

Mr. POWELL. I thought the hon. gentleman was desirous to have it now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to give it now, but I will be glad if he would do it later.

Mr. POWELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman if these figures show the number of cars on the train, because the cost per train mile has nothing whatever to do with the cost per ton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the nearest approximation that you can get to the facts in regard to the cost, and I maintain that it is utterly impossible for any person, I do not care whom, the general manager of the Intercolonial himself, to give information or to give any other calculation than this. It is impossible for you to say what the cost of each car is. It might be done if you took a long time and set a staff of clerks to work to hunt through the whole of the records and accounts in the office to find out how many cars ran, where they ran, and how far each one ran, on a given day, but the return I am reading is the nearest approximation that is practically possible to give, and the hon. gentleman has no access to any information which would approach accuracy nearer.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman had put on these large Decapod engines to haul trains and doubled the tonnage of the old trains, the explanation of the hon. gentleman may be entirely accounted for in that way. But it does not show the cost of hauling trains so far as the cost per ton mile is concerned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The explanation might be accounted for in that way if the facts admitted of it, but the facts do not happen to exist which would enable such an explanation to be given. The large engines spoken of by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) were not upon the road in 1897-98, the figures for which I am now reading. They have only lately been put upon the road, so that the hon. gentleman must get some other fanciful reasons for his theory.

Now, I come to another branch of this discussion which has been the subject of an enormous amount of contention by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. They have shown a clamorous desire for information, and when information is given them they always appear to want just what they have not got, or something which cannot be supplied. No matter how ample the information supplied, they do not appear to be satisfied. A clamour has been raised from the beginning to the end of this Drummond County question, that they ought be furnished with a statement which would enable them to judge the relative proportion of the earnings of that road, and the advantage which has accrued to the Intercolonial Railway by reason of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, as compared with the rest of the Intercolonial Railway. I have said that I could not furnish that information, and I have stated on the authority of the Deputy Minister of my department, that that information cannot be supplied. Notwithstanding that, gentlemen opposite have insisted that I am concealing something, that I can tell just what that relative proportion is, and that there has been a combination on the part of the Minister and his officers, and every one else connected with it, to conceal some facts, which if they were only disclosed, would do what? The hon. gentlemen opposite have not told us, but I suppose they think it would tend to establish that the extension to Montreal has been a failure from a financial point of view, and that our business results would have been better if we had never undertaken this extension. If that is not the inference to be drawn, I am at a loss to conceive what end these gentlemen opposite can hope to serve. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) got up the other night, and with an appearance of great sadness—I almost could see the tears drop from his eye—he announced that he was going to be tremendously severe upon the Minister. To judge by him one would think that the result of the animadversions that he was going to cast upon me, would cause me to retire into insignificance. Well, he was severe on me, I suppose, according to the measure of severity he was capable of, and the severe handling I received from him amounted to a statement, that I should be able to tell what the relative earnings of this piece of road is, as compared with the whole Intercolonial, and to give minute figures and details concerning it, because in the case of the Baie des Chaleur Railway, a small piece of road twenty or thirty miles long, I was able to tell what the earnings of that road were and what the cost of operating it was. And the hon. gentleman said that if the Minister could tell that, why could he not tell us all about the extension to Montreal. Well, Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that the two propositions are as wide as the poles asunder. A gentleman who does not know any more about considering a railway problem, than to imagine that I could give the figures and tell every dollar and cent with respect to the extension to Montreal, because I was able to give them on a little road of twenty miles, ought not to attempt to talk about railway matters. We put the Baie des Chaleur, twenty-mile road as it were on one side, and we determined to find out exactly what the traffic on this twenty-mile branch was, how much freight it carried, what the receipts and what the expenses were. This was an independent piece of road, but the hon. gentleman argued that because I could do that, I should be able to tell this House with accu-

racy what the actual value of the extension to Montreal from a money point of view has been. Why, the proposition only requires to be stated to make its fallacy apparent. How are you going to calculate the enormous value of the Intercolonial Railway being extended to the great city of Montreal? How are you going to judge of the enormous amount of business that has come to the whole Intercolonial Railway line, which never did come before, and which, if we did not carry the line to Montreal, never would have come. These gentlemen opposite who can speak without any sense of responsibility, can declare what these figures are, but if I undertook to furnish the House with a valuation, or to make a contingent estimate, I wonder how long these gentlemen would be before denouncing me for having misled Parliament by pretending to do a thing which is not in my power to do with any approach to accuracy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) says: You lease a portion of your line to the Dominion Atlantic Railway and do not they pay you year by year an amount which can only be arrived at by knowing just what business is done. Well, the Dominion Atlantic is not a part of our through line; it is not a part of the line which brings any business to us this year more than last; it is not a part of our line that is a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway to any extent, as is the Montreal extension. The Montreal extension opens a gateway whereby traffic enters on the Intercolonial Railway; traffic which never had access to it before. Do I want any better evidence in support of this than the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) to the effect, that the condition of things when we had to connect and transfer at Lévis with the Grand Trunk Railway, was, in the interest of the business of the Intercolonial Railway, absolutely intolerable. If that expression of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) means anything, it meant that there was business which we ought to have got, and which we would have got and could have got, but which we were blocked from getting because our line did not go beyond Lévis. I therefore say, that we have removed the barrier which had been raised against our traffic. We have opened a door which admitted us to the great commercial emporium of Montreal; we have put ourselves in a position by which we can take advantage of every opportunity which is afforded for the increase of our traffic, and, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down I will present figures to this committee which, while they are not minute and in detail, will nevertheless lend additional proof, and will show beyond peradventure, that there is only one possible explanation to account for the enormous increase in the traffic and receipts of the Intercolonial Railway, and that is that we have carried out the policy which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) admits is the proper policy, but which his indifference or cowardice, or some other reason which I cannot explain, led him to abandon. If he had carried out that policy, as it was his duty to have done, we would before to-day have been realizing advantages which we are only now realizing and enjoying. Well, Sir, what is the case with the Dominion Atlantic? We deal with the Dominion Atlantic upon a mileage basis. Our officers go and see what traffic was hauled over that line, how far it was hauled, and what was received for that haul; and the receipts are divided for that mileage basis, and we get our proportion—a very simple matter, as compared with making anything approaching an actual calculation of the immense volume of business now being done over this extension, and having regard to the other necessary conditions that have to be taken into account.

The hon. gentleman refers to what is being done in the United States as proof of the ease with which such a statement could be furnished. He says, take up the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and what will they show? Why, that upon the 184,000 miles of railway in the United States the returns show the cost earnings per ton mile so much. I say those reports do not always show anything of the kind. There are, no doubt, some companies which make their returns to the Interstate Commission on the basis of the ton mile. There are others—and this is the system which obtains in Canada—which make it up altogether on the basis of the train mile. The one is a totally different system from the other. We could adopt the United States system here, and make up our reports showing the cost per ton per mile of the haul of freights on the Intercolonial; but we have never done that. There is no railway in Canada that does it; and you will see in the report already published tables which show that the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canada Atlantic and other railways, do exactly what the Intercolonial does. The accounts are made up, the staff organized and the returns handed in on the basis of the train mile; and on that basis you can make a comparison between the different companies. We could keep the accounts on the United States basis; but to do so we would require a very much larger staff than we have to-day, and we would not get any further; because, after all is said and done, what is it these hon. gentlemen want? I cannot for the life of me conceive that they want this information to throw any light on this question. I have explained as fairly and as strongly as I could that I cannot give them that information, and that is the reason they cry for it. Do they want it, so that they can judge whether the policy of extending the Intercolonial to Montreal is a wise policy? I do not think they do, because some of the men who clamour the loudest for this information are committed up to the hilt in favour of that policy, others

so clamouring have not ventured to declare in Parliament that they are opposed to it; and the hon. leader of the Opposition may to-day be classified among the latter number. He is the leader of his party; at least, he has that position officially and nominally, yet, up to the present, he has not given his party any suggestion as to what his position is on this question. I have not yet been able to ascertain it from anything the hon. gentleman has said; and it is not because he has not spoken lengthily, strongly, vociferously, I might almost add vituperously, on the question. He has not failed in any of these particulars; but, with them all, he has carefully concealed from Parliament and from his listening and waiting followers the slightest suggestion of what his own mind is. Having studied the question, as he does every question which he comes in reach of, profoundly, he is yet unwilling to disclose to a waiting Parliament and an impatient country, just where he stands on the question of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal. I am not doing injustice to hon. gentlemen opposite when I say that it is idle for them, when they are already convinced that the true policy, the wisest policy, the thing that ought to be done long ago, is to hasten to get to Montreal, to pretend that they want now to get a close calculation of the past earnings per ton mile carried over that railroad in order to judge whether or not we ought to get to Montreal. That question is settled, is closed absolutely. I do not think there is a gentleman representing Montreal among our friends opposite, who would vote that the Intercolonial should not be extended to Montreal; and I venture to say further, that there is not a gentleman from the maritime provinces who represents a constituency through which the Intercolonial passes, who would take the responsibility of defeating this extension by his vote, whatever he may say in Parliament. I think it only requires a moment's consideration for any one to see that. I want to deal with this phase of the matter fully and fairly, because the burden of the song which hon. gentlemen opposite have been singing has been that I could give them this information, but would not give it lest it would hurt the proposal, and, therefore, it has been delayed. Now, I want to ask that portion of hon. gentlemen opposite who are fair in their judgment, whether they think that any system of calculation into which I might enter, or any statement which I might lay before Parliament, would fairly indicate the value or volume of the accession to the business of the Intercolonial which is to come by reason of this extension. Are there not members of Parliament—not one, but dozens—who travel over the Intercolonial from the maritime provinces to Montreal, who, until this break between Lévis and Montreal was removed, never travelled over that railway? It is true, these gentlemen are, perhaps, enjoying the privilege, the fair privilege, of a pass when they come over the Intercolonial; but they had the same privilege over the Canadian Pacific Railway; and having that privilege on both roads, I want to know how many gentlemen living in the province of Nova Scotia east of Moncton, came over the Intercolonial during all the years they have been in Parliament before this extension took place? I would like them to tell me of one who made it a point to do so; and, if their usage was otherwise, how is it that now it is different? For the same reason there are hundreds of people who in the course of the year now come over the Intercolonial to Montreal who formerly preferred to come by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is it not solely and entirely due to the fact that we have extended the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal? And how are you going to set down in dollars and cents the growth of business, the amount of tonnage of freight, as well as the number of passengers, seeking the Intercolonial, for a large portion of its mileage east of Lévis, on the part of people who never used the Intercolonial Railway before? I think that you might as well claim that if you were to run a branch line of 15 or 20 miles out from the railway into a gold mine or quarry or something else that yielded you heavy and profitable freight, and that you got thousands of tons of freight by means of that branch, which furnished traffic over the whole road, you might just as well estimate the value of that little piece of branch line on the basis of its business per ton mile and say that is all it is worth, notwithstanding the fact that it furnished paying traffic for the whole of the rest of your main line. If this policy were to be treated and decided upon a basis of a pecuniary test as to the wisdom of its adoption, I would not be afraid to submit it to that test, and refer to the figures which the House has already before it as a fair way of testing the matter.

What were the earnings in 1896-97? They were $2,866,000—this was, mark you, before the extension to Montreal. What were the earnings of the present year? We only have had ten months of the present year, but in those ten months the earnings amount to nearly $3,100,000. Taking the same amount of business that we did, without any percentage of increase, last May and last June over the Intercolonial Railway, and adding it to the present receipts up to date, you get $3,660,000 as the gross earnings of the year. Or, in other words, the gross earnings for the whole year, taking in the two months to come on the same basis as these two months last year, amounts to $3,660,000, as compared with $2,860,000 in 1896. $800,000 mark you, of an increase, and I am going to show the committee a little further what this result means. The mileage in 1896-97 was 1,145; in 1898-9 it was 1,313. Taking the receipts for 1896-97, on the mileage we then had, we were earning $2,490 per mile; and taking the mileage for 1898-9, we are earning $2,740 per mile, or $250 per mile for

every mile of the Intercolonial Railway over the earnings in 1896-97. Can it be said that this is due solely to the improvement in business, to the fact that the prosperity we have been enjoying in the upper provinces has reached the provinces by the sea? Are you going to say it is due entirely, or in a large measure, to that? I am going to prove, to the satisfaction of the committee, that such is not the case. It is due to the policy we have adopted; it is due to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman give us the increase of expenditure now due to that increase?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One proposition at a time. I am probably giving the hon. gentleman as much as he can swallow now, and I would not like to increase the dose unduly lest it might have a serious effect. I think I can furnish proof to a demonstration of my assertion that the increase is not due to the prosperity in the maritime provinces. We all know that times are no better in the maritime provinces to-day than they have been at almost any period during the last ten years. I would be very sorry indeed to make a positive statement that we have been enjoying greater prosperity in the province of New Brunswick, during the last year or two, than at any period during the ten years preceding. What inference do I draw from that? I am going to ask you to examine with me the condition of business on the Intercolonial Railway during the last ten years preceding the year 1897, I am going to show what the business done each year, the highest and the lowest during that period was, and I will tell you what I consider is a fair deduction to draw from the facts. During the ten years from 1887 to 1897, there was a high and a low year. The high year was in 1892, when the gross receipts on the Intercolonial Railway were $3,065,000, and the low year was in 1894, when the gross receipts were $2,940,000. All the other years fluctuated between these two extremes, and the small sum of $125,000 represents the total rise from the low return in 1894 to the high return in 1892, or the drop from the high return in 1892 to the low return in 1894. Those of us who come from New Brunswick—and I think the same remark applies to the other maritime provinces—know that the most prosperous period we have known was when the Wilson tariff was in operation in the United States, and our lumber found access at a low rate of duty into the American markets. That was when the lumber business was prosperous, in my province at least, when the people had money to spend and felt comfortable and easy in their means, and a thrill was felt through every fibre of our commercial being. The lumber business was in that period in the most prosperous condition, but of late years, since the abrogation of the Wilson tariff down to the present moment, it has not been so prosperous, though I am glad to see that there is a considerable improvement in the English market and people are beginning to feel more sanguine. But with the exception of that short period, when the Wilson tariff was in operation, we enjoyed no very large measure of prosperity in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Now, what is the result of the figures I have given? It is that the mileage increase during these years has only been 14 per cent. The mileage increase, since the period I have mentioned, that is down to 1897, has been 168 miles on the Intercolonial Railway. I add this 168 to the previous mileage, and that increase represents a mileage increase of 14 per cent on the Intercolonial Railway. I have shown you that from 1897 down to 1899, there has been an enormous increase of $800,000 in the receipts as compared with an increase of $125,000 from the lowest to the highest figure during the ten years preceding. That means that while we have only increased our mileage, comparatively to the whole of the rest of the line, 14 per cent, we have in this period increased our business over the whole line—I am applying the increased receipts over the whole line—28 per cent. Now, Sir, what figures is it possible to produce that can gainsay the conclusiveness of the deductions I draw from these facts? How are you going to account for this gain in the business of the Intercolonial Railway unless you attribute it to the cause to which I have assigned it and to the policy the Government are now pressing upon the favourable consideration of Parliament? It is plain, I think, to any man who will look and see. It must carry conviction to any man's mind if his mind is open to conviction at all, that any such results as I have disclosed to the committee would have been impossible otherwise than by carrying out the extension to the city of Montreal.

The business of the Intercolonial Railway, during all these ten years, varied only 4 per cent. Just imagine the condition of stagnation which that fact indicates. There was no need of means to stimulate the business of the railway. I never thought that Parliament would be parsimonious if this question were approached in the proper spirit, and if it were made clear to Parliament that there was reasonable and businesslike effort made to turn the Intercolonial Railway to the best account. We need not have been resting for all these years under the conditions we have been living under if my hon. friend had been taking an interest in this matter or had felt a care whether the Intercolonial Railway developed under his administration or not. Four per cent represented the gross variation of the business of the Intercolonial Railway during these years. You cannot point to a live enterprise in any part of Canada which

exhibited such discouraging results as are here recorded. And now we see in two years a variation of 28 per cent. And I ask you whether you want me to sit down, whether you want the officers of my department to sit down and figure out fractions here or there or tell what it cost a ton to carry freight over the road, when I am able to present such a conclusion.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said the increase was $600,000 or $700,000 between the two years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said $800,000.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. Minister has the figures, would he kindly give us the comparison between 1897 and 1898 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get those figures for my hon. friend (Mr. Powell). I chose the year 1897 as the last of the ten years, because it was the last year of the old regime when we were running on the reduced mileage. I have given the House the mileage of the last year as it was during the years my hon. friend was administering the affairs of the road—1,145 miles. I have not taken 1898 because for four months of that time we were running the increased mileage. I have not misled the committee ; I have given two years credit for the increase, as you have heard me say. So the statement remains in all its force no matter what the figures may be for the year 1897. My impression is, if the hon. gentleman would accept that for the moment—I will verify the figures—that the receipts were a fraction over $3,000,000. I think the increase for this full year of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway has been between $700,000 and $800,000, as compared with $150,000 or $200,000, or whatever it may be, of the year preceding.

Now, I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) interrupted me, because it reminds me of a speech he made to Parliament some two years ago, when this subject was first under consideration. He dealt with a statement which I had furnished to Parliament from the reports of my Deputy Minister, and of the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway. And I remember how my hon. friend revelled in his ridicule and denunciation of the statement thus presented. If my memory serves me well, I think that "Hansard" will show that the officers of my department were of opinion that the first full year's operations of the Montreal extension would give earnings up to $3,800,000, and perhaps some fraction over. My hon. friend caught up the statement, he seized upon the details by which the officers of my department reached that conclusion, and he delighted himself, I am sure, whether he delighted Parliament or not, with the thoroughness with which he tore and shattered this statement. Why, he proved by figures, absolutely by figures, that this was a mere "phantom estimate." Those were his very words. He will remember the satisfaction with which he destroyed the value of these figures and the predictions which I had been making. I was not vain enough to assert that I had formed or could form much of an opinion on the matter myself ; I told the House that I gave the estimate of the officers of my department. When we said that the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for the first full year were going to be something over $3,800,000, he jumped upon the proposition and essayed to smash it into a thousand pieces. What conclusion did he arrive at ? Instead of there being a prospect of a surplus, he said that the figures which these gentlemen had made and which the Minister of Railways and Canals had endorsed, proved as conclusively as the logic of facts and experience could prove anything, that we were going to have a deficit of between three-quarters of a million and a million on the first year's operation under these conditions. And my hon. friend pictured with sadness and grief, the full strength and depth of which he found it difficult to exhibit to Parliament, the enormous disaster that was going to come upon this country for acting upon the representations I had made to Parliament, and the policy I was asking Parliament to adopt. Now, the figures which to the hon. gentleman's mathematical and rhetorical mind appeared so chimerical, have almost been reached. How far are we from $3,800,000 ? Why, you are a good deal closer to it than the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was when he told how many bushels of wheat we were going to raise in the North-west, and how much would be realized from the sales of land. I only wish that my hon. friends, in their railway calculations, had always come within a thousand miles of where we stand when we compare our predictions with the results.

Now, my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) ventured a prediction, too. He is not wise to prophesy until he knows ; and the same admonition, I think, might be taken to heart by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I am glad, Sir, he started out as he did, because I will be fairly justified hereafter in claiming that when he furnishes you with figures in the future, you will know just what value to attach to them. If my hon. friend is deprived of the privilege and advantage of revelling in fanciful figures, he is absolutely at a loss ; therefore, I am not at all sorry that he has given us an opportunity of forming a sound judgment as to the value and importance to be attached to his calculations when he seriously presents them to Parliament.

Now, Sir, remember that the figures which I gave the other day, show the result of the operations for about nine months. I have a statement here showing, a little later,

what the operations of the road are. I received a telegram the day before yesterday from Moncton, and they advised me that they have been able to make up returns for the month of April, showing what the expenditures were up to the 1st of May, what the receipts were, and what the balance is for the ten months. I showed you that, up to the first of the month preceding that, we had, I think I stated, some $13,000 or $14,000 of a balance. Up to the 1st of March the balance was $364. There was an improvement in March to the 1st of April, and it has become still better in April to the 1st of May. Now, the receipts for the ten months ending on the 30th of April have been $3,063,768.34. The working expenses up to that date have been $3,001,198.45, showing a net result of $62.569 on the right side. Now, we have not achieved this result by starving the road. I commenced earlier than was ever commenced before with our ballasting. We have not been skimping the road, we have not been starving it; we intend to keep it up as well as we can. I am not going to say but that I would feel, personally, very much like acting upon the declared policy of the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this office; I am in entire accord with the declaration he made the other day, when he said, that he felt that it was proper on the Intercolonial Railway, no matter if you had a large surplus, not to put that into the treasury, but to spend it for the betterment of the road, to use it to the advantage of the railway. The country does not look for any great return by way of surplus upon the operations of the railway. I think that is a point worthy of consideration. But down to the present moment I have not started in at all to starve the Intercolonial Railway road. Well, where do we stand now, relatively to the position occupied by my hon. friend, when he was in charge of the department? In 1894-95, the hon. gentleman, instead of having $62,500 to his credit, had $94,300 to his debit; in other words, he was in a less favourable position than we are to-day to the extent, in round figures, of $157,000. In 1895-96, he was $148,000 in a less favourable position than we are to-day, because he had $85,500, in round figures, of a deficit on the 1st of May, as against the $62,500 of a surplus which I have shown on the 1st of May. You see the comparison is going on. Now, we have paid all our expenses, we have paid our charges of maintenance, and we show $150,000 of an improvement. Now, where did all that come from? Can anybody be in doubt when I show you that, under ten years former operation, its whole receipts never varied more than $125,000 in that whole period? Why, you can find $170,000 better showing in our operation for ten months. In other words, you have $320,000 better showing, estimating the surplus at $50,000 for the current year, than you had before. How do I make this out. Add to the $50,000 surplus the rental paid for the extension, $210,000, and the maintenance charges for the Grand Trunk, $60,000. Now, where has that come from? I want that question answered. I do not think that any juggling with figures, I do not think that any pretense at a demand for information, is going to furnish an answer to that question. There is just one place, one source, from which we could look for this increase in our receipts, this improvement in our position, and that is the business which has come to the railway by reason of the extension to the city of Montreal.

Now, Sir, I come down to the question of the Grand Trunk contract. At the outset, I know my hon. friend, Mr. Haggart, if he repeats the experiment of the other evening, is going to find a great deal of fault with the legal form, with the phraseology, and with the drafting of this agreement. He is going to indulge in some very severe strictures upon the lawyers who have done the drafting of this paper, and he is going to visit the full weight of his displeasure upon the Justice Department. He is going to characterize the men who have had a hand in connection with the drafting of this paper, as dolts and fools, and he is going to tell us that it is a disgrace to anybody to have had a hand in its preparation. That is what my hon. friend is going to tell us. Well, my hon. friend's experience with such documents is no doubt very considerable: he has perhaps a very astute mind, and he may know better than people who have had much experience in drawing up such papers, how they should be drawn up. But there is one thing, which, I think, will probably operate as a little restraint upon my hon. friend. He started out, thundering a condemnation against this document, and, when he found that the Justice Department had a hand in it, and that it met with the approval of the officers of that department, in whom he has always had, up to the present time, unbounded confidence, because he could not recall what he had said, he had to go ahead, and he became still more severe, after he knew that the Justice Department had really superintended the preparation of the papers. I tried to follow the hon. gentleman as well as I could. Where the hon. gentleman was clear and explicit, I am bound to say, that I think he was entirely wrong; and, where he was not wrong, he was so confused and mixed up, that I could not make anything out of his statement. Perhaps my hon. friend will be a little more cautious from what occurred the other day after he spoke, or what occurred during the progress of the discussion. Two or three lawyers on his side took part in the discussion, and the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) spoke at considerable length. From the way that he danced about among the figures, I judge that he was short of material; he would, no doubt, have been very glad, if he could have found some pretext

for attacking either the illegality, or the informality, or the deficiency in this document in some form; but he fought shy of it, and never touched it; he kept a safe distance away. That ought to be a warning to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Then, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) also rose to speak on this question; he was full of it, and he was not at all sensitive about condemning it. He would have been only too glad to have visited this document with his condemnation if he could have done it on the ground that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways condemned it, but he kept entirely clear from that proposition. So, I think, my hon. friend will, perhaps, have to take a little caution from the fact that the legal gentlemen, the men who would naturally know what they are talking about, in discussing that question in this House, were careful not to repeat or endorse or approve the criticisms of my hon. friend. I think my hon. friend had better tarry in the region of railway administration and not get into the legal phase of the question. Now, I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw the remark that no first-class lawyer would ever be responsible for any document of this kind, the allegation that this does not convey any rights except from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, and that the drafting of this agreement is a disgrace to any department. I dare say my hon. friend feels, now, in a more friendly mood towards the gentlemen who are responsible for this agreement, and I would ask him, out of consideration for them, to withdraw his severe observations.

The committee will find, if they refer to the resolution, that there are a good many errors in the resolution as printed. They are typographical errors and will be corrected later. I fancy that the proof-reading has not been quite perfect, but the resolution, as it is found in the later motion, I think, will not contain these errors I have referred to. I will call attention, if it is necessary, to them later on in committee, but I think they will be then found all right. I directed that these corrections should be made, and I expect they will be found to have been made. Now, Sir, this resolution asks Parliament to confirm a lease which the Government has entered into, subject to the approval of Parliament, with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a term of 99 years, with a condition of renewal, of its line from the Chaudière end, which need not be dwelt upon, of the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, in which part of the company's property we get a one-half interest and title. We have in that portion of the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert as much ownership as the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself. If the Grand Trunk Railway owns any of it we own as much. The lease continues and gives us the right to have the full user, for all the business and all the trade of the Intercolonial Railway, of the Victoria Bridge, and it continues and gives us station rights, terminal facilities as they are owned to-day by the Grand Trunk Railway in and around the city of Montreal. It is the proper policy, they all say, to take the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal. But you have not chosen the right place; you ought to have taken some other means; you ought to have taken some other route; you ought to have done, in some events, in some particular, directly contrary, or, at all events, different from the way you have done. The hon. ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), last night sounded the line of opposition which he is going to take.

Mr. TALBOT. He sounded Gabriel's trumpet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, he sounded the trumpet and indicated that he does not like this arrangement we are making to get into Montreal. He has not so much fault to find with the Drummond County part of the scheme. I am glad to learn that, as I intimated when my hon. friend made the statement, that the position of my hon. friend has changed from what it was in times past. If any hon. gentleman in this committee will recall the discussion which took place in 1897, upon this proposition, I will venture to say that they will recall this impression left in their minds by the Opposition, that while they, the Opposition, condemned the Grand Trunk arrangement and did not think very favourably of it, the depth of infamy was sounded in respect to the Drummond County proposition. I cannot be mistaken about that. These hon. gentlemen said, what the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said the other night, only they said it in the reverse way. He said the most infamous transaction that any Government in Canada had ever been guilty of was this transaction for acquiring the Drummond County Railway. He had scarcely had that statement well launched when he proceeded to say that a greater and more infamous transaction was consummated when the Grand Trunk contract was entered into. My hon. friend is putting the proposition simply the reverse way of the way it was put two years ago. So that, if my recollection serves me, these gentlemen have had further light. I think the light results from this fact, that when they came to discuss the Drummond County contract they found that the more the contract was discussed the better it appeared, the more commendable it was in every respect and the better was the feeling throughout this entire country as respects its terms. If we had taken up the Grand Trunk agreement first and discussed that, the same consequences would have followed, because, I venture to say, that if this question of the Grand Trunk is discussed thoroughly in this House there will not be any real, honest, sincere opposition to it, and there will not be a corporal's guard, in the country, surround-

ing these hon. gentlemen. The more this proposition is discussed, the more clearly it is presented to the people, the more light they get upon it, the more acceptable it will be, and I am going to shed a little light upon it. I have never discussed it very fully——

Some hon MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never discussed it very fully. I was foolish enough; I was so inexperienced and so unsophisticated when I first presented this proposition to Parliament, that I really thought that when I had a proposition that was a good proposition to put before the House it would be accepted as such by the Opposition side of the House. I frankly admit that my eyes have been opened. I have only been here a couple of years, but I have reached rather the opposite conclusion, and it is that the better a transaction is the more these hon. gentlemen will opppose it. I have been driven reluctantly and painfully to that conclusion. I say that if this Grand Trunk proposition had been put before Parliament and discussed first, the hon. ex-Minister of Finance would have been putting the proposition in the very reverse way from that in which he has put it, and I will predict now that he will not get very much more comfort out of his discussion of the Grand Trunk agreement than he got out of the discussion of the Drummond County Railway agreement. I say with all confidence, that the more this arrangement is considered, the more thoroughly it is understood—and it is difficult to get these railway propositions fully before the public mind and the public understanding—the more it is known and understood, the more strongly it will appeal to the approval and commendation of the country. I venture to say that after a few years have passed, and the country has ceased to be agitated by the political issues raised in connection with this matter, there will be a consensus of opinion all over Canada, that this has been the best railroad arrangement that has ever been made by a Government of the Dominion.

It may be assumed then that it is good policy to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. How are we going to get there? I think it can be shown that the way we are proposing to get to Montreal is the most economical, the shortest, and in every way the best that can be suggested. Let any other proposal that may be made be examined critically—I am willing that this proposition shall be examined critically in its minutest details—and I say that if this proposition of ours is compared with any other, I believe that Parliament will conclude, and this country will conclude, that our arrangement is the best, the cheapest, the wisest, the most effective and satisfactory mode of reaching Montreal that it was possible for this or any Government to adopt. Now, let us remember this. In going from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal we are going over a piece of railway which is as well built, as substantial in every respect, and as permanent in all particulars, as any piece of railway on this continent. Anybody who knows the road knows that to be a fact. In getting a half ownership in that piece of railway, you are acquiring an interest in a railway that goes through one of the richest, one of the most productive, one of the most populous, one of the most promising sections of country in Canada. Are you not? In getting that piece of railway, you are not only getting—as the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) said last night—the right to use the tracks and run our trains over it, but you are getting the right and the title to all the business which it is possible for you to pick up on that section of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. On through trains?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not on through trains, but on any trains we choose to run over this line. On that piece of road, whenever and wherever it pleases us, having regard, of course, to railway usage, we are just as free as the Grand Trunk Railway itself. We are as well equipped as the Grand Trunk Railway to provide for local traffic, and every dollar we get goes into our own exchequer and not a cent of it into the pockets of the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is speaking of something which he does not know, which he has not studied. He is doing what he too often does—and in that particular he is like many of his friends on his side of the House—he is condemning a proposal the particulars of which he has not informed himself upon, for he undertook last night in unmeasured terms to condemn this arrangement, and yet he did not know until the present moment that we own the half of that road as fully as the Grand Trunk Railway owns it, and that all the earnings we can get go into our own exchequer. I would advise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to be a little cautious before he expresses himself too hastily on this question. There is nothing to be gained by a gentleman in Opposition—simply because he is in Opposition—condemning in the most helter-skelter fashion each and every proposal made by the Government. I would remind him that he is apt to have these statements which he has made in this haphazard careless manner, confronting him in the future to his disadvantage. It is just as well for him to acquaint himself somewhat fully with the question he is debating, and then pass his judgment on it. I venture to say, that when that gentleman and those associated with him, condemn in unmeasured terms the mode by which we propose to reach Montreal, he is not cognizant of the conditions which exist if he undertakes to reach that city by any other means. He has

not studied the situation, he does not know where he would land himself, if he committed any party with which he may be allied, to decide to reach Montreal by some other means than that which we are now proposing.

Now, Sir, I will go into this subject at some little detail, step by step, because if I can help it, I do not propose to leave these gentlemen opposite a single leg to stand on in their condemnation of this arrangement. I came down to Parliament with it because I felt in my own mind, after applying the best judgment I could to the question, that it was a proposal that should commend itself favourably to members on both sides of the House, and in saying that I do not pretend to suggest that there are not some minor particulars which I would have liked to have changed, but as to which, when you are making a contract to which the other party has to give its consent, you have got to consider the general end to be achieved, and you have to consider the contract as a whole. This pettyfogging criticism of minor details may be necessary from a political standpoint, but when you are dealing in a business way with this problem, they are not things which you can afford to give much weight to. Now, Sir, I say that we have got as good a piece of road, and we are going across as splendid, and as safe and secure a bridge structure as is to be found on the continent of America. None better, and double-tracked withal. There is no question about delay, you have two tracks, and you can speed on your way over this secure structure which cost a very large amount of money. I presume it is a matter of common knowledge what that bridge cost. It cost a great deal more when built by the Grand Trunk Railway, perhaps, than if built to-day. It cost some $10,000,000 altogether, and as I understand, it probably could be built for $6,000,000 to-day, but there is that great structure which is a source of pride to the country, and we are in a position under this contract to utilize to the full extent the railway opportunities which that bridge affords.

Well, now, when we are in Montreal what do we get? We are getting the use of terminals and facilities which are of inestimable value; the real value of which it is difficult for any man who has any credit to sustain, to estimate in dollars and cents. Somebody may say: Oh, you are getting the use of all these terminals, but in your little business you cannot use them all. We cannot use them all at once, it is true, but we can use them all at times, and I will venture to say, that taking into consideration, the terminals and connections which the Grand Trunk Railway is throwing open under this contract, to our free and uninterrupted use, any portion of them we may need, and any portion we may rightly be supposed to need and require to use in the course of a year's business.

It is all very well for gentlemen who do not know anything about railway arrangements—and that was the way the examination was conducted before this committee by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) and other gentlemen—to talk as if all you wanted was rails enough laid down to carry your cars and engines—as if no other requirements were needed, and as if, instead of these acres and miles of terminals, simply a corner for the use of the Intercolonial Railway would give you a cheaper and more beneficial arrangement. Let me say, with all respect to these gentlemen, that such a proposition would not commend itself to anybody who knew anything of the running of a railway. What do these terminals and connections mean? They mean that they enable you to reach all points, to load or unload your cars, or where you want to make connection with another line, and receive or deliver freight. If you only had a few sections of these terminals assigned to you, and you were compelled to limit yourself to these, where would you be, when you wanted to get freight for the Intercolonial from some other portion of the terminals? You would actually have to employ teams and pay cartage to get the freight carted to the railway. In the same way, in the delivery of freight, if you wanted to get to a certain point—here a lumber yard, here a cattle yard, here wharfs, here immigration sheds—you would be able to carry the different classes of business to wherever they might be located, at different points of the terminals. If, instead of having the use of all the terminals, we were crowded, as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us be, into a corner, we should be absolutely paralysed. It is simply absurd to hear these gentlemen criticise this railway proposition in the way they do. I do not complain very much, and I do not censure them: they are doing it out of the fulness of their want of knowledge. If they knew more, they would not have these things to say. It must be very amusing to the railway magnates connected with our various railway systems to read the criticisms these hon. gentlemen are making on this proposal. We have acres and miles of the best terminals and yards to be found, not simply in Canada. There is nothing like them in Canada, and I do not know anything like them outside of Canada. They are the accumulation of years. They have cost hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars. The Grand Trunk Company will tell you frankly and truthfully that $20,000,000 would not equip them as they are equipped to-day; and is anybody going to say, that it is not of value to the Intercolonial, whose object is to get in the quickest and least expensive manner to the point where it is to receive and deliver its freight, to be so placed that it can get there, especially as it does not cost any more than it would have cost us, had we allowed ourselves to be crowded into

a corner? By this arrangement, we are enjoying all the facilities which the means and the experience of the Grand Trunk have provided for itself during the many years that it has been in operation. Further than that, we are getting right into the centre of Montreal. We are centrally located; we are where we can pick up business; I say, without any hesitation, that, if we could not get into Montreal so that we would be right alongside of and in connection with either the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, my feeling would be against making the attempt to reach the city at all. I am trying at the present moment to make arrangements to have a Pullman or Wagner car put on the Canada Atlantic train coming to Ottawa, so that, if a gentleman wants to travel from Ottawa to Halifax, or from Halifax to Ottawa, all he has to do is to get aboard his car and go right through, without having to make any transfer. What sort of position would we be in, if a passenger leaving the Grand Trunk in Montreal had to take a cab to get to the Intercolonial? We have got to the centre of the city, and that is where we want to get, near the hotels and near the business. People who come by the Grand Trunk, or the Canada Atlantic, are alongside of our train, and those who reach the city by the Canadian Pacific Railway are not very far from our train. It is only a step from the Canadian Pacific Railway depot to the station at the foot of the hill, where they can board the Intercolonial. I say that is worth money. I do not think I am a wild and extravagant man in my ordinary ideas; but I say it is not business, it is not intelligent, it is not enterprising, to talk about a five, or fifteen, or twenty dollar bill in connection with an arrangement which involves such important results, and which, when done right, is done for all time, and which, if done wrong, had better never have been done at all. What is the complaint, then? Why, you are paying too much money; you are giving $140,000 a year. Well, Mr. Chairman, are we? This question is entitled to be considered from two points of view. Upon any ordinary and reasonable way of making a calculation of the money we propose to pay the Grand Trunk, are we giving them too much? Is there some other means of working out this problem and getting what we need at less cost? There are the two points of view. Let us see what is the fairer judgment to pass on the question, looked at from the first point of view. We say to the Grand Trunk: We will give you $140,000. We do not divide the amount up and appropriate $37,500 to the Ste. Rosalie-St. Lambert line, $40,000 to the bridge, and $62,500 to the terminals. We put all these together, and we dealt with the whole thing as one general proposition, although, of course, we reached our conclusion by looking at the details. They made their propositions, and we made our offers, having the details in our mind. Remember, we had no compulsory powers. We could not compel the Grand Trunk to accept our proposition. We had to come to an agreement with them or the agreement was not going to take place. They had the option of saying on what terms they would allow us to enjoy these privileges, and we had the option of saying whether their terms were such as we considered in the interest of the country, and, in view of the policy we thought ought to be carried out, we would be justified in acceding to. That is the point of view. While I say this with regard to the division of the rentals over the three sections, I do it because it is not a material question, and I do not care whether, when you are judging as to the reasonableness or fairness of a rental of $140,000, you apportion more or less to any one particular part of these divisions. I say that for this reason. I find that there is a disposition among the Opposition to say: Oh, you are getting the bridge very reasonable, it is worth more than that, but you are paying too much for the railway section. Well, as a matter of fact, the railway company wanted $50,000 annual rental for the bridge, and in the negotiations they stood very firm for a long time upon that. In other words, they wanted $150,000 for what they finally agreed to give us at $140,000. We said to them: We cannot give you $150,000, but will give you $140,000, and $10,000 was taken off. I do not know that the $10,000, in the minds of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, are taken off the bridge or off the terminal rental, or the Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert end. I do not care which end it is taken off, that does not alter the case. The question is: Are you giving too much on the whole or are you not? I say we are not. I say we have made a good arrangement. I say that when you examine the figures I have given you, I think even my hon. friends opposite will be disposed—whether they will acknowledge it or not—to admit that the arrangement was a good one.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am really afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I am unduly trespassing upon the indulgence of the committee in taking so much time to discuss this question, but I may be permitted to plead in extenuation that I do not think I have ever risen in this House, since I have been a member of it, unless I felt under compulsion, in fact, to do so; and now that I am on my feet, I propose, if the House will permit me, to treat the question thoroughly and to present, as clearly as I am able, what is my own judgment upon the question. I think

I will not be presuming too much if I say that, as the responsibility of working out this whole question more directly devolved upon myself, I am supposed to be better informed upon it than any of my colleagues, and it is only reasonable that I should take the time I consider necessary to present the case to the best of my ability.

I was proceeding to point out to the committee what I thought would be a fair view to take of the whole question, looking at it in detail, as respects the different sections. I would ask you to keep, however, always present in your mind, the suggestion I made a while ago, that this question must be dealt with as a whole, and yet I have not concealed from the House, either on this or any previous occasion, the amounts of rental I applied in my own mind to each section, by which I reached the result that we can afford to give $140,000 per year rental, and that the contract was not an unreasonable one to make.

Now, subject to this reservation, I am willing to examine, and will for a few moments examine, the question as to whether we are paying an unreasonable rental, when we are applying, if you like, $37,500 a year to that portion of the road which extends from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. The mileage of that section is thirty-two miles. When you arrive at St. Lambert, there are considerable approaches before you reach the bridge, but the section from St. Lambert is the section to which, if we apply any part of the rental at all, we would apply the $37,500. You will see that, taking the rental of the whole, $140,000, that would amount, capitalized at 3 per cent—which is, I suppose, the lowest amount of interest any person would think we could fairly estimate upon—$4,500,000 as the cash value of the property, the privileges, the rights, which we are in the whole acquiring. Well, the Grand Trunk Railway people said to me, in the course of the negotiations, that they thought it would not be unfair that we should, if we required half its rights and title in the railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, allow the company interest upon one-half its cost, and that cost was $1,500,000. It is just possible that that amount may be somewhat in excess of what the Grand Trunk Railway Company could have built that section for to-day. That is just possible. But you had to get the Grand Trunk Railway Company's consent before you could make a bargain; and they strongly contended that it would be a fair valuation to put upon that property to estimate it at what it cost them, and divide that sum by two. Then as to the question of the interest upon that, they said that 5 per cent was a proper rate to allow; and in the discussion it came out that the Grand Trunk at that moment were paying 5 per cent upon the money which they had borrowed to construct this line. Unless you had some means to compel them to do that which they did not feel it fair to be called upon to do, which they would not voluntarily consent to do, you could not expect them to allow us to fix the rental at a less rate than 5 per cent, the rate they were paying. It is not fair either to say that the Grand Trunk, with the improved conditions and lowered rate of money in the market, could borrow at 4 per cent, and, therefore, this should be estimated on the basis of 4 per cent. That is a matter which, I think, would not be arguable, and for the reason I have already suggested—that they must be a consenting party to the transaction. Let us take it, then, on that basis. Is $750,000 for half the road an unreasonable sum to allow? Is 5 per cent interest an unreasonable rate? I would say that neither the principal sum nor the rate of interest is unreasonable. I will tell you why I think so. When you estimate as closely as you can the cost of building another line of railway equally as favourably situated between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, you find that it would cost you a great deal more than the $750,000 which they ask you to allow as half. It will cost you a good deal more than that—and I will show in a moment that it will cost you a great deal more—you are not making an excessive or unreasonable allowance to the Grand Trunk. And the rate of interest is not much to be considered when you consider that the terms of the bargain will enable us to realize the profits of operating that line. Those profits would soon extinguish the extra 2 per cent representing the difference between the 5 per cent which the Grand Trunk are paying and the 3 per cent at which the Government can borrow money. Let us look at the question of the cost of a new section, a question which, in all respects but one, that is, the matter of land damages, can be closely ascertained. I will show, at a later stage, how much the officers and engineers of my department tell me it would cost to duplicate that line—not to make as good a line, because we would not make as good a line for the money they have estimated, but to make a line we would be able to use. Assuming that we have not made an unreasonable allowance in $37,500, and bearing in mind that if it be unreasonable, you have only to take off $10,000 on the ground I have suggested and you get $27,500—we find ourselves at St. Lambert. Is there any objection made to the arrangement with the Grand Trunk for the use of the bridge? I have not heard any. I can go further and say we have all heard one of the gentlemen opposite, the arithmetical rhetorician of the party, stating that the arrangement with respect to the bridge is not an unfair arrangement. As to the terminals, I think they speak for themselves. I have pointed out how valuable these are. I may add that before I received from the Grand Trunk the statement as to the amount they would consider fair rental for the use of these privileges, I had the officers of my department go into the matter very

fully and carefully. And the figures which the chief engineer gave me, and which I had in hand when I received those of the Grand Trunk, was over $61,000, and within a few hundred dollars of what the Grand Trunk had, in their statement when they made up the sum to cover the use of these privileges. So, I take it, if we are to use the line to St. Lambert, if we are to cross this bridge and to use these terminals, the amount is not excessive. Now, I suppose that some hon. gentlemen opposite will repeat what they have already said. I take it that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), who, I would judge, has his eye upon the Department of Railways and Canals in the future, and who, I regret, is not here to-night, has given the House the benefit of his railroad experience in the estimate of the cost of the construction of the line and the building of a new line. I only regret, seeing the merely nominal figures at which he avows he can find responsible men to build these lines, to construct these bridges, that he has kept his great light so long hid under a bushel. He was the adviser and friend of the late Government for many years; but they never profited by his vast experience and wonderful capabilities. Where has my hon. friend from Glengarry been all these years, with his knowledge of how to touch the button and bring about the construction of all these great works at merely nominal figures? He is much to blame and has been greatly remiss in his duty to his party, not to speak of his larger duties to his country, when, having this vast knowledge and experience, he permitted his friends to indulge in such atrocious expenditures of public money in the prosecution of their railway enterprises and never raised his voice in protest.

Let me just for one moment refer to something which I came across yesterday in an editorial article of the "Mail and Empire," and which may be appropriately mentioned here. The editor of this paper has expressed his views in regard to this arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway. We know, without my stating it, what that opinion would be. But they have been giving expression to an idea here which seems to me to be scarcely worthy of the source from which it sprung as the organ of a great party. They say:

> The rejection of the deal by the Senate has resulted in a revision of the terms, and now, instead of paying five per cent on half the cost of construction, we are to contribute four per cent upon a proportion of the cost calculated upon the user.
>
> But we are still to pay $140,000 a year as rental for ninety-nine years.
>
> This sum is equivalent, on the annuity principle, to $4,500,000 with interest,——

Calculating the interest at 3 per cent, which I presume, is the rate they have taken, it would produce about that amount.

——that is to say,——

—it goes on to remark—

> ——if we were to borrow $4,500,000 and pay $140,000 a year back, the capital and the interest would be covered by the end of the ninety-nine years.

That is a somewhat startling proposition to me. If it is true, the editor of the "Mail and Empire" has made a discovery which ought to land him in a position of opulence greater than even Crœsus could boast of. If you can borrow four and a half millions, and by paying 3 per cent, extinguish the principal in 99 years, that is a feat of financial legerdemain in which, I think, they should not continue to hold the exclusive property. But let us take the figures at $4,500,000, and where are we in this calculation? Is there anybody in this House who has applied his mind to it, or who has availed himself of reliable information, who is able to show that you could start from Ste. Rosalie, build a line to St. Lambert, and construct a bridge across the St. Lawrence River, and get into an equally favourable situation to the one we are in Montreal to-day, with an expenditure of $4,500,000 only? I would like to see the individual who would pledge his credit, if he had any credit to pledge, to the establishment of any such proposition. I would like to see my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance do it, although he may be very familiar with the intricacies of governmental finance, but whom I would scarcely like to trust in making a calculation of the probable cost of railway construction on the basis of his statement in the House the other day. I venture to say that $4,500,000 will not begin to give us the valuable and extensive terminals we have in Montreal alone, or give us the location which we have in Montreal. I venture to say that $4,500,000 by no process of calculation and under the construction of no contractor or engineer, let him be even the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), would be sufficient to put the Intercolonial Railway into any part of the city of Montreal, or place us where the people of this country would be content that the Intercolonial Railway, their Government railway system, should be located. More than that, I do not believe that it could be done for four times that amount, from the information which I have been able to gather; at all events, I will say it cannot be done for anything like the sum represented by $140,000 rental, capitalized at 3 per cent.

Now, if you are not disposed to take advantage of the opportunity which there lies at your hand, if you are not prepared to turn to account, as you can as fully and as adequately as if you owned every fraction of the railway, so far as the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway system are concerned, if you are not content to take advantage of the opportunity, I was almost going to say, which God and nature had put into our hands, but which I will say the Grand Trunk Railway have agreed to let us use upon

those terms, if you are not willing to take advantage of those terms and of those facilities, but are going to start out in the construction of another road on your own account, let us see where this construction is going to land you. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would build another line. I judge so. Well, is he going to build to St. Lambert? Has he any idea what it would cost? I can give him an idea of what it will cost, founded, not upon my own unaided judgment, but upon the careful estimates and calculations of my officials in the department, made not to-day, not yesterday, but before I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues the adoption of this scheme. Well, what are these calculations? These calculations are that it would cost, for the laying down of the line of 32 miles, $485,440, independently of the two great bridges, one across the Yamaska and one across the Richelieu, and outside of the probable large amount of land damages which you would be called upon, and would be called upon, to pay. Now, $485,000 would be the cost, according to the judgment of the officials of the department, if we were to undertake to build a railway through an ordinary country; but mind you, this is not an ordinary country, as I will show you before I have proceeded much further. Well, it is going to cost $400,000 to build a bridge across the Richelieu River, and it is going to cost $300,000 to build a bridge over the Yamaska. There you have got $1,185,440 as the estimated cost of building the 32 miles of railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. And, mark you, you have in this calculation only allowed land damages, at from $100 to $150 per acre. Now, when you come to consider the expropriation of the right of way through that country from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, who is going to say what the amount of those damages will be? There are, to begin with, no less than 11 or 12 considerable towns and villages, some of them of considerable magnitude, towns which have grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built. The Grand Trunk Railway Company did not have to pay land damages when they built their line upon the same basis we would have to pay them if we were to build a road which will serve all these towns and villages. Just imagine getting the right of way through 11 towns and villages, one of them, at least, of the importance of St. Hyacinthe, and hon. gentlemen in the committee know the importance of the other places. Is it reasonable, would any Government be safe, would I not be worthy of the severest condemnation, if, as Minister of Railways, I advised my colleagues that we could expropriate the right of way from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert on the basis of even $150 per acre? Why, Sir, it would be idle for me to make any such proposition. You cannot tell, when you go into the question of land damages, just where you are going to land. It would be the part of prudence of any Government to pay a little more than they think would be even a reasonable value of this railway, than incur obligations the magnitude of which no man could foresee. We are not without experience, and the late Government was not without experience of this question of land damages when they found it necessary to expropriate property. In the case of the St. Charles branch alone we see just how those land damages roll up—the enormous sum of $1,000,000 for the land alone that was required for that road of 14 miles. And they did not go through 11 or 12 towns and villages, they did not go through a country of the same value as the country from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. There is no gentleman familiar with both countries that will not bear me out in that statement. So I say that it was the part of prudence for this Government to avail themselves of the opportunity which was open, when they knew there was a limit to the liabilities that they were assuming, and when they knew they could get all they required at a reasonable sum, unhampered with any unforeseen liabilities.

Well, Sir, we have then, $1,185,000, besides an unknown sum to be added to this for the land damages which we would have to pay for the new road to St. Lambert. How much are you going to add for land damages? Well, if you only added one-half of what it took to pay the land damages for less than half the distance on the St. Charles branch, if you only added half a million you would have to pay $1,685,000. Then what would you have? A railway which, to all intents and purposes, would be in direct competition, and would have opposed to it all the business interests, all the energy, and all the enterprise of the Grand Trunk Railway. How much traffic would you be able, under those circumstances, to pick up along your own little line, which you are conducting for yourselves, independently of the Grand Trunk Railway and in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway? Moreover, you have to bear this in mind, a most important consideration which you must never allow to drop out of view when you are considering the value of this proposition in all its bearings. You have got to pay the whole cost of maintenance, for the establishment of all the stations, for the salaries of all the officials, ticket agents, station agents, baggagemen, porters, trackmen, sectionmen, telegraphers, despatchers, the whole staff of labourers from one end to the other; you have to maintain all these on you own independent line, without any assistance and without any contribution from any quarter. But you are getting all the railway facilities you require to the fullest and the amplest extent, as I have enumerated them, and you are paying by your rental a proportion of the cost of these charges which are borne in part by the Grand Trunk Railway Company under the

existing system. You have, therefore, a very potential series of facts to the credit of the transaction, when you come to look at them closely and see their relative weight and importance. Well, Sir, you have then $2,500,000 out of $4,500,000 that I have already disposed of.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is there for land damages ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I estimated $500,000 for land damages.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that make ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That makes $1,685,000.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $1,685,000 out of $4,500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Be accurate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I only hope that my hon. friend will act upon that suggestion when he comes to deal with the matter. It is $1,685,000 out of $4,500,000 ; we will call it $1,500,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert we only pay to the Grand Trunk Railway our proportionate user ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is all we pay according to the amount of business we do on a wheelage basis for maintenance, repairs and all the other charges connected with the employees and staff as I have already stated them. Then we have $1,500,000 ; we will throw off $185,000 and call it $1,500,000. We will then have $3,000,000 of the $4,500,000 left. What have we to do with that ? Does the hon. gentleman propose to cross the St. Lawrence by a new bridge ? If he is going to construct a new bridge, then he can make an estimate of what it will cost him. My engineer's estimate is $6,000,000 for building another bridge across the St. Lawrence. You would wipe out your $3,000,000 and get $3,000,000 on the wrong side of the account. Let us suppose that hon. gentlemen, who have given any attention to this subject, have come to the conclusion that they will not build another bridge, but that they will use the Grand Trunk Railway bridge. Let us see where we will arrive at upon that basis. In the first place it will be admitted that we cannot take the Grand Trunk Railway Company by the throat and compel them to give us the use of their bridge. Possibly, and I will argue it on that basis, an application might be made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for the right to use that bridge. The Railway Committee might feel itself justified in making an order in accordance with that application, but when this matter would come before the Railway Committee what facts would be taken into consideration ? First, that this bridge cost $10,000,000. That fact would be presented by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and they would argue that, having built that bridge, although they may have built it some years ago, at a time when the construction of bridges was more expensive than it is to-day, yet, having taken the risk and having assumed the responsibility of constructing this great structure, are they to be robbed of a fair enjoyment of those advantages without having a suitable allowance made to them ?

Mr. POWELL. I think if the hon. Minister will read the Act authorizing the Grand Trunk to build that bridge he will see that there is an expressed provision that other railways may use the bridge whenever they have occasion to use it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not antagonizing that proposition ; I am assuming that an application can be successfully made, but I think it is a fair matter for us to consider, when we are dealing with an alternative proposition, as to what we can count upon in judging of this proposition and as to how it is likely to work out. If that argument were presented to the Railway Commiftee the Railway Committee would be obliged to recognize the force of it. The Governor in Council, acting on the broad lines that the Government is expected to act upon, recognizing what is fair and just and not merely governing its action by what would be particularly in the interest of the Government, would be bound to acknowledge that that argument has the element of strength, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would be entitled to a liberal allowance, and that it would not be justified in fixing an amount of compensation which would be based on the present cost and in disregard of the actual cost to the company. You can see at once if that argument is put on the basis of $10,000,000 it would not take you very long to swallow up more than your $40,000, more than your $50,000, more than $60,000, and you will possibly find yourself somewhere in the neighbourhood of $75,000 or $100,000 fixed upon you as a rental for the bridge. I will tell you why that would not be an unreasonable expectation. There is another way in which the bridge might possibly be turned to account by the Government which would build a second road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert in accordance with the theory which, I assume, some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are disposed to put forward. There is another way of using the bridge. We might apply to the Railway Committee, or approach the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and ask that they should allow us, not to pay a fixed rental for the use of this bridge, but that they should assess us a fair and reasonable sum for each engine, each freight or

passenger car, each passenger, each ton of freight, or upon some basis such as that, which is not an unknown or an unusual system of compensating for the use of a bridge owned by one company and used by another. I had this question gone into before we made our arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. My engineers were asked to estimate the cost if we were to apply to the Railway Committee, or to approach the Grand Trunk Railway Company and ask to acquire the use of this bridge, not on the basis of fixed rental, but by paying a fair and reasonable sum for every car, locomotive, passenger and ton of freight on the same basis as is adopted in reference to other bridges, and particularly in reference to the Niagara bridge by the railway companies that are using it in payment to the company which owns it. My engineers made a report upon this subject and they showed, making an estimate on the number of trains we would be likely to use and the number of passengers crossing there on the basis of our probable business for the first one or two years, that on the same terms and on the same basis as the companies pay for the use of the Niagara bridge, it would cost us $77,000 a year instead of $40,000 a year. These figures were presented before the committee which sat a year ago, and hon. gentlemen have had ample opportunity of subjecting them to a critical examination. Where would you be after you got to St. Lambert with this road, which you are going to construct? If you are going to cross the bridge and to pay on the business you are doing, irrespective of the business you would do in the future, you would pay $37,000 a year more for the use of that bridge than we are paying under this agreement, and that this is not an unreasonable argument is proved by the fact that the engineers pointed out, that the Niagara is a short bridge and that this bridge is a very long bridge. I do not know exactly what the length of the Niagara bridge is.

Mr. GIBSON. Eight hundred feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Eight hundred feet; less than a sixth of a mile, and here is a bridge twelve times the length.

Mr. GIBSON. Thirteen times the length.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Thirteen times the length. If you apply to this bridge the same rate, or half of the rate, or a quarter of the rate, that is applied to the Niagara bridge, you would get a larger annual charge imposed on the traffic and business of the Intercolonial Railway than is now imposed on it under the arrangement we have made. But you have under this arrangement of ours, the additional guarantee and assurance that no matter what volume your business may attain, your rental is fixed and you have no additional amount charged against you for its use. I think, Mr. Chairman, that whatever way you may look at it, you do not make much progress in establishing a case against the Government's proposition, by starting out upon an independent line or an independent bridge. And, when my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) gets across the St. Lawrence River, what happens? If you are liberal and generous and willing to spend the $6,000,000 to build the bridge, and you get over into Montreal, where are you when you arrive at the north shore of the St. Lawrence? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster), if he had charge of the enterprise, would no doubt turn back with all possible despatch. He would not linger a minute on the opposite shore. He would reconsider the proposition and start out on a new tack. Within no reasonable limits of cost are you going to get from the shore of the St. Lawrence River into the centre of the city of Montreal? I assume that my hon. friend is now in sympathy with me in my proposition, and that we may now accompany one another back from the northern side of the St. Lawrence to the starting point at Ste. Rosalie.

There is possibly another proposal likely to be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, for we have had hints of it, and I am not sure that my ambitious friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has not the idea in his head, for he gave some suggestion of it the other night. He is going to build another line, not parallel to the Grand Trunk Railway, but he is going to build from Ste. Rosalie to Caughnawaga, and he is going to cross the St. Lawrence at Lachine, where he says it can be done cheaply. Let me follow out his proposition, and see where it will bring us. You will remember that by his plan you avoid the extra cost of building an enormously expensive bridge across the St. Lawrence from St. Lambert, but you must remember also that you have got to build a trifling addition of no less than seventeen miles to your railway.

Mr. GIBSON. And seventeen back to Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not speaking of going back yet. And I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), when he accompanies me will ever get back. Is not the building of seventeen miles a considerable item? For the sake of $5,000, or $10,000, or $20,000 a year rental, yes, I might say $25,000 a year rental, is the Government going to put itself to the expense of building seventeen additional miles of railway which this route would necessitate? I do not think they are. At all events, it is a matter which one ought seriously to consider, and we should not jump at a conclusion with reference to it with that rapidity which some of our friends on the other side of the House have shown in proposing this alternative propo-

sition. Well, we have got to Caughnawaga, and my engineers say:

Instead of having to travel 38 miles to get from Ste. Rosalie by the present proposed route into the Bonaventure station, we would have to travel 55 miles, going up to Caughnawaga and crossing the river coming back again on the other side into the city of Montreal.

It is going to cost $17,000 a mile to build these miles of railroad, and then you get somewhere near the outskirts of the city of Montreal on the way down. You will not have very heavy land damages for a portion of the line after you cross the river, because you can come down upon the canal property that belongs to the Government, but you will have to pay land damages, which I do not estimate would be much, between Ste. Rosalie and Caughnawaga. You have to pay $17,000 a mile for the railway; you have $1,500,000 for a bridge across the St. Lawrence at that point; you have to pay $300,000, according to the estimate of my engineers, for two miles as you are entering the outskirts of the city of Montreal, to get down to where the Government has ample land upon which to locate a passenger station and build its shops and tracks and yards. Any gentleman who knows Montreal will recognize that this would take us to the cattle-yard, so-called, in that city. You get there after spending $300,000 for two miles, $1,500,000 for a bridge, and $17,000 a mile upon the fifty-three miles which it would be necessary to build, and then you have to face the grave problem of getting into the business centre of the city. Is any one in this Parliament willing that the main passenger station of the Intercolonial Railway should be located at the Montreal cattle-yards? The proposition is absurd. The cattle-yards are about a mile from the heart of the city—it takes you fifteen minutes in the cars to get down there from the Windsor Hotel. It is said to be a mile from the cattle-yards to the Bonaventure station; it is probably more, and certainly not less. Would it do to have the chief passenger station of the Government railway alongside the cattle-yards of the Grand Trunk Railway? Nobody would tolerate that for an instant. Is there any gentleman here representing the city of Montreal who will say that such a thing would be in the interests of the city, in the interests of the Government, in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, or in the interests of the country at large? I do not think any one of them would say so. Then, if you want to get your station elsewhere, to somewhere near the hotels and the business centre of the city, you have to expropriate your way through a mile of built-up, valuable city property, and to encounter all the difficulties that attend the extension of a line of railway under such conditions. Is that a problem which can be faced with a jaunty feeling? Would any man responsible for the government of the country like to say, that, within the margin of $140,000 a year, capitalized at 3 per cent, you could make all these arrangements—build these 55 miles of railway, build this bridge, get down to the cattle-yards, and then fight your way another mile to the centre of the city—that you could do all this within the limit of $4,500,000, or any sum approaching it? I have not ventured to name a sum, and my engineers are not prepared to say what it would cost to get through that mile.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You get down to the shipping, as well.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but I am only speaking of getting a passenger depot where it would be likely to meet the public convenience, and where, with the disadvantage you are labouring under of having a separate station from other roads, you would get facilities for the travelling public. I have not named any sum; I cannot name any precise sum. Let some gentleman who has more courage than I have, put the cost into figures. I would not like to say, that you could do it for four or five times what it is costing on the principle contained in the existing proposition. And, Mr. Chairman, remember that if you are content to stay at the cattle-yards, which is an impossible proposition, or, if you are bold enough to go this mile further and locate yourself in the centre of the business of Montreal, then, where are your connections? You are not connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or with the Grand Trunk Railway, or with the Canada Atlantic. You are absolutely nowhere, from a railway point of view. In my judgment, it would be infinitely better that you had stayed out of Montreal altogether than to seek admission into that city on either of the alternative plans which have been hinted at by the other side of the House. The hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), I may say in this connection, has said, with all the gravity and all the impressiveness which he can sometimes assume, that this proposition has not any business side, that there never has been a business argument advanced in its favour, and that there cannot be. I make my hon. friend a present of these arguments, and I venture to suggest that it will be difficult for my hon. friend to gainsay their business force or business value, let him deal with them as he may. I ask him, whether or not it is a business proposition you have before you. I ask whether the objections I have endeavoured to present to the alternative proposition, are business objections, founded in good sense, in reason, in experience, and in the absolute necessity of things under the conditions which exist.

Now, Sir, let me recapitulate. Fifty-five miles of railway, at $17,000 per mile, will cost $935,000; or, taking off the two special miles, there will be 53 miles, which will cost $900,000. The 2 miles within the city limits

will cost $300,000. The bridge at Caughnawaga will cost $1,500,000. One mile expropriated through the centre of the city I will ask leave of the committee to put at $2,000,000 or $2,500,000. Perhaps that may be considered absurdly small. I am told it cost the Canadian Pacific Railway, to expropriate its way into the city, $10,000,000. Perhaps half of that amount would not be an unreasonable or excessive estimate to make in respect to this; but let us give away one-half the amount, and call it $2,500,000, and you have $5,235,000 as the cost of this alternative route, with not a station building, a workshop or a building of any kind erected in the city, and not a track made, except the track that brings you in—no terminal connections, none of those vital things which are necessary, if you are going to do a railway business. Moreover, to add to all these other drawbacks, you have 17 miles of additional road to cover to reach your terminal than by the Government plan. There is a little bit of evidence which I will venture to suggest to the committee—indeed, there are two pieces of evidence—to show that, after all, we cannot have gone so very far afield in the terms on which we made this arrangement. If you look at the contract which was entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, you will find parallel conditions just as favourable for the Canadian Pacific Railway as exist for us; yet you will find that for the 38 miles between Toronto and Hamilton, the Grand Trunk Railway Company leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the user for $40,000 a year, or more than $1,000 per mile. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were under no compulsion to make that arrangement, and I presume they would not have made it unless it was in their interest to do so. Is anybody justified in denouncing that as an absurd and unreasonable transaction? I take it, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were not under any political pressure; they had not any deal on; they had no job to perpetrate, such as we are charged with; and yet they paid $40,000 a year rental for the use of those 38 miles. And that is not all. They had no costly bridge to use. They pay their proportion of the maintenance, just precisely as we do, on a wheelage basis. And that is not all. They do not pick up one dollar of freight in the whole 38 miles. If a passenger travels on their train, with a ticket of the Grand Trunk, or any other railway, which would entitle him to pass over the route, the Canadian Pacific have a right simply to retain a trifling percentage, I think 10 per cent for collecting, and the balance goes to the Grand Trunk Railway. Compare those two transactions together, and can anybody say, that our transaction is less favourable than that which the Canadian Pacific Company made with the Grand Trunk Company? But this is not all. I have some knowledge of negotiations which have been pending for nearly two years between the Canada Atlantic Company and the Grand Trunk Company. The Canada Atlantic have desired for a long time to get into Montreal under a more favourable arrangement than they have at present, and they have been endeavouring to induce the Grand Trunk to make an arrangement with them for a fixed rental for a term of years, similar to our contract; and what is the condition of the proposed arrangement? The lowest sum the Grand Trunk Company have been willing to accept for the use of the 38 miles from Coteau to Montreal and the terminals is $150,000 a year; and they have no bridge to cross, and no 2 miles of enormously expensive structure, which cost three times more than all the rest of the road put together. Yet they are asking and insisting upon $150,000. It is true that the Canada Atlantic is not agreeing to that, but think that the sum is large and therefore have not come to an understanding, and there is nothing in it unless they agree that such a contract can be entered into. Would we compare that with ours? Is ours less favourable? Is anybody justified in condemning this and saying the Government has not safeguarded the public interest in making the contract we have done?

I am bringing my observations now, you will say, happily, to a close. I think I have established that we have made a good bargain, that we have taken the cheapest and most economical means of obtaining an entrance into the city of Montreal. I think we have shown that we have obtained a splendid road, that we have secured all the facilities, all the track, all the bridging, we require, all the terminals we can ever require, and are in as good a position for the purposes of prosecuting the business of the Intercolonial Railway as if we owned the entire property from end to end.

My hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister says: Oh, this matter is a very grave question, for you are proposing to make an arrangement that is going to bind this country for ninety-nine years, and possibly longer. Well, if the Government which may be then in power—and by the most sanguine stretch of the imagination, I cannot imagine that my right hon. friend will be able to preside over the destinies of the country for that lengthy period—whatever Government will then exist, will have it in its power to break the contract or continue it. If I were to venture a prophesy, I would say that that contract will be renewed, because there can be no conditions so favourable to the breaking of it, that the Government would think it was in the public interest to rescind the contract. But the ex-Minister of Finance cries, you are assuming an obligation which is to last ninety-nine years. Well, if we spent $4,500,000, the obligation would not be any shorter or the burden any less than under this arrangement, yet the hon.

gentleman would spend, apparently $4,500,000 in some other direction where his friends think it could be better spent. But if you lay out money, you incur a debt which time does not extinguish. You incur a debt which has to be paid. And this expenditure is no more a weight on the shoulders of the people in the form in which we expend the money than it would be in any other form in which hon. gentlemen opposite think it could be expended, or than if we were to borrow the money and buy out all these privileges from the Grand Trunk Railway for $4,500,000. You have to do it one way or the other, and I think this is equal to the best.

There are some features of this contract which have been much dwelt upon. They are what I call unimportant matters, and which I think I am justified in describing as the minor features in the contract. They are not important, not essential, not vital at all. The question as to whether we should have paid 5 per centum upon the cost of betterments is not a vital question, as it appears to me. When we made the rate of 5 per cent, we did so because that is the rate the Grand Trunk Railway are paying, and we could not pay them the cash, because then we would be expending our money upon property subject to encumbrance, and that is a principle we could not approve and which, if we were to act upon it, we would be condemned for admitting by the other side. But with regard to this question, it is a small matter, because the expenditure will not be large under any circumstances. We hold the key of the situation in our own hands, and I think it would not be amiss for hon. gentlemen, when discussing this question and exaggerating its importance, if they would simply carry in their minds this one clause—they do not know it, probably they have not examined it—but if they would carry in their minds this clause, they would see that no betterments are to constitute a charge against the Government unless the Government sanction the expenditure by a memorandum signed by the Minister declaring that the Government will pay its share. We hold, therefore, the control in our own hands; and when I hear these gentlemen talking about the betterments, as though the Grand Trunk Railway was going to spend untold millions out of which they would pay four or five or six dollars to our one—or something in that neighbourhood—when they say that the Grand Trunk Railway are going to spend an enormous amount of money for the purpose of getting out of us a small proportion of it, there is just as much ground for that sort of exaggerated talk as there was for the denouncing by these hon. gentlemen of the Yukon contract, because the district to be granted was a land of gold. But that gold will not be found in the lifetime of the generation now living, and you will not find this enormous expense on betterments incurred in the lifetime of this generation. That is one of the tunes our hon. friends opposite are playing to tickle the ears of the groundlings, and not because they have any conviction that it is an item of magnitude or importance.

So with regard to the two or three other minor details. I rather prefer to discuss this question as broadly as possible, without going into minute details. But these details, if challenged, I can defend to the fullest extent, and defend them on business grounds. I can show that they are reasonable, and I say, even if I could not, they are not worthy of the serious consideration of this Parliament or country, because we are dealing with a question of large policy, with the question as to whether or not we should locate our Government road in the great city of Montreal. And when we found ourselves able to arrive at satisfactory terms, when the Grand Trunk Railway and we were able to come together upon a large basis of settlement, it would have been idle for us to have stopped the negotiations and withdraw from the proposal because on these minor matters the Grand Trunk Railway would not give way. Wherever there is any feature in them which hon. gentlemen might think could be improved upon, I am justified in saying that they were a subject of discussion and constant negotiation with the Grand Trunk Railway. Taking the general proposition, as a whole, having regard to all the important interests involved, I felt that we were justified in agreeing to this contract in the main and in the details, just as we have presented it to this House.

I think there is another point of view from which it would be proper for the members of this Parliament, if they have not already done so, to consider this question of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway. Remember that this is a railway which belongs to the people, to the Government of Canada. I think that the prestige, the character, the reputation, of the people and the Government are involved in the proper maintenance and operation of its great system of railways. When people come to this country from abroad, do you not think they are liable to take from our public works, from our Government railway system, their ideas as to what kind of Government we have, as to what kind of people we have, as to whether we have any large ideas or views at all commensurate with the extent and greatness of this ocuntry? I think that it is a question of importance to the people of Canada, that we should get into the city of Montreal with our great Intercolonial Railway; that we should get there in the best possible shape; that we should get there with all the advantages it is possible for us to command; that we should get there over a railway of which we need not

be ashamed ; that we should reach a portion of the city where the traffic would expect to find us, and that we should be housed suitably as the terminus of a Government railway. And if I never have my name identified with any railway proposition of the Government except this of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal, I shall feel that I have reason to be proud, not alone of the fact that we have reached Montreal, not alone of the improvement we have been able to make with respect to the maintenance and operation of the Intercolonial Railway, but over and above all else, proud of the terms upon which that improvement has been brought about.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) began his remarks with a discussion of the old controversial question that was before the House several days ago with reference to the traffic arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman was going to bring the subject home to me. He suggests that if the timber-headed predecessor of the hon. gentleman who presides over the affairs of the Department of Railways and Canals had paid any attention to the orders that were issued by his subordinates when he was in office he would not have made the remarks he made the other day with reference to this arrangement. The House will remember that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals detailed what he would have us believe was one of the most infamous agreements ever entered into between a Government and a railway, by which the employees of the Intercolonial Railway were forbidden to look for freight along their own lines. I happened to controvert that by reading the agreement to the House the other evening. Notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman returns to the subject and tries to nail me by orders which were issued by my department and of which he says I ought to have had cognizance. I paid very particular attention to the orders which the hon. gentleman read. It is a matter of indifference whether they were issued when I was in control of the department or before, because I was supposed to have knowledge of the orders issued by my subordinates. It makes little difference whether they were issued under my administration or under that of Sir John Macdonald or Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who preceded me—I assumed the whole responsibility. Still, to bring it particularly home to me, the hon. gentleman read some orders issued in 1890, 1891 and 1892, before I was in office at all. The only order that he read that was issued when I was head of the department was one issued in 1893 which had no reference to the subject whatever. Now, what was the effect of these orders ? These orders were strict injunctions to the agents and subordinate officers of the Intercolonial Railway to carry out the written agreement which had been entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. I took the trouble to read that agreement the other day in this House. If there is anything objectionable in that agreement, I cannot see it. If it bears the interpretation the hon. gentleman puts upon it, then, I do not understand it. Let me read, again, the parts having reference to the instructions to local ticket agents and freight agents :

The Minister of Railways and Canals shall use every endeavour to cause the station agents or local ticket and freight agents at stations on the line of the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John, excepting St. John, except as hereinafter provided, to be strictly neutral as between the Canadian Pacific Railway via St. John, N.B., and other lines competing with it, and to way-bill freight and sell tickets by such of these routes as may be indicated by shippers or passengers.

This is the clause "hereinafter provided"

Either party shall be free to employ such canvassing agents as it may see fit, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be free to establish such agencies at points on the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John as its interests may require ;——

Does the hon. gentleman object to that ? Has not the Canadian Pacific Railway a right to appoint agents independent to this agreement in any place where they may require them ?

——provided, however, that should it establish agencies for the sale of tickets and canvassing for freight at points on the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John where other lines of railway competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway, via Point Lévis or Chaudière Junction, have not established similar agencies, the preceding clause as to neutrality shall not apply to such points ;—

In any case where there was not a Grand Trunk agent and a Canadian Pacific agent, where the two companies were not competing for freight, the Intercolonial Railway had a right to establish an agent as against the Canadian Pacific and to compete with it over its long line.

——but if the Government or any railway company competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Point Lévis or Chaudière Junction, shall likewise establish such agencies at the same points the conditions as to neutrality shall be observed by the station agents, local ticket and freight agents of the Intercolonial Railway at such stations.

I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to continue an agreement such as that with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He will never be able to make better terms if he intends that company to go to St. John and Halifax. It was the late right hon. Sir John Macdonald who entered into this agreement, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will never be able to make better terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway than Sir John Macdonald made with the Grand Trunk in 1879 and with the Canadian Pacific in 1890. The hon. Minister dwelt at great length on this question. He stated that the effect of this agreement was to prevent the

Intercolonial Railway agents from one part of the country to the other to competing for freights over their own line of railway. His intention was, I suppose, to convey the impression that they were not allowed to compete for freight to be taken by the long haul to Lévis instead of by the short haul by St. John. The agreement says distinctly what the arrangement was, and there was no such condition as the hon. gentleman says there was. I had several controversies with the Canadian Pacific Railway on that subject. They were always complaining. They applied twice for leave to enter an action against the Crown for damages they claimed to have sustained under the agreement. I told them they had sustained no damages under the agreement. I had the opinion of Sir John Thompson on the subject. He says that the opinion in the department was, that it only applied to the New Glasgow and Oxford road and the Cape Breton road; he says, that the agreement did not apply to these particular portions of the road. I say, that the agreement did not in any way bind the agents on the Intercolonial Railway system to take traffic, trade and passengers from their long line of road; and there were no instructions sent to any officer on the Intercolonial Railway, or to any agency, which prevented it. It was well known that there was a strong esprit de corps among the officials of the road; they were proud of the Intercolonial Railway, and did all they could for the purpose of diverting trade along the long line of road. They succeeded in doing so, and were not interfered with, no agent was dismissed, and there were none of the terrible consequences the hon. gentleman pointed out.

As I stated before, the agreement entered into in 1890 is a perfectly justifiable one, and compares favourably with the agreement at present enterd into with the Grand Trunk Railway by the same gentlemen.

The hon. gentleman twitted us upon asking for papers. We wanted information as to the earnings of the road from Point Lévis to Montreal. He has been running it a while, and the Government promised, through Sir Oliver Mowat in the Senate, that. if they passed this annual subsidy to the road, they would run it for perhaps a year or two, and would then be able to show by the earnings of the road that it might be a profitable undertaking, and would perhaps justify them in making some other agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. gentleman says it is impossible to do anything of that kind. Every railroad man in the country knows the absurdity of the statement that has been put into the hon. gentleman's mouth; every one knows that every leased line of road by the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, no matter how short or how long it is, has a separate account kept of its operations. The hon. gentleman knows, I suppose, that there was a separate account kept of the main line in order to make out the immense benefits which would accrue to the Intercolonial Railway by the increased traffic in consequence of having a terminus in Montreal, and the hon. gentleman goes on to state that the increased traffic on the Intercolonial Railway amounts to about $800,000 a year. He took a great deal of pains to show that the variation in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway for the last ten years only amounted to about $125,000. I asked the hon. gentleman to show us what the expenditure was, but he very carefully avoided that question. He states that the receipts from the Intercolonial Railway this year on account of the terminals being in Montreal, amount to $800,000. That sum cannot be in consequence of local freights from one section of the road to the other, because the local freights for the last ten years show a variation in the neighbourhood of only $125,000. The hon. gentleman has told us exactly what the local freights from one end of the road to the other amount to. The presumption is, that he had the evidence, but he did not dare to produce it. Let us look, judging him by his own figures, at these increased receipts of $800,000, and what do we find? The deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is nearly $200,000 more than it was the year before. What, then, is the presumption to be drawn from the argument of the Minister of Railways and Canals? That, in order to get the $800,000 worth of extra freight and passengers and the extra receipts from freight and passengers at the city of Montreal, he had to expend $1,000,000. There is no other inference to be drawn. The hon. Minister knew it perfectly well, when he was using the argument; he knew that the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is over $200,000 this year. The receipts and expenditures nearly balanced for the few years previously. Take $50,000 off for the deficit, and that would leave $150,000. Add $150,000 to $800,000, and, in order to get the $800,000 of extra receipts for freight, passengers and other business, he had to pay $950,000.

The hon. gentleman, however, goes on to treat the question on a broader scale. He says, that the necessity arose, and, if I had had the energy, the business principles which ought to have characterized a Minister of Railways and Canals, I should at once have made a connection between Point Lévis and Montreal. It was left to the hon. gentleman, who has the energy, and ability, and the push to accomplish it. I had considered it for a number of years, and had come to the conclusion that it was better not to make the connection. I hoped for better things from the Grand Trunk Railway, from the better management, and from a closer connection at Point Lévis. The result justified my anticipation, because, if the present management of the Grand Trunk Railway had been in power then, there would have been no necessity to consider another ar-

rangement. But, no matter how great an expenditure may be required for the purpose of accomplishing the object, the hon. gentleman is ready to make any expenditure of the people's money that he thinks proper, for the purpose of accomplishing it. The hon. gentleman criticised my statement, and I noticed how very careful he was. He does not represent these minor details as worth mentioning. He does not gloat upon the better arrangement he made in 1898, over the one in 1897. He does not tell you, that he has not to pay for one-half the betterments on the Grand Trunk Railway at 5 per cent per annum; nor did he tell us, that he had got connection with the bridge on that line of railway, which was to be so beneficial to the Intercolonial Railway, and which connected the Grand Trunk Railway system with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Before the committee on which I had the honour of sitting, he pointed out the difference between the two agreements; he pointed out that, not only have we connection now with the Grand Trunk Railway, but with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have secured it after a good deal of haggling and a good deal of trouble, from the Grand Trunk Railway, but he did not mention it to-day.

I have stated that I looked over the agreement, and, fortunately, I have taken the precaution of submitting the agreement again and again to different lawyers throughout the country. I did not think that I could possibly be mistaken as to the meaning of plain English words in a plain agreement, and I stated that the Minister has not a conveyance of what he said he had a conveyance, that that agreement does not cover it. The hon. gentleman said, that I owed an apology to the House, that perhaps I was having a rap at his department because his department was responsible for the agreement. But, when he told me, that the Justice Department had drawn out the agreement, he thought that was sufficient to set every doubt at rest. Now, I will take the trouble again to read the agreement, and I maintain that my opinion is correct, notwithstanding what may be said by the Minister of Railways and Canals or the Minister of Justice. The Justice Department may have drawn out the agreement in the terms that were directed to be used for the purpose of conveying what the Minister of Railways and Canals told them was to be conveyed. Here is the agreement:

Now this indenture witnesseth that the expression "Montreal Joint Section," wherever used in this indenture shall mean the company's line and connections at Ste. Rosalie, and the whole line and branches and appurtenances hereby demised from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and the Victoria Bridge, together with the terminals at Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and at Point St. Charles, St. Henri and between Point St. Charles and the Bonaventure station, and also with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Jacques Cartier Junction,——

That is as plain as it can be.

——and the expression "Chaudière Joint Section" shall mean the Chaudière Bridge and connections, except when the meaning shall conflict with the context or otherwise plainly expressed terms of the clause in which the same is used.

This is the demise:

That the said company in consideration of the rents, covenants, conditions and agreements hereinafter contained and reserved hath given, granted, demised and leased, and by these presents doth give, grant, demise and lease unto Her Majesty, her successors and assigns all an undivided one-half share interest, right and title to all the company's line of railway, road-bed and property from and including Ste. Rosalie station in the county of Bagot, in the province of Quebec, to the Victoria Bridge,——

That is as plain as possible.

——and also the undivided one-half right, share, title or interest in the company's line of railway from a point on the western side of the Chaudière Bridge at the proposed junction of the Drummond County Railway with the company's line,——

There can be no mistake as to these two covenants:

——and including the Chaudière Bridge, and to and including the switch at the easterly side of the Chaudière Curve station, being the same rights and privileges agreed to be leased to the Drummond County Railway by the company, with the full and unlimited right and privileges such as the company itself enjoys of running the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains of the said Intercolonial Railway, either separately or combined, and as frequently and at such times as its business and traffic may require, and in both directions, over any and every portion of the said company's railway between and including the said points aforesaid, and the use of the Victoria Bridge across the River St. Lawrence as it at present exists, or as it may at any time during the subsistence of this lease be improved, re-constructed, enlarged or extended, and over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria Bridge and into the Bonaventure station, in the city of Montreal, and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the company hereinbefore more particularly described, together with the full and unlimited right and privilege of having the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway——

This is not described before in the demise. The Ste. Rosalie section is described in the Montreal joint section, and there is also the Chaudière joint section. The Government have to pay for their share of the user of these two particular parts of the road.

——done in and about the stations and premises of the said company, upon any portions of the company's line hereinbefore described, and of the terminals and connections hereinbefore mentioned, and all intermediate stations and premises of the company in and about and upon all stations, tracks and sidings, branches or extensions belonging to or leased by the company or connected with the tracks of the company, together with the full and unlimited right in Her Majesty of constructing stations, tracks, branches and sidings, and connecting said tracks,

branches and sidings with the main branch and leased lines of the company at any point or points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, on the terms and conditions hereinafter contained, for the term of ninety-nine years.

I may be mistaken entirely; I ventured the opinion the other day in the House, and I have had the opinion of many lawyers since who support the view that this agreement does not convey that part of the road that the hon. Minister stated that after a good deal of haggling he had got from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Enough upon that point. I will now deal with the portion of the road between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. The hon. Minister says that he has made a perfect arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. He proceeds to analyse it and presents a defence upon statements made by his department prepared to justify the Minister in making his statement to the House. What does he pay for the use of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, and it is only a 5 per cent use that he is going to get. The hon. gentleman pays $37,500 a year, or if capitalized, it amounts to nearly $1,400,000. No, it is not 5 per cent, because he gets more than that use of it. He has the right to run through trains and to collect freights, and the Minister said, in reply to the hon. Minister of Finance, that he had the right to collect freight on all trains. He has no right to do any local business at all, unless on through trains from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie over the line of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You had better read the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. I read the contract very carefully, and I know what I am speaking about. The hon. gentleman cannot stop a train between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert to collect freights. The train must be a through train from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, and connecting with the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman owns half of the road; he gets half of the money the Grand Trunk Railway Company receives from leased lines, but he does not get a percentage of the excessive user which the Grand Trunk has over and above his user. I was anxious the other day to get from the hon. Minister the percentage of user that the Intercolonial make of these stations and that road as compared with the Grand Trunk. I did not get a statement, but the statement of the hon. Minister to-day was that it was in the neighbourhood of 5 per cent. The hon. gentleman said that he was unable to get information from Moncton as to the exact percentage of user. I will take his statement: For half of what the Grand Trunk Railway Company receive from leased lines and for 5 per cent of the user, the Intercolonial Railway has to pay $1,400,000 for that 32 miles from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. In the statement furnished by his department it was said that this road could be built for $450,000 a mile and that the bridges across the Richelieu and the other river would cost $600,000 or $700,000. Take the hon. gentleman's own figures, and although they included the amount required to build the bridges, yet the hon. gentleman adds $500,000. The estimate furnished by his department was $1,185,440, including the two bridges. In order to show what a magnificent bargain the hon. gentleman has made, you will see, Mr. Chairman, the nature of the estimate that was furnished the hon. Minister by his department. He pays for one-half the revenue which is got from the leased lines and 5 per cent, which is the user of the Intercolonial Railway of that portion of the road, nearly $260,000 more than the estimate, that his own department furnished him, at which the Government could have built the whole line. What is the estimate of the hon. gentleman?—$1,600,000, and hon. gentlemen will have noticed how he blundered in his figures. He got $1,100,000 and added $500,000 and that made $1,600,000. But he got it up to $2,500,000 and had to correct himself afterwards and make it $1,600,000. The estimate of his department is $1,185,440. Take as a fair beginning that he has to pay one-half of this amount $1,300,000 and double that, and that will give $2,600,000. Just fancy, that for these 32 miles of road the Minister allows the Grand Trunk Railway in the neighbourhood of $90,000 a mile under this arrangement of his. He told us that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) forgot the additional 17 miles of railway which would have to be built to arrive at Caughnawaga, but, if I remember aright, the distance from Montreal to Sherbrooke via the Canadian Pacific Railway is only eight miles longer than by the Grand Trunk Railway, and how the Minister got 17 additional miles from the end of the bridge to Caughnawaga I do not know. I suppose he went straight up and when he got across the bridge he went straight down again. Any one who knows the locality knows that the distance could not possibly be 17 miles. The Minister (Mr. Blair) told us that a fair estimate for the Grand Trunk Railway bridge was $6,000,000, but it has been stated again and again that the Canadian Pacific Railway built their bridge across the St. Lawrence for less than $1,500,000, and that to-day, with the more modern appliances and cheaper rates, they could build it for $1,200,000, and yet, the Minister (Mr. Blair) arranges with the Grand Trunk Railway for a 5 per cent user of that bridge at the rate of $3,000,000. The hon. gentleman criticises the figures in the "Mail" with reference to the terminable annuity that would be realized for 99 years at $140,000 a year. I do not know the percentage upon which the "Mail" calculated, but I know that the accountant of the Finance Department made up the terminable annuity for 99 years at $64,000 a year at over $2,100,000. We could pay the amount in full at the end of 99 years and

be clear, whereas, under this bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway, we have a lease for 99 years, and we pay this amount each year, but we do not get the property at the end of 99 years, and we continue to pay the annual charge for ever if we like. The Minister presumes that our party will be in power then, and that, no doubt, the Minister of Railways of that day will make as good an arrangement as he did. I say that the statement of the "Mail" newspaper in regard to the terminable annuity for 99 years at $140,000 a year is absolutely correct, and that it will realize $4,500,000. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to figure out that with his officers, he will find that my statement is correct. The Minister may deceive his followers in this House, but he cannot deceive the country, for every railway man knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge across the St. Lawrence, including approaches, engineering, and everything, cost $1,500,000, and that that bridge can be built to-day for $1,200,000. The hon. Minister pictured the enormous amount of money that would be required for the purpose of getting the line into Montreal. I can tell him that from Lachine into Montreal, the Government owns the best railway track it is possible to get, and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have been anxious to have it. He could run his line along either bank of the Lachine Canal, and when he gets to Montreal he will find numbers of railways connecting with large manufacturing places along his own property, which is leased during pleasure to these parties, and he can make all the connections there with the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, that he wants to. I defy any contradiction of the statement I made the other day, that you can build a double line of railway for what the Minister proposes to give the Grand Trunk Railway; you can expend $60,000 a mile upon it if you like, and you can get into Montreal over your own road, and own your own terminals for a great deal less than the Minister (Mr. Blair) is paying to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway. Take the $1,100,000 which is the hon. gentleman's estimate; add that to the $2,600,000; take $140,000 per annum for 99 years and capitalize it upon the last borrowing rate, and it realizes over $5,000,000. Take from that the $2,600,000, and you have $2,400,000 to make your terminals and connections in Montreal. But the Minister tells us that the value of the privileges which he is receiving from the Grand Trunk Railway is incalculable. The House must remember that besides that $5,000,000 we are giving to the Grand Trunk Railway, we pay for all the water used by our engines and for all the repairs, and we pay a percentage of all the expenditure at the station for terminal facilities and everything else according to the user. That amounts, as nearly as I can make out from the information we have, to about $70,000 a year; perhaps more. Take $5,000,000 for the 5 per cent user of the Grand Trunk property, and take twenty times $5,000,000, and we have what the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) has calculated to be the value of the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, upon the basis of user that the Intercolonial Railway makes of it. Why did not the Minister furnish the House with information as to what the other railways which, at present, use these terminals pay to the Grand Trunk Railway? There are three railways so using them, and it is easy for him to give information as to what the actual amount is that each of these railways pay according to the whole user of the Montreal terminals. If we had that information we would be able to arrive at some estimate of what we ought to pay. But instead of that, the Minister gives us an estimate from his engineer as to the probable amount of passengers and freight that would pass over the bridge at Montreal, and drawing a comparison between that and some Niagara Bridge, he figures out the enormous expenditure of $70,000 a year. The hon. gentleman may impose upon some fools in the country, but he cannot impose upon any one who knows about railways and railway construction. The Minister could have gone to the Grand Trunk authorities and got the user of the bridge and the terminals upon the same terms as any other railway is at present using them. The Grand Trunk Railway would be glad to accept such an offer. And what is the justification which the Minister gives for this enormous expenditure? He says it is a grand scheme, and he tells us the details of it must not be entered into, because the grandeur of the scheme is sufficient justification for what he has done. The people of the country, I hope, will think differently from that. Both of these transactions bear the mark of stupidity, at least. The hon. gentleman justifies them by some comparisons and some remarks on the Yukon Railway. I should have thought the hon. gentleman would have been ashamed to have mentioned that. He has got a report from one of the officers of his department, which shows the stupidity of the arrangement which he tried to foist on this country some time ago; and there is not a man from British Columbia to the maritime provinces, but thanks God that we had a Senate to prevent him perpetrating that infamous scheme. I am not making any charge of infamy against the arrangement between the Government and the Grand Trunk Company. It may be of some advantage politically to the Government in the future. I do not suppose that one cent passed between the Grand Trunk and the Government, whatever my suspicions may be with regard to the Drummond County deal. But it bears a greater mark than rascality on its face. It bears the mark of stupidity. An officer of this country may commit a rascally crime, and may do better in the future; but for a man who acts stupidity there is no hope in the future.

You may hope something for a rascal, but for a stupid man there is no hope. As I shall have another opportunity to deal with this matter, I will not take up any more of the time of the committee to-night, but will just close by thanking you for the patience with which you have listened to me.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken, I wish to accept the invitation of the hon. Minister of Railways——

Mr. FOSTER. But the Minister, after he invited his guest, left the board.

Mr. POWELL—in respect to a statement which I made the other evening as to the cost of every dollar of additional earnings upon the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman has, as he has announced to the House, been acquainted with myself for a number of years, and I have been acquainted with him for as long a time; and there is no gentleman of my acquaintance who is so able to draw upon the realm of nothingness and fabricate so conclusively his facts. I thought that through long exercise, his stock of raw material had been somewhat exhausted; but I find to-night that such is not the case, and that the genius of the artificer is as yet unimpared. He stated that I had wilfully made an incorrect statement with regard to the cost of the additional revenue, which I placed at $1.32 for every dollar of additional revenue. If he knows as much about railway matters as he presumes to know, as a gentleman at the head of the Department of Railways should know, he knows that no man, not even the merest tyro in railway matters, would pretend for one moment to base an elaborate argument upon the earnings per train mile of a railway. Why, Sir, that depends entirely upon the size of the train. Nothing can be deduced from that. It is well known to this House that the hon. gentleman a few years ago introduced upon the Intercolonial Railway system several large engines, two so large that the bridges of the Grand Trunk were unable to support them; and, after coming to Montreal, they had to be taken by the short line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Moncton, and put into the yards there. The object of the hon. gentleman was a legitimate object, and I have no fault to find with him so far as that is concerned. We know that the railroads in the republic to the south of us during the last few years have found that they could greatly reduce the cost of transportation by increasing the size of the engines, the number of cars, and the weight of the train loads; but while that is true, I must say that the hon. gentleman, having at his command his own report, the facts from which he could tell whether my statement was true or not, it was his duty to appeal to them. Now, Sir, I hurl back at the hon. Minister of Railways the charge which he hurled against myself, and I tell him that a more manifest example of unfairness was never exhibited in this House. How did I arrive at this estimate that each dollar of additional earnings cost $1.32? It may be that the hon. gentleman's returns given to Parliament in his report are entirely unreliable; but my estimate was based upon those returns. I find that the total earnings of the Intercolonial Railway in 1897 were $2,866,028.02, and in 1898, $3,117,669.85, a net increase of $251,641.83. Now, compare the expenses. The total expenses in 1897 were $2,925,968.68, while in 1898 they were $3,257,648.51, an increase of $331,679.84. Now, what does that mean? That the Minister of Railways earned $251,641 additional, and that to earn that additional sum he expended $331,679. What does that mean? That every dollar of additional earnings cost this country $1.32. Now, I leave to this House, I leave to the hon. gentleman's associates in the Government, I leave to his followers behind him, this statement as a fair sample of the statistics he has given us. While I am on my feet, I will touch upon another matter in connection with which the hon. gentleman referred to myself. I mentioned the increase of traffic that legitimately belonged to the old section of the Intercolonial Railway, that is, the Intercolonial Railway exclusive of the Montreal extension; and I make this charge against him now, and I do it deliberately, and I challenge him to controvert my position—not because his own mouth is closed by his statement that he is unable to give us the earnings of the Montreal extension or the expenses of its management; I charge home against him that in making the Montreal extension he has used up hundreds of thousands of dollars of a legitimate surplus on the old portion of the road; that instead of devoting that surplus to giving increased wages to the poor trackmen and others employed on the railway, and putting a balance into the treasury, he has wasted it in connection with this scheme, which is thoroughly indefensible from a commercial point of view.

The hon. gentleman says to-night, that the increase of earnings was due entirely to this section of the road. I ask him how, under the circumstances, that could be the case. Has the taking over of this line generated one additional ton of freight that must be moved east to west, or west to east? It has not. It simply gives to the Intercolonial Railway a chance of capturing a certain amount of freight that heretofore belonged to the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, and, inasmuch as this very freight had to pass to and from some point on the Intercolonial Railway to and from Montreal or points west, it had, in the very nature of the case, to pass over some portion at least of the Intercolonial Railway. But the increased receipts of the Intercolonial Railway, my hon. friend says, were not due

to the increased trade in this country. I will put it to you, Mr. Chairman, whether there is any better barometer known to the commercial world than the amount of freight transported by the railways. Increased commerce, increased trade, demand, as a necessary sequence, increased transportation facilities. When there is a larger amount of trade or commerce in a country, a larger amount of transportation is required; and the rise or fall of tonnage carried by the railways indicates very exactly indeed the rise or fall of commercial enterprise. I cannot understand it. Here was the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the floor of this House, scarcely a few weeks ago—and I may be pardoned for referring to a previous debate—assuring the House that all over Canada there was an unexampled boom, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and gentlemen opposite cheered him, as he spoke of the unexampled and unparalleled impetus that trade had received.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to say, that at the same time I stated that in the maritime provinces we had not shared this increased trade so fully. I admitted that there were evidences that in the maritime provinces matters were taking a more hopeful shape, but I distinctly stated, with some regret of course, that, while the condition of the country was more prosperous, we had not shared in that increased prosperity as fully in the maritime provinces as elsewhere; and, to that extent, I hope the hon. gentleman will qualify his remarks.

Mr. POWELL. I do not think they need any qualification; but I would ask him whether, when he said, that the maritime provinces had not shared to the same extent as the others, he did not glory in the extent to which they shared. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) says there was no marked increase of local traffic on the Intercolonial Railway. I state deliberately, that the hon. gentleman knows better. He knows there was a very marked increase. Does he not know that almost a year ago he, through his agent, Mr. Harris, entered into a contract for the transportation of coal over the Intercolonial Railway from the Springhill and other Nova Scotia mines to the city of St. John, and that, in consequence the whole system of barge transportation, from Parrsborough, in the constituency represented by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), was dispensed with, and the Intercolonial cars have since carried immense quantities of coal for St. John? Does he not know that, in consequence of arrangements for through trade which he made. Mr. Reid established a steamship line to Sydney in the Island of Cape Breton, from Newfoundland, and that, in consequence, of that arrangement, 40 to 50 carloads, on an average, per week have passed over the Intercolonial Railway during the past year? Does he not also know that this arrangement has diverted to the Intercolonial a very large passenger traffic, which previously came to Halifax or went directly to the United States? Does he not know also that, in connection with the railway in Cape Breton, there has been during the past year an unexampled impetus given to the lumber trade, and that one gentleman, a member of this House, freighted and routed 65 cars additional entirely over that line? Besides that, does he not know that there have been 135 car-loads carried over the Intercolonial Railway by the Dominion Coal Company for their works on the island of Cape Breton?

Mr. HAGGART. Is that per day or per week?

Mr. POWELL. I am giving the total. In addition, does he not know that the Steel and Iron Works at Ferrona, in the county of Pictou, have, instead of being supplied with coal by the mines in their immediate vicinity, undertaken to get coal from Cape Breton, which is superior, or better adapted to their purposes, and that, on an average, for a long time during the past year, there have been two or three car-loads of coal per day passing over that line in connection with the Iron and Steel Works? Furthermore, as a matter of fact, there are in his department statistics to show that the train employees on the Cape Breton road have been getting almost double pay during the last year on account of extra work they had to perform in this way, in connection with an entirely local traffic.

One increase the hon. gentleman denied the other evening, and then admitted it afterwards. That is the increase of rates. I am assured that there is an increased rate on coal. As an example of what prevails over the Intercolonial Railway system in the maritime provinces, let me say, that on a haul of 45 miles the rates were increased from 25 per cent to 30 per cent, making an increase of between 30 per cent and 50 per cent in the rates on coal alone. The hon. gentleman denied, the other evening, that, after Mr. Harris was appointed, he increased the local rates. He said that I was wrong. Well, he resorted to a mere subterfuge, and before he got through his speech he admitted—and there are gentlemen in this House who know that the admission is correct—that Mr. Harris did increase the rates. Whether he increased them directly by increasing the charge per car-load, or indirectly by having the cars weighed and measured, where previously they had not been, does not matter; the fact remains that the rates were increased 25 per cent to 50 per cent.

In the case of cord wood in the county I have the honour to represent, whereas previous to Mr. Harris taking charge, quite a lucrative business had been carried on in supplying the city of Moncton with fire-

wood, after Mr. Harris was appointed, without any notice at all of the change of tariff, a gentleman engaged in this particular trade brought several car-loads to Moncton, and, when he went to pay his freight, after he had effected a sale, he found that, in order to pay the freight, he had to use the total proceeds of his sale and add a few dollars to boot. That will give an illustration of the increase of local freights. Not only that, but there was a public agitation against this increase by the hon. gentleman's own supporters down there. One gentleman, a strong supporter of the Government, who was appointed to quite a lucrative office under this Government, told me that he had written the Minister of Railways, that, if he did not change the traffic and put the rates back to what they were, he would scarcely be able to get a single vote along the whole line of the Intercolonial Railway; and that statement is an approximation to the truth.

There is another matter to which the hon. gentleman referred, and with which I think he connected my name. He spoke of the Richelieu River and the cost of the bridge across that river. I do not know how broad is the Richelieu where the bridge was built, but I do know that the statement that $500,000 was a fair estimate of the cost of erecting a bridge over that river—a shallow river, with a hard, rock bottom—is simply absurd.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate is $400,000.

Mr. POWELL. Well, I will give some facts about bridges. Any gentleman who goes over the Intercolonial Railway to the Island of Cape Breton will cross what is called the Grand Narrows Bridge. This bridge is 1,720 feet long. I do not know the exact length of the bridge over the Richelieu, but I do not think it is anything like as long as that. The piers of the Grand Narrows Bridge are built in from 50 to 75 feet of water, the deepest water is 76 feet. You can see the enormous expense involved in erecting a bridge in such deep water. There is a four and a half knot current and the piers have to be very strong to resist the ice. That bridge cost a little over $500,000—I think $520,000 was the exact price. There are seven spans including a draw, and gentlemen who are familiar with the building of bridges know that a draw adds considerably to the cost. Why, if hon. gentleman will take up any work on railway construction he will learn something about bridges. Take the Kinzua viaduct on the Erie Railway. It is 2,600 feet long and 310 feet up in the air, and the cost of it was $300,000, exclusive of the cost of the low abutments supporting the pillars. And then the hon. gentleman talks about erecting a bridge over a little river like the Richelieu, with the best bottom in the world, and spending $400,000 or $500,000 upon it. I did not rise to make any lengthened remarks, but simply to call attention to these matters in which the hon. gentleman reflected upon myself.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I merely wish to offer a very few remarks on this very important question. In all the years that I have sat in this House I have never known an Opposition to be placed in such an exceedingly awkward position as that in which hon. gentlemen opposite are placed to-day. For many years they handled the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway. Year by year that road ran into arrears, annually rolling up a deficit——

Mr. POWELL. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. If my hon. friend will allow me—annually rolling up a deficit, with the exception of three or four years when there were very small amounts on the right side of the ledger. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are the men who are possessed of the ability and statesmanship to manage the affairs of this country. For eighteen years they handled the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway, and, though they knew that deficit after deficit was the result of its operation, they never made an effort to take it out of the financial rut into which it had fallen and to put it on such a basis that at least it would earn running expenses. From the time of the completion of the Intercolonial Railway down to last year, the entire receipts were $57,101,249, while the total sum paid out for operating expenses was $63,450,405, a net loss in operating expenses of $6,349,156. That was the condition when the present Government took office. About $55,000,000 of the people's money has been sunk in the road. This represents an interest charged of about $2,000,000 a year. Taking the 30 years for which it has been run, this would mean a loss to the country of some $60,000,000, to which we have to add the deficit upon operating expenses which I have just quoted. Notwithstanding the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite to the monopoly of the statesmanship and shrewdness in the management of public affairs in this country, they made no move to lift the Intercolonial Railway out of the unfortunate position to which it had fallen. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has frequently charged the present occupants of the Treasury benches with incapacity, declaring that they are not possessed of the ability or the knowledge or the shrewdness to handle the affairs of this country. He was Minister of Railways and Canals for five years. During that time, undoubtedly, he operated the road so as to show a small surplus over working expenses. In his first year there was a deficit of $97,131.33. The next year, 1881, he had the magnificent surplus of $542; in 1882 he showed a surplus of $9,605; in 1883 one of $10,547, and in 1884 his surplus was $9,068. But how did he bring about these surpluses? He accomplished it by charging everything he could

think of, everything he could dare charge to capital account. In place of making the necessary repairs to rolling stock, the engines and cars that could not be safely used were shunted upon the siding and left to rot, and new engines and cars were bought and charged to capital account. Instead of charging snow fences to working expenses, as was shown in this House, he actually charged them to capital account. By keeping the accounts in this fashion for five years, he managed to show a small surplus. But during the five years of his administration he enormously increased the capital account. In five years he increased that capital account $6,244,325. And what had we to represent this expenditure? We had two additional branches. One was the St. Charles branch, which was a political sink hole into which the money of this country was thrown and wasted. Another was the Oxford and New Glasgow branch which virtually duplicated the existing Intercolonial Railway. We remember the glowing terms in which the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) when he was Minister of Railways and Canals, presented his scheme for the construction of his line. He declared that it it would be the means of placing the Intercolonial Railway in such a position that it would largely increase its earning power, that the grades upon the new branch, in place of being so enormously heavy, as on the old line, would have almost no grade and would be 45 miles shorter than the old one. But when it was built, owing to the fact that he found it necessary to carry it through his constituency from pillar to post to suit those that urged upon him to give them railway conveniences, and through a section belonging to the county of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and through a section belonging to the county of the then Postmaster General, Mr. McLellan, the result was that when the road was finished it was only four and a half miles shorter, and the engineer under examination swore that the grades were heavier in place of being lower. I am now pointing out what the hon. gentleman did for the Intercolonial Railway during the time they were in office. These were the moves that they made, and still they are prepared to declare before an intelligent community, to declare before the reading public of this Dominion, that the men who now occupy the Treasury benches are incompetents, are incapable of handling the affairs of this country, and that with them rests all the statesmanship and all the wisdom; although during 18 years they allowed the Intercolonial Railway to dribble along, rolling up a deficit each year, and adding enormously to the capital account for operating purposes, and at the end of that time they left it just in the same hole in which they found it 18 years before. They never had the statesmanship, the ability, the shrewdness to make an effort to bring it to Montreal, the chief city of this Dominion, we may say the Liverpool of Canada, and the only place where we could hope to get some freight for that road.

Now, Sir, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) tells us that the present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) should give us exactly the sum earned over the Drummond County Railway, and the additions, and over the Grand Trunk Railway, during the period that he has operated that portion of the line. He insists that if the Minister were disposed to do it, he could easily give that information. Well, who is responsible for having consolidated the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway? The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was the man that put all the lines together. And what did he put them together for? Because the branches they had built showed such an enormous deficit every year. the Cape Breton branch, the St. Charles branch, and the Oxford and New Glasgow branch showed such a deficit in working expenses that, in order to cover up those things they had been guilty of themselves, they consolidated the whole book-keeping system so that these accounts could not be kept separate. When we were on the other side of the House we demanded of the then Minister of Railways and Canals a statement showing the earnings of the Cape Breton branch and of the other branches, and he always replied that the accounts had been consolidated, and that it was impossible to give the earnings of one branch separate from another. Now, he turns round and demands of the present Minister of Railways and Canals an answer to the very question that he declared himself could not be answered when he was Minister of Railways and Canals. Then he says that after due consideration he came to the conclusion not to make a connection at Montreal. Well, it shows an enormous amount of statesmanship on the part of a man that was Minister of Railways and Canals, and of the Government of which he was a member, that after 18 years of experience of that road, always showing a balance on the wrong side of the ledger, they in their wisdom came to the decision that they could not think of making a connection at Montreal.

Now, Sir, I listened, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite listened, with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon. I must say that during the many years that I have sat in this House I have never heard a clearer, a more concise and a more convincing statement of facts connected with any scheme than that which was laid before the House this afternoon. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not been able to answer it. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals made a faint attempt at reply, and it was the lamest that I ever heard him make. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) sat silent up to this moment; although he is a critic, and an able one on finance, he has never dared to rise in his place and

challenge the statements that have been presented to this House. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has also sat in his place, and although he is a critic with any amount of assurance, and is prepared to challenge anything and do it with a good deal of force, he has sat in the House during the afternoon, he has listened to the statement presented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and although he has declared that these men are incompetents, that they are not possessed of the ability required to handle the affairs of this country, he has not dared to get up and challenge the extended statement that the Minister of Railways and Canals has presented with regard to this scheme. Now, Sir, I claim that if there is any one act that this Government can claim credit for before the people of this country, it is the honest effort that they have made, through the Minister of Railways and Canals to lift the Intercolonial Railway out of the position in which it has been for 18 or 20 years, yes, 30 years, and place it upon a basis that, at least, it will pay running expenses. They deserve the thanks of every ratepayer in this country for making that effort. I believe the bargain that they have made is a good one, it is a prudent one, it is one that in the end will prove to the people of this country that there are statesmen at the head of the affairs of this Dominion, men who know what they are doing, men who are actuated with a sincere desire to do the best that they can in the interest of the people. They have shown more ability in connection with this very matter than has been shown by hon. gentlemen opposite if you were to roll all their heads together. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot show a single thing that would compare with it in magnitude and statesmanship. This scheme bears upon its face evidence that a man is now grappling with the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway who is possessed of more ability, more genius and more shrewdness than any man that has ever presided over that department before. I believe that is true, and I believe the people will come to that conclusion when they read the speech that he made this afternoon in connection with the bargain that this House is asked to sanction with the Grand Trunk Railway. I think it is one of the grandest schemes that I have seen for some years, when you come to conclude, as you undoubtedly will have to admit, that the accommodation the Intercolonial Railway has obtained in Montreal is very extensive. The Grand Trunk Railway has undoubtedly the best terminal advantages of any line in the city of Montreal, and it has been building them up for some 35 years. We get the use of all these advantages, as the Minister of Railways and Canals said this afternoon, and we only pay a sum for keeping them up proportionate to the extent to which we use them. If the Grand Trunk Railway makes double the amount of use that the Intercolonial does then we will only have to pay one-third of the expense. I was amazed to hear the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) say this evening, that it would cost this country about $70,000 to pay for keeping the line in proper order in the city of Montreal. I do not believe it will cost anything like that sum. I believe that the hon. Minister of Railways has made an exceedingly shrewd bargain in stipulating that he shall pay the expense of keeping the tracks, the station buildings and the general accommodations in order proportionate to the amount of work that the Intercolonial Railway does. If the Grand Trunk does double the amount of business that the Intercolonial Railway does the Grand Trunk pays double the amount of the expense in keeping these things in order. Then, again, we are getting magnificent accommodations in station grounds and station buildings, and these accommodations are open to the use of the Intercolonial Railway, as well as to that of the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not know what arrangement has been made in regard to taxes. I do not know what the agreement contains in regard to that matter, or whether we will have to pay any taxes to the city of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Moreover, the Grand Trunk Railway will have to pay taxes, to a good large amount, and we will not have to pay any taxes at all for the advantages that we enjoy. Then, there is another advantage; the agents of the Intercolonial Railway will be able to go to any place, west, on the Grand Trunk line, and covenant for freight over the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk is bound to carry that freight at rates as low as it will carry it for any other person that wants freight carried to Portland or to Boston, and, if at any time, any dispute arises in regard to the rates, if the Minister in charge of the Intercolonial Railway claims that the Grand Trunk is asking too much, that question is to be settled by arbitration. We have virtually got the Intercolonial not only into Montreal, but we have it extended to Sarnia, to Detroit and to Chicago, if you like. Intercolonial agents may take freight at any place along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway, and can covenant for its delivery at Halifax or at St. John, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company is bound to carry it at the same rates as they will carry it for any other person or company. That is all included in the $140,000 a year, so that I consider the bargain that has been made is an exceedingly good one. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have attempted to point out a difference between the bargain of 1897 and that of 1898. The hon. leader of the Opposition got up in this House a few evenings ago and declared that the later bargain is $1,000,000 better than the former one; while the ex-Minister of

Finance (Mr. Foster) would not risk his reputation by going that far. In two of the last speeches he made he said that it was about $500,000 better than the former bargain. Here are two hon. gentlemen sitting side by side, one the leader of the Opposition and the other the ex-Finance Minister, who, after having thought this matter over, are in doubt as to whether it is really $1,000,000 or whether it is only $500,000 better.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) $400,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Or $400,000. That shows what a divergence of opinion exists between the leading lights amongst hon. gentlemen opposite as to the relative advantages of this present bargain and the bargain of 1897.

Mr. CLANCY. What do you say about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell my hon. friend, and I will be very frank with him. If I were the owner of the Drummond County Railway, and I had an offer to sell, I frankly confess that I would rather have $1,600,000 in cash than take a lease from the country agreeing to pay $64,000 for ninety-nine years.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I would not.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says he would not. You have to take this into consideration; you have not a security that you are going to place on the London market that is a bond of this Dominion with coupons attached for interest payable annually. You have no desirable investment that you can divide up. It has to be handled by one man. Suppose you wanted to dispose of that lease at $64,000 for ninety-nine years, the man who buys it would have to take into consideration the cost of the collection of the money. The probabilities are that it would be payable at the Receiver General's Office in Ottawa. Suppose the purchaser lives in London. He has to take into account the exchange, the time that the money is being transmitted, the cost of transmission every year of this $64,000, and he would have to take into consideration the risk that he might have to run because hon. gentlemen opposite might get into power, and, if they did, the credit of the country might so run down that he would find his security not as saleable as it may be at the present time. Notwithstanding the statement that the hon. ex-Minister of Finance has made, I will venture to predict that although it may suit his convenience now to say that he would take the lease, with a payment of $64,000 for ninety-nine years, that if you placed on one counter $1,600,000 in cash, and a bond of that kind—I will stake my seat in this House that he would take the $1,600,00.

Mr. FOSTER. Just try it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Because there would be considerable difficulty in handling a bond of that kind. There may be some men in England who could handle it. They might possibly form themselves together and handle it in that way, but it is not a desirable investment. In England it would not be considered a desirable investment; it is not an investment you could place on the market in England, nor would you get money at the rate of interest at which this Dominion can borrow. I believe it was the view of the owners of the Drummond County Railway, when the scheme was presented to their minds, that it was better for them to take $1,600,000 than to run the risk of handling that bond, placing it on the London market and maybe making $200,000 or $300,000 more. I believe they came to that conclusion, and I believe that they were wise in their day and generation. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat said that the Intercolonial were only capturing freight that properly belonged to the Grand Trunk Railway. We rejoice that the Grand Trunk Railway is prosperous, and we are glad to see every railway in the country prosperous, but even supposing we do, and supposing that the Grand Trunk should suffer a little owing to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway is getting this volume of the business of the country, the country will reap the benefit if the Grand Trunk does not reap the benefit. I believe that in the course of a year or two, when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has had an opportunity to mature and put into successful operation the scheme that he has now propounded to the House, it will show that there is wisdom and prudence in the course that he adopted that the country is going to get out of the everlasting deficits in the operation of that railway, and that eventually it will pay a handsome revenue in addition to the working expenses, and the country will get something in return for the amount of money that has been sunk in that road. I believe that will be the result, and I believe the country will be grateful to the Minister (Mr. Blair) for the efforts which he has made to change the unfortunate condition of things which has existed on the Intercolonial Railway for thirty years. The statement made by the Minister, that the receipts on that road have increased $860,000 during the last year, is a most gratifying announcement, and I hope that gentlemen opposite will blush before they again rise in this House and talk about the incapacity of this Government. I hope that these gentlemen on the other side, will realize that when their hats are on, all the brains in this country are not covered. The men in this Government have shown that they have ability to properly conduct our national affairs. I congratulate the Minister of Railways on the magnificent showing he has made, and I repeat, that he deserves the

thanks of this House and of the country. He has made a change in the history of the Intercolonial Railway that will inure to his credit for many, many long years. The people of Canada will recognize that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is possessed of ability, common sense and statesmanship, and that he has rendered valuable and lasting services to his country.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln). It is not my desire at this late hour to take up the time of the committee, particularly as the matter has been dealt with in such an able manner by the Minister of Railways that it has left very little for members on either side of the House to say. I cannot, however, help noticing the marked contrast between the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) and the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart). We all remember that when the Liberal party was in Opposition and when they made charges across the floor of this House of extravagance against the then Minister (Mr. Haggart)—sometimes the work exceeding his estimates by hundreds of thousands of dollars—his answer simply was: "I know nothing about it; I left that in the hands of my engineers and officers." Contrast that conduct with the manner in which the present Minister (Mr. Blair) has dealt with this subject. Contrast his able statement to-night with the reply of the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart). Consider the statements that were brought down by the Minister (Mr. Blair), statements and estimates carefully prepared by the officers of the department, and contrast that with the declaration of the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) on his responsibility as a member of Parliament, that he could duplicate the Victoria Bridge to-day for $1,500,000. In view of such a statement, I leave the country to judge of the ability of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) to ever have occupied the position of Minister of Railways and Canals. Sir, the original Grand Trunk Railway Bridge, built by perhaps one of the greatest engineers the world has ever produced, Mr. Robert Stevenson, cost $6,750,000. True, the new bridge of to-day could be built for the same amount, or perhaps for $5,000,000. But look at the bridge of forty-five years ago, with only one single track, with no accommodation for foot passengers, simply a tunnel of iron, but with material enough to build the bridge of to-day, which is capable of carrying 11,000 pounds weight to the running foot of each line of the track; contrast that bridge of to-day with the bridge of forty years ago, when the greatest load that it was considered possible to put on a single line of railway was 2,240 pounds to the running foot. That Victoria Bridge to-day is capable of sustaining a running load of 11,500 pounds to the running foot on each of its tracks, or in other words, it has ten times the carrying capacity of the old bridge. I leave it to the House and to the country to judge, whether the bargain made by the Minister (Mr. Blair) was good or bad, when we remember that that bargain allows all the trains of the Intercolonial Railway to pass over and through that bridge for the sum of $40,000 or $50,000 a year. I happen to know something of some of the bridges in this country, and I will give you one instance in the case of the old Suspension Bridge in the county of Welland, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary), who will know whether I am speaking by the book or not. That bridge is only 800 feet long between the towers. The original bridge cost half a million dollars. The Grand Trunk Railway Company entered into a 999 years lease with the Suspension Bridge Company for a rental of $50,000 a year, or ten per cent of the total cost of the original bridge for 999 years. The traffic of the lower bridge was in the hands of the Bridge Company. All the tolls that were collected became the property of the Bridge Company. They kept officers for collecting the toll by day and by night, and everything under the upper tracks of the bridge solely and wholly belonged to the Suspension Bridge Company. Now, in addition to that, the Grand Trunk Railway Company had to maintain the upper deck and the upper floors of the bridge; maintain its track and own and maintain its approaches; so that all the expenses in connection with that 800 feet bridge, were maintained in toto by the Grand Trunk Railway. Since this growing time of business, the traffic on the Grand Trunk Railway like the business of every corporation and individual in this country had to have greater facilities, and the Suspension Bridge Company knowing that there was no possibility of increasing the carrying power of the old Suspension Bridge, or of giving greater railway facilities for the traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway, decided, and decided wisely to do away with the old Suspension Bridge, and to erect a steel arch bridge in its place. The Grand Trunk Railway Company as a business corporation did not haggle, as my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House do, about a matter of $4,000 or $5,000, but the moment the Suspension Bridge Company declared their willingness and ability to replace the old Suspension Bridge with a steel arch bridge, the Grand Trunk Railway Company at once acquiesced in the proposal and made new terms. I may say, in passing, that the arch there is the wonder of the world to-day, and it was erected without for one moment stopping the traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway, or any of the other railways that use that bridge. I venture to remark, that for no five minutes of the 24 hours of the day is there not a railway train or a shunting engine on the top of that bridge. When we went to the Grand Trunk Railway Company with our proposition to build a new bridge, we were at once met with the old lease, but they did not haggle about the 999 year lease which was to hold the Bridge Company for all time to come, no matter what improvement they

might make in the matter of giving greater facilities to the Grand Trunk Railway. No. Sir, they at once entered into an arrangement to increase the annual rental with the Bridge Company by $12,500, so that to-day, for 800 feet of a bridge, the Grand Trunk Railway Company are paying us $62,500 a year rental. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has still to maintain the approaches at the Canadian end as well as at the American end of the bridge; and I want to say, for the benefit of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who was so anxious about the Alien Labour Act, that I had Canadians working on the American end of the bridge during the months of April and May. I took my tools of trade over there and I was not interfered with.

Mr. CLARKE. Why do you not try to influence the Government to prevent aliens coming in to take the places of the men now on strike on the Grand Trunk Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Chairman, I am in a position to state, by the authority of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that that company are not importing, and do not intend to import any foreign labour.

Mr. CLARKE. I drew the attention of the hon. First Minister several weeks ago to the fact that Italians were being brought to the city of Toronto, and I asked him if he intended to have the Alien Labour Law enforced then.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. GIBSON. I just wish, in passing, to say to my hon. friend who has been pointing out how commonly Canadians are being deported from the United States, that, as the Prime Minister stated yesterday, in only one city in the United States is that law being enforced, that is, in the city of Buffalo by a man named DeBarry. I have had, perhaps, as much experience of the Alien Labour Law as any man in this country, and I may say to the hon. member for West Toronto, that I built the American end, as well as the Canadian end of the Grand Trunk tunnel with Canadian workmen and Canadian material, and I never had a man stopped.

Mr. BEATTIE. The United States law was not then in force.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) knows all about that, as he does about everything else. I want to inform him that, if the Alien Labour Law had been enforced, I was then liable for a fine, not of $500 per day, as now, but a fine of $1,000 per day. That is the difference between the law of 1892 and the law of 1898.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman will permit me for a moment. He has made the statement that in only one city of the United States is the Alien Labour Law enforced. I wish to draw his attention to the fact that on the 30th of March last a despatch from Washington was published, which stated:

> Drury J. Tallant, of Great Falls, Montana, has been appointed an immigration inspector for service at Coutts, Canada. This appointment is made in accordance with the recommendation of the collector of customs at Great Falls, who states that an additional inspector is urgently needed to prevent the importation into this country of alien contract labourers.

Mr. GIBSON. I was just pointing out that, notwithstanding the increased rental given by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, they have still to maintain their approaches, and I wish, in passing, to say to the hon. member for West Toronto, who, with his colleague from East Toronto, has the Alien Labour Law on the brain——

Mr. CLARKE. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman until he had pointedly mentioned my name in connection with this discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. GIBSON. Now, I want to say, that this Government, in paying a rental of $50,000, or $75,000, or $100,000 a year for the use of the Victoria Bridge between Point St. Charles and St. Lambert, would not be paying one cent more than the Grand Trunk Company would be entitled to receive; for $100,000 a year would only be 1 per cent on $10,000,000. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been lamenting that the Government were paying from 4 per cent to 5 per cent on the valuation put on the Grand Trunk Company's property. These hon. gentlemen forget that it is not the Dominion Government that is raising the money at 2½ per cent to bring these enterprises to completion, but that it is the Grand Trunk Company who are providing the money. The Victoria Bridge is 13·2 times longer than the Suspension Bridge between the towers and, according to the old rate of rental of the Suspension Bridge per running foot, the Grand Trunk Company would be entitled to receive from the Government $660,000 per year; or, under the new rental of $62,500 a year for the Suspension Bridge, the rental for a bridge 13·2 greater in length would amount to $825,000 a year. But, putting that comparison aside, and bringing the estimate down to a basis of value, when you consider that the Suspension Bridge cost less than $800,000, and that the Victoria Bridge, the old and the new, cost in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000, I think, that the Government have done well for the people of this country in getting the use of the new Victoria Bridge at a rental of one-half of 1 per cent per annum. Then, we have had some experience of how railway companies charge passengers on the other side of the line for passing over bridges. I am

sure my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will remember that, when we crossed over the bridge at St. Louis, we found that the bridge company had an agent come on board the train and collect from the through passengers 75 cents per head; from the local passengers, 50 cents per head, and from those living in the city of St. Louis, 25 cents per head. Going further down the Mississippi and crossing the bridge at Memphis, we found that every passenger had to pay 75 cents. If the same rule were followed with regard to the trains on the Intercolonial Railway passing over the Victoria Bridge, I believe I am safe in saying, that, with the increased traffic which we may expect, these tolls would amount to a great deal more than $50,000 a year. Then, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) said he had made a survey of the road. He said that he had had a varied experience in building railroads in Nova Scotia and other provinces of the Dominion. That statement I have no reason to doubt; but I do say—and I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, because I asked him the question, when he was giving the House his experience, and his knowledge of railway building—that, so far as his inspection went, the line between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie was nothing but sand, and could be worked with road scrapers. That work, he said, could be let for 12 cents a yard to the main contractor and be sub-let again for 10 cents a yard. I knew that when the hon. gentleman made that statement, he was not making it from his own knowledge, because, starting at the very commencement of the line, at St. Lambert itself, instead of sandy loam, he will find rock cutting worth $1 to $1.50 a yard to take out. He will find, also, on passing along the line, that there is a swamp of over two miles in extent, and when he goes to St. Hyacinthe, right outside of the town, the first bridge he leaves, he will find a culvert there that cost $10,000 to build. He said, in the estimates he gave, that $25,000 would build all the small culverts and structures between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie. I can tell him of one small culvert that was put in at St. Hyacinthe which cost $8,000, and another bridge that was put in at St. Lambert, which cost $10,000, making $18,000 for the two, which would leave him the magnificent sum of $7,000, with which to put in stone culverts over 38 miles of railway. If he described the condition of things on the Grand Trunk Railway between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie, as he saw them, I am obliged to come to the conclusion that he must have ridden on the last car of the train and mistook the gravel that bedded the ties for the loam and sandy soil he saw in that portion of the line. He said he could get reputable men, and could furnish them in ten days, who would build this line at the prices he stated. Well, I was speaking to-day to a gentleman whose experience cannot be gainsaid, Mr. Mann, of Mann & Mackenzie, and when I told him that the hon. member for Glengarry had made that assertion, he said it was absurd, because he was paying to-day to sub-contractors 17 cents per cubic yard for earthwork on a section of the line he is building in the North-west at present.

The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the Richelieu Bridge, and gave even the number of piers and yards in that bridge. The masonry he estimated at $20 a yard and the superstructure at $45 a running foot. His whole estimate for the Richelieu Bridge was $76,630—$49,630 for the masonry, and $27,000 for the superstructure. Well, $27,000 would not build the centre span of the swing bridge on the Richelieu River, and, as a responsible member of this House, I am prepared to stake my reputation on the statements I have made, and I am more disposed to accept, with the knowledge I have had of public works, the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) and of a reputable officer of his department, than the statement which the hon. gentleman made across the floor for the sole purpose of criticising the bad bargain, as he called it, which the Government have made with the Grand Trunk Railway. If we are going to accept the Minister's and his officer's statement, the hon. gentleman is only out $323,000 on the Richelieu Bridge.

Then, when you come down to the bridge at St. Hyacinthe, he modestly put that at $29,500. You, Mr. Chairman, heard to-night the statement made by a responsible Minister of the Crown and the estimate given by the responsble officer of his department, which showed that it would cost $300,000 to put that bridge alone in its place, and yet we find that this gentleman, the member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is prepared to duplicate that bridge for $29,500. I am sorry to say that in this case he is as much astray as in the case of the Richelieu Bridge. He is only $270,500 short on this bridge.

Then, there is another item which he laid great stress upon, and that is the ballasting of the road bed, that is, taking gravel from the gravel pit and placing it on the side of the road, to be used as ballast according as required. I can tell the hon. gentleman and his friends that no reputable engineer in this country would undertake to place the cost of ballasting any railway under 50 cents per cubic yard. And so along the line with every thing else the hon. genleman said. The statements he made, the estimates he read, the manner and tone he saw fit to adopt, showed that he himself did not understand the figures he was reading, and led me to no other conclusion than that the statements were prepared for him and he did not know what he was talking about.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) said last night, and the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) said this afternoon that the giving of $37,500 per mile by the Government to the Grand Trunk Railway for the

line from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie was a most disgraceful act. Now, I would like to put the hon. gentleman to a test, because they are old admirers of the Canadian Pacific Railway. No man will stand up in his place on either side of the House and say that the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway did not know their business, and that neither did the management of the Grand Trunk Railway; and let me point out to you that on the line between Toronto and Hamilton Junction—if I may be allowed to make the comparison—a mile west of Hamilton where it diverges on to the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, a distance of 38 miles, the Grand Trunk Railway has a lease signed, sealed and delivered and to be in operation for fifty years at $40,000 per year or a rental of $1,025 per mile per annum of our money. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that that is a bad bargain? Does he pretend to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not know what it is doing, and allowed the Grand Trunk Railway to fleece it to the extent of $1,025 per mile? But I want to point out that while the Canadian Pacific Railway pays $1,025 per mile to the Grand Trunk Railway for the use of its tracks between Toronto and Hamilton Junction, or the point of junction with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, they have not the right to stop a train after they leave Parkdale until they reach Hamilton.

They can neither stop to take up or lay down a passenger on that line. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) wants to delude the House into believing that the same condition applies to the bargain made by the Dominion Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In addition to that $40,000 a year of rental for the use of this 38 miles of track, the Grand Trunk receives a rental for the terminus, the Union Station, which is held jointly by the two companies, and they pay the wages of the men jointly. And the Canadian Pacific Railway does not own or get a single mile of track from the Grand Trunk, except that portion of it leading into and out of the Union Station. It has to provide its own roundhouses, its own water tanks, and, as my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said, it must pay its own taxes in the city of Toronto. What is the difference in that bargain and the bargain we are dealing with which the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) says is of so monstrous a character? The Grand Trunk gets the money, and the Canadian Pacific Railway has to pay, in addition to the rental of $40,000 a year, half the maintenance of operation according to the number of miles that the trains are run, and there is no other way of making railway calculations except on the train mileage on which everything is based. When they reach the city of Hamilton they have to pay an additional sum. I think they have to pay from $10,000 to $20,000 a year for the use of the tracks of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway and the use of its station yards in that city. They have no accommodation from the Grand Trunk. We were told this afternoon that the Intercolonial Railway receives no privileges from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Now, if you will pardon me, I will read the 4th paragraph of the agreement:

> Fourth.—That Her Majesty shall have the right for all purposes of business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, under the reasonable rules and regulations of the company, to the full and unlimited use and the full and unlimited access thereto, as the same is or may be enjoyed by the company itself, of, to and from all engine-houses, car-houses and sheds, fuel sheds, water tanks, station-houses, depots freight and ticket offices, warehouses, freight sheds, baggage rooms, dining-rooms, and all furniture and fittings appertaining thereto; all weighing scales and baggage and freight trucks; all tracks, sidings, branches or extensions either belonging to or leased by the company at Montreal, including the terminals and other connections of the company at Point St. Charles and intermediate points between Point St. Charles and Bonaventure station, and of the connections with other railways as hereinbefore specified, as the same now exists or as they may hereafter be built, rebuilt or improved upon terms as herein specified.

I think my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) will bear me out in this, that when the Grand Trunk acquired the property known as the old Northern Railway Company, it was the opinion of the public, at all events it was the opinion of railway men, that the terminal facilities acquired in the city of Toronto were worth the sum paid for the road. And I want to say further that the terminals and facilities that the Intercolonial Railway have secured in the city of Montreal are worth the cost of the line from Montreal to Toronto. If the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite were carried out, they would sink $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 in buying terminal facilities equal to those now enjoyed by the Intercolonial Railway from the Grand Trunk, if they sought to get them by purchase or expropriation of property in the city of Montreal. As was so well pointed out by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) you have free access to Bonaventure Station, access to every siding, every warehouse, every shop of the Grand Trunk. I would like any of the hon. gentlemen opposite the next time they are in the city of Montreal to observe carefully the facilities that the Intercolonial Railway enjoys. I think they will come to the conclusion that the bargain is all on the other side of the dish. I do not think there is any man in this House who has a proper appreciation of the real value of these terminal properties. Look at the advantage, for instance, in coming alongside the wharf to receive coal at the upper end of this line, coal brought up from Nova Scotia by water, as it is now received by the Grand Trunk, instead of hauling its coal as the Intercolonial Railway has had to do to Chau-

dière Junction. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) the other night admitted that its present terminus was no place to leave the Intercolonial Railway. And I am sure my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), and the hon. gentleman sitting in front of him (Mr. Ives), will agree that the policy of the Government in bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal must meet with the approval of every man who loves Canada. I was proud to hear the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon that he was negotiating for a car to be put on that would go through without breaking bulk until you arrive at the city of Halifax. How nice it would be for my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) when he wants to go down to the sea to step on board his car at the Canada Atlantic Railway Station here and be carried through to Halifax.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). He goes the other way to reach the sea now.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, no doubt we shall have it from Vancouver to Halifax without breaking bulk. Before I sit down I might point out that in addition to the Canadian Pacific Railway paying the Grand Trunk $1,000 a mile, the Wabash, running as it does from Port Erie on the Grand Trunk Air Line through to Glencoe, where it meets the Grand Trunk double track to Windsor, pays the same money for the privilege.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It pays $1,000 a mile.

Mr .GIBSON. I am assured by my hon. friend from Kent that they pay $1,000 a mile. But instead of the Intercolonial Railway paying $1,025 a mile, as the Canadian Pacific Railway pays the Grand Trunk, it only pays $756.41 per mile, or a saving of $268.59, or $10,000 a year less than the Grand Trunk receives from the Canadian Pacific Railway for the same service. Then the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) wanted to convince the House, and he was supported by the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), that the Intercolonial Railway could not sell a ticket, could not collect a fare, except on the through trains. What advantage would there be for the Intercolonial Railway or for the Grand Trunk either to sell local tickets upon its through trains? But I want to say to the ex-Minister of Finance, that I give him sufficient credit for believing that if he had looked at this agreement closer than he did, he would never have made the statement.

Mr. FOSTER. What statement?

Mr. GIBSON. The statement that the Intercolonial Railway could not collect any fares between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie.

Mr. FOSTER. I made no such statement.

Mr. GIBSON. You made the statement last night.

Mr. FOSTER. No, nor at any other time.

Mr. GIBSON. And he repeated the statement this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend what I did say. I stated in reply to the Minister of Railways and Canals that he could only collect on through trains, and the Minister of Railways and Canals knows that is true.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No, that is not true.

Mr. FOSTER. It is true.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Railways and Canals has no authority under that agreement to-day to collect any fares on any other than through trains, and there is a section which defines what a through train is. The section that defines what a through train is says that through trains are those which run all the way from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All the way to Ste. Rosalie.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend knows it. He cannot put on what you would call a suburban train which reaches short of Ste. Rosalie. That is what my statement was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We call a through train a train running to Ste. Rosalie, the 32 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I said, that you could only collect these local tickets and local fares on through trains, which is true.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's phraseology. It is evident that he does not know much about railroad phraseology, and the meaning of through trains. I would understand, and any railway man would understand, that a through train meant a train running from Montreal through to Halifax or some other point on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. The interpretation given in the document my hon. friend holds will enlighten either him or me as to what is meant by a through train in that connection, there are so many English words that express it.

Mr. GIBSON. If my hon. friend will just keep his soul in patience I will try and explain it to him. Now, my hon. friend knows very well that a through train is not in the habit of stopping at way stations, he will surely grant me that. Then what in the name of common sense is the use of bickering about the sale of tickets on a through train where the train does not stop? Now, if the hon. gentleman will listen to

me for one minute, I think he will find that there is a provision made for the Intercolonial Railway Company not only selling tickets but collecting fares upon its trains. Let me mention here that the Wabash Railway, in addition to its paying $1,000 a mile to the Grand Trunk Railway, is bound to accept passes granted by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; and I am informed by a friend of mine who was travelling the other day on the Intercolonial Railway, that the Intercolonial Railway did not honour passes given by the Grand Trunk Railway Company upon its cars. Let the hon. gentleman look at section 17 of the agreement:

That all moneys collected in the vehicles and trains of the Intercolonial Railway at any and all points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal shall belong to and be deemed to have been earned by Her Majesty, and the company shall not be entitled to receive any portion thereof; and that all moneys collected and received by the station masters and any and all other persons who may from time to time be authorized or instructed by the proper officials of the Intercolonial Railway to collect and receive money between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal for Intercolonial Railway business and traffic, including among other things car rental, storage in freight in cars and storage of goods in the company's warehouses and freight sheds, or collected and received for any other business in any way connected with the Intercolonial Railway, belongs to Her Majesty and shall be deposited in bank to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, or remitted to the cashier of the Intercolonial Railway, or otherwise deposited of as the Minister may from time to time direct.

Now then section 18 says:

That local tickets issued by either of the parties hereto for passage between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, or any intermediate station, shall be accepted on all trains of either party hereto between said points, and the party who issued the tickets shall, on presentation of the ticket so used and collected, pay to the party who carried the passenger the full amount received for the said ticket.

Is not the hon. gentleman satisfied now that the Intercolonial Railway can issue intermediate tickets to intermediate stations? If a passenger wishing to go by the Intercolonial Railway goes down to the station and buys a ticket by the Intercolonial Railway and he finds that he is an hour late, he jumps on the Grand Trunk Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway takes that ticket and charges the Intercolonial Railway at the end of the month, just as the railways do under the English system in the clearing-house in London.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, how far have you got?

Mr. GIBSON. There is nobody else, I will not say so stupid as the hon. gentleman, because the hon. gentleman is not a stupid man, but he is too astute not to see the connection between the words "between" and "intermediate." He says you must go on a through train, that local tickets can only be issued upon a through train that does not stop.

Mr. FOSTER. No, no; I did not put in the words "that does not stop."

Mr. GIBSON. But my hon. friend knows that a through train does not stop. When he goes down to Montreal he, of all men, prefers to take a through train, although it may stop at one or two stations between here and Montreal, in preference to a train that stops at every station, and he will not dispute it. To-morrow, if he wanted to go down to Montreal on the Canada Atlantic Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they asked him for a ticket at such and such a station, what would happen? If the conductor presented himself for a ticket, would he say: Mr. Foster, you are on the wrong train, it does not stop at the first station, we will have to either put you off or carry you on? The hon. gentleman will understand, then, the meaning of a through train, a through train does not stop at every station. Now, I have tried to infuse into the hon. gentleman's mind an idea of the difference between a through train and a train that is doing a local business. My hon. friend knows, and every hon. gentleman on the other side knows, that the Government to-day, through the able Minister of Railways and Canals, has made the best bargain for the Dominion of Canada in railway matters that the Dominion of Canada has ever made since confederation; and I venture to say that when the whole matter is publicly discussed among business men as it has been in the past, and when the statement of my hon. friend, that I am proud of, occupying the position that he does, goes to the country to-morrow, from one end of the Dominion to the other, no one will regard the threat thrown out by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) equivalent to saying that he hoped the Senate would throw it out again; I say that no Senate, and no body of men, in face of the evidence and of all the facts brought before them, have a right to say that this is a bad bargain. It is a good bargain, it has been done in a businesslike way, and not in the slipshod way that has characterized the bargains made by hon. gentlemen opposite for eighteen years. No, Sir, the business of this country to-day is done by business men, on business principles; it is not done upon the percentage basis either, as to whether the money is to be paid now or at the next general election. I, for one, with some practical knowledge of railway matters, am proud of the Government of which I am a humble supporter, and as long as I have the honour of representing the county that sends me here, I shall raise my voice and give my vote to sustain this Gov-

ernment, which I think is doing so much for the Dominion of Canada.

Resolutions reported, on division.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he can tell us when he is going to bring down the first supplementary Estimates or the second supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The supplementary Estimates for the current year ought to be brought down at a very early day. They are nearly complete, and I hope to bring them down at an early day, I should say, the first of the week.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they going to be large?

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

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the right hon. First Minister what he proposes to ask this side of the House to do to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER. The same thing as to-day. We will go on with the Drummond County Railway Resolution.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 2nd June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 136)—from the Senate—for the relief of Annie Inkson Dowding.—(Mr. Clarke.)

THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) presented the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts:

Your committee recommend that the evidence taken and the exhibits filed before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts during the last session of the House of Commons, in connection with the payment of $300 to Col. Domville for J. Milton Barnes, be referred to this committee for the purpose of further examination and report.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) moved:

That the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be now adopted.

Mr. GIBSON.

Mr. JAMES DOMVILLE (King's, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, I think before that motion is put, it might not be out of place to say a few words on it. I called the attention of the Public Accounts Committee, this morning, to the fact that a gentleman who undertook to bring me before that committee last year had taken a wise course. He waited until I was away, until I had left. I had gone to British Columbia, which was patent to everybody. I refer to the hon. member for York, N.B. There is a very long investigation on it, and my hon. friend who undertook this Crown prosecution, for, I presume, it must be called a Crown prosecution or a prosecution general, as it is called in some parts of the world, in that kindly feeling that always has been exhibited on all occasions started out in the House, as I find in "Hansard" of the 19th of April, by saying that he had seen a copy of the charges, and "I think they are charges which no militia officer should be under." Then he goes on to say that he considers it really in the light of the Good Samaritan that my course should be cleared up and that I should stand before the House and the country in a favourable position. Remarkably kind, but he would have been kinder still if he had taken the trouble to have made some proper inquiries before he placed broadcast before the country charges against another member of this House which cannot be cut away so easily as they are made. We know that a lie travels fast and the truth lags by the way. If you take the seeds of a flower and throw them in the air, you know how impossible it is to afterwards pick up the petals grown from those seeds. So it is with a lie, it is hard to gather it in again by the truth. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tried for his own personal advantage, and to elevate his personal standing, to cast aspersions on me, but I can assure him that my standing in Parliament and before the country will compare most favourably with his own, and that I have been more fortunate than he was in my public appearances in the county I represent. Was not this done as an attempt to destroy my reputation? I say it was. If the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair, why did he not make these statements when I was here and not wait until I had left the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was very anxious last year to insist that every member sitting in this House should have his character cleared, but we have been here ten weeks this session, and while he has attacked every one else he dared not say a word against me. I must be careful to confine my remarks in this House to parliamentary language, Mr. Speaker, and I know I can say outside what I cannot say in it, and so I will let his conduct pass by saying that his conduct was not manly. Why did he not bring the charges forward this session? Last year he had them pubished in the "Sun" newspaper. I do not know whether he is the owner or editor of the "Sun," but we have not to look far back

to find his name appearing as the editor or manager. I saw a copy of that paper when I was out in Vancouver, and the heading was "The Great Domville Scandal," "Misappropriation of Public Funds." Was it fair to do that when my back was turned, and then to let it rest for the ten weeks of this session? He was ready to attack every one in this House this session; he was ready to talk at length about the saving of $14, which he effected on potatoes if they were bought at 40 cents a bushel when they cost 50 cents; but he was not ready to repeat his charges against me. His attack was directed against me as the representative of King's; that fair county that I am proud to represent after fighting my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) for so many years, and after having had the honour of driving him out of it. He has always said he was a King's county boy, although I differ from him in that, for I do not think he is.

An hon. MEMBER. What county is he from?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not know what his county is, but he now represents York in this House. I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to occupy the time of the House, but I wish to state that my character is quite as unassailable as is the character of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I stand in this House to-day enjoying the confidence of my people. I might have cast stories around this House, and some of them might not be very pleasant for some gentlemen, but since I have been in this House I have refrained from going into personal matters, and I hope I shall continue that so long as I am here. Why should the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) cast reflections on the people of King's, whose representative he was once, and why should he unjustly assail its member in this House. It ill-becomes him to sit here in silence for ten weeks without making good his charges. I hold him responsible before this House, I hold him responsible before Canada, to make his charges good if he can. The hon. gentleman had a right to find out what he was doing before he made a public statement in this House, and if he does not make it good then he must stand before this House and before the country convicted of an attempt to injure a member of the House of Commons without having any evidence in his possession. There is no use of him trying to hide himself behind Major Markum. He stated, as recorded in "Hansard," that Major Markum gave him these reports. How did he get them from Major Markum? What has Major Markum got to do with this House? Did he ask Major Markum for those charges or did Major Markum volunteer to give them? Sir, it was a premeditated attempt to injure me before the country, at a time when I was not here to defend myself, and when I had left for British Columbia on my way to Dawson City. I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to prosecute the attack, or if he finds out there is nothing in it, I shall ask from him that which I expect to get, a candid apology for his bringing this matter before the House without knowing what he was doing.

Motion agreed to, and report adopted.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) to further amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters. He said: Last session a Bill was passed by the House prohibiting the dumping into navigable waters of any refuse from steamers or otherwise, in waters less than 12 fathoms in depth; and the question arose whether that would extend to the harbours under the control of the harbour masters who are authorized to allow vessels coming in ballast to dump the ballast in certain specified places. The Department of Justice thought a proviso should be inserted making it clear that the Act of last session does not extend to such cases.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved: That the House do, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada, authorized by chapter 6 of the Acts of 1897, shall, on the termination of the period therein mentioned, be gradually reduced during a limited term until they are extinguished, and that the bounties to be paid for the additional term shall be as follows:—

(a) From the 23rd of April, 1902, to the 30th of June, 1903, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 90 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(b) From the 1st of July, 1903, to the 30th of June, 1904, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 75 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(c) From the 1st of July, 1904, to the 30th of June, 1905, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 55 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(d) From the 1st of July, 1905, to the 30th of June, 1906, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 35 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(e) From the 1st of July, 1906, to the 30th of June, 1907, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 20 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

Provided, however, that if any steel ingots be made from puddled iron bars manufactured in Canada, no bounty shall be paid on such steel ingots.

The said bounties shall cease and determine on the 30th of June, 1907.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) will remember that a promise was made to bring down papers in connection with the appointment of Mr. Russell, steamboat inspector in the Yukon. Those papers were to be brought down on Tuesday. On that day, or the day before, one of the hon. gentleman's officers told me that, if the return was to embrace a certain period, its preparation would take some time. On Wednesday, I asked the hon. Minister of Marine, across the floor, if he would expedite the first part of the return, as I was very anxious to get it, leaving the balance for a supplementary return, as his officer had told me that the first part was ready. I would be greatly convenienced, if the hon. Minister would give me the main portion of the return, and the rest may take its course. While on my feet, I would like to remind the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) of a similar case, that is, the return relating to the Crown Timber Office of New Westminster. I asked him, if he would expedite that portion of the return containing the correspondence leading up to the Order in Council authorizing the commission of inquiry and the appointment, leaving out the evidence, which would be the bulky part, and which does not concern the object I had in view.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I do not remember my hon. friend's calling my attention to it. Does he desire that I should bring down a partial return ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, the papers other than the evidence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The inspector, Mr. Russell, sent me, the other day, a memorandum, which I sent to my deputy, asking him to prepare a partial return which I could lay on the Table. I saw him in the afternoon, and he said that he was engaged with the clerks in copying it, and that he expected to have it ready yesterday afternoon. He has not sent it yet, but he is engaged on it, and I will bring it down as soon as possible.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), when I may expect a return which I asked for about three weeks ago, with reference to a lease or transfer of property in connection with the railway at Grand Narrows.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I stated to the hon. gentleman, if my memory serves me, in answer to his inquiry, that there was some information which we required to get from Moncton. It has been sent for, and I will furnish it the very moment it arrives.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the consent of the House, I would like to move that the papers brought down today, the supplementary return in regard to the Manitoba prosecutions, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

On the Order,

Second reading of Bill (No. 133) an Act to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.—(Mr. Blair.)

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Would it make any difference, if we proceeded first with the Grand Trunk Resolutions, so far as getting the Bill to its second reading ? When we get into committee on that measure, in which there are fifty or sixty items, a good many explanations, I think, will be required ; and, if we could finish that while we are warm on the subject, it would be better than to make the diversion ; and then both Bills could come before us at the same stage. Before they are finally disposed of, my hon. friend must know that there will be a little more speaking. I would ask, if that is convenient to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is a matter of indifference to me which Bill is taken first. I am in a position to introduce the Grand Trunk Bill now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is printed, is it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have one copy. I do not think the Bill has been distributed, but I think it will be distributed this afternoon. In the meantime, I move the second reading of the Drummond County Railway Bill.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). This Bill for the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway offers a subject for much comment and criticism. This Bill now under discussion, as submitted by the hon. Minister of Railways for the deliberation of this House, in the preamble commences as follows :—

> Whereas it is expedient to provide for the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway, to the end that it may be made part of the Intercolonial Railway, &c., &c.

Now, I cannot see where the "expediency," or the advisability to purchase or acquire this road as the property of Canada, to be operated and to form a part of the Intercolonial Railway system into Montreal, comes in, when the annual report from the Railway Department for last year shows quite a deficit, notwithstanding the promise from the hon. Minister to the contrary, that the

Intercolonial, with the Drummond County attached, extending into Montreal, would show a net profit per year of some $300,000, or thereabouts. Now, what are the facts? How do we find the accounts? What are the real results? To make it clear to the minds of all, as to how the account stood at the end of last year, and to make it still more comprehensive as to how it compares with previous years, I here give a tabulated statement for each of the last six fiscal years, or from 1893 to 1898, inclusive:

Year.	Profit.	Loss.
1893	$20,181	.....
1894	5,838	.....
1895	3,815	.....
1896	.....	$55,940
1897	.....	59,940
1898	.....	209,978

By this you will observe that for the three years the Liberal-Conservatives were in power there was a net profit each year, whilst for the last three years the Liberals, or present Government, were in power, we had deficits, notwithstanding the hon. Minister of Railway's estimate that with the extension of the Intercolonial into Montreal, that is, with the Drummond County Railway tacked on, we would have a surplus of somewhere about $350,000 at the end of 1898. Instead of a forecast of this sort having been accomplished, results have shown, as per table, that we have suffered last year a serious loss, to the amount of $209,978 between receipts and expenditure, to come out of the taxpayers of the people of this country.

This is a serious state of affairs and such as should elicit the most searching inquiry as to the capabilities of this Drummond County road in past years, before being asked to pass judgment and become a purchaser. Such inquiry has been called for, but the satisfaction has not been forthcoming, which, to my mind, appears singular, and naturally leads to the one conclusion, that as this large deficit last year was the result of the extension, that is the Drummond County Railway attached to the Intercolonial Railway, it is very manifest the hon. Minister of Railways, by his refusal of so reasonable a request, is afraid to have the real facts of the case known, lest the resolution would be rejected by his usually subservient followers, who would consider the medicine too difficult to swallow.

Now, if this Drummond County Railway, which we are asked to purchase, has not proved a success, not even paid running expenses, but, on the contrary, has shown decided loss when operated as a private undertaking, when rigid economy doubtless had been exercised, what encouragement may we expect? What hopes can be extended to Parliament by way of benefits, if we accept the resolution as submitted? It is very certain that if a private corporation could do nothing with it, where economy had been exercised, we cannot have it succeed, under the Government's management, with so many private interests to serve, and the result must necessarily be a signal failure.

We are informed by the ex-Minister of Railways that when the late Government was in power this railway was offered by the company for $550,000, but as the Government at that time had information that it had been offered to private parties for $400,000, the ex-Minister of Railways considered there was no urgent necessity at that time for accepting their offer. If this is true, and I certainly have no reason to doubt it, I ask, is it not unreasonable at this time for this Parliament to accept this railway at the increased rate of $1,600,000?

This, it will be remembered, is the same railway hon. gentlemen opposite were wanting Parliament to purchase last year for $2,100,000, but which fortunately was rejected by the members of the other Chamber, for which, on their part, coupled with their rejection of that iniquitous Yukon railway, or tramway, Bill, they (the Government) had threatened the Senate to deprive them of their independence or usefulness as a body.

This same company that then offered this road for $2,100,000 last year, has now dropped their figures to $1,600,000, or four times the price they were originally willing to accept. It is evident to my mind that some political trickster is making money out of this deal, but the great difficulty is to trace it.

Should not some statement, some papers, with data, be exhibited to Parliament with regard to this road, as to the past record, whereby the receipts and expenditures, the earnings of this road, could serve as a guide, before asking Parliament to vote? I say the course the Government is pursuing is unjust and unwise in the interests of Canada.

The refusal on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways, in charge of this Bill, to communicate to Parliament any information respecting the earning capabilities of this railway is being fully commented upon by the unsubsidized press and the people of Canada.

The Montreal "Gazette" says of it as follows:—

> The refusal of the Government to lay before Parliament a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Drummond County extension of the Intercolonial is in keeping with its whole conduct in the remarkable transaction that seems destined to turn out so favourably for Mr. J. N. Greenshields and his associates, and so unfavourably for the country. It is alleged for the Government that the arrangement under which the Drummond County line is being operated as part of the Intercolonial, by increasing the traffic, has justified the purchase of the property. There are no figures to establish this before Parliament, or the country. There are some that contradict the claim.

This same paper then quotes the figures the same as I have already given, as published

by the Railway Department, which shows that the earning power of the Intercolonial Railway had not been improved by the extension to Montreal.

It concluded as follows:—

The purchase cannot be justified on business grounds. If it could the Government, to strengthen its case, would gladly give all the information possible bearing on the business of the section. Both what is known of the operation of the Intercolonial, since the Drummond County road was attached to it, and what the Government refuses to disclose, will operate to convince the unprejudiced onlooker that the scheme to which it is sought to commit Parliament is not in the interest of the country, and will only tend to make the Intercolonial a permanently heavier burden on the taxpayers.

The "Montreal Star" dealt with the Minister of Railways in this fashion:

As a general rule, when the Hon. Mr. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals, professes ignorance of railway matters, there is no disposition on the part of the public to question his sincerity, because the hon. gentleman has given such convincing proofs from time to time of his capacity for not knowing anything about these matters. We mean no reflection upon the Minister's intelligence, because nobody who knows Mr. Blair believes him to be lacking in intelligence. His ignorance of matters connected with his own department has rather the appearance of premeditated ignorance. He may, perhaps, take as his motto: "Where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise." When he introduced the Canadian Yukon Railway Bill, he showed so little knowledge of the scheme as to create the impression that he was ashamed of and wanted to repudiate the paternity of the measure. But his statement that he is unable to lay any information before Parliament regarding the earnings of the Drummond County Railway since it was leased by the Government reveals a degree of ignorance that really amounts to an achievement. Mr. Blair asks Parliament for $1,600,000 to buy a railway already under his control, and he does not know whether it is earning its axle-grease! The Government railway accounts are kept in such a way that the Government does not know which parts of the system are paying and which are not. Mr. Blair has never had any curiosity as to whether the Drummond County Railway was earning its rental or not.

We can see the wisdom of the late Government in declining to think of the purchase of this road with a record of reputed losses each year instead of gain, giving deficits instead of surpluses, and the more reasonable does it appear to my mind when we consider the number of competing lines and tap railways from Montreal to the Atlantic Ocean. I was surprised when running my eye over the map to find so many. I will enumerate them seriatim from south to north. There is the New York Central, Vermont Central, Boston and Maine, Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, Quebec Central, Drummond County, South Shore, North Shore or Canadian Pacific Railway, projected Great Northern, and last but not least we have the great River St. Lawrence, the principal and main great highway during the summer season, on its navigable waters for the transport of the products of western Canada from Montreal east to all parts of the world.

I merely have referred to the projected Great Northern Railway, but which I believe will be one of the great competing roads of Canada when connected with the Parry Sound Railway for the carriage of grain, cattle, &c., from the great grain-growing centres of the west to the Atlantic Ocean.

Viewing the situation, as I have given it, from a commercial standpoint, and considering all these competing lines, some of them natural highways to the sea from Montreal, is it not well for us to call a halt, and carefully consider the position we are about placing ourselves in, it not being an expenditure or investment from which we might expect a surplus, or even the interest of our money, but on the contrary, and for all time an annual deficit which must come out of the pockets of the people of Canada, and not for one year, but every year the road is kept running. If this railway is approved of by Parliament, that is the extension into Montreal, I feel it is only the beginning of an immense outlay each year. There is the right of way over the Grand Trunk Railway, the use of Victoria bridge into Montreal, the proposed extension of the bridge—the right to use terminals, and the other concessions to the Grand Trunk, all which will place us in a worse position than anything we can at present estimate or think of.

I am anxious to have all the transport of goods, whether the product of Canada for foreign markets, or the imports of goods into Canada, all moving as far as is possible in Canadian channels, and as a part of a means to that end to utilize the Intercolonial and extend it by a bridge over the St. Lawrence and thence by rail with the great water stretches of Canada to open wide a door to the vast regions of the west, rich in agriculture and mineral deposit—and wrest the trade which largely hitherto had been diverted through channels across the border and over American territory to seaport towns in the United States for shipment to all parts of the world.

We have fine harbours all along our Atlantic coast, and as a terminal point for the Intercolonial Railway, Halifax excels, as it is easy of approach from the sea, well lighted, with excellent water and without tortuous tides or currents to divert the course of ships. I am very unwilling to pay tribute to seaports of a foreign country when we have such excellent ports of our own in Canada.

I do not want to be understood that I am opposed to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, far from it, but I am opposed to the purchase of this Drummond County Railway as it will be an extravagant road to keep up, and we are paying too much for it—besides considering the many competing roads, it will be a losing investment for us every year it is operated.

I may be asked as to what is my proposal. Well, I don't hesitate to give it. It is this. The Government I understand is pledged to build a bridge across the St. Lawrence near Quebec to connect with the Intercolonial near Lévis. I therefore propose that we acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the north shore, or the projected Great Northern, and that with the Parry Sound Railway leading to Georgian Bay, and with the great water stretches we can tap all the products of the great North-west and be independent of our neighbours to the south of the River St. Lawrence between Lévis and Montreal, and, best of all, free from interference from the competing lines as referred to.

By this project we will have at all events a part of the trade of Montreal, and fully as much as were we to acquire by purchase this Drummond County line. We will have the trade of Ottawa as a commercial centre—as the road will take the Ottawa valley—part of the trade in summer of Quebec city and confines, and certainly the whole of the city and province of Quebec in the winter season, save that part of the province of Quebec known as the Eastern Townships.

Unfortunately for the Intercolonial Railway, and for the interests of Nova Scotia, we have not the influence of the hon. Minister of Railways with us for Nova Scotia, he being from New Brunswick and unquestionably favouring St. John, as is shown by what he has done for that city as a terminal point for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and his reference to that city as being nearer for shipment of goods from Montreal than Halifax by some 250 miles, but neglecting to state at the same time that if Halifax is further from Montreal than St. John, she is at the same time that many miles nearer the place of shipment across the Atlantic, with a safer and a better harbour and more easy of access than that of St. John.

I cannot see why, under all the circumstances and for the reasons I have advanced, there should be this undue haste on the part of the Government to press this purchase of the Drummond County Railway, unless necessitated by a fear that were the people of Canada to see the results of a full year's operation, the country would rise in revolt against such an extravagant and unfair transaction, and pronounce in no uncertain terms against them.

Before concluding my remarks I might say that it will be remembered there are two main channels or arteries for the transport of shipments from the west into Montreal—the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. Surely the Government do not for one moment imagine that either of these great corporations, after bringing grain or other commodities from the west, are willing to transfer their freight to the Intercolonial. It is reasonable they want the long hauls themselves to the ports of shipment by the sea. Therefore, it is plainly seen that with a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec extending the Intercolonial Railway to Parry Sound by the Ottawa valley we are, or would be, independent of our neighbours on the south side of the St. Lawrence, and could control the entire trade of the north side of the St. Lawrence in our own hands and in the winter season entirely, so far as shipments are concerned from Quebec to the sea.

I propose, therefore, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway by a bridge across the St. Lawrence and not acquire the Drummond County Railway. Consequently I oppose this Bill and will record my vote accordingly.

Mr. R. POPE (Compton). I have listened with considerable interest to the debate that has taken place in connection with this question, and I must say that I am under the impression that more or less politics have been mixed up with the purchase and extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal. I have listened also to the legal talent of this House on both sides, and have paid great attention to the subtlety of their arguments, and I must confess that there seems to be an effort on the part of those legal gentlemen to see which could split the smallest hair in connection with this subject. It is well known that I cannot sympathize altogether with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with regard to this question; but the simple fact that I entertain a difference of opinion or judgment upon a matter of this character, will not, I am sure, carry with it any feeling of animosity by myself towards those who differ from me, and with whom I usually act in this House, and I am sure on their part they have no right to have any feeling towards me personally on that account. I feel that in debating the question of whether we should pay $10,000, or $12,000 or $15,000 a mile for the Drummond County Railway, there is a tendency to ignore the importance of the great commercial principle of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal. I do not believe that we can afford to ignore the commercial principle in dwelling upon the question as to whether we should pay $10,000 or $12,000 a mile for this railway. I cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal means a great deal more than the present mileage of the Intercolonial Railway but I will endeavour to deal with that question later on. I regret very much that the Department of Railways has not been able to furnish the evidence or figures that I asked for several weeks ago, and if they had been brought down I would be able to discuss more intelligently this question than I shall be able to do in my few remarks this afternoon.

Now, Sir, we had long discussion yesterday in this House, and we have done so previously, in connection with the old Canadian Pacific Railway agreement by which the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway entered the lower provinces. I must say that I do not sympathize very much with a discussion of those old contracts, and I am not sure whether, in the light of to-day, under the present circumstances, if another contract was to be made, it should not be made precisely in the same way as the contract was made at that time. That does not cut much figure, in my opinion, in the consideration of this question. But I am bound to say that bringing the terminus of our first transcontinental railway through Canada into the lower provinces, whether you call it an agreement, or whether you call it a lease, or whether you call it a bonus, or whether you call it anything else, I think it was a wise arrangement, and one which has since proved, I am sure, a boon to the city of St. John, and our winter ports, showing conclusively that that contract had a value to that section of Canada. I go further than that in believing that there is a very great work to be done yet in transcontinental communication in this country. I believe that the day is not far distant. I believe that the day is not more than five years distant, when we will have another transcontinental line across Canada, a line running through a strip of territory far more fertile than the district which is now traversed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Take a look from the west of the head of Lake Winnipegosis, and you find a territory lying between that point via Edmonton at least 200 miles wide and 1,000 or 1,500 miles in length, of as fine a country as there is on the face of God's earth, and a far more fertile section than that which is served to-day by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, it is not in the interests of that community, it is not in the interests of the settlement of that section of the country, that they should have to construct new lines of railway at right angles in order to reach the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe that five years from the time that I am speaking, we shall have the pleasure of travelling over that distant country upon a transcontinental railway. We know that the increased grain tonnage of the products of the soil in the future is bound to be north of the international boundary line. The United States, to a very large extent, have settled up their own territory, and their valuable lands are now nearly all occupied with an increasing population. The export trade of the United States of those grains will rather diminish than increase. We have seen desperate efforts put forth on this continent to reach the back territories in order to catch the trade that was bound to follow their settlement, and we are going to see the same effort put forward to reach the northern portions of the continent of America in Canada, by all the great lines of railway that are seeking freight of that character. At present we are to some extent working under difficulties in this country in the development of our shipping ports, owing to our climate and other conditions; and when we consider that we have strong competitors on the Atlantic coast in New York, Boston, Portland and other large centres in the United States, with their railways extending over that great district, seeing the fertility of the soil, seeing the immense area of that fertile region, it is only natural that these railways and seaports should endeavour to tap that section of country in order to get the advantage of the development that is bound to follow. So I say it is well that the Government of the day should make every effort to see that, at least, we retain our share of the advantage that will follow the development of that great section of Canada for the transportation and export business of this country. I believe firmly that we should see at an early day another transcontinental railway, which may be called the Northern, or the Canadian Northern, or whatever other name you choose to call it, passing through that district of country and down to the central portions of Canada, connected with the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Parry Sound Railway, or whatever road they may choose to tap, to find a terminus at Montreal. Some gentlemen have intimated that it might go as far north as the Lake St. John region, but I do not think that is practicable or possible; because the freight that they would have to take back west with them must be manufactured products, and they will desire to run through the manufacturing centres of Canada. So, preparatory to the construction of that road, I say it is well that the Government should endeavour to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, and to make such freight arrangements as will prepare the way for this through transcontinental line, in order that not only the Canadian Pacific Railway may find its way to Halifax and St. John, but that we shall also have a terminus at Montreal, under the same arrangements, or under some well balanced arrangement, of this new transcontinental line which, in the near future, will be an accomplished fact.

Now, I have been somewhat astonished to find that the Intercolonial Railway, during the last two years, has not been placed more directly under a business management than it has been. I think from the speeches that were delivered by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, both inside of this House and outside of it, that, when we were asked to purchase the Drummond County road, we had, at least, a right to expect close business management applied to that railway. I believe that, if we had had that business management, we would have had greater success in the operation of that railway than we have had under the management of any Government in this country, because I do not believe that you can manage successfully any railway with political machinery, and whether it be under a Conservative Government or under a Liberal Government, the result of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway has been very unsatisfactory. As

nearly as I can calculate, I find that, by operating that road during the last twenty-one years we have lost, taking simply the difference between expenditures and receipts and saying nothing of the tremendous amount of money that has been put into the road-bed—we have lost, with interest accumulated for twenty-one years, something like $6,500,000. I asked the question a few days ago why Mr. Harris's services had been dispensed with. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals informed me that it was because he had created a certain amount of friction. That hon. gentleman must have fancied that Mr. Harris was to continue as the agent of the political organization to which he belonged. I have done business with Mr. Harris for many years, and I must say that these relations have always been satisfactory, and that there has been no friction. But I can well understand that, when he went to a section of the country where every person in connection with that road had received certain favours under the guise of politics, it would be a very difficult task for Mr. Harris, or any other gentleman to move in the direction of bettering the conditions in the operation of that road. I fully understood when he undertook that task, that it was a very difficult one, and I should, at least, have said that it would have taken more than six months for that gentleman to have brought about a proper feeling between himself and the people of the maritime provinces. I firmly believe, Sir, that if that gentleman had been retained, if he had had an opportunity of working out his own problem in connection with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, we would have had a return that we now will not have so long as it is run by political machinery, no matter what party may be in power. I believe that it is not necessary that $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 or $10,000,000 should be thrown away in the operation of that road. Take the total receipts of the operation of that road during these twenty-one years and you find that about $5,000,000 of money without the interest being added, have been spent on that road in ordinary expenditures for working expenses, more than has been received. I think it is generally admitted that a railway is supposed to be operated for from 70 to 80 per cent of its receipts, but we find an opposite condition of affairs in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. So far as any investigation goes that I have been able to make, which has been limited, but still I have endeavoured to acquire information that I thought would be reliable, I am bound to say that, in the operation of that road to-day, there are five men working where three men could do the work; not only to-day, but during the entire operation of that railway this has been the result. But because it has been badly operated, is no reason why, in the future, if proper connections are made and business principles applied to the management of the road, it should not pay at least its expenses and leave some profit to the gentlemen who undertake the reorganization and reconstruction of that railway. They say that there is nothing talks so pointedly as money. I have gone into this question very carefully, and, believing in the possibilities of the earning of that road, I would be willing to say this much, that I would be pleased to offer the Government of the day an arrangement which, financially, I am sure, would be satisfactory, for a term of thirty years. I would be pleased to take this extension to the city of Montreal with all the fearful financial responsibilities that my hon. friend who just preceded me mentioned. I would say that with that road extended to Montreal I would have a good snap from a financial point of view. If it were brought out of the woods, back to Lévis, and if it were extended to the city of Montreal, to the heart and centre of business, I would be prepared to say to the Government that, for the first ten years I would give $200,000, that for the next ten years I would give $300,000, and that for the next ten years I would give $400,000; I would pay the $140,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway, and maintain that road in its present condition; I having the readjustment of the freight rates, I may explain, that in the reconstruction of the freight rates for those provinces I do not think it is necessary to materially change the rates in the provinces, although I have no figures in regard to this. I may say that there are figures that I asked for and which I have not got. The difference between that proposition and the one under which we have been working during the last twenty-one years means simply this: During the last twenty-one years we have lost somewhere about $6,500,000 in the operation of that road. Upon these figures, calculating interest, we would gain about $14,000,000; to run on to the next ten years under a $6,000,000 loss it would make a difference between the operation of that road under the old system and the proposition I have just made to this House, which, Sir, I am prepared to stand by and produce sufficient financial evidence of the fact, of $24,000,000. I believe I have sufficiently presented the reasons why I am warranted in making the proposition that I have just made. Permit me to say here that, in my judgment, it is the best evidence of the value of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, and I shall be only too pleased if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will send his card around to me and give me an opportunity to execute a contract and make permanent arrangements for the acquisition of that railway at the earliest possible date. The hon. gentleman knows, as well as I am speaking here, that I am not talking through my hat. There is no part of the proposition that I have just made that I am not prepared to fulfil,

and satisfactorily fulfil, under any reasonable conditions that the Government may impose in connection with this road. I know it is important, and I believe that the difference between a political and a business management is what I have said, that there is a reasonable profit over and above the figures I have just offered to the Government for the acquisition of the Intercolonial Railway. Under these circumstances, I believe that the responsibility that the Government assume for the future in operating that road must certainly be their responsibility. The hon. gentleman might think that he cannot afford to accept the proposition so made in regard to that road without offering it to tender. If he is of that impression he has an opportunity now of knowing that if it is put up for tender, there will be reasonable bids made for the acquisition, under favourable terms, to the people of the lower provinces, of that road. I have no doubt about it. I have no doubt that there would be more than one or two or three tenders for the acquisition of that road for a term of years if the Government thought fit to do so, and under conditions which, I am sure, would not prove onerous to the people of the lower provinces, on conditions that I believe would work out the development of our maritime ports far better than though it were under Government control. The city of St. John owes much to the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because the Canadian Pacific Railway is managed upon business principles, and, if the Intercolonial Railway is ever to prove that benefit to the seaports of the lower provinces that we all wish, it will be when it is operated on the best possible business management that can be applied. I well understand that there is a feeling in the lower provinces that this road was built as a sort of substitution for the canal system in western Canada, and that the people of the lower provinces have a special right in the way of freight rates. I believe that these special conditions could be maintained to a legitimate extent, even under a business management of that road, by which the produce of the great west would be brought to our Canadian seaports. There is no reason why the people of the lower provinces should not share in any reasonable cost that is necessary to bring about the development of their own trade. Frightened, as some people may be, at the thought of the Intercolonial Railway passing under a business management, yet, I believe that a fair contract might be entered into with business men who might propose to acquire that road, and the road placed beyond the possibility of further increasing the debt of the country, while, at the same time, developing to the fullest extent the sections through which it passes. Such a contract, when properly drawn up and explained to the people, would do away with all fear that they would be deprived of any of the special benefits they believe they are entitled to, as citizens of the provinces down by the sea.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As the House is very well aware, this question, both on the resolutions with regard to the Drummond County Railway and with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement—which I am very glad the Minister of Railways consented should precede the introduction of any Bill—has been very exhaustively debated, and I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the debate. I wish, however, to say, that, as the second reading involves the principle of the Bill, this would be a proper time to take the vote; but I have had some communication with the right hon. leader of the House on the subject, and we have arrived at the conclusion that, as a large number of members who would like to vote, are absent, we could take the second reading of the Bill on division, and vote on the third reading.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the second reading of the Bill, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister (Mr. Blair) to clause 4, which says:

> There may be paid for the said railway and undertaking and other property as aforesaid, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the sum of $1,600,000, less any sum paid the company as authorized by chapter 4 of the statutes of 1897, to be granted to the said company as a subsidy for 42½ miles of its railway from Moose Park to the Chaudière River.

I suppose the Bill follows very closely the resolutions, but there is no provision for the reduction of the $1,600,000 by the $103,000 which the Government has expended in the betterment of the road, and which I understood was to be deducted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would not be necessary. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will understand that is a matter of contract between the Drummond County Railway and the Government, and, as a matter of contract, of course the Drummond County Railway Company would be liable for it. We do not require to incorporate in this Bill any provision in respect to that in order to enable us to retain any amount of money that may be due in respect to that $100,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill authorizes the entering into an entirely new contract, and does away with the leases that are at present in existence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not do away with the leases. The matter, of course, is in that form that it authorizes the Government to make a purchase on this basis. I explained to the committee that there is no necessity for putting any such clause in the Bill.

Motion for second reading agreed to on division.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the House do resolve itself in committee on Bill (No. 133) to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself in committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister, whether any arrangement has yet been come to as to the purchase of the rolling stock, and if so, what amount has been paid, or is to be paid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No arrangement of that nature has been come to at all with the Drummond County. We have purchased a snow-plough and one or other parts of their plant which we could with advantage buy, and we are going to ask for an appropriation in our supplementary Estimates for the payment of this purchase. Beyond that, we have no arrangement. Up to the present moment, we have no arrangement with them to make any larger purchase.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister think that the railway company will forego that clause in the agreement which bound the Government to purchase their rolling stock? Of course, they are out of business now, and the rolling stock is no good to them, except it might be used for a curiosity. They will certainly hold to that part of their contract. Does my hon. friend mean to say, that the road has been, as I understand it, operated for thirteen or fourteen months, and that there has been no arrangement yet come to with reference to the rolling stock, and no negotiations looking to that end ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly not.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) a list of the rolling stock that is now left by that company upon the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware that there has been any inventory made. If there has, it is not in the possession of the department or has not been brought to my knowledge. There were a number of small articles, like tools, of which a very extended inventory was made ; but, beyond that, there has been none that I am aware of, and we have not been called upon by the Drummond County to buy their stock. I think it is not understood that we are under any obligations to do so. I think they regard it as a matter in our discretion, and entirely optional with us. That is the view I myself have taken of it and nothing has occurred to shake my confidence in the correctness of that view.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the 8th clause of the resolutions which were passed by the House on the 11th June, 1897, and which contained the agreement, is as follows :—

Her Majesty will purchase the rolling stock and railway supplies of the company at a valuation to be agreed upon between the company and the Minister.

That was a part of the agreement. I judge, then, from what the hon. gentleman says, that the company does not think it has the power or does not propose to press that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not communicated with me as to their view on that point, and I have not been pressed to declare my mind upon it. That is the situation.

Mr. FOSTER. And I think we had an estimate of the Minister, when we adopted the resolutions, of the value of that rolling-stock, amounting to $45,000 or $50,000. The hon. gentleman has not used any of that rolling-stock in the operation of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that my hon. friend will find that that agreement having been passed by this House, the company will ask us to stand by it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt they will if they get much more encouragement to do so. They have not pressed it upon my mind down to the present moment ; that is all I can say.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend does not think that a member of the Opposition, in discharging his duty by calling the attention of the Minister of Railways to a clause of a contract which he has made, is giving any encouragement or incitement to the company to make claims on the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not think anything has occurred which would justify me in regarding it in that sense ; but we know that people get encouragement even when statements are not made with that view. People follow these debates, particularly if they are interested in them, and views are sometimes put forward which suggest a course of action which might not otherwise be taken.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot help that. We have this measure fathered by the Government, brought down by them in the most open manner, and fully discussed, and it is quite too late in the day to say, because a member of the Opposition calls the attention of the Government to a provision of the agreement, that he is giving information which otherwise might not be information to a company as lynx-eyed as the Drummond County Company, or at least one member of it Mr. Greenshields, to wit. What I did want to know was whether that old rolling-

stock had been paid for, and if so at what valuation. The clause is imperative; it says, "Her Majesty shall."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If later the conclusion arrived at is that we are under compulsion to take the rolling-stock at a proper valuation, we would have to ask Parliament for authority to pay the money before any step would be taken which would be irrevocable on our part.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is just one caution which a man in the Opposition always has to put forward in these perilous times, because the Government seem to have adopted the habit of making their contracts and binding the country to pay before they ask the House anything about it. I notice by the newspapers that the Government are to-day building a very expensive telegraph line to Dawson City. I do not recollect that they took any appropriation or got any power from this House to build that telegraph line. I look upon it only as a rumour, of course, because I have no right to think that the Government would undertake such a work without being authorized by the House.

On section 3,

Mr. FOSTER. It is only by implication that one can come to a conclusion as to where that $6,000 has gone to, and I would like to have it cleared up before we go any further. The hon. gentleman will remember that the resolutions passed in 1897 provided for giving the company $70,000 a year. Of that $64,000 a year was to buy the road, which was to come into the possession of the Government at the end of ninety-nine years, and $6,000 a year was to go as a rental which the company had to pay to the Grand Trunk Company for the Chaudière section. At the present time, the Minister is only taking power to pay the Drummond County Company an even sum of money. This thing has had its gradations. In the first place, the company were to be paid on a valuation of $1,600,000, but the $1,600,000 was not to be paid, except in the form of $64,000 a year for ninety-nine years. Then the hon. gentleman proposed that that should be made optional, so that the Government might pay the $1,600,000 or do the other thing; but I am happy to find, when the Bill comes down at the final stage, that even the option has been foregone, and the Minister binds himself to pay absolutely the $1,600,000 in lieu of the $64,000 a year, for the Drummond County property. But, as I understand, the company were under obligation to pay $6,000 a year to the Grand Trunk Company for the Chaudière section. What has become of that? Is this one of the betterments which has been got from the Grand Trunk? If so, we would like to know it, because we want to give the hon. gentleman all the credit we can, in order that we may by-and-by call it to the mind of such ardent admirers as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who, in 1897, as now, believed that the Minister of Railways had made the very best bargain that any man had ever made for the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said nothing of it in 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, my hon. friend has experienced a change of heart since 1897?

Mr. McMULLEN. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because if he said nothing in 1897, and he is not given to be economical of adulations of the Ministers—he must have experienced a change of heart since then. Are there prospects in view? Is the hon. gentleman's—what we used to think—somewhat hard nature softening under the influence of time and other things? But last night was the most perfect, the most absolutely generous, the most self-denying tribute I ever heard a member give to a Minister whom he supported in this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to take all the credit the hon. gentleman is supposed to bestow.

Mr. FOSTER. But I want to know what has become of the $6,000, and then I will give him credit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The arrangement we finally made with the Grand Trunk Railway permitting of our getting all the privileges which belonged to the Chaudière, as well as the Montreal connection. Any increase of the rental——

Mr. FOSTER. It is a decrease.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the other arrangement, if a lease had been made with the Drummond County road, in place of a purchase, the Grand Trunk Railway would have enjoyed that advantage; but when we succeeded having an arrangement with the Drummond County road for the purchase out and out, the Grand Trunk Railway were placed in a position in which they could insist on that, but which we finally prevailed on them not to press.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that $6,000 given up by the Grand Trunk Railway to the Drummond County road or to the Minister?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Given to us.

On section 4,

Mr. FOSTER. Have the subsidies all been paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister by him the report of the road as finished, which authorized its taking over. I suppose he got a report from his engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but I have not got it just at hand. I will bring it down before the third reading. There were many reports, and the company had a good deal of trouble satisfying our engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the engineer so hard to be satisfied, the same gentleman you sent down, on a six hours' trip, to examine the road, and upon whose report was founded your first entry into the bargain?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend will not tie me down too closely to a question of hours, I will answer his inquiry. One of the gentlement sent down was the engineer who made the trip, which was characterized as rather expeditious—Mr. McLeod.

The committee rose and reported progress.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the consent of the House, I would like to ask permission to read a telegram to the Montreal "Star," from London, on an important question, which will, I think, be of interest to the House:

London, 2nd June, 1899.

The "Times" and other New York and Washington telegrams continue to abuse Canada for daring to reject the agreement between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Choate regarding the Alaskan boundary, after the rising of the Joint High Commission in February. What the British public would much like to know is, whether Canada was fully consulted in the negotiations of this agreement. If not, Canada will receive much sympathy here. As the "Outlook" says to-day: "The British public feel that the day has gone by when any self-governing British colony can be dragooned into a settlement in which it has no say. Canada is no serf, is not even a child; she is a junior partner, and has a junior partner's rights, the last word being always with the senior partner."

I am not quite sure of that.

Mr. Smalley and his friends would ignore this if they could, but it remains a central fact in the administration of "the British Empire." A full official Canadian statement is greatly needed to meet the allegations with which the Washington telegrams are prejudicing opinion against Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am happy to say, and indeed I will surprise nobody in this House by stating, that the British authorities, the Foreign Office, through the Colonial Office, has kept us fully informed of the negotiations between the Foreign Office and the American Ambassador at the Court of St. James. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to be in a position to place before the House and the Canadian public the whole of the negotiations and the views we have expressed upon the questions referred to us. But as my hon. friend knows, I am not in a position to state anything at this moment. I noticed particularly the ending words of the quotation from the "Star," which has just been read by my hon. friend, that a full official statement coming from the Canadian side on this question would be much appreciated in England. I can fully reciprocate that sentiment, and wish we were in a position to make such a statement, and I believe if we were, a good deal of the anxiety which prevails in some quarters would be relieved and a good deal of the clouds which apparently surround this question and the sentiment more or less unfriendly which has been elicited in some quarters would also be removed. But so long as the negotiations continue, it is quite certain I will not be in a position to give out anything to the public.

I may say, however, that as the question of the Yukon boundary has been removed by the conference itself from the questions with which it had to deal and referred to the respective Governments, British and American, and as, therefore, so far as the commission is concerned, that matter is no longer pending before the commission, I am not without hope, before the session is over, that the last protocol on the conference may be laid on the Table.

Of course I need not remind the House that as to all the other questions which are pending before the conference at this moment, it would not be possible to give any publicity to what took place. But this one particular question is no longer among the subjects to be treated by the conference. The negotiations on this question are closed, that is, so far as the conference is concerned. I may say, for my part, I see no objection—on the contrary, I see a good deal to be said in favour, of having the true position placed before the public as it was when we adjourned the conference.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the resolution to confirm an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and Her Majesty for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal, be read the second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 138) to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall this Bill be read the second time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Bill is not distributed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to make one remark. I thought it would, perhaps, suit the convenience of hon. members and be in accord with the understanding between hon. gentlemen opposite and the Prime Minister if the House were to resolve itself into committee on this Bill at once——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is the Bill distributed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS I was going to speak of that. I have a message from the Printing Bureau, that inside of 15 minutes the Bill will be here for distribution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we shall have to await the distribution of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well; it can be taken up after that. I suppose there is no objection to the second reading on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. Reference to the Committee of the Whole can be made later on in the afternoon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. Of course, this is subject to the same statement that we have already made in regard to the second reading of the Drummond County Bill. We are departing a little from the usual course, which is to have the division on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill? At the present sitting of the House?

SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go into Supply, I want to give my hon. friends opposite fair notice that they have not been as diligent as they should have been in bringing down returns that have been ordered by the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has brought down a great many of late.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been very lenient. Others have been pressing the derelictions of the Government so strongly that, out of pity, I have held back thus far. But I find that this does not bring my returns. Therefore, I am going to make a short statement of what is due. Up to the present date, I have asked for and have been accorded by the House, demands for 23 returns. Of these 23, only two, and these very unimportant ones, have been brought down. That leaves 21 still due, and nearly all of them important returns, without which it is impossible for me, personally, to take up the estimates of the various departments of Government and discuss them in relation to the information that I want. I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up the time of the House now in going over all these returns I have asked for. It is the business of the Ministers and their officers, of course, to keep themselves informed regarding the returns asked for and to supply those returns. It is as well for me to state the number and to state that they are due and that payment is expected, and that at an early date, as it would be to take up an hour in going over the various returns I want.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think we have pretty well succeeded in satisfying my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. I despair, then, of doing so. I thought we were deserving of some credit. Well, we will try to satisfy my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) and see if he is less exacting.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I am going to have my pound of flesh.

SUPPLY—INVESTIGATION INTO THE CONDUCT OF JUDGES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I wish to draw the attention of the House to a very important subject which concerns the judiciary of this country and the mode of charges that may be made against one occupying that important position. I have given to the Solicitor General a copy of the resolution which I propose to ask the House to consider to-day. In the consideration of it, it will be necessary for me to refer at some length to the papers that have been brought down in answer to an Address of the House of Commons, dated 18th April, 1898, for copies of all petitions, correspondence, &c., relating to the inquiry into the conduct of Judge Spinks, judge of the county of Yale, by Mr. Justice McColl, of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. I approach this subject with all the greater confidence because I have not the pleasure of knowing this judge and have had no communication with him at any time. The subject of the return was a subject of general interest, and, as I have filled the position of Minister of Justice of this country, I profess

to know something of the procedure that has been heretofore adopted in connection with such a delicate question as misconduct on the part of the judiciary. Following the practice that has prevailed in Great Britain, in all the provinces of which Canada is composed, and, since 1867, in the Dominion, the greatest possible care has been taken to prevent any improper attack or any general or vague attack upon the judiciary. The position of the Superior Court judges, of course, is of such a character, that that position can only be attacked by an Address from both Houses of Parliament after the most solemn procedure known to Parliament has been followed—and in regard to that I shall have a word or two to say later on. Coming to the position of the judges of the County Court, all the reasons for care and caution in permitting their character to be attacked or called in question existed, but the Dominion Parliament has seen fit to adopt a certain procedure which does not obtain in the case of judges of the Supreme or Superior Courts. Under this procedure, for cause, His Excellency the Governor General may be advised to issue a commission of inquiry, and after the constitution of that commission, the judge is called upon to answer such charges as should be investigated and considered.

Now, in these cases regard has heretofore very properly been had to the solemn and careful steps that are taken in the case of an impeachment of a Superior Court judge: that is to say, the Government is bound, before even calling on a judge to answer charges that have been presented to the proper department against his conduct, to see that these charges are themselves so specific and so exact that they are not only ready for issue to be taken upon them, but that they are of such a character that, if established in the form in which they are presented, they would constitute a case for the removal of the judge from his position. That is following, as I say, the procedure in a case of impeachment where a great many preliminary forms having regard to the exalted position and the many important considerations attaching to it, tabling the articles practically, having them carefully considered, having them sent to the party affected, before any other stage in the procedure is taken. So, following on after these specific charges have been formulated and carried up to the standard which I have mentioned, the very proper procedure and practice has been to communicate those to the judge, and even in that case should the charge be serious enough and come under the rules that I have mentioned, still it does not follow that a commission should issue; in that case it is still necessary to ascertain from the judge what explanation he may have to give. I have a case in mind where the charges were made and the request for an investigation and inquiry were endorsed by the bar society of a province, and after those charges had been communicated to the judge the answer of the judge was deemed to be of such a character that it was not considered proper or fit in the interests of justice to pursue the inquiry further, and a commission was refused. So I say the procedure, even after the charges have been properly formulated and submitted, is to give the judge an opportunity to make to the Minister of Justice such explanation as he may have to offer in connection with the case. Then if that explanation is not satisfactory, if it is not such an explanation as is satisfactory, having regard to the position which is attacked, and to the practice of Parliament, and to the practice of the executive, the Governor General is advised to issue his commission. The next point is that the greatest possible expedition should be used. It should not be tolerated or permitted under any circumstances that a judge should be in a position to exercise his great powers and his important duties for any length of time, if the charges are such as, after proof, would necessitate his removal from the bench. So that in taking that step it is necessary, and it is the rule, that the greatest possible expedition should be shown. Then it has not been the practice for the Government to appear as the prosecutor of charges against the judge. It is not the duty of a Government to appear in the proceedings as the prosecutor, and to proceed in fastening these charges, made upon the responsibility of a relator, on the shoulders of a judge. Now, I will support the position which I have outlined in regard to the delicacy of these inquiries, because they are extraordinary cases, there are no other officers in the service of this country who hold anything like this position, or are entitled to anything like this kind of protection that I have mentioned. There are no people in England, for instance, paid by the Crown who hold such a position in that country. They form a special class in this regard, and for reasons which are obvious, at any rate, to the members of the profession in this House. In regard to this practice, and in regard to the care and caution observed in calling into question the character of any of the judiciary, I would refer to Todd, Government in England, second edition, page 870, Vol. 2, concerning an inquiry into the character of Lord Abinger:

> The Attorney General (Sir S. Pollock) did not deny the proper vocation of the House of Commons for such inquiries in general, but considered the present complaint to be wholly unsubstantiated. It is in fact an admitted principle that no Government should support a motion for an inquiry into the conduct of a judge, unless they have first made an investigation, and are prepared to say that they think it a fit case to be followed up by an Address for his dismissal.

That refers, as the debate shows, to a case where the Attorney General in Parliament assume responsibility in regard to articles that have been tabled. He should not for a moment pass an opinion on those

articles nor their contents, no matter how grave, until he has by inquiry satisfied himself, before the next stage is reached, that they should be followed up. And again, referring to that same debate, the text says:

Lord John Russell objected that Lord Abinger had spoken both as a politician and as a lawyer, when he should have spoken only as a judge. Nevertheless, he regarded the independence of the judges to be so sacred that nothing but the most imperious necessity——

I would call attention to this because this is a standard debate referred to by Todd, as happily there are very few cases for an illustration of this kind in England, and I may say, speaking relatively, there are even fewer cases to be found in Canada.

Nevertheless, he regarded the independence of the judges so sacred that nothing but the most imperious necessity should induce the House to adopt a course that might tend to weaken their standing or endanger their authority.

Then Sir James Graham is quoted by Todd as having declared:

That except in Baron Smith's case, wherein the House retracted its steps, there had been no instance of the House of Commons instituting an inquiry with a view to discover evidence, but that it had been the invariable practice for distinct charges and specific allegations to be made, with a proffer of evidence in support of the same, before the House was called upon to commence proceedings of this description.

And Mr. Duncombe's motion was voted down, as Todd says, by a large majority. Then, one further remark only in summing up what Todd says in this connection. After having referred to the opinion of leading men at the bar, and leading men in the Parliament in England, he says:

Bearing in mind the general reponsibility of Ministers of the Crown for the due administration of justice throughout the Kingdom, and the obligation which they owe to the dispensers of justice to preserve them from injurious attack or calumnious accusations, it is necessary that, before consenting to any motion for a parliamentary inquiry into the conduct of a judge—or even for the reception of a petition complaining of the conduct of a judge, and not asking for his removal in accordance with the statute—or not alleging reasonable grounds for such a proceeding—Ministers should themselves have investigated the matter of complaint, and be prepared either to oppose or facilitate the interference of Parliament on the particular occasion.

It does not require any lengthy argument to show that the analogy is perfect and ought to be observed in the case of a judge of the county court. The reasons, outside of the expeditious manner of proceeding that apply in the case of a judge of the county court in some provinces having extraordinary and very wide jurisdiction indeed, apply to cases of other judges, the simple difference being that one is a procedure in Parliament, while the other is a procedure outside of Parliament, and the only time in which a case of the removal of a county court judge need come before Parliament is on some such motion as this when the motion comes up for consideration, having regard to the responsibility of the Crown or to that of the advisers of the Crown. Now, in this case I shall refer to the important features, and which exclude, of course, the evidence; the evidence is not material, so far as the view I am presenting to the House is concerned. The evidence was evidence that came at the last stage. What I am calling in question is the conduct of His Excellency's advisers in leading up to the stage where the evidence was taken, because, I say, the practice adopted in the case of Judge Spinks was a practice that was most injudicious to follow, a practice that does not obtain in connection with the Supreme Court judges, and a practice that should not have obtained, and has not obtained, in the cases of county court judges. To come immediately to this return, which is doubtless full and complete, we find that the machinery under the statute was started by letters from individuals who wrote as politicians. The first letter is avowedly a letter from a political supporter of the Administration; stress is laid upon that in the letter, and these letters cover the vaguest kinds of charges. The first letter is a letter from Grand Forks, dated June 1st, 1897, marked "personal," and addressed to the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, Minister of Justice, Ottawa, Ont.:

(Personal.)

Grand Forks, June 1, 1897.

The Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat,
Minister of Justice, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I have arrived up here as Deputy Supreme Chief Ranger for the Independent Order of Foresters from Victoria, where, as you know, my home is. There is a matter that as a Liberal and a friend, I deem it my duty to acquaint you of, viz., the conduct of W. W. Spinks, Judge of Yale district. I am at a loss to use words to convey my impressions regarding his unseemly conduct, but it is simply appalling. If ever an investigation was necessary to inquire into the conduct of any man, it is necessary in this case, for the good name of your department and for the glaring atrocities and the extreme favouritism shown by this official, it is a highly necessary step in the interest of justice and good government to have a commission appointed to investigate at once.

Believe me, Honourable Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JAMES H. FALCONER.

Address:
24 Rithet St., Victoria, B.C.

It is clear that my position is sound as to what are the preliminary facts that would justify the hon. Minister of Justice in paying attention to charges against a county court judge. There is not a line, or syllable, in that letter that would have warranted any action being taken beyond the acknowledgment of the receipt of that letter. The next letter is dated the 3rd of June, 1897:

Greenwood, B.C., June 3, 1897.

The Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat,
Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

Sir,—Re the administration of justice by the County Court Judge of Yale, I have heard many complaints.

In my opinion, no judge should be allowed to be the owner or part-owner of a mineral claim, and I think it would be a good thing if a commission were appointed to inquire into the state of affairs in this district.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant.
(Sgd.) JAMES KERR, J.P.

There is no charge of any kind whatsoever, nor is there a pretended charge in that letter; there is merely a statement made by this justice of the peace that he heard many complaints respecting the administration of justice by that county court judge of Yale. Complaints, I fancy, are just as numerous as there are judges of any court, on the part of the unfortunate or the unlucky suitors before the judge. He generally complains of the judgment when it is against him, but the expression of the opinion that no judge should be allowed to be interested in a mining claim is far from the statement even that this judge was interested in a mining claim, and even if this statement were made there would be very little to form a ground for inquiry. Now, the longest letter, and perhaps the strongest letter, the others meaning nothing, is a letter from Mr. Peter T. McCallum, justice of the peace, which is dated the 3rd of June, 1897. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to these letters, for these are the only foundation for the inquiry that was put on foot, long-continued and kept hanging over the head of a judge of one of the courts of this country while he was discharging his judicial functions:

Grand Forks, B.C., June 3, 1897.

The Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat,
Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have been requested by several residents of this district to report to you direct certain alleged abuses in connection with the administration of justice by His Honour Judge Spinks, County Court Judge of Yale district in this province.

I ask the attention of the House, for a moment, to say that not one of these gentlemen ventures to state a charge on his own authority or ventures to specify or formulate a charge within the rules, that I have referred to, governing cases of charges and inquiries into the conduct and character of judges:

It is a well-known fact that Judge Spinks, for the past two or three years, has not conducted himself as a gentleman, holding the high office he does, should. Complaints have been made for that period, and are being made, in reference to favouritism and partiality exhibited by Judge Spinks from the bench, both in civil and criminal cases, where certain rings and cliques are interested.

I think no member of the bar, nor the Solicitor General, will argue that that paragraph contains anything that should be brought to the notice of a judge, if such a communication were sent respecting every judge of the county court or any other judge, because the thing is drawn with great care to avoid the statement of anything more than that complaints of a general character are being made. This letter shows that although it bears the signature of Peter T. McCallum, he was not in the very best position to be the critic of a gentleman holding the position of the judge of the county court.

It is a well-recognized fact, Sir, that Judge Spinks, during the period above mentioned, has rarely, if ever, appeared at the different places appointed throughout the district for the holding of county courts on time, but is always from two to three days late, allowing suitors, witnesses and persons in custody on trial for criminal offences to wait his pleasure, thereby causing them great loss of time travelling to and from the place of trial, and entailing great unnecessary expense.

Mr. MORRISON. Does the hon. gentleman characterize that as not being a serious charge against a judge who is sworn to do his duty?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I will have some remarks to make concerning the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Morrison) interference in this case, I would prefer he would not interfere with my speech until I have finished.

Mr. MORRISON. I have a perfect right to do so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) is ignorant of the rules of the House.

Mr. MORRISON. I have the right subject to the Speaker's ruling.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) is absolutely ignorant of the rules of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) has not the right to interrupt, except with the consent of the gentleman who has the floor.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) who did interrupt has indicated clearly that he has not done me the courtesy of listening to my introductory observations. They may be well founded or they be entirely erroneous; but if he followed me at all, he would have understood quickly that the position I am taking is, that the Department of Justice should never have treated that paragraph with sufficient seriousness, to do more than acknowledge its receipt, for it does not come within any of the rules I have mentioned as laid down by the books and practice in such cases. I may be wrong, but it is so obvious that I am surprised the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) should ask a question about it.

was about to observe when I was interrupted, that this paragraph fails to state one single day on which the judge was late, or even the year when he came late to court. It fails to give any fact which might not be susceptible of reasonable explanation, in a part of the country where travelling is at times difficult, and in a province where it is historically true that the greatest difficulty has existed in keeping any fixed appointment for the trial of cases. But, avoiding all particulars, this man makes a general charge that the judge :

Had rarely, if ever, appeared at the different places appointed throughout the district for the holding of county courts on time, but is always from two to three days late.

Suppose that is all true, is there any one in this House who would suggest that a judge should be removed simply on a general fact established that he was late. The statement suggests that there must have been a reason for that, and no action should have been taken until the judge had an opportunity of giving the reason ; although I argue, that if any regard is paid to the practice heretofore so properly obtaining, no inquiry would have been made on so vague a charge.

It has repeatedly happened that prisoners awaiting trial have been held over two or three days over the time appointed for their trial and then acquitted.

Not the name of a case given about which the Attorney General could have been communicated with. This was in connection with the business conducted by the Attorney General of the province, and the very fact that no case was named by the man—whose character was bad as the commissioner's report will show—where the matter was susceptible of inquiry through a letter to the Attorney General of the province, even the absence of any complaint by the Attorney General should have prevented the department paying any regard to this whatever. The only possible course they would be justified in would be to have written to the Attorney General of British Columbia to know whether in connection with the administration of criminal justice, the county court judge of this district had misbehaved. Here is the first case mentioned :

A marked case of this was the Queen vs. Davis, tried here at the second last sittings of the county court, and this, sir, is not the exception, it is a rule with Judge Spinks.

Here we have the statement that he was late in one case, and the general statement that this is the rule. He says :

It is also charged against Judge Spinks——

Charged against Judge Spinks by persons unknown, for no names are mentioned :

——that he violates his oath of office in allowing influence to be used upon him and acquitting guilty men. Two marked cases of this nature have occurred in this district within the past twelve months.

I again stop to say that there is not a line in that which comes within the regulation in connection with these cases—and the rule is a sound one—that would have justified the department paying any attention to such a general observation, especially in view of the fact that there is a responsible Attorney General who could at once give an explanation, and deny or corroborate the statement if the department here was at all exercised about it. The very fact that no Attorney General ever made a complaint, was an indication that there was no good ground for making this charge.

It is also an admitted fact——

It is not stated by whom.

——that Judge Spinks was one of the members of a clique in Grand Forks, who are owners of the town site, and members of this clique have been known to boast that no action could succeed against them while Judge Spinks sat on the bench.

The idlest piece of gossip imaginable, retailed by this justice of the peace, and, to the disgrace of the Department of Justice, given consideration by it.

From my own knowledge, sir, I may say that on one occasion, I say, as one of the Board of License Commissioners for the district when an application came before us by one of the members of the ring above mentioned came before the board for a retail license,——

You will observe the illiteracy and bad English of this correspondent who is discussing a delicate question of law on the administration of the license laws, as between this board which boasts of him as a member, and the judge of the county court.

——the applicant was clearly not entitled to a license,——

That is in the opinion of the justice of the peace.

——and the board refused the application ; an appeal was taken to Judge Spinks, and as the applicant——

The appellant, I suppose, or the applicant for the license—

——belonged to this particular ring, of which Judge Spinks is an admitted member, he granted a license in the face of the licensing board's refusal.

I would not stop to argue for a moment that there was a particle of that statement that constituted anything else than insolence.

In conclusion, sir, let me say that the above are only a few of the minor charges brought against Judge Spinks. There is general dissatisfaction among the people throughout the whole district, and complaints have appeared through the press on many occasions without avail, till at last an innocent and long-suffering people have come to accept it as a condition of things which is remedyless and must be borne without complaint. Let me say, sir, that if ever a public

office in British Columbia required to be aired, if there was ever a case which required a Royal Commission to issue to examine into these abuses, which are so flagrant and so numerous that it would be impossible for me to enumerate them in detail.

The rest of the sentence is not concluded.

Again, let me say that I will urge upon you the great necessity of issuing a commission immediately to inquire into these abuses, as your Honour, with your long experience in the administration of justice must well know, that abuses like these are dangerous to the well-being of society and are ruinous to the best interests of the public at large.

* * * * * *

And here what was, no doubt, the most interesting part of this effusion is left out. Asterisks follow in a letter which must be considered as the basis for the proceedings that were taken, and the concluding paragraph is left out. I could supply the omission, I think, for there seems to be no purpose for this whole return, other than to squeeze Mr. Justice Spinks out, and put in a nominee of the two gentlemen whose names are mentioned, and who appear as showing the greatest possible desire to employ a lawyer in the province of British Columbia in connection with this matter, and get rid of Mr. Justice Spinks. Whether this procedure was properly initiated or not —and I think it was not, feeling that there was no ground whatever for any action to be taken—it is a great pity that these gentlemen were not able to bring sufficient influence to bear on the powers that existed at the time the commission was issued, so that the inquiry would have been carried on promptly, and this man cleared promptly, as he was finally, of the charges which were made against him, and which were circulated through the press in the very community where he was sitting as one of the judges of the county court.

Mr. MAXWELL. What were the names of those two gentlemen ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will come to the names later on. I think the House will be surprised to learn that, instead of any of these letters being sent to the county court judge for him to give such answer as might occur to him, supposing my first point to have been badly taken, and that the charges were sufficiently serious and specific to cause attention to be drawn to them on the part of the judge, the House will be surprised to learn that these charges were never submitted to Mr. Justice Spinks, and that a commission had issued for months before the commissioner himself could get the charges into which the Government had directed the inquiry. I think the House will be surprised to learn that the first communication sent to Judge Spinks was a telegram, the contents of which were most extraordinary. This is the telegram, sent on the 24th of June, the first document which issued from the Department of Justice after the receipt of these three letters :

His Honour Judge Spinks,
Yale, B.C.

Serious charges preferred against you, in effect that you have been guilty of favouritism and partiality, and have allowed yourself to be unduly influenced in the administration of justice. That you are usually late in keeping judicial appointments, thereby causing delay and expense to suitors and prolonging the custody of persons committed upon criminal charges. The Minister considers these charges so grave as to call for an immediate commission of inquiry. Do you desire to make any reply before commission issues ?

(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE.

A more brutal message was never sent to a judge in Canada, or in any province of Canada. Before any commission issued, there was a necessary and proper etiquette that should have been observed. The idea that over the wires of this country there should go from the Minister of Justice, no matter whether he was Sir Oliver Mowat or any other gentleman who had attained a high and distinguished position in the profession to which he belonged, such a message, especially in the absence of the usual and ordinary etiquette of submitting the charges to the judge through the mail and asking his explanation before coming to the conclusion that these charges were of such a character that they should be inquired into. But, with these vague and general statements, and these gossipy letters, couched in the language which I have read, that telegram was sent. To that, of course, there could only be one answer. It was not for the judge, attacked in that manner and spirit, to stand on form or to wait a moment. That telegram reached him at Vernon on the 26th of June, and was answered by him as follows :

Vernon, B.C., June 26, 1897.

To E. L. Newcombe,
Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Telegram just received. The more full and speedy inquiry the better. Would suggest inquiry be made at place where complaint made.

(Sgd.) WARD SPINKS.

That was a reasonable position for Judge Spinks to take. He put aside and ignored the question which I have raised. He was attacked by the Minister of Justice with a club, saying that most serious complaints had been made against him. His answer was, that the sooner the inquiry was made, the better ; and you will observe that he asks for a speedy inquiry particularly. He was not suspended ; he was not asked to abstain from his judicial duties ; and, therefore, for the public interest, as well as for his own, he demanded that there should be no delay. Now, we will see what happened. That was on the 26th of June. He follows that with a letter, in which he acknowledges the receipt of the telegram of the same date,

and asks, in addition, that a stenographer be employed to report the whole proceedings. The department conducts this matter for a time with great celerity. The first telegram, which was of such an extraordinary character, had failed in its purpose, if its purpose was to frighten the judge off the bench. Nevertheless, the communications are quickly carried on for a time, to drop, as you will see, and to remain without action for a very long time later on. On the 29th of June, a telegram is sent to Mr. Justice McColl, of New Westminster, B.C., as follows :—

Department of Justice,
Ottawa, June 29, 1897.

The Hon. Mr. Justice McColl,
New Westminster, B.C.

Commission to be issued to investigate charges against Judge Spinks under chap. 138, sec. 2. Will you act as commissioner ? Wire answer.

(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE.

Publish it all over the place, that the Minister of Justice had told Mr. Justice Spinks that serious and terrible charges had been preferred against him ; telegraph it to New Westminster, and ask him if he will act as commissioner. All this is in June ; and yet for months this judge was permitted to go on the bench and perform his ordinary duties. He was not granted the request which he made so promptly for a speedy and full investigation, with a stenographer to take down everything that was said for and against him. Judge McColl, on the 30th of June, telegraphs back to the Department of Justice that he will act as commissioner. Then, a rush is made to His Excellency ; a report to Council is drawn up by the Minister of Justice on the 2nd of July, asking for the appointment of Judge McColl as a commissioner " to inquire into and report upon the complaints that have been made respecting the administration of justice by W. W. Spinks." The dates are all important. The 2nd July that report is made, and, though the Order in Council is not under my hand in this return, no doubt it was very pretty quickly issued, because we have the following letter of the 5th July from the Department of Justice to Judge Spinks, acknowledging the receipt of his communication of the 26th June, which I have already read. Then, on the 6th July, Mr. Wilson, who was counsel for the judge in this matter, writes a letter to Mr. Newcombe, this portion of which I think is important :

Mr. Spinks further consulted with me as to the propriety of holding court pending the inquiry, and I advised him that although there might be some temporary unpleasantness in continuing to discharge his duties, after charges of this character had been made and before their final determination, it was better to submit to the unpleasantness, as delay in holding the court might seriously interfere with the administration of justice and put the public to very great inconvenience.

Those things are brought to the attention of the Department of Justice, not merely by a telegram of the 5th June to the judge, but formally by Judge Spinks's counsel, Mr. Wilson, in a letter of July 6th, concerning as they did, not merely the judge, but the public interest, and there is a further letter, later on, where this thing is again pressed on the department without avail. The telegraphic period had ceased, the judge would not budge from his position, but stood his ground, and then the department adopted the system of letters, and the letter of Mr. Wilson is acknowledged in this manner :

I may inform you that Mr. Justice McColl is to act as commissioner, and I shall forward the commission and instructions to him within a few days. I have no doubt you will be able to make arrangements with him for a sitting at a convenient time and place. It is not intended——

I call attention to this particularly, because the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) and the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) had not appeared on the scene at that particular time. No doubt, they were behind, and in concert with the other parties, but they had not shown their hands in this matter.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken ; and, if his other statements are not better founded, he is taking up time uselessly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that he was called to order a little while ago, and was instructed that he was not at liberty to interrupt. I am sorry he is excited, but he will have an opportunity to speak at great length.

Mr. MORRISON. Of which I shall take advantage.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He will have the opportunity of explaining his part of the transaction, for part he certainly had, as the correspondence will undoubtedly show, and I may read that part of it a little later on. But, doubtless, he and the hon. member for Yale had not made their appearance on the scene at this period. Three parties had appeared, who had induced Sir Oliver Mowat to send that extraordinary telegram, and they disappeared as quickly as they appeared, for Judge McColl had the greatest possible difficulty in finding them, as would appear from his report. He found one, I think, and had to get him by a subpœna. And, if I recollect rightly, two of them never appeared on the scene again, but, instead of those two appearing, the hon. member for Westminster and the hon. member for Yale did appear, and they succeeded in inducing the Government to change its position, which was a very proper one under the circumstances, and involved this country in a considerable bill of expense. And they employed a gentleman who is practising, I believe, in New Westminster. This is what was stated, however, at this period, before they appeared on the scene :

It is not intended in this case to instruct counsel on behalf of the Crown, but there will be, of course, no objection to counsel appearing for the judge and for the persons preferring the charges.

That was not an unreasonable or unusual course, and the Department of Justice, on the 13th July, were prepared to treat Judge Spinks with some fairness and some of the consideration shown to other judges in similar matters.

I am to add that I do not consider that Judge Spinks should allow the fact that these charges are pending and are to be investigated, to interfere with his holding courts and otherwise performing his ordinary duties.

So that you have this extraordinary condition of things presented, that on that flimsy material Sir Oliver Mowat was induced to direct a telegram to be sent to the judge, stating that these charges were serious, and you have the judge then saying: Investigate them, and do so quickly. Under the circumstances, he said, is it fit that I should be permitted to discharge the duties of a judge? If serious charges have been preferred, charges so serious that I am not entitled to the ordinary courtesy of seeing them before any machinery is set in motion for a trial, and if all the facts exist, and you have possession of them, is it fitting that I should continue discharging my duty? And on the 13th July, having looked into this matter, having found out that the judge was standing to his guns, and that these charges were going to vanish into thin air, the department would not take the responsibility of saying that, in the meanwhile, it would be more fitting that he should abstain from exercising his judicial functions. It is quite clear that the charges were not sufficiently serious, in the language of this letter, to prevent his holding court and otherwise performing his ordinary duties. For months he was permitted, with these charges hanging over his head and a commission pending, to go on performing his ordinary duties. Then comes the document I was looking for, the Order in Council of the 2nd July, authorizing this commission on the report I have read. Then, there was no need either for haste; there was no vacancy likely to be created in that position, and it was not until the 27th August that we find the acknowledgment of the letter of the 25th August from the Department of the Secretary of State, inclosing a draft of the commission of Judge McColl to inquire into and report upon certain complaints against Judge Spinks, of British Columbia, and stating that the matter would receive attention.

That is an important feature of the transaction. You have what I believe were not serious charges, not charges in the form they ought to be, when affecting the position of a judge; you have the Order in Council passed on the 2nd July, and no action on the part of the Department until the 25th August. Then His Excellency was induced to sign the commission, and strange enough, according to the return—and I will call the attention of the Solicitor General to this fact—the draft commission was sent to the Secretary of State for the affixing of the Great Seal and His Excellency's signature, and the commission itself, under the seal, with His Excellency's signature, is dated the 21st August.

As a matter of fact, it is quite clear that it was not sent at that time, and was in the shape of a draft on the 27th of August. Now, some explanation might be given for that delay. But let us see what further delay occurred. On the 21st of September, nothing had happened except the issue of this commission, and we find this letter from the judge who was appointed a commissioner:

I am to-day in receipt of a commission appointing me a commissioner.

Then, the second paragraph of that letter is as follows:

I have had no communication with your department since the telegram received in June last, inquiring whether I would act as commissioner, and in the absence of any instructions and of a copy of the complaints upon which the commission was issued, I am uncertain how to act.

So that, the celerity shown at the start, with these telegrams fired at the judge so charged, the department became so indifferent to the public interest and to the fact that these charges had been made, and that that commission had been issued in July, that here is their commissioner telling them on the 21st of September, that while he has got the commission, he has no complaints, and has no instructions, and he does not know what to do. Now, following this return comes a letter of September 22nd from the judge's counsel, who writes:

In the matter of the proposed inquiry into Judge Spinks's administration of justice in his district, there have been paragraphs in the newspapers that a commission has been or would be issued, and as a result the fact is quite public.

After your letter to me of the 13th July, I waited on Mr. Justice McColl, who informed me that he expected to be appointed to conduct the inquiry, and after the commission arrived he would make the necessary arrangements. Since then I have several times inquired, only to learn that the commission had not been received by Mr. Justice McColl, and apparently he was without instructions.

I am writing you now on this subject because I am in receipt of a letter from Judge Spinks, pointing out that one of those active in promoting the charges, of which, by the way, we yet know nothing definitely, is engaged in circulating rumours highly prejudicial to the judge, and which, under existing circumstances, and with this promised commission of inquiry hanging over him, he cannot notice.

The judge's position is becoming almost intolerable in consequence of the delay in disposing of this matter, and I may perhaps be permitted to remind you that in that letter you stated that you would forward the commission and instructions in a few days.

Is it quite fair to leave a judicial officer in this position ? Surely to invite attention to it should be sufficient without more, to ensure the inquiry being held without any further delay.

There is the manner in which that occupant of the bench was treated. And what justification can there be for it in regard to a man holding such a position ? To fire these telegrams over the wires was bad enough, but it was worse to have it given forth in the newspapers, spread about in the mouths of the people of the community, that he was a judge whose conduct was to be investigated, and although he had employed counsel, and had put this counsel in communication with the department, they are for several months appealing to the department in vain to expedite an inquiry and to relieve him of the unpleasant position in which he was placed. But he was pleading to deaf ears. You cannot suggest, Mr. Speaker, after a perusal of this return, that it simply took the ordinary red tape routine, and that some official or officials were not guilty of extraordinary delay in this matter. We will see where politicians do come in, and we will not. I think, make a very extravagant inference if we find reasons for communications of that kind, and that all regard to the judge's position, put aside altogether regard for himself personally, all regard of that kind was thrown to the winds, and consideration given to matters that ought never to have been considered. That is the second appeal on the part of the judge affected, and this is what happens. Then, on the 28th of September is an acknowledgment of Mr. Newcombe's letter :

In Mr. Newcombe's absence, I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant, relative to the proposed inquiry into Judge Spinks' administration of justice in his district. In reply, I beg leave to inform you that the commission issued was forwarded to Mr. Justice McColl on the 10th instant. The judge has acknowledged receipt of the commission under date of the 21st instant.

We find the next document dated the 12th of October, where the Department of Justice at long last is sending the documents :

I have now the honour to forward you copies of the letters which show the complaints made against the judge.

Some hon. gentlemen, having regard to what I said at the outset, may think that these complaints were in proper form, that they were sufficiently specific in a matter of this kind. But it will appear that the commissioner in this case was not of that opinion. Nevertheless, those other complaints were not forwarded. Those documents that were sent to the Department of Justice in June, form the only justification for that extraordinary and heartless telegram already quoted. In July, the judge says : I am not only ready to meet the charges, but I wish you to hasten the trial. But these charges do not reach the commissioner until they send a letter on the 12th of October, after an appeal had been twice made to the department to expedite the inquiry. Then, there is a formal communication of November 13th, from R. G. Sidley, justice of the peace, one of the correspondents in this matter. He speaks of having notice that the judge was going to sit. On the 13th of November, 1897, there is a letter from Mr. Newcombe to Mr. Sidley, giving him the information he wanted. On the 10th of December, the next date, we have a telegram from the commission, and from this return it is clear he never received a single communication that had been sent by the judge pressing for expedition. None of these letters from Mr. Wilson, counsel for Judge Spinks, had ever reached the commission, according to the information brought down to the House ; not even that courtesy was shown ; and, therefore, Judge McColl does not fix a day for the trial until he telegraphs, as it is shown here, on the 10th of December to the Department of Justice :

Re Spinks.—Commission opens at Burnham 15th instant. Am informed for complainants that they have not retained counsel, and expect department will.

Now comes in the hon. member for Yale. The department alone, the department acting on its own initiative, according to the traditional practice, did not intend to employ counsel. They so stated. But the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo appeared on the scene. And so we see : "Bostock also writes me it is desirable." If it were parliamentary I would say, and, using the expression in the parliamentary sense, I will say, this was a most impertinent interference on the part of the hon. member for Yale. I do not mean to say it was insolent ; I mean that he had no connection with the case properly considered, and I say he should not have been permitted, either by Judge McColl, now Chief Justice of the province, or the department to act in the matter unless he took the position of counsel or had some official status. The fact that he was member for Yale did not give him the right to be heard or to communicate with the commissioner appointed, any more than he has the right to interfere in a criminal matter before Judge McColl when he does not appear as counsel, either for the Crown or for the prisoner. He did not pretend to be acting, and he was not acting in any other capacity than as member of Parliament, as representative of the district ; and his office boy had as much right to communicate with Judge McColl in this matter as the hon. gentleman had. But the judge listened to him. The judge was in an extraordinary position. He could not get instructions until he demanded them from the department, he could not get complaints and know what the charges were until he insisted on receiving them. And so, I suppose, in desperation, he was induced to act upon the representations of the hon. member for Yale. It appears from the despatches that "Mr. Bostock thought it was desirable" that there

should be counsel for these gentlemen. But he thought that it was desirable that the tax-payers of Canada should pay this counsel, such counsel as he and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) might agree upon. The hon. gentleman thought it desirable that this assistance should be given so long as he had not to pay for it, so long as it was a charge upon the public exchequer. And so he advised Judge McColl that it was advisable, and, not having regard to the decision communicated in the letter of the Minister of Justice, we find that he had sufficient political influence to cause the retaining of the friend of the hon. member for New Westminster.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Calvert.)

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Frost.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved:

That Bill (No. 90) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company—(Mr. Macpherson)—be now read the third time.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia) moved in amendment:

That Bill (No. 90) be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending it by striking out section 3 and substituting the following as section 3:—

"Section 5 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the words '1st day of August,' in the seventh and eighth lines thereof, and substituting for the same '1st day of December.'"

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. gentleman to explain the change that is made in this Bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the Bill that is before the House is to this effect, that an additional year's delay is asked. The company propose to expend $20.000 on construction during the year as a guarantee to the people interested in this road that they will go on with the work as soon as they can make the necessary preparations. I may inform the House that this road has been before the people for the past eleven or twelve years. This road runs over the original survey of the Canadian Pacific Railway, heading for Yellow Head Pass. The people, on the strength of the promise of the construction of this railway, settled all along the line and they have been looking forward, year after year, to the construction of the road. Unfortunately, the company that had control of the charter had continual difficulties and came to us, year after year, asking an extension of time, until now, the people feel that it is their right to appeal to this House for protection in regard to this juggling in connection with railway charters. It is the road they want. The difficulties that the late company have had do not meet the necessities of their case. The fact that there has been continued litigation does not help the settlers in getting their grain to market. This whole country through which the railway passes is well settled, and the settlements have made good progress. They have a large amount of stuff to be got out each year, and they feel that it is only reasonable that they should appeal to this House in support of their contention that this road should be built forthwith. Last year the Canadian Pacific Railway bought out the road from the old company, and they now make this proposal to expend $20.000 during the present season, but they ask an additional year for the construction of the twenty miles which the charter calls for. You will observe that this amendment which we have moved meets the views of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a certain extent. Instead of giving a year, we are prepared, if the House sustains the amendment, to allow them up to the 1st of December; whereas the Bill that passed the House last year entailed upon the company that they should build ten miles last autumn, and then fifteen miles before the 1st of August next. We ask the House to sustain us in the demand, that the company keeps its engagement to this extent, that they should build twenty miles by the 1st of December, and thus be in a position to remove a portion of the crop of the present year. I might say a great deal about the nature of the country through which this road passes. This line leaves the Canadian Pacific Railway east of Brandon, and runs in a north-westerly direction. It is now constructed as far as Hamiota, thence proceeding in the direction of Birtle, and leaving the boundary of Manitoba it strikes my constituency on the east side, and runs the whole length of it in the direction of Battleford towards the Yellow Head Pass. You will remember that on the north banks of the Qu'Appelle we have a great number of colonies. We have an Icelandic colony; we have a large settlement of Canadians from Huron, between the two Cutarm Creeks who have been in that country since 1882 or 1883. Then we have the Hungarian colony, the Bohemian colony, the Swedish colony, the German colony, and the Temperance colony from Ontario.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What about the French?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a French colony further west. All along the line the land is well settled and there is a large area under cultivation. I am sorry I had not an opportunity of calling to my aid the large petitions that were sent to the Minister of Railways in connection with the ability of the people to produce, but I have here a record of the produce of simply nineteen settlers on this line. These nineteen settlers, last year, produced 106,236 bushels wheat, and they had this spring, ready for cultivation, 9,931 acres. Further west, when we come to the country immediately north of Indian Head in the direction of Pheasant Plains, there the ability to produce grain is very much increased, and the improvement in the country is very much more apparent. These people have all to cross the Qu'Appelle valley, where I reside myself. Its banks are four hundred feet high and the valley two miles wide, so that on the average these people are hauling their grain from 30 to 40 miles, and crossing this valley with it. It can easily be shown that this has been a very great hardship, and the people of that district deserve very great credit that they have continued all these years without railroad facilities. I am quite sure that I could prove to the House, that in many cases it has been done at a loss, and it is only within the last three years when prices have been better for grain, that it could be made pay. I have known my teams hauling grain for 30 miles across the Qu'Appelle to Moosomin, and when they reached home the second day, if I deducted the usual prices for transportation, they would not have in hand any profit whatever. I remember on one occasion when I wished to get two ponies and a man to drive me, they asked me $14 to drive 30 miles and back, and a team with a load of grain going over the same distance would not bring back that amount. However, better prices have prevailed for the last three years and the people have reaped the benefit. Still, these people feel that they deserve the consideration of this House. They have patiently and persistently gone forward with their improvements for the past fourteen or fifteen years, and they are getting tired of this continual waiting for railway facilities. It is no comfort to them to know that railway companies have had endless litigation; what they want is the railroad, and they believe that they will provide sufficient traffic to make it pay from the first day of the equipment. The 50 miles of this road which have been built always paid expenses and paid a fair dividend, and we believe if it were continued it would be a paying road from the very commencement. From one end of the route to the other the people are opposed to delay, and our instructions as representing the people is to protest against the delay. The Northern Pacific and the other companies would be quite willing to go into that country and provide the people with a railroad, so that we feel the offer which the Canadian Pacific Railway made the other day in the committee, was simply a bagatelle—a matter of $20,000 would scarcely buy a candy stick for each settler and keep him in good humour until the year is through. The Canadian Pacific Railway are quite able to fulfil the engagements they entered into with Parliament last year and build the 20 miles, and thus meet the wishes of the people, and give them the encouragement which their patience and perseverance deserve. I would also mention the fact that many of the people have left the district in consequence. A large number of settlers, specially from the temperance colonies, have moved away, and though they have gone elsewhere in the territories, yet they have left their property and it is a loss to them personally, because land when not cultivated goes back to weeds, and is, as a rule, of less value than if it were unbroken prairie. We hope, then, that in consideration of the patience, perseverance, energy and enterprise of the people, that this House will see the necessity of asking the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to keep the engagement it entered into with Parliament last session. For the present, we meet them by granting an extension of time from the 1st of August to the 1st of December, on condition that they build the 20 miles, as was agreed upon at the last session of Parliment. I might call your attention to the fact that, in the western part of the riding, there is a large wheat country, comprising the districts of Balcarres, Abernethy, Lorlie, Pheasant Forks, Saltoun, Kenlis, Lebret, Chickney, Bayward, Parklands, Loon Creek and Fort Qu'Appelle. The people of these districts declare in their petition that they are from 18 to 40 miles distant from the present Canadian Pacific Railway; that numbers of settlers have located in these districts on the strength of projected railways; that a large number of settlers have in past years abandoned their homesteads for lack of transportation facilities in the more distant settlements; that the distance from the railway curtails the operations of the settlers and prevents the settlement of other lands; that, notwithstanding this disadvantage, the country above referred has been steadily growing and prospering, thus proving the enormous natural advantages it enjoys; and that, in the settlements named and adjoining, there is an abundance of good farming land awaiting settlement. Therefore, these people insist upon their request being granted, that no further delay be given to the company, but that they be required to proceed forthwith to make good their engagement with the Government last year. I call your attention also to a resolution passed by a municipality in Manitoba affected by this railway. At a meeting held in Beulah Hall, Beulah, on Friday, March 31st, 1899,

the following resolution was passed, after some discussion, on motion of W. A. Doyle, seconded by C. T. Gurney :—

That this meeting of the residents of the municipality of Miniota hereby desires our representative in the Parliament of Canada, W. J. Roche, M.D., to oppose the application of the Great Northwest Central Railway Co. for an extension of time till 1900, for the construction of twenty miles of their railway westward from Hamiota. And that as this settlement has been promised railway service by the Dominion Government for the past nineteen years, and our earlier settlers became residents in consequence of such promise, we feel that we have a right to call upon the entire Parliament of Canada to protect our interest against any further juggling on the part of the said railway company.

I think it should be evident to the House that this is not a question of factious opposition to any railway company ; it is not that the people are opposed to one line and prefer another line ; but it is simply this, that, now that they have been so long in the country, and have developed their lands, and have produced so abundantly and with such success, they feel that, as citizens, they have a right to the consideration of the House. I move, therefore, that this amendment be made to the Bill now before the House.

Mr. J. SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). Having moved the third reading of this Bill, I may say, that I fully sympathize with the people represented by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, in their desire to have railway facilities and to have this road built at the earliest possible moment. I understand that many parts of that district have been settled for a long time, and that the people were encouraged to believe that the railway would be built. They naturally desire, therefore, after waiting so long, that it should be proceeded with without any further delay. I believe the great majority of the members of the committee also fully sympathize with the desire of the people of that district to have their desires fulfilled. Everything my hon. friend has said, with regard to the past history of this road, is correct, and perhaps a good deal more could be said. Unfortunately, the charter was held by people who were not able to continue the work ; but, as was pointed out in the committee, the franchise had passed into new hands. I understand that it was purchased by Mr. Angus, Mr. Shaughnessy and Mr. Clark, with their own private means, but, no doubt, in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as, I think, was stated before the committee. But it was also pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could not spend one dollar in carrying out this work, until this company had the legislation which is being asked for in this Bill. For that reason, they ask for a short extension of time, in order that they may complete their arrangements and raise the capital necessary to proceed with the work. A proposition was made, that the gentlemen who now own the charter, to give an earnest of their good faith, should expend $20,000 in construction on or before the 31st of December of this year. I believe that the great majority of the committee, along with myself, felt that the character of the men and the company they were representing was a sufficient guarantee that this work would be carried out, and that they would expend $20,000 this year in construction. The Bill provided for an extension of only one year, and we had every reason to feel that, if this legislation were granted, the road would be completed before the end of this year. It was probably felt that, to put a greater obligation upon these men until they had an opportunity of transferring the undertaking to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and making their financial arrangements, would be a hardship to them. For that reason I cannot support the amendment. I hope the Bill will be allowed to pass as it is, and that there will be no further juggling, as my hon. friend says, in this matter, and no disappointment to the settlers in that district. I feel fully convinced, as, I think, most of the members of this House do, that the work will be carried out in good faith. These men can hardly be held responsible for the failure in the past.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I did not know that this Bill would be reached to-night and, therefore, am not prepared to enter into any lengthy discussion, but as a goodly portion of the road runs through my constituency, I know how very anxious the people there are to receive the railway construction they have been promised, and have failed to receive, for the last fifteen or sixteen years. When Mr. Howland, the solicitor of the old company, appeared before the railway committee two sessions ago, his chief argument was that the question was up for final adjudication before the Privy Council in Great Britain that year to decide the ownership, and that when that was decided there would be no further litigation, and that company would have no further excuse for not going on with the construction of the road, which they were as anxious to construct as the people were to see it in operation. That judgment was given in the interests of his clients, but, still, it seems that litigation has not ceased. I believe that last session, when this Bill was up before the House, an extension of time was asked for by the present owners of the road, Mr. Angus, Mr. Shaughnessy, and several other Canadian Pacific Railway magnates, who had purchased it, although the Bill was presented in the old form under the old management. I think that a compromise was made last session, binding them only to construct ten miles instead of twenty by the end of December, 1898. They sent out some surveyors and made a show of doing some work, but the surveyors were soon recalled, and the people had felt sure they were going to get the railway and felt

very jubilant over the prospect. As time went on, however, the same old story was repeated, and now we have an application made again for a further extension.

As regards this new arrangement entered into by the company, by which they agree to spend $20,000 per annum, that would be a perfectly valueless expenditure, as far as the people are concerned, because $20,000 would not construct three miles of the railway, and will be expended, probably, in surveys. So far, therefore, as regards assisting the people out of their difficulties, who are in want of railway construction, that expenditure would be of no value at all. The people held a mass meeting and passed resolutions, the municipal councils memorialized the Government, and last session even, the Manitoba legislature sent an Address praying the Governor General in Council not to grant a further extension of time, unless at least twenty miles of the railway were constructed during that season, and this same agitation is being repeated this year, except that the Manitoba legislature has not memorialized the Government. It is time this Parliament should see that the people's interests are protected a little better than they have been in the past. Hon. gentlemen have no idea of the difficulties these people have to labour under. Many of them settled in that country on the old original survey of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That line was deflected to the south, and these people have been living between the Manitoba and North-western on the north and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the south, many of them having to haul their grain thirty or forty miles, which certainly detracts from the value of that commodity. They have been living there, year after year, in the anticipation of early railway construction, and it is time this Parliament should compel those in possession of the charter, either to fulfil its conditions or forfeit it. Mr. Shaughnessy and Mr. Angus and the other magnates of the Canadian Pacific Railway who now control the charter, surely can raise sufficient money for the construction of twenty miles of road. Prairie roads can be constructed at a cost of about $8,000 per mile, so that, the cost of constructing these twenty miles would be only $160,000, and surely the Canadian Pacific Railway people are good for that amount. It is simply nonsense to state that an expenditure of $20,000 during the coming year is any evidence of good faith.

I need not add anything to what has been so well said by the mover of this amendment, which has my hearty support. It is my opinion that if this Bill passes, we shall have the same process again repeated in the coming session. Judge Clark, the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, would not promise that he would not come back next session and ask for a further extension. It is time that the people's interests were protected by compelling the company to construct the line or give way to others who are willing to construct it.

Mr. ROCHE.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I presume it would be proper that some member of the committee should state to the House the reasons which led the committee to arrive at the conclusion it did. It will not, I assume, be taken for granted that this matter was not very thoroughly discussed by the committee, and that there were not good reasons for leading them to the conclusion they formed. I do not think there was a member of that committee present who did not sympathize with the case presented by my hon. friend. We all could readily recall the transactions which took place a year ago and the strong feeling then existing that the time had come when these continued appeals should not be permitted to go on, and that the people in that section were entitled, at the earliest possible moment as a matter of simple justice, to have the railway constructed. But still we all—or at least a majority—felt strongly that it was impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that we were not going to further this undertaking by either withholding assent to the Bill or imposing any more stringent conditions than those embodied in the Bill as it stands. It was admitted, I think, by the friends of this railway, perhaps by my hon. friend himself, that owing to the existing conditions, it will be impossible, in less than three months after the Bill became law, for the company to make the necessary financial arrangements to go on with the work of construction. Presuming that the Bill will receive assent by the 1st of July, July, August and September would pass, and the company would find itself, on the 1st of October, so near the winter season, the cold season, at all events, that it would be quite impossible, with the utmost desire to prosecute the work, to carry it on to any extent before the winter finally closed in, and, at all events, it would be impossible to lay down the road and have it in operation so as to enabe it to carry out the expectations of the people. The question for the committee then, is whether anything would be likely to be gained by refusing this company—which undoubtedly intended to go on with the work, which was committing itself, positively, to the undertaking—this Bill or annexing to it impossible conditions, which would practically have the same effect as refusing the Bill altogether. Now, as I have said, sympathizing to the fullest degree as I did, and as I am satisfied the committee did, with the desire of my hon. friend, we felt that there was no other course opened to us than to pass the Bill practically as submitted, but adding the condition—I made the proposal myself—that a substantial sum should be spent indicating the bona fides of the company and giving the people what, I think, is a sufficient guarantee that before the 1st of August next—which is the date under the existing charter at which the twenty or twenty-five miles had to be completed—such work to be carried to completion to that extent. I think we could count, with a moderate degree of certainty—as certain as anything human can be—that this will be ac-

complished and if it is accomplished, the people of that locality will get, at the earliest possible moment, all that they could hope for. I did not hear that there was any corporation which was now seeking authority from Parliament to go on with this road that would be prepared instantly to take it up and would have this twenty or twenty-five miles built to carry out the season's crops. I think there was no statement to that effect. No doubt, there might be found companies that would be willing to take it up as soon as possible and carry it on rapidly. But we had no evidence before us that greater rapidity of construction would be secured by throwing out the charter than by granting it with the condition annexed.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). It seems to me that by granting the motion my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) has moved, we should be very seriously jeopardizing this Bill altogether. This Bill was discussed in a very full committee when the parties were represented and when every possible consideration could be given to it, and when, as has been stated, every one sympathized to a great extent with the arguments put forward by the members from Manitoba and the North-west. And, considering all these things, this was the view taken of the matter in hand: That the persons who, it was assumed—and I believe rightly—had taken hold of this undertaking were not responsible for the past delay, and that there is a pledge that the work shall be proceeded with with all possible despatch from this time forward. Besides, by amending section 5 and removing from that section all the restrictions that were placed in the Act in regard to negotiations of their bonds, it is in effect admitted that they are in a position now to go on and complete the undertaking. Now, conceding that they were handicapped by the clause under section 5, which, by this Bill, is removed, and which is not now objected to, it seems that we ought to grant what is asked for in this Bill. What is really the difference between the Bill as it stands and the clause as it has been proposed to be amended by the hon. member (Mr. Douglas)? He is willing to extend the time from 1st August to 1st December, 1899. No work, I suppose, can be advantageously done after the middle of October. So it amounts to saying that they shall have an extension from the 1st of August to the middle of October. On the part of the promoters it is asked to extend the time for a year. It seems to me it is better to grant the extension than that they should come to the next Parliament and say: We took up the matter and we found that we could not accomplish the work of building in the time, and so we ask for an extension. Will any hon. members say that if they show good faith in the undertaking, when they come to the next session of Parliament, that extension would not be granted? If it would be granted under those circumstances, I submit it should be granted now. And we should not pass the amendment, much as we desire to favour it, as it is moved by an hon. gentleman who knows so much about the subject.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Feeling interested in this Bill for reasons I stated yesterday in the Railway Committee, I would advise the hon. gentleman from the North-west in the interest of his own Bill, to withdraw his amendment and not kill the goose that proposes to lay golden eggs for him. I do not know that the hon. gentleman will get the railway by putting obstructions in the way of the company that proposes to build it in the manner set forth in the Bill. I am not aware that any proposition comes from any other source which is likely to cause the railway to be built through that section of the country any sooner than it will be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway people. I feel strongly in this matter; I have friends who are interested in the construction of this road. I would urge that this amendment be withdrawn and this legislation allowed to pass, hoping that the company, since these financial difficulties are settled, will go on in good faith with the construction of the road.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members representing the different constituencies in the North-west and Manitoba are in a better position to speak on this question than the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). This thing has been going on for a great many years. I have been in this House for three years. The first session I was here I went into the Railway Committee and found an application there for the extension of this charter for a year. The company told us then that they were going on with the road, and would start work at once. Last year they came to the House with another proposition for an extension, practically an extension for two years. The members for the west thought that was rather too long and took strong ground against it; and the upshot of that was that at the end of the session an agreement was arrived at by which twenty miles was to be built last and this year. I understand that in place of the parties building the twenty miles they were to build, they have sold their interest in this road to the Canadian Pacific Railway. And now we find the Canadian Pacific Railway people coming here asking for an extension. Now, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said, we are not certain, if we allow this to go through, that they will not be back next year for another extension of time. Now, the settlers in that country should not be left out of consideration. This charter was granted thirteen years ago, and many settlers went in on the strength of the charter granted and the subsidy pro-

mised for the building of the road. They have been there all these years anxiously waiting for the extension of this road. Year after year these parties come and ask for an extension of time, and to-night we hear the same old story. If there is one cause more than another that has retarded the settlement and development of the North-west Territories it is this constant extending of charters. This case of the Great North-west Central is not the only one. Charters have been granted time and time again, and the people have gone in and settled on the proposed line in good faith, having been invited to go in by the press and by the immigration agents. Many of them are 100 miles from railway communication waiting for these arrangements to be carried out, and the line to be built. Extensions of charters are granted from time to time until the people get tired of waiting, and many of them leave the country. This proposed line runs through a portion of my constituency called Saskatoon and Battleford. The people there are anxiously awaiting the construction of this road. They would like some action to be taken to force the parties to go on with the work. Another case of this kind was that of the Manitoba and North-western. That company got a charter to build from Portage la Prairie, from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Prince Albert. They were to construct 50 miles each and every year until the road was completed. On the strength of that agreement they received from the Government of this country 6,400 acres of land per mile. That land was handed over to them, some of the choicest land in the Saskatchewan Valley. Now, we find they have built to the the boundary of Manitoba, where the road is paying in the meantime, and they stop there. And they have come to this House year after year for I do not know how many years asking to have the charter extended, and it has been extended. Once they asked to have the length of road they were to build each year reduced from fifty miles a year to twenty miles. That was done, still they are not building a mile of the road. But, just the same, they hold their land, some of the choicest land, close to the settlement of Prince Albert. Some 500 settlers have gone in and have been there fourteen or fifteen years on the strength of the charter granted, and in the hope of the road being extended, and the road has not been extended to them up to the present time.

Now, I do not think that the mover of this resolution is asking too much. He has only asked to have the agreement entered into last year by the promoters carried out. I think it is nothing but fair that the Canadian Pacific Railway, who got this charter, should at the same time accept these conditions. They had no right to assume that they could come back to this House and get an extension of time for another year, or for two years. When they bought out this charter and bought out the piece of road already built, they did so knowing that these conditions were attached, and that they would have to construct the road. Now I myself have been appealed to in relation to this matter, resolutions have been sent to me that were passed by some settlers, I think, in the constituency of Marquette at a place called Beulah. The people up there feel strongly on this question, and they wish their representative, as well as the members representing other constituencies in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to take some action and to oppose the principle of the extension of charters from time to time:

At a meeting held in Beulah Hall, Beulah, on Friday, March 31st, 1899, Mr. D. Gerrand in the chair:

After some discussion, a motion was brought before the meeting by Mr. W. A. Doyle, seconded by Mr. C. T. Gurney, and carried:

"That this meeting of the residents of the municipality of Miniota hereby desire our representative in the Parliament of Canada, W. J. Roche, M.D., to oppose the application of the Great North-west Central Railway Company for an extension of time, till 1900, for the construction of 20 miles of their railway westward from Hamiota.

"And that, as this settlement has been promised railway service by the Dominion Government for the past nineteen years, and our earlier settlers became residents in consequence of such promises,——

Thus bearing out what I have stated to the House that these people went in and settled there on the strength of the promises made in this charter.

——we feel that we have a right to call upon the entire Parliament of Canada to protect our interest against any further juggling on the part of the said railway company.

"And that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Railways, and the members of the said Parliament representing Manitoba and North-west constituencies."

I suppose that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) and the said members of Parliament have received a copy of those resolutions.

There is a strong appeal from people who are living on the proposed line. They feel strongly on this question, and think that this House should not extend the charter. I do not think that the fact of the Canadian Pacific Railway telling us that they are going to spend $20,000 this year, should be taken into consideration. Why, Sir, $20,000 would not build much more than two miles of road, if it could do that. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway could readily build the 20 miles of road, as suggested by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia, before the 1st of October; therefore, I would strongly oppose this extension being granted. As this railroad runs through my constituency, and as there is a great deal of fertile land there that we expect is going to be filled up with settlers, we cannot expect to get these

settlers into that part of the country as long as these extensions are granted from time to time. Now, we know as a matter of fact that any person who proposes to settle in that portion of the country, when he finds out that this road was promised 13 years ago, and that the company gets an extension every year, why, he will never think of settling there. Therefore, in this way a great injury is done to the constituency which I represent. I have no doubt at all that if this road was built through that portion of my constituency I could get several thousand good settlers to come in and locate on those lands, because they are some of the choicest lands in the whole North-west Territories, there is no question about that. We have land in the neighbourhood of Battleford, first-class land, on which we can place 20,000 families. But as long as there is no prospect of extending the railway, we are never going to get these settlers into the country.

SUPPLY—INVESTIGATION INTO THE CONDUCT OF JUDGES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). When the House rose at six o'clock, I had reached, in this extraordinary history of what might fairly be called an attack upon one of the judges of this country by the Department of Justice, the phase of it where two gentlemen apparently instrumental in bringing about all this irregular procedure, make their appearance, and make their appearance in, I think, a most reprehensible manner. I was dealing with the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) who, it appears, had ventured to approach the judge, who had ventured to interfere between the complainants whose cause he dared not avow, whose cause he had never advocated over his own signature, either in Parliament or out of it, for whom he was willing to undertake, not the responsibility of one farthing financially, but whom he was willing to represent at the cost of the public exchequer by this indirect and irregular exercise of his political influence. Behind the doors of this judicial tribunal it appears that he not only had relations with the judge, but correspondence with him, and I am not surprised that his letters do not appear, they would be interesting reading in this return. Yet, we have from the judge himself the statement that the member for Yale and Cariboo ventured to write to him upon a matter where the character of a judge was involved, and where it was attacked on the statement of three men, none of whose names is that of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo. So while he dared not take any responsibility in this matter, or vouch for a single statement these men have made, either to the department or in Parliament, he began to attempt manipulations of this character. The judge says:

> Am informed from complainants that they have not retained counsel.

It will be quite clear who informed him. The complainants, from the day that they sent this communication to the Minister of Justice to the last day of the investigation, disappear from the scene, and when these men who had made the charges ran away from them, it appears that the member for Yale and Cariboo and the member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) bob up, not openly, not in man fashion, not in open court, not before the judge, not before the accused, but by private correspondence, Mr. Speaker, private letters to the judge. There is an exercise of some extraordinary influence which apparently was successful, because the great thing that the members for Yale and Cariboo and New Westminster were concerned about was the retainer of a gentleman of easy political virtue, a Mr. Henderson, of New Westminster, who was elected to serve a certain class of the constituency and who, after reaching the legislature, by their voice and their support——

Mr. MORRISON. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some inexperienced gentleman, I think, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), says order. I do not know what is the trouble with him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, may I tell the hon. gentleman what my objection is?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; it is not at all material. Some gentleman, devoid of political virtue, who was elected in that constituency, where the hon. member for New Westminster resides, to serve a certain class of gentlemen who had political opinions of the character with which he at the moment sympathized, no sooner reached Parliament than he turned right-about and went across the floor of the House. This gentleman had to be assisted by the hon. member for New Westminster and the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and, consequently, he appears on the scene in this way, and this is the way in which he got in. It was the declared and open policy of the Department of Justice that they would not, on these flimsy charges, assume the responsibility of retaining counsel to prosecute a judge of the county court. They stated so in an official communication which I read to-day. But, if the Department of Justice had shown extreme impetuosity, flying at this judge with a telegram in June, and when the judge would not be terrified into resigning, but boldly stood his ground and asked for an immediate inquiry, only after the intervention of his counsel was he or his counsel able to obtain action in December, and a final investigation in the next year. In the meanwhile, sub rosa, the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, and the hon. member for New Westminster were doing their very best to enable this Mr. Henderson, to whom

I have referred, to pull $400 out of the public exchequer of this country, to waste, in the most scandalous manner, $400. That is what they succeeded in doing, though neither of them dared appear in the proceedings or to face Judge Spinks as his accusers. Neither of them ventured to put in an appearance, in man fashion, yet, when Judge Spinks was trying to face his accusers, or their counsel, who were behind the charges, these gentlemen were exercising their influence to have retained at the public expense, Mr. Henderson, to prosecute these charges. What were these charges? I have read the letters; not one of the letters contained material, as the record shows, sufficient to initiate an investigation upon, and even these charges, flabby and flimsy and empty as they were, the Department of Justice, to its credit, was so ashamed of that it would not even send them to the judge till months after they reached the department, and the judge had importuned the department to go on and issue a commission. Months had elapsed and these letters and complaints had not been sent to the judge. Then, as I say, in come these two worthy gentlemen, the representatives I have named, to advocate the great cause and claims of Mr. Alexander Henderson. This is the telegram of Mr. McColl:

> Am informed for complainants that they have not retained counsel, and expect department will. Mr. Bostock also writes me this desirable.

Who asked the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo to approach the judge in that irregular and unjustifiable manner? Who asked him to interfere, and, if the complainants asked him to interfere, did he act as the representative of Yale-Cariboo and does he think that a political representative has any more right to interfere in a matter like this than he has now to go and suggest to Chief Justice McColl, or any other judge on the bench in British Columbia, some course of procedure that he thinks would be wise in the case of a political election either federal or local? If he had any right to interfere in this case, he has a right to interfere in the trial of an election case, in the trial of a case between A and B, in the trial of a case between the Queen and any one else. This was the most serious character of a trial that any one could very well imagine. Nevertheless, he has not stated on this record who asked him to interfere and, for obvious reasons, the correspondence he had with the judge does not appear in this return and is not a matter of public record. Nevertheless, he and the hon. member for New Westminster had to be placated; something must come of this investigation. Whoever attempted to remove Judge Spinks, or terrify him, so that he would leave the bench, had failed. Nothing was to come of the commission, and the gentleman who desired his place could not have his wish gratified; but they could retain Mr. Alexander Henderson, they could pay $400 into Alexander Henderson's pocket from the treasury of this country, though the charges at that time had vanished into thin air, though the charges were never followed up, though the country had to be scoured by bailiffs and court officers to find the men who made the charges, and though they were finally dragged up on subpœna issued by the judge, Mr. Speaker, the only man who had appeared with his head in the noose, and that one of the original complainants, the judge deals with, as we will see later on. We had a telegram dated the 10th of December, 1897, which is as follows:—

> Hon. David Mills, Ottawa.
>
> Re Spinks: I recommend Alexander Henderson, department agent here, be retained herein.
>
> (Sgd.) AULAY MORRISON.

This was sent, although Sir Oliver Mowat had decided that no one should be retained at the public charge and the public cost to press these charges made against Judge Spinks. Although nothing had come of this thing, something had to come of it, and the result was that cash came from it to the pockets of Mr. Henderson. That was about the result and the wishes of the hon. members for Yale and Cariboo and New Westminster were gratified. So you have the interference of these two gentlemen in this matter according to this record, unparalleled in cases of this importance. Consequently, here is a telegram that came. It was a matter that could not wait for ordinary correspondence, the retainer of Mr. Henderson. Judge Spinks was appealing always, formally and strongly, by his counsel, for an immediate investigation, pointing out to the Government the injury to the public interest to have these charges hanging over his head and having the news spread broadcast over his district that a commission of inquiry was going to sit in his case, asking that speedy steps be taken to have this case dealt with, to have the witnesses and charges brought before him face to face. Weeks would elapse, a letter would be sent to Judge Spinks's counsel, but when the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, or the hon. member for New Westminster stepped in, in hot haste, to have Mr. Henderson employed, under no circumstances were they, knowing nothing about the charges, not daring to come forward and father one single line of them, telegrams became the order of the day. The telegram of the 10th of December called for an answer, and on the 13th of December a telegram was sent to Mr. Justice McColl:

> Judge Spink's commission opens Vernon 15th instant. Please attend and prosecute charges for department. Obtain copies from Judge McColl, commissioner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a remarkable feature of this business. Remember the authorities I referred to to-day to show that no inquiry of this kind ought to be set on foot in the case of a judge of the Superior Court, or a judge of the county court, unless the charges were in such form

and of such a character that, if they were proven or admitted, they were sufficient to remove the judge from the bench. This commission issued July 2nd, and listen, Mr. Speaker, to this sentence of the instructions sent to the counsel employed after the importunities of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison):

See that no charges are prosecuted unless sufficient particulars are furnished.

The judge had been able to extract, in October, from the Government such charges as they had in July, when they issued the commission; but, on the 13th of September, this caution is thrown out to Mr. Henderson:

See that no charges are prosecuted unless sufficient particulars are furnished, and have matter disposed of as expeditiously as possible.

Expedition was needed, then, to get rid of Mr. Henderson. The department, finding Mr. Spinks would not retire, when that extraordinary telegram was hurled against him by the Justice Department, telling him of the awful charges, then the department idled and dilly-dallied until finally a counsel is on their hands. The wishes of two supporters of the Administration had been gratified. Mr. Henderson is employed, but there must be a limit even to recklessness of that character, and, therefore, expedition is needed, or the bill of Mr. Alexander Henderson will be a serious matter to be responsible for. Now we come to the letter of the chief justice of the 13th December, 1897, in which he explains how it was that he came to ask for this counsel, and again appears the name of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), who had nothing whatever to do with this case, no right to interfere in any shape or form, who did not appear in any open manner, and with reference to whom up to this time it was impossible that Judge Spinks could know who was pulling the wires for these witnesses who never dared to show their faces in court, when the judge was present to confront them. Mr. Justice McColl says:

I have the honour to explain with reference to my telegram to you of the 10th instant, and your reply of this date, that I was under the impression until just before I sent the telegram that counsel would be instructed to appear for some of the complainants; but I then learned that it was assumed by them, as it had been by Mr. Bostock, M.P., that the department would instruct counsel to appear.

It is quite clear that the responsibility for this extraordinary inquiry rests, for the moment, largely on the shoulders of a gentleman who did not intend to come to light, but who worked behind the backs of these three gentlemen who vanished into thin air by the time the inquiry came on. Consequently, neither the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) nor these extraordinary justices of the peace and other gentlemen appeared to make good these charges. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) has succeeded in his work; he had got a counsel employed at the public expense to press these charges, and he disappears from the record. The counsel remained, and the disgrace came to all who were concerned, directly or indirectly, in promoting this investigation. Then, we have the report, and, Mr. Speaker, you will not be surprised since I have shown, as the record points out, that there never was a case that should have been put on foot against any judge. And, Sir, after this case was put on foot, the Department of Justice seemed ashamed of it, and they let the matter lag and drag until the scandal of not pressing the inquiry was forced upon them by the judge who was charged. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, you will not be surprised at the report of the judge who was called upon to conduct the inquiry. Judge McColl reports on January, 1898, more than half a year after this commission had been issued and inquiry instituted, the charges hanging over the head of the judge, who was permitted, by the express sanction of the Department of Justice, to exercise his ordinary functions. Judge McColl reports as follows:—

The complaints being couched in general terms,——

I ask you to mark, Mr. Speaker, that none of these particulars were furnished, as required, even by the instructions to Mr. Alexander Henderson.

——and apparently confined to one locality, it was deemed proper to hold, in the first instance, upon notice to the complainants, a sitting at Vernon, the assize town of the district, from which the complaints proceeded, before determining the scope of the investigation. To advertise the proceedings generally would be, in case the charges were not substantiated, to needlessly impair the usefulness of Mr. Spinks.

The judge appreciated the point urged by Mr. Spinks upon the Department of Justice, as to the danger of his usefulness being impaired by the notoriety which this commission had acquired, and the fact that nothing was being done in regard to it.

And such advertisement, and the holding of sittings throughout the district, would, owing to their vast extent, be very expensive.

The judge goes on to say:

None of the complainants acknowledged the receipt of the request for particulars of the charges made by them, nor did any of them appear to give evidence.

He does not mention that the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) was conspicuous by his absence, and that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) failed to take the slightest part of the responsibility, or that they did not identify themselves with these extraordinary complaints; but the judge goes on to say, that they did get one man, viz., Mr. Peter McCallum:

Except Mr. Peter McCallum, who attended under a subpœna.

Do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Henderson, with the assistance and co-operation of the members for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) and for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), issued that subpœna? Oh, no. They put in no appearance, but the subpœna was issued on behalf of Mr. Spinks. So, it was left for Mr. Spinks to drag before the commission the only man he could get hold of in connection with these charges, and the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) were discreetly out of sight, although we find now, late in the day, that —for the gratification of some extraordinary whim or caprice—they have been the cause of a useless expenditure by this country of several hundred dollars. Then, says the judge:

It having come to the knowledge of the undersigned that no counsel had been instructed by the complainants to appear for them,——

This was told to him in piteous terms by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo. The judge goes on to explain his communication, which I have read, asking that counsel be appointed to prosecute the inquiry. So the commissioner and these parties behind him obtained the assistance of a prosecuting counsel, and in consequence:

——Mr. Henderson attended the proceedings; and it was also decided to hold a sitting at Midway, at which all parties interested might attend, instead of at Vernon, and they were so notified accordingly. Of the three complainants, Mr. McCallum and Mr. James Falconer admitted having no personal knowledge of the matters complained of, and Mr. Kerr, who resides at or near Midway, had, it appeared, left home a few days before the sitting there on a visit to Vernon.

So it appears that the complainants, on whose letters the Minister of Justice used the telegraphic system of this country, and then permitted it to be known in the country that he was using the telegraphic service and that very serious charges had been made and would be investigated against the judge, failed to appear.

The only person who attended in support of any charge against Mr. Spinks was Mr. Richard Graves Clark Sidley,——

Not one word of the original complainants; not one of the men who had introduced the charge, and obtained the issue of the commission—

——Mr. Richard Graves Clark Sidley, the particulars of whose complaints appear in the records of the proceedings.

He goes on to say:

It is only necessary to remark that with one exception these charges were admittedly founded on hearsay or imperfect knowledge, and were not substantiated or indeed pressed by Mr. Sidley himself.

There is an exception, Mr. Speaker, and it is this:

The exception is with reference to certain charges made against Mr. Sidley, adjudicated upon by Mr. Spinks, as to which the undersigned thinks it sufficient to observe that as no reason was suggested why Mr. Spinks would be likely to act unjustly towards Mr. Sidley, while the procedure by summons instead of by warrant would seem to indicate the absence of any personal ill-feeling on the part of Mr. Spinks towards Mr. Sidley, and, as the latter admits that the evidence was such as would have justified his committal for trial, it does not appear in what way Mr. Spinks was guilty of any improper conduct in this regard; and that the confusion as to the dates of the proceedings, while not unnaturally difficult to be explained after the lapse of time, does not seem to be material in the admitted circumstances of the case.

That is the one serious question that remained to be discussed by the judge. It was never before the Department of Justice before the commission issued and this inquiry was instituted. It was something they fell back upon; but it was not sufficient to obtain the slightest endorsement from the commissioner. The Chief Justice goes on:

In view of the time when the matters complained of occurred, and the course adopted by the complainants who requested the issue of the commission, and, from the evidence given, it would appear that the complaints were instigated by some person or persons who preferred not to appear upon the proceedings.

I wonder if the judge is referring to the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, or to the hon. member for New Westminster. He does not say directly by whom the proceedings were instigated. But he knew of these gentlemen; he knew of the interest they took in the proceedings at a certain stage; he knew they were connected with it: and so, without saying directly to whom he refers, I could understand the judge's annoyance. I could understand his contempt for gentlemen who had been so conspicuous in securing the retainer for Mr. Alexander Henderson to prosecute the charges, and who by that very interference, and the position they occupied as members of Parliament would, he supposed, have taken the pains to ascertain who were the parties who made the complaints and the principles on which the complaints were founded. I could understand his annoyance, if not some other feeling for these gentlemen. But this is his language:

That it would appear that the complaints were instigated by some person or persons who preferred not to appear on the proceedings. In this connection a written statement made by Mr. McCallum at the sitting at Midway was produced by Mr. Henderson at the New Westminster sitting, and offered in evidence by Mr. Wilson for Mr. Spinks.

This was the sort of evidence preferred by a counsel who was retained by the department, with particular instructions not to press charges unless he obtained the particulars on which to press them; and here is the judge saying that after all these other men have failed to appear, and after he had

riddled the statement made as a sort of ulterior suggestion by Mr. Sidley, then the counsel whom these two gentlemen, members of Parliament, had brought into this case by the side door, produced a written statement made by Mr. McCallum, which was offered in evidence by Mr. Wilson for Mr. Spinks :

It was not admitted in evidence, not being strictly admissible. Its admission, however, would have been unfair to the person mentioned unless an opportunity were given him to deny or explain the statements made ; and the undersigned did not think it expedient to protract the investigation in the circumstances by holding another sitting merely for this purpose.

There is the condition of things : that a man comes and puts a statement, as it were, on the end of a stick, and pokes it in through the door, and the Government counsel hands this thing in, and the counsel for the judge, desiring that no technical resistance should be offered to any kind of evidence offered, asks to have the entire evidence brought before him, so that he can deal with it then and there. The judge has to interfere and do what the counsel of the Crown should have done—kicked this thing out in this contemptuous manner, and not permit the judge to give it the slightest attention when brought before him in that irregular and extraordinary manner. Consequently, this is the end of the story, so far as the commissioner is concerned. But there is a conclusion, so far as the taxpayers of this country are concerned. Every purpose, no matter on whose part, to ruin or injure this judge, had failed, and failed in the most extraordinary and complete manner. But this sort of thing cannot go on without some one paying for it. The complainants were not willing to pay a farthing : the members for Yale and Cariboo and New Westminster were not willing to risk a dollar or to show their noses in the tribunal as having any responsibility, pecuniary or otherwise. But you cannot push this sort of charges against the judges of the land without not only incurring merited condemnation for violating the very proper safeguards that have been provided for the judiciary of the country, but without taxing the people or charging it up to the people who have no direct knowledge of the matter whatever, and who never sanctioned the proceedings, directly or indirectly And so, to gratify the spleen, the spite and the cowardly vindictiveness of the people who promoted and pressed the charges, the country has to pay, and the bill is not inconsiderable. It is larger than it would have been, had the members from Yale and Cariboo and New Westminster not interfered. Had they not interfered, it would have been one hundred pounds less, but that, of course, is a bagatelle to these gentlemen, especially when it is not they who have to pay. We find the present Minister of Justice compelled to report to His Excellency, on the 2nd January, 1898, that the commission had failed. After having been so urgent, after having used the telegraph wires, when the attack was first made on Judge Spinks in July, no action was taken with the inquiry until December, and then, in January, 1898, a report is made to Council, and that report is approved, and the minute shows what it was. The Minister observed that the commissioners report that, although ample opportunity was afforded, none of the charges were substantiated by the evidence, and the Minister recommended, therefore, that Judge Spinks be informed to that effect and that no further action be taken in the matter. Not even an apology, not even an expression of regret that a gentleman occupying a distinguished position had been harassed, and annoyed, and put to expense because of these three irresponsibles, and because of these two gentlemen who ought to be responsible, the two members of Parliament. Mr. Spinks is simply told that the commission has failed. Here we come to one of the reasons why the parliament of England and this country, and the parliaments of the old provinces, have always been so careful with regard to promoting or permitting to be proceeded with investigations or trials of judges, and that is the fact that, even though the charges failed, even though, as in this case, the complainants behaved in the most disgraceful, cowardly and shabby manner, even though the judge was exonerated in every particular, there is no provision by which the Government can pay his cost ; there is no authority for the payment to him of one farthing by the Treasury benches, or for indemnifying him to the extent of a dollar. There is no precedent, no matter how high a judge may be, even a judge of the highest court in England, that will authorize the treasury to pay him one farthing, when his character has been vindicated, although that character was attacked in the most formal manner possible. That is one of the reasons why the British and our parliaments have been so reluctant to press charges against the judges. The others, of course, are reasons of public interest, to prevent the passions of unsuccessful litigants being gratified by exercising their ingenuity, as they well could, if we allowed a door to be opened, for this sort of thing, to attack the judges time and time again. It is not in the interests of the judges, but in the interests of the public, in the interests of commerce, that all these precautions are observed and those steps insisted upon. Yet, in this case, none of these precautions were observed, none of these steps were followed, but there was a simple, reckless, pell-mell attack upon that judge at the start, then the most callous indifference on the part of the department that had gone so ferociously to work at the outset ; then, the manipulations by members of Parliament in the interest of a member of the profession, and then the dis-

graceful farce and fiasco at the end, the collapse of the whole thing, after the judge had suffered for six months and been six months complaining that he was placed in such an unfortunate position by this crass delay, and then left poor in pocket—he, one of the officers of justice, not very well paid in any part of Canada, and, under all the circumstances, underpaid in the province of British Columbia—left poorer in pocket, because he had to fee his counsel, and pay his own expenses. He could not dip his hands into the public treasury and obtain money, for his counsel and witness fees and his own personal disbursements. There is the confession in the report of the Minister of Justice, and there is the statement that Judge Spinks will be informed of the result of the inquiry.

Then we come to that part which ought to be interesting to the taxpayers of the country, and the people who were directly or indirectly connected with this matter ought to be made to feel a sense of their responsibility. This is the report made on the 2nd of February:

The undersigned has the honour to recommend that authority be granted for the payment from the appropriation for miscellaneous justice——

A very proper term for the fund out of which to pay charges of this character.

——the undermentioned sums for fees and expenses incurred in connection with the recent commission of inquiry into the charges against Judge Spinks:

To Mr. Justice McColl, commissioner—

Expenses	$155 50
Fee, 13 days	130 00
Total	$285 50

To Oscar C. Bass, clerk and stenographer—

Expenses	$132 10
Fees	100 00
Total	$232 10

That is not all. The Government seem to have hesitated; they did not, apparently, feel like informing His Excellency, on the 2nd February, what the fiasco had cost. They seemed to think it was advisable just to mention those expenses, and that Order in Council was obtained, but, on the 3rd February, they were induced to advise His Excellency as follows:—

The undersigned have the honour to recommend that authority be granted for the payment of a sum of $434.30 to Mr. Alexander Henderson, barrister, of New Westminster, for his fees and disbursements in prosecuting——

I ask you to mark the term.

——the charges against Judge Spinks in the recent commission, and that the amounts be charged against miscellaneous justice.

That amount was paid, and, consequently, there was this extraordinary expenditure in the case of a commission that absolutely failed to do anything else than expose the recklessness of the Government and the absence, to say the least, of any pretense to etiquette in dealing with the judge, and it simply showed that the Government, in this way, were able to gratify the desires of two gentlemen who supported them in this House.

Then, Mr. Sidley is not even censured. Mr. Sidley, who appears in the role, the description of which I have just read in the language of the commissioner, is in communication with the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock). Apparently, there was no way to make him pay the cost of bringing the attack which he failed to substantiate. There was no responsibility placed upon him. Notwithstanding the disgraceful ending of this disgraceful chapter, we find the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo is still bringing this gentleman's name to the attention of the Department of Justice, and asking for copies of public documents, and so on. Here is a letter which comes down in the return, addressed by Mr. R. G. Sidley to Mr. Hewitt Bostock, M.P.:

Sidley, B.C., Feb. 25, 1898.

Sir,—Owing to the contradictory rumours and reports current respecting the decision of the Minister of Justice re the Spinks commission, I would feel greatly obliged if you could send me a copy of that decision. Trusting I am not putting you to too much trouble.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) R. G. SIDLEY.

I have no doubt that his wishes were complied with, without that compliance being accompanied with any well-merited censure. There was a treasury report approved by the Governor in Council for the payment of the money to Mr. Henderson; and the Minister of Justice writes on the 12th March:

Dear Mr. Bostock,—The report of the commission was that nothing was proven against Mr. Justice Spinks,——

A most unfair statement on the part of the Minister of Justice. We know that in this country we do not recognize the Scotch verdict, "not proven." Instead of saying that Judge Spinks had been cleared in every possible way and that his accusers did not venture to go into court to substantiate their charges, this is the way the Minister of Justice, to use a common expression, attempts to let down Mr. Sidley. That is not the language of his own report to the Governor General, in which greater care had to be taken. But it is the language of the letter of the 12th of March, that "nothing was proven."

——and, as you desire, I will see that communication of this fact is made to Mr. Sidley.

Great care was taken to keep in touch with Mr. Sidley, and further proof is given of the connection and the power behind the scenes that was working in this, I consider, most disgraceful manner. And so, accordingly, the department has to draw up a formal letter—not of censure—to Mr. Sidley.

It is dated the 14th March, and reads as follows:—

Your letter of the 25th February to Mr. H. Bostock, M.P., has been handed to the Minister of Justice, and I am directed to inform you that the report of the commission in the case of Judge Spinks was that nothing was proven against the said judge.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

I say that is not a fair communication from the Department of Justice, that it does not do justice to Mr. Spinks, and does not show, as Judge McColl's report shows, that the result was much stronger in Mr. Spinks' favour than the Scotch verdict of "not proven." Now, before I put in your hands the resolution I desire to move, I will refer to one other observation in connection with this class of cases. This is from the same debate as I referred to in the afternoon, but I will bring home to those who did not hear the other authorities, that I am not putting the matter too high when I say in regard to the judges of the land, the judges of the superior courts and the judges of the county courts, there is, and very properly, a special course required when charges are made against them. And, Sir, Sir James Graham, to whom I referred before, said:

I feel strongly that it is due to the cause of justice itself to defend the judges of the land, unless we shall be satisfied that their conduct has been corrupt and their motives dishonest.

I call particular attention to that, which is the burden of my speech, the idea running through it from start to finish. But, in contrast to that very proper, healthy and sound principle which has obtained heretofore, you have this Government forced or induced against the principles in which they started out in this inquiry, so far as that feature is concerned, to prosecute these charges. It was impossible for any man in the department or any Minister to say he had satisfied himself that the charges were right, and therefore he would take the responsibility of prosecuting them. But, departing from that healthy principle, as I say, they were influenced to violate it in the most extraordinary manner and to appear as the prosecutors of these charges into which they had made no preliminary investigation whatever; in regard to which they had not even shown the usual courteous treatment of asking by correspondence what the judge had to say before intimating to him bluntly and by telegram, as they did, that the charges were so serious that they thought a commission should issue. Sir James Graham proceeds:

It is only fair to a judge, considering his eminent station, the great power with which he is entrusted, and the grave responsibility under which he acts, that the House should not adopt such a motion as this,——

—this was to inquire into the conduct of Lord Abinger—

——unless, in our deliberate judgment, we are satisfied that there has been manifested, on the part of the judge who is the object of it, a badness of heart and corrupt intention, which have contributed to the perversion of his judgment.

That is the rule which has never been departed from in England, and I challenge hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to show that it has ever been departed from in this country. This is the only case they can point to, and it is a disgrace to the Government that such a case should exist. Unless we take the extraordinary view of the hon. member for New Westminster, that one paragraph of the letter did contain a serious charge, you cannot find that such a charge was made. Nor can it be shown that the Government attempted to act within the rule and make a preliminary investigation. What course could they have taken? They might have sent to the judge a statement of the charges with a courteous request for such explanation as he could give. The result shows how necessary this was. But I would not base my argument upon the result. Even if the charges had been much stronger and if the case against the judge had been stronger, my position would have been the same, because I am attacking the procedure before the investigation took place. This case which struck the hon. member for New Westminster as serious, could have been disposed of without spending a dollar. If communication had been held with the Attorney General of the province, the officer charged with the prosecution of criminals, and his attention called to the fact that it had been stated that in criminal trials one of the judges charged with the duty of presiding over these trials was acting in such a manner as to cause grave injustice to prisoners and confusion in the business, is it not to be supposed that the Attorney General would have been able to shape largely the course of the Government in a matter like this. Supposing they did not wish, for any reasons to follow the ordinary course and ask the judge, they should have asked the gentleman who is responsible for seeing that justice is done in criminal cases. That is an important feature in this matter not to be lost sight of, that, not the Attorney General of Canada, but the Attorney General of British Columbia was the officer who had the supervision of the course of criminal justice in the county courts, including this, and the suggestions that these men made, reflect as much on the Attorney General of British Columbia as they do on Judge Spinks. If such things were happening and persons were being tried as this man said, though he gave no names of prisoners, though the prisoners had themselves never complained, it is clear the Attorney General was derelict in his duties. And yet no notice was sent to him, either before or after the commission issued, in

case he should desire to vindicate himself, or the Crown officer who was charged by him in that particular district. So it was clear that had these ordinary and proper steps been taken the judge himself would have been saved the annoyance, worry and cost, and the community would have been saved the scandal, and the people of this country would have been saved the expense. Under these circumstances, I move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out and the following added instead thereof:—"it appears by a return to an Address of the House of Commons, dated 18th April, 1898:

"That on June 1st, 1897, a personal letter was written to the hon. the Minister of Justice from 'a Liberal and a friend,' stating that an investigation was necessary in the case of W. W. Spinks, judge of the County Court of Yale district, 'for the glaring atrocities and extreme favouritism' by the judge. That one James Kerr, J.P., of Green Wood, B.C., wrote to the hon. the Minister of Justice under date June 3rd, 1897, that respecting this judge he had 'heard many complaints.'"

That on the said date one Peter T. McCallum, J.P., wrote the said Minister that Judge Spinks "has not conducted himself as a gentleman holding the high office he does should: complaints have been made for that period, and are being made in reference to favouritism and partiality exhibited by Judge Spinks from the bench both in civil and criminal cases, where certain rings and cliques are interested—that the judge was late in appearing at places appointed for holding court;" and Mr. McCallum wrote: "It is also charged against Judge Spinks that he violated his oath of office in allowing influence to be used upon him and acquitting guilty men," and again: "It is also an admitted fact that Judge Spinks is one of the members of the clique in Grand Forks who are owners of the town site, and members of the clique have been known to boast that no action could succeed against them while Judge Spinks sat on the bench."

And "from my own knowledge, Sir, I may say, that on one occasion, I say as one of the Board of License Commissioners for the district, when an application came before us by one of the members of the ring above mentioned, came before the board for a retail liquor license, the applicant was clearly not entitled to a license, and the board refused the application, an appeal was taken to Judge Spinks, and as the applicant belonged to this particular ring, of which Judge Spinks is an admitted member, he granted the license in the face of the license board's refusal."

That after information of the above character, on the 24th June, 1897, the hon. the Minister of Justice caused the following telegram to be sent to Judge Spinks:—"Serious charges preferred against you, in effect that you have been guilty of favouritism and partiality, and have allowed yourself to be unduly influenced in the administration of justice. That you were usually late in keeping judicial appointments, thereby causing delay and expense to suitors and prolonging the custody of persons committed upon criminal charges. The Minister considers these charges so grave as to call for an immediate commission of inquiry. Do you desire to make any reply before commission issues?"

That Judge Spinks replied to the above telegram by the following telegraphic message:—

"Telegram just received. The more full and speedy inquiry, the better. Would suggest inquiry be made at place where complaints made."

That on 21st August, 1897, the Hon. Angus McColl, then one of the puisne judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, was appointed a commissioner to inquire into and report upon the complaints aforesaid. That on the 4th day of September, 1897, the said commission of inquiry was received by the said Judge McColl, but without instructions of any kind. That on the 22nd September, 1897, Judge Spinks caused representations to be made to the Department of Justice complaining of the publication of the commission in the papers without action being taken, and it was asked: "is it quite fair to leave a judicial officer in this position?"

That not until the 12th October, 1897, was the communication of Mr. Justice McColl of 21st September replied to, when the Department of Justice forwarded copies of the letters of complaints aforesaid

That on the 10th December, 1897, Mr. Justice McColl sent the following telegraphic message to the Department of Justice:—

"Re Spinks: Commission opens at Vernon 15th instant. Am informed for complainants that they have not retained counsel and expect department will. Mr. Bostock also writes me this desirable. I think it most unfortunate in interest of justice if complainants not represented by counsel and suggest for your consideration Mr. Henderson's appointment."

That on the same day Mr. Auley Morrison telegraphed endorsing Mr. Henderson's retainer in the case.

That on the 13th December, 1897, Mr. Henderson was instructed by the Justice Department "to attend and prosecute charges for Department," and further "to see that no charges are prosecuted unless sufficient particulars are furnished."

That the commissioner reported on the 8th day of January, 1898, among other things: "The complaints being couched in general terms."

"None of the complainants acknowledged the receipt of the request for particulars of the charges made by them, nor did any of them appear to give evidence except Mr. Peter McCallum, who attended under a subpœna issued on behalf of Mr. Spinks."

"Of the three complainants, Mr. McCallum and Mr. Jas. Falconer admitted having no personal knowledge of the matters complained of, and Mr. Kerr, who resides at or near Midway, had, it appeared, left home a few days before the sitting there on a visit to Vernon."

"The only person who attended in support of any charge against Mr. Spinks was Mr. Richard Graves Sidley, the particulars of whose complaints appear in the record of the proceedings.

"It is only necesary to remark that with one exception these charges were admittedly founded on hearsay or imperfect knowledge and were not substantiated or, indeed, pressed by Mr. Sidley himself.

"The exception is with reference to certain charges made against Mr. Sidley, adjudicated upon by Mr. Spinks, as to which the undersigned thinks it sufficient to observe that, as no reason was suggested why Mr. Spinks would be likely to act unjustly towards Mr. Sidley, while the procedure by summons instead of warrant would seem to indicate the absence of any personal ill-feeling on the part of Mr. Spinks towards Mr. Sidley, and, as the latter admits that the evidence was such as would have justified his commital for trial, it does not appear in what way Mr. Spinks was guilty of any improper conduct in this regard and that the confusion as to the dates of the proceedings, while not unnaturally difficult to be explained after the lapse of time, does not seem to be material in the admitted circumstances of the case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

That on the 24th January, 1898, the Honourable the Minister of Justice reported to His Excellency that the Commissioner reports that although ample opportunity has been afforded none of the charges have been substantiated by evidence.

That the following expenses have been paid out of the public funds in connection with the foregoing :—

To Mr. Justice McColl—		
Expenses	$ 155 50	
Fees, 13 days	130 00	
		$ 285 50
Stenographer—		
Expenses	$ 132 10	
Fees	100 00	
		$ 232 10
Alexander Henderson—		
Fees and disbursements in prosecuting charges against Judge Spinks		440 30
		$ 957 90

Resolved, That no charges against a Judge of the County Court, except such as those upon allegation of misconduct that would be sufficient, if proved, to justify his removal from the Bench, should be entertained by the Government.

That before providing for a Commission of Inquiry into charges of misconduct on the part of a Judge of the County Court, it is the duty of the Government to secure full and complete particulars of the same, and to submit them to the judge for his consideration and reply.

And this House is further of opinion that the action taken by the Government in the premises was ill-considered and injurious to the position, usefulness and dignity of the judiciary—and involved a scandalous waste of public funds."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, I have at the outset to acknowledge the courtesy of my hon. and learned friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who was good enough, some days ago, to communicate to me a copy of his resolution. He also was good enough to say that he would take the first opportunity of bringing this resolution before the House. I am sorry that I cannot congratulate him on the speech that he has just delivered. He has certainly not been parsimonious in the use of his adjectives and he has not hesitated to characterize the conduct of all those who have had any connection with this matter, in language which, if I may be permitted to say so, was much more forcible than polite. He spoke of the spleen, the spite, and the cowardly malice of the complainants; he characterized the telegram sent by the Deputy Minister of Justice under the responsibility of the then Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) as a brutal production. He then went on to speak of the underhand work done by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) and the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and finally he did not hesitate, by innuendo and insinuation, to attack even the Chief Justice of British Columbia. What does all this mean? With some of the things that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said there is no desire on this side of the House to find any fault. When he talks to us of the necessity of surrounding our judges, in the administration of justice, with those safeguards which will ensure them against attacks either of political partisans or of persons who bear them malice, I am sure that no one disagrees with him. When he speaks of the necessity of removing judges from the controlling influence of political partisans, I am sure that he also awakened a responsive chord. Perhaps, I may add to what he has said that, while judges should be free from the attacks of political partisans, there is another principle which is no less sacred, and it is that judges should also keep themselves free, as far as possible, from the influence of politicians. I think there is no axiom more accepted than that which says that a judge, when he goes upon the bench, should cut himself clear from all connection with either of the political parties, and that there is nothing more detrimental to the proper administration of justice than that judges, after going on the bench, should enter into bargains with politicians and say that at a given time they will come down from the bench and enter into the political arena. I will take occasion to deal with that matter later on before the end of this session. Let us now deal with the matter in hand. I say that while it is important that judges should be protected against improper attacks which may have the effect of causing them personal inconvenience, and also to diminish their capacity to render service to the litigants, we must bear this in mind that where judges, as in the present case, are far removed from these controlling influences which operate in large centres, where public opinion is active, where there are newspapers and where they are not under the control and observation of the bar—where they are far removed from these controlling influences, it is important that the Department of Justice should exercise even greater care and closer supervision than over the administration of justice in these centres. In this case the judge was living in British Columbia. It is important for the administration of justice that the source of justice should be pure; it is no less important that those who are obliged to drink at the waters of justice should feel that they flow from a pure source. It is no less important that the judges should be pure and free from all corrupting influences than that those who go before them should feel that they are pure and free from these corrupting influences. As a result of this inquiry Judge Spinks had been benefited, because there can be no doubt, that previous to this investigation, rumours had circulated all through the district in which he administered justice, that influences were at work which would have destroyed his capacity for usefulness and the influence that he ought to exercise in the vicinity among those who are litigants before him. Let me proceed

to demonstrate what I have said. Here I ought to say that, as a result of this investigation, Judge Spinks comes out of this ordeal free from any suggestion of wrongdoing, and I am delighted to be able to bear him this testimony, at the present time. On the 3rd of June, Mr. Kerr, justice of the peace, writes to the department in the terms communicated to the House by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). On the same day that Mr. Kerr writes from Greenwood, B.C., from Grand Forks, from another quarter of the same district, another gentleman connected with the administration of justice, a justice of the peace, Mr. McCallum, writes in the terms that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), communicated to the House. Then my hon. friend was good enough to refer to Mr. Faulkner, who happened to be Deputy Supreme Chief Ranger of the Ancient Order of Foresters, from Victoria, who was on an official visit to this locality. Then, again, you have Mr. Sidley, another magistrate, called upon to administer justice in this district. You have these three magistrates communicating with the Department of Justice and making charges against this county court judge. I do not intend to weary the House by going into the details. My hon. friend has communicated some of the letters almost in their entirety, but he was not very fair when he dealt with my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and when he suppressed the portion of a letter written by Judge McColl.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is included in my resolution.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The portions that could not be of any use to my hon. friend were suppressed by him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must clearly overlook the fact that my resolution contains a portion of the letter which I did not read in my argument. If so this is an admission that there is no suppression.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, Sir, there is a suppression. When the hon. gentleman made his argument he deliberately read the first sentences from Judge McColl's letter and suppressed all that part of it which followed immediately afterwards. We have these three letters coming from these three gentlemen, these three magistrates who, in a minor role, it is true, form part of the administration of justice in that locality. They communicated these charges to the Department of Justice. These charges were corroborated by Mr. Faulkner, a gentleman who occupied an important position, a gentleman against whose character I have never heard anything said. The hon. gentleman has not hesitated to assail these three gentlemen, to talk about spleen and spite and cowardly malice, but I have not heard him apply these words to this particular person. What has he done, so far as Mr. Faulkner is concerned? All that he has done is to read a line in a letter where Mr. Faulkner says that he is a Liberal and a friend of the Government. I am not aware that the fact of a man being a Liberal and a friend of the Government precludes him from writing a complaint against an officer under the control of the Government, because a judge is under the control of the Government; I am not aware that because a man is a Liberal and a friend of the Government he is precluded from writing a complaint against an improper interference in the administration of justice. Up to the present time I have been under the belief, that it is because a man is a Liberal that he wishes to have the administration of justice free and pure from the controlling influences of party politicians.

Then a telegram is sent to this gentleman, and this telegram was characterized by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) as a brutal telegram. It was a telegram sent by Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, of course with the sanction and under the control of the department. There is no desire whatever to separate the department from Mr. Newcombe in this matter; on the contrary, the full responsibility for all that is done is assumed, in so far as the Department of Justice is concerned. But what occurred? After these charges were made, on the 24th of June, this telegram was sent:

> Serious charges preferred against you, in effect that you have been guilty of favouritism and partiality, and have allowed yourself to be unduly influenced in the administration of justice. That you are usually late in keeping judicial appointments, thereby causing delay and expense to suitors and prolonging the custody of persons committed upon criminal charges. The Minister considers these charges so grave as to call for an immediate commission of inquiry. Do you desire to make any reply before commission issues?

Immediately these papers reached the office, this telegram was sent to the judge. Now, was it true that the judge was charged, in effect, with having been guilty of favouritism and partiality? Can any one who has listened to the letter read by my hon. friend, coming from McCallum, doubt the truth of that? Was it true that he was charged with having allowed himself to be unduly influenced in the administration of justice? Can there be any doubt that such charge was made? Was it true that he was charged with being unusually late in keeping judicial appointments? No doubt about it. The department does not say to this gentleman: These things are true. They simply say: You are charged with these things, and they ask him, if he has any reply to make to these charges before a commission issues. Now, what did Mr. Spinks do?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Solicitor General going to pass that over without referring to the point which I particularly made, viz., that, before asking Mr. Spinks what he had to say, the expression of opinion of the Minister of Justice was, that a commission should issue?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, the charges as made and answered, ought to be investigated, undoubtedly. The Minister of Justice said: I am of opinion, on the prima facie evidence before me, that a commission should issue, but I want you to say, if you have anything to answer to that. If the Minister of Justice did not want to be guided to some extent by the answer of the judge, why communicate this message to him at all? Now, I shall not attempt to lecture, not an older man than myself, but an older parliamentarian than I am, upon the expressions he should use in this House, but I think the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was rather severe in his remarks. After all, a telegram sent by Mr. Newcombe, on the responsibility of Sir Oliver Mowat, who has had some experience in the administration of justice, who had been a judge himself, who occupied the position of Attorney General of Ontario for many years—a telegram written by Sir Oliver Mowat, it seems to me, ought not be characterized as a brutal telegram. I think it was deserving of a more parliamentary expression than my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) used. I would draw the attention of the House and the country to this fact, that Sir Oliver Mowat, with the record and reputation that he has in this country, having this evidence before him, came to the conclusion that there ought be an inquiry. Against Sir Oliver Mowat's opinion we have the opinion of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper); and, if these two opinions remained alone, it would be for this House and the country to choose between them—I think the choice would soon be made. More than that, you have the two letters upon which the opinion was given, and I say these letters justify to the fullest the telegram that was sent on that date, and every expression that was used in that telegram. But what occurred after the telegram was sent to this gentleman, and he is asked to say what answer he could give to the charges contained in the letter. The answer is very prompt, and I say here at once, it does credit to the manliness of Judge Spinks, who wrote it. He does not say: I want to rebut this evidence communicated to you by letters; but he says: Bring on the investigation. Here is the telegram:

> Telegram just received. The more full and speedy inquiry the better. Would suggest inquiry be made at place where complaint made.

Now, in justice not only to the complainant, but in justice to the judge himself, what did the Government do under these circumstances? In justice to the judge, until these charges were withdrawn, a commission ought to have been issued, so as to give him an opportunity to do what he did, namely, to prove that there was no foundation for the charges in question. What was the Government to do, in view of that telegram? I repeat, that the only course left open to the Government was to grant the request of the judge for a full and complete inquiry, so that the public at large would be satisfied that, in the administration of justice, he had comported himself as an honest judge. That telegram was followed by a letter, on June 26th) 1897, in which the judge says:

> I received your telegram informing me that a commission is about to issue to inquire into certain charges laid against me, to-day. I must ask that a stenographer be employed and a verbatim report made of the whole proceedings. It is necessary that I should mention this as I know of none in this district, and one will have to be sent from the coast.

Of course, that request was complied with, and, when the commission did issue, a stenographer was appointed at the judge's request, because it was only fair he should have a verbatim report of the evidence that was adduced against him before this commission. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says there was delay. And what was the delay? Between the time this telegram was sent and the appointment of a commission, there was a delay of a month or two, and, after that delay, his appointment was communicated to Judge McColl. He was then on the point of starting on circuit, and he said at the time the commission was received, that he would be absent for several weeks. He did start, and he was absent for several weeks, and that was the prime cause of the delay after the commission was issued. I do not wish to permit this matter to be mixed up with the skilful advocate who has put the case before the House; I do not want the House to allow the kernel of this question to be hid in a mass of words. The whole question comes down to this. Three persons connected with the administration of justice, justices of the peace in British Columbia—not justices of the peace appointed by this Government, but appointed by the Government of British Columbia—complained to the department of the manner of administering justice by Judge Spinks. The gist of that complaint was communicated to the judge, and he asked for an inquiry. The inquiry was granted, and that is all there is about it up to that point. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) proceeds to lay the foundation of a charge against my hon. friends from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) and from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). He says they appeared suddenly on the scene, and he proceeds to describe what he calls their underhand work. He says: The fine Italian hand from my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo appeared in a telegram of

the 10th December sent by Mr. Justice McColl. I am quite sure my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) never intended to attribute to the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) any such charge as the language he used would indicate. I am sure my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) never meant to say, that the hon. member (Mr. Bostock) acted in an underhand way, or that he is the sort of man who would be afraid to stand by any accusation he thought well founded. I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a man in this House, whatever his opinions may be in politics, who would for one moment think that the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) would make a statement that he did not think to be true and founded upon fact.

I am certain that, having made the statement, he would back it up against any and all comers. Now, how does my hon. friend for Yale and Cariboo appear in this matter? This court was in the limits of his electoral district. If his constituents complain of the improper administration of justice or of improper conduct on the part of Mr. Justice Spinks, and desire their complaint to be heard by the Department of Justice at Ottawa, to whom should they go to give expression to their complaints and to have access to the Department of Justice at Otawa if not to their representative, whom they have sent here for the purpose of expressing their grievances and making known their wants? They went to the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, and what does he do? This is where the attack is made on Judge McColl by insinuation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not insinuate anything against Judge McColl. I questioned the propriety of his hearing the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, or any one else who had not a locus stand, and I argued that contention. I insinuated nothing, but said everything I wished to say.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman questioned the locus standi of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In a judicial investigation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In a judicial investigation. I think he must have gone further and insinuated impropriety in the conduct of the judge in hearing him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I insinuated nothing. I questioned the conduct of the commissioner. I said he should not have heard the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and I withdraw the word insinuate. I say that he charged the judge with having been improperly influenced by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo; but where is this improper influence? The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo had the audacity to suggest to the judge that he entertained the idea that in a matter of this sort, where the purpose was to ascertain whether a judge had been derelict in his duty, the complainants would be represented by counsel, which counsel he expected would be paid by the department. There may be some doubt as to whether it was proper for the complainants to be represented by counsel paid by the department. There can be no doubt about their right to be represented by counsel at their own expense. What my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo did was to suggest that they might be paid by the department. What is there improper in the fact that my hon. friend volunteered a suggestion to the judge that counsel should be retained? What does the judge himself think about it? And here I deal with that portion of the judge's letter which my hon. friend did not read. On the 13th of December, 1897, the day he sent the telegram, the judge wrote this letter to Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice:

> I have the honour to explain, with reference to my telegram to you of the 10th instant, and your reply of this date, that I was under the impression, until just before I sent the telegram, that counsel would be instructed to appear for some of the complainants; but I then learned that it was assumed by them, as it had been by Mr. Bostock, M.P., that the department would instruct counsel to appear.
>
> I was aware that in some instances, as for example the British Columbia Penitentiary inquiry, that counsel were instructed to appear for the department, and, feeling that dissatisfaction would be felt, and probably expressed strongly in the locality from which the complaints were made, and probably in other quarters as well, if no counsel should appear on instructions from the department, and also that the investigation could hardly proceed satisfactorily if no counsel were to appear for the complainants, because of the inevitable offering in such case of evidence not admissible, with the result that to persons unacquainted with the rules of evidence the investigation would appear not to be thorough, and so that the interests of justice might be prejudiced instead of furthered in such circumstances by the proceedings under the commission, I thought it my duty to suggest for your consideration the instruction of Mr. Henderson to appear.

The judge tells you that it is because he thinks it necessary in the interest of justice, that he asks that Mr. Henderson be instructed to appear; and it is because of this request made by the judge, with which the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo had the connection, and for which he had the responsibility, as mentioned in this letter, that my hon. friend is charged with underhand interference in this matter, and that an attempt is made to create the impression, both in this House and out of it, and especially in the mind of the judge, that probably the secret inspirer of this whole attack on the judge was my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo. That was clearly the intention, and that must have been the only object the hon. gentleman had in view when he made this

attack upon my hon. friend. The whole foundation for the attack made on my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo was that he suggested the name of Mr. Henderson, and the propriety of employing him as counsel in this matter. On that same point, the judge reported to the department:

> It having come to the knowledge of the undersigned that no counsel had been instructed by the complainants to appear for them, that it was commonly supposed that counsel would be instructed by the Department of Justice, and that it might be inconvenient to them to attend at Vernon; and believing it essential as regards the administration of justice, the commission having issued, not merely that every reasonable opportunity and facility should be afforded to all parties desiring to give evidence to do so to the best advantage, but also that the proceedings should be conducted in such a manner as that no impression to the contrary on the part of the public might arise, the undersigned deemed it to be his duty, in the circumstances, to suggest to the Deputy Minister of Justice the question of the expediency of instructing counsel to appear upon the inquiry, in consequence of which Mr. Henderson attended the proceedings.

So the judge from the outset assumes the entire responsibility for the appointment of Mr. Henderson and for having suggested his name to the Department of Justice. Now, in what respect does the name of my hon. friend from New Westminster come into this matter? He comes in because he had the audacity, when the question of the counsel to be appointed came up, to suggest that if counsel were to be appointed, the person to be appointed should be the man who was employed as agent for the Department of Justice in that locality. That is the whole extent to which my hon. friend from New Westminster appeared in this matter, and that is the sole fact on which the hon. gentleman based the whole of his attack upon my hon. friend. Now, it seems to me that it is not necessary to take up the time of the House at any further length on this matter. The charges were made by men against whose character my hon. friend could not find anything better to say than that they were actuated by spleen and contemptible malice. They were made by men who were themselves part and parcel of the administration of justice in the district; upon these charges the judge demanded an inquiry. Convinced as we were that the fountain of justice should be pure, the investigation was ordered; and I say that the money spent on that investigation was well spent, in the interest of the administration of justice, and in the interest of the judge himself.

It is well spent, because now the idle rumours circulated in that locality have been set at rest and we are satisfied now that he does his duty. Perhaps he does it a little better now than he did before, though I know nothing about that, and every right minded man must be satisfied he is a fair, honest, pure-minded judge, and to have established that fact in that locality, where it is important everybody should be satisfied with the administration of justice, is to have established something for the proving of what the money was well spent. And to-morrow we would be prepared to spend the same money again in order to accomplish the same result.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I have always understood that it is a principle of British law and fair-play that when a man is found innocent, the charge against him must for ever after be dropped; but to-night it seems to me the hon. Solicitor General set at naught that axiom of British justice, and again resurrected these rumours, as he termed them, with reference to Judge Spinks. At the outset of his remarks, he undertook to lecture my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on what he termed his impropriety in casting innuendoes at one of the judges in the person of Mr. Justice McColl; and in the next breath he declared that to-day political trafficking was going on with one of the judges of this Dominion in order to induce him to come down from his high place and enter the political ranks, which, by inference, we must presume to be the ranks of hon. gentlemen on this side. Why, to my mind, that was a gross insult to the judiciary. The hon. gentleman further said that he intends to bring this up at a later day in the House. It would be much more manly on his part and much more fair on his part to the judiciary of this country, that he should at once name the judge he has in his mind; but I will be bound to say that before the session closes, he will be mute and inglorious with reference to the judge to whom he alleges overtures have been made to induce him to leave his position. However, the slander has gone forth, and every judge bears the brand of the suspicion cast by the hon. gentleman who has not dared to particularize the one to whom he alludes. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he refers to one of the judges in the province of Ontario, because if so all sense of propriety will be shocked in that province, where the judges are from time to time called on to administer the law in election trials, and I am glad to say that, after some revelations we had the other day, there is some work of that kind to be done. Will he state frankly whether it is a judge of the Superior Court of Ontario to whom he alludes, because if so I can only say that all public confidence will be shaken in any of the judges who may preside at any of the trials soon to take place in that province, since the word has gone forth from the Solicitor General that one of those judges, whom he has not had the manliness to name, may be persuaded to leave his position, and presumably cast in his political lot with hon. gentlemen on this side. The hon. gentleman should surely refrain from charging my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) with cowardice. That charge should at least

not come from one who has cast this insinuation against one of the superior judges, without venturing to mention the name.

What has been the whole defence of the Solicitor General. From first to last it has been this, that if you bring under the notice of this Government the slightest scintilla or flavour of a charge against a judge, it then becomes the bounden duty of the Department of Justice to inquire into his conduct. Why, surely the hon. Solicitor General was in the House last session, and must have heard certain charges made here against one of the judges. During that session, there was a debate over the payment of certain moneys to certain parties in connection with an election in the riding of North Ontario, and the hon. member for North Victoria charged Judge Dartnell, of the county of Ontario, in the following words :—

> We have a summing up of the ballots by a favoured judge, Mr. Dartnell, a gentleman who, I say, and I say it advisedly—for I know whereof I speak—in a certain sense, was at the mercy of the Liberal party, or conceived himself to be at the mercy of the Liberal party.

Here the Solicitor General sat and the hon. gentlemen associated with him, and heard that the judge who had presided in the recount had unfairly and improperly and indecently acted, and yet this Government never saw fit to make any inquiry at all into his conduct. But on the mere rumour of a justice of the peace—and God help the justices of the peace in British Columbia if they are not any bettter than are those in the province of Ontario as a rule—the hon. gentleman proceeds to hold an investigation. The whole question sums itself up into this —not so much whether the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) or the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) acted rightly in this matter, as whether or not the Minister of Justice was not altogether to blame ; and, speaking for myself, I think that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was rather harsh on both of these hon. gentlemen. First and foremost, they had precedent for everything they did. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo was quite justified in interviewing the judge before the trial, because the principle was laid down last session that it was a proper thing to go before a judge before whom the trial took place and interview him in advance of the trial, since in that same debate the hon. member for North Victoria stated that Mr. Osler had called on Mr. Justice Robertson on Sunday, and did so influence him that when an application for a recount was made the next morning it required considerable time and argument to remove from the mind of the judge the prejudice which had been cast into it by Mr. Osler. There should, therefore, be no complaint against the hon. member for Yale, who is a layman, for having interviewed the judge.

Mr. BENNETT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is a barrister.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not know he was a barrister. But here was a precedent laid down in that case, that Mr. B. B. Osler acted properly in interviewing Judge Robertson in advance with regard to this recount in the county of Ontario, because no inquiry was held in that case, and it was considered quite proper to go and see the judges in advance and fortify him with arguments before the other side approached him. Then, these hon. gentlemen were justified also in this respect, that they came from the province of British Columbia, where there was a certain grasping and greed for everything in sight ; and when they asked that one of their professional brethren should be liberally paid at the expense of the Dominion, they were only asking what they thought the surroundings justified them in demanding, namely, a little share of the public plunder.

As to the idea of dispossessing the judge altogether of his position, one can easily understand how any hon. gentleman, who has had a seat in this House a couple of sessions, should have had it in his mind that it was perfectly right, where you had a political opponent occupying a position and a friend who required it, to unhorse the political opponent by all means and obtain the position for his friend. I say, therefore, that those hon. gentlemen had precedents for everything they did in order to dispossess the judge of his position and give to a party friend a lucrative retaining fee.

But there is another phase of the question, which the hon. Solicitor General overlooked and which the hon. member for Pictou did not recall, and that is this fact. These hon. gentlemen were both here when the hon. Minister of Justice telegraphed to Judge Spinks, because the House did not rise until the 29th June. Now, these reports were not reports of a day or week, but, according to the statements that are in this return, I will be bound to say—and neither hon. gentleman will contradict me—that long before they came to this House in the session of 1897 they had heard some of the complaints against Judge Spinks, whether these complaints were true or not.

Now, there was a manly course for either of these hon. gentlemen to pursue. I have no doubt they had both been in consultation with the Minister of Justice, as they were here until the 29th June, when the session closed, and this telegram was sent on the 23rd June. Instead of bringing the matter up in this House they permit it to be taken up in the irregular manner we see. It should be borne in mind that this House did not rise until the 29th June, and these hon. gentlemen must have been there. In his defence the Solicitor General drags in the name of

Mr. Newcombe—it may be to impress upon his followers the idea that Mr. Newcombe, the deputy, was the man to blame. However, he says the Department of Justice recognize their responsibility in the matter. The complaint against the department is in this resolution :

That the action taken by the Government in the premises is without precedent and injurious to the position, usefulness and dignity of the judiciary, and involves a scandalous waste of public funds.

Let us take the facts of the case. These gentlemen interested themselves in the matter. First, the hon. member for Yale interviewed the commissioner personally to suggest the propriety of having prosecuting counsel, and the hon. member for New Westminster suggested the name of such a counsel. Both of these gentlemen were here in the city of Ottawa on the 29th of June, and yet this telegram is sent to the accused on the 23rd of June. The Solicitor General says he has no fault to find with the telegram. I have always understood that a telegram was rather a public way of imparting any information. Besides, in view of the fact that the investigation never went on until the month of December, nearly six months afterwards, what was the justification for this indecent haste to have it flashed over the wires that this judge had been charged "with favouritism, with partiality, both in civil and criminal cases were certain rings and cliques were interested ? Surely the Solicitor General will not stand up and say, in view of the fact that the whole investigation was trifling or related to matters so unimportant that nearly six months elepsed before they were inquired into, that there was a necessity to have the charge made on that particular day. I rather incline to the opinion that the hon. member for Yale and the hon. member for New Westminster, being in Ottawa when the telegram was sent, must have pressed their very strongest upon the Minister of Justice that Mr. Justice Spinks must not have his case inquired into in the usual way, must not be given a fair and ordinary and decent—yes, that is the word—a decent notice, but in their haste and importunity they insist on this telegram being sent. What was the result ? A most manly reply on the part of the judge. He asked to be brought face to face with his accusers. I am not going over one word of what has been said by the hon. member for Pictou, but I endorse every word of what he has said as to the hon. member for New Westminster and the hon. member for Yale. They had taken upon themselves the responsibility of this inquiry. I will not say that they had instigated it, as I am not aware whether they did or not. But I say that it is without the bounds of possibility to believe that they had never heard this complaint until later when they made the suggestion as to the retaining of counsel. I believe that both these hon. gentlemen were aware, being at Ottawa at the time the telegram was sent that it was about to be sent. Well, what follows ? The flimsy nature of the whole case is apparent on the face of the record, as cited here this afternoon. Neither of these hon. gentlemen took part in it or backed it up. The magistrates or justices of the peace who had made the charges did not even appear. And one of the most notable facts is that there would not have been a witness at all had there not been one subpœnaed by the accused. The whole case on the face of it shows that there must have been a most importunate pleading on the part of some hungry supporter for a position and an anxious desire on the part of these gentlemen to see that a party friend was fed ; and there must have been a great longing on the part of parties interested in the removal of Mr. Justice Spinks. A thousand dollars was spent, and the judge has had his character amply vindicated, though the Solicitor General revives the story of rumours. Though the man has been tried, though he has been persecuted—I will not say prosecuted—though the funds of the department have been placed at the disposal of the parties who prosecuted, still the rumour must be revived of wrong-doing on the part of this judge. It is a wonderful thing to me how hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes jump at rumours. They have heard rumours and more than rumours in the case of the Yukon. But they have held no investigation. They heard more than rumours in the case of Judge Dartnell, for an hon. member charged on the floor of this House that the judge had acted unfairly and indefensibly in the matter of the return of a member of this House. And yet there is no investigation. We find that justice—and I speak more particularly of my own county of Simcoe—justice and law have become nothing short of matters of politics. Why, the county attorney, the sheriffs and the authorities concerned in the administration of justice do exactly as they did the other day in the county of Elgin, where there was a serious charge in the case of the West Elgin provincial election ; and when a man named Bole was charged with being one of a party of conspirators in the matter of stuffing the ballot-boxes, and so on, to the surprise of everybody who hoped to see something like decency in the administration of justice there, the county attorney, who is paid to see to the administration of the law, appeared to defend the accused. And what did we see in the county of Ontario ? With all the hideous disclosures made in the trial which resulted in unseating Mr. John Dryden the other day, when there should be a prosecution, a proper prosecution of a gang of scoundrels there, the Department of the Attorney General of Ontario are laughing in their sleeve at the whole matter. And there was a case in which I was concerned as

counsel, a case that arose simply out of politics in the county of Simcoe. A magistrate there was bold enough and brave enough to stand to his guns in the matter of hearing a case, notwithstanding that a gang of magistrates were brought from 15 to 20 miles away to endeavour to pack the court and force him out of giving his decision. What was done in that case by the Premier of Ontario? When the committal and the enforcement of a fine was to be brought about, the Premier and Attorney General of the province writes to the magistrate who had made the conviction that he had better be very careful what he was doing, because a complaint had been made to him. And when the magistrate went down to the city of Toronto and demanded an audience with the Attorney General, Mr. Hardy, and to demand a full and thorough inquiry into the case, what was the result? Why, the inquiry was refused. When we demanded that an inquiry should be made in the case of the magistrates who had been brought there 17 or 20 miles around to pack the bench, the result was that no inquiry could be had and no inquiry has been had up to this date in that case. But thank goodness! there are courts of appeal in the province of Ontario, and when these people appealed from the decision given by the convicting magistrate, there was a decision by Chief Justice Armour, and I cannot do better than quote his remarks in the full Court of Queen's Bench, upholding the decision of the magistrate against the decision of the county attorney, backed as it was by the Attorney General of the province, Mr. Hardy. Mr. Justice Armour gave the decision of the court in these words: in the case of Regina vs. McRae:

> It is not to be tolerated that the accused should bring with him, when he comes up for trial, partisan justices who insist upon his acquittal. Look at the consequences. Suppose a man were charged with murder, and brought before a magistrate, he might, no matter what the evidence, be discharged upon the preliminary hearing, by packing the bench with friendly justices. All the justices in each county are equal in authority, but, as it would be contrary to the public interest as well as indecent that there should be a contest between different justices, we must lay down the rule that when a party charged comes or is brought before a magistrate in obedience to a summons or warrant, no other magistrate should interfere in the investigation of or adjudication upon the charge, except at his request.

And if we had not in the province of Ontario courts of review, justice and right would have been set at defiance, and everything would have been made subordinate to party ends. The Solicitor General has made no defence of this case, to my mind. He has not shown that there was a bona fida case made out against this judge before the investigation was started; he has not shown that it was the duty of the Crown to retain counsel and prosecute this case. Why, the Solicitor General must have amused himself, as well as the House when he instituted a parallel between this and the case of an inquiry into a penitentiary official. The cases are altogether on a different footing, there is no analogy between them. The whole case has proceeded from this: Some person wished the position that Judge Spinks had; who that was, I suppose the locality well knows. A Liberal solicitor wished to have a fee, under the principle laid down, I suppose, in the alleged election frauds in Manitoba, and when he saw the relatives of the Minister getting a part of the public funds, he thought he should have a portion too. But the fact must remain before the public that the Department of Justice went out of their way in order to prosecute this case against Mr. Justice Spinks, and that the department have utterly failed and must utterly fail to justify the action they took in this case against this judge. It ill-becomes the Solicitor General here to-night to attempt to brag over the member for Pictou in reference to innuendoes made against this judge. The case has been fairly and honourably treated by my hon. friend. In referring to the judges, I have this to say, that, the other day, in the course of a certain debate, I referred to the fact that it was impolitic to introduce judges into the party arena at all, and because I mentioned a case in the province of Ontario without referring to the name of the judge, the Premier saw fit to resent what I had said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, the hon. gentleman must not wander from the subject of debate.

Mr. BENNETT. However, I will only say that I entirely coincide with what the Solicitor General has said that the judiciary should be above suspicion, that the judiciary should not be made cheap in this country; and if we are going to make the judiciary cheap in this country, no better way can be taken than has been taken in the present case of bringing alleged charges in here on the floor of the House. Both the hon. members for Yale and Cariboo and New Westminster had an opportuity of doing so before the 29th of June, 1897, when the House rose, when the matter could have been vindicated fairly and above board, rather than that the procedure followed in this case.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). If any evidence were wanted of the crass ignorance of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat in respect to a matter with which he should be very familiar, it is only necessary to recall the remark with which he concluded his speech. Now, let me state very briefly my own connection with this matter. In doing so, I wish to deny categorically the statements and insinuations made both by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I may tell the hon. member for East Simcoe that he could have ascertained, if he had taken the

trouble to ask me, that I knew absolutey nothing about the telegram at the time it was sent, or before, nor anything about the subject matter of that telegram. If my recollection serves me right, the information concerning the charges against Judge Spinks came to me from the Pacific coast. Not knowing that this matter would come up in this shape at the present time, I have not provided myself with the details; but I am certain that it was incidentally that I ascertained that my friend Judge Spinks was being charged by somebody with doing something which he should not have done in his position as a judge. I went down to the Department of Justice and interviewed Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister, and found out from him that these letters had been received by the department, and that he had sent a telegram, which telegram I read, and which letters I read. Up to that time I had no knowledge of the contents of those letters, had no knowledge that a telegram had been sent, or what its contents were. I think that is about the date that the House prorogued, or a few days before, because I intended sending a wire to Judge Spinks to meet me at Sicamous, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, near his place, in order that I might have a conversation with him. I felt very much perturbed at hearing that these letters had been written about him, because he was a very particular friend of mine. Judge Spinks is not a judge of the county in which I live; he is farther removed from where I practise my profession than the county of East Simcoe is from the city of Ottawa. He is away up in the Kootenay district, and I live down at the mouth of the Fraser River. He lived entirely beyond my county, so that anything which Judge Spinks might do in his own jurisdiction was no concern of mine, otherwise than his being a friend of mine, and I would be interested in knowing what action had been taken for or against him. Mr. Justice McColl, Chief Justice of the province, was appointed a commissioner to investigate the charges against Judge Spinks. Again, if my memory serves me right, the suggestion of having counsel brought in in the way in which Mr. Henderson was brought in originated with Mr. Justice McColl. At any rate, I found out that it was decided to have counsel brought in, and from my own experience of commissions emanating from the Department of Justice, I knew that the representatives of the Minister of Justice in the province of British Columbia invariably appeared before those investigations. I had in my mind the investigation into the case of Mr. Fitzsimmons, deputy warden of the penitentiary at New Westminster, at which I appeared as counsel for Mr. Fitzsimmons. During the long course of that investigation, Mr. Charles Wilson, Q.C., of Vancouver, the then representative of the Minister of Justice, appeared in that investigation assisting the sitting judge, Mr. Justice Drake. Doing his duty, as he always does, he felt it incumbent upon him to see that all the evidence was produced, as well for as against Mr. Fitzsimmons, as was done, I believe, in this present instance.

Knowing that a counsel was about to be appointed to watch this case, and thinking that, probably, the department might select the agent of the department in Victoria, when there would be no necessity for overlooking the agent of the department on the mainland, I suggested that Mr. Henderson be chosen, and he was selected. Mr. Henderson is a gentleman of high standing at the bar in British Columbia, and I do not think, for one moment, that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) would undertake to assail him or to impute improper motives to him. He has had the bad taste to make the most unprofessional statements and to impute the most improper motives in regard to Mr. Henderson's connection with this case. I resent the imputation of wrongful motives to myself in having sent that telegram, as well as the tone of voice in which the hon. member for Pictou read that telegram, in which I said: "I recommend Alexander Henderson, Q.C., New Westminster, as counsel in this case." The way in which he wound up that telegram reminded me of the famous Sergeant Buz-fuz: "Chops and tomato sauce! Gracious Heavens, is the virtue of an unprotected widow to be trifled away by artifices of this sort?" This was what he based his tremendous fabric upon. I say, it is unworthy of any gentleman who has a position on the floor of this House, or at the bar, or any place where decent conduct is expected, to make the insinuations and cowardly innuendoes that the hon. gentleman has made. He has made statements and insinuations on the floor of this House which, if they had been made 100 yards from here, there would be a by-election in Pictou in a short time. The hon. gentleman, standing on the floor of this House, and putting on record in this House remarks and insinuations such as he has made, has done something that is absolutely unworthy of him, and I trust that the hon. gentleman will not pursue the tactics which he has adopted on this occasion. I do not know how long before this he has been accustomed to follow this line of attack, which, I say, is unworthy of an hon. member of this House. I am amazed that, on such flimsy foundation, he should for a moment consider that it was worth his while to take up the time of the House in the way that he has done. He has talked about this tremendous expense of $400 which was paid as a fee of Mr. Alexander Henderson, Q.C., of New Westminster. I did not follow the hon. gentleman all through his rambling remarks, but I amused myself by making a little calculation as to expenditures while he was talking about the expenditure of this $400. I find that hon. gentleman has been spending money at the rate of $400 an hour since he began to speak this afternoon, making a simple calculation as to what it costs to keep this

House running during the seven hours that it usually sits.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has cost about 10 cents up to the present time.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. gentleman has put that in the most insulting way. This afternoon, when I sought to put a relevant question, he would not even answer the question, but hid himself under the cowardly excuse of saying that I should say: Please, sir, may I ask you a question? There is not a gentleman in this House who invades the rules of debate more than the hon. member for Pictou. The hon. gentleman talks about the expenditure of money, in the way in which this $400 was spent, yet he has actually expended, or has caused to be spent, the sum of $2,000 since he began speaking this afternoon. After the very concise and excellent statement of the case by the hon. Solicitor General, it would be really superfluous for me to take up the time of the House in saying anything further upon this matter; but I would like to say, that the hon. member for Pictou, in presenting that resolution, has presented it upon absolutely no substantial ground whatever. There is not one allegation that the hon. member made in respect to myself, and I venture to say, in regard to the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), which is founded on fact. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has also made statements which are entirely at variance with the facts, and I would like to say to him, that his insinuations and his suppositions, in regard to my participation in this matter, are entirely erroneous.

Mr. BENNETT. If he will recall what I said, he will remember that I said, that I believed both himself and the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo yielded to the importunity of their friends.

Mr. MORRISON. I have not.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I said their connection with it was. I acquitted the hon. gentleman of any other connection with it.

Mr. MORRISON. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will go further, and acquit me of that, because I have had no communication with the friends of either of the people who wrote these letters. I knew nothing about it, except in the way I have said in opening my statement. I would not condescend to offer this explanation to the hon. gentlemen opposite and to take up the time of the House in making these few remarks, if the hon. member for Pictou had not thought that he had something that was sufficiently important to justify him in taking up four hours' time and in moving this resolution asking the House to vote want of confidence in the Government. This is what justifies me in adopting this circumlocutionary method of giving a denial to the statements made by the hon. member for Pictou and the hon. member for East Simcoe. I am satisfied, as far as the participation of the Department of Justice is concerned, to take the estimate of Sir Oliver Mowat, the late Minister of Justice, in regard to the proper procedure in this matter. I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons, but, when it comes down to making a comparison as between the hon. gentleman who occupied the position at one time of Minister of Justice, and who comes here and endeavours to convince the House that the course taken by Sir Oliver Mowat was wrong, and makes a comparison between himself and between Sir Oliver Mowat in a case of that kind, it reminds me very much of comparing a singed cat to a Bengal tiger. I say, that the hon. member for Pictou, in standing up here and treating us to such a harangue for such a time, assailing the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat, is receding to a depth to which I did not think it was possible for a member of Parliament to reach. I trust that the hon. member for Cariboo will deem it necessary to make a few remarks in regard to the references which have been made to himself. As far as I am concerned, I had no communication with the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo. I did not see him about this matter. I did not know that he had anything to do with it. It may surprise the the House to know that, as far as I am concerned, the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, Mr. Henderson, Chief Justice McColl, Judge Spinks, are all of them on the most amicable terms with me that they could possibly be. Judge Spinks, as I said before, is a particular friend of mine, and there is no man in this House regrets more than I that Judge Spinks's name should be dragged forward in this unnecessary way, and being put on "Hansard" and in the press of the country. I am sure that Judge Spinks would be the last man to give credit to the hon. member for Pictou for what he has done to-day. There is no doubt in the world that the object of the hon. member for Pictou is to make political cudos for himself in British Columbia. I have lost all respect for the hon. gentleman's judgment in adopting the course which he has taken, for, if there is one thing more than another which tends to discredit the hon. gentleman, particularly where Judge Spinks is known, and where the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo is known, it is what he has done here to-night. All I can say is, that, if he is going to keep this thing up, as far as we are concerned, politically speaking: God speed him.

Mr. H. BOSTOCK (Yale and Cariboo). A rather strong reference has been made to me in the course of this discussion, and motives have been imputed to me which are not justified by the facts. Judging from what the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said, I assume that he would be actuated by the motives in a case of this

kind, which he has endeavoured to impute to me. I would not be so actuated. I may state for his benefit, that so far as I know, no gentleman was looking for the position that Mr. Spinks occupied then, and occupies now. No friends of mine or friends of the Liberal party were pushing to get Mr. Spinks's position. My part in the matter came in at the time that I wrote a letter, on receiving a letter from Mr. Sidley. Mr. Sidley wrote to me wanting to know whether those who asked for the investigation were to have counsel, and Mr. Justice McColl being in the province of British Columbia, it was easier and quicker to get an answer from him, and I wrote him, presuming that he would have received instructions if such a thing was going to be done. I wrote the letter which has been read. But, so far as my taking a part in this matter or wishing to do Mr. Spinks any harm is concerned, I entirely repudiate any such intent. I may state that I consider the administration of justice in my constituency as a most important matter, and one that has to be watched more carefully there than possibly in any other province in the Dominion, because at the present time we have a large population coming from all parts of the world, and they are apt to criticise more closely any action of the judges than possibly people would in the older and more settled portions of the Dominion. I do think a great deal of good has resulted from this investigation, because the rumours which were abroad have been set at rest, and the people feel that Mr. Spinks is properly carrying out the duties of the position he occupies—a position of great importance in that part of the country—and they now feel that he is actuated by proper motives. I took no part in the matter of getting Mr. Henderson or any other person appointed to that commission. I simply wrote this letter to Judge McColl; I never spoke to him on the matter; and I think if any hon. member of this House had been written to for information by a constituent, as Mr. Sidley is a constituent of mine, that member would have taken the course that I did. My only other course would have been to have written to the Department of Justice itself. I never had any idea of interviewing Mr. Justice McColl for the purpose, in any shape or form, of influencing him in anything he might have to do with the case; I never did anything other than write the letter which has been referred to. I shall not further take up the time of the House. I think the House will be satisfied with this personal explanation, and as to the conduct of the Department of Justice, the hon. the Solicitor General has fully stated the situation to the House, and I think the House will agree in the considerations he has advanced.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, and it may be presumption on my part to have anything to say on this legal question, but in my own county I have had some experience in respect to charges against judges, and I have a great deal of sympathy with Judge Spinks under the circumstances. While a layman who has nothing to do with the administration of justice may be excused for offering complaints against a judge, I cannot understand how it comes that three justices of the peace, charged with the administration of justice in British Columbia, could be so mistaken in their complaints against this judge, as is proven by the action of the Justice Department, and by the judge who investigated these charges. It has been shown clearly that Judge Spinks was in no way to blame, and that there was nothing in these complaints.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And never was anything.

Mr. INGRAM. And never was anything. I am glad to hear both the gentlemen from British Columbia disclaiming any collusion with these complainants, and asserting that they simply had done their duty as representatives of the people, but I am sorry to say that the same policy is not carried out with respect to other departments of the Government. My experience is, that when members have made their complaints to the departments about the conduct of public affairs in their constituency, and when the officers have been instructed to investigate these complaints, even after that, some of the departments consult Liberal members and defeated Liberal candidates as to the course the department should pursue. That is a wrong policy, because if the responsible Ministers send responsible officers to deal with these complaints, no irresponsible person, be he member or defeated candidate, should be consulted to influence the result. Now, the Solicitor General made a few statements to-night, with some of which I entirely agree, and they are not the only statements of that hon. gentlemen with which I agree, because I have found him very fair in a good many things. He has stated that the waters of justice should flow from a pure spring for those who drink them. I agree with that. He also stated that he did not think a Liberal and a friend of the Government was precluded from making a complaint as to the manner in which justice was being administered. I quite agree with that. No Liberal should be precluded from making a complaint, but I go further, and I ask the Solicitor General if he will agree with me in this proposition: If a Conservative makes a complaint as to the way in which justice is being administered, will the department take the same steps as they would in the case of a Liberal, and investigate the complaint made by the Conservative? Now, if that proposition of mine be assented to, I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will pardon the remarks I am about to make, and I will endeavour to make them

free from any partisan feeling, and in what I believe to be in the interests of the administration of justice in Canada. As we have listened all afternoon to the way in which justice has been administered in British Columbia, I take it that the Department of Justice are always glad to find out the way in which the provincial governments of this Dominion administer justice to the people of the various provinces, and I want to quote a sample or two from my own county in the province of Ontario. We have a police magistrate temporarily appointed in the city of St. Thomas, whose duty it is to deal out even-handed justice irrespective of party. This gentleman is supposed to be one of those who are pure, and who is to administer justice from this pure fountain, and how has he done it? Several men have been charged with stuffing ballots and stealing ballots, also personating voters and deputy returning officers in West Elgin. Unlike the hon. gentleman who is charged with making certain statements in this House this afternoon which he would not dare to make outside of this House, I make the statement that one Duncan Bole, of the own of Sault Ste. Marie, came to the west riding of Elgin, and deliberately stole ballots that should have been given credit to the Conservative candidate in West Elgin. I can prove that to be true in any court of law in this country, and I will make the statement outside of this House over my own signature, and will get dozens of others to do the same.

Mr. MORRISON. Why don't you do it?

Mr. INGRAM. I will explain. In order to prosecute this gentleman for the crime which he has committed, he was arrested and brought to where he had committed the crime. He was brought before a justice of the peace, whose duty it was to administer the law; and who was brought there to try this man charged with one of the most heinous crimes that a man can commit—stealing the franchise of a man who had honestly marked his ballot for the candidate of his choice? We find that the County Crown attorney of that county went there to defend the thief, and for doing so I understand was paid by the province. What I wish to know is this: if the Department of Justice finds money to investigate charges such as we have heard of in British Columbia, will they find money to investigate the charge that I have stated? The Attorney General of the province, whose duty it is to see that the law of this Dominion is properly carried out, especially the criminal law, was asked to produce the ballots so that the case could be proceeded with, and he declined to produce them. The County Crown attorney, who should represent the Crown, went there for the express purpose of raising a technicality to defeat the ends of justice. Next, we had this St. Thomas police magistrate, who is temporarily appointed on the recommendation of a gentleman who is now the representative of West Elgin in the local legislature, and who, if appointed permanently, will owe his appointment to that gentleman. I ask, is it human nature for a gentleman of that kind to deal out even-handed justice from this pure fountain, and injure the man to whom he owes his appointment? I say it should be the duty of the Department of Justice, in a case of that kind to procure somebody who would deal out even-handed justice. This man not only presides as police magistrate, but he goes round and endeavours to secure sureties that the participators will appear at a certain day, and he lets them go with $200 in their own name and $200 in two sureties; and when the case comes up again, these men do not appear, and that is how they get out of it.

Amendment negatived; motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend does not intend to go on?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have an item in the Fisheries which we had better pass.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that the item was left for the very purpose of discussing it.

Inspection of Dominion steamers and fog alarms $1,300

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has got the report which his officer told me on Tuesday was ready up to a certain point?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I asked my officer to-day, and he says the hon. gentleman misunderstood him altogether if he said the report was ready. He is having it copied as rapidly as possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If at that time it was ready up to a certain point, that much could be brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My officer brought me the material so far as it was copied to-day, and it was not in a shape to be brought down; but he is getting it ready. He has four or five clerks engaged in copying it.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is now prepared to let me have the papers in the two cases I brought before him some time ago—one, that of the lighthouse-keeper at Point Jerome, Richmond County, the papers of which he promised to let me have by yesterday week. I want to know if he is prepared to hand them to me now?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not got them. The papers with reference to the dismissal of the fishery officer were brought down last year to the Senate. I have had them copied and I may perhaps be able to give them to the hon. gentleman to-night. There is nothing in them except exactly what I told the hon. gentleman that he was reported by the Commissioner of Fisheries as an inefficient officer.

Mr. GILLIES. There is no such report in them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This item was to stand until the report came down. That was the agreement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not understand that it was to stand until the report came down. It is being prepared. I cannot make the officials copy the documents faster.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely, with the understanding we had before the House, the hon. gentleman does not want to press this item of $1,300 until the report is brought down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not understand that there was a specific agreement of that kind, but I understood that we should leave one item stand, with liberty to discuss all items generally.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was item 208. We had passed 207 before reaching 208, with the exception of that item, and it was understood that the report should be prepared and brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then pass 208, and I will let the other stand.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all; I have a great deal to say on that.

Oyster culture $7,000

Mr. INGRAM. The understanding was, the other night, that item 208 would all pass except one item, and that on that one item we could discuss any of the others. I asked him then if he would charge his memory with regard to the legal expenses paid here. I find an item of $70 paid to John Farleyson Thomas, page K—80. What was this for?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am unable to recollect. It is for legal expenses over 18 months ago.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot understand where the $70 would come from.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is quite open to move for the vouchers in the Public Accounts Committee; he can hardly expect me to charge my memory with all these items.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not a member of that committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman can get some one who is a member to move for it.

Mr. INGRAM. Last evening I called the hon. gentleman's attention to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not recollect his doing so, and do not think he did, or it would be in "Hansard."

Mr. INGRAM. I am not impatient at all, but am willing to wait for the information.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In considering the subject, the other evening, the hon. Minister made a few observations on a very important question, and I am surprised to find that, according to the report in his department, there has been a large amount of correspondence on that question which is not in the report, nor has it been brought down in any shape before Parliament. For instance, the hon. gentleman has reached an arrangement with some of the provinces in connection with the jurisdiction of the fisheries of the federal and local Governments, and the correspondence that took place ought to be furnished to Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think there was any correspondence of any moment at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I gathered, the other night, that was the hon. gentleman's impression, and that there had simply been pourparlers between him and members of the governments in the provinces, but I find that his Deputy Minister at page 35 of the report, states that the decision of the Privy Council was not perfectly understood, and that while the power to make fishery regulations was vested in the Dominion, there were other rights of great importance which could not longer be exercised by the Federal Government. The issuing of licenses are defined to be in the jurisdiction of the provinces and the collection of revenues, except in the case of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I do not understand that exception.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The decision was that at the time of confederation the several provinces that became united were the owners of certain property, among which was the right of fishing, and that right was not transferred to the Dominion. That, however, does not apply to Manitoba or the North-west Territories, because these portions of the Dominion became part of the confederation later.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said there was not much correspondence, but in the report his deputy says that a large amount of correspondence took place between the department and the provincial authorities on the announcement

of the decision, and that there were many points concerning which there was still great uncertainty. We ought to have that correspondence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is purely departmental correspondence relating to administration. For instance, the province of Ontario appointed an officer to carry out the work, and he had correspondence with Mr. Prince, regarding the manner in which we administer that branch of the department, and we gave him copies of the books and showed him how we had worked out the administration of the fisheries, but the correspondence had nothing to do with the legal points involved. They were discussed between Mr. Hardy and his legal advisers, Mr. Marchand and his legal advisers and myself and my legal advisers here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course, that is satisfactory, if the hon. gentleman is clear that this is only relating to such matters, and not to the so-called modus vivendi. The deputy seems to leave that impression.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There has been some correspondence between myself and the province of Quebec with reference to the sea-coast fisheries; also, as I told the hon. gentleman, with the Premiers of the maritime provinces with reference to a possible agreement upon a case to be submitted. This is since the report came out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think any correspondence on such an important question as that might come down, unless——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it should not come down at the present stage.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to that at any rate. There is another matter to which I wish to refer. It is stated that "a thorough revision of the existing laws is in hand." Will the hon. gentleman tell me what that means?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It simply means that the existing law will have to be amended in some few particulars. For instance, the Privy Council determine that the main section of our Act, section 2, so far as it permits us to give leases, is ultra vires. I have to get the Bill drafted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is drafting it? Is it being done outside the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. I intend to submit a draft to the Justice Department. It will be prepared in my own department. I would suggest that we might reserve one item of $1,300 until he gets the report, and the rest of the item might pass.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have not discussed the points arising out of this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought the hon. gentleman had discussed them pretty well. However, I do not want to shorten the discussion.

Mr. BENNETT. The other evening, I referred to the case of Noble Brothers, a case which attracted, and still attracts, a great deal of attention. Among the fishermen in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, there are some who, like other fishermen, sometimes make the mistake of fishing illegally. The result is, that these men, comparatively poor men, have been visited with the terrors of the law. Not only have heavy fines been imposed, but they have suffered the loss of nets, and sometimes of their boats—for that is the punishment decreed under the very salutary law carried out by the Dominion. But these fishermen of the Georgian Bay, adjoining the riding of East Simcoe, complain that, as against them, the law has been rigidly enforced, but in the case of Noble Brothers, a large and wealthy firm, who measure their wealth, not by hundreds, but by thousands, though they have been prosecuted in the courts by the inspector and convicted, a different course is followed. Their large fleet of boats was seized, but, being placed under a bond, they have been released. And though this occurred some four years ago, Noble Brothers have gone free, and no retribution has been visited upon them. The Minister and the House will understand that when poor men stand and see their accumulations of years go up in smoke because they have been fishing illegally—when, perhaps, they have hunger at the door, and they see this wealthy firm, with their great political influence in Algoma, go free—it is not to be wondered at that they think that justice is not fairly administered. I referred to this matter the other night, but the House closed at the time, and the Minister did not make a statement in reference to the present situation of the case. I would now ask the Minister, if he will state the amount of the bond and whether or not all the fleet of boats have been restored to the Noble Brothers, and whether any part of the fines have been paid; and if not, is it the intention of the department to permit Noble Brothers to go scot free, or is it intended to exact the fines inflicted and carry out the punishment decided by the inspector?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has referred to a case which happened many years ago, before I became the head of the department. Any action taken was taken by my predecessor, and not by me. No action has been taken by me, ex-

cept that I informed Mr. Osler, the counsel for Noble Brothers, that, if he chose to reopen the case, I would listen to his argument and give him such a decision as I thought was fair. He said he would prefer to wait until the decision of the Privy Council was given as to the relative jurisdiction of the Dominion and the province, and he would then take such action as he thought best. Since then nothing has been done by him, and nothing has been done by me.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised at that statement, in view of the fact that Noble Brothers can hardly be looked to to take the initiative. Fancy a plaintiff who has a verdict in his favour, moving to set aside his verdict.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). That is a very frequent occurrence.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, he sometimes moves to have it increased. But that is not suggested in this case. If the facts are as I believe them to be, the hon. member for Pictou, who was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the opinion of many fishermen on the shore of Georgian Bay, did not deal by any means harshly with Noble Brothers. I believe I am right, when I say, that the Minister has lying in his department a bond for the forthcoming of these tugs and sailing vessels, and also a record, or minute of the heavy fines imposed by Mr. Elliott, the fishery inspector. And no better proof could be had of the fact that Mr. Elliott was right, than the fact that he is still retained in the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I am very sorry that he has been removed. Why was it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry, also. His services were dispensed with, along with the others, after the decision of the Privy Council.

Mr. BENNETT. He proved himself a most fearless and impartial officer in the administration of the law. But the Minister can inquire of the officer of his department who is present to-night, and ascertain if there is standing against the Noble Brothers large fines. And, if the Noble Brothers are to be permitted to go unwhipt of justice, when the man who has a forty or fifty-dollar fishing boat and a hundred dollars' worth of nets, if caught illegally fishing, must not only lose his property, but pay a heavy fine, I can only say, that the fishermen will not have much faith in the administration of law or justice in the country. Now, I ask the Minister, what was the amount of fines that were recorded?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know. The matter is a very old one, and began long before I came into the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I would like to know, because I have been asked by at least twenty fishermen in my own riding what the Government intend to do about the Noble case. The Minister admits the case is not without his review, because he had communications with Mr. Osler upon the subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I assume from what Mr. Osler tells me that they will bring a case against this Government for enormous damages.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the Government will grant them a fiat to bring on the action. In the next place, I think they will be only too happy to cry quits. I am only asking for information so that I may be enabled to tell the men who are engaged in fishing, what disposition has been made of the Noble case. It is a matter that excited a great deal of attention, and occupied columns of newspaper comment. The matter was even introduced on the floor of the House by some hon. gentlemen then on the left who now sit on the right of the Speaker. Strong complaint was made against the conduct of the then acting Minister, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I think the Minister should certainly give the House the information whether the fines have been paid, and whether it is the intention of the Government to enforce the fines.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I tell the hon. gentleman that the case is hoary with age. There is any amount of manuscript over there that any one may consult if he pleases. The case was disposed of by the Minister who preceded me, and the counsel for the Messrs. Noble intimated to me that they would await the decision of the Privy Council, and then take such action in the courts as they thought the interest of their clients required. I assume they will do so, and when they come into court, if they have any claim against the Government, it will be decided in the proper way. I do not intend to pay them any damages. I do not think the hon. gentleman as a lawyer would advise me to take any action to recover those old fines.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the question of the Noble Brothers, I am surprised to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries take such a position. He cannot dismiss it by saying that it is hoary with age. The decision of the Privy Council at no time could possibly affect the action of the department in the matter of enforcing the regulations. Nothing in that decision throws a doubt upon the validity of the fishery regulations, on the contrary the right to enforce them is upheld. The case

of the Noble Brothers was a most harsh case. It is harsh enough to burn up the nets and boats of poor fishermen, as the Minister's officers are doing now, and the papers do not think it worth while to take up their case: but if a powerful firm like the Noble Brothers come forward and openly violate the regulations, with tugs going into the waters at their own sweet will, contrary to the regulations of the close season, if you seize their tugs a great outcry is made. Instead of the Minister being, as I suppose I would be, at that time blamed for not summarily dealing with these people, because I took the tugs and kept them, I became the subject of abuse, both in the House and in the press of the country, the Toronto "Globe" leading off in the fight, whereas my officers were only doing their duty. But I had personal knowledge of the manner in which the Noble Brothers were acting. While one of them was in my office trying to palliate the facts of the case, a telegram was put into my hands from my officers in the waters concerned, saying that another tug of the Nobles had just been caught taking fish in the close season. Well, the excitement that these people stirred up through their powerful position was something extraordinary, and instead of getting the support of the public, the department got very little popular support. Knowing as I did that the poorer classes of fishermen suffered from the loss of their boats and nets far more than the Noble Brothers, I did endeavour to hold the Nobles down to the same rule and the same treatment. Boards of Trade all over Ontario sent in strong representations on behalf of the Noble Brothers, who bought enormous supplies from the merchants, and pressure was brought from all quarters, representations were made so determinedly and so positively that finally, after consulting with my colleagues, we agreed to hold these tugs and not dispose of them by sale in the ordinary course. We appointed Mr. Samuel Wilmot, Superintendent of Fish Culture, to hear what these people had to say. They employed eminent counsel, the firmof McCarthy & Osler, and they went before Mr. Wilmot and treated the commissioner as if it were a regular tribunal, and raised all sorts of technical objections, with which no doubt Mr. Wilmot was exceedingly embarrassed. Though Mr. Wilmot reported the case, and though a large amount of evidence was taken, it was still standing in the department when I left. Then, the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), my colleague, assumed office, and, of course, we are both responsible for all that occurred then. I think, speaking subject to correction, a judge was afterwards substituted in place of Mr. Wilmot, and a rehearing was granted. Meanwhile the tugs were given back to the Noble Bros., they giving a bond to the Crown conditioned on the result of this investigation. If it should turn out that these tugs had been violating the law, then security was taken so

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

that they would not get scot free. There was no vindictiveness in the matter; it was an endeavour on my part simply to say that there was no difference between the rich and the poor, that the fishermen should understand that we were not merely burning up and destroying their property and mulcting them in penalties because they were poor but that these were regulations which must be observed. It was not long before we left office in June, 1896, that this arrangement for an investigation before Judge Johnston—I think it was Judge Johnston—at any rate, a judge was made, and it was required that the matter should be pressed to the end in order to give them an opportuity of establishing their innocence, of establishing the simple fact as to whether their tugs were, or were not, fishing at the time they were seized. Another thing that entered into the consideration of this matter was that it was not their first infraction. They were reported as old offenders, as frequent offenders, and it was a question as to whether they were to have a license or not. Under the regulations, in the case of these poor fishermen, to whom I have alluded, when they frequently violated the regulations, when they violated them more than once, they were not given a renewal of their licenses. There was an implied condition of good behaviour during the time they held their licenses, because these licenses were necessarily limited to a chosen few who should behave, who would treat the regulations fairly and do no injury to the fisheries. This was in 1896, and all these matters to which I have referred did not occupy a long time. But there has been a long delay and the Minister cannot lie back now and say that because this matter was not disposed of when he came to office the matter has grown hoary with age, that he does not know how the matter stands, and that there is a suggestion that they are going to sue. What are they going to sue about? One of these investigations was adverse to them, or, I think, that it was adverse to them. My recollection is that the Minister himself has told us that the finding was against them. Then came in this specious plea of Mr. Osler, who, of course, only wants delay, who says that a suit would be brought. Then comes this specious plea that the Privy Council is going to decide the matter in reference to these regulations. There is the decision of the Privy Council, and that decision in no way affects the matter, as the hon. Minister knows. Nothing in that decision will prevent the recovery of the bond. The Minister is bound to take some action in regard to that bond.

Mr. McGREGOR. Oh, cut it short; we will be here all night.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister will not cut it short. The Minister has left this matter too long.

Mr. McGREGOR. He would not ruin them like you would.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know why the hon. gentleman says that I would ruin them. I did not ruin them. I certainly would have preferred to have ruined them rather than to ruin the poor creatures we had to ruin in enforcing the regulations, because when they lost their boats and their nets they lost their all. It is for the Minister to perform his duties and to be cursed in the same quarters that I was cursed by the parties who have been punished. The Minister must deal with this case so that he can decide who was right and who was wrong. He must either decide to sue on that bond or give the bond up. I would like to ask the Minister if all this time Noble Bros. have been given their license to fish?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister is misinformed on that point; yes, they have been fishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was answering the question of the hon. member for Pictou, as to whether they had been given a license to fish. I say I do not think so.

Mr. McGREGOR. They buy their fish.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I am right in saying that they have not been given a license. Here is a case which occurred five or six years ago, and without any notice being given to me, in any way, it suddenly springs up in the midst of the estimates, and I am asked to say what my policy is. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will move for the papers and bring the matter before the House, the decision and the action which has been taken can be reviewed. To ask me in the middle of the estimates, for this year, to go into the details of a case which took place many years ago, before I came into the department, without notice, and to expect me to carry all these details in my head, is asking too much of me.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the hon. Minister can hardly complain that he has not had notice. Surely the case is of such importance that, when I brought it to his notice the other night, it is strange if he has not seen fit to ask his department for the facts. As to not having brought it up last year, I certainly did not bring it up for the reason that I knew the question was pending in the department. I know Mr. Charles Noble, and the Minister, I think, knows him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I do not know him.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Charles Noble was here last year for about a week, and he certainly must have seen the Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He may have seen me; I do not know the man.

Mr. BENNETT. I know his whole business here was in connection with that case. A friend of his informed me that Mr. Noble stayed here several days in connection with this matter, and that Mr. Noble was very hopeful of a favourable result, that there was going to be no exaction of the penalty or the bond. The hon. Minister can hardly complain of lack of notice when the matter was introduced the other evening. I referred to the importance of the matter, and surely the officers of his department could assure him, and he must have known of his own knowledge that the matter would be brought up from the fact that an hon. gentleman behind him, is saying that it was a case of hardship. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has several times said that it was a case of hardship.

Mr. McGREGOR. I know all about it.

Mr. BENNETT. And he says that he knew all about it. I have no doubt he knew all about it; I knew Mr. Noble was here session after session.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know Mr. Noble; I never met him in my life.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) was not so fortunate as many other gentlemen on his side of the House, because Mr. Noble met a good many of them. The case is of importance, inasmuch as the Nobles not only had the assistance of strong Liberals, but they had the support of very pronounced Conservative friends of the then Administration, owing to business and other relations that existed between them. What answer can I make when I go back to my riding and am asked, as I am perpetually asked, as to this partial administration of the law? Take the case of the Tiny shore, where there are a large number of French Canadians who had all their capital, amounting to $300 or $400, invested in a fishing outfit. These men were in poor circumstances, and if they left their nets down a few days after the open season, because they were not able to lift them by reason of inclement weather, they saw all their belongings go up in smoke before their eyes. How am I to explain this rigid enforcement of the law against these poor men, when this wealthy firm of Noble Bros., who have not only a large financial standing, but were the most active Liberal politicians on the whole shore, have not the law enforced against them. The Nobles did not confine their operations to their own riding of Algoma, but they were an important factor in North Simcoe and in Parry Sound. In the elections of 1896, the Noble Bros. left Algoma, where the elections would not take place until after the general elections, and they used their powerful influence in Parry Sound in favour of the Liberal candidate; and their influence was powerful, because they had a large number of men

in their employ and had a still larger number depending on them by reason of their supplying fishing outfits. I have heard the Noble Bros. estimated to be worth $200,000, they were the kings in the fishing business there, and after the repeated breaking of the law by these men, and after their being brought to book, the Minister now says this case is hoary with age and that is the end of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I declined to say anything about the case, because I was not in possession of the facts. I will not commit myself to saying anything about it, and I do not think any hon. gentleman should ask me about a matter which took place six years ago, and which is suddenly sprung up in Supply.

Mr. BENNETT. To my own knowledge Mr. Charles Noble was here last year, and I was informed by a friend of his that he was here to see whether the penalty was to be enacted. The Minister does not deny Mr. Noble was here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Noble may have been here and he may have seen me, but I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, it is highly probable he did see the Minister. I am sure the hon. gentleman from Algoma (Mr. Dyment) has repeatedly seen the Minister on this case, because it is a matter of the greatest importance to the Liberal candidate in Algoma whether or not he has the influence of this important firm whose ramifications in the fishing business extend for miles and miles along that shore. Now, I hold that the Minister should state what his position is on this question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not in a position to state, because I have not seen the papers.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, at the next session of the House?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How is it possible for me to go through that volume of evidence before the next session of the House. I would certainly have to lay the whole thing before the Department of Justice.

Mr. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) I rise to say a few words because I would not like the impression to go abroad that while poor fishermen have been punished for breaking the law, the Noble Bros., who are a fishing firm of some wealth, went scot free. I do not dispute a word that has been said by my predecessor in office, and who administered that department with so much ability, and under whose administration the first proceedings were instituted against this firm. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will not blame me if I say that on some points we might differ. I might take a more lenient view than he would, in one case, and perhaps in another instance he might take a more lenient view than I. I acted for that gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, while he was away at the Paris Arbitration for about six months, and that case then came under my notice. During the time I acted for that hon. gentleman, I felt the responsibility that no matter what my own views might be, I was bound to have proper regard for his decisions as the Minister of the department, and not to reverse his decision. The Noble case attracted a great deal of attention, and proceedings were taken against them. Afterwards I became the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the case still continued. I will not attempt from memory to go through the history of the case, as my object in speaking is simply, as I have said, to prevent the impression going abroad that the Nobles, being men of wealth and influence, got off scot free, while poor men had their nets burned and destroyed. I am thoroughly satisfied in my own mind that the Noble Bros. suffered most severely. I believe that, without regard to any penalty, they suffered in their business to such an extent as would be satisfactory punishment for the breaches of the regulations they committed. I believe that honestly. Their whole plant, which was considerable, was seized, and I do not question the propriety of that seizure for a breach of the regulations. It was seized by officers who showed a great disposition to pay more attention to the Nobles in that district than to most any other fishermen —one officer in particular. The boats were seized and tied up to the wharfs, without any one to look after them, exposed to the heat of the summer, and the property became much deteriorated. In addition to that, a number of smaller boats with oars and plant were not sold by public auction, but sold at private sale by some of the officers, and when the bond was executed, and the time came to render an account we were unable to show this plant. My predecessor (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is right in saying that the next proceeding was to hand the matter over to a judge—Judge Johnstone, I think, but it was longer before the change of Government than he has stated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was Minister of Justice at the time, because I remember that you consulted with me.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes. The case was referred to the judge in the locality, who would be in a position to get the evidence, and perhaps make as fair a report as could be got on the subject. He made reports from time to time, and I know that it must have been nearly a year before the change of Government when this judge was appointed. I do not know what his final judgment was, because speaking from my

recollection it was not given in my time. I do not rise to say that these men had not committed breaches of the regulations or that they were not liable to penalties; but I do rise to say that it is not fair to give out the impression that they were so favoured that they got off scot-free and did not suffer severely in their business. The representations made to me were not made by men on one side of politics only; but some of the most respectable men supporting our Government came forward and complained most bitterly of the extraordinarily severe treatment these men were receiving. I rise to make this statement in justice to these men.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The point I want to make is this. We could discuss the treatment of the Nobles, and the point of all the views regarding their treatment is that the matter should be brought to a termination. The Minister of Marine has no more important duty to perform than to bring it to a conclusion, but I understand him to say that he cannot charge his mind with these things. Why, every session you will find, according to "Hansard," that this matter has been inquired into, and the Minister has undertaken to give answer upon it. It was brought up the other night just as the committee was rising, as a most important subject. My old colleague, who held the same responsibility as I did in connection with this case, might have one view, I might have another, different members of the committee might have different views on the subject; but the point I have endeavoured to press on the Minister of Marine is that he has not been given that attention to this important subject which he should. In fairness to me, that matter should be concluded. I was the one who had to bear the brunt of it, rightly or wrongly. I was charged with having been cruel and vindictive to the Nobles. That charge was made in the "Globe," and repeated in all the smaller papers on the same side. The Prime Minister, when leader of the Opposition, attacked the Government on the same ground, that we had been unduly cruel towards these people. He said:

If I understand, the complaint made by the Nobles was that they were the victims of a conspiracy, that their record had been falsified by the officers of the department.

Mr. McGREGOR. So they were.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman from Essex says, so they were. And these are the statements that have gone against the officers, because the hon. Minister of Marine is not in a position to defend his officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was six years ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman came into office in 1896, and this matter was standing to be dealt with, and it is a reflection upon himself to say that the matter has faded from his mind, and that he knows nothing of it. It ought to have been dealt with finally. I am not insisting that he should sue on the bond; I am not insisting that he should show leniency to these people, or that he should accept the idea of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan); but I am insisting that he should perform the duty of his office and bring these matters to some conclusion, and not allow them to grow hoary. The Prime Minister, when leader of the Opposition, pressed in the strongest manner this case as one in which these people had been the victims of a conspiracy, and in which the officers had falsified the record in order to do them an injustice. He said:

They cannot enter upon their defence successfully, especially when they feel so strongly that they are blamed unjustly and are the victims of a conspiracy. It must strike the sense of justice of my hon. friends that they cannot successfully vindicate their character unless they are placed in possession of everything which pertains to this case, and of all the charges laid against them.

This was the special favour to be shown to these people, if you please. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) testifies that there was no such system of treatment for the rich as against another system for the poor; and here was the Prime Minister using his eloquence to ask for special favours to these men who had a bad record in the department as regards the regulations. I say nothing as to their character; but in that debate it came out that they had been put upon the black list, and had been fined for violating the regulations. The Prime Minister never raised his voice on behalf of poor fishermen who had been in the same position; but here he was pressing the Government to bring down all the papers and documents in the Noble case. And a motion of that character was pressed, and was of course resisted by the hon. member for Victoria as well as by myself. On that occasion the hon. member for Victoria summed up the matter thus:

I do not doubt at all the very deep sympathy of the hon. gentleman for these men. No doubt he feels that they have been very badly treated and that the Government deserve very severe censure. That may be true, but I am not yet in a position to discuss the question, pending an investigation by a legal tribunal. The delay is not the fault of the Government, or the Minister or the department. The delay has been caused by the gentlemen with whom the last speaker has expressed such great sympathy, the Nobles themselves. After their vessels had been condemned, my predecessor listened to the appeal made by them, in which they assured him that if a rehearing were granted, they could bring forward such evidence as would reverse the former decision, and induce him to restore the property. He consented to a rehearing, fixing the time and place. When the time for the rehearing was about to arrive, I was in charge of the department, and the legal advisers of the

Nobles, Messrs. McCarthy & Osler, notified the department that they would advise their clients to appeal for a change in the arrangements for the rehearing. They took exception to the place, called Massey, as inconvenient to reach, and they also raised an objection that the rehearing was to be before a very prominent officer of the department. All these things were taken into consideration, and in order to give them every possible chance to make out their case, we agreed to a rehearing which they proposed should take place at Collingwood, perhaps before the county court judge. Where the rehearing will take place is under consideration by the Government, but I hope my hon. friend will not conclude that there has been unnecessary delay.

We were at that time being charged by the Opposition, the gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches, with delaying this matter; and now, the hon. gentleman who has been responsible for the delay since 1896, laughs, and thinks us most unreasonable when we ask him if he has reached any decision in the matter.

In this case, Mr. Landerkin moved for copies of all the papers, and made a long speech, much longer than the speech I have made to-night. Then, the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) followed with a concise statement of the facts, which I have read. Then, the hon. leader of the Opposition, now the First Minister, took the matter up after Recess, after these other gentlemen had discussed it all afternoon, and I replied in a few remarks. Mr. McDonald, of Algoma, followed, and after him Mr. Sproule made a few remarks. Then the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) could not restrain himself, and, notwithstanding the fact that the House was weary, he spoke at great length. Sir James Grant, who is, unfortunately, not now with us, also addressed the House on this subject, and after him came the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), after whose remarks all interest seemed to drop out of the subject. This shows how the tables are turned. This case, which was cited by hon. gentlemen opposite as an example of the incapacity of the Government in 1895, stands forth to-day as a monument of the incapacity of this Government in 1899. Here we have a Minister of Marine and Fisheries who does not hesitate to say, that he does not know enough about this subject, which he and his friends discussed at such length in 1895, to be able to tell us to-day whether all these charges which were made by them against the late Government, were substantiated; and, although he knows that the Government of that time did take a well-defined position, he is to-day in the pitiable position of not being able to advise his colleagues to take any stand whatever on the case to-day. I do not suppose the hon. Minister, under the circumstances, will complain of our taking a few moments to refresh his recollection. We have given him some idea of how the Nobles must be laughing in their sleeve that they have been able to have their own way, because the Minister looks on this as so unimportant that he will not investigate it. Before I sit down——

Mr. McMULLEN. Do not sit down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I promise my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that there are several subjects on which I intend to speak. For instance, fish culture would be an interesting thing to discuss. I wish, however, to bring up a sad case in connection with the administration of this department, and to show the rather cruel and summary action of the present Minister. Captain William Babb was, in my day, the officer in charge of the life-saving station at Goderich, Ont. Those acquainted with his work know that it gave satisfaction. Not only was his record satisfactory, but I believe he had saved life, and for his heroism had been the recipient of a medal.

Mr. BENNETT. A Cobden medal?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, not a Cobden medal. If he had received a Cobden medal, and had gone back on the principles for which he received it, I am sure he would have returned it. At any rate, he served this country from 1885 down to 1899. In May of this year, he received the following summary communication from the Deputy Minister.

Ottawa, 16th May, 1899.

Sir,—I have to inform you that Captain John Cragie has been appointed coxswain of the life-saving service at Goderich, and I have to request you to hand over to him the life-boat and all Government property in your possession.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. GOURDEAU,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Capt. William Babb,
Goderich, Ont.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What age did the hon. gentleman say he was?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think he was in his prime of life, but I do not know.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a pretty safe answer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to know the age of his successor?

Mr. FOSTER. About the same age as Palmer, down in King's County.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) might mention the case of Palmer to-night. I have read the only notice that Captain Babb received of dismissal. Captain Babb writes the following letter, which Sir Charles Tupper, to whom it was addressed, has handed to me. It is as follows:—

Goderich, Ont., May 26th, 1899.

The Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper,
Ottawa.

Hon. Sir,—I inclose in this the copies of the documents relating to my appointment to and dismissal from the position of captain of the life-saving station at Goderich. As you will see, I received my appointment October, 1885, since then I have done my duty so well that there has been no complaint against either myself or crew. Instead of such being the case, the Government that appointed me had such confidence in my judgment and ability that they have requested me to visit different life-saving stations to give instructions to the crews and report, which I have done.

I refer you to the chief engineer of the Marine Department, also to the marine adviser, who I am satisfied will speak favourably of me.

My reason for writing you in this matter is that I have been dismissed without cause, unless being a Conservative is one, and I would feel very grateful to you if you or one of your supporters would make the necessary inquiries of the Government regarding the same.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
CAPTAIN WM. BABB,
Late of the Royal Navy.

I think that the hon. Minister should be able to say why an officer like Captain Babb was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should have been glad if the hon. gentleman had given me notice that he intended to bring the matter up. I would have brought the papers. I am not able to speak definitely as to the case. The reason I asked the hon. gentleman as to Captain Babb is that my impression is that he was reported by the inspector to be too old a man for the position. I think he was reported as over 80.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He writes a very good hand. I have never seen him, but I remember his appointment, and I remember receiving his reports, he had a good record.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My impression is that he was removed that a more active man might be appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) would make a note of it, so that we may learn the facts later on.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, before we leave——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite that we pass this item and go home.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have not got half through discussing this item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All right.

Mr. BENNETT. Before we leave the Noble case, I would ask the hon. Minister if he will state at the next meeting what his intentions are in regard to it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Most assuredly I would not give such a promise. It would take me at least three weeks to master the evidence. I shall certainly refer to the Department of Justice before coming to any conclusion on a matter of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I stated at first when we got through with the other part of the business, that I did not think it was fair to the House to enter upon a discussion of Estimates at that hour of the night. Unfortunately for me, I was not present when these Estimates were going through the other night. I would like very much to discuss two of the items, one being relating to oyster culture and the other to the fish breeding establishments under the new order of things. I would suggest that my hon. friend should allow the general discusion to proceed on item 207, and in that case I think item 208 might be passed. It is impossible at one o'clock in the morning, to enter on anything like a fair discussion of items involving important questions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have been 19 sessions a member of this House, and there never was one-tenth of the time taken up in discussing the estimates of the department of Marine and Fisherbies that there has been this year. This is the fifth sitting of the House which has been taken up in discussing mere formal matters which are passed every year without discussion at all. There has not been a subject brought up for discussion which should have taken more than a few minutes time. I was informed by the Prime Minister that this item would be allowed to pass, and that he so understood from the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, what is the use of our remaining here after one o'clock at night when we can make a proposition and carry it out? We will pass 208 and we will keep 207 standing, with liberty to make a general discussion on that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I recognize the power of the Opposition, and I never oppose any reasonable proposition. I do not propose to kill myself sitting here all night, until I see the time has arrived when hon. gentlemen are simply obstructing. When that time comes, I must be prepared to sit here day and night, week and month, summer and winter, as my hon. friends talk about doing. But I trust that time will not come.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 5th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Canadian Railway Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION—PROTOCOL RE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, on a recent occasion I expressed the hope that probably during the present session, the Government would be able to lay before the House the protocol of the Anglo-American Commission which was adopted by it at one of its last sittings, and which treated of the question of the Alaskan boundary. Late on Saturday evening permission was obtained from the Imperial authorities—I see also that a blue-book has been issued by the Imperial authorities on the same subject—and I beg, therefore, to lay on the Table of the House the last protocol, 63, of the commission, which is in the following terms :—

PROTOCOL No. LXIII.

Washington, February 18, 1899.

The Joint High Commission assembled pursuant to adjournment at the conference rooms, at ten o'clock a.m., all the members being present except Lord Herschell and Hon. John W. Foster, who were detained by illness, and Sir Richard J. Cartwright.

The protocol of the last meeting was read and approved.

The question of the boundary between Alaska and Canada was again taken up for discussion.

The British commissioners represented that the commission having been unable to agree on that question, it should be referred to arbitration. They, therefore, made the following proposition as a basis to be proceeded upon in framing a treaty :—

Article I.—An Arbitral Tribunal shall be immediately appointed to determine the boundary line between the territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada within the limits defined in Article III.

Article II.—The Tribunal shall consist of three jurists of repute, one on the part of Great Britain, nominated by the members for the time being of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, one on the part of the United States, nominated by the President, and of a third jurist to be selected by the two persons so nominated, in the event of their failure to agree within three months of the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty to be selected by * * *

Nobody was then suggested.

In the case of death, absence or incapacity to serve of either of the two arbitrators nominated as aforesaid, or in the event of either of such arbitrators omitting or declining or ceasing to act as such, another jurist of repute shall be forthwith substituted in his place. If such vacancy shall occur in the case of the arbitrator nominated by Great Britain, the substitute shall be appointed by the members for the time being of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council. If such vacancy shall occur in the case of the arbitrator nominated by the United States, he shall be appointed by the President. In case of the death, absence or incapacity to serve of the third arbitrator selected as aforesaid, or in the event of such arbitrator omitting or declining or ceasing to act as such, another jurist of repute shall be forthwith substituted in his place who shall be selected by the two other arbitrators, or in the event of their failure to agree within one month of such vacancy occurring by * * *

Nobody was then suggested.

Article III.—The Tribunal shall determine and delineate on suitable maps the boundary line between the territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada from the southernmost point of Prince of Wales' Island to Mount St. Elias, in accordance with the treaty between Russia and Great Britain of February 23, 1825.

Article IV.—In deciding the matters submitted, the arbitrators shall ascertain all facts which they deem necessary to a decision of the controversy, and shall be governed by the following rules, which are agreed upon by the high contracting parties as rules to be taken as applicable to the case, and by such principles of international law not inconsistent therewith as the arbitrators shall determine to be applicable to the case.

Rules.

(a) Adverse holding or prescription during a period of fifty years shall make a good title. The arbitrators may deem exclusive political control of a district, as well as actual settlement thereof, sufficient to constitute adverse holding or to make title by prescription.

(b) The arbitrators may recognize and give effect to rights and claims resting on any other ground whatever valid according to international law, and on any principles of international law which the arbitrators may deem to be applicable to the case, and which are not in contravention of the foregoing rule.

(c) In determining the boundary line, if territory of one party shall be found by the Tribunal to have been at the date of this treaty in the occupation of the subjects or citizens of the other party, such effect shall be given to such occupation as reason, justice, the principles of international law, and the equities of the case shall, in the opinion of the Tribunal, require.

I need not read the other articles of the proposed treaty, because they are purely formal, and such as are to be found in every arbitration of the kind. I shall read simply what constituted our main proposal with regard to the arbitration. The protocol goes on to say :

The commissioners of the United States announced that they accepted the proposals made as the basis of adjustment, but desired an amend-

ment in relation to the Arbitral Tribunal and a modification of rule "c" to make it conform to the present local conditions in Alaska.

They then presented the Project of Articles as modified, which was as follows :—

Article I.—An Arbitral Tribunal shall be immediately appointed to determine the boundary line between the territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, within the limits defined in the following Article III.

Article II.—The Tribunal shall consist of six impartial jurists of repute, three on the part of Great Britain, nominated by the members for the time being of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and three on the part of the United States, nominated by the President.

In the case of the death, absence or incapacity to serve of either of the arbitrators nominated as aforesaid, or in the event of either of such arbitrators omitting or declining or ceasing to act as such, another impartial jurist of repute shall be forthwith nominated in his place by the same authority which appointed his predecessor.

Article III.—The Tribunal shall determine, and, if practicable, delineate on suitable maps the boundary line between the territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada from the southernmost point of Prince of Wales' Island to Mount St. Elias, in accordance with the treaty between Russia and Great Britain dated February 28-16, 1825, and the treaty of cession from Russia to the United States dated March 30th, 1867, or as the same shall be established by said Tribunal under the rules hereinafter provided.

Article IV.—Before deciding the matters submitted, the arbitrators shall ascertain all geographical, historical and other facts which they deem necessary to a decision of the controversy, and shall be governed upon by the high contracting parties as rules to be taken as applicable to the case, and by such principles of international law not inconsistent therewith as the arbitrators shall determine to be applicable to the case.

Rules.

(a) Adverse holding or prescription during a period of fifty years shall make a good title. The arbitrators may deem exclusive political control of a district, as well as actual settlement thereof, sufficient to constitute adverse holding or to make title by prescription.

(b) The arbitrators may recognize and give effect to rights and claims resting on any other ground whatever, valid according to international law, and on any principles of international law which the arbitrators may deem to be applicable to the case, and which are not in contravention of the foregoing rule.

(c) In considering the "coast" referred to in said treaties mentioned in Article II, it is understood that the coast of the continent is intended. In determining the boundary line, if territory of one party shall be found by the Tribunal to have been at the date of this treaty in the occupation of the subjects or citizens of the other party, such effect shall be given to such occupation as reason, justice, the principles of international law and the equities of the case shall, in the opinion of the Tribunal, require; and all towns and settlements on tide-water, settled under the authority of the United States and under the jurisdiction of the United States at the date of this treaty, shall remain within the territory and jurisdiction of the United States.

With regard to the rest of the proposals of the United States commissioners, I need not go into them just now, because they are purely formal; but I want to call the attention of the House at once to the difference existing between the proposition made by the British commissioners and the proposition made by the American commissioners. The first difference of opinion was with regard to the composition of the tribunal. The tribunal proposed by the British commissioners was a tribunal of three jurists of repute—one to be selected by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for Great Britain, the other to be selected by the President of the United States, and the third to be selected by the two, or, in the event of a disagreement to be selected by a friendly power, the friendly power, however, not being named. With regard to the possible question which might arise on account of occupation, the British commissioners proposed to follow identically the rules laid down by the Venezuela Treaty. The rules laid down by the Venezuelan Treaty were in substance the following two: That adverse possession of 50 years, or the equivalent of possession, should constitute a title——

Mr. FOSTER. National.

The PRIME MINISTER. A national title; that is to say, if territory were to be found occupied by the United States which under he terms of the treaty would rightly belong to Great Britain, possession of 50 years would constitute a title; possession of less than 50 years would simply constitute an equitable title, which was to be referred altogether to the arbitrators, to determine what in their opinion law, justice and equity might require.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask my hon. friend just here, as it is a very interesting point, would the adverse possession by Russia, as well as by the United States, in this case, count on behalf of the United States contention ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I would suppose that under such circumstances the arbitrators would decide in the affirmative; but I am not here to lay down exactly what would be the interpretation. We simply thought, under the circumstances, without going minutely into the law or ethics of the case, that all the law and ethics of the case would be amply met and amply provided for by adopting the very rules which had been adopted by the two powers, Great Britain and the United States, in the case of the Venezuela difficulty. The American proposals differed from this. On the first point, as to the constitution of the tribunal, while we proposed, as I said before, a tribunal of three—one arbitrator to represent Great Britain, another to represent the United States, and an umpire—the American proposal was that the tribunal should be composed of six eminent jurists—three to be appointed by the American authorities and three to be appointed by the British authorities. With regard to the rules proposed by us according to the precedent of the Venezuela case, the Americans adopted the same rules—Rule A, rule B

and rule C—but with this important rider, that all towns and settlements on tide-water, settled on the authority of the United States and under the jurisdiction of the United States at the date of this treaty, should remain within the territory and jurisdiction of the United States, no matter whether within British territory or not. To this proposition the British commissioners made a rejoinder in the following terms of the protocol :—

A recess of the Joint High Commission was then taken until three o'clock p.m. Under reassembling, the British commissioners stated that they were absolutely unable to accept the modifications to their proposition suggested by the American commissioners, and gave the reason of their dissent as follows :—

The British commissioners having considered the amendments suggested to their proposal of yesterday for a reference to arbitration of the Alaska-Canadian boundary line by the United States commissioners, regret that they are unable to agree to same for the following reasons :—

1. Because the suggested amendment to Article II does not provide a Tribunal which would necessarily and in the possible event of differences of opinion, finally dispose of the question.

On the 11th of February the British commissioners submitted that in their opinion "such provision can only be made, in the term of the protocol (in default of agreement as to the boundary) by an agreement, for some steps to be taken, which will, if taken, necessarily result in a delimitation of the whole boundary."

They adhere most strongly to this opinion, and cannot depart from it.

2. Because the suggestion in subsection "c" of Article IV that "all towns or settlements on tide-water, settled under the authority of the United States and under the jurisdiction of the United States at the date of this treaty shall remain within the territory and jurisdiction of the United States," is a marked and important departure from the rules of the Venezuela boundary reference, which provided that all equities arising from possession or other facts alleged by either of the parties to the reference, should be left for the consideration and determination of the arbitration, and be given by them such weight as reason, justice, and the principles of international law and the equities of the case should require. The words added by the United States commissioners claim that an effect should be given to their occupation of land in British territory, which justice, reason, and the equities of the case do not require.

The British commissioners further object to the declaration added to the first part of rule "c" as follows :—

"In considering the 'coast' referred to in said treaties mentioned in Article III, it is understood that the coast of the continent is intended."

While it was probably only intended by this clause that the line should be drawn upon the continent, the language used is open to misconstruction.

Holding these views, the British commissioners are of the opinion that no useful end will be served by further pressing at the present time the negotiations, and must refer the matter to their Government.

In the exchange of views in respect to the constitution of the Arbitral Tribunal which followed this communication, inquiry was made by the United States commissioners whether the British commissioners had considered the question of selecting an umpire from the American continents.

To this it was replied that they had considered it, and thought it most objectionable, in view of the policy long maintained and recently reasserted by the Government of the United States towards the other countries on the said continents. The selection of an umpire by any such nation would not in their opinion offer the guarantee of impartiality which is the first qualification requisite for the discharge of the duties entrusted to him.

In view of the reference of the subject to their Government, as announced by the British commissioners, the commissioners of the United States regarded it unnecessary to make any further observations upon the subject of the Alaskan boundary.

They then proposed that the Joint High Commission should proceed to a determination of the remaining subjects of difference named in the original protocol. They regarded it as unwise to further defer the adjustments so nearly concluded after full consideration. Several subjects were so far advanced as to assure the probability of a settlement. If, then, all differences except one could now be adjusted, would it not be a most commendable advance in neighbourly friendship ? Could not our respective Governments be trusted to settle the principal remaining difference by direct negotiations ?

The United States commissioners further regretted the suspension for any long time of the negotiations, in view of the progress already made in solving the differences.

They therefore urged that the Joint High Commission should advance to a conclusion their negotiations upon the remaining subjects as early as possible.

The British commissioners replied that all such questions should be deferred until the boundary question had been disposed of, either by agreement or a reference to arbitration. The manner in which they would be prepared to adjust some of the other important matters under consideration must depend, in their view, upon whether it is possible to arrive at a settlement of all the questions which might at any time occasion acute controversy and even conflict.

The Joint High Commission thereupon adjourned until Monday, February 20th, at ten o'clock in the forenoon.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that, in the case of a communication of this kind, a motion for leave to introduce or an order is not necessary. It may be introduced by command of His Excellency, which is according to the English practice, and then, in order that a discussion or observations may not be prevented by the rules of the House, the Prime Minister will move that the communication be laid on the Table.

The PRIME MINISTER. I move that this communication be now laid on the Table, and be printed, and the rule 94 suspended.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like, Mr. Speaker, in the first place, to ask my right hon. friend, if he is not able to carry us further. This leaves us where the commission adjourned until the 2nd day of August, but it would be interesting, after all the discussion that has taken place and the statements given to the press by the United States—statements, in fact, I may say, semi-official—to know whether my right hon. friend is in a position to take the House into his confidence as to whether an agreement

for an arbitration had been arrived at, or, at all events, for a modus vivendi pending arbitration, or as to whether an arrangement for an arbitration had been arrived at between the United States and Great Britain, but was prevented by the fact that the Canadian Government were not prepared to agree to the modus vivendi, as proposed. I do not know whether my right hon. friend is free to make any further communications; but, if so, should be glad to have them made now.

The PRIME MINISTER. There was no proposal whatever, I am at liberty to say, for a modus vivendi, pending the negotiations. What was proposed was the terms of an arbitration for a permanent settlement of this boundary, and these are under negotiation at this moment. I am not in a position—and regret it very much—as the negotiations are still pending, to give to the House communication of what is taking place. There have been communications in the American press, imputing one thing and another to Canada, but, so long as the negotiations are pending, I have no authority from the Imperial Government to make any communication to the House. With regard to a modus vivendi, I may say, there has been no proposal to have one, but a proposition was made to have a provisional boundary established on the Lynn Canal. For the last two years, we have had a provisional boundary accepted by the two countries, on the summit of White Pass and the summit of Chilkoot Pass, and a proposal was made to us a few days ago to have a provisional boundary put up on the Dalton Trail. We have sent a proposition in accordance with that, and I believe I will be in a position very soon to lay it before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, that the protocols—which they really are—as they exist between the two parties, were pretty fairly understood before, and this brings me to the conclusion that the position I took was the correct one, namely, that the statement of the difficulty, or the impasse, at which the commissioners had arrived with regard to the boundary question, and the remission of that for diplomatic treatment between the United States and Great Britain, virtually amounted to a suspension of the proceedings, and that the British commissioners ought not to have adjourned the proceedings of the commission, which practically were arrested until that question was disposed of. As the case was stated by the communication made to the public, under the authority of my right hon. friend and the Hon. Mr. Fairbanks, the leader of the American commission, it appeared that, although this difficulty had been reached in dealing with the question of the boundary, they had adjourned, after having remitted that question to their respective Governments, to the 2nd day of August, and without stating that the meeting on the 2nd day of August would only take place in case this subject, in the meantime, were referred to arbitration and the question practically settled by an international arbitration agreeable to both countries. I think, therefore, that the position, taken by the Government on that occasion, as now explained by these protocols and the statement with which we are now favoured, brings us very much to the same conclusion that the action taken—and, I think, taken very properly—by Her Majesty's commissioners on this question, was that, until the Alaskan boundary question was absolutely removed by settlement or by arbitration, no further proceedings should take place. I merely mention that in passing, because it, to my mind, presents the position taken by Her Majesty's commissioners on that occasion in a stronger and a better light than viewed in the light of the information we had when the commission broke up.

I may say, that I called the attention of my right hon. friend some time ago to what I regarded as a question that might assume a good deal of importance, and that was the adoption of the Venezuela precedent as the one to be followed in the case of the Alaskan boundary. How the United States of America could, for a single moment, raise any question or controversy upon a proposal, such as the British commissioners made, that the Venezuela precedent should be taken and adopted in the case of the Alaskan boundary, I am utterly at a loss to imagine. Because, as we all know, the Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lord Salisbury, receded very much from the position he originally took in regard to the question, and a compromise was arrived at by which Great Britain agreed not to press her claim to any territory which was not shown to have been in adverse possession for over fifty years. This was a great concession. What I feared was that the adoption of that precedent in the case of Alaska might raise a very important question. It is true that it is only about twenty-seven years, I think, since the United States of America came into possession of Alaska, making their purchase from Russia and acquiring the rights of Russia as they were under the Treaty of 1825. But the Treaty of 1825 between Russia and Great Britain carries us away back for over seventy years. And we remember that my right hon. friend, and also, and more especially the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), notwithstanding a very strong caution from this side of the House made a declaration on the floor of Parliament that adverse possession had been had along that coast from time immemorial—that is the term used, I think, by the Minister of the Interior, meaning that it had been in possession of Russia, and afterwards of the United States as the purchaser of Russia's claims. I want to draw my right

hon. friend's attention before it becomes too late—and until the matter is finally closed it is not too late—to the fact that, so far as Venezuelan boundary was concerned, it was a matter of comparative indifference to Great Britain whether this settlement or that settlement along the line in controversy should belong to one country or the other; but as it is a matter of immense importance to Canada that adverse possession should not establish a title to anything that was not included as belonging to Russia under the Treaty of 1825. That treaty between Russia and Great Britain established an actual line of demarkation as well as could be established on paper. It provided that the boundary should be a certain line of longitude until you come to Mount St. Elias, and from Mount St. Elias down to Prince of Wales' Island, a line ten marine leagues from the coast line was to be followed. The question, what is the coast line is the matter in controversy between Great Britain and the United States—whether it should follow the general coast line, or whether it should include the upper waters of the indentations or inlets. The contention of Great Britain always has been that the coast line should follow along the general contour of the sea-coast, not following the inlets to their upper waters. The point to which I wish to call special attention is whether Russia might not set up a claim that she has been in possession of that territory, and that, under a reference in which the Venezuela precedent was followed, the international experts would be precluded from declaring this to be territory belonging to Canada. So it might become a matter of the most vital importance to establish how far back the United States or the Russian claim of possession adverse to Great Britain could go so far as affects this line from Mount St. Elias to Prince of Wales Island. I do not intend to raise any controversy or discussion further than to draw my right hon. friend's attention to this point, as it might be an important point to consider before matters are concluded, and to express the confident hope that, under the arrangements that appear to have been pretty well arrived at by the Peace conference, this matter will undoubtedly be settled at no distant day by a reference to such an international board of arbitration as a question over which two such great nations as Great Britain and the United States cannot afford, in the 19th century, to have very long controversy.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend and the House will permit me, I desire to make only one or two observations upon the line of argument he has advanced. We came to the conclusion, after giving the matter our best thought, that the only rules which could be adopted in the position of things which existed in that distant part of the country, were the rules so recently adopted for the settlement of the Venezuelan difficulty. With regard to the occupation by Russia, I do not know how far it is a matter at the moment affecting the case.

Supposing it to be true that Russia had, at the head of the Lynn Canal, for instance, such possession or occupation as would constitute a title under the terms of the Venezuelan treaty, still, the fact remains that under our construction of the treaty, the line crosses the Lynn Canal at a point which would leave those settlements clearly within Canadian territory. If it be determined by the arbitrators that that is the real line under the Treaty of 1825, then, Russia, by recognizing that line as the boundary gave up her claim to the territory on which those settlements were, notwithstanding that she had those settlements and was, in that sense, in possession.

I will not follow the argument further. I hope, with my hon. friend, in fact, I feel sure with him, that we shall have the question referred, and I hope before long, to arbitration. The experts and lawyers will find abundant work in the settlement of the questions involved, and I do not know that any discussion in Parliament to-day can throw more light on the subject.

Mr. WALLACE. The Prime Minister has stated that the British blue-books contain the information he has imparted to us in these protocols. I would like to ask if the British blue-books contain information about the other subjects that were under consideration by the commissioners?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, they contain no information on the other subjects. This subject of the boundary was referred by the commissioners to their respective Governments, the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United States. Therefore, the question is no longer within the jurisdiction of the commission, and that is the reason why it has been given to the public now. The other matters are still under consideration and within the jurisdiction of the commission.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERY OVERSEER LENOIR.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to lay upon the Table of the House certain papers relating to the dismissal of Fishery Overseer Lenoir.

Motion agreed to.

SHERIFF OF YUKON TERRITORY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Referring to a return to an Address of the House of Commons, 15th May, 1899, relating to

the appointment of a sheriff for Yukon territory—

(a) Was a bond given by the sheriff ?

(b) Was an oath taken by the sheriff referred to ?

(c) Was the clerk of the court while Mr. Wade was out of the Yukon district and before Mr. Girouard was appointed ?

(d) Did Mr. Snell act as clerk of the court for any period, and if so, what period ?

(e) If Mr. Snell so acted, under what authority did he act ?

(f) If he acted, was a commission issued to him ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to question No. 1 I would say (a) That Mr. Constantine, the inspector of Mounted Police, was the first sheriff appointed to the Yukon Territory. He received no salary for his services until after his retirement as sheriff, and no bond seems to have been exacted of him. He resigned his office. Next, Mr. Harper was sheriff. He was in the territory. He was written to, and informed that he would be required to give a bond, but up to the present time no bond has been received ; (b) Cannot say, but, no doubt, as the sheriff is an officer of the court, the judge would administer the oath of office before he entered upon his duties ; (c) H. A. Bliss acted as clerk of the court. Have no doubt he was appointed by the court to discharge these duties during Mr. Wade's absence, and before the appointment of Mr. Girouard ; (d) We have no information in the department in respect to Mr. Snell. If he so acted, he was doubtless appointed by the court, and would act under its authority ; (e) Answered above ; (f) The department of Justice has no information upon the subject. The distance is so great, the country has hitherto been so difficult of access, that if an officer resigns it might be unknown for months afterwards, and under these circumstances it is fitting that the judge should appoint an officer to discharge these duties, as in the Yukon district the judge constitutes the court, and the clerk is an officer of his court.

COMMISSION TO MAJOR WALSH.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

By virtue of what Act and section thereof, if any, and if no statute by virtue of what authority or warrant was the commission under the Great Seal issued to Major Walsh as chief executive officer for the Yukon district ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Revised Statutes of Canada, section 1, chapter 19, as amended by 56 Vict., chapter 14.

POST OFFICE, VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Hughes) asked :

1. Is the ownership of the old post office site and building in Victoria, B.C., vested in the Dominion Government or in the Provincial Government ?

2. Under what title is it held ?

3. Has the Government offered this property for sale either by public or private tender ?

4. If so, what offers, if any, were received for same, in whose names, and for what amounts ?

5. Has the Government rented out the building, or any portion of it, for business purposes ?

6. If so, to whom, and at what annual rentals ?

7. Does the Government pay any municipal taxes on same ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Ownership vested in the Dominion Government. 2. By a provincial Act dated 1st of July, 1876. 3. Yes, by public advertisement. 4. Two tenders were received, viz. : Thomas Bros. & Co., $12,500 ; A. Williams & Co., $20,000. 5. Yes, a portion of the building is rented out. 6. Hardress Clarke, $75 per month ; Humber & Campbell, $55 per month ; Lewis Blank, $70 per month; Danes & Ruckhabor, $55 per month. 7. No.

RELATIVES OF J. S. WILLISON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Is J. W. Willison, Crown timber agent in Yukon, a cousin of J. S. Willison, Esq., editor of the Toronto "Globe" newspaper ?

2. Is William Wright, an employee in the recording office at Dawson, a nephew of the said J. S. Willison ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Neither the pedigree of the editor of the "Globe" nor of the officers mentioned, is on record in the department, and the Government have no information upon the subject. I am quite unable to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTES OF CANADA.

Mr. HENDERSON (by Mr. Hughes) asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to provide for a consolidation of the Statutes of Canada this year ?

2. If not, when may such consolidation be expected ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not in a position to give any information on this subject to my hon. friend to-day. The matter is under consideration.

REBUILDING OF THE SOURIS BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the Government had under consideration a certain claim for damages arising from a contract awarded to Messrs. Thomas Mellish and George Wightman for rebuilding the Souris breakwater, in Prince Edward Island, about the year 1895 ?

2. Is the Government aware that the contractors in this case were prevented from beginning work as early in the season as desirable owing to delay on the part of the Department of Public Works in attending to the signing of the contract and delays on the part of the Government engineer in charge ?

3. Is the Government aware that such delay retarded the prosecution of the work, and left it only partially completed when the stormy season and winter set in, with the result that the greater part of the work constructed was carried away ?

4. If the Government has had this claim under consideration, is it intended to repay those contractors for their loss ?

5. If the Government resists payment, on what grounds does it base such resistance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. No, the contractors signified their acceptance of their contract on the 15th of July, 1893, the contract was sent down on the 25th, and was signed on the 3rd of August following, so that only about 15 days elapsed between the acceptance and signing of the contract. 3. No, the following memorandum made in June, 1897, by the then chief engineer of the department, gives what has been so far considered by the department as the correct statement of the facts : Messrs. Wightman & Mellish signed their contract on or about the 3rd of August, 1893. On the 23rd of August 150 feet of breakwater was carried away. Mr. Hogan was immediately asked to prepare a plan showing what new work would be required to fill the breach made by the sea. On the 31st of August, Mr. Hogan was authorized to obtain an offer from Wightman & Mellish to repair the breach. On the 1st of September, the contractors offered to do the necessary repairs for $3,200. On the 2nd, authority was given to accept the contractors' offer. On the 4th they were notified. The work was finished on the 24th of October, and on the 6th of November an account in favour of the contractors for $3,200 was rendered. While they were thus repairing the breach they commenced work on their contract, which consisted in the construction of a new timber block. Whether they neglected to properly load their crib or not, it is on record that on the 8th of September what was done of this contract was carried away by storm. They, however, continued the work and completed it on the 22nd of June, and the final estimate was rendered on the 10th of July. (Signed), Louis Coste. 4. The department has in its possession a receipt signed by the contractors on the 30th July, 1894, accepting the sum of $5,600 then paid to them in full compensation and final settlement of all claim which they may have or have had in connection with their contract. A copy of the receipt is attached :

Department of Public Works, Canada.

Received from Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented by the hon. the Minister of Public Works of Canada, the sum of five thousand and six hundred dollars and no cents of lawful money of Canada, being the balance due us on our contract price for the construction of an additional block to the breakwater at Souris, P.E.I., the said sum being accepted by us in full compensation and final settlement of all claims which we may have or have had in connection with the said contract.

Mr. MARTIN.

In consideration whereof, we do hereby acquit and relase Her said Majesty, represented as aforesaid, her heirs and successors, from all past and future claims and demands whatsoever for the same in connection therewith.

Signed at Montague, this 30th day of July, A.D. 1894.

(Sgd.) WIGHTMAN & MELLISH,
Per Geo. Wightman.
(L. S.)

Signed in the presence of
(Sgd.) JAS. M. WIGHTMAN.

POSTMASTER OF EAST TORONTO.

Mr. MACLEAN (by Mr. Sproule) asked :

Has any person or persons been recommended to the Postmaster General for the vacant position of postmaster of East Toronto ? If so, what are the names ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Yes, the widow of the late postmaster was recommended for the position.

POSTMASTER OF STE. EULALIE.

Mr. GAUVREAU (by Mr. Flint) asked :

1. Was an inquiry held by the Post Office Department in the matter of Mr. Legris, postmaster of Ste. Eulalie, county of Nicolet ?

2. If so, by whom and when ?

3. Was a report made, and what are the conclusions thereof ?

4. Subsequently to the inquiry were not affidavits by the postmaster, or by other parties, forwarded to the department ?

5. If so, by whom ?

6. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to discharge Mr. Legris should the report not be favourable to him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes. 2. By the post office inspector of the Quebec division, acting through Mr. J. H. Larue of his office. 3. An inquiry was held on the 6th April, 1898. The inspector's report was made under date the 3rd of May, 1898, and it showed that the postmaster's assistant (his wife), who, having lost a post card which had arrived at the Ste. Eulalie post office, and concerning the arrival of which she had notified the addressee, substituted another card for it, on which she wrote the substance, as she remembered it, of the communication on the original card. This, it appears, was done without the knowledge of the postmaster, and, as the assistant alleges, under the influence of great alarm at the discovery that she had mislaid a card which she remembered was marked 'pressé." Charges were also made against the postmaster of having sometimes misdelivered letters, read post cards and opened packets of newspaper matter. 4. Yes. 5. By Alphonse Gaudet, of St. Celestin, and Joseph Ernest Houde, of Three Rivers, their tenor being in the direction of exculpating the assistant from a charge brought against her of having given information (alleged to have been derived from a post card) respecting the business relations of the two parties.

Both testified that no such relations existed between them as were assumed in the charge and that no such post card as mentioned therein had ever been sent by Mr. Houde to Mr. Gaudet. Whatever action is taken will be such as the facts appear to warrant.

PURCHASE OF IRON DOORS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. HODGINS (by Mr. Hughes) asked :

1. Were a number of iron doors purchased for the public buildings during the past year ?
2. If so, how many ?
3. By whom were they supplied ?
4. Were tenders called for by advertisement or by letter ?
5. If by letter, how many parties were notified?
6. To whom was the order given ?
7. Why were not tenders publicly invited ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). On behalf of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Tarte, I beg to answer the hon. gentleman's questions as follows :—1. Yes. 2. Four sets. 3. The Edward Cavanagh Co., Montreal. 4. By letter. 5. One. 6. The Edward Cavanagh Co. 7. Because it would have been a useless expenditure of money.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. WILLIAM J. POUPORE (Pontiac). Mr. Speaker, on the 31st of May last the privilege was accorded to me by the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to introduce a discussion of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal question. On that occasion, as you will remember, Sir, there was a very animated debate, in which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House took part. At the close of that debate, I was very much pleased with the concluding portion of the reply of the right hon. First Minister to the proposition which was made by me on behalf of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company. The concluding words of the right hon. Prime Minister were these ; speaking of other enterprises, the Prime Minister said :

> At the present time, unfortunately, the bondholders of the Chignecto Ship Railway are in a very unfortunate position, because they have been induced to invest their money by the moral sanction and authority of the Canadian Government. That is unfortunate in many ways, and my hon. friend will, I am sure, agree with me that it is the duty of this Government to take every means to see that no scheme is put upon the English market with its sanction unless it has before it a fairly reasonable assurance of the commercial success of the scheme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here are the words to which I want to draw your particular attention. The Prime Minister proceeds :

> When that is the position of this project, the Government will be prepared to look into it. Certainly the scheme is one that has merit in it. Assuredly it is one that is not to be dismissed contemptuously. On the contrary, my hon. friend has made a case, and a case which the Government is bound to take into consideration ; but he will agree with me, I am sure, that he cannot fairly expect the Government at this time to take up the scheme, although he can expect the Government will give to it its very best consideration.

Mr. Speaker, since that debate took place and since that pronouncement of the right hon. First Minister, a good deal of agitation has taken place, not only in Canada, but in Great Britain, over this great canal project. Meetings have been held generally throughout the Ottawa valley. And, when I say the Ottawa valley, I mean the whole district lying between the city of Montreal and the mouth of the French River. I claim that the Ottawa valley extends from Montreal City clear through to the Georgian Bay, because that whole section of country is tributary to the city of Montreal, and forms practically part of the Ottawa valley. In addition to that, we have a valley running from Mattawa to the head of Temiscamingue Lake, which is a portion of the Ottawa valley, and this country is tributary to Montreal and to the seaports of Canada also. As I have remarked, meetings were held at various towns along the Ottawa River, from Hawkesbury to Mattawa. We find a general consensus of opinion that the Government of the day should lend to this project any assistance necessary to start it towards construction and to carry it to completion. We not only find that this is the opinion of the people of the Ottawa valley, but we find that the same opinion prevails in Europe ; we find, in fact, that it prevails in the United States of America. On the occasion of a visit of American gentlemen here last January—the Ticket Agents' Association—we found, at a dinner given in the Russell House, these gentlemen saying that, if the engineering difficulties were not insurmountable, and if a sufficient depth of water could be found at the water level, American capital could be found to push this work to completion.

If that be the view entertained by some very progressive American gentlemen, is it surprising that we should expect that the Government of Canada should give to this project all the assistance in its power, in order that it may be carried to completion ? In addition to the other meetings to which I have referred, we find that the different boards of trade in the Ottawa Valley have endorsed the scheme, and have passed resolutions asking the Government of Canada to assist it. We find that the county councils throughout the whole Ottawa Valley have unanimously adopted resolutions asking the Government to assist this scheme, so as to enable those who are willing to invest their money, to proceed with the work. In addition, we find that the public opinion of the country is so much in favour of the

project that the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), at a banquet given in the Monument Nationale, Montreal, expressed himself entirely in favour of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal. Let me give a reference to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works on that occasion :

Mr. Tarte is grappling hard with the question of transportation. In his speech in Montreal on Tuesday night he stated that negotiations were going on between the Government and the Grand Trunk for a route between Collingwood and Toronto so as to bring the upper lakes in direct communication over the Grand Trunk Railway with the Intercolonial Railway and maritime seaboard.

The Minister of Public Works says that he would recommend the further deepening of the Toronto and Collingwood harbours if the Grand Trunk instead of carrying its trade to Portland would take it to Montreal and deliver to the ocean steamers in the summer.

Mr. Tarte's idea is to make Montreal the Buffalo of Canada. With elevators in Montreal in which to store the grain, the same as at Buffalo, he says, there is no reason why this should not be done. In winter the Erie Canal is closed, and the trade goes by the railways to the seaboard. The Intercolonial Railway ought to be able to handle a large part of the traffic from Montreal which now finds its way by American routes.

As a result of proper harbour improvements, Mr. Tarte gives Kingston as an illustration. He sent a dredge there and had the harbour deepened. Now two additional elevators were built at Kingston, and 15,000,000 bushels of grain were handled there. The department gave improved facilities to the Parry Sound at Coteau, and about 15,000,000 bushels of grain are now handled at that point.

Mr. Tarte is surprised at the statement which came from Toronto that the Government was side-tracking that city by recognizing the Parry Sound road. He did not believe in this. Trade would flow in its natural channel, and there was enough for both routes. "If I had my way," said Mr. Tarte, "I would build the Georgian Bay Canal and I would make traffic arrangements with the Parry Sound in connection with the Intercolonial, and I would like to see the Collingwood and Toronto route straightened out. With the improvement of our water and rail communication and the proper equipment of the harbour at Montreal, there is no limitation to the possibilities of development in the Canadian carrying trade."

Now, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that any thoughtful Canadian will at once see that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte)—who, I regret to see, is not in his seat at this moment—has grasped the correct idea as to the solution of the transportation question in Canada. He sees Canada's needs in this direction, and has seen them for some time, and I judge of him by his actions: he has done everything in his power to improve the facilities of the different ports of Canada. He is now ridiculed by some, because he speaks of expending more money. Spending more money to do what ? Spending more money to improve the harbour accommodation in Montreal. Is he to be condemned for that ? I say, that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), in taking the ground he has, in expressing himself as he has, and in doing as he has done since he became Minister of Public Works, has stamped himself, in my estimation, as a statesman of the first water. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) realizes that, in order to bring our traffic through Canadian seaports, we must spend money to improve the facilities of these seaports. I can quite understand that it may be somewhat distasteful to some of my friends, that I should thus express myself, but I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that with me this is a non-political question. It must be kept non-political, for, if we were to bring it into the ordinary, every-day party fights in this country, we could never hope to succeed with this project. In my estimation, Sir, this question is away and above any political partisanship ; it is away and above any little sectarian cry that may be raised ; it is a national question ; it is an Imperial question, and I am one of those who is willing to give credit where credit is due, when I see any Minister so conducting himself and managing his department as to assist in solving this very great problem of cheap transportation. I again want to quote from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). In his speech on the Address, he thus expressed himself :

"But I ask this House and the country if the time has not come when the port of Montreal should be made a genuine national harbour? The port of Montreal is the distributing point between the east and the west. Is it not a crying shame that out of about 50,000,000 tons of trade on the great lakes, on that magnificent reservoir of great lakes, we get scarcely anything, although our St. Lawrence route is the shortest ? Are we not bound to make it the best ? It is the shortest, and it is possible to make it the best. I say that not only is it possible, but it has already been done. Since taking this office I have felt a deep interest in the transportation question. It is not a Montreal question ; it is not a St. John or Halifax question ; it is not a Toronto question—it is a national question par excellence."

He discussed in detail the several proposals for bringing the trade of the lakes and the North-west to Montreal. "A great deal," continued Mr. Tarte, "has been said about the Georgian Bay Canal. I am not prepared to give my opinion to-day as to the best mode of carrying on that work, but I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion that project is worthy of all consideration."

This is the comment of the Ottawa "Citizen" upon these observations :

While the "Citizen" has had occasion to animadvert upon certain expenditures authorized by the Minister of Public Works, it congratulates him upon his recognition of the merits of the projected Georgian Bay Canal. It is a work which will develop an important portion of the province of Ontario, and greatly facilitate and cheapen the cost of transportation from the lakes to the seaboard, and we can assure the Government that in fostering this enterprise it will merit and receive the approval of the people of Canada.

Again, let me quote from the Ottawa "Citizen," under the heading "A General Rally Needed":

"Canada will be the highway of the world," according to Sir William Van Horne, when certain conditions are complied with. And there is probably no better authority on such subjects than Sir William. But the condition must be complied with, and promptly. What those conditions are have been fully described, but they have been very clearly summarized by Mr. Tarte in the statement which appeared in these columns last night. The great need at present is adequate harbour accommodation, and this must be provided with all possible expedition. The country will not object to any expenditure, even though the figure be large, for this purpose. Every dollar so expended will yield a hundred-fold within a year or two. With the ports on the St. Lawrence, and sea-coast, placed on a satisfactory footing, there need be no doubt as to the result. Nor need there be any doubt as to the route by which the traffic from the North-west will pass, and the Minister of Public Works does not speak on that phase of the question with any ambiguity. The traffic from the west will, in his opinion, naturally flow to Montreal, but he appears also to see clearly that it will be by way of the Ottawa. "As to the Parry Sound Railway, the case is a very clear one indeed." Quite so. Quietly, and without any great effort, that road has demonstrated the fact that it supplies a great want.

Now, you will see that the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has shown himself on different occasions to be a man of action and a man willing to keep pace with the times, is aware, as I am, and as are other men who have taken the trouble to look into this question, that the American people at the present moment are putting forth tremendous efforts to improve their waterways. At a dinner given recently in New York, at which there were present some 1,700 guests, all men of high financial standing, Mayor Van Wyck, who presided, pointed out that Canada was now being exercised and agitated over the construction of the shortest and most direct route to the seaboard from the great lakes, by way of the Ottawa River; and he sounded a note of warning to his hearers that the American people must be up and doing, that they could not afford to remain dormant or sluggish, that the moment the Ottawa River channel was opened up from the great lakes to Montreal, a great part of the traffic which now goes by Buffalo and the Erie Canal would be deflected and brought down the Ottawa River route. This was not the only occasion on which that opinion has been expressed by Americans. The following is an article from the New York "Sun":—

THE PROPOSED SHIP CANAL IN CANADA.

The idea of connecting Montreal with the upper great lakes by means of a canal is again urgently advocated by Mr. McLeod Stewart, a son of the Canadian politician by whom the scheme was first brought forward some fifty years ago. It is worth while to note what may be said for the project, if only to emphasize the duty of prosecuting with energy the work of widening and deepening our own Erie Canal.

The proposed canal would run from the mouth of the French River at the northern end of Georgian Bay, the north-eastern angle of Lake Huron, to Montreal, on the St. Lawrence, by a line as nearly straight as any stretch of inland navigation can be expected to follow. Its advocates maintain not only that it would shorten the distance between Chicago and Liverpool materially, and do away with the delay and expense incident to transhipments, but also that—owing to the configuration of the country traversed—it could be constructed at a relatively small cost. Of these assertions the former at all events seems to be borne out by the facts. The distance between Georgian Bay and Montreal is 430 miles; the length of the whole route from Chicago to Liverpool by way of the projected canal would be 3,780 miles, while by way of Buffalo, the Erie Canal and Hudson River to New York, and thence to Liverpool, the distance is 4,495 miles, or via the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals 4,148 miles.

Now, as regards the cost of construction. It appears from the report of the surveyors made half a century ago that of the 430 miles between Georgian Bay and Montreal only about 58 would need to be canalized. The rest of the waterway is provided by nature in the form of a chain of lakes and rivers. The French River itself is a series of small connected lakes, after which, as you proceed eastward, comes Lake Nipissing, 40 miles in length; next are encountered Trout Lake, Turtle Lake, Talon Lake, Aiguilles Lake and Chant Lake. The confluence of the Mattawan and Ottawa rivers is then reached, and the latter waterway is followed to its junction with the St. Lawrence. It was doubtless owing to the fact that so little portage was required on this route that Champlain was led to adopt it in 1615 on his way to the great inland seas of the continent; for the same reason it formed for many years the principal channel for carrying on the business of the Hudson's Bay Company.

The cost originally computed by Government engineers was $25,000,000, but this was for a canal only 10 feet deep and from 100 to 60 feet wide. It remains to be seen how much this figure would have to be increased for a canal possessing depth and width enough to admit vessels of the modern type proceeding directly from Liverpool to Chicago.

This is a mistaken idea, Mr. Speaker. There is no intention of opening up a waterway that will admit vessels which will proceed all the way from Liverpool to Chicago. This to my mind would be absurd. Seagoing vessels are not adapted to river or canal navigation. But I will quote the concluding portion of this article to show that American gentlemen are on the qui vive in regard to this question. The article continues:

As the present tendency of deep-sea cargo ships is toward enormous dimensions, beyond the possibility of accommodation in canal locks, of which there would be many on the proposed route, it may be deemed wise to contemplate a single transhipment at Montreal, and to construct a canal of moderate size, from 15 to 16 feet in depth, suitable for lake steamers.

The objection to the projected waterway is the number of locks that would be required. Even though the level of the summit lakes should be lowered, as we are told it might be, the highest point of the canal would be 624 feet above Montreal, and 83 feet above Georgian Bay. There are no mechanical ob-

stacles, however, that might not be surmounted, provided the canal be designed for vessels drawing not more than 16 feet. There is reason to believe that the scheme is being earnestly commended to the Canadian Government.

While I am on that head, I would like to quote another of the American papers to show this House that this question is receiving general attention everywhere. Here is an article which appeared in the Utica "Globe" of the 1st of April, 1899:

CANADA'S SHORT WATERWAY.

American Commerce Face to Face with a Killing Rival.

The recent announcement of plans for the construction of great elevators and other terminal appliances for the grain trade at Montreal by American capitalists is highly interesting and sngnificant, says the New York "Tribune." Taken alone it would mean a menace to the grain trade of New York and the other Atlantic ports of the United States. For the distance from Montreal to Liverpool is 250 miles less than that from New York. But, taken in connection with Canada's great canal scheme, it is immeasurably more significant.

We have already told of the improvements that have been made to the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, and their vast superiority over the canals of New York state, but the Dominion is not satisfied with them. It has entered upon the construction of a short-cut waterway from the St. Lawrence to the upper lakes without entering Lakes Ontario and Erie at all.

I wish that what is stated here was true. It says that the Government has entered upon this work. It has not started yet, I regret to say, but I hope it soon will start.

It now has a canal from Montreal to Ottawa. It will extend it along the line of the Ottawa River to Lake Nipissing, and thence along French River to Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. It has indeed actually begun this vast enterprise, and expects to have it done and the whole waterway open to traffic within three years. At first this canal will not be more than twice the depth of the Erie Canal. Even that will permit large lake barges and steamers to pass through it directly from Duluth, Port Arthur and elsewhere on the lakes to tide-water or to the great terminal which Americans are to build at Montreal. But it is intended in time to deepen it so as to give passage to ocean steamers. Then the latter will be able to take on cargoes on Lake Superior and go straight across to Liverpool without breaking bulk.

That is not correct.

This directness of route will in itself give Canada a great advantage over the United States. But the route is also much shorter than any of ours. It is 375 miles shorter than the St. Lawrence River route, and 450 miles——

That is another mistake. It is 900 miles shorter.

——shorter than by way of the Erie Canal. The distance from Chicago to Liverpool by way of the Ottawa Canal will be 700 miles shorter than by way of the Erie Canal.

There is a contradiction there.

Moreover, while the Erie route includes 360 miles of artificial waterway, the St. Lawrence route 71 miles, the Ottawa route will have only 30 miles, all the rest being natural waterway. It is calculated that the Ottawa route will be in point of time four days shorter than the Erie and a day and a half shorter than the St. Lawrence.

Such is the rivalry which Canada, backed by all the resources of the British Empire, is about to offer to the grain and other trade of the northern United States. It is idle to suppose that the merchandise which comes through the Sault Ste. Marie and the Strait of Mackinaw will come to New York on its way to Europe, with costly and tedious transhipments at Buffalo and New York, when it can go by way of Ottawa and Montreal without a single transhipment and in four days less time, or rather with the transshipments on the Erie route a week less. When it is possible, as it will be in three years, to send a cargo from any point on Lake Superior or Lake Michigan clear to Liverpool by way of Ottawa as quickly as it can be sent to New York by way of the Erie Canal, all the European trade of the upper lakes, both Canadian and United States, will go by way of the Canadian canal. That is the interesting prospect which confronts American commerce.

There is an article written by one of the leading papers of the United States, which expresses the American idea about this project, and is not that sufficient of itself to awaken the people of Canada to the great necessity of pushing through at once this short waterway to the ocean. If there be one thing more than another that ought to induce our Government to give assistance to this waterway, that very thing expressed in the articles which I have quoted from the American press is the one which ought to prompt the Government to take action.

What is the position of Canada as regards the transportation question? Is it not a fact that last year, with all our facilities, with all our railways, with our enlarged canal system, with all put together, the total export from Montreal to Europe amounted to less than 38,000,000 bushels of grain? Is it not also a statistical fact that from the port of Buffalo 267,000,000 bushels of grain were sent on to the seaports of the United States. Now, we find that of that 267,000,000 bushels of grain shipped from Buffalo to the seaports of the United States, a large proportion came from Canadian territory. We find that the grain produced in Canada is not shipped from Canadian ports. On the contrary, it is allowed to go to American seaports, to build up those ports to the detriment of our Canadian seaports. This is why I felt it my duty to pay the compliment which I did to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), when I said that he properly gauged the situation, when he declared on several occasions that the way to bring traffic by the shortest route to Europe is to improve our harbour facilities at Montreal and Quebec. In that he struck the keynote, because without those facilities we cannot accommodate the traffic that must eventually come to those ports; but if we open up the Ottawa River Canal, if we deepen the river to fourteen feet, with our St. Lawrence waterway, we are going to attract, I firmly believe—

and that is said by men who are competent authority—from the Sault Ste. Marie Canal a large proportion of that traffic that now goes direct to Buffalo from the Duluth and Lake Superior district. It cannot be otherwise. Trade will follow the shortest and cheapest route—and we have the shortest and cheapest route—the only trouble being that it is not navigable at present. It will require the expenditure of a good deal of money to make it navigable, but what will that expenditure amount to as compared with the advantages that will accrue to Canada.

If we are going to make Montreal and Quebec the first seaports of this continent, if we are going to divert to those ports the traffic that now flows to Buffalo and keeps running day and night, the whole year round, the fifty-two elevators in that city and every railway that can come there, and during the navigable season, to the fullest extent, the capacity of the Erie Canal, and which traffic is still too great to be accommodated with promptitude at that port at all times, we must open up this short waterway. Is it unreasonable for us to think that if we open up this short waterway, which is a thousand miles closer to Liverpool than any other route, we will divert traffic by that route? And in doing so, what will be the effect at Ottawa, Quebec and Montreal and other stopping places along the route? Will it not be to increase the population during the construction itself, and is it not reasonable to suppose that a certain proportion of that population must become fixed? Why, the construction and opening of this waterway will not only increase the population, but it will develop to-day resources we are now stumbling against and that are now developing themselves, you may say. Go out twenty miles from where I stand, and you will find that we have discovered gold; you will find that a company is organized and have sunk a shaft, and is now extending its shaft down to a level of 130 feet. In the immediate vicinity of that there are other discoveries, and there is nothing to lead any one to doubt that we have untold wealth in our Ottawa valley. I need not repeat, but you will remember that last year I pointed out that on the Calumet Island, in my county, we have a deposit of galena, remarkable for its vastness, and a deposit of cobalt, lead and nickel right on that small island. Go a little further east, and at Portage du Fort we have a deposit of marble, than which there is no better to be found anywhere. In fact, I do not know of any place where you can find it so good—an immense deposit that cannot to-day be handled for the want of easy means of transportation. These are some of the things that this canal will develop, and by the development of those resources, we must add to the population of Canada. It is a very elementary statement to make that what we want in Canada is an increase of our population, and anything that will conduce to the increase of our population is a thing which Canada ought to do. We have vast areas of land, arable land fit for settlement, for agricultural purposes, vast areas of land fit for mining purposes. Take the New Ontario idea. We have immense districts there opening up every day, producing valuable minerals.

Now, the opening of this canal must of necessity serve that vast region. Outside of any other consideration, the mineral products of that country alone would warrant the Government in taking up this project and guaranteeing the bonds which it is necessary should be guaranteed before any company will undertake the construction of the canal. But, apart from the minerals, let us consider the other resources of the country. Let us take up the pulp question, upon which I said a few words in my address of last year. We find to-day that the pulp industry of Canada stands second to none in the country, so far as our woods and forests are concerned. You have not far to travel from this Chamber to see the amount of money that is invested and is being invested every day in the different portions of the Ottawa district—and I speak of the Ottawa district alone—in the erection of mills and the equipping of manufacturing establishments to produce pulp. This simply means the development of one of our great resources of a kind of wood that heretofore has been looked upon as valueless. In days gone by the province of Quebec, as well as the northern part of Ontario had as its principal, almost its only source of wealth, its pine timber. When the pine timber was removed, it was supposed that almost no other resource remained. But we find that the pulp industry is using everything that years ago was supposed to be valueless, and we find that these woods, hitherto so little regarded have become one of the greatest resources of the Ottawa valley. Then in addition to the mines and the forests there is another source of wealth, concerning which but little has been said—I speak of the production of power by electricity. In this connection I would like to call to your attention certain portions of a very valuable paper which was read at this year's meeting of the Royal Society of Canada by the President, Mr. T. C. Keefer. The subject of this address is: "Canadian water-power, and electrical products in relation to the undeveloped resources of the Dominion." In my speech of last year, I said it was estimated that some two million horse-power could be produced between the city of Montreal and the mouth of the French River. Many people thought that I was shooting over the mark. I think I can show that I was quite within the mark. I made a calculation upon the basis of the price of electrical power delivered in Montreal. I found that it sold in Montreal at $25 per horse-power per year. Now, I simply figured it out this way: If we have two million of horse-power of electricity in the Ottawa River and only get $2 per horse-

power per year, we shall have a revenue of $4,000,000 from electricity alone. In this relation I will read a portion of this paper which was read by the President of the Royal Society of Canada, a society for which every gentleman in this House and every gentleman in Canada entertains the very highest respect because it is composed of the highest men in our country intellectually and scientifically :

The substitution of electricty for steam as the motive power for railways on many roads is regarded as inevitable sooner or later. It has already taken place as regards suburban railways, notably in the case of the Charlevoix road and Hull and Aylmer Railway, where water-power is doing the work which has heretofore been done by coal. The chief obstacles to an early change on the larger roads are the hundreds of millions invested in locomotives, and the very large outlay required to equip existing steam roads with the electric system. The principal inducement would be the passenger service, owing to the increased speed possible, it being confidently stated that, with electricity, a speed considerably over 100 miles per hour could be attained. Moreover, there would be entire abolition of the poisonous smoke which drops upon the Pullman in preference to any coach ahead of it.

While the conversion of trunk lines would be attended with a cost which is for the present prohibitory, this objection does not apply to new lines which may be worked independently or in connection with electric ones. When the time arrives for such railways, water-power will have a field of usefulness of which we can at present form little conception. Water-wheels and wires would displace the coal-docks, the coal-laden vessels, the huge coal-yards, and the trains, for distributing their contents over hundreds of miles of lines.

An interior line, connecting Lake St. John, on the Saguenay, with Lake Témiscamingue, on the Ottawa (which could ultimately be extended via Missanabi, Nepigon and Lac Seul to the Saskatchewan) would be a colonization road, removed from the frontier, and one which could be worked, possibly altogether, by water-power, and open a virgin tract in which electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries might arise, as well as those connected with the products of the forests and the mine.

That is his reference to the uses in which electricity can be put. Now, he deals with the transportation question, the one I am so feebly trying to make myself understood about :

The more extended use of our water-power in the immediate future for manufacturing and mining purposes, especially for the electro-chemical and metallurgical productions, naturally leads to the consideration of the character of the output, especially with regard to markets, and transportation problems generally.

Transportation next to production is the most important commercial question to a country of vast distances, and low-priced products affording great tonnage, such as we produce, and for which we have expended hundreds of millions in canals annually, harbours, lighthouses and steamers, a sum disproportioned to our realized wealth, as it certainly is to our population. But, "noblesse oblige," we possess a vast estate, and are compelled to develop it and await results.

The question of transportation determines, to a great extent, the existence, or otherwise, of the possible industry, and enhances or diminishes the value of every article of export just in proportion to its efficiency and economy. On the other hand, where transportation is necessarily expensive, cheap production may maintain an industry, and here is where our abundant water-power may come in.

The geographical position of Canada in relation to the commercial centre of gravity of the North American continent is at least noteworthy. This centre is very near Lake Erie. From the western end of this lake the water route to the Atlantic, at the Straits of Belle Isle, follows the general direction of a great circle, which cuts the commercial heart of Europe, the shortest route, or "air line," which cuts Liverpool. Our two peninsulas, the Sarnia-Detroit, and that at Sault Ste. Marie, which are the railway gates of the lake region, afford the most direct as well as the only land routes to the Atlantic for all the north-western states, and are traversed by the trunk lines of railway. From Lake Erie, water communication on the largest scale extends through Lake Huron to the extremities of Lakes Michigan and Superior. One-third of the population of the United States are dependent upon the great lakes largely as to exports and imports, and wholly as to rates, which are fixed by the water for the rail routes.

One-half of the population of the United States is found within a radius of 400 miles from Cleveland, a Lake Erie port claimed to be second only to the Clyde as a ship-building one, and also the largest iron ore market in the world.

The paper and pulp industry, as well as some of the electro-chemicals and metallurgical ones (to the present list of which many additions may be made), are distinguished by the large tonnage produced, the output of several pulp mills exceeding 100 tons per day. For this the St. Lawrence is the natural route for exportation, and to it this heavy tonnage is of the greatest importance as a means of attracting tramps as well as liners during the open season. Increase of sea tonnage into the St. Lawrence is essential to her inland commerce ; by it only can sufficient west-bound freights be secured to attract a proper share of the commerce of the lakes, after all has been done to give to the latter a quick despatch at Montreal or Quebec. There is probably no place in the world where inland transportation is carried on with greater expedition and economy than in the valley of the St. Lawrence. This is due to the character of the inland navigation, unequalled elsewhere, and to the influence which this exerts upon the railways competing with it ; and also, because the valley of the St. Lawrence is not only the greatest highway for agricultural products, but of mineral ones, as well as of the products of the forest and the fisheries.

More than half of the iron ore produced in the United States is mined around Lake Superior. Into this lake an increasing number of railways are pouring the produce of the vast wheat fields between it and the Rocky Mountains, and thus placing this grain within a thousand miles of Montreal, which is the nearest seaport by hundreds of miles, and the only one which can be reached by vessels capable of navigating the lakes.

Without tiring the House in reading the whole of this paper, we find that over one-half of the iron used in the United States is taken from the Lake Superior region. Not only so, but I have an article from an English paper on the same subject, showing

that England, if we had this short waterway, would transport ore from Lake Superior to England, they would use the ores of Lake Superior in the English furnaces. This is a matter of very great importance, as I am sure it will be admitted by every one who has given any thought to the question. Here is an article which appeared in the "Canadian Trade Review":

The exportation of Lake Superior iron ore to England may appear to be a rosy dream of the dim future, but with an all-water route, English capital in control of a good ore property, best machinery at loading and unloading points, and ocean-going vessels specially constructed for such trade, it will be accomplished within a very short period. It is a well-known fact that the native ores of England are about exhausted, and that what remains is of a lean variety, also that while there may still be a large deposit of ore in the Bilboa district, in Spain, which ores are largely used in England, still they are much inferior in quality and much harder to work than the richer and more easily reduced ores of the Lake Superior region. Based on the price paid in England for Spanish ore to-day, English manufacturers could afford to pay from $4.50 to $4.75 per ton for the best ores of the Mesabi Tange. With the conditions before named, this price should be sufficient to enable ore to be mined in the Lake Superior region and sent to England at a fair profit.

Now, in this quotation Mr. Keefer says that more than half the iron ore produced in the United States is mined around Lake Superior. We find in this other article that England will have to look for her ore to Lake Superior. If Lake Superior be the producing point and we can handle that ore by a shorter and a cheaper route than any other known to exist, is it not fair to conclude that by opening up this waterway we would thereby open up a route by which the iron products of the Lake Superior district would furnish the world? The quantity of iron that can be produced around Lake Superior is inestimable, and the quality is looked upon as being superior to anything they have got in England. All that is required to bring this ore into the markets of the world is the opening up of this natural waterway. When I say "natural," I speak advisedly, because it is a waterway already, and we have only to improve it a little at different points to make it one of the most magnificent waterways on this continent. Providence gave us the waterway, and Providence demands that we should do something to improve it in order to make it one of the highways of this continent.

Mr. Speaker, in opening up that river we would be carrying out one of the greatest enterprises that have ever been undertaken in Canada, I bar none, I do not even except the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway was necessary, of course; it was one of the greatest achievements of the Dominion Government, and to the men who carried it to completion the world will ever be indebted. The names of those men who carried through that great work will go down to history embalmed in the hearts of Canadians. But we have a scheme here which is not second even to the Canadian Pacific Railway. And why is it not second? Because it is a waterway, and at every step of its progress along the Ottawa River it is going to originate industries, and develop untold resources that nobody knows how to estimate at this moment. We shall never be able to estimate fully the advantages we possess in our Ottawa valley. When I speak in this strain, people who have never looked into the question, simply say: Well, Poupore is a great admirer of the Georgian Bay Canal. Now, Sir, I can give a reason for the faith that is in me; I can tell why I am a great admirer of the Georgian Bay Canal; I can tell why this Government or any Government in Canada will not be doing its duty by the people unless it takes up this project and assists the men who are willing to put their money into the development of that waterway. When I say that this would be one of the vastest schemes, I think I must borrow the expression of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and say that I think it will be a "vaster scheme than has been." If this scheme be taken up it will be a vaster scheme than ever has been. No such scheme, I think, has ever been undertaken in the history of this country, indeed I might almost except, though I do not like to, even the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway fulfilled one great function for Canada, it cemented the union of the scattered provinces of the Dominion, and fulfilled the objects that the fathers of confederations had in view when they entered into that compact. That was all right. But now we want something more. We want something more than a railway running over the surface of the ground to fulfil the objects of the compact entered into by the various provinces forming this great Dominion; we want other things to develop the resources that lie dormant to-day. We need to be astir, because the people of the United States are not asleep. They are now very anxious at our progress. At the dinner to which I referred sometime ago, Mayor Van Wyck, of New York, pointed out that unless they were up and doing, and at once enlarged the Erie Canal to meet the requirements of trade, Canada would open up this short waterway and take away that trade which now goes to Buffalo and builds up American ports. Is that not a significant statement to be made by a public man at a public dinner in New York city? Take up the Buffalo papers, some of which I have before me, and they show how much danger our friends to the south of us see in allowing the Canadian people to go on and open up this canal. They feel that Canada, no doubt, will do its duty. We find when we go down to Washington and ask the American people to do what is fair by us—for

all we want is simply to get something that is fair, something that will protect the interests of Canada—we find when we want to enter into negotiations with them that they are very independent. Now, the way to treat people who are so very independent, is to be independent ourselves. We have got within our reach the means of making Canada, not so populous a country, perhaps, but we have the means of making Canada wholly independent of the people of the United States, unless they are willing to treat us as one brother would treat another. We have within our reach the means of being absolutely independent; we can find markets elsewhere if the people of the United States refuse to deal with us, but, in order to find markets, we must improve our waterways, build up and increase our population and develop our resources. This is what we must do as a nation. Speaking of the resources of the Ottawa valley, to which I have alluded, I want to point out something as showing what we are possessed of, in addition to what is already known to ourselves, that outsiders are coming in and investing their money in the mineral development of our country. Here is an article, the truthfulness of which I can vouch for, because I know the gentleman referred to myself:

ARE READY TO INVEST.

British Capitalists are not Backward About Spending their Money in Canadian Mines.

Canadian nickel mining is to be further developed by British capital. Mr. J. E. S. Trelawney, son of Sir William Trelawney, Bart., of Cornwall, England, is at present in Ottawa, representing English capitalists who purpose investing to a considerable extent in nickel claims in the Sudbury region. The deal will probably be closed shortly, and operations commenced as soon as the necessary machinery can be put in place. Mr. Trelawney is the guest of Mr. J. Carling Kelly, the well-known mining agent, at his residence on Somerset Street.

Wednesday a "Citizen" reporter learned from Mr. Trelawney much that is of gratifying interest concerning Canadian mineral wealth, and the light in which it is viewed in foreign markets, such as London, Paris and Hamburg. The Canadian nickel mines produce two-thirds of the world's supply,——

Is that not astonishing? Fancy having in Canada two-thirds of the whole nickel supply of the world!

——and, as the demand is increasing, Canadian mines will be even more heavily drawn on in the future. Thus English and French capital will open up and develop regions hitherto untouched in the Dominion. The gold and copper deposits of the country are also favourably mentioned, although as yet the British Columbia fields are the only ones known in foreign markets besides the Klondike. The English promoters favour hydraulic mining, but on account of the inaccessibility of the Yukon and the climatic conditions that retard the country, the Britishers do not take with favour to it. On the other hand, the great reduction in the cost of smelting—from $22 to $7 per ton—in the British Columbia district, will induce free investments of British capital in the mines of that province. It is strange that Ontario's wealth of gold should not be better known on the London and other European markets, but as yet the attention is on British Columbia and that province only. Mr. Kelly believes, though, that the wealth of newer Ontario, Hastings County, the Ottawa district, &c., will all quickly find English capital to develop it, as soon as it is brought to the attention of foreign investors.

This is the condition of affairs in spite of the difficulty we have in transporting our ores and in spite of the extra cost that we are obliged to pay to take these ores to the smelters of Europe. Of this I know something, because I am concerned myself in a mine that is shipping ore to Belgium. The value of that ore at the mouth of the mine is about $50 per ton, but the total net profit we can make out of it is $10 to $15 per ton. The rest goes to transportation charges and the cost of smelting. You will see that the question of transportation, then, is one of the most vital importance. Whilst speaking of this matter, I want to refer to an article which I have read in the "Cosmopolitan" Magazine on the question of transportation. Here is an article written by Mr. F. W. Fitzpatrick, an American gentleman who is very well posted on the question. Speaking of the great volume of trade that goes through the lakes, he says:

Our annual freight bill is enormous. It amounts to more than $800,000,000 a year—a tax upon our commerce equal to $60 a year for every family, or, assuming the Government's calculations to be correct, and that the average income of each labourer is $500 a year, this means that the equivalent of every one month's labour of each head of a family must be set aside to pay for his share of the freight bill. Anything that lessens this tax upon the people will soon find favour with them.

We go on and find that this gentleman, who has produced a very well written article, says about the navigation of the lakes and the great traffic that is done upon them:

In spite of my promise not to produce any arguments for the "deep waterways to the sea," the temptation to say something for it is strong. It is a most fascinating theme, grand in its possibilities, and fairly bristling with figures. But that is another story. To-day Buffalo is practically the eastern terminus of lake traffic. A few small, most Canadian, vessels, go down the Welland Canal, around Niagara, and the other north shore canals and the St. Lawrence River to Montreal and the seaboard, but that traffic is not worth mentioning.

He calls them small vessels; they do not amount to anything, and that is the trade that comes to Canada.

A considerable quantity of cereals, coal and lumber, is transferred to steam or mule canal barges at Buffalo, for transportation down the Erie Canal to the Hudson River and New York, but the great bulk of lake freight for the east is transferred at Buffalo to the railroads.

That is the American view of our waterways; they look upon them as being of no very great use. They do not amount to

much in their estimation. That is why, when they find that we are waking up, they think they had better be stirring themselves or we will likely take some of their trade away. Under all these circumstances, I think the time has come for Canada to be active in this transportation question. We find that Mr. McLeod Stewart—a gentleman whose name is becoming a household word, not only in Canada but in England, in connection with the Georgian Bay Canal—during his recent visit to England, made such arrangements as will enable the company to carry on the construction of this canal upon the condition, of course, and always upon the condition, that the Government of Canada shall sanction it by guaranteeing the interest upon its bonds. Last session, as I have already pointed out, the right hon. First Minister said that when this project shall have reached the position that the success of the undertaking will be assured, the Government of Canada would feel disposed to give it its very best consideration. Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached that period. I think we can establish, before this debate is ended, that this is not only a feasible question, that it is not only a practical question, but that it is a project in which a number of capitalists of Europe are willing to risk their money, provided the Government of Canada will give it that sanction, which, I think the Government should give it. The Government is not asked in any way to advance or contribute one dollar, and if the case ever arises in which the Government is called upon to pay anything on account of interest, its claim will be a first lien, and a first charge upon all these works. And besides that, from the receipts from the operations of that canal, after its construction, the working expenses will be taken out and paid, and whatever is left over and above that will go to the reduction of the moneys the Government may have to pay on account of interest until the whole thing is wiped out. By this proposition, which I shall give to the House before I conclude, the Government is not asked to advance one single dollar until the project is completed; the Government is not asked to become responsible for one single cent until the work is completed, and if that be the position, and if other men are willing to put their money into it, it does seem to me that the Government is asked for very little when it is asked simply to guarantee the interest on the bonds.

Mr. DAVIN. How much interest?

Mr. POUPORE. The proposition that was made last year was, 2 per cent on $17,000,000. The proposition which I am about to make now is a little different from that, but, I think, not so different as to make it objectionable to the Government. Let me say, that, in connection with the organization of the company, Mr. McLeod Stewart succeeded in England in having a syndicate formed of reputable men of very high commercial standing, who are not only ready to undertake the construction of the canal, but who have the right, by their letters of association as a syndicate, to develop mines, to acquire francnises, and to do anything that comes within the scope of mercantile transactions. A majority of the board of directors of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company will be composed of the gentlemen who formed the syndicate. A condition which they impose is, that a majority of European stockholders shall be on the board of directors of that canal company, and this, of course, is readily agreed to by Mr. Stewart. Under the franchise which Mr. Stewart and his company hold from the Government of Canada, the obligation rests upon the promoters to organize the company in Canada; the head office is to be in Ottawa, and that is why the company was not formed in England. The syndicate was formed in England on about the same lines as the syndicate which was formed to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. All these details, of course, and all the evidence, will be furnished to the Government before they are asked to proceed; but I may mention that two millions or three millions—at all events, between two and three millions—dollars have been subscribed by the canal company, and 10 per cent of $2,000,000 have been paid into a chartered bank, which sum has been transmitted to Canada. This fulfils one of the requirements of the franchise, which states distinctly that no company can proceed to do anything in the line of constructing this canal, until $2,000,000 of stock has been subscribed and 10 per cent of that paid into a chartered bank of Canada. Now, this requirement has been fulfilled, and, when all the facts in connection with this project which have occurred since the last session of Parliament, are made known to the Prime Minister of Canada and his Government, I predict in advance that the Prime Minister will take that view which he so nicely outlined last year, in the closing remarks of his speech in this debate. Let me read an article which appeared in the "Sun".

The PRIME MINISTER. What "Sun," may I ask?

Mr. POUPORE. The London "Sun." It says:

> It would seem that Canada is at last to control her own waterway between the waters of the great lakes and the ports of shipping upon the Atlantic Ocean. An improved version of the plans of 1860 will be laid before the Imperial Government with a view of obtaining a partial subsidy towards the work of construction. A canal, similar to the proposed new Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay navigation scheme, is of paramount importance to the Imperial interests of the Dominion, since in the event of any rupture in the relations between this country and America, Canada possesses no strategic or

commercial canal which would not come within the jurisdiction of the United States. The reasons which induced the Chancellor of the Exchequer to refuse Mr. Cecil Rhodes's proposals cannot be applied to the Canadian canal, since its presence must improve the prosperity of Canada in a way which is at once apparent, and beyond even the "wasp stings of Little Englanders."

This, Sir, is a feature of the project which ought not be dismissed without a great deal of serious thought. We are speaking of a canal that may cost Canada, we will say, for the present, $8,000,000 or $10,000,000. Now, from the information which I have upon the subject, I am convinced that, for commercial purposes alone, the Government of Canada would be warranted in giving that amount of expenditure as a bonus. As a public man, I say from my seat in this House, that, if the Government of Canada gave a bonus of $10,000,000 for the purpose of opening up that waterway, then, from a commercial point of view alone, I, as a business man, feel that it would be a wise thing for the Government to do. And why, from a commercial standpoint, would it be a wise thing for the Government to do? First, it would increase the population of Canada; second, it would extend the seaports of our country and bring through Canada the traffic that belongs to us; third, it would develop the resources of our country, which will remain undeveloped unless something is done in this direction. And, in developing these resources, what will follow? Look at the mining industries of other countries, and what do you find? Go to Butte City, Montana. That city has been built up because the people of that city went into the mining industry, and the product of ore was so great that a company was formed to build a smelter. The moment that smelter was built, the number of people employed in and about the smelter and the mines formed the city of Butte, and, as the result of that one smelter in a mining district in the United States, you have to-day the large and growing city of Butte. Open up the Ottawa valley, and, with the mineral resources we possess there, you will find that we must build smelters. We will have to build a smelter at Ottawa; we will have to build a smelter at the mouth of the French River, and we will have to furnish the means necessary to get the ores to these smelters. All this will expand the country, increase the population, and develop our resources that to-day lie dormant. That is why I say, that, if the Government of Canada to-day gave $10,000,000 as a bonus to this canal, it would be warranted in doing so, from a commercial stand-point alone.

But let us regard the scheme from a strategic point of view; let us look at it as a matter of defence. Have we any assurance, have we any guarantee from Divine Providence, that we are free from any possible chance of being involved in a conflict? Is it possible to imagine that we are to go through this world unmolested in the years to come—unmolested by our neighbours to the south of us. That is rather improbable. I hope the day will never come when the relations between the two countries will be so strained as to make it necessary that the one country shall have to stand up in conflict against the other. I hope that day shall never come; but, if it come, is it not well that we should be ready? Is it not well that we should have some means of defence, or is it better that we should be, as we are to-day, with an exposed frontier of some 2,000 miles along the St. Lawrence River, a river that is common to both countries? The Americans have just as much right to come down the St. Lawrence River as we have; they can use our canals, on fulfilling certain conditions, and, in case of trouble, they would have just as free access to that river as we have. Where would our protection be then?

Why, they would gobble us up in one day, exposed as we are now. But if we went on and opened up the Ottawa River as a waterway to the great lakes, consider the position we should then occupy. Who could then come near the internal districts of our country? We certainly could resist any attack that could be made upon us. The enemy could not reach the interior of the country, through which this canal would pass, without finding some way of getting there, and the chances are that we would set a trap for them before they would reach it. So that, apart from the commercial view of the case, we cannot dismiss from our minds the great importance of this strategical view. Go away back to the time when General Sir John Michel was in command of the Canadian troops, thirty-five years ago, and you will find that he predicted that this great waterway must be opened up as an Imperial work, important to the Empire as a whole, and not simply to Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. So did Lieut. Synge.

Mr. POUPORE. Yes. These men many years ago saw the necessity of opening up this canal, not for commercial purposes alone, but as a safeguard for the British Empire.

Now, it does seem to me opportune at this particular time, when no other great work is before the Government of Canada, that this great project should be taken up with promptness. It is true, we are completing the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals; but it is also true that that work will be completed about the end of the present year. The Government of Canada will then be free from the burden of any great public work, and now is the time that this work should be sanctioned and assisted by the Government. It is true, it has been said to me, "Why did not your own friends, Mr. Poupore, take up this project when they

were in power?" That is a very proper question to put, I confess; but there is an answer to that question which I think ought to be sufficient for any man. I do not want to see this question brought into the arena of politics. It is of too great magnitude to be made a political question. We want men of good-will everywhere to join in this great scheme, because we must have unity of action from all quarters in order to succeed. When the Spanish-American war broke out a year ago, the people of the United States, in mustering their forces, did not stop to inquire to what political party any man belonged. There was no question of party at all. All the people of the great republic stood up as one man for the defence of their country; and Canadians should stand up as one man, not only for the defence of their country, but for the development of their country, teeming as it is with untold resources, which are lying dormant, and for the protection of their country where it requires protection. I say, then, that this is not a political, but a national question—ay, a question of Imperial importance; and I believe the Imperial authorities would gladly lend a hand to the completion of this project if properly approached and asked to do so. But, to answer the question put to me by an hon. friend on the other side of the House, "Mr. Poupore, why did not your friends take up this question when they were in power?" let me say that last year an answer was given by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart). He said he thought the proper way to build this canal was to have it done by the Government in small instalments from year to year; but he said the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) was a tight-fisted man, and that he had held the purse-strings too tightly. Of course, I do not think that was a very strong reason. The reason I assigned, in answer to the gentleman who asked me the question, was this. I said that the political party to which I belonged, which had constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway, which had inaugurated the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals, which had carried the Intercolonial Railway to completion, had certainly left behind it an evidence of progress—had left its foot-prints on the sands of time. I repeat what I said last year, that the obligations which the Dominion of Canada undertook at confederation were onerous and numerous. The large amount of money that had to be paid for the North-west Territories, the immense sums that had been contributed to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the expenses connected with the Intercolonial Railway, with the enlargement of the Welland Canal, with the St. Lawrence canals, and with the Ottawa River canals—all these had to be undertaken by the Government of that time. Now, it is quite easy to be understood that while these great works were in progress the Government of the day was not prone to undertake any new obligations of the magnitude of this project. But is it unreasonable for us to ask the Government of the day, having just about completed the work they undertook when they entered office, and being almost entirely relieved of great public works, to take an active interest in this project? Would it not redound to the credit of the hon. the First Minister and his Government for all time to come? Would it not make him one of the greatest men Canada had produced if he took up this project and carried it to completion? It would redound to the credit of any Government, be it Liberal or Conservative. Any Government that takes up this work and assists it to completion, will have the undivided support of the whole of this part of Canada, regardless of any political issue that may arise in the meantime. Mr. Speaker, I want distinctly to state that I am not a very strong partisan when you talk Georgian Bay Canal to me. I am a Georgian Bay Canal man first, last and always. I am prepared to support any Government or any party or any man who will help us to build the Georgian Bay Canal. That is my politics exactly; that is Georgian Bay Canal politics; and you will find, Mr. Speaker, that I am not alone in this country in holding these views. If we can get the Georgian Bay Canal, we shall feel indebted to those who help us to get it. If we cannot get the Georgian Bay Canal, we shall hold a reckoning with those who refuse to help us to get it. This is not said with a desire to threaten anybody. It is simply expressing the sentiment of the people of this part of Canada. When I speak of this part of Canada, I speak of a part of Canada that cannot be ignored in any way. When I speak of this part of Canada, I speak of both sides of the Ottawa River from Montreal to the mouth of the French River. That means between twenty-three and twenty-five counties; and I say that no Government, no party, no political scheme, can do without that phalanx of the people of Canada. If the people who are interested, as I am, in the Georgian Bay Canal, unite as they should, in making this part of Canada what it ought to be, they will simply stand together and say, we must have the Georgian Bay Canal, and we belong to no party that will not help us to get it. I would like to say a word as to the effect which this project will have upon this city, of which I am a resident.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman takes that up, may I ask him what is the present proposal?

Mr. POUPORE. I thank the hon. leader of the Opposition for reminding me of this omission on my part. By the arrangement entered into with the syndicate to which I have referred, the syndicate feel that the Government of Canada should be asked to

guarantee bonds to the extent of $20,000,000 at 2½ per cent instead of $17,000,000 at 2 per cent, as stated last year. The particulars of that will be more fully dealt with by gentlemen who are to follow me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What term are the bonds to run ?

Mr. POUPORE. Twenty years. Now, let me read something that has been written by a gentleman very prominent in electrical matters, and which I think is worth submitting to the House. W. H. Hunter, in the "Engineer's Magazine," writes the following article, headed "What Would Happen":

The meeting in the city hall to-night is one which every well-wisher of Ottawa, every enterprising citizen of the capital, should attend. It should be such a gathering as will strengthen the hands of the promoter of the Georgian Bay Canal by proving that it is a project in which Ottawa is vitally interested; such a meeting, in short, as will convince the Government that, in guaranteeing the bonds of the canal, it will be forwarding an enterprise fraught with magnificent possibilities, not only to the Ottawa district, but to the Dominion as a whole.

What the completion of the Georgian Bay Canal would mean for this city may be inferred from what the ship canal has done for Manchester. It is pointed out by Mr. W. H. Hunter, in the "Engineering Magazine" for January, that building operations in Manchester are progressing at a rate which has had no parallel in the long history of the town. The streets are so thronged with traffic that the problem of dealing with them in such a manner as to avoid positive congestion is forcing itself upon the inhabitants. Returns of the railway companies running into Manchester show an annual increase so marked that company after company has initiated and carried out, or is in the course of carrying out, additions and improvements of a most extensive character, having for their object the increase of their conveying and storing capacity. In a word, threatened decay has been turned into vigorous growth, and adversity into prosperity. No competent person would, for a moment, hesitate, if asked, for the reason for this unparalleled progress. It is, as the writer points out, one of the results of the Manchester Ship Canal.

I believe that this canal will do more for the city of Ottawa than any one imagines. Last year the press of Ottawa asked some of the leading men of this city what would be the best means of encouraging and expanding its business. Answers were given by a number of leading men, one of which I propose to read, given by Mr. William Scott, managing director of the McKay Milling Company. He said:

Mr. William Scott, managing director of the McKay Milling Company, stated that, in his opinion, the one thing which more than any other would attain the permanent prosperity of Ottawa, was the carrying into effect of the Georgian Bay Canal scheme. The project was one which merited the support of the business community of Ottawa. It would bring the products of the North-west to Ottawa, building up the towns along the line and developing their shipping and commercial interests. Mr. Scott said it was difficult to comprehend the magnitude of the grain trade. In a few years the crop in Manitoba would yield 100,000,000 bushels. During the past year 218,000,000 bushels of wheat from the Western States and Manitoba passed through Buffalo, and over fifty grain elevators were located there. The opening up of the Georgian Bay Canal would mean that a great proportion of this immense traffic would come to Ottawa, and elevators would be established here. The enormous trade of supplying the vessels engaged in transportation would come to Ottawa.

Speaking of the question of local manufactures, Mr. Scott said, that, if any assistance was to be given, it should go to encourage those already established here. In addition to the immense lumber industry, there were two furniture factories, machine shops, car shops and the largest flour mill in the province. There was nothing in the wood line but what could be manufactured in Ottawa, and the manufacturing interests should be encouraged to the fullest extent.

There is the opinion of one of the leading men of Ottawa, and an opinion which, I think, is shared by every business man in the city. I would like to read an extract from a newspaper published in my own county, and which, by the way, is a Liberal newspaper, to show that even those who live in rural districts are fully alive to the importance and the magnitude of this great scheme. This editorial was written by the editor of the Pontiac "Advance," in my county:

Georgian Bay Canal stock took a big jump, when the Hon. Mr. Tarte, addressing the great Liberal meeting at the Monument Nationale, in Montreal, the other day, intimated, in language so distinct as to admit of no equivocation, that, in furtherance of his intention to make Montreal the Buffalo of Canada, he was in favour of the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal, among other schemes, as subsidiary to this great object.

This manifesto, made as a Minister of the Crown, and in the hearing of his colleagues, and with the tacit consent of his chief, at last elevates this great undertaking to the realm of practical politics.

That the schemes outlined by Mr. Tarte have received the ear-mark of the Government is evidenced by the feverish eagerness with which the press of western Ontario is now seeking by every argument to boom those most intimately associated with its own interests, and, if other proof of the fact be needed, the complete concurrence with which it ignores, by the faintest mention, our canal project should suffice.

No wonder the self-assertive people of western Ontario look upon the success of their schemes as assured, if they gauge the temper of the whole people of the Ottawa valley by the indifference displayed by the struggling pioneers who dot the vast expanse of timber limits ycleped Pontiac.

The people of the Ottawa valley may as well, realizing that the simultaneous carrying out of the enterprises outlined by Mr. Tarte, even with Government assistance, is beyond the limits of present possibility, and that "united we stand, divided we fall" in any attempt to enforce the recognition of the claims with which nature has so prodigally endowed us. There is no sentiment in politics, as we find them now; combative self-interest will risk a burn to get the chestnuts, while those who pulingly wait in expectation of Providence providing vicarious assistance, will get left.

Pontiac should know that another factor has been introduced into the politics of this district, and be prepared to use every effort to make our

claims upon the Government effective. The time is near when an opportunity will be afforded to give an unwonted emphasis to them.

This is written by a Liberal newspaper writer of Pontiac county.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been convinced for quite a little while that I have been tiring the House; I am discovering now that I am getting tired myself. But, before taking my seat, I would like to refer to a paper that was read at the meeting of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, in Montreal, by Mr. Wicksteed, a civil engineer, who has had a great deal of practical experience in canal building. He deals very largely with this canal question. The report of it I have here states "in conclusion, Mr. Wicksteed gave these most striking figures, which are corroborated by Mr. Marcus Smith, to show the advantages possessed by the Ottawa route, as compared with the St. Lawrence." Now, I would like to be well understood, that, when I speak of the Ottawa route, as compared with the St. Lawrence route, I do not speak with a desire to intimate that there is any feeling of rivalry. No rivalry can possibly exist between these two schemes. We require the St. Lawrence, as well as the Ottawa River. The Trent Canal, likewise, can never be a rival of the Ottawa Valley Canal. The Trent Canal will fulfil the purpose for which it is intended, and that is, to supply all the intervening country between the Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario with the means of water communication, taking whatever freight arises in Lake Huron. The Trent Canal is not of the proper proportions to tap the traffic that comes from Lake Superior by way of Sault Ste. Marie. The Ottawa River Canal is intended to go to the mouth of the French River, then along the protected shore of Lake Huron, inside the Manitoulin Island to Sault Ste. Marie, to tap the traffic, a good deal of which now finds its way to Buffalo. It will not be a competing line with the St. Lawrence; it will never be a rival of the Trent Canal scheme, so ably advocated by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). The figures given by Mr. Wicksteed show that by the St. Lawrence route you have 1,145 miles of lake navigation, 132 of river and 71 miles of canal, making a total of 1,348. By the Ottawa we have 575 miles of lake navigation, 372 of river navigation and 33 miles of canal. The total length of the Ottawa route is 980 miles, or 368 miles shorter than the route by the St. Lawrence. Mr. Wicksteed says:

Thus the comparison by distance is enormously in favour of the Ottawa route, but when the estimates of time required by each route are contrasted, the wonderful advantages of the Ottawa route are seen at a glance. Taking the average lake craft, it requires 202·50 hours to go from Chicago to Montreal by the St. Lawrence, while by the Ottawa valley canal it will only call for 127·61, a saving of 74·89 hours each trip.

Now, I do not think there can be any discussion or controversy as to the difference in point of distance. I do not think there will be any attempt to challenge comparison in point of safety. By the Ottawa valley route, we have the advantage in point of safety of the absence of a great deal of lake navigation. On the route to Buffalo, you are exposed to tempests of Lake Huron and Lake Erie; the St. Lawrence route has the same feature. The consequence is, that marine insurance on that route is very much higher than it can possibly be by the route that we shall have. Thus we shall have the advantage of safety, the advantage of distance and the advantage of cheapness. When I speak of cheapness, I mean in respect of time saved. Beyond all these, there is the fact that it will develop our own country.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to conclude; but, before taking my seat, I wish to recall to the mind of the Prime Minister his words, which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks, his good words of last session, on the termination of the debate on this subject.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) closes his remarks, I am sure the House will be glad to know what will be the character of the work which the company that asks for this subsidy, would give us. I understood, from what he stated in answer to a remark made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), that the proposition of last year with regard to the subsidy is abandoned. A subsidy would not be asked of a guarantee of 2 per cent on seventeen and a half millions, but of 2½ per cent on 20 millions. I have followed my hon. friend pretty closely, but I do not think he has given us anything as to the character of the proposed canal. What would be the depth of it? What would be the difficulties to be met, in the way of shallows to be deepened, falls to be overcome, and cuttings made? We would be interested in knowing some details on these features of the scheme.

Mr. POUPORE. I thank the right hon. Prime Minister for calling attention to that. But I think a few words of mine must have escaped his attention, when I said, that the facts on these points will be given by succeeding speakers. However, I will give them, so far as I know them. The character of the work will be similar to the enlarged St. Lawrence Canals—14 feet. The shallows will be dredged out. The most recent reports we have show that, at the normal high-water mark, we shall have navigation in the different stretches of the Ottawa for a depth of 16 feet, except that it will be necessary to remove shallows at the confluences of other rivers, or places where sediment is deposited.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the date of that report?

Mr. POUPORE. That is the most recent report of Mr. Marcus Smith. The date of this report is December 30th, 1898. As to the character of the work, I may say that the canal will be 14 feet. The rivers will be dredged out 16 feet, and there will be the necessary docks. I may mention an important feature of this work which will explain why the syndicate ask for a guarantee on twenty millions instead of seventeen millions. They feel that the navigation should be made uniform between Ottawa and Montreal, and that elevators should be erected at different points, for instance, at Hawkesbury, at Pembroke, at the mouth of the Mattawa River, at the mouth of the French River, and another at Arnprior. Those features of the case will be laid before the Government in writing and in proper form. I just allude to them en passant. Now the works will be of the most substantial character, like those that are now being made on the St. Lawrence. The obstacles that may be met with in the different rapids along the river will be overcome by a series of stone locks. The deepening of the river will be proceeded with in the usual way, by dredging and by subaqueous excavations, either of rock or of earth. The estimated cost of the work is $25,000,000, and that is to include the enlargement of the canal from Ottawa to Montreal. There are somewhat over 100 miles of navigation between Ottawa and Montreal of only 9 feet, that would be enlarged to 14 feet, and provided with all the docks and wharfs and accommodation necessary at Montreal, and with elevators at the different places that I have mentioned. The syndicate propose that this should be done in order to make the system complete, and, therefore, they ask for a 2½ per cent guarantee on $20,000,000 instead of $17,000,000. One of the reasons why they ask a guarantee at 2½ per cent instead of 2 per cent, is that a guarantee of 2½ per cent makes the bonds gilt-edged, while with a guarantee of only 2 per cent, the bonds will hardly bring more than 80.

Mr. Speaker, I must now apologize to you and to the House for having spoken at such length. I suppose the correct apology to make is always the true one. The only apology that I have to offer you is the importance of this subject. I feel that this is one of the greatest and most important subjects that can possibly occupy the attention of the Parliament of Canada. It is to be very far reaching in its effects upon this country; it is going to render to Canada the greatest possible amount of business freedom and expansion. I look upon it as one of the greatest schemes that have ever been taken up in the history of Canada since the day we entered into the compact of confederation. I now thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask my hon. friends in the House to pardon me for having trespassed so long upon their patience.

Mr. POUPORE.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Towards the close of last session it was my privilege to join my efforts with those of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) in bringing to the attention of the Government and of the House the vast importance of this truly national question, the construction of the Georgian Bay water route. I desire again to join him to-day in returning thanks to the Prime Minister for the opportunity which we are afforded of again addressing you on this subject. I sincerely and heartily congratulate the hon. member for Pontiac on the able, eloquent and very exhaustive speech and presentment of the question which he has made to us this afternoon. I cannot help expressing a regret that I have to follow him. He has spoken so well, so eloquently, and so authoritatively on this subject that he has made it a very difficult task indeed for me to say anything that will interest the House. I regret also that I have had little time to put into shape the large amount of data which I have at hand concerning the Georgian Bay Canal, and consequently my remarks, I fear, will be somewhat disjointed, and will not be presented with that connexity of thought and argument which the subject deserves. However, I shall endeavour to do my best, and in treating this question I shall endeavour to avoid as much as possible viewing it from the same aspects from which it has been viewed by my hon. friend.

When the subject was brought up last year the right hon. the Prime Minister had no hesitation whatever in saying that if the Georgian Bay water route was constructed it would indeed be a very potent factor in assuring for Canada a very large portion of the trade of Ontario, and of the western sections of the continent. The hon. gentleman would, I believe, and I was emboldened to think so from his remarks at that time, have given an assurance of the guarantee which my hon. friend and myself asked him to give, if he had been thoroughly satisfied in his own mind of the possibility, the practicability, and the commercial value of this great enterprise. Now, Sir, our justification in taking up the time of the House again this session on this subject, is to be found in the large amount of very convincing evidence which has been brought to light since the close of last session concerning the possibility, the practicability and the commercial value of this enterprise. Valuable as that evidence was last session, voluminous as were the data which we then had, I may say without hesitation that a great deal more of convincing evidence has come to light since. I shall, with your permission, endeavour as briefly and in as sober language as possible to satisfy the Prime Minister and the hon. members of this House that this project is not only possible and practicable, but that it is of undoubted commercial value, of such commercial value

as will not only justify but command, I believe, the Government of the day in giving to it the assistance which is now asked by the promoters. Before doing so I wish briefly to refer to the material advantages which this river route will offer. My learned friend has pretty well covered the ground, but there are, perhaps, one or two aspects of the matter he has not referred to which may be of interest to the House. He has referred to the strategic or military aspect of the matter. I confess that to my mind that is, perhaps, the least important feature of the undertaking. When we look to very recent events, when we see the immense progress, the tremendous strides which have been made and are being made at this very moment towards settling all international questions and differences by means of arbitration, it seems to me that the strategic or military feature of this enterprise has not, perhaps, to-day the importance it had a few years ago. However, the matter is of some consequence, and, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), it would ensure, in case of difficulty, an easy means of transporting ammunition and troops into the interior of the country. It would afford a means of bringing in our defences and putting them in the field and avoiding the danger that would be met if these ammunitions and forces were taken up by means of the St. Lawrence River and the St. Lawrence Canals. The strategic and military importance of the scheme is, perhaps, of greater importance to the British public, and in reading various articles, which have appeared in their press, one cannot fail to see that the British mind has been very strongly impressed with that aspect of the matter. In reference to the agricultural benefits and advantages which this enterprise would bring forth, it seems to me that it is beyond calculation, even beyond any possible suggestion, what they may be. All we require to remember is that the Ottawa River route will give access to millions and millions of acres of as fertile land as there is to be found anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. When we look at the recent developments which have taken place in the districts of Algoma, Temiscamingue and Nipissing, when we see the great settlements which have sprung up there within a very few years, one cannot help seeing in his own mind the immense agricultural development which the improvement of our waterways would bring forth. We all know that the colonization of the country follows immediately in the wake of the waterways and railways. Look at our history; Canada was settled first along the St. Lawrence, then along the Ottawa, and along their tributaries. Our waterways have been the first and most active force in the colonization of Canada.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Beattie.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. Osler.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank, and to change its name to the Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. Bertram.)

Bill (No. 76) respecting the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company (Mr. Dyment) considered in committee and reported.

Mr. BERTRAM moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to have the Bill left over until the next sitting of the House, as I have something to say upon it, and I do not wish to take up the time of the House now. If the Bill is left over, we shall have an opportunity of looking at it, for I have not seen it since it came from the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose we shall have to accede to the hon. gentleman's request, unless he is satisfied with the explanation that the Bill was amended to meet the wishes of the town of Port Arthur, if that is the point.

Mr. SPROULE. No, that is not the point.

Bill allowed to stand.

EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 93) respecting the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver).

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I move that the word "September" be struck out and the word "October" inserted in lieu thereof. This motion is made at the request of the promoters of the Bill. The people live in the old country, and they think October would be more satisfactory than September, and there is no objection on the part of the department.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 7,

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I have given notice of an amendment to this section, which I will take the liberty of explaining to the committee. The question was discussed in the Railway Committee, and a conclusion was arrived at; but there was at that time a lack of information which I am now able to supply, and which I think it my duty to place before the committee in proposing my amendment. The question is as to requiring this railway company to build into a certain village, and the principle involved is one of great importance throughout the whole of the North-west Territories. It is, perhaps, not known to the members of the House who live in eastern Canada that in the western country, where everything is in process of development, it is the almost universal custom of railway companies, when they are constructing their lines, instead of building those lines to accommodate the business of the country already established, to so construct them as to take advantage of the business necessities then existing, in order to levy upon the people of that country what they, the people, consider to be unjust tribute. The pioneers go into the country and establish a business centre. They build mills or stores or other business places, and when a railroad comes to that vicinity, either the railway company demands a bonus for giving those people the benefits to which they are entitled by reason of their exertions as pioneers, or else establishes a station at some other point for the purpose of building up a rival town and destroying the investment of those pioneers in that original town site. That is what is being done throughout the North-west repeatedly, and I would like to inform the House that there is nothing done in the North-west which has a greater effect in retarding its development than that same course of action. While we admit that railways are necessary to the development of the country and do develop it, it must be easily seen that unless there is a certain development preceding the railway, its construction is going to hang back. A railway is not built in advance of settlement, but is built to settlement. Then, if those who invest their time and money—who, in many cases, invest twenty or twenty-five years of their lives—in establishing business in certain places, know, as a matter of fact, that when the time comes when they might reasonably expect a return on their investment of time, money and labour, instead of getting that return, they are either held up for an unjust bonus or an attempt is made to build up a rival centre, and thus destroy their investment, the result is that the advantages of the pioneers are detracted from, and the people do not go ahead of the railways as they otherwise would. Instead of having the country filled up in advance of the railways by enterprising people, this system of allowing railways to levy tribute upon the enterprise of other men, tends to discourage pioneering and thereby development. Everything must have a beginning, and the end turns on the beginning. If you do not allow the beginning under auspicious circumstances, you do not have a satisfactory ending, and you, gentlemen, who complain about the slow growth of the North-west, should understand that one of the reasons for its slow growth is that the pioneers have been given to understand, by the system adopted with regard to railways in that country, that they are to be systematically deprived of the fruits of their labour.

It is the pioneers who sow the settlements which finally grow to be groups of population and wealth, and if the seed is not sown properly and well, if there are difficulties put in the way of sowing that seed, you will not have a crop. You complain that you have not a crop (and you have not such as you should have) and one reason is because the seed has been very badly sown in that way. The western country, however, has awakened to the injustice that is being done, and the representatives of that country are anxious to see that injustice remedied. It is the business of this House to remedy that injustice. It is our business to see that when we grant a privilege to a railway company, the rights of the people are protected. If the House decides that these rights are not to be protected, the responsibility is upon it. From the railways we expect nothing any more than we do from any other business enterprise. These companies are out for all they can make, no matter whether they make it in accord with public policy or otherwise.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do not the men who build the villages look out for themselves also?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, they do. They are the men who send representatives to Parliament, they are the men who pay the taxes of the country, they are the men whose work is developing the country, they are the men who are making the country valuable, and who are entitled to receive a legitimate benefit from their labour. It is not the speculators who come in after the seed has been sown, after the difficulties have been encountered, after the country has been developed, who should reap the crop they did not sow.

I, for one, at any rate, as representing a section of the people of the North-west, stand here to advocate the interests of those people and to ask for justice at the hands of this House. In the case of the application for this railway charter, I ask that the interests of the people of the village of Fort Saskatchewan be protected by requiring that company, if it constructs its line, to construct it into that village, so as to protect the interests of the men established there in business.

I might say further that besides the ordinary public, this Government has a particular interest in this town site. It was, in the first place, established as a police post. There was a large police reserve established there, so that anything that is done to the advantage of that town site at Fort Saskatchewan will be an advantage directly to the interests of the Dominion Government, because it will, to that extent, increase the value of the property held by the Government. Anything done to the detriment of that village will be done to the detriment of the Dominion treasury. It is only fair, therefore, that members should understand that they have a direct interest in this matter as guardians of the public treasury, as well as the guardians of legislation.

The country is well settled from the nearest present railway point to Fort Saskatchewan, and also for thirty or forty miles beyond, but there is no immediate prospect of the construction of a railway except to Fort Saskatchewan. That is the main point of this railway proposition. It is not so set forth in the Bill, but I say, knowing the condition of the country, that that is the main point. It is desirable and it is probable that the railway will be built through the twenty miles of well-settled country to Fort Saskatchewan, establishing that as the practical terminus of railway construction, for the time being; and it is because that is the important point in the proposition that I ask the consideration of the House to the resolution I am about to propose. If this were a line that was being built for a long distance, say a through line across the continent or something of that kind, it would not be reasonable to expect the company to deviate this or that way a few miles to accommodate this or that centre; but, as a matter of fact, this road is, if anything, a colonization road, a road to take advantage of existing conditions and improve those conditions. Therefore, there is every reason why the existing conditions, which are being taken advantage of by the company, should be improved by the construction of a road through that country.

As to the point raised in the Railway Committee, that we were not able to show to the committee what the area of the village of Fort Saskatchewan is, and therefore could not say whether it was practicable to take a railway in there or not, I have secured the information by telegram that the area of the village extends about one mile back from the bank of the river. I am entirely familiar with the conditions there, having lived in that country and thereabouts for the past twenty-three years; and if my word as a member of Parliament and acquainted with the circumstances of the case, is worth anything, I beg to assure the committee that there are absolutely no engineering difficulties in the way of reaching the village of Fort Saskatchewan, any more than can exist in crossing a perfectly level and possibly somewhat sandy piece of country. It is not in the valley of the river, it is on the bank of the valley, and it is an ordinary level country which presents no obstacles to prevent a railway getting in or out.

All I ask at the hands of the committee is that the interests of the pioneers shall be protected by requiring that this colonization road, relying for its business on the work of the people in that particular locality, should not be given a charter unless we provide that the interests of these people are protected in that charter, and by so doing we will not in the slightest degree prejudice the legitimate and proper interests of the road. I thererfore move:

That the seventh line of section 7 of the printed Bill, at the head of page 2, be amended by striking out the words "or as near as practicable" and the words "or settlement" where they appear in that line, making it read "a point in the village of Fort Saskatchewan."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The reason why the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Oliver's) views did not prevail in the committee were, first, the committee were not sure that it was practicable at the various villages named for the road to be built inside the corporation. I do not know whether the villages are incorporated or not, but even if they are incorporated it might not be practicable to build within their limits. A village might be situated in a hollow or at the top of a hill, making it quite impossible for the railway to be built to it. In the second place, the Minister of Railways and Canals has a Bill before the House to prevent the recurrence of such events as have taken place in the past in railways establishing their stations outside of a town or demanding from the people some concessions for placing their station inside the town. For these reasons, the Bill was amended, as hon. gentlemen will remember, on motion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to read: "in or as near as practicable to." And it was thought that that would be sufficient to protect the interests of the people in this district. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is quite right in saying that in the west, and as we know the same has occurred in the east, that localities have been much injured by the railway not being taken nearer to the centre of settlement than it has been. But by adopting such a proposal as is here made, the committee might stop the building of the railway altogether. If charters were generally granted with such terms as this, it might add to the cost of the road by millions of dollars, and thus the building of railways for the benefit of settlers in new parts of the country would be delayed or prevented. It is believed that the Bill introduced by the Minister of Railways and Canals will safeguard the interests of the public in this respect.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that what the hon. member asks is unreasonable in view of the fact that he has pledged his word that there is no engineering difficulties in the locality. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the village of Saskatchewan is incorporated ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it seems to me that makes it all right. Otherwise the amendment would be of little use, as according to the Bill the railway may be built either to the village of Saskatchewan or to the settlement. This latter seems a very indefinite term and would allow the railway company much greater latitude in locating their railway than they should have. As there is a village there, as the pioneers have gone in and made improvements, and, no doubt, it is for the pioneers that the railway is being sought for, they ought to have some benefit of the railway when built. It is well known to those who have visited the North-west country that railway companies pay very little attention to the interests of the people living along the route where the railway is to run. If they cannot get every consideration from a town, whether in the way of right of way or a large grant of land they give the town the go-by. I do not think they should have the privilege of doing that in this case, especially as there are no engineering difficulties to be overcome.

Mr. CASEY. I have to differ from my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). As a general rule, I am quite in sympathy with the principle that railways should not have the power to hold up a town along their route and compel them to pay in order to get connection with the railway. But this is a question of building a railway through a country that is almost unsettled.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. It is well settled.

Mr. CASEY. My information is that the greater part of it is not well settled. It may be fairly settled along the Saskatchewan, but that is all. This Fort Saskatchewan is down in a valley.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CASEY. At all events it is in such a position that it is not convenient for a railway to get to it without great expense, such expense as might prevent the building of the railway altogether. It does not do to push a general principle too far. Here is a railway that will lead to large new settlements in the country and create a great deal of traffic. In every case it is reasonable to suppose a village has been placed so as to suit the first settlers, but it does not follow that its location is suitable for a railway station. It is hardly reasonable to seriously deflect a line of railway to benefit 200 people in one particular spot. My hon. friend from Alberta is, doubtless, seeking to benefit some of his constituents, but he must look to the fact that there are constituents to come. He has to look to the settlers who come in along the line as well as to the pioneers who are already there. I do not think it would be fair to say that the railway should go within this or that settlement at present existing ; and I do not think it fair to tie a railway up in that way. It was thought necessary, in the public interest, when the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was chartered, to compel them to go into Lethbridge and Macleod. I supported that proposition at the time on the general principle that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has been speaking on. I am not sure that we did wisely to compel a railway to go to those places. When I went to the spot and saw that it had added many miles to the length of the road, and caused the construction of large bridges and the creation of very considerable grades, and all for the convenience of small places, I am not sure that we should not have done better to allow the road to take the best and shortest route from Medicine Hat through the mountains with the view to becoming a through route. I do not think there are any such important centres of settlement in that district, and I am compelled to join with the majority of the Railway Committee in opposing what the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. OLIVER. I may be permitted to correct a statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I really do not know where he derives his information. I have lived in that country, and almost in the immediate vicinity, for 23 years ; and as a member of this House, I humbly submit that whether another member is willing to accept my statement or not, he must admit that my statement is evidence. Whether he considers it true or not, he is hardly at liberty to state what is directly opposite to what I have stated when the facts are not within his own personal knowledge. Now, I beg to assure the House that the village of Fort Saskatchewan is not in the valley of the river ; it is on the upland, and the upland is level. There are absolutely no physical obstacles to the building of a railroad into the limits of the corporation. The whole line of this projected railroad is within present existing settlements. The road is not in an unsettled country. There is along the present line of this railroad a population running anywhere from 10,000 to 15,000, or possibly 20,000.

Mr. CASEY. Probably the mistake arises from the different conception the hon. gentleman has of what a settled country is from my notion of a settled country. He says there is a population of 10,000 or 15,000 along a length of 200 miles of railroad. I

would not call that a settled country; of course there is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of the term "settled country." There are no doubt settlements scattered along the line of that railway, but there is no doubt, on the other hand, that the railway is meant to produce and will produce a much greater and closer settlement in the large districts that have not now any settlers at all along that railway.

Mr. OLIVER. There are no large districts along that line where there are no settlers.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I do not think it makes any difference whether there are 15,000 or 20,000 people living along that proposed line. The important point for the committee to consider is whether we should protect the settlements and villages as they exist at the present time. Now it would almost seem to me superfluous and a reflection upon the good sense of this committee, that anything further should need to be said in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). At the close of the 19th century it seems to me that it would be an outrageous thing for an hon. gentleman of the House of Commons of the great Dominion of Canada to lay down the proposition that these villages and towns shall not be protected; more especially when we recall to mind the experience the towns and villages of this western country have had during the past ten or fifteen years. These railway companies have systematically held up these towns, insisting on the pound of flesh in the matter of bonuses from these corporations, and if they did not get their pound of flesh, if they did not get everything they wanted, they simply purchased towns and established new towns there. Therefore, we have witnessed the spectacle not only on one occasion, but on several occasions of towns being side-tracked. I might mention such cases as Pilot Mound in my own constituency, Manitou in my own constituency, Morden in my own constituency, and Deloraine beyond my own constituency, and I think Nelson was entirely wiped out. These were important towns where pioneers had gone in and laboured and established towns, and when the railway came along they absolutely refused to go to these towns with their line, and these people were compelled, in these instances, and many others that I need not mention, to move the entire town over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to the railway station. So that we have witnessed the spectacle from time to time of the mountain moving to Mahomet. Now it seems to me that it is a fair and a reasonable proposition that this House should say that we do not propose to allow that thing to continue. Why, we actually had the spectacle of the Canadian Pacific Railway threatening to side-track the city of Winnipeg after it had a population of 20,000 or 25,000. I remember myself reading a telegram from Sir George Stephen, now Lord Mount-Stephen, in which he accused the people of Winnipeg of being shysters and speculators and said that he would make the grass grow in the streets of Winnipeg by side-tracking that metropolis. Now, it is within the power of this Parliament to put a stop for ever to that sort of thing by this Bill. Why not put it right in the bond at the present time? It is all very well to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals is going to introduce a Bill, or that he has introduced a Bill. Quite possible, but will he press that Bill to a conclusion this session? We do not know that he will. The time to protect the rights of these people is the present time. When you are making a bargain put it in the bond. We have an opportunity at the present time of putting it in the bond. I say it is almost a reflection upon the Parliament of Canada that anybody should have to rise and urge that that clause be put in the bond. I have no doubt that the committee will unanimously agree to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Alberta. Why, we had two rebellions in the North-west which cost an enormous sum of money, to say nothing of the human blood that was spilt, because the rights of the pioneers were not respected when the Government came to deal with their claims.

Mr. COCHRANE. You had better not go back so far as that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman has a habit of interjecting remarks which he thinks are very clever. While he gives the impression that he is very fair and desires to protect the public, still we always find the hon. gentleman voting wrong. But I hope on this occasion he will stand up and vote right.

Mr. COCHRANE. Read the files of your own paper, and see what you have said.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let the hon. gentleman be calm, he will have his innings. We have the assurance of the hon. member for Alberta that there is no hardship in this case. He knows the country, and has given the committee his absolute assurance that this road can be built to this village without any loss to the company. I think the committee ought to accept that assurance, and I hope it will see its way clear to accept the hon. gentleman's amendment on the present occasion.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The amendment, as read by the hon. member for Alberta, contains another clause, that I do not see there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Yes, there was something there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend is mistaken. This is the original amendment.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. A portion of it has been left out.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Bill, as it now reads, says: "in" or "at," or "as near as practicable." The amendment strikes out everything but "in".

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Chairman, I was very much surprised at the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) criticising my action in this House. I want to draw his attention to the fact that I have always endeavoured to vote conscientiously and for what I believed to be the best interests of the country. These gentlemen from the North-west must remember, when they get railways built, that we cannot tie the railways down to conditions that we do not impose in any other part of the country. The hon. member for Lisgar says, that I am always voting wrong. He had better read the editorials in his own paper, and then consider how he has been voting. He is on one horn of the dilemma or the other: he is either trying to mislead the electors through his paper, or he is voting wrong in this House, because he does not vote on the lines that his paper advocates. I think the hon. gentleman had better set his own house in order before he attempts to lecture members of the House of Commons.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman give me an instance?

Mr. COCHRANE. It would take the whole night to draw attention to all the instances. I do not want to fool away the time of this committee by drawing attention to all the instances in which there is a difference between the hon. gentleman's votes and the utterances of his paper. As I understand it, this committee is desirous of doing justice to the best of their judgment. We decided that it was best to leave the Bill as it was. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) distinctly told us that he was going to bring in a Bill that would provide that no town should be bled in the manner that the hon. member for Lisgar has indicated to-night. I do not think it would be wise in this committee to bring in a resolution to oblige a railway to run into some little town that we do not know anything about. Then, to tell us that the people in these little towns are pioneers! I do not think these men that go and build up a little village, to which they expect railways to come and enhance their property, are pioneers. I wonder if the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has any town lots.

Mr. OLIVER. For the information of the hon. gentleman, I may say, that I have not.

Mr. COCHRANE. Perhaps you have a friend who has.

Mr. OLIVER. The voters of Fort Saskatchewan are the only friends I have there.

Mr. COCHRANE. The pioneers in my section of the country were the men who went in and opened up the country, and not the men who built up little paltry villages. They were the men who went in and carved out homes for themselves, made settlements and raised produce, not the men that squatted down in little villages and took the life-blood out of the farmers around them. I think we had better do even-handed justice to all the communities, and not make a special case of that little village.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has made out a very good case, and that the reasons of the chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals for refusing to accept it were not very good. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) told us that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is going to introduce a Bill, and that this Bill will have a provision to carry out the views that are being expressed in that amendment. This Bill is before the Bill that the hon. member says is coming in.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did not say that; I said the hon. Minister had introduced a Bill, and that Bill will have that addition, but that it will be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. WALLACE. We are as big as the Governor in Council. We have the Governor in Council in this Chamber, and a good many more than the Governor in Council, except the Governor, and we have all the facts placed before us here to-night. These facts cannot be disputed. They were attempted to be disputed by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who, apparently, knew nothing whatever about that which he was talking, and he has disappeared, ashamed of the arguments he was trying to use. We cannot easily put into the Bill what the hon. member for Alberta proposes, and which proposition is a very reasonable one. As was stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), these great roads are in the habit of dictating to communities and acting in an arbitrary and unfair manner. If a community settles in a place, that is prima facie evidence that this is the place for settlement. There are advantages at that point, or the people would not go there for settlement and form a community for a village or town. This, I am told, is an incorporated village or a town; it is a place that has attained some importance. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) says that there are no engineering difficulties whatever, though the railway urged that as an excuse for building the station a mile, or two miles, away and destroying all the industry that has been created at this place. Experience shows that the village or town must cluster around the station, and, if the station is

removed from the place, it becomes absolutely worthless. When these pioneers go into that country, and when they, in their wisdom and in their discretion, select these places, the railway is built to take the business and carry the traffic of that community, and they should not be permitted to say: We will build our station two miles away; we will build it on our own lands, and build up a rival town, and make money out of selling town lots. That the railway company should be prevented from doing. The hon. chairman of the Committee of Railways and Canals tells us that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has introduced a Bill with that object in view. This Bill is ahead of his; we do not know whether this Parliament will agree to his Bill, or what will come of it. We know that this Bill is before us now, and there are good reasons given by the promoters of the amendment why it should be adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time for the consideration for private Bills having lapsed, the House will go on with the Orders of the Day.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Government to one or two pressing matters in connection with returns. One is, perhaps, not immediately under the control of the Government, but I would ask their good offices in the matter. Some days ago, a report from Mr. Ogilvie, in connection with the Yukon question, was ordered to be printed. Some matters that were sent to be printed, after that Order, have been attended to, but, having made inquiry, I find that the report of Mr. Ogilvie has not been attended to. I would ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is leading the House, if he would be good enough to expedite that, so far as the Government can.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have taken a note of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), a few days ago, to hasten, at any rate, the preliminary compliance, with an order of the House granted in connection with the appointment of Mr. Russell, as inspector of steamboats, and the Minister mentioned that the report was long. I then asked that there should be a first return and a supplementary one in addition, so that possibly the papers that were ready would suit the purposes which I immediately had in view. On the 15th of May I made the same request to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in regard to a return in relation to the commission of the New Westminster Crown and Timber Office. A commission was issued to investigate into circumstances connected with the crown and timber office at New Westminster. I intimated to the Minister that I would be content with the return without the evidence, which could come down as a supplementary return, and, therefore, the first part should be expedited. I was anxious to call the attention of the Minister (Mr. Sifton) to a personal matter, in a sense, relating to the examination of Mr. Bower as a Dominion land surveyor. I sent the Minister a letter from Mr. Bower in which this gentleman asked a speedy decision in his case. I was in hopes I would be able to telegraph to this gentleman to-day the decision of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). What is it about?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This gentleman was a candidate at an examination held in Victoria for Dominion land surveyors. The successful candidates received their certificates, and Mr. Bower, who is said to be a very efficient man, woud have been in that position were it not that he was compelled by a process of the court to leave the examination and come up country as a witness in a case. He was allowed to be examined later, but he fears his papers will not be passed on until some time in August, and this precludes him from undertaking work which he has engaged to do in the railway belt. As there seems to be no doubt about his qualifications it resolves itself into a mere matter of form.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will take a note of this.

WINDING UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOS. FORTIN (Laval) moved second reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend the Winding-up Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FORTIN. The provisions of this Bill have been already explained to the House, and I shall say only a few words to remind the committee of the object and purpose of the Bill. The first two clauses provide for the appointment of one or more inspectors in case of a joint stock company, to which the Winding-up Act applies, becomes insolvent. It is well known the Winding-up Act applies to large commercial corporations and joint stock companies, and as the Act now stands, it provides for the appointment of one or more liquidators, but there is no provision by which the courts are empowered to ap-

point inspectors. The necessity of appointing inspectors in such a case is so well recognized, that even in the absence of legislation, the judges take upon themselves to appoint inspectors. This is wholly irregular, but it shows the necessity for this provision in the law. According to our common law in the province of Quebec, in all cases of insolvency the moment there is an abandonment of property, whatever may be the value of the estate, there is always a curator and inspectors appointed. If that be deemed useful in ordinary cases, it seems to me to be all the more necessary in the cases to which the Winding-up Act applies, for it has to do with large concerns, and the conduct of liquidation requires a great deal of work and supervision. Under the Winding-up Act, the liquidator may be allowed to continue the business, but he is deprived of the assistance of the former board of directors, because the moment the winding up order is issued, the directors cease to hold office. The first section of the Bill is to amend section 20 of the Winding-up Act, by adding to it the following subsection :—

2. The court may also appoint one or more inspectors whose duty it shall be to assist and advise the liquidator, and supervise generally the liquidation of the company.

It will be noticed that this section is optional. The court will not be bound to appoint the inspector or inspectors in all cases, and in practice, it will only be upon the request of the most important creditors that such an appointment may be made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman used the language of the old Insolvent Act in connection with the appointment of an inspector ?

Mr. FORTIN. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It occurred to me that the words "assist," "advise" and "supervise" might have been used in the old Insolvency Act.

Mr. FORTIN. There cannot be much difference. These words might be omitted, for it is well understood that the appointment of an inspector is to assist the liquidator, and to supervise generally the affairs of the liquidation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The words "assist" and "advise" are well understood, but the use of the word "supervise" might lead to a question as to the particular duties of those two officials. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) that the liquidator should complete the matter without the supervision of the inspector ? The "assistance" and "advice" is one thing, but the supervision of this liquidator is an entirely different thing. It may put the inspector, not in the position of an adviser or assistant of the liquidator, but it may make him a higher officer or an officer without whom the liquidator might not act.

Mr. FORTIN. It was not the intention to give any superior power such as would seem to be conveyed by the expression "supervise," and I would be most willing to amend the clause if it is likely to be susceptible of any construction that would create a difficulty of that kind. I will move that this clause be amended by striking out the words "and supervise generally," and insert in lieu thereof the word "in."

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no doubt my hon. friend has fully considered the advantage which this amendment will give, but I cannot quite understand what particular advantage will result from it. The position of the liquidator, as I understand, under this Act, differs to a considerable extent from the general assignee under the old Insolvent Act. Under the statute at present the liquidator acts only with the approval of the court, and he has no powers or very inconsiderable powers, except with the sanction of the court. He has authority, however, with the sanction of the court, to employ servants or clerks to assist him, and to appoint a solicitor or law agent. If my hon. friend can suggest what useful purpose an inspector would serve outside of the services which would be performed by the servants or assistants, or by a solicitor or law agent, I would be very glad if my hon. friend would give us a little information on that point.

Mr. FORTIN. I can only speak from my own experience. In my experience, in every case in which a company has been put into liquidation, the necessity of inspectors has been so well recognized that they have been appointed in each case. The last case I can cite is that of the Pratte Company, which was put into liquidation last winter. When the case was presented to the court for the appointment of a liquidator, some creditor asked also for the appointment of an inspector. I appeared before the court in that case as representing some of the creditors, and I objected to the appointment of an inspector on the ground that the law did not provide for such an appointment. After full discussion, the judge took the point "en delibéré," and two or three days afterwards he came on the bench and declared that after having consulted all his colleagues—and there are ten judges in the city of Montreal—he had come to the conclusion to appoint in each of those cases an inspector. The hon. gentleman asks what is the necessity for such an appointment ; the liquidator can do nothing except by the authorization of the court, and what is the use of appointing an inspector ? Now, a legal adviser or solicitor knows very little, say, about pianos. A manufacturer of pianos may have a lot of material in process of manufacture, or he may have a large stock of pianos or other instruments in stock. How are these to be sold ? By auction, in lump or in detail ? Will the manufactures be kept going in order to finish the pianos in process of manufacture ? All these are questions which the inspectors are called up-

on to decide, and it is only in details of this kind that their advice is sought. So much is this the case that though the appointment is not legal it is made actually. For instance, the judges in the district of Montreal will not grant a provision authorizing the liquidator to sell $5 worth of the assets of any company unless they are presented with a written advice signed by the inspectors. The judges do not know any more about the particular business of joint stock companies than do the solicitors. In order to make sure that the liquidator will not abuse his authority or power, the judges exact a petition, signed with the written advice of the inspector. It is difficult to enumerate all the acts of assistance which the inspectors are called upon to perform; but if the hon. gentleman has had any experience of the working of this Winding-up Act, I am sure he will agree with me when I say that if inspectors are required in any case of insolvency, they are surely required in the case to which this Act applies. If inspectors are required in any case of insolvency it is surely in a case where this Act applies, because it applies, as is well known, to large business concerns, and where the estates are considerable. There may be points of conflict between the shareholders and the ordinary creditors which are very delicate and sometimes very difficult to settle. The shareholders may have paid only a portion of their shares, they may be called on to pay the balance of their shares, there may be a conflict between the creditors and the shareholders, and in all those questions surely the assistance of inspectors will be most valuable to the liquidator.

Mr. BRITTON. It seems to me there is going to be a difficulty in this section in carrying out just what the hon. gentleman intends. By this section, what status is given to the inspector? What power has he got? Supposing he does advise, and the liquidator does not choose to take his advice, what then?

Mr. FORTIN. All conflicts of that kind are settled by the courts.

Mr. BRITTON. Is the power given inspectors, when two or more are appointed, to override the decision of the liquidators? In the Ontario Winding-up Act, which is similar in many respects to the Act now in question, there is power in the shareholders, not in the court, to appoint one or more inspectors, but the words of that section are these:

The creditors of the company may at any meeting appoint one or more inspectors to superintend and direct the proceedings of the liquidators in the management and winding-up of the estate, and in case of one inspector being appointed, all the powers of the liquidator shall be exercised, subject to the advice and direction of the inspector.

In that case, it is clear that if there were two inspectors, and they decided one way, the liquidator would be bound to act in accord with their decision. But if there should be only one inspector, and the inspector and liquidator should differ, I suppose the court would have to determine between them. There is the difficulty. I said, when the matter was up before, that it seemed to me wise to have inspectors appointed, but taking the Act as it is presented to the committee, this section, it seems to me, will lead to a great deal of difficulty, if it is passed, simply giving power to appoint one or more inspectors, without defining better than the section does the duty of these inspectors or the power they may have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I suggest to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) that in the practice which I have had under this Act, the difficulties he has referred to have been usually dealt with in this way. If a company carrying on business goes into liquidation, the liquidator is usually a person who is familiar with that kind of business, and able to carry it on, if necessary. If, however, he is not such a person, if as is very often the case now, the liquidator is an incorporated company, then the course pursued, and which has seemed to work successfully, is this. The liquidator applies to the court for permission to appoint a manager of the business, as a going concern, and that manager, being familiar with that particular kind of business, carries it on under the direction of the liquidator, who again is under the direction of the court. My hon. friend says that in his province the advice of the inspector, such as here provided for, would be acted on by the court without further evidence.

Mr. FORTIN. Generally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that would be the case in our province. I think our judges would still require evidence by affidavit of the facts before coming to any conclusion. If the clause, however, is carefully drafted and made entirely permissive, so that it shall be perfectly clear that it is not necessary to appoint an inspector, I would have no great objection, because the hon. gentleman is better able to judge than I am of the necessity which arises for it in his own province.

I would like, however, to point this out, that he should make it perfectly clear as to whether or not it is necessary to appoint an inspector when you make a winding-up order. He is, no doubt, aware that there has been difficulty, at least in our province, under section 20. That section reads this way:

The court in making up a winding-up order, may appoint a liquidator.

I think at one time it read "shall" appoint a liquidator. Now, is it intended that this

inspector shall be appointed by the winding-up order at the same time as the liquidator is appointed, or that the court shall have jurisdiction at any time to appoint an inspector. I think it might be desirable for my hon. friend to consider whether or not he has made that point plain.

Mr. FORTIN. The practice in our courts is this. When a petition is presented for a winding-up order, the judge generally appoints a temporary liquidator. Then a meeting of the creditors is held, and at that meeting a winding-up order is made final and a liquidator appointed. I am aware of the difficulties pointed out by my hon. friend. The question has arisen, to my knowledge, whether a liquidator should not be appointed when the petition is made for a winding-up order, or whether he should not be appointed at a meeting subsequent to the granting of the winding-up order. But I understand the practice is now general, and there is no more difficulty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That clause was amended, I think, in 1888.

Mr. FORTIN. I do not know of the amendment, but I know that now there is no such difficulty. When the petition is presented, an interim liquidator is appointed, then a meeting of the creditors is called, and at that meeting a liquidator is appointed by the court.

The second subsection which I wish to add to section 20, is made in a permissive way. My hon. friend will see, by the words used, that the appointment is not compulsory. "The court may also appoint one or more inspectors."

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the proposed subsection uses exactly the same language as the main section. It uses the word "may," it is true, but that is exactly the word used in the main section, and I would prefer, if my hon. friend has no objection, that it should be made perfectly clear that the two things are not exactly on the same basis.

It is necessary to appoint a liquidator, but it may not be necessary to appoint an inspector, and my hon. friend does not think it is, in all cases. I think, then, that if some words were introduced in that section to make that perfectly clear, it would be more acceptable from my standpoint.

Mr. FORTIN. No word is clearer than the word "may," as expressing a thing that is permissable. It is true that section 20 uses the same word.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) is aware that the word "may," when used with respect to a court, is sometimes used in a mandatory sense. I think an illustration of this use is to be found in section 20.

Mr. FORTIN. Perhaps it might do to put in the words "when found advisable," making it read "the court may also, when found advisable, appoint one or more inspectors," and so on. I would move that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would answer.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) to explain this clause.

Mr. FORTIN. It is possible that the clause might require to be amended. The object is this. Under section 31 of the Winding-up Act, the liquidator is authorized, with the approval of the court, to exercise a series of powers. Now, one of these powers, under subsection "f," is to

> Draw, accept, make and endorse any bill of exchange of or promissory note in the name and behalf of the company.

Then, he is authorized to

> Raise upon the security of the assets of the company from time to time any requisite sum or sums of money; and the drawing, accepting, making or endorsing of every such bill of exchange or promissory note, as aforesaid, on behalf of the company shall have the same effect, with respect to the liability of such company, as if such bill or note had been drawn, accepted, made or endorsed by or on behalf of such company in the course of the carrying on of its business.

Now, a difficulty arises, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. Though the liquidator is authorized to raise on the assets of a company any reasonable sum or sums of money, still, the main portion of his duty is to sell and dispose of the assets of the company. Now, in Quebec no valid contract or pledge of security can be given upon movable assets, without their things being actually placed in the possession of the creditor or in the possession of a third person agreed upon by the parties. So, if the liquidator is to borrow money on the security of movable assets of the company, he must divest himself of such assets, and that paralyses the liquidation. Precisely such a difficulty arose in the case already stated, the case of the Pratte Piano Company. They had a large stock of pianos on hand, and the liquidator had been empowered to continue the affairs of the company in order to dispose of the material in process of manufacture. For this purpose he wanted some money. He was authorized by the judge to borrow money upon the security of the assets of the company, and he went to the bank for that purpose. The bank said: You are authorized by the judge to borrow money, but you are not directed by the judge how to make the contract. In order to make the contract valid under our common law, you must deliver to us the pos-

session of the pianos. If he had done so, he could not have liquidated, and in that case the liquidator was prevented from borrowing the necessary funds to carry on the business of the company. The object of the amendment is to meet such a case, though it may go too far with regard to negotiable instruments. There seems to me no difficulty, however, in the province of Quebec where the chattel mortgage is totally unknown. When the Bill was first presented to the House, some objection was taken to this clause by hon. members from other provinces, and it then came to my mind for the first time that there might be something in the objection, because of the existence of the chattel mortgage, which is recognized by all the provinces except Quebec. It might, therefore, be necessary to declare that, as the lien offered by the liquidator would be subject to any pre-existing liens conferred on other creditors, either by way of chattel mortgage or otherwise. I would, therefore, be ready to add a few words to the subsection, in order to meet the difficulty that might arise in other provinces. In the first place, I am quite willing to amend the clause by striking out the words "by discounting any negotiable instrument." This will exactly meet the difficulty arising from the way of raising security upon the assests of the company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How will that read ?

Mr. FORTIN (reading).

And no delivery of the whole nor of any part of the assets of the company shall be necessary to give a lien to any person making a loan to the liquidator in virtue of the provisions of this section.

Perhaps some words might be added here, such as "the whole without prejudice to all previous liens existing upon the securities or assets of the company." I am quite willing to accept suggestions from the learned members of the profession. Perhaps the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), or the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), might suggest a few words that would cover that point. As regards the province of Quebec, the law would meet our case perfectly, because we have no chattel mortgages there. But in order to avoid a conflict between a lien created by a liquidator and some previous liens existing upon the assets, we might add a few words.

Mr. BRITTON. I oppose altogether the amendment for the province of Ontario ; it would be introducing an entirely new state of things so far as the Ontario law is concerned, and will lead to endless confusion and litigation. It will not work at all in the province of Ontario. The liquidator at present has the power of an individual to carry on business, to make such contracts as an individual could make if the property was his own and he was dealing with it. Now, in order that an individual may give a lien upon the property there must be an actual delivery of it, with actual and continued possession, or it must be in writing and the writing, whether it is a bill of sale or a chattel mortgage, must be registered. Then anybody who is dealing with the person who owns the property knows just what is being done in reference to it. If this law passes, it will place the liquidator of an insolvent concern or of a company that is being wound up, as to the property he is dealing with, in an entirely different position from any individual under similar circumstances would be, and there is no reason for that. I do not know how it may be as to other provinces. I am speaking simply as to the province of Ontario where, if a person who loans money sets a lien upon the particular goods of the liquidator without delivery, or writing of any kind, would be something entirely novel, and as I said would lead to a great deal of trouble. Then comes this question of the liquidator borrowing money from several persons. Then of course will arise the question of priority as to these liens. Why should the man who lends money in the first place to the liquidator be in any better position than the man who lends the money in the second place is to the liquidator, so long as the man who lends the money secondly is not in any way aware of the lien that has been created ? When this question was before the committee before, the argument that were adduced were much stronger than I can possibly make them, and they seemed to me conclusive that no such legislation ought to be passed by this House applicable to Ontario, which changes altogether the ordinary law of contract in reference to personal property.

Mr. FORTIN. I think the hon. gentleman entirely misconstrues the effect of this amendment. There is no question in this amendment of making special provisions that will put the liquidator in a different position to any other person with respect to a contract of this kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the difficulty of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) would be removed by substituting these words :

Shall be necessary to give a lien to any person taking security upon the assets of the company.

No delivery shall be necessary.

Mr. BRITTON. I think that is the whole question. Taking security then would mean taking security according to the laws of the province where the thing was done. I do not see any objection to such an amendment

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. BEATTIE moved that Bill (No. 32) to amend the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets be read the second time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into committee on the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BEATTIE. This Bill is brought up at the instance of the Steam Ferry Boat Company running between Windsor and Detroit. They hold a charter from this Government, and have, I believe, some $400,000 invested in first-class steam ferry boats. Under their charter from the Government they are obliged to sell ten tickets for 25 cents; but they are still more liberal than that, and they sell tickets at the rate of 1½ cents a piece provided $1 worth are purchased at a time. But speculators or scalpers purchase these tickets, in quantities, and through newsboys and other agents, sell tickets for 5 cents to occasional passengers who do not cross the river very often, and who do not carry tickets with them. By that means the company is deprived of its regular profits on the tickets. They lose a great deal of legitimate business by that interference with their trade, and the Bill asks that unauthorized agents shall be deprived from selling the company's tickets, the same as railways are protected.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. GEORGE R. MAXWELL (Burrard) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 49) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, in asking the House to pass the second reading of this Bill, I crave the indulgence of the House while I seek, in as few words as possible, to present our grievances, as British Columbians, so far as this subject is concerned. I frankly confess that this question has no charm for me, but, if we are to do honestly our part as representatives of the people who send us here to voice their sentiments, then we must be prepared to tackle things disagreeable as well as things agreeable. Our bed is not always one of roses. Our path is sometimes rough and thorny. Duty is stern and unbending. We have, therefore, to take the bitter along with the sweet, and we have to look at all questions in the light, in the higher light of how these questions affect the well being or ill being of the men and women who are linked with us for weal or woe in all things pertaining to the material progress of our fair Dominion. For a proper grasp and appreciation of our difficulties in the golden west—two lions bar the way. I wish to be frank—for frankness is best and will help rather than mitigate against our case. First, this is largely a question affecting one section of our broad Dominion. It is largely a local grievance, and removed so far away from most of the representatives of this House, that it is hard for some hon. gentlemen to understand the full meaning of what we contend for. Still, this drawback is not so great as it used to be. Thanks to the persistent efforts of many representatives who have preceded me in this House, this question has been brought home to you both through their speeches, and through the press in such a telling way, that I am emboldened to say, Sir, the question is getting to be understood, and that we are supported by all who are anxious to give a fair show to the labouring classes of our country. Thanks also to the marvellous discoveries of our great mineral wealth, we have been brought closer to other parts of the Dominion. Our province is no longer a terra incognita. Many of you, realizing our immense possibilities, have come to see us, and have got now a fair view of our material conditions. You have seen the thing of which we complain yourselves, and I sincerely hope you will join with us in trying to settle this question for all time in harmony with the wishes of the people. Further, our evil is becoming your evil. Toronto and Montreal are beginning to feel as we have felt for many years. The Chinese are sweeping across the continent, and already are making the labouring classes of our industrial centres sensible of what will be when they become more numerous. And I am glad for our sakes, for to this fact we have both an amount of sympathy and support that never would have been ours had the Chinese confined themselves to British Columbia. Many of you, however, know nothing personally of our grievances—and we want your practical help. Sir, no representative can absolve himself from responsibility in this matter. No one should say that because it does not affect his province, he has no interest in it. We are here to legislate for the whole and not for a part, and what injures the part injures the whole. In other words, in spite of our provincial divisions, we are the representatives of the whole people, and as such I ask you to join with us in obtaining that redress which we have long and earnestly sought, and which we sincerely believe is absolutely necessary for the well-being of our people.

Second, this proposal runs counter to teachings we all respect. I am sensible of that. But, Sir, this House, by the imposition of a $50 tax, has already departed from theory, and few, if any, advocate its abolition. Two things move me in this matter, so far as the Chinese are concerened. I honestly believe that it would be better for themselves to stay in China, and so far as the

churches are concerned, they could and can more easily change them in China than here. Then, as one considers his duty in this matter, he finds something like this staring him in the face. Present legislation bears heavily against the labouring man. That man is bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. He supports our religious, educational, municipal, provincial and political institutions. Without him churches would dwindle, schools would grow less numerous, and our political organizations would lose their best friends. In other words, the labouring man is the backbone of all things which are our pride. If then my choice is whether I shall legislate for his interests, or for the interests of the Chinese, and that is our choice, then I have not the slightest hesitation, Sir, in saying that our first duty is towards those who are of our own household. I can conceive of no law, and no teachings that should compel us to be oblivious of the interests of our brethren, and any condition or circumstance or law that drives them to the wall in favour of a lower civilization cannot, in my opinion, be just. The legislation of this House protects the manufacturer or the capitalists; there is no doubt about that. Let us be consistent by doing something to protect the interests of the labourer.

To give the House as complete a view of this question as possible, a short statement of previous efforts in this direction seems necessary. I would like to pay a tribute to those earnest workers in the past, who believed that while they were pleading for the settlement of this vexed question, that they were in reality labouring for the emancipation of their province. Some of these are dead and gone, but about their sincerity and purity of motive there can be no doubt. We have entered in to their labours, and if we are nearer the goal of success, I am willing to own that it is largely owing to the increasing efforts of these men. I pass by the earlier efforts of the early agitators. For practical purposes, the later developments are quite suited to our purposes. In 1883, Mr. Shakespeare moved:

> That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law similar in principle to the law now in force in Australia, and entitled the Influx of Chinese Restriction Act, 1881.

The motion was negatived on a division. The result was not altogether unsatisfactory. Several able speeches were delivered in support, and several others which, while halting between two opinions, yet gave evidence that the speakers were on the fair way to become converted. The leader of the Government, now, unhappily, gone, and whose presence in this Chamber will ever be missed by those who knew him and loved him, said:

> It is a very serious question, one whose importance cannot be over-estimated, one that cannot be slurred over, but must be treated. It is of great consequence to British Columbia, and is of subsequent importance to the eastern provinces.

This question, Sir, let me remind hon. members of both sides of the House, is of greater consequence to-day than it was then, and is of greater importance to eastern provinces to-day than it has ever been, and to the members of the present Government to whom we look with considerable confidence that they will not disappoint us, I would say, that our demand cannot be overestimated, it cannot be slurred over, but must be breasted, and the sooner the better. In 1884, the same gentleman, the representative of the then most important constituency in British Columbia, moved:

> That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law prohibiting the incoming of Chinese to that portion of Canada known as British Columbia.

As the result, the Government promised to issue a commission to look into the whole subject, and, in the words of Sir John A. Macdonald:

> To consider its trade relations, its social relations, and all those moral considerations which make Chinese immigration inadvisable.

According to promise, the commission was issued, and, as the result of their labours on the coast, we have, on the whole, a volume of considerable value. In 1885, the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, who was one of the commissioners, moved:

> That it is expedient to impose an entry fee or duty of $50 on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada, and that no vessel carrying Chinese immigrants to any port in Canada shall carry more than one such immigrant for every fifty tons of its tonnage.

That is the law in existence. The hon. gentleman was frank enough to tell this House that the Bill was regarded as a milk-and-water measure, and the opinion then expressed is almost universal now. Even the representatives then were not satisfied. One said:

> It is getting in the thin end of the wedge.

Victoria, the capital of the province, became excited, and the late chief justice seconded a motion, which was unanimously carried, calling upon the then representatives of British Columbia in this House to urge upon the Government the necessity of immediately adopting the strongest restrictive measures as to Chinese immigration. Mr. Gordon, one of the best representatives ever sent from British Columbia, said that

> Personally, he would like to see the tax $500, but was prepared to give this measure a fair trial.

And so, with the best expectations that the cure had been found which would lessen our evils, the Bill became law. Since then we have had time and opportunity to consider the merits and demerits of that legislation. I can assure you, Sir, that there was every desire to give it fair-play, but, when all is said that can be said in its favour, we have sorrowfully to confess that it comes far from

what was expected and what was wanted. It has been weighed and found wanting. The Government of that day said the law now in existence was for the regulation, and not for the prohibiting of Chinese immigration. Neither the one nor the other has been accomplished; all that has been done, and is being done, is simply to put so many thousand dollars per year into the treasury, but we are practically left defenceless. The tax is inadequate, for the Chinese bosses can pay the tax and bring in all they want, being sure of making a good thing out of their investment. Little, if any, decrease has taken place; so that, practically, we stand where we were before. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in 1886:

> If the present Act is not effective, then its object ceases altogether and it should be repealed.

No Government can with safety repeal the present law, imperfect as it is. Though it does not provide us with a remedy, I do not object to those gentlemen paying something to the support of a country that treats them so handsomely. There can be no backward movement, nor can we allow things to remain as they are. What we should do, if the present law is not effective, is to make it effective by raising the tax to such a point as will compel these bosses to give up their nefarious trade, and thus ensure our country from being overrun by a class which, take them all in all, are most undesirable immigrants. Sir, from 1886 till the present, the agitation has been going on. The discontent has been growing deeper and stronger, not only in British Columbia, but throughout Canada, and we feel that the time has come for more vigorous measures. Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Government in 1883, said:

> At any moment when the Legislature of Canada chooses, it can shut down the gate and say: "No more immigration shall come here form China," and then no more immigrants will come, and those in the country at the time will rapidly disappear.

We believe that this House should now shut down the gate. Sir, I think it is apparent that there must be good reasons for this agitation. One old teacher, when importuned to oppose a certain agitation, practically said: No: if it is false, it will pass away like smoke; but, if it is right, it will stand. Many of us are familiar with agitations that made a noise, a great noise, at the beginning, and then fizzled out, like a sky-rocket. This question has been agitating the people of British Columbia for nearly thirty years, and it is stronger than ever. Time has neither changed nor mollified opinions. The very unchangeableness of the people is, to me, a sign that they must have right on their side. Our reasons have often been laid before this honourable House, but in asking the Government to take this step, it would not be fair, if we did not back up our request with substantial arguments. What reasons I give are those which commend themselves to my mind. There may be other reasons which may be more cogent with others; but, however we may differ as to the reasons for this request, there is no difference among us about the request itself.

We object to Chinese immigration because those who come to our land are mostly slaves. I have already referred to the Chinese bosses, and these I blame for a great deal of the trouble which we have had with the Chinamen. They are our modern Shylocks, who fatten and grow rich on the misfortunes of their poor countrymen. They have their agents in China. These agents select the victims. Being unable to pay either ship money or the tax, the poor Chinamen contract to become the slaves of these bosses until that money is paid. When they arrive here, they are consigned, like so many sheep, to their respective owners, who use them and abuse them, according as it suits their financial profit. While, on the part of the slave, it is his interest to free himself as quickly as possible from his galling bondage, it is the interest of his master to keep him, by hook or by crook, as long as possible in his service. The testimony of competent witnesses is most complete and convincing. Hon. John Robson, a late Premier of British Columbia, says:

> My opinion is that the greater portion of Chinese brought here are brought by private companies.

The Rev. Philip Dwyer says:

> They are mostly young single men, being imported as slaves on speculation.

David W. Gordon, head of a firm of wharf-owners, and a contractor, says:

> So far as I can gather, from the most reliable Chinese and other sources, the class of immigrants, or more properly speaking serfs or slaves who come here from China are gathered by agents of Chinese companies from amongst the criminal and poverty-stricken population. When they arrive here they follow any pursuit their owners can turn them to with advantage.

Gilbert M. Sproat, who received a prize of $1,000 for an essay on India and China, and who has thoroughly studied this question, says:

> Many of them enmeshed in labour contracts with their own performances guaranteed by cruel penalties to their relatives at home are less free here than they were in China.

Thomas H. King, ten years in China, says:

> Most of them who are brought here come to supply the coolie broker or contractor, who hires them out. They dare not break their contract.

G. C. Hastings, a chief justice of the Supreme Court of California, says:

> Chinese labour is a servile caste. The Chinaman is in a state of peonage. They are not free men.

S. H. Phillips, Attorney General of the Sandwich Islands, on oath, says:

The Chinese who come to the Sandwich Islands are under contracts which are indefinite and assignable. They are bought and sold out body and soul to the person who employs them for a term of years, generally five.

Consul Bailey, of Hong Kong, says:

The emigration from China to all parts of the world is an organized business, in which men with large capital engage, in which men are bought and sold at so much per head precisely as a piece of merchandise is handled at the market value. The coolie of China is bought by the rich trader to serve his purchaser at a low rate of wages for a series of years in a foreign country under a contract for the full performance of which in many cases he gives a mortgage on his wife and family.

Sir, that evidence is surely conclusive. It reveals what one might call a horrible state of affairs. Slavery in any form is repugnant. "Man's ownership of man is so palpably unjust that it requires no prophet to discover the injustice." Canada, you know, when slavery was looked at differently than it is now, was the first among the nations to proclaim that freedom was the inalienable right of every man, and that no man in her wide domain should ever grow rich by enslaving others. As things go, slavery flourishes—the slave toils, and the slave-masters grow rich. In the name of Liberty, I plead that this horrid traffic should cease. In the name of a right which some for gold are willing to barter and to destroy, I plead that better far would it be for these Celestial slaves, were they never to see our shores, than to come as they do, and the only effective solution is the raising the tax to such a point as will make it impossible for these inhuman wretches to traffic with profit in human flesh.

Secondly, we oppose Chinese immigration because these slaves are dangerous competitors with our labouring classes. If I was asked, Sir, one reason why this movement has maintained its vitality for so long, I should unhesitatingly answer that it is because the presence of the Chinese in our land is an injustice to our working classes. The working classes know that, feel it, and because they know and feel it, they have been perfectly within their right in keeping alive this agitation, and they are perfectly within their right in asking you to come to their help. I know, Sir, that this point is disputed, and it will be necessary on that account to investigate the facts of the case. Mr. N. Shakespeare, when a member of this House, and a very worthy member he was, too, stated:

It has been found impracticable in all departments of labour and industry involving manual labour for a white man to compete with a Chinaman, especially in those light situations which have hitherto been filled with women and young people.

Mr. Barnard, who was another member of this honourable House, said—and he knew what he was talking about:

I have seen the practical working of this Chinese problem, and I have found that they are competitors with white labour.

The mover of the Bill now in force declared that the antagonism between the white and Chinese labourer was due to this very cause, and the object of the Bill was to give the white labourer fair-play. Again, he said:

I say that the mass of Chinese immigrants are of a class who necessarily will compete with the labouring men, with the ordinary working men of the country, and I say that it is little wonder that objections should be raised to the large immigration of this class.

These testimonies are taken from "Hansard," and were I to turn to the report of the Chinese commission many more might be adduced. Now, you might ask, Sir, why does Chinese labour interfere disastrously with white labour? Well, Sir, that it not difficult to answer. The Chinaman is a cheap worker. He is not the product of nineteenth-century civilization. He has not been taught to feast his eyes and his soul on pictures and music; to have a nice home and have it stocked, say, with a carpet, comfortable chairs and an organ. He is a creature of few wants. In fact, he has one want and one only, and that is he wants money. All the rest he can dispense with without a tear. Hence, as one competent authourity puts it—I think it was Sir Adolphe Chapleau:

A Chinaman will live on wages that will not support a white man and his family, being well provided himself on a handful of rice and other trifling necessaries. He becomes rich, according to his own standard, on wages that would beggar a white man's family. Now, take the white labourer's view of the case. While my work is very arduous, I go out with a light heart and perform it cheerfully, because it enables me to support my wife and my children. I am in a position to bring up my daughters to be good wives, and faithful mothers, and to offer my sons better opportunities in life than I had myself. I cheerfully contribute to support those churches, charitable institutions and other objects that enter into our daily life, but after I have maintained my family and performed these duties, not much is left of my wages when the week is ended. How is it with the Chinaman? The Chinaman can do as much work underground as I can. He has no wife and family. He performs none of these duties. Forty or fifty of his kind can live in a house no larger than mine. He craves no variety of food. He has inherited no taste for comfort or for social enjoyment. Conditions that satisfy him, and make him contented, would make my life not worth living.

As the Hon. Mr. Chapleau says, this is the feeling of the workingmen, and I am not prepared to say that it is not excusable or even justifiable. Now, important results may be noted. First, the Chinese crowd out the white labourer. This is disputed, but I believe the evidence is conclusive. Mr. Shakespeare says:

I know of instances myself where white men were engaged in certain callings previous to such a large influx of Chinese, who were doing well, and making comfortable livings; but after—through their competitors—they were obliged to abandon their callings, and leave the country.

Mr. Homer, another representative, in 1885, testified to the same fact. But such testimonies are practically unnecessary. The facts testify enough. In the coal mines there are about 600 Chinamen; they are doing the work which white labour could well do. When you consider the immense hold which they have got of the laundry business; you cannot but realize that they have driven the white labourer out. In market gardening few whites have been able to compete against them, and when you consider that there are thousands of them employed in our canneries, you cannot but see that white labour has been crushed out.

Secondly, labour is degraded. The eloquent leader of the present Opposition, in 1883, said:

I believe that the tendency of such an immigration must necessarily be to cheapen and degrade labour, and to lower labour all through the country is entirely a wrong and erroneous principle to prevail in the councils of the nation.

A sentiment I heartily applaud; and I further add, in the language of a friend of our cause, Mr. Fairbank:

I believe no greater calamity can befall any class of the community, or any community itself, than anything which tends to degrade labour.

Now, Sir, should such things be? Is it fair or is it just to the labourer that he should be treated in this manner? Legislation in this House, and both the late and the present governments have said our manufacturers must be protected. While a free trader, as things exist across the line, I think there is reason for so doing. Protect labour and the white labourer. Realize his importance in our life, that in very truth Canada's greatness depends and will ever depend, not so much in her mines as in her men. Consider his struggles—struggles for which he is often ill-prepared. Consider how much more necessary the white labour is to this land than is the other, and I ask that to-day you will not turn a deaf ear to an appeal for justice which has been long and earnestly made.

One objection that was urged—and, Sir, I must confess that at times there was some force in the objection, and that was—that owing to the scarcity of white labour, Chinese were absolutely necessary. I don't know that those who urged this were perfectly sincere, or whether they used it simply as a blind to get that cheap, ignorant, passive worker introduced, so as to make them a sort of base currency for fixing the value of white labour, whatever was the motive, the appearances of things were decidedly in favour. In 1883 we were told you must keep Chinese labour until white labour is ready to supplant it. Sir John A. Macdonald in a remarkable speech, which has an important bearing on our Bill to-day, said:

As soon as that takes place, then I will go just as strongly as the then leader of this question in this honourable House.

Then a railway was about to be built and we were assured that white labour could not be had. To-day another railway was built and white labour has been had in abundance. That excuse has no force to-day. No one can honestly urge that argument to-day. We believe, and we think that we have good grounds for believing, that white labour is ready to supplant Chinese labour, if white labour is to have justice meted out. I grant that we may not have that labour just at hand, and the reason why it is not at hand, is just where the shoe pinches. We want more people—not Orientals—children of the Anglo-Saxon race, and all others of other nations who will join with us in developing our wonderful resources, and in supporting our educational, religious and political institutions. Why is it that the richest province, perhaps, in Canada, or for that in the world, cannot command all the white labour it requires? Why is it that white labour give us the go-by? It is not, Sir, as you know, because we have no inducements to offer. It is not because our climate is wintry, it is not because of the poverty of the soil or the forest, or the mine, or our seas and rivers. Why do we then lack the services of those whose services ever enrich any land? I believe that Mr. Barnard stated the truth, and the whole truth, when he said:

I believe that white labour is to be had in abundance, only for the presence of the Chinese, but white men do not care to come so long as they are present in such large numbers.

Proclaim then to-day by the adoption of this Bill, that henceforth the white labourer will have the same rights and privileges, will be put upon the same industrial level here, as he has in all civilized countries of the world, and that the value of a Chinaman will not be his value, then we shall have such an influx of white labour as will be mutually beneficial to all; then churches will flourish, schools will grow larger and more numerous, money will become more plentiful, population will increase by leaps and bounds, businesses will increase, and merchants will prosper, while a thousand and one avenues will be opened up for the preferment of our growing youth.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there can be but one opinion in this House to-day, and that is, we have a grievance. Long ago, the eloquent ex-Finance Minister said:

I do wish that something might be done to settle this question permanently, and to alleviate what I believe is a grievance to the people of British Columbia, and which in its present form,

is weighing somewhat heavily upon the peace and prosperity of that country.

And immediately after, the present leader of the Opposition, said :

Since this debate has commenced I have been strongly impressed that the people of British Columbia are labouring under a grievance.

Both hon. gentlemen know British Columbia a great deal better to-day than they did then, and I am sure their better knowledge will only make more manifest what they learned through debate. An attempt was made to settle this question permanently. I believe the framers of the Bill now in force meant to settle this grievance for all time. Their intentions were good, and while it has proved more or less ineffective, the legislation was a step in the right direction. Here then you have a question that is continually thrusting itself upward, and continually projecting itself into the political arena. Here to-day you have a people worthy in every way of your kind consideration, asking you almost unitedly to permanently settle this question. Agitations of this kind are injurious both to a province and country. The longer it is kept up—and it will keep up—class is set against class, labour against capital, and feelings are engendered which do irreparable harm all round. Frankly, I confess other problems of deeper importance should be engrossing our attention, but so long as the grievance lasts, just so long will the spirit of discontent prevent us attaining our higher and nobler destiny. What then are you going to do ? Is the present Government going to do something for labour, and thus for the labourer, or is it by refusal or inaction going to declare—that it values the Chinaman more than it does those whom it ought to honour ? A choice has to be made, and conscious of all that is at stake, I plead that the choice may be the one that appeals to all the better instincts of our race and country : The question may be asked—what do you want ? My answer to that, Sir, is we want the tax raised from $50 to $500. Bear in mind we say nothing against those who are here. Granting all that advocates of cheap labour claim, we say in addition we have enough of Chinese to do all the cheap labour, and we don't want now any more. As matters stand, we may at any moment be deluged ; we want that possibility changed into an impossibility, by the raising of the tax. Further, in asking for this we are not asking for something that is new and unprecedented. We are not the only country that has had to deal with this problem, and this hon. House is not the only House that has had legislation pressed upon them of this kind. In truth we are but following in the footsteps of others. The United States had to deal in a very summary way with these people. A short time ago the Government of Hawaii had to protect their people from their inroad. It is more pertinent perhaps to note what has transpired under the shadow of the British Crown. Queensland has had its Chinese trouble, and a law was passed in 1884 directed against Asiatic and African aliens. New South Wales has been tinkering away with this subject like ourselves until the legislators of that important colony were constrained by the voice of the people to raise the tax to $500. From all the information which can be obtained, there is a consensus of opinion that that tax has settled the question for ever. New Zealand, face to face with the same dangers, has had to follow suit. What, therefore, other colonies have done, and what other legislators have done should be precedent enough for us. Possibly if we had been the first to take this step, I might have faltered in proposing or in pleading for its enforcement ; but seeing others have had to cure this grievance by a similar proposal, their action should be a lesson to us to go and do likewise. This proposal may be Draconian—for that I do not care—sufficient for me the experience of others—that you cannot settle this grievance any other way. I believe there is one member of the Cabinet, the hon. Minister of Justice, to whom this proposal will be welcome, at least, it will have his support ; for I find in 1887 that he used the following words :—

If the hon. gentleman thinks there are too many Chinese in the country, let him double the capitation tax. I do not object to such a tax as will serve to exclude the Chinese, but I say let the tax be upon the Chinaman, and let the Chinaman's wife come in free—the wife cuts a small figure in this question, but we hope that he will withstand the wiles of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Sometimes during debate on this matter, the question has been asked what will Britain say or do should we pass legislation like this ? Very often that question was raised as a warning that Britain would not recognize it, in fact would throw it out. The true statesmen of this country knew differently. Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1884, said :

I presume that England would not interfere with any legislation of ours.

The Hon. Mr. Chapleau, in 1885, said :

I may state here that, as soon as the Government of the Dominion had decided to take this matter into consideration, we received from the Imperial authorities a communication stating that, notwithstanding the commercial treaty between Great Britain and China, the Imperial authorities left the Canadian Government free to dispose of the question as they deemed expedient.

We have the same freedom to-day. The legislature of New South Wales has been allowed, and the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain plainly told Earl Li Hung Chang, the particular friend of the chivalrous Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), that in these matters the colonies were entirely self-governing. No difficulty prevents us that way, in fact, all is

smooth sailing. But it may be further asked. How will legislation like this affect our trade relations with China? We have a magnificent fleet of vessels plying between Vancouver and China. Will not this imposition affect their trade? I do not think so. I think we can claim that we have treated the Chinaman fairly well. The only real enemies he has in British Columbia are small boys and dogs? Explain it how you will, but a dog barks at a Chinaman every time he sees him. In the United States they were treated at times with great inhumanity, and this proposal is not so bad as the Geary Act. Yet what do we find? American statesmen are in high favour at Pekin, one of them being selected to arrange the treaty of peace between China and Japan, while American business men, bankers and contractors are, if anything, more in favour than those of other countries. Further, there are steamers, American steamers, plying between American ports and China, and they are doing well. In short, American legislation has not interfered with their commercial enterprise. I should be sorry, Sir, to do anything, or advise anything to hurt the Empress Line of steamers. They are a credit to all concerned. There is but one blot—and that is, the large number of Chinamen employed. In all sincerity I say, these ought to give place to the sons of the countries which have given so much for their maintenance. I say I would regret to do anything to injure their prosperity, but we may naturally expect that as with the United States, so with Canada; China will grin and bear it. The sweet reasonableness, and the sunny ways of our gifted Premier, will, if necessary, make all things straight and plain.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present our case as briefly and clearly as possible. We have heard it often, and it is difficult to galvanize an old subject into life. Let me say that the press is largely with us. Almost every paper in British Columbia supports this request to-day. When I come east there is a marvellous unanimity also. The Montreal "Gazette" says:

An increase in the capitation tax would do no harm. John Chinaman is too much with us, not only in Montreal, but in all the cities and larger towns of Quebec and Ontario. He displaces Christian labour, and is in no sense a welcome or desirable addition to our population.

The Toronto "World" says, in an article headed "Exclude the Chinese":

The Chinese are a people that Canada can afford to exclude. They are producers in no sense of the word——

I can hardly go that far.

They do not take to farming. They are not needed as scavengers. One Doukhobor is worth a dozen Chinese. In addition to their worthlessness as producers, the Chinese are decidedly a low caste people. They are filthy in their habits and a menace to the public health.

That is absolutely true.

The Chinese will not assimilate with the people of any civilized country. Assimilation is impossible because the Caucasian is of a different breed, and he will have nothing to do with the Oriental. In British Columbia, where they know the Chinese best, the antipathy towards them is strongest. The per capita tax of $50 is wholly ineffective in keeping the Chinese out of Canada. During the year ending June 30, 1898, no less than 2263 Chinese immigrants paid the tax and entered Canada through British Columbia ports. The average for the past three years has been over 2100 per annum. It is time this wholesale importation should be stopped. By imposing a tax of $50 per head the Government declares that its policy is hostile to further immigration of these undesirable people. As the $50 tax has proved ineffectual it should be raised to such an amount as will prevent their getting into the country. Other British colonies have found it necessary to exclude the Chinese. In New South Wales and New Zealand a per capita tax of $500 is imposed, and ships carrying Chinese immigrants to those colonies are allowed to land not more than one Chinese to each 300 tons and 200 tons ship's burthen respectively.

The Toronto "World," the Bible of this side of the House, some time ago, gave us a leading article. I hope it was "inspired," and I wish I could give it all, for it is one of the best contributions to this subject that I have read. Let me give you two brief extracts:

The ultimate object of all legislation is the building up of a nation, founded on a superior standard of manhood. To that end we tax ourselves to secure a desirable class of immigrants, and it is equally essential and equally sound in policy that we exclude all classes likely to lower the standard of living or lower the tone of citizenship.

The article concludes as follows:—

If the leading politicians of eastern Canada could see the Chinese problem as it confronts the people of the west, the need of an effective restriction on such immigration would be at once recognized.

Our legislature is with us also, and I think this House and the Government also should take into consideration the views of the legislature of British Columbia. During the last session, this resolution was adopted, on the motion of Mr. Deane, seconded by Mr. Helgesen:

Whereas it is the declared policy of the Parliament of Canada to restrict the immigration of persons of the Chinese race into Canada, as shown by the enactment which imposes a tax of $50 on each Chinese entering the country:

And whereas this per capita tax is so low as to be wholly ineffective in carrying out the desires and wishes of the Dominion Parliament in this regard, as is plainly shown by the steady increase in the influx of Chinese persons into this country:

And whereas it is desirable that effective measures be taken as speedily as possible to prevent any further immigration of Chinese into the Dominion of Canada:

Therefore be it resolved, That a respectful Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, requesting him to acquaint the Dominion Government and Parliament with the opinion and desire of this legislature, that the per capita tax on Chinese immigrants should be at once increased to at least $500, and that His Honour may be pleased, in bringing this matter

to the attention of the Dominion authorities to cite the following :—

1. During the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1898, as shown by the Customs returns, no less a number than 2,263 Chinese immigrants paid the tax and entered Canada through the ports of this province alone, the average for the past three years being over 2,100 per annum.

2. This enormous influx, together with the present Chinese population of the province, estimated at about 14,000, and the natural increase by births in the province, has already driven workingmen of British race and blood out of many of the fields of labour, and threatens before long, if not stopped, to leave very little occupation remaining for the white labourer.

3. The history of the sister colonies of Great Britain, as well as of other countries, has fully demonstrated that wherever Chinese immigration has taken place, and where the influx has been unrestricted, the white worker has been in the first place degraded by the competition to which they were subjected, and ultimately wholly or largely driven out.

4. That the Imperial authorities are in sympathy with the efforts of the British colonies to protect British workers from the destructive incursions of Asiatic coolies is shown by their non-interference in restrictive legislation passed and enforced by those colonies.

5. Effective restriction is now being enforced in various of the colonies. In New South Wales and in New Zealand a per capita tax of £100, or £500, is imposed, and ships carrying Chinese immigrants to those colonies are allowed to land not more than one Chinese to each 300 tons and 200 tons ship's burthen, respectively. In New South Wales, no Chinese is allowed to became naturalized.

6. So effective has this legislation proved that the Chinese population of those colonies is gradually dwindling, while the number of immigrants has decreased from the thousands that were annually imported before these restrictive measures were enforced to almost an imperceptible number. These colonies will soon be rid of Chinese altogether. The latest returns show that the departures are beginning largely to exceed the arrivals.

7. It is well known to be the habitual custom of Chinese labourers to send their surplus earnings to China, and when that is not the case these earnings are usually extorted from them by "Companies" (as they are called) which, in the first place, have sent the coolie out here in a position of complete bondage to them. Thus there is going on a constant drain to the riches of the country, the depletion of its natural wealth, and the consequent impoverishment of the people.

That is practically the opinion of the people of British Columbia. I may say still further that the labour unions of British Columbia, as well as of the east, are also in favour of this measure. It has become one of the articles of the creed of the Trades and Labour Congress that a tax of $500 shall be put upon each Chinese immigrant. I may say still further that the people themselves that is those who have no axes to grind, are deeply stirred upon this matter, and earnestly desire that the Government should come to their aid and relieve them of this incubus. Now, I want to say in conclusion that when the telegram which came from the Premier was read at one of the largest meetings, I believe, ever held in the city of Vancouver, saying that our wishes would be his wishes, a cheer went up, one of the most enthusiastic I ever heard, because then the people seemed to realize that our political Moses had been found at last. I hope that the Government will be true to that position. In the good old Book we read of a woman who came again and again to a judge appealing for justice. Again and again, she was denied, but we are told for our encouragement that by persisting she succeeded. Now, we, the people of British Columbia, have this grievance, there is no doubt about that. They have done everything they possibly could in order to have their grievance ventilated, and to obtain the sympathy of the Government. We have been refused again and again. Now we are making this one more effort, and I do hope that the Government, at this late stage of the agitation, will feel it to be their duty to respond to our wishes, and that they will at least give us some more restrictive power than we have at the present time. Let our labouring classes be encouraged to continue their good work in the various fields of labour, so that British Columbia, so rich, so fair and so fertile, may become the home alone of the good old Anglo-Saxon stock, and of all other races who will join with that stock in making British Columbia one of the greatest and wealthiest provinces of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ELLIS. I wish to raise a point of order. I beg to submit that this is really a tax; the hon. gentleman himself speaks of it as a tax, and that is his idea. Well, if it be a tax, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that it ought to be recommended to this House by His Excellency the Governor General, and it ought to originate in Committee of the Whole.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman should have taken that point earlier in the debate.

Mr. ELLIS. I had not heard the argument.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Only one side of this question has been put, and the hon. gentleman should be the last to wish the debate to be closed without hearing the other side. I do not think the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Ellis) has stated the point of order fully. In the first place, this is not a tax on any of Her Majesty's subjects, there are no duties in the sense of ordinary tariff duties involved at all. These are duties imposed upon foreigners coming into the country.

Mr. ELLIS. It is a tax raised in Canada.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not in any sense like ordinary fiscal duties nor does it come within the letter of the rule, at any rate, as being a duty upon subjects of the Queen or upon Canadians.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I submit that the hon. gentleman does not meet the case submitted by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis). The only point he makes is that it cannot be a tax because it is not imposed upon the subjects of Her Majesty. Under our system, taxes are imposed not only upon subjects of Her Majesty, but persons who are not subjects of Her Majesty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The word tax is not used with regard to that rule.

The PRIME MINISTER. That does not matter, the effect is the same, it levies money upon persons coming into the country, which money goes into the treasury of Canada. If that is not a tax, I do not know what is. Under our system, if a man imports a cargo of tea, whether he be a foreigner or a subject, before he gets his tea into the country he has to pay a tax on the same. I think the objection of the hon. member for St. John is well taken, and I will suggest that the Speaker reserve his decision so that the debate may go on on the merits of the case, and we can have the decision later on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may mention that in 1885 a motion was brought before the House to levy a tax of $50 upon Chinese coming into the country, and that proceeding was initiated by resolution of the House, as may be found in the Journals of the House of Commons of the 2nd of July, 1885. I was under the impression that that precedent should be followed ; but if the House does not wish to press the question, it can remain in abeyance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Bill was then in the hands of a member of the Government, and, as a matter of fact, it went through in the usual way and received the assent of the Crown.

The PRIME MINISTER. That course was adopted to meet the objection now raised by my hon. friend. But I would suggest that Mr. Speaker reserve his decision on this point until a later stage, and let the discussion go on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the Prime Minister desire to go on with the debate to-night ? I would not like to move the adjournment of the debate, but I would like an opportunity of speaking on the Bill.

Mr. WOOD. As the point has been decided as well taken, how can the debate continue ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Decision has been reserved until this Bill comes up again on Monday next.

Mr. BRITTON moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

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

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the right hon. gentleman will say what business he proposes to take up to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will take up the Drummond County Railway Bill.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 6th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 141) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Penberthy Injector Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to the printed report of Mr. Ogilvie, which has been distributed. The report refers to the evidence, which he transmits with the report, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is not intended to bring down the evidence as part of the report. I thought it was all in the printers' hands, but it seems not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTEIOR (Mr. Sifton). When I brought down the report and laid it on the Table of the House, I stated that the evidence was very voluminous, and would be copied as rapidly as possible and brought down. The entire clerical staff in the department are working on the evidence, and as soon as it is finished it will be brought down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. Minister able to give us a reasonable idea as to when the evidence will be brought down ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I should think it ought to be ready within five or six days.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the last statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior, some important business to be brought on this side of the House, actually

waits for that evidence. It is almost absolutely necessary that the evidence should be had before we can go on. I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that if there is delay in an important piece of business before the House, it will depend entirely on the delay in bringing down that evidence. I do not think it need be printed, but should be brought down as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will be brought down as rapidly as it can be prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. There is plenty of money in the treasury, and with the means the Government have at hand it ought to be possible to have that evidence ready in a couple of days.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have the facilities and plenty of good will, but have a great many demands from hon. gentlemen opposite. The claim of the hon. gentleman, however, is reasonable, and we will attend to it.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. INGRAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: One of the objects of this Bill is to amend the present Election Act which, in my judgment, is not quite sufficient to meet all the difficulties that arise. Judging by the way elections are conducted nowadays, it was a very good Act up to within the last few years, but owing to the advanced and not too creditable methods now adopted at elections, I propose to amend some sections which I think are not complete. In the first place, I find that in some sections of the country, especially Ontario, one of the new methods used is to import foreign or non-resident deputy returning officers, who are experts in their particular line of business, and do not hesitate to stuff ballot-boxes or mutilate ballots, and my object in amending the particular section in question is to have deputy returning officers appointed who are residents in the municipalities where they are appointed. In Ontario, we brag of our educational system, and I see no reason why, if we have such a magnificent system, we should be compelled to import characters such as I have described.

Next, a deposit of $200 is required before a candidate can be nominated, and against this requisite there is a strong feeling in some sections of Ontario. In our provincial law no deposit is required, and I see no reason why it should be required in the Dominion elections.

I propose to amend section 30, which provides that the returning officer shall appoint his deputies at least within two days before the election. I have had some experience in asking a returning officer to give the names of the gentlemen who are to act as his deputies, and he has declined to furnish those names. Now, as both political parties pay for the services of the returning officer, I do not see any good reason why he should refuse to give the names of his deputies and the polls at which each deputy is appointed to act. I propose, therefore, to amend that section by providing that, on the request of a candidate or his agent, a returning officer shall, within a certain time before the opening of the polls, furnish the names of the deputy returning officers and the polls to which they are appointed.

Then, I also wish to have resident poll clerks. As it is now, non-resident poll clerks may be imported, who understand their business, and are up to very fine work, and who for that reason are imported.

An hon. MEMBER. Skilled artisans.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes. Then, I propose to increase the penalty for carrying ballots out of the polling booths. It is an ordinary practice now to take the proper ballot out, and substitute another one in its place, and by that means make sure of securing the vote of the person paid to vote. Then, in section 65, when a voter spoils his ballot paper by inadvertence, I propose that the deputy returning officer shall be compelled to furnish him with a new ballot. At present he has discretion either to furnish it to him or refuse to do so. One case in particular came under my observation, in which an elector voted for the candidate he was opposed to. He discovered his mistake after marking his ballot, and then came and reported to the deputy returning officer that he had spoiled his ballot and wished to have another. The deputy asked to see the ballot, and, when he found it was marked for the candidate he approved, he said: This ballot is good enough; and he slipped it into the box. But the elector thought he had spoiled his ballot by voting for the wrong man, and I may add, that the deputy returning officer, who did see the ballot, was one of those imported officers.

The next section, 56, deals with the counting of the ballots, and hon. gentlemen will remember that the other day, in the county of Waterloo, two deputy returning officers refused to let the agents or the candidates see the faces of the ballots or how they were marked. In West Elgin and Waterloo and one or two other counties in Ontario, the deputy returning officers simply refused to allow the agents to see the faces of the ballots cast for the election.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Was that a Dominion election?

Mr. INGRAM. No, an Ontario election.

Mr. HUGHES. The same crowd.

Mr. INGRAM. In counting the ballots, section 56 of the Dominion Act does not

compel the deputy to expose the faces of the ballots to the agents of either party, and I propose that he shall be compelled to expose them to the view of both of the candidates and their agents.

Then, section 58 provides for the return of the ballot-boxes, and, in my experience, a certain deputy returning officer brought the ballot-box to within a block or two of the returning officer, kept it all night, and delivered it to him the next morning at ten o'clock ; and the agent, who differed with him in politics, was of the opinion that the box had been tampered with and certain ballots mutilated. I propose to provide that all boxes used within twelve miles of the office of the returning officer, shall be returned within five hours of the closing of the polls.

Now, section 59 as to furnishing statements to agents on request. I propose to remove the words "on being requested to do so," and simply make it lawful for the deputy returning officer to furnish it without being asked. As to section 65, in case of a return of an election made to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by the returning officer in violation of sections 64 and 65, a difficulty arises which I propose to remedy. I am informed that in Leeds and Grenville, my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) was declared elected and the returning officer forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery his return, and when an attempt was made to have a recount, it was found there was no power under the law to compel the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to return the ballot-boxes to the returning officer so that the recount might be held. There are only two particular cases in which the Act applies, but a recount is not one of them. I have inserted a section here which I think will cover the case. It provides that if a returning officer violates the provisions of section 64 or section 65, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on the demand of the returning officer authorized by a signed order of the judge who has the right to try such cases, shall return the ballots and allow the recount to be proceeded with in the ordinary way. Then, I propose, under several sections, to make the penalty more severe in the matter of stealing ballots, stuffing ballot-boxes, personation or assisting personation, and all the tricks so well known now to the gentlemen who have become experts in the manipulation of elections.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXCLUSION OF JAPANESE LABOURERS—DISALLOWANCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA LEGISLATION.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to call the attention of the Government to a report that certain legislation recently passed by British Columbia has been disallowed. I would like to have a statement from the leader of the Government whether that is correct, and if it is, what legislation has been disallowed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). After correspondence with the Government of British Columbia with regard to certain legislation passed by the legislature of that province in the session of 1898 concerning the exclusion of Japanese labour, we came to the conclusion that these Acts should be disallowed, and we so recommended His Excellency. The correspondence on this matter will be brought down at an early day.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In relation to the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, it was arranged to take place to-day, but the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) not being in town I agreed, so far as I was concerned, that two cases could stand over. But the committee did not meet, and I notice now that, according to the Votes and Proceedings, it is called for 11 o'clock to-morrow. I would like to say that the Solicitor General has communicated with me about the other matter. He is personally anxious that the committee should meet at 10.30 instead of 11 o'clock, to make up for lost time, I suppose, and also to expedite, so far as we can, some of the business before the committee this week. I desire to mention this matter, as the chairman of the committee is here.

Mr. FRASER. The reason why the committee was not called to-day was the absence of the Solicitor General and also the absence of Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière, who wishes to be present. There is no objection to the meeting being held at 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, and, if it has not already been called, I will instruct the Clerk to call it for that hour.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that there has been a rather arbitrary use of power. The committee decided that it would meet at a certain hour, and merely because one member who wished to attend it with reference to a certain case could not be there, the chairman takes on himself to put off the meeting altogether. I do not think the chairman of the committee has power to do that ; if he has power, I do not think that power should be used. Why should not the committee have come together this morning at the hour when it was agreed upon ? And then, if there was no business the committee could have adjourned. If Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière was not able to be there, the case in which he was interested might have stood over, because the com-

mittee would always be inclined to hold a case over, the principal party in which is not present. It seems to me, that this is an abuse of power. I am not saying this as censure on the present chairman, but this assumption of power is hardly right for the chairman of the committee to make. The committee must have the power to decide when it shall meet, and when it decides to meet, that decision should not be overridden by the chairman.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). While we are on this subject, I think it might be well to draw the attention of the Government and the House to the unsatisfactory manner in which the business of the committees has been conducted this session. We sometimes have several committees, such as the Railway Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, the Committee on Agriculture, all meeting at the same time. There are many members who are on two or more of these committees, and who, though they would gladly take an interest in the business of all, are prevented from doing so by the fact that they are only human and cannot be in two places at the same time. I think there should be a definite understanding come to at any rate for next session in regard to this matter, so that a division of time shall be made among the committees and members given an opportunity to attend to their duties on the several committees. We might have the Railway Committee on Tuesday, the Public Accounts on Wednesday, and the Banking and Commerce on Thursday. Then, on the spare days, any committee might meet that had an unusual quantity of work to do. An arrangement like that would be preferable to the present condition of things.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this matter of the changing of the time of the committees is important, and I would like to have the opinion of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon it. I want it understood that I am not raising it in any spirit of censure, but because I would like to have the practice understood.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the observation made a moment ago by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) concerning the non-calling of the Public Accounts Committee, that, as I understood, was done after conference with my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and the Solicitor General——

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. The chairman is here to speak for himself. I think there is some force in the observation of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), still there seems to be another side to the question. With regard to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I question very much if it could be carried into effect. These committees have not all the same amount of business to transact. The Railway Committee is overloaded with business, and if it were to meet only once or twice a week, it could not discharge the duties it is supposed to discharge. From the very nature of the case, from the mass of important legislation referred to that committee, it has to meet three times, or sometimes four times a week; and so long as that condition of affairs exists, I do not think that the public interest would be served by restrictions which would prevent the committee from having all the time it requires. There is, I say, the inconvenience brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), but the remedy does not seem to be so obvious. I do not think it is possible to lay down any rule; the only arrangement I can suggest would be some understanding between the chairmen of the different committees, so that the meetings of the different committees should be timed to meet the convenience of all. To lay down a hard and fast rule would work more injuriously, I think, than otherwise.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not quite satisfied with the rather easy way in which my hon. friend slid out of the first part of this question. I think the rule is explicit:

> Committees should be regularly adjourned from day to day, though in the case of select committees, particularly, the chairman is frequently allowed to arrange a day and hour of sitting, but this can be done only with the consent of all the members of the committee.

I think that is a rule which is absolute; I do not think that it should be within the arbitrary power of the chairman without consultation with the members of the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. But my hon. friend is aware that this rule is never observed. The rule says that committees should be adjourned from day to day, but it is impossible to observe this rule. If you had four or five committees adjourned at the same time for the following day, they could not all meet.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend surely does not attend these committees. At the close of the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee we consult informally as to when we shall meet, and a day or an hour is set.

The PRIME MINISTER. But the rule says from day to day, and that rule is not observed.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not says from day to day. It says:

> Committees should be regularly adjourned from day to day, though in the case of select committees, particularly, the chairman is frequently allowed to arrange a day and hour of sitting, but

this can be done only with the consent of all the members of the committee.

When a committee is sitting, we adjourn to another day which is known to the rest of the committee. It is sometimes a matter of much inconvenience. I came up this morning on purpose to attend that committee. I went to the committee room and found that no committee was sitting, and was told the chairman had put it off until another day. It is really a point of some importance.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think the hon. gentleman will find that what he is quoting is a transcript of the English rule. Now, I make a suggestion for the consideration of the House. I have often thought that we make a mistake in having such an enormous number of members on our special committees. That is necessary, probably, in the case of the Railway Committee, for considerations which are obvious to every hon. gentleman. But my experience—and I just give the House the benefit of it, so that next session, if my views were to meet with acceptance, they might be considered—is that the business of this House would be enormously facilitated if several of the important committees were reduced to a very much smaller number. A much smaller number, as the hon. gentleman knows, could transact the business equally well, and the difficulty which he speaks of and which the hon. member for North Wellington speaks of, would be much less liable to arise.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to correct a misapprehension of the Prime Minister as to the arrangement between the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and myself, more on his account than on mine, because I used his name. Neither he nor I attempted to interfere with the meeting of the committee to-day; it was merely that certain matters that we were informed upon should not come up owing to his absence. But so far from attempting to interfere with the meeting of the committee to-day, he suggested to me by letter that matters were to come up in which he was not at all concerned.

Mr. CASEY. The remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), I think, have been very much to the point. The fact is that the private business before this House has increased to such an extent that the committees having charge of that business must inevitably clash with each other, and must inevitably, some two or more of them, be sitting at the same time. In the British House of Commons private business long ago reached such a volume that a much more rational system, to my mind, had to be introduced, the system of committing each particular private Bill to a committee of five members only, four chosen by lot amongst the laymen of the House, and a chairman chosen from amongst the legal members of the House. These five members are sworn to be disinterested parties, to try the case fairly, as if they were a jury, and are bound by the rules of the House to attend every meeting of that committee. In this way a dozen private Bills might be progressing at the same time, and would be much more carefully inquired into and much more thoroughly sifted by weighing and studying the evidence, than they could possibly be before a committee of the size of the Railway Committee, or of the other committees of this House. I have long felt that matters were coming to that stage in this House that some such plan would have to be adopted. I am glad the matter has come up, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given the weight of his great influence to that point of view.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the right hon. First Minister misapprehends the wording of the book that the member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) read from. When it states that the committee are to adjourn from day to day, I apprehend that it means from one day to some other day, that it does not mean until the next day in every case, but to some other day to be selected. Then, with reference to the point made by my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the committees overlap each other, meeting on the same day, I think many of the members are members of two or three committees that meet on the same date, and it is impossible, therefore, for them to attend to the duties of all the committees. I think that can be easily remedied by the committees meeting some weeks, if not some months, earlier than they have been called together. At the beginning of the session, and at the beginning of the two previous sessions, we were here weeks in the meeting of Parliament before a single committee was called together. When were the committees of this session called together? Were we not nearly two months in session?

The PRIME MINISTER. When the debate on the Address was closed.

Mr. WALLACE. The Standing Orders Committee were doing their work and reporting to this House, and why could not the Public Accounts Committee have been appointed and begun its work? Instructions were given to the Public Accounts Committee that they should meet at the earliest possible moment this session, and conclude work that was under way and not finished during the last session of Parliament. But week after week elapsed, nearly months elapsed, before that committee was called together. Now, I think it should be an instruction to this House that next session the committee should be called together during the first week so as to get to work. The Public Accounts Committee and the Committee on Railways and Canals should get to work at once, because a large portion of the railway

legislation, if not the whole of it, is in long before the session opens, and the members of the Railway Committee could be considering these matters in the early days of the session, and thereby prevent that blockade to which attention has been called.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. According to my observation, I think the difficulty and inconvenience that have been complained of by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) arise from the action taken and advised by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). A few members at the close of the meeting say: Let the meeting stand adjourned until to-morrow or some other day without giving the chairman, or those most interested, an opportunity of consulting the wishes of the members of that committee and of other committees. I find that usually when a committee adjourns to the call of the chair, we have an opportunity of consulting the chairmen of the various committees, and the Ministers and the members mostly interested in legislation before the committees, and in that way we generally manage to suit the convenience of the great majority of the members. I have found on all occasions where it was said by somebody that we will adjourn until to-morrow, or until the following day, as the case may be, that it is generally found to meet the convenience of the members. I fully believe that it will be time enough to find fault when the committees are not called often enough or when the time of meetings is found not to suit the convenience of the members. In regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), there is a good deal to be said on both sides. I no doubt agree with him that, probably, the business would be better done if we had a smaller committee; on the other hand, I think, while it might probably obviate some inconvenience to members, yet, if there is a contentious matter before the committee, composed as it is now, it is settled once for all, and we seldom have it up in the House again. However, while I believe it is desirable that the House should try and keep down, to some extent, the numbers on the various committees, I think the suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is quite feasible, and that, except in a few cases, there should be no difficulty in meeting the convenience of the members of the different committees. If they would meet together and arrange, except in some special cases, that certain committees would meet on certain days of the week and other committees on other days of the week, a solution of the difficulty might be arrived at. Of course, one or two days in the week would not be sufficient for the Railway Committee to dispose of the legislation that is before the House, but there are several other committees that have not a great amount of business to do, and if they could meet earlier in the session, it would leave an opportunity for the more important committees to do their work. If an understanding could be arrived at as to when these committees should meet, I am sure it would conduce greatly to the convenience of the House and promote the business before these committees.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) complained about the amount of work to be done, and that to get it done they had to call two or three committees on the same day. What is the cause of that? To my mind, it is because we are not alive to a realization of the rules which govern the introduction of Bills into this House. I drew attention to this matter once or twice last session when it was brought up, and I believe it was understood that we should observe the rules as closely as possible. It is provided that:

> Petitions for private Bills shall only be received by the House within the first three weeks of the session.

Yet to-day we have petitions for private Bills being laid on the Table, although we have been nearly twelve weeks in session. We have had them presented over and over again during the last six or eight weeks, and I have called the attention of the House to this matter before.

> Private Bills may only be presented to the House within the first four weeks of the session.

Nearly twelve weeks have elapsed since the beginning of the session, and we are still introducing private Bills; hon. members go on introducing private Bills; by some means they get through the Standing Orders Committee, and certain rules are suspended so as to allow of their introduction. I think, in the interest of private legislation, we should observe the rules of the House much more closely than this. It would reduce our work, give proper notice to the country of what is being done, and make it better all around. There is another thing which I think could be done, which would help us in regard to the meetings of these committees. Why do not our committees have meetings on Mondays? It is said that we cannot have a committee meeting on Monday because the members have gone home. It is the duty of the members to stay here and attend to legislation. If it were the custom to have committees meet on Monday it would be the custom to find members here attending to the work. The sooner that we come to understand that Monday is the same as any other day in the week, that any meeting may be called, and that any committee may be expected to work on that day, the sooner we will have members remaining here over Sunday attending to their business. Members from the maritime provinces and the far west are obliged to remain here, but most of the members from

Ontario and Quebec, make it a practice to go home every Friday evening. We have a thin House every Friday evening, a very thin House, and on Monday, and until Tuesday we do not enter upon the work of the week. Every member would be here if it were known that the work of the House would go on regularly on Monday. In regard to the adjournment of committees there are two ways in which committees are adjourned. One is for the committee to adjourn to be called at the request of the chairman. The committee is then at the call of the chairman. The other is after consultation in the committee to adjourn to a certain day, and if a committee is adjourned to a certain day it is obligatory upon the committee to meet on that day. When an adjournment is made to a certain day, as in the present case, it should not be allowed that one or two members can consult together and postpone the meeting from that day. That is entirely irregular, and I was going to say it was illegal. It is illegal so far as the rules go, because, if an adjournment is made to a certain day, the committee should meet on that day just as in the case of this House; if it is adjourned to meet on a certain day it must meet on that day. It is not right that the chairman or any individual member of the committee to postpone the meeting of a committee until another day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, it is obvious to the whole House that this discussion is irregular. As it is one connected with the regulations and the domestic economy, as it were, of the House, it seemed to be the unanimous feeling of the House that we should go on thus far, but I do not want it to be considered as a precedent.

THE YUKON MAIL SERVICE.,

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker. I will try not to make a precedent by discussing this question. I have a letter, which I received this morning, and as it is a matter of interest to the House, and perhaps to the country, I wish to read it for the benefit of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who, I see, is in his place:

Gananoque, Ont., 5th June, 1899.

George Taylor, Esq., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Early last month I sent three separate registered parcels to my son Kenneth at Dawson through the post office, but they have all been stopped at Victoria and returned to me. I am very anxious to have these parcels delivered to Kenneth, and do not understand why they have been returned, as I complied in every way with the post office regulations. I shall be greatly obliged if you will inquire at your early convenience as to whether the post office authorities intend accepting parcels at any time soon for transmission to points in the Yukon district.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. F. LATIMER.

Mr. SPROULE. This was in May; the parcels were delivered to the post office there and the amount of registration and postage was paid. They went to Victoria, arriving there probably early in May. They were returned here a day or two ago to the post office. I do not know what rule or authority warrants the Victoria postmaster in returning them. If it were against the law to send these parcels, we would expect that the post office at the point where they were mailed would refuse to have taken them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Parcels cannot get through to the Yukon until navigation is opened from Lake Bennett to Dawson. I do not know that it is open yet. If it is open and it is possible to go through they will go.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Postmaster General kindly give us the authority under which he arrests mail matter? I presume he must have some authority. What is the authority?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that it can be called arresting. It is a physical impossibility to carry it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not quite satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think we ought to have a discussion at this stage.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will take an opportunity of discussing this matter later.

Mr. FOSTER. Meanwhile I do not know whether I have the right to send parcels or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. My correspondent wants to know whether he can send parcels or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) was not in the House when I stated, in answer to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), that when navigation was opened the parcel post would be part of the regular mail service, but during the winter, when it is performed by dog train, it is not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it open now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no information as to its being open. There is a period during the fall and spring when it cannot be open.

Mr. WALLACE. The regulations, or want of regulations, of the Postmaster General, are absurd. Here is a parcel sent in the month of May and returned from Victoria. Would it not be the better to detain it for a week or so there, until navigation opened than to send it back? Why did not the Postmaster General notify the public that parcels would be sent when navigation opened, and that it was expected that navigation would open at a certain date?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did the Postmaster General give any instructions with reference to the return of these parcels. The postmasters throughout the country seem to be absolutely ignorant of any rule in regard to the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I stated on a previous occasion that for the winter service, instructions were given that mail matter other than letters could not go to the Yukon. My inquiry in the department since has confirmed that. I am informed that general publicity was given through the press about it.

Mr. WALLACE. We never knew it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not responsible for the hon. gentleman not knowing it, but I am assured by the department that full publicity was given through the press. Up to the present it has not been possible to make a parcel post arrangement, but we have now a contract let, for the first time, of a satisfactory character for the mail service by water. I do not expect that contract will begin much before the 15th of June, when the route is expected to be open.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are we to understand that the postmasters throughout the country are supposed to take newspaper reports as official?

Mr. WALLACE. The explanation of the Postmaster General leaves the matter in a still worse position. Surely he has means of communicating with his postmasters, and if he made a regulation of that kind, he ought to have it printed and sent to the various postmasters.

I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—AGREEMENT WITH THE G. T. R.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee on Bill (No. 138) to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway System to the city of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself in committee on the resolution.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to mention a matter which I made reference to the other day, as to the purchase of the rolling stock of the Drummond County Railway. If I understand it, the agreement that was first brought down with the Drummond County Railway Company provided that the Minister should buy the rolling-stock at a valuation to be agreed upon between the Minister and the company. That was presented to the House, but it was not ratified. What then becomes of that agreement? Has it since been ratified by the House?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That agreement has never been ratified—at least, it was ratified by the House last session.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean by Parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has never been ratified by Parliament, and we are not asking Parliament now to ratify it.

Mr. FOSTER. In that respect that agreement is worth no more than waste paper so far as it is concerned, and of course I think the Minister is perfectly right in saying there is no obligation on him to purchase the rolling-stock. If afterwards he makes an agreement to purchase the rolling-stock, and Parliament gives him power, it can be done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is my view.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to recall what I said before. I was under the impression at the time that it having passed this House, it passed Parliament. But it did not pass Parliament, and so has no binding force.

On paragraph 4 of agreement,

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to this, I wish to ask a question. An argument in favour of giving large sums of money by way of rental is made by the statement that we own one-half of these two sections in which we have an undivided half interest. Suppose that, at the end of ninety-nine years, this agreement is not continued, what becomes of our undivided half interest in these two sections?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It absolutely terminates.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, what I want to bring to the attention of the committee is this. We may, if we like, play upon the words that we own one-half of the branch between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, and that we own one-half of the other section; but we do not own it in the sense in which a man has an indefeasible right to a property, in whole or in part. We simply own it so far as we have the right of user; so that, if at the end of ninety-nine years the agreement is not entered into for another period, the fact that we do or do not own a half interest is not material either way, because from that moment our interest in the property ceases.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be right to say, that we do not own half the property in a certain way. We have what lawyers would correctly describe as a "base fee". We have for ninety-nine years as large an inter-

est as the Grand Trunk Railway Company have in the property, and it is entirely optional with us at the end of that time whether we shall continue our interest, in perpetuity, or not. If circumstances arise which lead us to decide that it is not in our interest to continue out title or ownership, it is within our power to terminate it; but, in the meantime, we have as large an ownership for all purposes as the Grand Trunk Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend answer another question on which I have some doubt? Will he tell the committee what advantage in any respect is gained by the Government in stipulating for an undivided half interest? Would he not have exactly the same advantage under a simple rental clause, conveying the right of user?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has always appeared to me to be a consideration of value. The chances are, that in the near future there will be other railways which will find it to their pecuniary and business interest to have the use of this double-track line, perhaps from Richmond, perhaps from Ste. Rosalie, perhaps from other points between St. Lambert and Richmond; and, if they do desire to acquire, and are willing to make satisfactory arrangements to acquire, such running interest, then, under this arrangement, we shall be entitled to participate in all the advantages which would accrue to the owners from the use of the railway by those other companies. If we had only the privilege of running over the road ourselves, on the basis of user, then other companies might be allowed by the Grand Trunk Company also to acquire a similar interest, and the Grand Trunk might thereby be realizing some very substantial return from these other companies, independently of us. But they cannot do that now. If they get $1,000, or $500, or $200 a mile from any other company for the use of any portion of this line, we participate to an equal extent with them in the results.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend participates in these results, not by virtue of his having, an undivided half interest, but by virtue of a section which says, out and out, that, inasmuch as we have paid you a rental for the privilege of user, we stipulate that, if other companies come in and pay a rental to you, we shall participate to the extent of one-half interest. That is our compensation for the rental fee which you have made us pay before you allow us to use the line at all. So that, even if you did not have the words, "an undivided half interest," in the agreement, and paid them simply a rental, stipulating what you would get for that rental—one-half interest in what might be received from other roads using the line—you would have it just as absolutely as you do by providing for an undivided half interest.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would have just what the contract gave us. But we do not ask, nor could we reasonably expect, that the Grand Trunk would include such interest as the hon. gentleman refers to, unless we had a half interest in that line. They based the value they charged us upon a half interest, and it was so embodied in the Bill; but, in order that there might be no possibility of question, I was able to secure the insertion of the succeeding clause, which plainly recognizes that the interpretation I have put upon the clause is correct. It provides against any possible contingency that might hereafter arise of difference between the company and ourselves.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that, properly speaking, he is not the owner of one-half at all. His own admission supports that, because he says that if at the end of ninety-nine years, we do not choose to go on with the arrangement, we have no right or title in it at all. We are simply giving a rental for a certain period that we have stipulated for, and for that rental we shall have not only the right of user, but our share in whatever income is derived from these terminals and these sections by other roads running over them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways, under what clause of this agreement are we entitled to participate in moneys which the Grand Trunk may receive from the running of trains of other railways over that portion of the line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the 30th section, page 11.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us now, whether or not he understands the agreement to cover this: If any other railway exchanges running rights with the Grand Trunk over this portion, and gives as compensation to the Grand Trunk the right to run over a portion of its lines, do we participate in any such arrangement, and if so, under what clause of the agreement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think there would be no question but that whatever benefits are capable of being ascertained and valued in a pecuniary way, arising from the conveying by the Grand Trunk to any other company of the use of this portion, we are entitled to participate in, under that clause:

Thirtieth.—That all rents, revenues, benefits and receipts now accruing from any other company to the company by reason of the user of the line between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, or the exercise of any running power, privilege or rights therein, or which may hereafter accrue from any such grant or user shall enure to the joint benefit of Her Majesty and the company, share and share alike, and said benefits and receipts shall be

accounted for by the parties hereto when the accounting shall take place from time to time between them. As to the other portions of the company's line herein demised the company hereby reserves to itself all revenues from any source whatever arising from the use thereof.

I can see no reason why there would be any difficulty in working this out. In framing this clause, I had in my mind the possibility to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and I think those words were well chosen.

Mr. HAGGART. Take the case of an arrangement between two railway companies, in which each has an undivided share or leasehold in this portion, and the one exercises a user ten times the extent of the other, shall they be obliged to account to one another for that user ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the Intercolonial Railway were using it ten times more than the Grand Trunk, the Intercolonial Railway would only have to account to the Grand Trunk upon its proportion of the user in respect of maintenance and repairs, and in one of the clauses, in respect of betterments on any portion of the line.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Have any other roads running power into the Bonaventure station at Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None, others at present. We would have no control of the use by any other road of that station. We are paying a fixed rental, and do not acquire one-half of the property in the station, but only the full use of it for our own business. Of course, the stations are enormously valued.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Does the Delaware and Hudson not go into the Bonaventure station at Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I see here that the land valuation for right of way on the alternate route suggested is put down at $100 and $150 per acre, and then $500,000 more. What does that mean ? Is that for the right of way in both cases ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not catch what the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). In the Minister's speech, he said, that an estimate was made of the valuation of the land at $100 and $150 per acre.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think my speech will explain itself pretty well.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Then, it would cost $500,000 more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not here, but he surely would not ask me to go over my speech again.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am only asking the hon. gentleman, if he said this, and he must know what he said. It is an important point that should not be forgotten.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not here at the time.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). If the hon. gentleman will not answer, I shall have to deal with it. It is a very important matter, which the people of the country want to know something about. I find that the valuation of the lands—that is, at an average width of 66 feet, making 8 acres per mile, the same as the Drummond County Railway—would amount to over $1,800 per acre.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will state, as tersely as I can, what I did say. I said, that the estimate made by my officers as to the cost of construction of the new line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, included a sum from $100 to $150 per acre to cover land damages. Further, that that sum was taken to represent what would simply be the country portion of the district, and it is based upon a valuation going through a farming country, and did not include valuation of lands taken for a railway which passed through the towns, cities and villages along that line. I said, further, that the estimate was—of course, it was purely an estimate—that, instead of it only costing us $100 and $150 per acre, it would more likely cost half a million dollars to expropriate through that whole territory from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, and the difference in amount resulted from the fact that you were not running your railway and taking the property of ordinary farm land, but property in towns and villages and settled districts for a very considerable portion of the line.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). There was some criticism on what I said here the other day, and now I am going to see whose estimate was right—the hon. Minister's and the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson's) or mine. Now, we will deal with this land. First, I must say, there are no villages and towns, as represented. I have been over the line, and you have stations there not worth $200. St. Hyacinthe may be a town of ordinary size, but it is some little distance from the railway, and there is no other town or village near the railway ; so that the right of way would not cost any more than ordinary farm lands. Now, we find that this $150 an acre would amount to $57,600—that is, if we paid $150 an acre. That is allowing 99 feet, which is a chain and a half, about the width generally adopted by first class railways. Take the Drummond County Railway, and you will find

that the width is a little over 66 feet, making 8½ acres per mile. If you were buying the right of way for the Drummond County Railway at the rate estimated by the Minister of Railways and Canals for the Grand Trunk Railway portion, it would cost more than you are paying for the purchase of that road.

The province of Ontario is as good an agricultural province as there is in Canada, and I want to put this on record for the benefit of the farmers, who know the value of land as well as any other class of people in the country. The report of the Bureau of Industries of the province of Ontario, which is prepared by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, shows that the average price of land in Ontario is $24.06 per acre, and there is not one county in the province where the land is valued higher than $46. The people who know of these values, know that it is quite an unreasonable valuation that has been placed on the right of way by the hon. Minister. I venture to say you can buy a farm of 100 acres for what he would be paying according to his estimate for two acres. Now, the hon. gentleman has put as high a price on his grading as he possibly could and the prices upon the bridges are most unreasonable. I sent a good engineer to examine the Yamaska bridge, and I have received his report since coming into the House to-day. Here is a bridge with two piers and two abutments and a length of 381 feet that the hon. gentleman says is going to cost $300,000. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara criticised me when I estimated the masonry at $20 a yard. But I find that the official reports of the Government published in the blue-books, show that the masonry for the swing bridge at Sault Ste. Marie cost only $12 a yard. The valuation that I now put upon the Yamaska bridge considering the additional length and superstructure cannot exceed $50,000. At every point the estimates of the hon. Minister are extravagant. I have known Mr. Schreiber for many years, and I have never known him to be so liberal as he appears to be in making these estimates. It is something like the case of the school teacher, who, when being hired by the trustees, was asked whether he believed the world to be round or square, and he replied that he believed that it was square, but he would teach that it was round or square as they pleased. It appears that Mr. Schreiber was not asked to make a square estimate, and that he is in the hands of the hon. Minister and has to obey orders. I am sorry that he should be in a position to be subjected to that kind of thing. I am looking into the Richelieu bridge, but am not able to give an estimate on it at this moment. We propose to build a straight line to strike the St. Lawrence at a place where we would put a bridge across, and by doing so we should not increase the length of the line. We could build a bridge as cheap as the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, and I believe that putting a bridge at such a point would not lengthen the distance at all. As I showed the other day, the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost less than a million dollars. I got my information from a statement made at a meeting of the Canadian Engineering Society. The chief engineer of the Canada Atlantic Railway was reading a paper on the Cotean bridge, which, he said, cost $1,264,000. Mr. Peters, the chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, made a statement as to the cost of that company's bridge across the St. Lawrence at Lachine, that cost being a little less than a million dollars from bank to bank, according to the plans. The hon. Minister estimates the cost of the bridge at Montreal at $10,000,000. I never heard of such a value being put on that bridge before. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara made the statement the other day that the cost was $6,750,000, and that a bridge could be built there now for $5,000,000. When we have such statements as these, why should we have the Minister of Railways and Canals coming into this House and estimating the cost of a bridge across the St. Lawrence at $10,000,000? The only way to account for it is that the estimate must be high to account for all the money that the hon. Minister proposes to pay for this deal. He pays 5 per cent on all this money, when he could borrow money at 3 per cent and the Government build a line of their own at much less cost. We find that the Minister is very favourable to large corporations. He gave the Canadian Pacific Railway two million dollars more than they were willing to take from the late Government for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. If the money of the people is to be squandered in this way, it is high time that the people should know it. I showed the other day that, as to terminals, the Government have land of their own at Point St. Charles upon which they could make their own improvements and which is convenient to the business part of the city. It is estimated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Grand Trunk terminals, of which we are to have the use, cost twenty millions of dollars. It is a very fortunate thing for the country that we were not called upon to pay 5 per cent on half this money for the last 43 years. You can see, Mr. Chairman, that it would have been better to build the line and establish our own terminals.

The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara said that I was wrong when I said that on the section of road between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie there was sandy soil. I say it is a sandy soil. He said there was a swamp there. I say there is no swamp there. He said there were rock cuts that would cost a dollar to a dollar and a half a yard. I say there is not a rock on the whole section, unless it was put there. There are only two small cuts, one of 6 feet and one of 3 feet. There is not a rock in the whole place. I

repeat that this is a beautiful country for railway building. He says that he spoke to Mr. Mann, the contractor, and he told Mr. Mann that I had put it at 12 cents a yard. I did not put it at 12 cents a yard. I said I believed that if tenders had been asked for, they could have got a tender as low as 12 cents a yard; but I put it at 18 cents a yard. The statement of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara was misleading. Again, he says that it is the greatest folly to speak of doing the ballasting for 30 cents a yard and that it has never been done for less than 50 cents per yard. I want to show the committee that the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson) does not understand this kind of work. I want to tell him that if I required a man to assist me in preparing estimates I would want some one better qualified than the member for Lincoln and Niagara. Here is a record of contracts from 1867 to a recent date and I find that McGreevy and Heney, supposed to be men who know their business, put in a tender on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at a place where wages were low, for 22 cents a yard for ballasting. Then, I find another gentleman named C. Scripture, tendered for 27 cents a yard. This is on contract No 37 of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, there are Curran and Monette, who tendered at 30 cents a yard; Starrs and Hanly, 25 cents a yard, and $200 for track-laying; Murphy and Upper, the latter of whom I knew very well some years ago, tendered for the ballasting at 29 cents a yard. I do not ask the committee to take my word for these prices, I am furnishing proof for it all. We have next Charlebois and Shanley, who, all will admit, know their business, and in tendering on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in a place where wages were high, their offer was 28 cents a yard. Then, I find Wardrope and Ross—Mr. John Ross is the gentleman who had charge of the Northern Pacific—their price was 20 cents a yard. There are prices at 28 cents, 25 cents, and so on. The book which I hold in my hand, and from which I take this information, can be seen in the Department of Public Works.

Now, Sir, I think that the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson) should take pains to inform himself of the value of work of this kind, because he never did any such work, before he raises a question as to the value of it. He says this work could not be done at less than 50 cents a yard. Now, I have given you the names of gentlemen who know more about doing this kind of work than he does. I have done it myself for 22 cents a yard, and made money at it. I have no desire to occupy the time of this committee. I know that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is determined to put this deal through. I am sorry to say that we are in the minority, and cannot very well prevent it. I have here a contract on a line of road running from Ste. Rosalie towards Sorel, and the average quantity of excavation amounted to 8,500 yards a mile. The price paid on that road a few years ago was 15 cents a yard for excavation, and the price paid for the masonry was $13 a yard, so you can see that the price of 18 cents at which I put this work, considering the country it is going through, is sufficient to do the excavation. You can also see that the price I put upon the masonry is sufficient to do all the stonework connected with the road. You will see that the bridges are a few feet longer than I thought they were. Going over them quickly and without measuring them, I thought they were 100 feet span, but I find they are 127 feet span. If there is any difference, it would be but little, and I provide for a margin in the price of the masonry, and in the $30,000 that I allowed for contingencies. The hon. gentleman is paying $1,400 to $1,800 an acre for land in the province of Quebec. Let the people of this country, the farmers of this country, know these facts, and when they do know them, I think they will resent such extravagance.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to have some explanation by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. McLennan) is a practical builder. The other evening the Minister made a statement to this House and to this country, in which his great endeavour was to persuade us that there was no better method of getting into the city of Montreal, and getting a chance at traffic in the city of Montreal, than the plan adopted by the Government. In order to do that, he adopted the method, amongst others, of calculating what the cost would be to get into Montreal by an independent line. My hon. friend was not content to depend simply upon his own judgment, but this is what he says:

I can give him an idea of what it will cost, founded, not upon my own unaided judgment, but upon the careful estimates and calculations of my officials in the department, made not to-day, not yesterday, but before I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues the adoption of this scheme. Well, what are these calculations? These calculations are that it would cost, for the laying down of the line of 32 miles, $485,440, independently of the two great bridges, one across the Yamaska and one across the Richelieu, and outside of the probable large amount of land damages which you might be called upon, and would be called upon, to pay. Now, $485,000 would be the cost, according to the judgment of the officials of the department, if we were to undertake to build a railway through an ordinary country; but mind you, this is not an ordinary country, as I will show you before I have proceeded much further. Well, it is going to cost $460,000 to build a bridge across the Richelieu River, and it is going to cost $300,000 to build a bridge over the Yamaska.

It was by such statements as these, of the

immense sums it would take to get in from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert by a new line, that my hon. friend has influenced the House, and attempted to influence the country, to approve of this bargain. Now, here is a gentleman, a practical man, a member of this House, relying not only upon his own knowledge, but upon the report of an engineer which he has in his hand, and his statement is that a bridge across the Yamaska would be only 331 feet long, and that it can be built for between $40,000 and $50,000. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways cannot allow this statement to rest as it does. He must give to this House and to the country the authority upon which he led this House, or attempted to lead it, to certain conclusions by declaring that that bridge across the Yamaska River would cost $300,000 to build. I would like to hear his explanation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not imagine—if he does he would be in error—that I would be justified in putting forward to this House any statement based on any knowledge, or judgment of my own as to what it would probably cost to build these bridges. I inquired of the officers of my department, one of whom is acknowledged to be an experienced engineer. I had him present to me his estimate, ascertained, I presume, upon data, which would be satisfactory to his mind, as to what would be his opinion of the probable cost of the construction of the bridges, the construction of the railway and the amount of land damages for that piece of road. I presented that to the committee just as I had received it from him, just as it was accepted by me and as it was presented to my mind, at the time this matter was being negotiated. I presented it to the committee on the strength of his information, and I have no further explanation to offer to the House than that fact. We have a statement of an hon. gentleman, who has built bridges and who has knowledge upon this subject, characterizing the estimate of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) as being entirely erroneous from his own personal experience. As to an explanation, I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would have or what he could have me to say more than I have said. I have exhausted my knowledge and information upon the subject and put it in the possession of the committee. It is not to be expected, I presume, that every engineer will agree. Engineers do not always agree in cases when they are approaching a subject with the desire to make the figures as small as possible. I have furnished the committee with all the information of which I am in possession and I have placed it at the disposal of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. FOSTER. What I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals ought to do is to give the House the estimate of his engineer over his own signature. I have not until, within two days' time, read the evidence given at that committee which sat last year and which had these gentlemen before them, but I am perfectly ready to say here, in this House, that I never yet have read of an undertaking anywhere approaching the size and having the values of this undertaking, in which, from first to last, there was such an utter absence of scientific and accurate data as to the manner, both of the valuation of the Drummond County Railway and of the Grand Trunk Railway, in this scheme which is before the House. You can take the evidence of Mr. Schreiber and take that of any other gentleman who was before the committee, and I will leave it to hon. gentlemen who were upon that committee, if, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, they could give anything approaching a definite statement. After Mr. Schreiber had given statement after statement, he was asked if he had made these upon any scientific data, upon figures and measurements, and he admitted that he had not. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is making a proposition to the House which is a matter of importance. The bridge is 331 feet long over the Yamaska River; it is not a very difficult river to bridge, and my hon. friend ought to give us measurements. Maybe the hon. member for Glengarry is incorrect. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals cannot afford to be wrong; the hon. member for Glengarry can afford to make a guess at the measurements. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals cannot afford to make a guess. When he comes down and asks us to expend the people's money on a scheme and buttresses that scheme by saying that if you adopted this other plan you would have to expend $300,000, $400,000 for the bridges, and a further amount of $485,000 for the railway, he cannot afford to be incorrect, and he must give the data to this House. No one would object to the idea that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals advances that he must take information from qualified men. Every man who administers an office in the Government, not being a specialist, must take his information from specialists, but the House should know the exact and definite authority upon which these statements are made. Here is a vast difference of opinion, a difference of opinion ranging between $50,000 and $300,000. The hon. member for Glengarry says that it would cost $50,000 to build that bridge, while the hon. Minister says that the alternative route would cost an equivalent of $7,000,000, that you must pay these immense sums if you adopt the alternative course. When he says that it would cost $300,000 to build this bridge across the Yamaska he ought to give the engineer's estimate, the measurements, the width of the river, the width of the span, and information of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, as I said to the commit-

tee very clearly, when this matter was under discussion before, that the conclusion the Government arrived at was that the proposition, as a whole, of getting into the city of Montreal and into the centre of that city, where we would have that connection with other railway systems that it is desirable we should have, for $140,000, as far as the Grand Trunk is concerned, was an arrangement which had everything to justify it, and that it was a good arrangement, taken as a whole. Then I pointed out to the committee that if you were to examine the details, if you were to take the several sections or divisions under which the contract or arrangement has been made up, if you were to take that portion, for instance, of the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and separate it from the other part of the arrangement, you would even then find that it was a beneficial arrangement. I did not ask my engineer to get down to the minutest details and go and measure the road exactly; I did not ask him, for it was not necessary, that he should get down to the minutest particulars as to the cost of the line, because we did not intend to build another line. The arrangement, on the whole, was beneficial; it commended itself to the Government, and we thought that it should be justified in Parliament. But even if my hon. friend proposes to lay down another line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, he would find that it would cost more than the amount we are proposing to allow the Grand Trunk Railway Company for it upon the basis of the arrangement we have made. If you take the cost of the line, which was estimated at $485,000, if you take the cost of the bridges that we would have to build, one at a cost of $400,000, and the other at a cost of $300,000, and if you allow what would be a fair and reasonable amount for land damages, in the more settled portions through which the road would pass, you would have a total sum which would double the amount which we estimate the value of our portion of the Grand Trunk. Taking the money involved in the construction of a new line, paying the amounts which the engineers estimated it would cost, it would be double the sum we are paying under our calculation for our half of the Grand Trunk line. It would not matter how close it was measured. The hon. gentleman tells us that there never was a railway project entered into in which close measurements were not made. He tells me what we know is not in accordance with the facts; he tells me what we know was never the experience of the late Administration. There was no careful calculation made, as the records show, when they bought 125 miles of the Grand Trunk Railway from Rivière du Loup to Lévis; there was no calculation made at all. They just took that road as it was, and it required nearly half a million dollars to be expended on the road bed alone to make it suitable for traffic. They paid $12,000 a mile for it, and where is the evidence of any careful consideration in that? Where was the evidence furnished to Parliament of engineers who had gone over the road, and made estimates of the cost of embankments? The hon. gentleman need not refer to "Hansard" as to what occurred at that time; he will be aware that there was no such evidence furnished to Parliament. There never was a railway proposition submitted to Parliament by the late Government, that was subjected by the Opposition to any such minute and Pecksniffian criticism as this proposition has been subjected to, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out. I do not care what instance you take in which the late Government have acquired, or constructed railways in connection with the Intercolonial Railway; in not a single instance was there any such minute information furnished as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) claims ought be furnished by the Government now. I am not saying, that because it was not done by the late Government in any of these numerous cases, it ought not be done by us, but I do say, that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) states that no proposition ought be submitted to Parliament unless it is fortified by minute and careful engineering reports such as he has referred to; it was never done in times past, and, therefore, it is an unreasonable and illogical demand which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) puts forward now. I do not pretend to say that I had, nor have I, anything more than a general report which I received from the Chief Engineer, as to what in his judgment would be the estimated cost of constructing a new line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. He put these figures before me, and I used them in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will not get me off the track by drawing that herring across it. I did not state that in every case preceding this, close calculations had been given, but, what I did state was, that I never knew an instance of a bargain involving as much as this, in which evidence was taken from engineers and others, where there was so little definiteness and where everything seemed to be on so indefinite a plan. That is the chief refuge and sure shelter of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) in this whole matter. He will not bind himself with close calculations. If he did he would not have a leg to stand on. He revolves around in the upper regions; he floats around immense possibilities and the like of that; but in this case the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) forgot himself so far as to come down to this mundane sphere, and he pressed the argument upon this House, and he convinced his own followers to such a degree that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) pronounced a famous eulogium upon the Minister of Rail-

ways and Canals, on account of the completeness of statements given, and the absolute conviction that the speech of the Minister made on his mind. But the Minister (Mr. Blair) disdains to present his facts, and as a responsible Minister of the Crown he came before this House and he said: that with reference to this one bridge it would cost $300,000, and that it cost $400,000 to put one bridge over the Richelieu, and he massed his figures, and turned round triumphantly to his side of the House and to the country, and said: Now, do you not see we are entirely justified in this matter; see how much it would cost us if we were to take an alternate route to try to get to the city of Montreal. Does the Minister (Mr. Blair) know what the length of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge at Caughnawaga is? I do not know, and I must rely on the Minister for that information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got that.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, but I think you will find it is somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 feet; say, 3,600 feet. That bridge was built by the Canadian Pacific Railway at Caughnawaga for less than $1,000,000, and yet my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) told us the other night that for a bridge over the Yamaska River which we now find will be about 330 feet——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My information is that the Caughnawaga bridge cost $1,500,000. I do not know where you got it that it cost less than $1,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) stated to-day in the House, that his authority for that was an engineer's report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He may be right, but my information is that it cost $1,500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I took what my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) stated on the authority of an engineer. But suppose it cost $1,500,000. It does not seem reasonable that a small bridge, with shorter spans and over banks which are but a slight distance comparatively from each other, would cost what the Minister stated.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you know what the lengths of the Miramichi, south-west and north-west bridge's lengths are?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My information is that they cost $3,000,000 between the two of them, and something over.

Mr. BERGERON. That is in New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The bridges cost high there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You cannot judge of the cost of a bridge entirely by its length. When the statement was made to me that the Yamaska bridge would cost $300,000, and that the Richelieu bridge actually cost over $400,000. I could not dispute it. It was stated by responsible officers. I do know that bridges cost very often a great deal more in some places in proportion to the length, than they do in others. It depends very much upon the character of the stream. I asked one of the engineers why these bridges could cost as much as represented, and I was told that probably the water was very deep and the bottom would be such that it would be difficult of construction.

Mr. BERGERON. The water in the Yamaska?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. I did not go into that very minutely. I got enough general information on it, to satisfy me that the general cost of the construction of a line between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert would be more than we are paying really to the Grand Trunk Railway, for the use of one-half of their portion of the line.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has not been able to fortify his position very much by citing possible difficulties in building over such a river as the Yamaska. I do not know whether the Yamaska is a navigable stream or not.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think it is.

The PRIME MINISTER. Partly.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose a great deal would depend upon the tonnage of the craft.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not navigable there.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a nice boating stream, but I do not think it is at all a difficult stream to build over.

The PRIME MINISTER. On the contrary, I would imagine that it was a very difficult stream to build over.

Mr. FOSTER. That shows where our difficulty is. Neither the Minister of Railways, nor the right hon. gentleman, nor myself, are technical men, and when an argument is addressed to the House in this way and an appeal is made to engineering authority, we have the right to ask that at least the estimate of the engineer should be laid on the Table. The fact is that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has no estimate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had an estimate simply stating

that the construction of the line of railway would cost so much, and I think I have details as to how that was made up. Then the estimated cost of the two bridges is added to the cost. That is all I had.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister (Mr. Blair) had the measurements and the estimated cost in detail, that would be satisfactory to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not proposing to build a line.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but the Minister was proposing to build up an absolutely convincing argument why his policy would be the best, and to do that he throws definite figures fortified by engineering authority at the House and the country, and when we ask him for the authority he will not give it to us. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) threw some tremendous figures at the House some years ago, as to what would be the increase in passengers and freight by opening up this Drummond County and Grand Trunk Railway extension. He gave them on the authority of the engineers, and they were read to this House, but they escaped from this House, and they escaped the embalming process of the "Hansard" in some extraordinary fashion. But I noticed when the committee was sitting, and when Mr. Schreiber was being examined, and when the question was put to him as to whether he had made that estimate upon written data or statistics he had before him, he acknowledged in his sworn evidence that he had no written data before him, and that he had not made the estimates in that way. It was just a sort of rough and ready guess.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was not very far astray in his totals, at any rate.

Mr. FOSTER. Of the traffic?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He was very far astray, and it is just such a rough and ready guess that my hon. friend brings down here and moulds into the form of a definite statement. The hon. gentleman is not doing justice to the House in not giving us the engineer's estimate of the cost of that bridge.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Here we are at the eleventh hour, after every opportunity has been given to my hon. friend and other members on that side of the House to have all the details of information on this subject; and when we are in Committee of the Whole on the Bill, my hon. friend wants more information on one specific subject, that is, the cost of the bridge across the Yamaska River. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways made the statement the other day that, not in his own opinion, but in the opinion of his chief engineer, the man who by law is to advise him in this matter, that bridge would cost $300,000. To-day, we have the opinion, not of an engineer, but of a practical contractor, that the estimate of the chief engineer of the department is altogether exaggerated, and that in his opinion it would not cost over $50,000. We have thus opinion against opinion, one opinion, I admit, just as good as the other. For my own part, I would think the opinion of the chief engineer was just as good as the opinion advanced against it; and I think we require his opinion to be combatted by something more than the mere ipse dixit of the hon. gentleman. In the building of bridges, it is not so much the width of the river which is to be taken into consideration. There are other elements which will go to make up the cost of a bridge. My hon. friend has referred to the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge at Lachine. I have never heard that that bridge cost less than $1,000,000, though I have always understood that it cost less than $2,000,000. But when we compare that bridge with the Victoria bridge, we cannot fail to be struck by the wide difference in the cost of the two. What is the reason of the difference? They pass over the same stream, the St. Lawrence, at a distance of not more than nine miles apart; yet, if built to-day, the one would cost at least $6,000,000, and the other less than $2,000,000. The reason is very obvious. At Lachine the water is shallow, I am sure not over three feet deep, and the bridge is carried from island to island and built on the solid rock, whereas the Victoria bridge had to be sunk in deep water. Now, what is the condition of the Yamaska River? It is not a wide stream; but I would imagine, though I am not an engineer, that the foundations of that bridge would be very costly, because the banks of the river are clay and are very high. That may be the reason why the chief engineer of the department estimated the cost at a high figure. I do not know; but as we have the opinion of one engineer against that of another, there is no excuse at this late date for my hon. friend's demand. This matter has been already investigated. It was referred last year to a special committee of this House, and that committee reported upon it. Therefore, to ask at the last moment for a detailed estimate of the cost of this bridge is not reasonable. Moreover, there is this other reason, which is supreme, that, as the Minister of Railways has said, we have to take this matter as a whole. It is as a whole that the scheme is projected; and, even if there had been a mistake in the cost of the Yamaska bridge, that should not be a reason why the whole scheme should be rejected

Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman forgets the drift of the argument. My

hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), in making his argument the other day, stated what he considered to be the cost of this particular portion of road. He was attacked by the hon. Minister, who, in support of his statement, adduced the evidence of his Deputy Minister. Now, all evidence of that kind ought to be produced in the House, so that we may have an opportunity to analyse it. But what does the evidence amount to? The hon. Minister says the road would cost for the thirty-two miles $400,000, the bridge across the Yamaska River would cost $300,000, and the bridge across the Richelieu River, $400,000; and add to that $150 per acre for right of way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that was included in the $435,000—from $100 to $150 per acre.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, that is included in the total amount of $1,184,000; and the hon. gentleman says this is a justification for the lease of the road from Ste. Rosalie to the end of the bridge. He says that if we had to build the bridge, it would cost a far greater sum than we have to pay for half of it, which showed the advantage of our bargain. Why, it shows, according to the estimate of his own engineer, as I stated the other day, that you could build the whole line, including the bridge and the equipment of the railway, for less money than the hon. gentleman is giving for half the user of the road.

Mr. POWELL. And save $300,000 to boot.

Mr. HAGGART. And save $300,000 to boot. The road, according to the estimate of his own engineer, bridge and all, could be built at a cost of $1,184,000; and yet he is giving for that portion of the road $37,500 a year, which, capitalized, is greater by $300,000 than the whole line would cost, according to his own engineer's estimate. He says that is sufficient justification for the bargain; for he says this does not include the land damages. The line passes through a number of villages, and, taking the St. Charles branch as a precedent, you ought to add as a moderate estimate, $500,000 on that account, or about $1,500 or $1,600 per acre. On a right of way ninety-nine feet wide, which is the utmost width expropriated, you will find that an addition of $500.000 would be equivalent to about $1,800 an acre.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It cost nearly a million for two miles of the St. Charles branch.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman cannot get away from the St. Charles branch. The Minister has estimates in his office for every mile that was expropriated and every dollar expended for land damages in building railways from one end of the country to the other, and he knows that $600 or $700 per mile is a large estimate for land damages to be paid by any railway through any ordinary section of country. The reason that land damages on this portion of the Intercolonial Railway were so large was, because a lot of wharfs and a lot of revenues in the way of booming timber were expropriated to Point Lévis, so that, really, the whole expenditure was not in a rural section at all, but an expenditure for a certain portion of the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. We had that charged against us as one of the most corrupt and iniquitous pieces of management in the building of a railway ever perpetrated in any part of the known globe. I have heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) get up, again and again, and attack the then Minister of Railways for the extravagant sum expended for that purpose. Yet here we now have that advanced as a justification for this expenditure in the case of a road built through a purely rural section of the country. As I have said, the hon. member for Glengarry is perfectly right. What will engineers, from one end of the country to the other, think, what will any one who has passed over the Richelieu River and knows the stone bottom of that river, knows how shallow it is, except the portion excavated for navigation, of this proposal to spend $400.000 for a bridge over that river, or $300.000 for the Yamaska bridge? The hon. gentleman has an estimate; he has the exact amount spent on the building of the bridge at the Strait of Canso, and he knows himself that his estimate as regards these bridges is entirely absurd. What was the cost of the bridge across the Strait of Canso? $500.000 was the cost, if I remember rightly, and some of the piers were 60 to 70 feet deep.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). On what authority does the hon. gentleman give that statement?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) gave me the figures the other day. He made a comparison between it and the crossing of the bridge at Miramichi. Why, some of the piers were sunk down 90 to 120 feet below the sea level. The cost of that bridge was nearly entirely in the putting down of the piers, and at the time there were none of the mechanism or improved plans we have for building piers at present. Bridging the Richelieu is a comparatively easy job, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Glengarry was perfectly correct in his estimate that an excessive estimate for bridging it would be $60,000, and $90,000 for the Yamaska bridge, or a total of $150,000; and yet the hon. gentleman estimates these at $300,000 and $400,000.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I would like to draw attention to something I have

here. I have no desire to mislead the House or make any statement that will not bear the test of examination. I have sent an enquirer there, and this is a sketch I have obtained from him since this debate started. There are two piers and two abutments, and it is easy to see what these would cost, even if they are deeper than I said the other day. I valued the masonry at $20 per cubic yard, which is a very large price, because the masonry at the "Soo" Canal swing bridge cost only $12 per yard. Then, it is 81 feet longer than I estimated, going through without taking any measurements, and the superstructure I valued at $45 a running foot. Before making that valuation, I telephoned the Dominion Bridge Company, at Montreal, for their prices, and then made my calculation of the cost of the superstructure, feeling I was correct in taking their prices. How any man can put a valuation of $300,000 on a bridge like this, I cannot understand. We would not propose to be guided by the cost of the Richelieu bridge, because that was built in the early days, as the Victoria bridge was, and no doubt required a little more expenditure than would be necessary to-day. On the route that I believe should be adopted I find that some distance from the site of the present bridge there is an easier crossing and a much cheaper bridge can be built, and I have made an estimate of what it would cost. The hon. member for Niagara and Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) says, that it is a draw-bridge. But I counted the number of piers and abutments, and they are certainly no more than I gave the House the other day, and there cannot be much difference in the masonry portion. It may be a little longer than I expected, but there is only that number of spans, and, if you put the superstructure at double the price, how the hon. gentleman or any of his officials can arrive at $400,000 as the cost of that bridge, I cannot see.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is your estimate of the Richelieu bridge?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Somewhere about $80,000 or $90,000, with the addition, I suppose, to the length of the spans, which I understand, are longer, and the bridge a little longer, and there is a draw; but it cannot possibly amount to much more than the first estimate I made on the superstructure in any case. It would be a very small amount more. How the hon. gentleman can value these two bridges at $700,000, I cannot understand, and I am sure that no independent engineer, who would go there unprejudiced, would estimate the cost of those bridges at near one-third of that amount. I stated, the other day, the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, and the hon. Minister said, that his impression was, that it cost more than I said it did. Now, we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost, from bank to bank —what is known as the Lachine bridge—as per plans and specifications of Mr. Petersen, chief engineer, who was the engineer of that bridge, and who went into all details in connection with it, that are not interesting to the committee, $943,387; and from grade to grade, as per contract and plans—you see, there are long approaches there—$998,412.22. Now, the Coteau bridge cost $1,264,000. I will pass this book over to the hon. gentleman, if he would like to see it, and it is here marked in red, so that he will have no trouble seeing for himself. (Passed the book over to the Prime Minister.)

Before sitting down, let me say, with regard to the Richelieu bridge, that I have sent an enquirer to examine it, but have received no report yet, and, if I have made a mistake, I will be glad to acknowledge it; but, so far as the other bridge is concerned, it cannot be possible that it will cost anything more than $50,000 or $60,000, even with the little addition in the superstructure.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. First Minister, a few moments, said there were two opinions before the committee, and one was worth as much as the other. That is to say, the opinion of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, who gave the information to the Minister of Railways and Canals, that the cost of the bridge would be $300,000, and the information given by my hon. friend from Glengarry. I am sure that the right hon. gentleman would not give the House an erroneous impression, but, I hold, with all due respect—and I am sure that I am saying this in a way that is not intended to be offensive—we have not had the opinion of Mr. Schreiber. We have had the opinion of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not pretend to be able to form an opinion.

Mr. BERGERON. I repeat it—and I am saying it with all due deference—it is the Minister of Railways and Canals who has told us: My chief engineer has said so and so. Well, my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has been asking very often for information, and if he had been granted that information we would have avoided discussion. If we had the written opinion of Mr. Schreiber upon it then we could get the opinion of other engineers and have the matter discussed, the House would be in a better position to form an opinion. As it stands now, we have purely and simply the opinion of the Minister of Railways and Canals. We cannot hold Mr. Schreiber responsible before the country for the opinion which he has not signed. It seems to me that there is a plain way to find out if this opinion is correct or not. The Grand Trunk has built a bridge over the Yamaska River where the hon. gentleman spoke of building one if that scheme was carried out. How much did that bridge of the Grand Trunk cost? The

right hon. Prime Minister knows that the river is not navigable at that point.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say it was.

Mr. BERGERON. And it is not very large. And my right hon. friend knows another thing, that that bridge can be built in one span without piers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to set the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) right. I not only stated what I had been told by my engineer, but I said I had his figures and I had them before me, the gross figures which the engineer himself had given me. In the first place, he showed how he made up the sum total, allowing $100 to $150 an acre for land damages going through the country district, and the Yamaska bridge $300,000, and the Richelieu, $400,000. My engineer gave me these figures and I had them in my possession at the time and read from them.

Mr. BERGERON. That confirms everything I have said. We have what the hon. Minister says in comparison with what we have heard from the hon. member for Glengarry. We have not got Mr. Schreiber's figures with his signature to them so that they could be brought before a board of engineers and discussed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are you going to determine this question in that way?

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would be the best way to determine to what extent these reports may be trusted. I do not blame any man for not being a competent engineer or skilful in these questions, but, at least, we ought to get from the Minister, who is responsible to Parliament, something which we can depend upon; and I will call a report made by Mr. Schreiber and signed by him, something which, if we should not rely upon it, at least we could discuss it with other engineers. But, as we are to-day, we cannot do so.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has the very thing he has asked for. He has had the figures given by the Minister, figures signed by Mr. Schreiber, that the bridge over the Yamaska would cost $300,000.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said. My right hon. friend is very credulous and I will not reproach him for that. Moreover, he is not well informed on these matters. He said that the bridge at Lachine was built on islands, whereas there is not one island from one shore to the other. If he can make a mistake in a statement——

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not the point to which my hon. friend is referring If he will pardon me, he is juggling with the points in a way, I think, not consistent with his dignity as a member of this House. He wants to have figures under Mr. Schreiber's signature. He has them under Mr. Schreiber's signature when he has it given by the Minister as not his own figures, but figures given by Mr. Schreiber, and as against these he has the figures given by the hon. member for Glengarry.

Mr. BERGERON. I have never seen these figures of Mr. Schreiber's. I have heard a speech from the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), and I have seen a report of that speech in the "Hansard," stating these things, but I have not seen the figures as we see them in the report of an engineer where details are given, the figures put down and the signature of the engineer at the bottom. I was saying a moment ago that my right hon. friend made a mistake in speaking of the Lachine bridge. He probably meant to refer to the Coteau bridge, which is built on islands. The Lachine bridge cost less than a million dollars, and it has a length of almost 4,000 feet. I should not be surprised if Mr. Schreiber would not sign these figures estimating the cost of the bridge with one span of 331 feet at $300,000. The right hon. gentleman, when he spoke of the low cost of the Lachine bridge, said that it was because it was built upon islands. I wish to repeat that it was built from one shore to the other without anything else but the iron girders and the piers upon which it rests. Now, the hon. gentleman tried to make a point of the difference between the Victoria bridge and the Lachine bridge. He said that the Victoria bridge had cost a great deal more because it was built 30 years ago, and bridges could be built for less now than they could then. He gave another reason, that the Victoria bridge was built in deep water and the other in shallow water. He made a mistake. There is a great deal of shallow water where the Victoria bridge is built. In fact, there is only one place where vessels drawing seven feet of water can pass under it. The rest is built in shallow water just as much as the bridge at Lachine. This brings us down to the fact that bridges to-day can be built for a great deal less than when the Victoria bridge was constructed. Now, it seems to me that the Government is very much interested in giving satisfaction not merely to this committee, but to the country, regarding the transaction they are seeking to pass through Parliament. Why not, then, ask the cost of the bridge which the Grand Trunk have built over the Yamaska? Another point concerning which I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, but as he is not in his place now, I will ask the right hon. leader of the Government.

The Minister of Railways and Canals a few moments ago answered the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) that the Delaware and Hudson did not come into the Bonaventure station at Montreal. I

want to be sure of that. I ask the Minister again if it is not true that the Delaware and Hudson comes into the Bonaventure station, also that the Vermont Central has its terminus at the Bonaventure station. Surely those railways must lease from the Grand Trunk Railway in order to have their terminals in the city of Montreal. The object of the member for Glengarry in asking that question was to find out how much it cost the Delaware and Hudson to use the Bonaventure station in Montreal, in the same way that the Intercolonial Railway is going to use it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The information I have received on the subject is to the effect that these railways do not come in under any such conditions. They are coming into Montreal exactly the same as the Canada Atlantic Railway is coming in. The Grand Trunk Railway picks up the Canada Atlantic Railway trains at Coteau ; the Grand Trunk Railway picks up the Vermont Central at some point this side of the boundary, I think ; and it picks up the Delaware and Hudson in the same way. It takes these trains and brings them into the Bonaventure station, and gets its proportion of all the earnings from those points, and I suppose a mileage proportion of the whole from Boston, or Ottawa, or whatever point it may be. That is the arrangement. They would have no independent running rights. They are picked up by the Grand Trunk Railway engines and trains, which are manned by Grand Trunk Railway men. That is what the Grand Trunk Railway people tell me.

Mr. POWELL. I may say that Mr. Wainwright, under oath, made a similar statement before the committee. I suppose the point of the hon. Minister is that there is no rental.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No rental. These are the terms on which all these railways are coming in.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. gentleman learned from these companies what value they would put upon an entrance into Montreal if they were to come in on the same terms as the hon. gentlemen intends to bring in the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I tell my hon. friend that we do not believe we could get any better evidence of what the value of such an arrangement would be than is afforded by the arrangement between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, travelling over much the same kind of country on a railway involving very much the same character of work and probably the same amount of cost. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company felt that they were making a good business arrangement in paying $40,000 as user over thirty-eight miles, under a fifty-years' lease of the piece of road between Hamilton and Toronto, not giving them any terminal privileges or terminal rights, simply the mileage of these thirty-eight miles to the junction outside the city. I felt that we could not have any better evidence of what would be a fair rate, than this arrangement entered into between these two companies.

Mr. BERGERON. In carrying passengers upon the Intercolonial from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, which company will get the benefit ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the passenger is carried on the Intercolonial train, the Intercolonial train gets the full benefit ; if the passenger is carried on the Grand Trunk Railway train the Grand Trunk Railway will get the benefit.

Mr. SPROULE. It is just because of the trouble we have had in getting information that the Bill is not passed even at this late hour, information which was necessary to enable us to judge whether this was a good or a bad bargain. We never could get information, practically we have no information yet. When we analyse the small items of information that we have obtained, we find that they are entirely erroneous. The Minister tells us that we have made a good bargain, and he bases his statement on estimates made by comparison, saying that if we were to build a new road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert it would cost us so much. But when he comes down to particulars he says : My engineers tell me it would cost $300,000 to build a bridge over the Yamaska. We sent on a competent engineer to examine the locality, and the report he gives us is that the bridge could be built for $40,000 or $50,000. Then, the Minister says it would cost about $400,000 to build a bridge over the Richelieu ; but an examination of the proposed bridge in detail, made by a competent engineer, reveals the fact that it would cost $80,000 or $90,000. Therefore, when we come to analyse the few details he has given us, we find them very extravagant, and if we are to judge of the rest of his bargain by these items, we must come to the conclusion that it is a very bad bargain. We are also told that if we were building a new line it would cost us $1,400 an acre to pay for the right of way. Now, go into Ontario, perhaps the best farming province in the Dominion, and tell the farmers there that you have paid what is equivalent to a value of $1,400 an acre for the right of way, and they would say : The thing is absurd, we never get any such prices, we did not get one-tenth of that money when the right of way was taken from us. Yet their land is more valuable for agricultural purposes than the land which would be expropriated here. Then, the Minister says that he has no close and careful valuation as to the cost of the

road before purchasing. Well, does he give that as a justification for his bargain? No man in this House would be more ready to condemn such a statement if it was made by his opponents. He would require a close and careful valuation of the cost of these roads in order to enable him to judge whether the bargain was a good one or not. Now, we have no such information in regard to this bargain, we have no estimate made by a competent engineer, which I submit we should have, not only an estimate of a lump sum, but an estimate in detail. If we had such estimates, we could submit them to other competent men who might carefully examine them and ascertain upon what grounds his estimates were made in order that we may judge whether the bargain is a fair and reasonable one.

Now, the hon. Minister said we had all this information brought out before the special committee, and I think the right hon. First Minister agreed with him. It was never reported to this House, if I remember anything about that special committee. If I understood the purport of that special committee, it was for the purpose of ascertaining what had become of the money given by the country to build that railway, whether it was properly or improperly expended. It was not exactly in regard to the cost of the railway, or what it would have cost to build another railway like that. The report of that committee was never submitted in full to this House; I am in the judgment of the House, when I say, that, in the light of what we know now, the less said about the inquiry and report of that committee by hon. gentlemen, the better. If we are to take the report of that committee as a justification for what we are doing today, I say it will come far from satisfying the curiosity of the country, when they come to inquire into what are the revelations of that committee, or what the revelations which might have been made, if they were not made to this House, in connection with the inquiry into that railway. The less said about it by hon. gentlemen, the better, if they are mentioning it as a justification for the contract they are entering into. I say, that, in connection with this whole scheme, we have not the reasonable information that members of the committee ought to have to enable them to judge whether this bargain is a good one or a bad one. There has been a paucity of information given to this committee; there has practically been no information at all, although we have asked for information in regard to what was the earning of the road for the short time that we had it, what the mileage earnings were, what it would cost to build another road in case we did not take this one. We have been unable to get information to enable the committee to say whether this is a good or a bad bargain. When the few items of information that have been given to us as to the cost of building a bridge over the Yamaska and Richelieu rivers, are submitted to competent engineers who are capable of judging and going into a proper inquiry, we find a wide difference between the estimates given as to the cost of this work. In one case—the construction of a bridge across the Yamaska—we are informed that it can be built for $40,000 or $50,000, while the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says: My engineer says, that it will cost $300,000. In the other case, for building a bridge over the Richelieu River, a competent engineer, who has analysed the matter and inquired into it, says that it can be built for $80,000 or $90,000, while the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says, upon the estimate of his engineer, that it will cost about $400,000. When we take this difference between these estimates, between the estimates of the departmental engineer and men who have examined into this matter specifically, who are competent and intelligent engineers, we are justified in demanding that more information shall be submitted to this committee before we allow such a contract to pass and receive the sanction of this House. If we do not demand this information, we are not performing the duty that we owe to the country. We are making what is, in my judgment, an improvident bargain, and one which this House should not sanction, without all the data which, I assert, it has a right to have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals suggested, some time ago, that, in dealing with this matter, he did not think it necessary to get down to very minute details. It was only necessary for him to give us general information. I certainly think he has not got down very far into details, when he tells us that these two bridges would cost $300,000 and $400,000 respectively, while the hon. member for Glengarry, who is a practical man, and who has practical means to determine the cost of these bridges, says, that one would cost $40,000 and the other between $80,000 and $100,000. The statement which the hon. member for Glengarry makes in this respect is borne out, when we compare the length of one of these bridges with the length of the Lachine bridge. The Lachine bridge is 3,652 feet long, according to the report of the engineer, while the bridge over the Yamaska River is 331 feet long, or about one-eleventh of the other. If you admit that the engineering difficulties are quite as great over the Yamaska, although we can hardly suppose they are as great over a river of that sort as over the St. Lawrence; but, if you give to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and to his deputy the benefit of the doubt in that respect, you would not have the cost of this bridge exceeding $80,000 or $85,000. The bridge at Lachine over the St. Lawrence cost about $960,000; one-eleventh of that is between $80,000 and $90,000, I

think. Well, when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals founds an argument to this House—because it is in that view only that this matter is coming up—upon the fact that this bridge would cost $300.000, I think the committee have a right to demand from the hon. gentleman some further data, some better estimate than any he has afforded to us so far, because we have practical estimates made by the hon. member for Glengarry, who is a practical man, and we have also a fair basis of comparison between this bridge and the bridge at Lachine. I think, therefore, it is only fair that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should support the statement which he has made to the House and to the committee by some details, so that we can judge as to whether the estimate is reasonable. Another statement upon which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals joined issue with the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), was as to whether or not it could be properly said that this country has any ownership in this road. I venture to think that the statement made by the hon. member for York was correct. We have no such thing as ownership in this road at all. If, instead of getting a half interest in this road, this agreement had provided for an entire interest, it would still be only a leasehold interest; it would not be an ownership at all. It would be a leasehold for ninety-nine years, with the right of renewal. Therefore, it is wholly out of place to talk about an ownership in the road. We have only a half interest for ninety-nine years. In so far as the user is concerned, we do not make anything like a half user; we make something like a one-twentieth user. We are not in the same position as the Grand Trunk in reference to the road, as to selling our interest. We have simply a leasehold interest. We have a half interest for ninety-nine years at a fixed rate of rental, and we have nothing more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals must have the engineer's report in reference to this proposed alternative line. I find that, at page 4230 of the "Hansard," he said:

> Well, we have got to Caughnawaga, and my engineers say:
> "Instead of having to travel 38 miles to get from Ste. Rosalie by the present proposed route into the Bonaventure station, we would have to travel 55 miles, going up to Caughnawaga and coming back again on the other side."

That, evidently, is an excerpt from the engineer's report in reference to this alternative proposition. I think my hon. friend ought to bring that down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a map or plan that my engineer prepared showing what would be the alternative route, if an alternative route were taken up, where it would have to go, and the cost per mile.

Mr. FOSTER. A map would not have a translation of these words in italics.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is that?

Mr. FOSTER. What I have just read. This is evidently from the engineer's report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Anything you have quoted from the engineer's report will be found in the engineer's report. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to say where it is quoted?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, this is what you say:

> Well, we have got to Caughnawaga, and my engineers say:
> "Instead of having to travel 38 miles to get from Ste. Rosalie by the present proposed route into the Bonaventure station, we would have to travel 55 miles, going up to Caughnawaga and coming back again on the other side."

It must be in a report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The plan shows that.

Mr. FOSTER. What plan?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The plan the engineer put in my hand.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) see that if he makes a quotation——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not make any quotation, except that I stated to the House what the engineer of the department presented to me.

Mr. FOSTER. I will read it again: It is not what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) himself says, but in the "Hansard" it is printed as a quotation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I do not think it has any right to appear as a quotation, for I was not quoting the language of the engineer. I was stating the fact that his plan shows it was 55 miles instead of 38 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. It is printed in the "Hansard," as if it were an extract. Well, let me ask the Minister this question. Did he go into this bargain, prepare himself to pay that amount, come down to the House and justify his bargain by an elaborate statement as to what the alternate route would cost without having had the report of an engineer upon that alternate route?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not have any report of the engineer, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would put it. I had obtained from the engineer a statement as to what would be the cost of the alternate route, as to what the additional mileage, as to what it would cost per mile to build the 55 miles outside of the two miles I spoke of as running from the

outskirts of Montreal—the cost of the bridge and the cost of getting to the cattle-yard.

Mr. FOSTER. That would take in the cost of the bridge, too.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. I have given the figures on my engineer's statement to me.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) bring down the engineer's statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought I had it in my desk, but I find I have not.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister gives it after dinner, it will be all right. Now, I want the Minister to give some more information on this point—and it was a very strong point in his argument—namely, the cost of the right of way, and the cost of the right of way was, he said, heightened by the nature of the country through which the road would pass. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said:

> Just imagine getting the right of way through eleven towns and villages, one of them at least of the importance of St. Hyacinthe, and the hon. gentleman and the committee know the importance of other places.

Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) give us a list of the eleven towns and villages through which the alternate road would have to pass, and the population.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I can give you the population, but I can give you the list.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) can give the population.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bernier) will supplement my statement with a statement as to the population.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the only opportunity we have had of getting down to facts; hitherto we have been flying around in the ethereal regions, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) must give us some latitude.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I did state the other evening to the committee with reference to the probable cost of the alternate line, was drawn out of me by a suggestion made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) that another line could be built—I do not know whether he put that forward about building another parallel line to the line between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert; but he did with regard to a line to Caughnawaga, and coming down along the shore of the river and the canal lands. I stated that, not as a necessary part of our case, because our case on the whole, I desired it to be understood, was strong and ought to commend itself to Parliament.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go to the next section, I would like to hear from the Minister whether he has any further light with reference to the cost of that alternative line, especially the bridge over the Yamaska.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No, I have not any further information to give to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman not found his engineer's report?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not found my engineer's report. I have found the engineer's statement to me, which I used the other night. I have got the memorandum which he gave me.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. Minister object to put that on the Table?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not propose to put that on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. Minister propose to give any detail of the estimated cost of $300,000 for the Yamaska bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got any detail. I have just got what the hon. gentleman heard me say, the statement of the engineer that he estimated the cost of the bridge at $300,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I think we may come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman has not any estimate or any statement signed by any reputable engineer, his own or anybody else. He has committed himself to definite statements before the House, but he cannot give the House the name of any reputable or competent engineer signed under that estimate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means to imply by that. If he means to cast any doubt upon the accuracy of my statement about having received this estimate or memorandum from the engineer, I will relieve him and the House by putting my statement on the subject before the House, and leave the hon. gentleman to comment on it and criticise it as he pleases. I have stated to the House, on my responsibility as a member and a Minister, that my chief engineer and Deputy Minister gave me the information and data which I presented to the House the other night, and I think the hon. gentleman is going a long way and is scarcely contributing to the amenities and

proprieties of debate, when he undertakes to assume that the statement I have made to the House is not correct. My chief engineer furnished me with data which I use, and which I state to the House on his authority. The House is entitled to accept my statement. If the hon. gentleman will not accept it, I will let him deal with it as he pleases; but I think it is scarcely confining oneself within the bounds of propriety and within the amenities of debate when the hon. gentleman either insinuates or states that I have no such authority or statement as I have given to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no need for any heat in this matter, and there is no need for the ultimate resort to the absolute statement of the Minister that we are bound to receive. We receive with great respect the statements made by Ministers with reference to their departments, and yet the House, as one of its rights, insists upon having the reports of the technical officers, who certainly know more about such matters than the fleeting Minister of the department can know, both from training and from long familiarity with what is the work of their lives. If the hon. gentleman has a statement from one of his engineers throwing, by calculation or by conclusion, any light upon the matter of the alternative route, as to its cost, it certainly is an element imported into the discussion by the hon. gentleman himself; because it was on the ground of the great cost and what he thought was the non-feasibility of a reasonable alternative route that he induced the House and intends to induce the country to accept the present scheme. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what reasonable objection there is to his putting these statements and this data of the engineers of his department before the House. They are not his engineers; they are ours. We pay for them. They remain there just as long as this House says they shall remain. When this House says they shall not remain in office, they do not remain in office. They are not the personal appurtenance of the Minister at all, and any Minister who has that idea in his mind had better disabuse himself of that idea first as last. They are our officers, and the only reason the Minister has a staff in that building is because this Parliament votes money for that staff, thinks we ought to have them there, and is pleased to keep them there as long as they do their work—for whom? For this House and this country. The hon. gentleman is as helpless as an infant without the staff we give him. He has no more strength or power in his right arm to carry on a line of railway or build a bridge than the pages about this House. He gets his power, and his information from which his power comes, from the staff which we give him and which we pay. We have a perfect right to go behind the Minister himself and ask for the report of our officers. Mr. Schreiber in that department is our officer, and the Minister is going wide of the mark when he says, "Yes, I have got the information from my officers; do you doubt my word? If you do, you cut yourself off from the reasonable amenities of debate," That was not true. Neither would a threat of that kind frighten the Opposition or have the least weight with any man in this House. The hon. gentleman has gone upon data and information given him by men who know and he bases his argument on that information, and as one who does not know personally. Why should we not have the information at first hand? The hon. gentleman has it, how easy it is for him to lay it on the Table. If he has not got it, should he not give the House the information that our own officers, paid by the public money, have given him and which we require?

The whole difficulty in the situation is that the hon. gentleman has got down now to particulars. As long as he can float along over the heads of indefinite statements and talk grandly of through traffic and the like, and make estimates which are all indefinite in their very nature, he does very well; but he made the mistake of committing himself to a definite line of argument, bristling with definite statements. We want to have these reports at first hand. We want to know just what these statements are worth, so far as we, who are laymen, can judge them. What childishness it is for a Minister to come down to a couple of hundred men in this House, every man with just as much common sense, presumably, as himself, business men, who have as much right to draw conclusions from data given to them as he has from data given to him—what childishness on his part to refuse to give them that data. The hon. gentleman knows that when reports of a public nature, when the reports of engineers or anything of that kind, are made the foundation of an argument, he must give every member of the House access to it. To do otherwise is simply to assume that he is the heaven-born filter, through which all information is to come out, trickling to the members of the House, just as he turns the faucet. Well, I propose, in the language of the Solicitor General, to ask that I get the water from the fountain at first hand, unadulterated, and I would like to have it, as it flows from the engineers.

I do hope the hon. Minister will not put himself in the wrong by refusing this information, and I do hope he will not proceed to the extremity of saying that because we want the statements of his engineers at first hand, we mistrust his word and are therefore no longer fit for the society of gentlemen. Now, we do want to be gentlemen on this side, inasmuch as we have the fear of the hon. gentleman's condemnation in our eyes, but we still hold to our rights and have to ask for that information.

Dr. Bourinot lays down the rule very clearly:

When a Minister of the Crown quotes a public document and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, when called for, ought to be produced.

But, outside of constitutional rules, the common sense, business plan of dealing with us, who are a committee for the people, just as from the hon. gentleman who is in the position of one of the executive, is to give us the fullest information and the documents which he quotes. It is not dignified or common sense for a Minister to bristle up and say he will not give us the information because our asking for it implies that we do not believe him.

Another statement made by my hon. friend in his speech the other night, for which he gained great applause from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), amongst others—and the hon. member for North Wellington is now listening—was that the building of an alternative route would be much more expensive. The argument was imported by the hon. Minister himself. It did not occur to him on the spur of the moment, but was an argument he had gone over, no doubt, for days. He had furnished himself with the written statements of engineers, he had talked to these men about it, he had the whole argument complete, and a large part of his contention was that the alternative route was simply impossible because of its cost. There were bridges to be constructed, one of which would cost $300,000, and the other $400,000; there was the right of way to be purchased, which would cost $150 an acre, and again $500,000 more, and he reiterated these points as potential arguments in the case. I acknowledge that they are, if they are true. What was one of these? The hon. gentleman said:

Just imagine getting the right of way through eleven towns and villages, one of them at least of importance, St. Hyacinthe, and the hon. gentlemen in the committee know the importance of all the other places. Is it reasonable, would any Government be safe, would I not be worthy of the severest condemnation if, as Minister of Railways, I advised my colleagues that we could expropriate the right of way from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert on the basis of paying $150 per acre.

We have the right to know what are these dozen towns and villages, which would be such an essential element in the payment of high prices for the expropriation of land. The Minister, of course, will explain that in detail to the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated before six o'clock that I would have a memorandum furnishing the names of these places, and I will have it in a short time. I telephoned to one of the officials in my office, Mr. Jones, and he has just answered me that we will have it here shortly.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend cannot, of his own knowledge, name a number of these important towns.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give a list. I told him, when the matter was up before, that I could not recall the names of the different places.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he get this from his engineer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He gave them to me, and they were eleven.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he give you the names?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not in the statement of any kind and the hon. gentleman has nothing but the recollection that he was told so?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know it was so.

Mr. FOSTER. You knew there was eleven towns and villages there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but I know that he said so. I have already explained very fully to the committee the circumstances under which I made my statement the other night and on what authority. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks that this method of catechising with regard to an inferior detail, upon which the general policy of arranging with the Grand Trunk Railway as a means of reaching Montreal, was not based or defended, is very effective as an argument. Nor was that policy founded upon the question whether or not the Yamaska bridge would cost $300,000 or only half that amount.

I think I stated to the committee the other night, that in my view—and I think in that view I was justified in speaking for the Government—and I find the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) very fully agrees with me—it would be very much better for the Government not to reach Montreal at all than to attempt to reach it in any other way than the way we have arranged. I have based the agreement upon the general value of that arrangement, as realizing to the fullest possible extent, at a moderate charge, what we desired to obtain, and which arrangement compares favourably with those between the Grand Trunk Railway and other companies upon business principles.

It was in consequence of a suggestion thrown out on the other side of the House that I stated to the committee that any of the alternative methods which had been suggested, one of them by the hon. member for Glengarry, would not be more favourable, either financially or otherwise, and having regard to the advantages of reaching Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway—these would not be more favourable arrangements to make. I pointed out that so far as the construction of another line parallel with

or exactly along the same route from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, was concerned, that my engineers stated to me that they estimated the cost of that road at $485,000 outside the two bridges, and upon the basis that $100 to $150 an acre for land damages. But they were not taking into account, and could not take into account, what it would cost to run the line through the eleven towns and villages.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have you a written report of the engineer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engineer gave me memoranda upon the subject which I used in the House, and gave me along with it a map. As I read to the committee, he estimated the probable cost of constructing an independent line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, exclusive of the two bridges, at $485,440. The figures which would go to make up that amount were given in detail. I said that the land damages were estimated at a sum not exceeding $150 per acre in making up that sum total, but that the engineer advised me in these terms:

> In estimating the cost of 32 miles of railway between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, the value of the land has been treated as farm land, whereas, in passing through towns, of which there are several, the land should be treated as town lots.

And he was unable to make any estimate at all as to what the land damages would amount to. The figures as to the land damages which he included in his gross estimate of $485,000 were based upon a value of farm lands not to exceed $150 per acre. I gave that information to the committee, I stated that data was furnished to me in regard to the bridges in the gross, the Richelieu bridge would cost $400,000, and the Yamaska bridge, $300,000. If I were to put on the Table all the papers from which I made my statement, and which I have received from my deputy, it would not furnish the House with a particle more information than I have given it. I do not think that the data which I am using and which is furnished to the Minister in course of an address, is a public document in any sense to go upon the Table, therefore, I do not think that the request is a reasonable and proper request to make. I read no document but give the information as furnished to me, and the House is in full possession of the details in regard to the matter, such as they are, because there are really no details; the Richelieu bridge was stated at $400,000, and the Yamaska bridge at $300,000. If I had the detailed items going to show how the cost of these bridges was made up, and if the hon. gentlemen wished to see them, I would have no objection furnishing that information. But I have not got it; I have only got the gross amount as it was stated to me. I recollect at this moment that the engineer, in giving me his memoranda, added that he had obtained his idea as to the probable cost of these bridges largely from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, who have built bridges across both these rivers, and was, therefore, in a good position to say what would be the probable cost of these bridges.

Mr. POWELL. Will you let me see the paper?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The memoranda I have here is mixed up with other memoranda that I do not think the hon. gentleman would care to see. I will mark portions of it for him.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a question of interest to the House as to what rights the House has with regard to the services of engineers. It seems to me that one of the purposes for which the country employs them is to give information, not only to the Government, but to Parliament, which would enable Parliament to judge of the wisdom or otherwise of entering into great engagements. In this case above many others, it is most desirable that we should have not only the information that has been given to the hon. Minister, but much more specific and definite information, because it is only when we are in possession of detailed information that we are able to analyse it and judge how far we would be justified in going. I cannot see any reason why the Minister should withhold this information. Where contracts are to be let and where the Minister has to use private information, it might be necessary for him to withhold that information from the House. But there are no contracts to be let upon the basis of this information, therefore, I cannot see any justifiable reason why this information should be withheld. If he says that he has no information further than an epitome, then I think the House has a right to question whether he is himself in possession of the information which he ought to have, and which he ought to be able to give to this House before this Bill is passed. We want to be able to judge whether it would be preferable to build a new road or to purchase the one that is submitted to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would pay better to go by the Grand Trunk Railway than by any other way, even if you could get in for nothing by another way.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be, because there may be elements in the situation that I am not in possession of, which would make me a competent judge. But a contract is submitted for our ratification, and we are obliged, as representatives of the people, to consider it on its merits, and we wish to have certain information to enable us to judge. It is the comparison of how much it would cost for us to acquire the same

service by building a railway of our own. Therefore, if such a proposition were submitted to the House that we might build a railway of our own, or, as it is stated to the House, that we cannot build a railway of our own for anything like the expenditure here called for, we naturally ask upon what information you are justified in saying so. The meagre information given is, that this road is through a country in which it would cost a very considerable amount to build a railway—but we are not told how much per mile. We are told that the right of way will be expensive, as it goes through a number of villages. Those who know nothing of the geography, are unable to judge what this will cost, and those who live in the locality say, that they cannot locate the villages, any more than we can. The Minister says, there are eleven villages. We ask where they are, and what size they are, so that we may know whether land in the vicinity of these villages will be expensive or otherwise. But the information is not given us. The hon. gentleman tells us that the important item in the cost would be the building of two large bridges. One of these, he says, will cost $300,000. We ask for the estimate of the engineer, so that we may see on what basis he comes to that conclusion. We find that another engineer examines the locality and reports that the cost of the bridge would be $50,000. Which are we to believe? The engineer whose estimate is quoted by the Government, is certainly not more disinterested than the other, in fact, the independent engineer might be said to be more disinterested than the engineer who is standing by the Minister in the proposition he makes. Then, the Minister tells us that the other bridge would cost $400,000. The other engineer, I presume, after careful examination and working it out, says the cost will be $80,000 or $90,000. I say we are justified in entertaining a very strong suspicion that the Minister has not been furnished with data in sufficient detail to enable him to judge of the case correctly. We ask him to give the detailed information to the House, so that the House may judge whether the estimated cost of the bridge is reasonable or otherwise. If we have regard to the limited information given us as a basis for ratifying the contract entered into, we must come to the conclusion that we cannot estimate fairly whether this is a good bargain or a bad one. I say the House is entitled to more information. That is the reason why we keep engineers. There are times when the engineer's estimate must be kept private from the House, but this is not such a case, because it is not suggested that that information will be put to any wrong use. I can see no reason why the greatest freedom should not be exercised by the Minister in giving us the most detailed information that is given him by the engineer. If the engineer has given him no more information than he has given the House, I would advise him to instruct the engineer to go over the case again and furnish him with proper information on the subject.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask the Minister, whether he considers that the line in this paragraph mentioned, "hereinbefore described, and of the terminals and connections hereinbefore mentioned, and all intermediate stations and premises of the company," applies to what is described in the "Montreal joint section" and "Chaudière joint section," and whether that conveys also "connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, via Jacques-Cartier."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. POWELL. The Minister will pardon the gentlemen on this side of the House, if they are a little inclined to regard these certificates of the Deputy Minister as somewhat apocryphal. That gentleman gave a certificate which was put in before the Drummond County Committee of the value of this piece of road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Charles, showing it be a million and a half of dollars. And here we have an estimate in to-day of $1,185,000. There is a difference of $315,000 on 30 miles of railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) must be in error.

Mr. POWELL. Oh, no, I am not in error.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What the hon. gentleman would probably be justified in stating is, that the piece of road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert cost the Grand Trunk a million and a half of money.

Mr. POWELL. No, he estimates the value.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be a fair statement—it was not from Ste. Rosalie to St. Henri, but from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert.

Mr. POWELL. It does not matter; it was to the bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He would be justified in stating the railway was worth a million and a half, because it cost the Grand Trunk that amount.

Mr. POWELL. It was given for the purpose of a valuation. Whether it is a constructive valuation or not, it is immaterial. And now we have a valuation showing a difference of upwards of $300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is for another line.

Mr. POWELL. Whether it is for another line or not, it is for a first-class line between these two points. That is, it is the same

length of road; so, there is no difference so far as that is concerned, and the hon. Minister's explanation does not amount to much.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whether much or little, you were stating for a fact what was not a fact, and I corrected you.

Mr. POWELL. It is entirely immaterial whether we take a new road or a first-class road, like the Grand Trunk. I desire to refer particularly to bridges referred to by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). If there is work in this country that in the judgment of the Minister of Railways and Canals is first-class in every particular, if there is a possibility of there being in Canada a road that is equal to the Philadelphia Reading, or the best portions of the New York Central, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, that road would be the newly-constructed portion of the Drummond County road, the 43 miles constructed under the supervision of the hon. gentleman himself and the officers of his department. Now, it might be of interest to the House to know that there are some remarkably good bridges on that road. The bridges were one of the features dwelt upon in respect of the road; they were one of the chief features of the capital cost of this railway. When Mr. Phelps Johnson was upon the stand, I put him to the trouble of submitting two statements. The first was of the cost of these bridges, both on the old and new portions of this railway. But that was not quite sufficient for the purpose we had in view, and I called upon him to submit a second statement; and in that second statement we have further particulars than we had in the first. Now, for the information of the hon. Minister, I would refer him to page 155 of the report of the Drummond County Railway investigation. The very first item is the St. François River bridge, which cost $17,500.

Now, we will refer to this magnificent steel bridge. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the next page and find the statement which is adduced by Mr. Phelps Johnson, he will find that the St. François River bridge consists of three spans, two of which are 130 feet long each, and one 100 feet long. The hon. gentleman, with his experience, will know that a bridge with a span of 150 feet long is a much more expensive bridge than a bridge with a span of even 127 feet, as in the case of the smaller bridge on that particular portion of the line. Now, if he will multiply the 150 feet in each span by two, that will give him 300 feet, and if he will add the 100 feet of the other span that will make 400 feet. Compare this length with the length of the bridge over the Yamaska River and he will find that it is exactly 19 feet longer. Now, the bridge over the St. François which is first-class in every respect, cost $17,500 for the superstructure. If he will turn further to Mr. Phelps Johnson's testimony, he will find that this bridge was constructed in 1887, so that, from the sum named, 40 per cent will have to be subtracted in order to bring it down to modern prices. We will not go to the extent of 40 per cent; suppose we take 25 per cent off.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was thinking that you would have to add 40 per cent.

Mr. POWELL. That is just one difference between the hon. gentleman's judgment and the judgment of a gentleman who is in the business and who understands what he is talking about. If the hon. gentleman, instead of rushing into this matter had consulted such a man as Mr. Phelps Johnson, he would have estimated the cost of that bridge at the time at $4,000 less, which, taken from the $17,000, would give $13,000 or $14,000. I will call his attention to a later bridge which I know will meet his approval, as it was constructed under his very eye. I refer to the Maddington Falls bridge. For the information of this House I will tell him that that bridge was erected in February, 1897, and this, he will observe, was after the contract was entered into between himself and the Drummond County Railway Company, at a cost of $15,000. If he will turn to page 156 of this report he will see that, according to Mr. Phelps Johnson, the Maddington Falls bridge has one span of 103 feet, one span of 102 feet 4 inches, one of 100 feet 8 inches, and one of 98 feet 4 inches. Adding them altogether he will find the total length of the whole bridge is 404 feet, or 23 feet longer than the Yamaska bridge. This is a magnificent structure, completed to the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman, and equal to the most advanced products of modern science. The cost of that was $15,000. I think it will be assumed that this is a fair price for the superstructure. We have then left for four abutments on this magnificent bridge, $285,000, which would be $71,250 per abutment. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) adduced figures and measurements. I took the precaution to go over them and to make a calculation, and I find, taking the most extravagant price, of $20 per cubic yard for masonry, the cost of the substructure is lessened to $40,000. Adding to the cost of the Maddington Falls bridge, which is higher than the St. François bridge, to this we will find that that bridge could not have cost $55,000. If the hon. gentleman wishes to institute a comparison between the estimate for the Richelieu River bridge and another bridge—one of those magnificent bridges, not exactly constructed under the very eye of the Minister of Railways and Canals, but yet meeting with his approbation, he will find that a bridge known as the north-west branch of the Nicolet River bridge is 820 feet long. That bridge consists of three spans of 110 feet, one of 160 feet, eleven short spans of 30 feet, and that there are no less than 15 piers. These piers are of two

portions; in the first place, there is the pedestal of masonry, and in addition to that there is a steel tower. The hon. gentleman will find that the cost of these steel towers as well as the cost of the ordinary superstructure, added together, and these steel towers support a bridge 80 feet above water level, is $33,720 for the whole superstructure. The estimate which has been made by the hon. member for Glengarry is certainly in excess of what the real cost of the bridge would be. In the face of these facts, the hon. Minister of Railways must not be surprised if gentlemen of this side of the House, noticing the continued series of elongated veracities which the Minister of Railways is accustomed to submit to the House in connection with railway matters, are inclined to look upon as somewhat apocryphal these unproduced reports that are stated to emanate from the deputy of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I think, certainly, the hon. Minister is bound to say something in reply to these statements which have been made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). They are taken from blue-books; there is not the least doubt about the calculations; they are not the calculations of the hon. member for Westmoreland; they are the calculations of men who know, of engineers and of bridge builders and the like of that. Yet, the hon. gentleman, who has listened to this and who persists in declaring that a bridge over the Yamaska River would cost $300,000, and over the Richelieu $400,000, is equally determined in persisting that he shall not give the engineer's statement or memorandum to that effect. I leave the hon. gentleman with his own followers; I leave him with the country which will certainly take some cognizance of the way in which the Minister comports himself before the House. I am inclined to think, what I have had my suspicion of from the start, that from the beginning the hon. Minister has acted absolutely without information of any definite kind at all. This House has been kept in the dark from the first. The hon. gentleman did not really send an engineer down to look over the Drummond County Railway until he had made a contract with the Drummond County Company, or practically had done what is the same thing. The hon. gentleman did not bring down, even, that report to us until we had to fish it out of him, just before this measure was ready to go through this House, and it was with the greatest difficulty that we got this imperfect report brought before the House. I asked the hon. gentleman, the other day, for the engineer's report as to the condition of the road. He promised to bring it down, but I have not seen it, and the hon. gentleman has not fulfilled his promise in that respect. The hon. gentleman has not taken the House into that confidence that he should have taken it into by giving it the information which is the due of the House and which we desire to have. That brings me to another conclusion, and a conclusion which is a grave one. I have no hesitation in saying that, under these circumstances, I shall have very great hesitation in believing any assertion that the hon. Minister undertakes to make when he seeks to bolster up an argument he is presenting to the House. That is a hard statement to make, but I have to make it. I think the whole tenor of the hon. gentleman's conduct leads us to that conclusion, and that conculsion alone. I do not believe any engineer in his department will put his signature to a statement. and work it out, that any reasonable bridge across the Yamaska River will cost $300,000. I challenge the Minister (Mr. Blair) to bring down a statement from a single reliable engineer to show that. I do not believe he could get an engineer in his department to set his hand to the statement, and work out the quantities, and give it to this House, that a bridge across the river Richelieu, such as would have to be constructed for that alternate road, would cost $400,000. I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) to bring the statement of his engineer, if he can, before this House. Sir, what is the conclusion we must come to. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has tried to crawl out of the argument he made here the other night—an argument of tremendous force if it were true—that the alternative route was so expensive that it would be folly for any business man to think of it. He stated that it would take $300,000 to build a bridge over the Yamaska, and $400,000 for a bridge over the Richelieu. I believe from the information that I have heard to-night, read by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), and given also by the hon. gentleman from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), that $60,000 is the outside of the cost of a bridge over the Yamaska—as to the bridge over the Richelieu I do not know but I believe that one-third the amount the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has stated would be amply sufficient.

This brings us to a very lamentable crisis in the affairs of this Parliament, when a responsible Minister is going to put through a measure by dint of an argument, based on these figures he said he got from the engineers, and then refuses to bring the engineer's statement down to the House so that we may judge upon it. So much for that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) in his desire to make a large speech and be definite—I warn the Minister (Mr. Blair) never to attempt to be definite, because it always gets him into difficulties—in order to make a speech which would have definiteness and conclusiveness in it, he went into the question of land damages. What did he state? He referred to the St. Charles Branch and the great land damages there, and he said:

> And they did not go through eleven towns and villages, they did not go through a country of the same value as the country from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert; there is no gentleman

familiar with both countries that would not bear me out in that statement.

Again, he said :

And, mark you, you have not included the land damages of from $100 to $150 per acre. Now, when you come to consider the expropriation of the right of way through that country, from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie,——

Those were the two points the hon. gentleman spoke of :

——who is going to say what the amount of these damages will be ? There are, to begin with, no less than eleven or twelve considerable towns and villages, some of them of considerable magnitude, towns that have grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built.

Would not any gentleman in this House, listening to that speech, come to the conclusion that this was a section of the country, dotted in that 32 miles with eleven or twelve considerable towns and villages which had grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built, and which would entail on us large and heavy land damages. Where are the eleven or twelve towns and villages? The Minister has not given the name of one, outside of St. Hyacinthe. When I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) if he would give the basis of his information, he simply says : The engineer told me there were these, and I stated what I had heard. That information is not worth anything. That information, put as it was, was entirely unreliable, and could do nothing else than deceive the House. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) intended to deceive the House or not is a different matter, but I state again, that such information, given as the hon. gentleman gave it, had no other effect on the House and the country, than to deceive the House and the country. Here are the names of the towns that were sent in. In the first place, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has gone beyond his limit ; he has passed St. Lambert, and he has taken in the city of Montreal. But his argument had not to do with St. Henri or Montreal ; it had to do with the right of way between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie. Of course, by such an extraordinary course as bringing in the large village of Montreal, and the considerable village of St. Henri, he could make quite a respectable showing on land damages ; but that was not his proposition. What are the towns ? First, Ste. Rosalie. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) tell me how many houses there are at Ste. Rosalie, where this road passes ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not count.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does not know, and yet he made an elaborate argument in reference to that. Does he know that the station of Ste. Rosalie is twenty acres away from the church, which is generally the important part of the village ? There is nothing there but simply a station, there may be one or two houses.

An hon. MEMBER. Just the station.

Mr. FOSTER. Just the station, my hon. friend says, and he knows the locality. That is one of the large towns, by which the land damages are to be measured. Cover it with bank bills of the denomination of $5 each ; better still, cover the ground with gold, as the great value of the large and flourishing village of Ste. Rosalie, which has grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway passed through ! The next town is St. Hyacinthe ; a town of eight or nine thousand population, I think, and that is the one town on the list. And what large town has the Minister next in consideration. It is "U. C. Crossing." That means the United Counties Railway crossing, where there are, I think, two buildings and no more. Is that a considerable town ?

Mr. BERGERON. It is in a field.

Mr. FOSTER. It is in a field, my hon. friend says. It has not the distinction of having a house there ; it is out in the field. But according to the Minister (Mr. Blair), the land damages will be something tremendous in that hive of industry which has grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway passed through it. The next place mentioned is Ste. Madeleine, and will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) venture to say what the population of Ste. Madeleine is ?

Mr. WALLACE. Seven people.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) may be near it. The hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) is not so voluble now as he was when he was making his speech. He does not attempt to answer a question when it is put definitely to him. Ste. Madeleine is four miles from the parish church ; evidently not cutting through church property which would be valuable ; evidently not cutting through the aggregation of houses that generally collects about a church. Then, what about St. Hilaire, two miles from the church, a very, very little village. And what about Belœil, two miles or more from the parish church, and which is not a town, not even a village ? And what about St. Bruno, a little collection of houses, and St. Bazile, the same, and St. Hubert, the same, and then we come to St. Lambert, where we end for the purposes of this discussion. Again, I ask the Minister : Where are the eleven or twelve considerable towns and villages which were to make the land damages so high that we had better pay this immense amount for getting in by the Grand Trunk Railway, than to attempt to run an alternate route through them ? The information of the Minister (Mr. Blair) is just worth that much to the House. No man who listened to him, but who must have said : Of course if you attempt to put a railway through crowded and thriving towns

and villages, you will have to pay heavy expropriation damages. I, for one, had that idea from listening to his remarks, but when we come to analyse it, we find that the Minister has been running through fields and pastures the whole way, and his imagination has been as rich as the towns are scarce in the country through which that road would run.

Now, who gave the information to my hon. friend? Was it that engineer? If it was, I have still greater reason to doubt the estimates and statements of that engineer, and I would like to have his statement with reference to the bridges as well. I say this is simply meant—no, I will not put it that way; but I say the result of it is simply to deceive, first, the House and afterwards the country. Is that the kind of information the Minister of Railways expects this House to pass his measures upon? When he comes to give us definite information, that is the kind of information he gives us; and we find that it has no foundation, that it is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end—which the Minister himself cannot deny, and which he dare not bring a statement of one of his engineers to deny. The hon. gentleman has nothing to say. He simply wants to crawl out of it, and say, "The argument was not so important, at any rate." It is so important that there is involved in it the credibility of a Minister. The hon. gentleman tries to carry his measures through the House by using as facts things that are not facts. I challenge them from my place in this House, and I challenge him to substantiate those statements as facts. The Minister's reputation and position cannot be sustained unless he sustains as facts those things which he has given this House as facts. And yet the hon. gentleman has not a word to say. He simply shields himself behind his dignity and says nothing. A man's dignity is better conserved by his substantiating the statements that he makes in this House by the reports of his officers, or by whomsoever he can bring to substantiate them, than it is by his standing in front of his followers and in face of the Opposition of the country, and saying, "I will not answer you at all; I am a Minister, and when I ope my mouth, let no dog bark."

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in dealing with this same matter the other day, undertook to controvert the statement that had been made to the House in regard to the cost of constructing a line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. After indulging in some sneers at the estimates which had been given by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), the hon. Minister used this language:

> Has he any idea what it would cost? I can give him an idea of what it will cost, founded, not upon my own unaided judgment, but upon the careful estimates and calculations of my officials in the department, made not to-day, not yesterday, but before I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues the adoption of this scheme. Well, what are these calculations? These calculations are that it would cost, for the laying down of the line of 32 miles, $485,440, independently of the two great bridges, one across the Yamaska and one across the Richelieu, and outside of the probable large amount of land damages which you might be called upon, and would be called upon, to pay.

The discussion which has arisen in connection with this matter is as to whether or not the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, after stating to this House, for the purpose of controverting the argument of the hon. member for Glengarry, that his position was based upon the careful estimates and calculations of his officials, now refuses to put the House in possession of those estimates and calculations. Now, if we had no rule on this subject, it would be only right as a matter of common justice on the part of the hon. gentleman, that in undertaking to controvert the statements of a practical man, he should bring these estimates down. But, as a matter of fact, there can be no question about the duty of the hon. gentleman, after referring to these documents, to place them before the House. I read from "May's Parliamentary Practice," which is most explicit and clear on this point:

> A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it on the Table. This restraint is similar to that rule of evidence, in courts of law, which prevents counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence.

Now, the hon. gentleman is making an argument based on material to which we on this side of the House have no access, and to which we are entitled. He is arguing a case before the jury of the country on material to which he alone has access, and to which he denies us access. This constitutional authority, which my hon. friend will certainly not object to, says further:

> The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested, and when objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in. It has also been admitted that a document which has been cited, ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interests.

Now, there can be no injury to the public interests in laying on the Table of the House these documents, which are made not for the benefit of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or for the benefit of his department exclusively, but are made by these officials for the benefit of the country and paid for by the country. The hon. gentleman has not any argument or any suggestion on account of which he does not produce these documents, and I think, in fairness to himself, in fairness to his position

as a member of the House and a member of the Government, in fairness to his reputation as a man, he should lay them on the Table of the House, and put the House in a position to judge whether or not my hon. friend from Glengarry is right in the estimate he made in regard to the cost of this road and these bridges.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE. The Minister of Railways and Canals surely has something to say to the serious charges which are made from this side of the House. We have protested all through these proceedings that the papers which are required to form a judgment, and which he says he had before him before he would undertake to recommend this measure to his colleagues, should be laid on the Table of the House. What are we here for? We are here to vote away hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars of the people's money for this one project. Suppose I go back to my constituents, and they say to me, "What position did you take on that question of the Drummond County Railway?" "Well," I say, "I did not take any particular position." "Why not?" they ask. "Because I could not form a judgment on it, because the Minister persistently refused to give the evidence which he had in his possession, or which he said he had in his possession, in order to come to a conclusion before he could justify the project before his colleagues." We are the representatives of the people of Canada, met in Parliament to decide on voting away many millions of dollars on these enterprises, and we are denied the documents which the Minister says he has. I challenge the Minister to produce those documents. There are no such documents in existence to-day. There is no engineer in Canada who would stake his reputation on the figures which we have heard given to this House this afternoon, and on former occasions. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Chairman, that the evidence of the hon. member for Glengarry, with the evidence of the engineer he sent down there —evidence which is incontrovertible and conclusive—that there is an engineer in this country who has a reputation, and who would destroy his reputation for any ability in his profession by giving such figures as we have been treated to in this debate? The name of the engineer is, I presume, given. I was told of one engineer, who was sent down to examine this same railway and who never got beyond the city of Montreal, because it was not intended he should go any further, and the report comes from him presumably that everything is lovely and the road is in excellent order.

The whole question of building this railway is either buried in obscurity or in something which cannot bear the light of day. The hon. Minister tells us that he carefully examined into this, that he had the opinions of engineers before he could recommend it to his colleagues. Well, I make bold to say that another member of that Government had this bargain all cut and dry, had the whole thing arranged; not perhaps the details, but the essentials, long before that date. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), it is well known, had a finger in this pie, and had been boasting throughout the country that he had arranged this matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. He had more than a finger in the pie.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, a great deal more.

Mr. COCHRANE. A man could not pull out $30,000 with his finger.

Mr. WALLACE. He is sadly belied if he had not several good slices of the pie. All these things were arranged by the Minister of Public Works. Then the Minister of Railways appeared on the scene, and in order to justify the scheme, he said that he had got the opinions of engineers. Let him put those opinions on the Table; let us read them; let us tell the people what these reports are that will justify this House in voting the money or condemn us for voting it. We want to have a knowledge of all the facts. Yet the hon. Minister persistently refuses to give us the information. That may be very well for hon. gentlemen on that side, though I do not believe it is. I do not believe that those gentlemen, who sat silent all these days when this subject was open for discussion are satisfied with the course of affairs. We know how, in the days gone by, they insisted on having the fullest information of the smallest transactions as well as those involving expenditures of millions of dollars. We know the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), we know the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville). We know the hon. Minister of Customs, one (Paterson). We know the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), and we know the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). These men have not a word to say on this question, because they are too honest to justify what in their hearts they know cannot be justified. They have a record, they have a reputation, and they are not willing, even at the demand of those Ministers, to get up and destroy this reputation which they carefully got by so many years in Opposition.

But what is proposed to be done? According to the estimate made by the Minister and submitted to the House $1,400 an acre would have to be paid for land grants. Just imagine $1,400 per acre. I know that when the Toronto, Bruce and Grey Railway went through our country, that company did not pay on an average 5 per cent of that sum; and I venture to say that the land there is as valuable as that through this part of the country. $1,400 an acre for farm lands! The railway runs through a farm, and takes four acres, and for those four

acres pays $5,600, and I venture to say that the other 96 will sell for half the money in many places. That is the way the Minister makes his estimate of the expenditure that would be incurred if the railway were built, in order to present a statement that would justify such a ridiculously extravagant bargain as has been made. Then with reference to those towns, as has been pointed out by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), there are no such places. There is one town, the village of St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. TALBOT. A village—it has 10,000 inhabitants, and is one of the largest manufacturing districts of Canada.

Mr. WALLACE. I say there is one large town, you can call it a city if you like, for I suppose it has reached that dignity, and that is St. Hyacinthe. I would like this young man to get up and tell us any other town or village of any size in the whole of that thirty miles.

Mr. TALBOT. Do you want to know the names ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. TALBOT. When you get through, I may gratify you.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to give the information now, he seems so very anxious. He gets his information from the Minister, and the Minister told us that there were eleven or twelve important places. There is the town or city of St. Hyacinthe, which is a large place, but I am told that this railway does not go through that city but outside of it. Whether my information is correct or not, I have no personal knowledge, but the statement has been made to-night that the railway passes two miles away to one side of that city. Now, what about those other places ? There are simply hamlets, from all the information we have, and some of them have not even reached that dignity, The land damages, therefore, except in St. Hyacinthe, would simply amount to practically the value of farm land throughout the whole of that 32 miles, and the value of farm lands, we know, in any part of Canada. would not be one-tenth of the value which the hon. Minister estimates.

Now, another point. In Bourinot's "Parliamentary Practice," the rule is laid down that a Minister is not at liberty to quote from any document unless he is prepared to lay it on the Table. I ask the Minister of Railways: Is he prepared to lay on the Table the reports of this engineer which, he said, he had before him, before he would recommend this enterprise to his colleagues?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said what I would do.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I am asking the question: Is he prepared to lay these documents on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Finish your speech.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to know, and I am entitled to an answer from the Minister. I know it has been the habit of Ministers to treat with contempt any questions put to them. But this is a perfectly pertinent and proper question. It is a question whether the documents, to which we are entitled, by the rule I have quoted, are to be put on the Table. The Minister will not say whether he is prepared to lay them on the Table or not.

Mr. FOSTER. He refused a while ago.

Mr. WALLACE. And I presume that his evasive reply to me is a persistence in that refusal. Well, all I can say is that he will be condemned by the people of this country. If he has a statement made by an engineer that engineer is responsible for it, and we ought to be in position to compare that statement with those of other engineers, capable of forming opinions as to the cost of constructing bridges across those rivers and of making the roadbed of a railway and of moving earth and all those other works that enter into the construction of a railway. If the hon. Minister refuses to give information to the House, if he is not prepared, after he has given, as he says, the reports of these engineers to his colleagues, to give to us the opportunity of judging from those reports whether we can be justified in supporting this measure or whether we would not be still more justified in opposing it, he is treating the representatives of the people with contempt. I say he is treating the representatives of the people with contempt and the people when they are appealed to and learn the facts of the case will pay the Minister off for his want of courtesy and for his refusal to abide by the rules that Parliament has prescribed and have always been lived up to until the gentlemen attained power, and which should be lived up to still.

Now, there is in this list that the Minister submitted to the House, I am told, not only the towns and villages between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, but the Minister has crossed the bridge and gone into the Island of Montreal and taken the populous suburbs of Montreal in order to give a high figure for land damages on the route. But this agreement covers from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and that is what we are discussing. When we come to the other portions we can discuss them if we have the information to discuss them intelligently. But the information being refused on the question now before us, I think it probable it will be refused on the others as well. Now, let me say in conclusion, we are bound to have this information. Parliament is entitled to have this information. The representatives of the people want to know all about the cost of the construction of this road. They want to know if the bargain of the Grand Trunk road is a fair

bargain. It strikes me forcibly that it is an unfair bargain. They have arranged for a half interest in the road, notwithstanding that the Grand Trunk is doing about 90 per cent of the business, carrying in not only its own traffic, but also that of the Vermont Central and other roads. The Intercolonial Railway is doing the other 10 per cent, but under the arrangement for half interest, as I understand it, they will have to pay half the expenses of maintenance and half the running expenses of various kinds. It appeared to me that this was a very one-sided and unfair arrangement, when we know that arrangements are being made all over the country securing to railway companies running powers over the lines of other companies upon the basis of the proportion of traffic, a basis thoroughly understood and generally acted upon, which might easily have been adopted in this agreement.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) challenged us to give the names of towns and villages through which passes this portion of the Grand Trunk which the Government is now leasing for the Intercolonial Railway. The statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals was that the Grand Trunk passed through ten or eleven towns or villages. These towns are Ste. Rosalie, St. Hyacinthe, Ste. Madeleine, St. Hilaire, St. Hilaire station, Belœil, St. Bazile, St. Bruno, St. Hubert and St. Lambert, ten villages in all. So, in that respect, the Minister's statement is correct. As far as the value of land is concerned, let me give one instance. There is a Mr. Street who, in 1896, bought three acres of land, about four acres from the railway, and paid for it $1,000. I would appeal to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who is a fair-minded man and knows the country well, if this country from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert is not one of the finest farming sections and one of the most densely populated in Canada. I appeal to every fair-minded man in this country if it is not true that there is not a finer farming country than that between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. As to the towns: take St. Hyacinthe. That town has more than doubled its population in ten years. It is one of the great manufacturing centres of Canada. It has a population of 10,000, and it has more manufactures than almost any other town in Canada of 50,000 population. The knitting mills alone employ 1,500 hands. This is the country that the Grand Trunk Railway runs through and through which this road would have to be built.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has not told us how many of these places are towns and how many villages.

Mr. TALBOT. They are all important towns and villages, every one.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). My hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) has appealed to me; I am sorry I shall not be able to speak exactly in the way he would like. Now that this discussion is commenced, I might point out that there is one thing that indicates that this scheme has never been entered into for the good of the country. The Minister of Railways and Canals must be very angry against the men who have put him in the humiliating position in which he finds himself to-night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see that.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, if he does not see it yet he will before the Bill is through, and he will probably be sorry that he did not see it earlier. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcil) knows these places better than the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) being from that district, and, if I am not mistaken, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and others, have been trying to induce the hon. member (Mr. Marcil) to substantiate the allegations of the Minister of Railways and Canals; but the hon. member has not dared to do so. He cannot do it. What we complain of is this—and this simple instance will give the public an idea of the whole transaction. We said on a former occasion that the hon. Minister had gone into this scheme without knowing anything about it. Some people might have thought that that was exaggerated. But here is the proof of it, and I call the attention of my hon. friend from Bellechasse to it. The Minister says at first that it will cost $485,000 to build a line from Ste. Rosalie, that is, from the end of the present Intercolonial Railway, to the city of Montreal.

So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to see the Intercolonial come into Montreal; but nobody ever dreamed three years ago of bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal through that line. My right hon. friend would never have thought of it had not this scheme been propounded to him by some of his colleagues. It might have come in by the South Shore Railway, or by a bridge at Quebec, or by the Grand Trunk Railway, but the idea of going around like a man passing through Kingston to go from Ottawa to Montreal, would never have entered the mind of anybody until it was got up by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), prompted by some other of his colleagues for objects which are not, I repeat, pro bono publico. The hon. gentleman speaks about spending $485,000. Now, when the hon. gentleman says that his engineers have made reports, I desire to tell him, with all due respect, that we are entitled to see the reports of those engineers over their own names. We want to see the figures on all the quantities brought down over the signature of a competent engineer before we are able to judge of the merits of a Bill of this magni-

tude. The hon. gentleman says that he told his colleagues that it would cost $485,000 to build a line between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, besides the construction of two bridges. I will quote his own words:

> There you have got $1,185,440 as the estimated cost of building the 32 miles of railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. And mark you,——

Now, this is where I think the hon. gentleman puts himself in a humiliating position. If he had known what he was talking about, he would never have uttered these words. I say he ought to resent the position in which those who have instructed him have put him.

> And mark you, you have not included the land damages, at from $100 to $150 per acre. Now, when you come to consider the expropriation of the right of way through the country from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, who is going to say what the amount of those damages will be? There are, to begin with, no less than ten or twelve considerable towns and villages——

This is something the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcil) will not substantiate. With the exception of St. Hyacinthe, there is not another town on the whole thirty-two miles. Even the villages are not crossed by the railway. I do not think there is a single parish where the church is near the station, and in our province the church is usually in a village. The station at St. Hilaire must be over a mile from the church. Belœil station is certainly over two miles from the church. Now, he says:

> There are, to begin with, no less than eleven or twelve towns and villages, some of them of considerable magnitude,——

Now, just imagine a gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Railways and Canals making such a statement before Parliament, before 200 men, before the country, without knowing anything about what he is talking about, but he is simply giving us information which has been furnished to him by some one who wants to sell him a railway.

> ——some of them of considerable magnitude, towns which have grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built.

Sir, St. Hyacinthe is not the only town which has increased through the National Policy. The town of St. Hyacinthe was formerly nothing but a big village, but since the National Policy was established it has grown up to its present position of importance.

Mr. TALBOT. But they have always elected a Liberal.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman forgets that the man who was elected in St. Hyacinthe when the National Policy was introduced was a Conservative, the Hon. Mr. Teller, now judge. True, the Liberals are now in the majority, and they are very ungrateful, for after they became prosperous they turned against the Conservative party and elected Liberals. Now, I have read these words to show the humiliating position in which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has allowed himself to be placed. I say that since this scheme came before Parliament we have been witnesses to some extraordinary proceedings. It has already been acknowledged that the Senate of Canada, through their action, have saved this country over $600,000. Now, will the Government come back to this House with the very same scheme, or a similar one, after having acknowledged that the first scheme was an extravagant one? The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has stated to the members of this House, or to the country, who does not know that line, something that is not accurate. Is it to be believed that the Government of Canada will bring before Parliament schemes of such magnitude without fully explaining them to the people of this country? If that is possible, what guarantee have the electors themselves for economical government? I am convinced that the hon. gentleman did not know what he was talking about when he uttered these words that I have quoted. If the hon. gentleman knew that St. Hyacinthe was the only town on the whole line when he said there were eleven or twelve towns, what would you call such a statement as that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said towns and villages.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman's words are down here, I have read them as they are in the "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But you do not quote them quite accurately.

Mr. BERGERON. Perhaps I do not read English very well. But I have shown that there is only one town. What about the villages? At Ste. Rosalie there is nothing else than the station, the village is about twenty acres from the station. The United Counties crossing—well, that is in a field, There is only a little shanty there for the man who signals the trains to prevent them from colliding. Then there is Ste. Madeleine—I do not think there are ten houses at the crossing there. The right hon. Prime Minister knows very well the accuracy of what I am saying, and I am very much surprised that he would allow the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to put himself in that position. The idea of putting in those two names, St. Hilaire East and St. Hilaire. There is only one station at St. Hilaire, and that is about a mile from the church. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) says, that 3 acres of land sold for $1,000. It is a very nice place, although I would not like to pay $1,000 for 3 acres there. Otterburn Park is next, at the end of Belœil bridge. There is not one house at this station. It is about

ten or twelve acres from St. Hilaire. There is not even a platform ; it is a pic-nic place, where people from Montreal go and have pic-nics in the summer. It is near the Richelieu River. Hon. gentlemen call that a town of some magnitude—a considerable village. Belœil is next. There are a few houses at this place, occupied during the summer by summer residents, and which are closed up during the winter. The station is about 2 miles from the church. St. Bazile ; I do not think there are, at the station, three houses. The village is far away from the road. If the hon. gentleman says, that these are towns of considerable magnitude, which have been built up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built, he is making another mistake. The railway was built where it is to-day, and it has not increased these towns at all. St. Bruno ; the same remark applies to this place. Now the hon. gentleman comes to St. Lambert. The town itself is lower than the station. I am speaking of there being houses around the station. I do not want to speak about St. Charles or St. Henri, coming into Montreal, because what the hon. gentleman is trying to put before the House is the cost of building the road between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. I say frankly, that I am sorry to see a Minister of the Crown putting himself in the position in which the hon. Minister of Railways has put himself, coming down without knowing anything about that line, and telling the people, that, if this road was built, and there is no reason to build one, it would cross ten or twelve different towns and big villages, when, as a matter of fact, it would only cross one town. His object was to convey the idea that land would be dear. As an hon. gentleman said a few moments ago, and, I think, correctly, I do not think any piece of the land which might have to be bought, would be any more than ordinary farm land. The idea that the hon. gentleman wanted to send abroad into the country was, that the cost, on account of land damages, in crossing these towns and villages, would be very great. If everything else that the hon. gentleman has said about that scheme is as reliable as these statements, I think it is the greatest fraud that was ever brought before the people of this country.

Mr. J. E. MARCIL (Bagot). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to take part in the debate now going on, but as I have been appealed to by the hon. gentleman from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I deem it my duty to answer his appeal. The hon. gentleman has stated that the villages through which the Grand Trunk Railway runs between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal are places of very small importance. Now, I may tell the hon. gentleman from Beauharnois that at Ste. Rosalie, which is but a parish, while the station is two acres distant from the church, there are houses from the church down to the station ; that is to say, that the village extends from the church down to the Grand Trunk Railway station. It might be said that the village of Ste. Rosalie, from the Grand Trunk Railway station, forms a whole with that portion of the village which is opposite the church.

I do not think it necessary to dwell upon the importance of the town of St. Hyacinthe, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has admitted that it is a prosperous and thriving manufacturing centre, although he has given the credit for that prosperity to the National Policy ; but, for the moment, I shall refrain from entering into the merit of that question.

I heard a little while ago, an hon. gentleman stating that the Grand Trunk Railway station at St. Hyacinthe was two miles from the town. Well, I may tell the hon. gentleman that if he had only passed once through that locality, he would soon have found out that the station was not two miles from the town. It is true that the Grand Trunk Railway does not run through the very centre of the town, but it cannot be said that the Grand Trunk Railway passes outside of the city of St. Hyacinthe. Still, I would like to see how my hon. friend would lay out the line, did he wish to build a line independent from that of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I would like to know where he could locate that line nearer that of the Grand Trunk Railway, in order to avoid paying very heavy land damages on the route, should he not want to run his line through the centre of the town itself,

Next comes Ste. Madeleine, a parish in the immediate neighbourhood of St. Hyacinthe. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) stated that there were only seven or eight houses at that place. Let the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that his memory needs to be refreshed, or that very likely it was very long ago that he travelled through that country. Had he visited Ste. Madeleine a few days ago, he would have found out that it is a very thriving parish, with enough shops to satisfy the wants of the people there. There is a very fine church near the station, as well as a good hotel for the accommodation of travellers. Surely people do not build hotels in places where there are only seven or eight houses. On the other hand, were there only seven or eight houses there, they would not have granted a license to that inn. The hon. gentleman's statement is contrary to the facts, and should he take the trouble of visiting that locality, he would soon find out how far astray he was when stating that there were only seven or eight houses in that place.

The hon. member for Beauharnois pretends to know the country between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, and yet he does not seem to be able to distinguish St. Hilaire

station from the village of that name. Is not the hon. gentleman aware of the fact that one may start from Acton and reach the village of St. Hilaire, without going to the St. Hilaire station? The best proof that St. Hilaire is a thriving locality is found in the fact that it boasts of a magnificent church. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the station is four or five miles from the church and that houses are to be found on the whole distance? Is not the hon. gentleman aware that St. Hilaire is an important and picturesque place, a favourite resort of the sporting community? Several gentlemen from Montreal spend the summer season there and some even remain the whole year round. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the land there is very valuable? Let me quote the case of Mr. Brais, who paid $700 for a lot of 60 feet by 100. That may give us an idea of the value of the land in that village.

Moreover, near the St. Hilaire station, there are two hotels for the accommodation of travellers. Would there be any need for two such hotels should there be only a few houses at that place?

Then comes Belœil village. I say without any hesitation that the village of Belœil is one of the finest to be found in the province of Quebec. The village extends from the church to the station and on the whole distance the road is lined, on both sides, almost without any gaps, with houses. In the rear of the station are to be found two hotels for the accommodation of travellers.

Next comes St. Basile which, though not of great magnitude, still, enjoys some importance, and it may be remarked in this connection that this parish has been formed partly from that of St. Bruno and partly from that of Belœil. It is of recent formation; there is a fine church at that place, and though it is not located very near the station, still, it may be seen from the railway line.

There is also the village of St. Bruno, which is but a few acres distant from the station; it is a very fine and thriving village, as the hon. member for Beauharnois is well aware. It is an old parish, settled even prior to the building of the Grand Trunk, and it is very prosperous now.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated with good reason that some of those villages are of considerable magnitude, and have grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built, and that they have derived great benefits from that railway in as much as they have been enabled thereby to sell and export, with more profit, their farm produce.

St. Hubert is also a village of considerable importance, as St. Bruno and Belœil.

Let us now come to St. Lambert. From what we have heard here from some hon. gentlemen, one would be led to believe that St. Lambert was not a town but a mere hamlet. Now, let me say, for the information of the House, and of the hon. gentleman who made that statement, that St. Lambert was incorporated last year, and that it is a town now with a special charter. As to the value of the land, I heard, a little while ago, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) state that the value of the land between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert was about one-tenth of the estimation put upon it by the Minister of Railways and Canals, that is to say, that instead of selling at $150 an acre, it would only sell for $15 an acre. Does my hon. friend from Beauharnois really believe that one could buy land for $15 an acre in the parishes of St. Bruno, Ste. Madeleine, and even Ste. Rosalie? The same remark applies to the parishes of St. Hubert, St. Hilaire and St. Basile. In none of those parishes could land be bought for $15 an acre.

Mr. J. S. H. BERGERON. (Translation.) How much are you going to pay for it?

Mr. MARCIL. (Translation.) My hon. friend asks me how much I am going to pay for those lands. I may tell him that I never inquired about the price of lands in those localities, but I may take as a basis in estimating the value of those lands the price of land in my own locality. I am able to state that you could not buy land in the township of Acton for $15 an acre, and a fortiori, the lands on the line of the Grand Trunk Railway between Ste. Rosalie and St Lambert, which are of far better quality, could not be bought for $15 an acre. The lowest price that could be paid for those lands might be figured, without any exaggeration, at from $100 to $150 an acre.

Let me now refer to some statements made by the hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the construction of a new line. I do not think it necessary to reply at any length to the remarks fallen from those hon. members opposite, as the hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches and those behind them have amply answered them. But I may ask my hon. friend from Beauharnois, who pretends to know that country so well, whether, in his opinion, a bridge could be built across the River Yamaska at St. Hyacinthe as easily and at as little cost as it could be built across the St. Francis River? My hon. friend knows very well that the land on both sides of that river is a kind of loam. He knows also that in order to build a bridge of such importance on the river at St. Hyacinthe, it must rest on a very solid foundation; and, a fortiori, when it is a question of rearing a structure of that kind upon loam, it goes without saying that it is more expensive than when you build it on rock. He knows also that on the River St. Francis, an estimate has been made as to the cost of the Drummondville bridge, and that of a similar structure at St. Hyacinthe. He knows also that there is a great

difference between the St. Francis River and the Yamaska River at St. Hyacinthe, and that there is no comparison between those two localities as to the cost of building a bridge. The best proof that can be adduced in that connection is this, that when the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge was carried away by the flood, a bonus of $50,000 was offered that company towards the rebuilding of their bridge across the Yamaska River, and they declined that offer on the ground that it was too costly a structure. The Yamaska River is the same that flows at St. Hyacinthe.

I deemed it my duty, Mr. Chairman, to offer those few explanations in reply to the statements made by the hon. member from Beauharnois, as to the importance of the towns and villages as also to the value of the lands situate along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. I have stated the facts of the case as they are, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me, if he thinks the matter over and takes the trouble of refreshing his memory a little, that the explanations I have just given are fair and grounded on the facts of the case.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, before he resumes his seat, whether, as stated, there are really eleven or twelve important towns between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. Is he able to reply in the affirmative?

Mr. MARCIL. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman wants to know whether there are ten or eleven important towns between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, and here is my reply. I do not think I have said that there were ten or eleven towns between those two points. I confess to having stated that there were ten or eleven villages between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. There is St. Hyacinthe which was referred to during this debate as a town, although it has reached the dignity of a city; but apart from St. Hyacinthe, which is a manufacturing centre of some magnitude, there are splendid villages through which the railway runs, and the hon. gentleman is well aware of it. The hon. gentleman knows that the villages of Beloeil and St. Hilaire are unsurpassed for the beauty of their site.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I want the hon. gentleman to tell me whether there are really eleven or twelve towns in that country? Is he able to state that between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert there are eleven or twelve towns?

Mr. MARCIL. (Translation.) I do not think the Minister of Railways and Canals has stated in his speech that there were ten or eleven towns between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. I think the hon. Minister said there were no less than eleven or twelve towns and villages, some of them of considerable magnitude. Now, as I understand the words used by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, when he stated, on good grounds too, that there were no less than eleven or twelve towns and villages between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, he meant by the word town, St. Hyacinthe, which is even more than a town, being a full-fledged city.

Apart from St. Hyacinthe, there is the Belœil village, which, as the hon. gentleman knows very well, is a thriving and beautiful place. There is also Ste. Madeleine, a splendid parish; there is also a village of some importance there, although it is just starting into life. The hon. gentleman knows that the parish of Ste. Madeline is of recent creation, having been detached from older parishes, and that, moreover, it is progressing very rapidly.

Above Belœil, you come across St. Basile which was erected four or five years ago; having been formed from portions detached from the neighbouring parishes and it is also progressing very rapidly. The establishments to be found there, though they cannot properly be styled manufactures, fully supply the wants of the village. A church and shops are also found there, and the village is progressing rapidly. I think it may be said there are ten towns and villages between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? We are all aiming at the same object here——

Some hon. MEMBER. (Translation.) No, no.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) That depends, of course, upon the standpoint from which we consider that object.

At all events, we wish to know the truth; now, I want to ask my hon. friend who knows so well that country, and who is familiar with the English language, whether the Minister of Railways and Canals was right in stating in his speech that there are eleven or twelve towns of some magnitude between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert?

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.) And villages.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I have the floor and I have the right of asking a question.

Page 4224, of the unrevised edition of "Hansard," the Minister of Railways and Canals has stated.

Mr. MARCIL. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but when the Minister referred to towns, he had in view the city of St. Hyacinthe. I say the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals could not pass over in silence the city of St. Hyacinthe which is situated between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert; and that is the reason why the

Minister stated in his speech that there were in that country ten or eleven towns and villages.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Would my hon. friend allow me to call his attention to the following statement. I am going to read it in English, as the hon. gentleman understands that language.

Mr. MARCIL. (Translation.) Perfectly.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Here are the words used by the Minister of Railways and Canals:

> There are, to begin with, no less than eleven or twelve considerable towns and villages, some of them of considerable magnitude, towns which have grown up since the Grand Trunk Railway was built.

Mark you, the hon. Minister used the word "towns" in the plural. Could the hon. gentleman tell me whether there is more than one town between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, as implied by the Minister?

Mr. MARCIL. (Translation.) I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is more than one town on that line, as there is also the town of St. Lambert, which was incorporated last year. There is also the town of St. Hyacinthe, which has reached, as I said, the dignity of a city, owing to its population. As a matter of fact, St. Hyacinthe, the population of which was about nine thousand at the time of the last census, has now a population of twelve thousand souls. As the population required for a town to be entitled to the dignity of a city is ten thousand, I think we might properly speak of them as the city of St. Hyacinthe and the town of St. Lambert. That is the reason why my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals was right in using the word town in the plural, because there is the town of St. Lambert and there is the city of St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. BERGERON. There is one thing in connection with this matter which I wish specially to call the attention of the Prime Minister to. We were told for many years by the Liberal party, that the National Policy of the Conservative Government had reduced the price of farming lands throughout the country, but now we hear to-night, from my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Marcil), that in the country traversed by this line of railway, you cannot buy purely farming land for less than $150 an acre. I commend that to the serious consideration of the Prime Minister, if he ever thinks of doing away with the National Policy.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is since the Liberals came into power.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A question arose between the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who is not in his place now, as to the cost of the Grand Narrows bridge, the statement of the hon. member for Lanark, that it cost $500,000 or $520,000, being questioned by the Minister of Railways. I also understand that it has been said outside this House, that this statement of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is not correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was not in the Chamber, but I am informed that the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) took exception to the statement of the hon. member for Lanark. Now, the Minister of Railways has that contract in his department, as well as all the information in connection with the Grand Narrows bridge, and he should have given it to the House. But without going to the trouble of a particular examination of the records or the estimates submitted to Parliament from year to year during the construction of this work, I can inform the Minister that the contract price for the Grand Narrows bridge with Isbester & Reid was $515,000. I am quite sure that the extras did not amount to $5,000, so that the total cost of the bridge did not exceed about $520,000. The length of that bridge is 1,697 feet. It has six spans of 242 feet in length, and one span of 245 feet, making in all 1,697 feet. The deepest pier is in 76 feet of water; the next deepest is in about 67 feet—I am giving these figures from memory, but I believe they are about correct. The next pier is in something over 50 feet of water, and the draw is in about 45 or 46 feet of water, that being about the shallowest. These are the dimensions of the bridge. The bases of the piers are about 40 feet by 20 in size, and there is about a four-knot current there. The original length of the bridge as mentioned by some member in a previous discussion, was to be 1,720 feet, but that was reduced, when the construction was being proceeded with.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me say a few words in regard to the refusal of the Minister to give us the information. Either the Minister has or has not the information. If he has the information and refuses to give it to the House, then he is doing a great injustice to the representatives of the people. If he has not the information, I respectfully submit that he should get it and give it to the House before he expects us to pass this Bill. There is a double reason why we should have that information. First, the Minister has to satisfy this House as to the wisdom of ratifying this contract, and afterwards, through the same source, he has to satisfy the Senate before they ratify the contract. The Minister is aware that, when this scheme was before the Senate two years ago, it was thrown out. Upon what ground? Upon the ground that it was not a proper bargain to enter into; upon the ground that there was not sufficient infor-

mation given to justify the Senate in approving of the contract. And yet, after the lapse of a considerable time, the Minister has again submitted to this House a contract which is in every respect very much similar to the one which, two years ago, was thrown out by the other Chamber. And although the Minister may by sheer force of numbers—even in the absence of information which the House should have in order to judge whether it is a provident contract or not—although he may force this by his majority through the Commons, he must not forget that it has to run the ordeal of the Senate. If he refuses to give the information which can only come from him and his engineers, then I say, that his conduct is an open invitation to the Senate to again throw out the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would suit you

Mr. SPROULE. I submit, Sir, that it is an invitation to the Senate to throw out the Bill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) knows that several days ago information was asked for in the Senate, and, if he intends to treat the Senate with that silent contempt in which he treats the House to-night, then his conduct is an invitation to that body to throw out the Bill a second time. And, if in the absence of this reasonable information which is asked for, the Senate takes that course, the Senate will be amply justified by the country. I have gone carefully over this bargain which is now before us, and I can see very little merit in it more than there was in the last one. It is very much the same as the contract which was submitted to us two years ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. It is very much the same, and, if it is the same which was thrown out by the Senate, how does the Minister hope to get it through that Chamber now, if he gives no additional reasons why the bargain should be ratified? Nothing can be plainer, in my opinion, than that the Minister intends to invite the Senate to repeat its former action and to throw the Bill out. It may be said, that the purchase of the Drummond County under this contract is a better deal than the leasing of that road, which was before proposed. I am free to admit that, in the interests of the country, it is better we should make the purchase than that we should have entered into the former proposed deal But the other portions of the contract are no better than before. In view of the previous action of the Senate, there is a double reason that the Minister should furnish the information desired. If he refuses, the House and the country can only come to the conclusion, either that he has not the information and does not desire to get it, or that he will not give the information, although it is in his possession. Anyway, he is treating the representatives of the people with scant courtesy. He cannot plead, as he did in the Klondike Railway scheme, that it is a matter which has been sprung upon the Government, and that in the hurry he has not time to get particulars. In this case the Minister has had ample time; he has his engineers at his command, and there is nothing to prevent him getting the fullest information. I repeat, that he has not placed this House in possession of the facts that would enable us to do our duty in this matter. The Minister has not done his duty to the country, to Parliament, nor to his position as a Minister of the Crown. I once heard the Hon. Edward Blake make a remark in this House which, I think, applies with great force to the position we are in to-night. Mr. Blake's statement was in reference to a judgment that might be given by a court. He said: "It is not enough to satisfy this House that the court should give its judgment. What we want is a reasoned judgment; what we want are the grounds on which the judgment is based, so that we can analyse it and judge for ourselves whether the judgment is sound or not." That is what we want in this case. It is not the ipse dixit of an engineer, but his reasoned judgment; in other words, we want the data which the engineer had before him, and which enabled him to arrive at the conclusion he reached when he put the cost of one bridge at $300,000 and the cost of another at $400,000. It is only by a careful analysis of that data that we can arrive at a correct conclusion as to whether or not his judgment was correct.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). There has been a great deal of discussion on the question of land damages. We know that the true valuation of the right of way is not the same to-day as it was when the Grand Trunk was built. Then we know that if we built another railway, we would not build it on the line of the Grand Trunk. If we built it 400 or 500 feet away from the Grand Trunk, it would not touch one of the villages or towns along the line of the Grand Trunk unless it would be the suburbs of St. Hyacinthe. Therefore, all the hon. gentleman's argument about the great cost of land damages goes for nothing. But the estimates placed on the bridges and on the grading of the road were not enough in themselves to make a good case before the country; and, therefore, a large amount is added for right of way, to justify the Minister in making this enormous outlay. It must be understood that all men voting for this measure are voting to pay $1,400 to $1,800 an acre for the right of way. The Minister said there would require to be a large amount for expropriation. I have no doubt he fears that, because I believe he has been dabbling in something of the kind already and made a failure of it, and a burnt child dreads the

fire. No people in the country know the value of an acre of land better than the farmers, and they will compare the cost of the right of way with the price they can get for their land. When the Government proposes to pay for a right of way of the same width as that of the Drummond County Railway, that is 66 feet, they will be paying over $1,800 an acre. I venture to say that the Minister cannot get any engineer of reputation or standing in the Dominion of Canada who to-day will sign an estimate for half the amount he estimates this road to cost. I feel satisfied that he cannot force Mr. Schreiber to sign an estimate for half that amount. It is most unfortunate that the Minister would not condescend to treat the members on this side of the House as a Minister should. He appears to think we have no rights at all; he would scarcely give a civil answer. I want to impress upon this committee that this is a most unreasonable and extravagant estimate.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Chairman, it is usually understood that publicity is the very essence of the security which the people hold under a system of responsible government. All meetings of Parliamen and of parliamentary committees are open to the public. The sittings of our courts are also open to the public. All these proceedings are conducted with publicity, and that publicity has usually been held to have a value. It is insisted upon with a determined purpose—for the protection of the public. The fact that that is recognized to be the system under which our Government is carried on renders it essential that the powers that be, whether the Government of a country or the presiding judge of a court, should respect that principle in such a way as to make it fulfil to the people the purpose it is intended to fulfil. That can only be done by giving the amplest and fullest information to the people on all matters affecting their interests. Now, in connection with this railway question, which has occupied the attention of Parliament and of the country for a long time—because it is now nearly a month since the Minister of Railways introduced his resolution on the question—many long speeches have been made; and, although the Minister of Railways himself has dealt with this subject at great length, I venture to say that the people do no thoroughly understand it at this moment, and are not in a position to say whether or not the Government are acting wisely, and are properly husbanding the resources of Canada in buying the Drummond County Railway and in leasing the Grand Trunk property. Even the members of the House, who have had an opportunity of listening to everything said by the speakers on the Government side on this subject, are at this moment very largely without that precise information which would enable them to form an intelligent opinion upon it. Why are they here, and why is this matter submitted to them by the Government at all? Unquestionably, this matter is submitted to Parliament because it is impossible for the Government to impose this bargain on the country except by the consent of the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled. And yet the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled are deliberately refused that information which is essential to enable them to form an intelligent judgment on the question whether the Government are acting wisely in this matter or not. It was quite within the power of the Government, even at a very short notice, to have prepared, and prepared in such a form as could be readily comprehended, even by a person of very ordinary intelligence, all the items which enter into the consideration whether this is a good contract or a bad one. It is utterly impossible for individual members of Parliament to acquire this information, or, at least, so difficult that they cannot acquire it. Take one instance. We are asked here to vote a certain sum of money in the shape of an annual rental for the use of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway in the city of Montreal, but to form an intelligent idea as to whether we are paying too much or too little for the use of those terminals we would require to know the amount of user which the Grand Trunk Railway has already granted to the lines having running powers over its property and contrast that with the right of the user given the Intercolonial Railway. If those matters were submitted to Parliament, if a statement were put in the hands of every member, showing the number of miles and sidings, the number of warehouses, the actual passenger stations at Bonaventure, the cost of building, the extension of the lines—if such a statement were put in the hands of members, I think that any man who has secured the confidence of the electorate of any constituency in Canada would certainly have sufficient intelligence to form an intelligent opinion on the subject and decide, in a few moments, whether he should or should not support the bargain which the Government are submitting to us. But the Government decline to give us any information at all. And the statements that are made in reference to this matter in Parliament are so vague, so changing, so contradictory, that it is impossible for any person listening to the debate, unless he has made considerable preparation, to enable him to understand it fully and to know exactly what the agreement is and what it is that the speakers, particularly from the Government side, are talking about. For instance, in very nearly the whole of these negotiations and the proceedings which took place before the committee of investigation, the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, which is one important thing in this contract, is continually spoken of as 45 miles in length, and the people of Canada, if they have any

opinion on the subject, would say it was 45 miles long, because when the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal is mentioned, it must be understood that what is meant is the distance from Ste. Rosalie to the St. Lambert end of the Victoria Bridge, because there is a specific rental for that part.

After that we come to the bridge, for which there is another specific rental, and, therefore, what is meant, when we speak of the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, is the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert junction. That is talked of as a line of 35 miles, for which we are paying a rental of $37,500, or, in other words, a little more than $1,000 per mile, and that bargain is defended on the ground that $1,000 a mile is a reasonable rental. But from a brief inquiry into the matter, the fact becomes known that the line is not even 32 miles in length. Take the time tables of the Grand Trunk Railway, showing the distances, not merely in miles, but the fractions of miles, and we find that the distance from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, instead of being 35 miles, is 31·69 miles, or less than 32 miles. Therefore, there is an error of over three miles, when speaking of that portion of the line, and that error has been repeated by the Minister of Railways and incorporated in the evidence furnished before the committee, and sent to the country, with all the authority that would come from its being stated by the Minister of Railways. We have that as the deliberate opinion and knowledge of the Government, so far as we could obtain it.

When we come to cross the Victoria bridge and deal with these other portions of the property of the Grand Trunk Railway, that are on the Montreal side of the St. Lawrence, we are met with the names of a number of sidings which are very confusing. Now, it would not have been a great deal of trouble to the Government to have had a table prepared and placed in the hands of every member, which would have cost not more than probably $5—it would have been easy for the Government to have supplied every member of Parliament with a blue print or tracing, which would have shown the exact number of miles of siding and the exact area in acres which are comprised in the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway; and I maintain that the Government could have gone further and placed in the possession of every member, without any difficulty, figures to show what all the property of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, between the Victoria bridge and the Bonaventure station, had actually cost in cash. That would probably have required but a request to the Grand Trunk Railway, and that plan and tracing should have been placed in the possession of every member of Parliament, and we would have known absolutely with what we were dealing. But, instead of that, when the Government does choose to give the information which the House would have found valuable, it seems to me that the Minister of Railways is placed in a very extraordinary position.

Why should the Government depart from that course of conduct, which is so manfestly the course of conduct that should naturally be followed by any Government administering the affairs of a country such as this, which enjoys representative institutions and in which, evidently, the Government would be expected to be taken to task by every individual, in every matter in which it failed to do its duty? Why is this course of conduct pursued? What has the Government to gain by it? Parliament is deprived of its rights, the individual representatives of the people in this House are, to a certain extent, treated with contempt and insult, because that which is their inalienable and unquestionable right—the right to the fullest information possible—is denied them, and we are asked to decide a matter, while the details are deliberately withheld from us without which we cannot give a satisfactory decision. That being the case, it is really a most puzzling question to any one of these representatives of the people in this House to address himself to, when he asks why is this done. Why does the Government not place the House in the possession of the fullest possible information? Is it because of the difficulty of obtaining it? There could be nothing more easy than for the Government, with a large and well manned railway department, under the authority of the laws they are called on to administer, to obtain promptly all the information we require with respect to every railway over which it has control. It would not only be a matter of no difficulty, but of the most perfect ease, for the Government to have got all the information and have given it to the House. Yet we are asked to decide on a course when, in the absence of knowledge, we cannot determine whether that is a wise course to take. How is it possible for any member of this House to decide that it is a wise and prudent transaction to give to the Grand Trunk Railway $140,000 a year for the use of 38 miles of road, even if in that are included the terminals which lie in the city of Montreal. That is nearly $4,000 a mile. The actual distance, according to the Grand Trunk Railway time tables, from Ste. Rosalie to Bonaventure station, is 38 miles, and for that we pay $140,000 or nearly $4,000 a mile.

Now, the Intercolonial Railway is not so exacting when it leases its lines to others. It may be that the late Government are to blame for making a poor bargain, but it will be found in the evidence taken before the special committee last session that the line in Nova Scotia from Windsor to Halifax, is leased to the Annapolis and Windsor Railway for one-third of the gross receipts, and that the Government only got something like $16,000 per year, or $300 or $400 per mile, as against $4,000 a mile when they lease a line from others.

Now, why should not the Government treat the representatives of the people in this House as reasonable and intelligent men? They may say this is rather an extraordinary proposition, but we have strong reasons to advance in support of it. It may be that at first you are inclined to suspect there was something more than a mere business transaction in this arrangement. For, there was no doubt that statements were current in the country when the bargain was first proposed that some money was to come out of this transaction which would inure to the benefit of certain politicians not belonging to the Conservative party. There can be no doubt that that rumour was current. There are a great many people in Canada who still believe that that rumour was well-founded. And when we consider the very large price which we are paying for the Drummond County Railway and that we are giving for the lease of the Grand Trunk facilities, there is certain colour given to that statement. Now, we know that every one who is innocent courts investigation, wants to make everything plain, open and above board. But the conduct of the Government in this matter is not exactly what I have described. They not only do not court discussion, they deny the House the means of maintaining the discussion. They firmly refuse to give information. They do even worse. I am informed, in some cases, the Minister has cited authorities for his statements that he has declined to produce to the House afterwards. I need not argue that that is wrong; any person who knows anything of parliamentary procedure knows that it is wrong. It is entirely contrary to what we should have in this House, and what we, as an Opposition, have a right to demand. Even without the lesson we are receiving on this occasion we did not need to be told that the Government can enforce its will upon the minority. But it is our duty to protest against that way of carrying on the affairs of the country, and to make it as plain as possible to the people that if a bad bargain is made, we of the Opposition are not to blame for it. If we assent to this contract and it turns out a bad contract, as I think it will, we want the people to understand that our assent has been forced from us, not won by appeal to reason, that we have been practically compelled to buy the pig in a poke, to use a homely phrase, to buy a railway while the Government deliberately denies us the information that would enable us to arrive at an intelligent idea of its value. We have the advantage of having men of unquestioned knowledge and experience in railway matters who, though not in a position to command the resources of the country in order to secure the assistance of engineering and other experts, are still in a position to acquire a good deal of information, and who, with that information and with the experience they have had in building railways, are in a position to give a valuable opinion on the subject. We have the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), a gentleman who is known as one of the most eminent and successful contractors in Canada, and he comes again and again, and with all the force and authority that his unquestioned standing in the railway world gives him, declares that this is an improvident contract, and that there are many ways that the Government could have secured what it is now getting at a much less cost. When a gentleman of his authority in railway matters makes such a statement, it must go far to convince us; and when in reply there is nothing but appeals to documents which are refused or such evidently inaccurate statements as that made by the Minister in connection with the land damages on this line—shown to be inaccurate by the local knowledge of hon. members from Quebec—the statement made by the hon. member for Glengarry is to a very great extent confirmed. As to these statements of the hon. Minister concerning the towns and villages through which this road would pass, hon. members in this House are in a position to judge how entirely misleading and inaccurate they are. Hon. members from the maritime provinces pass over that line probably two or three times in a session. Do they pass through any grand towns or villages between Montreal and St. Hyacinthe? Does not every hon. gentleman know that we pass through open fields? When we pass the stations you will see no buildings indicating a place of importance. A mile or so away you may see the spire of the village church, but we all know that from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal the road runs for the most part through open cultivated fields. When we are told these farming lands are worth $150 an acre, knowing as we do that the best farming lands of the most important part of Ontario are selling at from $50 to $70 an acre, we feel that we are being trifled with, we feel that such evidence as this can only be put forward by the exercise of authority, that no representative of the people could be induced to rise in Parliament and make such a statement if he were not doing it under the solicitation of the Minister and doing something that he will never be able to maintain outside of this House. We remember the statements constantly made by the members of the present Government when in Opposition concerning the ruin overtaking Canada owing to the National Policy, and we knew them to be reckless and untrue. But it was scarcely to be expected that within two or three years of their getting into office they would be compelled to set up their supporters to give such unwilling testimony to show that farming property has advanced to $150 an acre, this being attributed, as they must necessarily

attribute it, to the good Government that existed in Canada for eighteen years. Now, there were several ways by which the Minister of Railways and Canals, if he desired to reach Montreal, might have proceeded. One that has occurred to me seems obvious. We know that one of the matters discussed between the Grand Trunk and the Government when they were making their arrangements, was the possibility that they might double-track the Grand Trunk, the cost to be borne by the Government and the company in certain proportions. Therefore, we know that was a matter that received consideration. What would any railway man say if he were asked what it would cost to double-track the Grand Trunk Railway? No man who knows anything about railway construction would suggest that it would cost over $10,000 a mile. Let the Government, then, if they wish to utilize that road, proceed to do that which, as we know, the Grand Trunk Railway have in contemplation, let them double track the road at $10,000 a mile. It would improve the property of the Grand Trunk Railway, and give it that advantage east of Montreal that it has west of Montreal on its line between Montreal and Toronto. Then the Government would have no railway damages to pay, no right of way to provide for, and they would have, at an expenditure of say, $320,000, which at 3 per cent would only cost Canada $9,600 a year—they would then have a double tracked railway over which to run their trains between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal. That would only be about one-fourth of the sum, $37,500, which they have agreed to pay to the Grand Trunk Railway. For one-fourth that sum they would have the privilege of using a double tracked railway, with all the resulting advantages of safety, economy and security to life and property; and they would have that property at an expense of $9,600 a year, as contrasted with $37,500. Under the arrangement made now, if it should be found necessary later on to double track the road, the Government would be compelled, in addition to paying $37,500 a year, to pay the interest at 4 per cent upon a portion of the cost of double tracking the road. So it strikes me that a most improvident bargain has been made, a most thoughtless bargain. But it may be argued that the Grand Trunk Railway would not consent to have their road double tracked; possibly they would not. I think it is well known that it is a thing they desire to do. But suppose they did not; from the statements made to us by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), and from some other authorities that have been cited, from the knowledge we have of railway construction all over Canada, from the knowledge of the nature of the ground between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, we know perfectly well that at most $15,000 a mile, or altogether some $450,000, would bring into Montreal a new and perfectly independent road. The sum of $450,000 would involve an annual expenditure of about $13,500 to the people. And still that is not done. And why? Because the Minister of Railways and Canals wants us to believe that it would cost half a million dollars to buy the right of way. That is absurd, as every man knows. In the lower provinces we are not accustomed to think ourselves living in a country very much inferior to Ontario and Quebec, we have had a great many railways built in that country, and in no instance whatever have people who own lands been paid any such sum as $150 an acre for right of way. We know that the late Government secured the right of way through the town of Dartmouth, in Nova Scotia, following the harbour front, taking the most valuable parts of the land, for less than $1,500 an acre. In my own town of New Glasgow, one of the most progressive and enterprising in the province, very desirable lands were taken, in some cases lying along main thoroughfares, at the rate of $300 an acre. If we had time we could produce evidence of many such specific cases to show that not a vestige of authority can be produced in support of the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals that it is going to cost $500,000 to buy the right of way from St. Hyacinthe to Montreal. It is obvious at first blush that that statement is inaccurate. When we find here in addition, the statement that this line of road runs through ten or twelve towns between St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, and when such a statement is made to men who are in the habit of traversing that line two or three times a year and must know that the statement is not correct, the person who makes that statement must be in a very desperate position.

Now, I think it should not be expected that this Parliament would willingly give its assent to this contract. The question whether this road is going to be a profitable one for Canada, is far from being settled. The statement was freely made when the first contract was presented to the House, that bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal was going to make it a profitable road. Well, in the last returns which we have, that road had been running some four months. During that four months we had all the advantages that could be derived from a Montreal connection; still we did not see the deficit wiped out, it had instead largely increased. It strikes me that it would be nothing more than prudent on the part of the Government to continue that experiment until they were able to produce results that would settle the question beyond doubt. Let them try the experiment during the whole of one fiscal year, and when we get the returns up to the end of June, 1898, then we will be in a better position to judge what the result would be if

the arrangement was made permanent. We will have had nearly two years in which to realize the increased passenger and freight traffic of which they talked so confidently, and they will have ample opportunity to prove whether the road will be able to export large quantities of cereals by using this line with steamer connection at Halifax. I do not think that it would be doing any great hardship if Parliament should decide to give the Government another year to continue that experiment in the way in which they have been conducting it during the past two years. If at the end of another year the Government still thought it well to insist upon an answer to the question as to whether they should buy this road, we would be in a much better position to give the answer if we had before us the reports and returns showing what the results actually were. Therefore, even if the Minister was disposed to give us the fullest information in his power, I think it would still be an open question whether we should agree to such a proposition. Under the circumstances, when we find a Minister of Railways and Canals, a man of undoubted ability, a man at the head of a well equipped department, when we find such a gentleman advancing statements unsupported, doubtful in many cases, and contrary to experience, I think we have abundant reason to pause and to take no further step until we know what the results are likely to be. When we find the Government giving us information which bears upon the face of it the stamp of worthlessness, this Parliament is not only justified in refusing its sanction, but it would be going out of its way and failing in its duty if it consents to do anything else than defeat such a measure presented in such a manner.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the preamble be adopted ?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no ; we are not more than to the third section of it. As I said to my hon. friend the other night, this is the only chance of really going into the Grand Trunk arrangement in detail, and it cannot be expected that all these 58 sections can be disposed of at a single sitting, or, perhaps, in two or three sittings I want to make an appeal to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I tried to make an appeal, in all kindness and as strong as I could, to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, but the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is disposed to be obdurate. He has stood upon what he calls his dignity, and he does not propose that members of the House shall have any of the information which is accessible to him. I do not think the Prime Minister sympathizes with that idea of it, but I am not quite sure whether he understands the gravity of the case. One part of the argument of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, a very important part of the argument, which he delivered here the other evening, was on the line of the necessity for the present arrangement for the reason that the building of an alternative line would be more expensive and practically impossible ; so that no business men, he went on to explain, would think that it was feasible to build an alternative line rather than accept the contract in behalf of which that argument was made. It had its force in the country ; it was intended to have a force in the country, and, wherever we go in the country, we will meet that argument in that respect. It is to that branch of the argument that we are devoting ourselves at the present time. We believe that we have proved that that branch of the argument is utterly fallacious and utterly untrustworthy. These are strong words, but none too strong to be used. When we press that view of the matter upon the Minister, he says, that he knows nothing about it himself, but that he has information which is provided by his officers. Thus, very naturally, we ask that that information shall be laid before the members of the committee, so that they may have the same right to form a conclusion upon that information that the hon. gentleman himself has had. That is predicated on the assumption, which is not a violent one, that other men in this House have brains, as well as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that other men in this House are quite as good business men as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that other men in this House know just as much about railways as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who knows nothing about them any more than ourselves, using the words in the technical point of view. We ask simply, that the same information which the hon. gentleman has had, may be presented to this committee, so that the members of it may form their own conclusions. Speaking of that information, the hon. Minister, in characterizing it at the commencement of that branch of the subject, said :

> Has he any idea what it would cost ? I can give him an idea of what it will cost, founded, not upon my own unaided judgment, but upon the careful estimates and calculations of my officials in the department, made not to-day, not yesterday, but before I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues the adoption of this scheme.

The inference from that is, that the information has been presented to his colleagues, and it was the force and conclusive nature of that evidence that made his colleagues agree with him in adopting the measure. Perhaps, some of his colleagues can give this information in detail which was prepared long ago—accurate estimates and calculations—by the officials of his department, for I do not think the members of the Government—there are thirteen of them—are gentlemen who would be willing to take up a scheme of this kind, pass it through

Council and authorize the Minister to bring it before the House, unless they had some information to go upon, other than the mere ipse dixit of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. They must have had this information, these estimates, these calculations, before them. Perhaps some of the Ministers, other than the Minister of Railways, can give us that information, though even then it would be second-hand. Does not the right hon. Prime Minister think that we have, as members of the House, a perfect right to have that information, these calculations and these estimates of the officials of his department, who are not owned by him, but who are the officials of this House and the servants of Parliament? These are calculations, and these are estimates which the Minister says were carefully prepared, not lately, but long before he took the responsibility of presenting this matter to his associates for their adjudication and judgment. Does not the Prime Minister think we have a perfect right to get that information? Why should the Minister interpose between our officials and this House? Will the hon. gentleman assume that the Minister of Railways has any right to assume a superior judgment to the other business men of this House, and to say to the two hundred members of this House: I have looked over these estimates and calculations, and I am satisfied. The other hon. members say we would like to look over these, if you do not mind. The Minister replies: You insult me, because, when you want to look over them, you imply that my word is not to be taken, and that I am not to be trusted. That is the way we are met. Does the right hon. gentleman think that this is the way one of his Ministers ought to act? If it can be done in this case, it can be done in all cases. Are we to sit here and simply accept the filtered information through the Minister of Railways and Canals, or have we a right to have the information ourselves? Would my right hon. friend tell us what interest would be harmed by giving us that information? Is there an answer to these questions? Will the right hon. gentleman tell us why the House is not seized of that information, why it is not laid on the Table here, so that we can scan it? We are suspicious of that filtered information for several reasons. We are suspicious of it because the Minister of Railways gravely declared that to build a bridge over the Yamaska River would cost $300,000, a bridge not over 331 feet span, where the difficulties cannot be great, and when it has been shown here to-night, by conclusive testimony, out of the blue-books, sworn testimony, evidence of engineers, that bridges longer and more difficult to build have been built for $17,000, for $15,000, for the superstructure and sub-structure, of which measurements and quantities have been given. More than that, the hon. member for Glengarry, who knows more about practical railway building than any of us here, probably, and who stakes his reputation, as a member of this House, and stakes his reputation as to the information he gives, who says that he himself has looked into the matter, that he has had an engineer make measurements and calculations, and who says, that that bridge can be built for within $60,000—he says $40,000 to $50,000. There is cumulative evidence. The Canadian Pacific Railway, building a modern structure, in modern times, 3,652 feet long, over the St. Lawrence River, built it all for $934,000. Three thousand six hundred and fifty-two feet, compared with three hundred and thirty-one feet; you can calculate the proportion yourself. Is it reasonable that a three hundred and thirty-one feet bridge over the Yamaska River, would cost $300,000, when a three thousand six hundred and fifty-two feet bridge over the St. Lawrence cost only $934,000. So, the evidence grows and grows, until we are led to the conclusion that the Minister has made a mistake, and we say to him: If you have not made a mistake you are putting your engineers in a bad position. They are engineers upon whom we must rely, pass estimates, and expend money. Will they estimate that a bridge which ought not to cost more than $60,000 will cost $300,000? I challenge the Minister (Mr. Blair) to put the estimate of Mr. Schreiber before this House on that basis with the calculations worked out. He says he will not, and that I am no gentleman because I ask it. He stands on his dignity and says: I am the Minister and, consequently, you must take the information as it filters through me. Now, Sir, I say that the House is deeply interested in knowing whether or not the country has proper men as engineers. What the House would like to know is, whether there is a engineer in that department who will put his signature to an estimate worked out for $300,000, as the cost of a bridge over the Yamaska. If there is, then I would like to have the common sense opinion of builders and business men in this House, as to whether such an estimate is a fair one, and whether we ought not change our engineer who would give an estimate of that kind for a bridge of that kind. That is a grave question, but a graver question still is: That you have a man here who, for the time being, happens to be a Minister of a department, who must rely upon the authorities in the department, and is this House to absolutely back him up in refusing to give the estimates of his engineer of the department. I say that it is intolerable. I say it is not only not constitutional, but it is illiberal and unparliamentary to a degree. I appeal to the right hon. the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) not to allow the obstinacy of his Minister of Railways to defeat the well known principles upon which we are guided in this House, and to defraud 212 representatives of the people of information, because he says: I have got it, I will filter

it out to you, and, you poor fellows there, should be very glad to get it in that way, and you will get it in no other way. This is a matter of some consequence, and I put it as strongly as I can in that light. But, there is more evidence which makes us suspicious. The Minister (Mr. Blair) was making his great speech ; fresh, or pretty nearly fresh, from a most lamentable attempt to put before this House the Yukon Railway business, as to which he confessed he knew nothing. The Minister this time determined he would make a great speech, and that he would demonstrate to his followers, and especially to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that he was a man of genius and a man of power. So he made a great speech ; but the foundations upon which one-third of it was built, had to crumble into dust to-night, before a little questioning and criticism. I want to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) to another thing. In that speech, which was meant to convert his own side of the House to an easy faith in the matter, and the country generally to the wisdom of the step, he went still further. One branch of the argument was as to the great cost of the right of way, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) led this House to suppose—a complete misrepresentation—that in building from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, you would be mulcted in extra heavy damages for land, because of the ten or eleven towns or villages through which the road would have to run. Everybody who was here to-night knows that these ten or eleven considerable towns and villages have dwindled into one town and a uniform farming country, with little aggregations around the hotels and churches of the different parishes, an absolutely agricultural country, much the same as it was years ago, with the exception of the town of St. Hyacinthe ; good farms, good land, and, I dare say, a contented and a happy and prosperous people, in the possession of their habitations. But, it is not a 32 miles of villages and towns to be run through cutting into establishments, cutting into lands which are owned by men living in cities and towns. It is an agricultural country, sparsely but generally populated, and running through these different parishes would be the road, running through farm lands, and farm lands which as taken would have to be paid for and these only. And when the Minister was questioned, he did not know the name of one of these towns, except St. Hyacinthe. He told us they were given to him by some of his men whom he consulted, and he refused to bring down the statement of the engineer in writing, and he tried to put off the House in that hap-hazard fashion of hearsay from some officer in his department. Now, this strong part of his argument has crumbled into utter dust. Put all these things together, and I say we are justified in having a very grave suspicion that when the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) puts a solemn argument, coming down to definite facts before the House, we cannot believe that his representations are what they are said to be, and, consequently, we must be critical. There is the proof we have so far as it goes. I appeal to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether, for the sake of general credibility, we are not justified in asking that the report and the estimates of the engineer, our officer, shall be laid before us who employ him, and who pay him, and who pay him in the interests of the people. I am sure this appeal to my right hon. friend, based as it is upon constitutional grounds, will have its effect, and that, perhaps, when he takes the night to think over it, he will bring his recalcitrant Minister of Railways into something of a better frame of mind ; better suited to the progress of business, better suited to the Parliament into which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has come, better suited to the position which, for the time being, he occupies. I am certain that the Opposition in asking for this information, does not ask for anything which a business man in Canada would not say is right we should ask for, and would not admit, should be at once complied with.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has appealed to me, I certainly owe him an answer, though I am very much afraid in advance that I shall not be able to satisfy him. My hon. friend is so very hypercritical in his views of looking at this matter, that I fear whatever we might do on this side of the House, we do not satisfy him. He will pardon me for saying, that I do not think he is particularly anxious for information, when I see that at half-past eleven at night we have no progress whatever in committee on this Bill. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) appealed to me as a member of this House, as a member of the Government, to know whether or not we have come to the conclusion which we ask this House to ratify, without having more information than he himself has. I think, Sir, there is enough information for my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and for every one else to form a proper judgment on the merits of the proposition which we submit to the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is a good debater, and he will pardon me if I say, that he is also a good special pleader. This scheme which is offered to the House to-day, in my judgment, commends itself on its own merits.

My hon. friend, in his speech the other day, one of very great ability, as we all know, showed conclusively to the satisfaction of every man in this House that it was absolutely impossible to have a railway from Ste. Rosalie to Bonaventure station for the sum of money which is represented by the rental of $140,000 a year which we are to pay. Capitalize that amount at 3 per cent, or 4 per cent, or 5 per cent, or 2 per cent, and double or treble the amount of capital so formed, and you would not be able to get the facilities which you have under this

agreement from Ste. Rosalie to Bonaventure station. Let the amount of capital be four, five, six or ten millions, and double that amount, and you could not get for it the facilities which you get under this agreement. That is a statement so broad, so clear and so certain that it cannot be successfully controverted. But my hon. friend the other day went out of his way to answer a speech delivered by the hon. member for Glengarry That hon. gentleman is a practical contractor, who speaks with authority, and his utterances ought to be treated with respect. I do not share all the views expressed by him; but I am bound to say that when he speaks on matters of this kind his views are entitled to respect, because he is supposed to know and does know what he is talking about. But as doctors disagree, so engineers will disagree; and my hon. friend went out of his way, it appeared to me, although it was out of the abundance of his case, to answer the statement made by the hon. member for Glengarry in regard to the estimated cost of building a road from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, passing into the city by the vicinity of the Lachine bridge. My hon. friend first stated, and in doing so he did not commit any breach of the truth, that there were some ten or eleven towns or villages which the railway would have to pass. Now, the hon. gentlemen opposite, in a carping spirit, if I may say so, at least in a hypercritical spirit, says there is only one town, St. Hyacinthe. I do not care whether you call St. Lambert a town or a village; the fact remains that from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal the line would cross the town of St. Hyacinthe and several of the wealthiest parishes in the province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Parishes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say parishes, and parishes which would give a great deal of freight to any railway in the shape of the agricultural products which they raise and which would find a market at Montreal. My hon. friend so stated. Then he stated that the land damages would amount to at least $150 an acre. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcil), who knows the locality very well, gives his opinion that the land in that vicinity would cost from $100 to $150 an acre. Then the bridge across the Yamaska River, at St. Hyacinthe, my hon. friend has stated, would cost $300,000. The hon. member for Glengarry estimates it at $50,000. I need not repeat what I said on this point this afternoon. My opinion on this subject being the opinion of a layman, I do not attach any value to it; but to any man who knows the locality at all it seems preposterous to suppose that you can build a bridge across the Yamaska River for $50,000. There was another bridge on the Yamaska River at the town of Yamaska, which belonged to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which was washed away five or six years ago by a spring freshet, and it has never been rebuilt, although there is offered at this moment a subsidy of $50,000 which was voted by this Parliament four or five years ago for the rebuilding of that bridge. That subsidy has been begging so far, for no one has accepted it. Now, we generally give subsidies for bridges to the amount of 15 per cent of the cost, which would make the cost of that bridge, which is within fifteen miles at most of the bridge at St. Hyacinthe, $300,000 or $400,000. So that the estimate of $50,000 seems to be preposterous. Whether the bridge would cost $300,000. I am not prepared to say at this moment; but even supposing the estimate of the engineer was too high, after all it is only a matter of opinion, and that is not a sufficient reason for defeating the proposition before the House. What is it my hon. friend opposite asks? My hon. friend the Minister of Railways spoke after having consulted his engineers, and having debated the matter with them again and again. My hon. friend knows that in the relations existing between the Minister and the Chief Engineer, the information given by the latter is often given in conversation or in an exchange of views, and when the Minister says: "I give you the estimate of my engineer, and he estimates that the bridge would cost $300,000," he gives you all that he could give you even if it were put in writing. There is more than that. As I stated this afternoon—and I call the attention of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to this fact—this question is not new; it has been debated in this House before; it has been investigated by a committee of the House; and I find among the list of documents brought before that committee, all the documents asked for by my hon. friend to-day. Among them were the following: Mr. Schreiber's first estimate of mileage and cost of construction of Drummond County Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière Junction; estimate of Mr. Schreiber as to amount to be paid Grand Trunk Railway Company for use of terminals at Point St. Charles and Bonaventure station, Montreal; estimate of Mr. Schreiber as to the amount to be paid to Grand Trunk Railway Company for the use of Victoria bridge; second estimate of Mr. Schreiber of mileage and cost of construction of Drummond County Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière, including Nicolet branch. All these things have been investigated. So it seems to me that my hon. friend, if he really wants information and is not obstructing this Bill, has already got the information before the House, and the very members who were entrusted with the investigation of this measure had the information also.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to say, with regard to the bridge for which the right hon. gentleman says a subsidy of $50,000 has been voted, that there is no parallel between that and the other bridge. The width of the

river at the village of Yamaska is double what it is at St. Hyacinthe.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is wider, certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. And my right hon. friend will remember, I am sure, that it is not on account of the expense that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do not want to build that bridge. Even if we offered them $100,000, they would not build it, because they were very glad to stop running their trains on that line, because it did not pay them. The right hon. gentleman knows very well that he cannot bring this as an argument at all to show the difference in the estimate of the bridge at St. Hyacinthe, between the hon. member for Glengarry and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman complains that we are now at 11.30 and nothing done. I think if he will reflect for a moment, he will see that if nothing is done, it is the fault of his own side. He says that the hon. Minister of Railways went out of his way to answer the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). We do not take that view. We feel that the argument which the hon. member for Glengarry addressed to this House was most cogent to show that those resolutions should not be passed. It went to show that for very much less cost than is proposed under this agreement, a road could be built, double-tracked, from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, and terminal facilities provided. How did the Minister of Railways meet this argument? By placing against the statement which had been made by the hon. member for Glengarry the estimates and calculation of the officials of his own department. Here were statements made by the hon. member for Glengarry, a practical man, based upon practical observations, which showed that a very much better arrangement could have been made by this Government than the one proposed. How then can the right hon. gentleman say that the Minister of Railways went out of his way to answer that argument. He did not go out of his way, it was directly in his way to answer that argument, and he attempted to answer it by stating that the estimate of my hon. friend from Glengarry was not correct, and that he had careful calculations made long ago by the engineers and officials in his own department, which showed that the argument of the hon. member for Glengarry was wrong.

Now, the question we have been discussing this evening is simply whether it is competent for the Minister of Railways to attempt to meet the argument of hon. gentlemen on this side by a reference to calculations of that kind, and then to obstruct this committee, from four o'clock this afternoon until 11.30 to-night, by refusing to produce these calculations, in violation of every rule of parliamentary procedure. Yet the right hon. gentleman says that this is a matter in respect of which the Minister of Railways went out of his way to answer the hon. member for Glengarry. He did not go out of his way to answer that hon. gentleman, but went out of his way to obstruct the business of the committee by refusing to produce the calculations which he himself brought before the House, and which he, under every principle of parliamentary procedure, was bound to place before the House.

I do not understand that the right hon. gentleman has given an answer at all to the appeal made to him by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). The question simply is this, whether it is competent for the Minister of Railways to attempt to meet an argument made from this side of the House based on practical knowledge and observation, by a reference to estimates and calculations of his own engineers, and then to keep this committee back, hour after hour, by refusing to produce those documents for its information. He might just as well bring down this Bill and these resolutions and this agreement, and say: I have made an excellent agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway, take my word for it; and if you do not believe that it is an excellent agreement you are doubting my word, and I will treat any complaint made with contempt.

But the right hon. gentleman himself affords the best answer to his own argument. After stating that the Minister of Railways and Canals had gone out of his way to answer the hon. member for Glengarry, he himself attempted to answer that hon. gentleman as to the cost of that bridge. The question is whether it would cost about $300,000 or $50,000, and the right hon. gentleman said he had some personal knowledge of the country and the right of way, &c. We listened to all that with great respect, but we would listen with a great deal more respect and attention to the calculations and estimates on which the Minister of Railways made his speech the other night. The right hon. gentleman has no technical knowledge of these matters, the engineers have, and the Minister of Railways based his argument upon the reports of those engineers, but now refuses to bring them down. I venture to think that, under no authority quoted to this House, is he at all justified in the course he has taken, and I do not think that the right hon. First Minister has succeeded in justifying the obstruction to which this committee has been subjected in attempting to advance this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose it is my hon. friend's intention to finish the schedule to-night?

The PRIME MINISTER. What, then, is my hon. friend's intention?

Mr. FOSTER. My intention, and I think that of my hon. friends, is what I stated the other day, when we made the arrangement for having a vote on the third reading. I think I mentioned that on the second reading the items would have to be thoroughly gone into, and that I had a good deal of criticism to make. We really had no opportunity of getting down to groundwork on this scheme at all until we got into committee on the second reading. The hon. Minister of Railways made a very long speech on the resolution, which was replied to, and my hon. friend will recollect that we then made no criticism of the different parts of the schedule, some fifty-eight sections in all. We let that go with the idea that on the second reading we would have an opportunity of criticising the fifty-eight sections. All are not equally important, but some are, as affecting the basis of the agreement, and it will take considerable time to thresh them out. The hon. gentleman may keep us here until the early morning, but that is not the way we will get through our discussion best. We have no desire to unduly criticise all those fifty-eight sections, but they must be reviewed and those we consider most important criticised.

We have kept on this one item for this long time for one purpose and one alone, and that is to emphasize the fact that the Minister of Railways has taken ground, by refusing us the information on which he made his argument which shows pretty conclusively that he is wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In what respect?

Mr. FOSTER. In this respect, that he has made a statement before this House to influence the judgment of members, which we believe cannot be sustained; and as I am not technical, and my hon. friend is not technical, and my hon. friend behind me is not a railway man, and the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government is not a railway man, why then have we not the authority of the engineer's statement? We can each have his opinion and meet assertion by assertion for a fortnight or longer, but the very argument of my hon. friend proves conclusively that we had better refer to some other authority, and that is the authority on which the Minister of Railways based the argument he made, in which argument I believe he is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that a part of the statement the hon. gentleman (Mr Foster) has made does not harmonize with the rest. He professes anxiety to have an opportunity of discussing the 48 clauses of this Bill, and yet he has been, apparently, standing upon the ground which relates exclusively to the general question, whether any portion of this Bill ought to be considered at all, whether, in fact, the Bill should have had its second reading. His contention is, that this arrangement is not beneficial to the country, and he says one of the matters I presented to the committee the other day, concerning the erection of the two bridges which now form part of the line of the Grand Trunk between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, was not accurate, but was excessive. Now, I cannot see how the question, as to whether these estimates, one or both of them, are excessive, can be a material question as affecting the general proposition before the committee. Whether or not this Bill, as a whole, with all its clauses and all the clauses in the contract, should pass, does not rest upon the question whether the engineer gave me an accurate estimate of the cost of these bridges. I quoted from the engineer's memorandum to the effect that the cost of the bridge across the Yamaska would be $300,000. Whether that estimate is accurate or not, or whether statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite should be accepted, is a very small part of a very large question. All through this discussion, the hon. gentleman has been putting it forward that, when I stated the other day that I had the authority of my engineer to state to this House that it would cost $485,000 for the building of a railway, outside of the two bridges over the Yamaska and Richelieu rivers, and $400,000 for the Richelieu and $300,000 for the Yamaska bridge, a total of $1,185,000, I was giving figures which were excessive and exaggerated. Well, if the hon. gentleman is of that opinion, let him draw his own conclusions from that as he pleases, and vote accordingly. But I do not see, nor do I think any hon gentleman in the committee will see, the relevancy or importance of our occupying the time of the committee in deciding whether or not the engineer's estimate was excessive. I have told the committee, over and over again, that the engineer gave me the total estimate of cost. He did not go into details; he did not tell me how many pounds of iron nor how many cubic yards of stone would be required, but gave me the figures exactly as I have presented them to the House. And I do not think that the hon. gentleman is treating me fairly; I do not think he is acting in a way which would commend itself to the fair-mindedness of the House, when he calls on me to produce something which I have never said I had, and which, as a matter of fact, I have never had—a statement under the hand of the engineer showing the details figured out closely and accurately of the cost of the Yamaska and Richelieu bridges. I do not think the hon. gentleman can hope to impress this side of the House, at any rate, with the idea that he merely desired to consider the clauses of this Bill, when he is resting his argument on the accuracy of the engineer's statement and comparing it with the statement of hon. gentlemen on the other side. That, surely, cannot be a sufficient reason

for delaying the consideration of the Bill in detail. We have already passed the second reading——

Mr. FOSTER. I want my hon. friend to stop there. He must not use that argument because it was distinctly understood between the leaders of the House that the vote, which should properly be taken on the second reading, should be deferred to the third reading, for the convenience of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AN CANALS. The vote—that might be.

Mr. FOSTER. The vote on the principle of the Bill. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows that the suggestion to have the vote on the third reading was made from this point of view—it was not a question as to what the result would be; there was no question as to what the sense of the House was upon the subject, and it was only necessary that the formal vote should be taken—the hon. gentleman and his friends desiring to put themselves upon record—and the third reading of the Bill was chosen as the more convenient opportunity for this purpose. The view expressed by the hon. gentleman is not the view, I think, of one who wishes to justify his delay in dealing with these clauses as they are now coming up.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I have listened to the hon. Minister with a great deal of interest, and I may say, with some surprise at the statement he has made, that the principle of this Bill has been confirmed by the House. I certainly did not so understand it, when the arrangement was come to that the division should take place on the third reading, instead of the second reading, on the whole question whether the acquiring of the Drummond County Railway or the extension of the Intercolonial Railway was in the general interest of the country. I do not think the House has decided that question yet, and that is what we will test, when we come to the vote on the third reading. To my mind, it is a very grave question whether this scheme is to the advantage of the country generally I, for one, representing a constituency in western Ontario, believe that, whatever advantage it may be to the province of Quebec or the maritime provinces, it is certainly not a scheme that is going to prove of any advantage to the province of Ontario. We do not in any way call for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, or any other railway, for the purpose of taking the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal. The whole terms of Confederation have been complied with and fully carried out, so far as railway construction is concerned, when the old province of Canada has been brought into connection with the maritime provinces by the Intercolonial Railway, as it now exists. Under the British North America Act, we are not expected and not called upon to do more than was done many years ago. Therefore, I say it is a question whether this scheme here proposed is a feasible one and one that will accrue to the benefit of the country generally. The Minister of Railways and Canals, in declining to give information in detail, which he has been pressed to give time and again, I think, fully justifies us in going back and discussing this question as to whether the scheme is one that commends itself to the House. When the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), a few moments ago, was addressing the House, he raised what, to my mind, was a very pertinent question, and gave me the idea of saying what I am now about to say, the question whether the Government acted wisely in acquiring that road.

Possibly the member for Pictou at that time was not discussing the question as to whether the Government should extend the road to Montreal, but perhaps he was discussing the question as to whether they had made the best bargain that could be made for the purpose of continuing the road to Montreal. But I go further, and I say that I do not consider that it is in the interests of this country, more especially of the western provinces, that that road should be continued any further than it is at the present time. I may say that in all the arguments that have been advanced during the present session and the preceding session, I have never yet been able to discover one that convinced me that the Government were in duty bound to continue that road to Montreal, or that it was going to benefit Canada as a whole, or was such an undertaking that it should be taken hold of by the Government. Now, I have stated my position clearly, and when a division is taken in this House on the principle of the purchase of this road, I must certainly vote against the whole scheme. Now, I may give you a few examples to show how much use this road is to us in the western part of Ontario. In the western part of Ontario we ship by the Grand Trunk Railway to Montreal, and goods are then transferred to the Intercolonial Railway for the lower provinces. Now, I live on the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I am convinced that goods shipped at our small way stations west of Toronto are carried to Montreal probably inside of 24 hours; then they are handed over to this new fangled system of the Intercolonial Railway which is going to be of such great benefit to Canada, and those goods cannot be carried from Montreal to the city of Halifax inside of one month. If that is going to be the case all the way through, what in the world is the use of this Government spending millions upon millions for the purpose of

improving transportation when you cannot carry a package of 200 pounds from Montreal to Halifax inside of a month? That is a thing that is occurring every day and is troubling the business men of this country to-day. Manufacturers in western Ontario, who are shipping goods to the east, cannot get their goods sent forward after they are shifted from the Grand Trunk Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. The arrangement seems to be that goods sent by the Grand Trunk Railway have to be transferred to the Intercolonial Railway before they are sent forward, and they either lie there in Montreal, or they are sent forward from station to station by some slow means. I know of cases where goods were shipped from the village of Acton, where I live, a manufacturing town having industries varying from $50,000 to $750,000, and those institutions are sending goods forward to the lower provinces. It is very important for the men carrying on business that these goods should be carried promptly. In one instance, goods were shipped from the village of Acton on April the 25th, to Mr. Ross, of Halifax, and they did not reach Mr. Ross until the 22nd of May. That shows the great advantage that we in the province of Ontario are going to get by spending millions of money for the purpose of acquiring the Drummond County Railway for the benefit of a few people in Quebec.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did the hon. gentleman inquire as to when they were delivered to the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HENDERSON. They were shipped from Acton, 35 miles west of Toronto, left Acton on the day they were shipped, the 25th of April, and I have no doubt those goods were in Montreal inside of 24 hours, or 36 hours at the latest.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that as a fact, but I know something of the expedition of the Grand Trunk Railway in sending forward any consignment that is given to it, and the delay must of necessity have occurred on this road that is being acquired for the general benefit of Canada, although it takes a month to carry goods from one province to another.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did you have any experience before the Drummond County Railway was acquired?

Mr. HENDERSON. I never heard these complaints made before. In fact I have shipped goods myself from Acton away down to Cape Breton as the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) can testify, and they reached that far distant point in less than half the time, and in the winter season, too, when the roads were liable to be blockaded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What goods were they that were shipped when this instance of delay occurred?

Mr. HENDERSON. They were glove manufactures. Goods shipped from the city of London to Mr. Ross, in the city of Halifax, on the 20th April, had not reached Mr. Ross on the 23rd day of May, or three days more than a month. Now, the Grand Trunk Railway carry goods direct from London to Montreal, and these goods are then offered to this Drummond County road, a sort of one-horse road which we are to pay millions of money to purchase for the general benefit of Canada, when we in the west can get no benefit out of it at all. I must protest against it. From Acton a short time ago goods were shipped to Westville in Pictou County, N.S., they were shipped on the 4th of May, and they had not reached Westville on the 2nd day of June, when the consignee was complaining of the wonderful expedition of the Drummond County Railway in getting goods down to the lower provinces. In another instance goods were shipped to Yarmouth in the province of Nova Scotia, though the Intercolonial Railway may not be responsible to the same extent, for they would have to pass over the Intercolonial Railway on to other roads. But the goods shipped from Acton on the 14th of April had not reached their destination in Yarmouth on the 3rd of May. Now these facts show why it is that the road is absolutely of no use to us at all in western Ontario for the purpose of interprovincial trade. We in the province of Ontario are very much opposed indeed to spending a large sum of money to purchase a road that is absolutely useless to the country generally, and is going out to benefit a few speculators only in the province of Quebec, and probably it may be of some benefit to the people of the maritime provinces. Therefore, viewing this scheme from the standpoint of its utter uselessness to the western part of the province, I say that the taxpayers should not be called upon to pay such an enormous sum of money, for the purpose of providing a railway for the people of the province of Quebec. For reasons of this kind, and the general reason that I do not believe in the principle of the Government acquiring railways in this manner unless we are going to adopt a general system of the purchase of railways by the Government, I feel it my duty to vote against this whole scheme.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go any further, I might ask the right hon. gentleman how late he proposes to sit?

The PRIME MINISTER. We should make some progress first.

Mr. FOSTER. As we do not have to pass section by section, it is difficult to know how much progress is being made. There are a great many sections in the schedule, some of which are important, and which we propose to criticise.

The PRIME MINISTER. We can go on for some time further.

Mr. CLANCY. I have not hitherto taken any part in this discussion, and I am not now going to discuss the general principle of the scheme, because that has been pretty well thrashed out already. I listened with much interest to the statement that was made by the right hon. first Minister in answering the reasonable request made by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and I listened also with much interest, because I was curious to know what response the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would make himself. I was astounded, as I am sure every member on that side of the House was astounded, at the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when he made that speech. His voice reached a high key and he laid especial stress upon the fact that he was in possession of reliable information in respect to the cost of this road. I will venture to say, if that statement had been threshed out in the inquiry, that since has taken place, hon. members on that side of the House, who rose, one after another, and declared that it was the best bargain that was ever made in Canada, would not have made speeches of that kind because the hon. Minister was risking his reputation by putting himself in such an unenviable position. If these hon. gentlemen had known that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had proceeded without having any information at all, because he declares that he has no information beyond that derived from the chief engineer of the department, who, he says, has not gone into it very carefully, they would not have approved the scheme so heartily. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals does not believe that there is any information in the possession of the department at this moment beyond mere guess work, because, if the chief engineer had made a careful estimate it seems to me, that these calculations to which he referred afterwards should be in the hands of the Minister, unless he is prepared to jump at conclusions. Take the hon. gentleman's statement here that he merely jumped at the conclusion, or if he did not jump at the conclusion he arrived at a conclusion. It is unfair to hon. members of this House to not have a definite statement of that kind given at this stage, if the hon. gentleman had that information himself. The general scheme has been pretty well threshed out. The accuracy and worth of that scheme must depend now upon the accuracy of the details. The hon. gentleman pledged himself to this House when he made his statement, to give that information to the House, but he stubbornly refuses to give it to the committee. What is the position of the committee? I think the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who says that we ought to make some progress, knows that there is a proper way of making progress and that is to have threshed out by this House all the information that he is in possession of. If there is any such information, if it has not been a mere guess, let us wait until we have that information. He cannot fairly ask the committee to pass a single section or to proceed one step further if we have not this information, because, I care not how friendly we may be, I care not how much we may be willing to give our opinions, we should not be expected to assume that everything is correct, because, I fancy, it has been pure assumption. I am sure that hon. gentlemen who have spoken hastily upon that side of the House took it for granted that this information would be forthcoming, but when we have arrived at the time when we are able to apply the crucial test and find out what the facts are, upon which this measure is based, we are unable to obtain the information that we require. Assuming that we divorced this question from party strife, that it were a business transaction, is there an hon. gentleman who would proceed in such a transaction without the information necessary upon which to proceed? The difficulty becomes more grave when we have the hon. Minister declaring that he had this information, that he proceeded on this information and when we find that that information is not now forthcoming. The hon. gentleman said that it is not important that we should have this information, because it is not of sufficient concern. The trouble is that the hon. gentleman thought it of sufficient concern himself and we did not discover until the progress that this measure has made in the House from stage to stage, that there was any information by which a different aspect would be given to the whole scheme. The attempt which has been made to deceive the House has succeeded up to this moment. I listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I say that that hon. gentleman should be possessed of information, in every detail, before he would presume to submit a measure of this kind to the House. Hon. gentlemen who have already made up their minds in favour of this scheme might well, in view of the developments that have taken place, change their minds. So, I think, now, that it would not be an unfair request if we were to say that before we proceed another step we should have all the information which the hon. gentleman himself declares he has, and which would justify any hon. gentleman in this House in supporting a scheme of that kind. I hope this measure will not be pressed, because, I think, it is unfair to press it under the circumstances. The hon. gentlemen by their majority and their staying qualities, may seek to force it, but I would very much deplore it if we are driven by stress of that kind, in a matter of this im-

portance, to a test of our powers of endurance. They may succeed in time, but that cannot justify them, any more than anything else, in refusing our request, which is so reasonable that the right hon. First Minister cannot well refuse it. If the great electorate of the Dominion of Canada sat in the gallery to-night and heard the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, by which, after the whole scheme has been threshed out and after we have entered upon this phase of it, a new question is raised, they would say that we were justified in taking the ground we do. We cannot hope to make progress until we have that information and the only excuse I have for taking part in this debate is that I feel that I and others would be wanting in our duty were we prepared to give assent by our silence in this Chamber to a proceeding of that kind. It is a matter which is so fair in itself and which is so clear a test of the good faith that must accompany a measure of that kind that there is no other course open to us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) having referred to documents, and based an argument upon them, he is, I submit, bound to lay them on the Table of the House. In "May's Parliamentary Practice," page 321, I find:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepare to lay it upon the Table. This restraint is similar to that rule of evidence, in courts of law, which prevents counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested, and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in. It has also been admitted that a document which has been cited, ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interests.

In Bourinot's "Parliamentary Procedure and Practice," page 409, the same rule is laid down, as follows:—

It has been laid down by the highest authorities that when a Minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House, and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced. But it is allowable to repeat to the House information which is contained in a private communication. When such private papers are quoted in the House there is no rule requiring them to be laid on the Table. The rule respecting the production of public papers, quoted by a Minister of the Crown, is necessary to give the House the same information he possesses, and enable it to come to a correct conclusion on a question.

I find that the Minister of Railways and Canals has founded an argument to the House, based upon a quotation from, and a reference to, estimates and calculations made by his officers. The language which he used, in answer to the argument addressed to this House by the hon. member from Glengarry, was as follows:—

I can give him an idea of what it will cost, founded not upon my own unaided judgment, but upon the careful estimates and calculations of my officials in the department, made not to-day, not yesterday, but before I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues the adoption of this scheme.

Then the Minister proceeds to state the effect of these calculations, and, among other things, he states that they show that it is going to cost $400,000 to build a bridge across the Richelieu River, and $300,000 to build a bridge across the Yamaska. Under these circumstances, I submit that it is not competent for the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr Blair) to refuse to lay upon the Table of this House the documents to which he has referred, and upon which he has founded his arguments, and which documents are not only relevant to the question now being debated before this committee, but are absolutely necessary in order to enable this committee to determine whether or not the view advanced by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), or the view advanced by the Minister, is the correct one. As I have said, the matter is relevant, because it directly relates to the question, as to whether or not it is better, in the interests of the country, to pass this Bill adopting this scheme, or whether it is better for the country to adopt the scheme suggested by the hon. member for Glengarry that the Government should build this road from Ste. Rosalie into Montreal and construct their own terminals upon their own land. There can, therefore, be no doubt as to the relevancy of this matter to the question before the House. There can be no doubt that the Minister of Railways and Canals has referred to official documents. There can be no doubt, also, that in the public interest, as well as for the purpose of preserving the correct rule of parliamentary procedure, these documents should be laid upon the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) rose to a point of order, but the question he raised can hardly be considered a point of order. My recollection of the statement of the Minister of Railways is, that he conveyed certain information, which he received from his officials, to the House, and he did not pretend to quote from any document. If there was a document, and if it was quoted from, that is a question which should have been raised at the proper time in this House, and there is no point of order in it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I submit that the proper time to raise this question is now, and if the Chairman should rule that the document ought not to be produced, then, of course, the question could be raised before the House by way of appeal. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks into the reference I made, that this is the way to raise the question, and

that in the English practice, if it is thought necessary, an appeal is taken to the Speaker. The Minister of Finance referred to the absence of the word "document" in the speech of the Minister of Railways; but I might cite a case that, even where a document was not referred to but where Sir Robert Peel referred to certain information he had touching the elections, there was quite a spirited debate, in which some of the present leaders of the English House of Commons took part, and they endeavoured to carry out the rule even as to that. There are cases mentioned in which Ministers of the Crown have referred to information of an official character, and the House has pressed that a memorandum of that information be laid on the Table of the House I have a case here where Lord Robert Cecil raised the question, and the Speaker ruled immediately on it, so that there is nothing in the objection of the Minister of Finance as to its not being a point of order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What was the document?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Attorney General was asked to lay a paper on the Table of the House, and he was declining, on the ground that it was a private document; but Lord Cecil raised the point, and the Speaker ruled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was quoting from a document; but the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) did not quote from a document, but made a general statement on information he received in conversation with an official.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He did not say that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I speak under reserve, but I do not recollect that the Minister of Railways pretended to quote from any particular document, and, even if there were a document, the point of order now taken is, I think, out of place.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is the language used by the Minister of Railways, and I will read it again, lest you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the Minister of Finance, may have forgotten it:

> I can give him an idea of what it will cost, founded, not upon my own unaided judgment, but upon the careful estimates and calculations of my officials in the department, made not to-day, not yesterday, but before I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues the adoption of this scheme.

The Minister of Railways has not pretended that that was not committed to writing.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is nothing in that which would lead any one to suppose that it was a report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is arrogating to himself your functions, Mr. Chairman. I call your attention to the fact that the Minister of Railways does not deny in any way, directly or indirectly, that this was in writing.

Mr. McMULLEN. He has never admitted it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon member (Mr. McMullen) will permit me for a moment; what the Minister stated is, that these calculations were in gross; but that particular details were not given. This is all the Minister of Railways has contended, yet there his recollection is a little at fault, because he says he was referring, not merely to the lump or bulk sums but to careful estimates and calculations, upon which he was basing his argument.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call your attention to the fact that the Minister of Railways quoted this very evening a document which he held in his hand, declaring that it came from the chief engineer. Whether that is the document containing the careful calculation referred to in his former speech, I am not prepared to say, but it is quite clear that he did quote from some document to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that this is not a case in which I should interfere. The document in question was referred to in a discussion that took place some days ago, and it is a rule which will be admitted by all the members of this House, that a question of order of this kind should be raised at the proper time, that is, at the time at which the document is quoted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He quoted the same document to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not hear the hon. gentleman quote the document to-night; perhaps it was when I was absent. But I understand from the hon. member that the quotation of the Minister was from a discussion that took place some days ago, and I do not think, therefore, that it is a case in which I should now interfere.

Mr. WALLACE. But, Mr. Chairman, let me point out this fact, that the Minister having made the statement, we presumed he had laid the document on the Table of the House. We could not know until the next day that he had not done so, and there was then no opportunity to raise the objection. We have to assume that each Minister complies with the well-known rules that govern the British Parliament and ours. But as soon as we discover that the document has not been laid on the Table of the House, we ask for your ruling on the subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you have given your ruling, and I desire to appeal from your ruling to the Speaker. It is a very important point.

The PRIME MINISTER. Make your motion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I move that this question be submitted to the Speaker in the Chair. The appeal to the Speaker is a question of right, and not a question for a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the proper way would be to make a motion that I report to the Speaker. I must be instructed to make such a report to the Speaker.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is on the request of the chairman of the committee I make the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is your motion ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My motion is that an appeal be taken from the decision of the Chair to the Speaker, and that the Speaker be called to the Chair for the purpose of this appeal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let the hon. member put the motion in writing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no motion. I claim the right to appeal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will find in Sir John Bourinot, at page 483 :

> If it be found expedient in either House to refer a point of order to the Speaker, a member will move that the chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the Chairman will report that the Committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well ; I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion negatived.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, there is no appeal from the Chair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, you have had your appeal.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that is a proper proceeding.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The PRIME MINISTER. The question is decided now.

Mr. BERGERON. Hon. gentlemen cannot stop us in that way. The same thing happened in 1896, during the discussion on the Remedial Bill. Although we had an immense majority, there was an appeal from the Chairman to the Speaker, and the Chairman simply called in the Speaker and reported what had taken place, and there was a vote in the full House. I do not think the right hon. gentleman will advance matters by treating us in that way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, matters have not been advanced by treating you otherwise.

Mr. BERGERON. That will not mend them. The right hon. gentleman will no doubt remember what happened in 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. The simple question, Mr. Chairman, is this : are we to be allowed the right of appeal simply on the vote of the majority ? The right of appeal is inherent.

The PRIME MINISTER. Suppose the Speaker were in the Chair and you had an appeal from his decision, the House would vote on that. The hon. gentleman has taken his course, he has moved that the committee rise, and the motion has been negatived. There is nothing to do now, but to proceed with the question.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the right hon. First Minister should get behind that motion, because the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was forced to make his motion ; it was made at the request of the Chairman. He did not want to take that course. He simply made his appeal to the Speaker, and he has a right to do so. We on this side of the House would be deprived entirely of the right of appeal if we were to be subject to the will of the majority on that side of the House. You might as well wipe out the appeal altogether. It seems to me that when the Chairman insisted on the hon. member for Pictou making a motion that the committee rise and report, the right hon. First Minister should not take advantage of that fact and deprive us of the right of appeal which we have without any motion. That was the practice followed in 1896 when the late Dalton McCarthy used the right of appeal.

The PRIME MINISTER. I want to know if the right hon. gentleman has a right, after what has happened since three o'clock today, to appeal to my fairness. I am certainly disposed to facilitate the business of the House, and it is my duty to do so, but when there is a deliberate intent to obstruct the business of the House, it is equally my duty to see that such obstruction is prevented.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has no right to use those words. Nothing which has transpired in this day's sitting, gives him the right to make that assertion.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a question of order raised because a certain document has not been produced. Eight days ago, when the Speaker was in the Chair, no objection was taken, either on that or the following day, to the non-production of the document, which was then referred to, but it is asked now, when the Speaker is not in the Chair, that the chairman shall rule that the document ought to be produced. If anybody

has the right to rule, it is the Speaker and not the chairman of the commitee, and when the chairman of the committee has decided very properly that it is not for him to decide the point of order, then there is an appeal from his decision to this House, which is clearly obstruction.

Mr. BERGERON. In the session of 1896, a similar difficulty arose. Mr. McCarthy refused to accept the ruling of the chairman of the committee and proposed to appeal to the House, and he cited that in 1885 it was settled that there was an appeal from the committee to the House. There was then a big majority in the House on the Government side, but on an appeal being taken from the ruling of the acting chairman, the Speaker took the Chair. The acting chairman informed him of what had taken place in committee, and a vote was taken, without debate. the Speaker refusing to allow any debate. Why are we not treated in the same way when we appeal from the chairman as the Opposition were treated in 1896? Are we to be treated in a different way simply because the parties have changed sides? Is this course to be taken by a Government calling itself liberal?

Mr. TAYLOR. The right hon. Prime Minister misled the House when he said that the Minister of Railways made a speech referring to these documents when the Speaker was in the Chair. He made the speech referring to them in committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) raised the point, he did not refer to what took place to-day, but to what took place eight days ago, when the Speaker was in the Chair.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is an old time rule that in settling these questions regard is always had to the practice of the House. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has referred to what took place in 1896, but I would refer to the session of 1885. The Franchise Bill was then under consideration in committee, and an appeal was taken from the ruling of the chairman of the committee. In that session, as well as in 1896, on a mere formal motion, which is the question put to-night, that the committee rise and report progress, the chairman rose, the Speaker took the Chair, the chairman reported the question that had arisen, the Speaker put the question, the House divided, and again resolved itself into committee, and the committee resumed its work. That is the course pointed out in Bourinot's work:

> If a question of order arise in committee, the chairman will decide it himself, unless it be deemed more advisable to refer the matter to the Speaker. Rule 76 provides that a question of order arising in Committee of the Whole shall be decided by the chairman, subject to an appeal to the House, but his order to the committee can only be censured by the House on the Speaker receiving a report thereof.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

It is out of respect to the Speaker that the practice I refer to has been followed, because the Speaker is considered the appelate authority who settles the practices, not only for the House, but the committee, and the chairman of the committee has not the right to prevent the Speaker regulating, if desired by any one in the committee, the point in dispute. According to Bourinot, if it be found expedient to have a point of order decided, any member may move that the chairman of the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the chairman will report that the committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question. The motion to rise and report progress is merely a formal one on which no debate takes place. The House then proceeds to take the matter into consideration, and the Speaker having been requested to give his opinion, will decide the matter in dispute. We have had an unbroken practice, since 1885 at any rate, that on a request of a member of the committee, an appeal will be taken, the motion is put as a matter of form, that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, and is carried as a matter of course, and the question referred to the Speaker.

Mr. CLANCY. By what other means can we determine that the majority of the House desire to reverse a reversal of the decision of the chairman of the committee, unless we appeal to the House when the Speaker is in the Chair. No division can take place in committee, but only when the Speaker is in the Chair, and, therefore, I would like to know how it can be determined in committee that there can be no appeal since no division can then take place?

The PRIME MINISTER. I conceive it to be my duty, as far as I can, to instruct the House whenever a point of this kind intervenes. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was hasty in moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. He did not move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was the motion of the hon. member. I must say that I have a very vivid recollection of what took place in 1896 and also in 1885. According to the ruling at that time no motion was necessary in a case of this kind. I remember a case in 1896. There was a motion to adjourn and a similar point to this was taken and an appeal was made to the Chair. It was moved also that the committee should adjourn, that is, there were two motions to adjourn. The rule was not interpreted as it was interpreted by my hon. friend from Picton a moment ago. Even when there is obstruction, gentlemen on the other side have the benefit of the rules of the House, and the rule is that Mr. Chairman leave the Chair, call the Speaker, and the question is put by the Speaker and put without debate.

Mr. INGRAM. I was just going to draw the attention of the House to a later decision than that of 1896. Last session——

The PRIME MINISTER. The debate should not take place now.

Mr. INGRAM. I just wish to call attention to this precedent. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), who occupied the position as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole gave an outrageous decision, and the decision was appealed against and the Speaker was called in. The result was——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Speaker pointed out that it was irregular and that there could be no appeal from the Speaker to the Speaker.

Mr. INGRAM. At any rate, he decided against the hon. member for Kent.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), if he desires to have the Speaker called in, should have called for some action on the part of the House declaring that it is expedient to have the question referred to the Speaker. The procedure he has taken would involve a conflict under the rules between the Speaker and the Chairman of the committee, and there is no parliamentary rule calling for such a conflict. He should have asked the House to call in the Speaker and get his ruling.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is clear that, as he has asked the Chairman for a ruling and is unwilling to accept that ruling, his appeal is to the House. I refer to rule 76:

Questions of order arising in Committee of the Whole House shall be decided by the chairman, subjected to an appeal——

Not to the Speaker, as my hon. friend says, but—

——to the House.

I understand that is exactly what we are doing under my hon. friend's motion.

The committee rose, and the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Brodeur) took the Chair.

Mr. FLINT reported from the Committee of the Whole.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has no right——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Yarmouth has no right to act in any official position in this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Flint reports from the Committee of the Whole certain resolutions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I beg to call your attention——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I beg to call your attention to the fact that Mr. Flint did nothing of the kind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER—and reports a certain question laid before the committee. On motion of Sir (Charles Hibbert Tupper) the committee has risen to have this question decided by the Speaker.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I respectfully say that Mr. Flint did not sit in the committee as Chairman, and made no report to the Speaker in the words you have given.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have a right to protest against an irregular proceeding.

Mr. BERGERON. This is ridiculous, to appeal to the same man.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the appeal is to the House. The point of order was taken——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am stating a point of order——

Sir CHARLES HIBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order, interrupting the Prime Minister, as my right is. I question your right, Sir, to sit in the Chair. There has been an appeal made and the committee has asked the Chairman of the committee to report to the Speaker the decision given by yourself as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and I deny your right at the present moment to occupy the Chair, and claim the right to have the appeal decided with the Speaker in the House of Commons and that without debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say, Mr. Speaker has no point of order to decide; the appeal is not to the Speaker but to the House. The Minister of Railways made a speech the other day in which it is stated that he quoted from a document. The Chairman of the committee ruled that he did not understand that the Minister had quoted from a document, but even if he had the point of order should have been taken at the time, and that it was now too late to raise it. The appeal is from that ruling, and that appeal is to the House and not to the Speaker.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has no right to do

what he is doing now. He knows this is not the procedure. The Chairman of the committee should report to the Speaker himself, not to the Prime Minister or anybody else, and he has not the right to say a word upon it. It is a matter to be dealt with by the Chairman of the Committee reporting to the Speaker himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let Mr. Speaker decide.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not the Mr. Speaker.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is, under the circumstances.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have been acting as Chairman of the committee, and I understand that I am now acting as Speaker of the House. I was asked by Mr. Speaker to take the Chair in his absence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will you rule on the question raised by me that you cannot rule on the question, that this matter cannot come before you as you stand, that you yourself were Chairman of the committee and cannot report to yourself ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is the point I have just decided.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). May I address myself to the point of order ? The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is astray. This question was threshed out in 1885. The Speaker has nothing to do with it but to take the Chair and put the point of order in the House. It is not a question of what his opinion is ; he is not asked for a ruling. He puts the question, and puts it without debate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My point of order is that the time has not come when the House can decide this point, because there must be a report from you individually to some one occupying the position of Speaker, that it is impossible for you to put this question to the House as you yourself sat as Chairman of the committee, and before the question could be put before the House, you, as Chairman of the committee, must report to some other individual who is the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the point of order just raised by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is well taken. The Speaker and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole are two persons, but, in the absence of Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker is to take the Chair. And now the Deputy Speaker, who is filling the Chair of the Speaker is acting as Speaker.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I desire to appeal to the House on that ruling. I would not take the responsibility of not appealing.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have another appeal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My hon. friend will permit me to close my remarks. There is a report made, not by the general Chairman of the committees, but by Mr. Flint, who has been called by the Chairman of the Committees to fill the place of Chairman of the Committees, a power which the Chairman of the Committees has a perfect right to exercise. Now, on the point of order from which appeal has been made to the Speaker, I have only this ruling to make, that the question as to the production of the document under discussion came before this House several days ago, and as the point of order was not taken at the time, I consider that it cannot be taken now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the House that has to decide it, as in 1885 when the Speaker took the Chair. You a moment ago were Deputy Speaker, you are now the Speaker ; but because you transformed yourself in a moment from the Deputy Speaker to Speaker, it does not give you a right as Speaker to decide this question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The members will now be called in to express their opinion.

The members having been called in,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In Committee of the Whole the point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to the effect that the Minister of Railways and Canals, in his speech delivered on the 1st of June, referred to a certain document prepared by the officers of his department, and the hon. member for Pictou raised the point of order that this document should now be laid on the Table. The Chairman of the Committee being requested to give his ruling on the question, decided that the point of order was not well taken, because, amongst other reasons, it should have been raised on the 1st of June, when reference was made to that document. Appeal has now been taken to this House from that decision. The question is as follows : "That the decision of the Chairman of Committee be confirmed." Those who are in favour of the opinion will please rise.

House divided.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Lewis,
Bazinet,	Macdonell,
Belth,	Mackie,
Bell (Prince, East),	McCarthy,
Blair,	McClure,
Bostock,	McGregor,
Bourassa,	McHugh,
Bourbonnais,	McIsaac,

Brown,	McMillan,
Burnett,	McMullen,
Calvert,	Madore,
Campbell,	Malouin,
Casey,	Marcil,
Copp,	Martineau,
Costigan,	Meigs,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mignault,
Dupré,	Morrison,
Ellis,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Pettet,
Fielding,	Richardson,
Fisher,	Rinfret,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Rogers,
Fraser (Lambton),	Russell,
Godbout,	Rutherford,
Haley,	Savard,
Holmes,	Scriver,
Hurley,	Semple,
Johnston,	Sifton,
Joly de Lotbinière, (Sir Henri),	Snetsinger,
Landerkin,	Stenson,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Stubbs,
Lavergne,	Sutherland, and
	Turcot.—65.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Marcotte,
Bennett,	Morin,
Borden (Halifax),	Pope,
Clancy,	Reid,
Foster,	Sproule,
Ganong,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Hughes,	Hibbert),
Kaulbach,	Wallace, and
LaRivière,	Wilson.—20.
McLennan (Glengarry),	

Decision of the Chairman of Committees confirmed.

Mr. BERGERON. I paired with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). Had I voted I would have voted against the decision.

Mr. FLINT. I paired with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). Had I voted I would have voted to sustain the Chair.

Mr. BRITTON. I paired with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). Had I voted, I would have voted to sustain the Chair.

Mr. PARMALEE. I paired with the hon. member for Toronto West. Had I voted, I would have voted to sustain the Chair.

Mr. EARLE. I paired with the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville) ; otherwise I would have voted against the decision of the Chair.

Mr. INGRAM. I paired with the hon. member for North Middlesex (Mr. Ratz) ; otherwise I would have voted against the Chair.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I paired with one of the members for Hamilton ; otherwise I would have voted against the decision.

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). When about two years ago the country was startled with the announcement that the Government intended to enter into the arrangement that was then broached for the Drummond County Railway extension, it was regarded almost as a jest, not only by the Conservative press, but by the Liberal press. The " Globe " on more than one occasion had announced that the policy of taking the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal would not be judicious legislation. Later on, the Montreal " Witness," which is a very strong Liberal paper, on the 12th of June, 1897, made this remark in connection with the extension of the Intercolonial Railway :

> The extension of the Intercolonial Railway seems of doubtful policy, and to create an annual charge of $210,000 a year seems unwise in view of the fact that there is no public demand for such an extension.

So it will be seen that two years ago, when the proposition was first announced, the public were taken with amazement that any Government should entertain such a proposition. I need not review the lengthy discussion which took place two years ago. On that occasion the Bill passed by one of those remarkable majorities in this House, an evidence of which has been displayed to-night, automatic, mechanical or whatever you might like to term it. But happily for the benefit of the country as a whole, there is another assembly in this country which acts as a safety valve and a check on public expenditure. I was trying to hear myself, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. As I was remarking, fortunately for the country, there is a second Chamber, or a Senate, and, when the Senate, in the interest of the country as a whole, saw fit to interpose and summarily throw out the then Bill, the hon. gentlemen were not sufficiently strong in their position to do that which the Government, under all ordinary circumstances, should have done. Here was a strong Government, with a large majority in the House, two years ago, that had based its political future on a certain line of policy ; here was a Government, having committed itself to a policy which was endorsed by a large majority in the popular Chamber—although I am pleased to say, that on that occasion there were certain members on that side of the House who could not swallow the pill, and who, therefore, voted against that policy. I trust that on this occasion the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) and the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers), both of whom on that occasion placed their votes against the Government, will again so record their votes. It was the right and privilege of the Government to have appealed to the great electorate and see whether the Dominion would en-

dorse the scheme and place on the shoulders of the tax-payers a payment of upwards of $7,000,000. The Government did not see fit to undertake such a grave responsibility, knowing full well that the people would not endorse such a proposition, and so they made the temporary arrangement which has been in force for the past year or two. What has been the result of that arrangement, which has been in force for the past year or two? We know that, in past years, deficits have occurred on the Intercolonial Railway, and that this year a large deficit has occurred, although, when the hon. Minister of Railways took charge of the department, he found that in the year before, instead of there being a deficit, there was a surplus to the credit of this railway. There cannot be a doubt that, if his office were managed at all on ordinary business principles, the Minister would be able to show the House and the country the true position of affairs, and whether or not the deficit that has been caused—and it was a large deficit—was due to the taking over of this Drummond County branch. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that there has been in the past large deficits in this connection. Now, the Government permitted last year to pass without introducing a similar proposition to this. However, there is now a proposition made to Parliament on the same terms as the former proposition, although the payment that is to be made to the Drummond County Railway Company is less by $10,000 than on the former occasion. I was surprised to see this proposition introduced this year, because I had looked forward to a proposition being introduced on the lines of that announced by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals at Halifax, in January last. I recall to my recollection having read, in the month of January last, a letter published by the Toronto "Globe," over the signature of the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). In that letter, the hon. member referred to the fact that the extension of the Intercolonial into Montreal had proved a miserable failure, and would inevitably prove a miserable failure; and, in proving his contention, he instanced the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had lately appeared in Halifax and addressed a meeting at the Board of Trade. The hon. junior member for Halifax reported that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had set forth very good reasons and made a good case as to the failure of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal. I am not able to use the exact words in the letter, which was a very lengthy epistle, but the most important part of it was that in which the hon. gentleman referred to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. He said, that the hon. Minister had stated in the city of Halifax that, under the present arrangement, nothing but a miserable failure could be brought about. The hon. Minister confined himself to this position on the extension into Montreal: He approaches a consignor over the Grand Trunk Railway who has goods for shipment to the ocean. These goods are brought by the Grand Trunk from western Ontario or from the western provinces. When the Intercolonial people make advances to that Grand Trunk shipper, and ask that he should transfer his freight from the Grand Trunk to the Intercolonial, he is at at once met with the statement: We would prefer to carry our carload of freight to Portland, which is a very considerable distance shorter than to take it by way of the Intercolonial Railway and Lévis to St. John. Then, he said, after they meet with failure with the Grand Trunk consignor, they turn to the consignor by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who says: I am not going to transfer my freight from the Canadian Pacific car and have the Intercolonial Railway carry it to St. John. In this connection, it would not be inappropriate to show the distance between these different points, and to show the disadvantage under which the Intercolonial, with its Drummond County connection, will suffer. From Montreal to St. John, by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is 480 miles. From Montreal to St. John, by way of the Intercolonial, it is 740 miles, while from Montreal to Portland, by way of the Grand Trunk, it is 297 miles. So that there cannot be very much expected to be carried over the Drummond County extension of the Intercolonial Railway in preference to the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk. What is the result? The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has stated, according to the hon. junior member for Halifax, that this is the dilemma that they are in. There is only one thing, the hon. Minister says, that we can do, and that is to have a line of communication from Montreal to some point on the western Ontario lakes, and he went on to point out, according to this letter, that the Canadian Pacific Railway were moving immense quantities of grain from Owen Sound to Montreal, and that the grain output of Manitoba would be very greatly increased in the future. He then pointed out that the Grand Trunk Railway were moving millions of bushels of grain, and that, if we are to do the business they wished to do, the only way they could do it would be by having a connection with the Parry Sound road, running from Ottawa to Montreal, and from Ottawa back to Parry Sound. When I saw this letter of the hon. member (Mr. Russell) I assumed he was doing a little preliminary tooting for the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), and that we would see this session, the greater proposition announced by the Government, to purchase the Booth line from Montreal to Parry Sound. We know that the present Government has a habit of introducing schemes of the most startling magnitude, involving huge expenditures, in the dying hours of the session, and so I

would not be surprised to see the Government come along with a proposition at the end of the session to purchase the Parry Sound road. There has been a good deal of correspondence in the newspapers on this subject, and as we know the Minister (Mr. Blair), when he puts his hand to the plough, never looks back, I believe that he will carry out his announcement made in Halifax, and spend millions of dollars in acquiring the Booth line. I believe myself that the Minister (Mr. Blair) was right when he pointed out to the Halifax Board of Trade, that the lamentable failure that had overtaken the Intercolonial Railway, even in this year of prosperity, was not his fault, and when he told them that the only way to overcome the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway was to buy out the Booth system, and with a terminus on the waters of Lake Huron, become a competitor with the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railways for the grain trade of the west. I am surprised that the Minister has not yet propounded that scheme to the House. We have had different views on the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. The Montreal "Witness" announced that as a business proposition it would be a mistake, and the "Globe" decried it altogether. First and foremost, the business sentiment of the country, irrespective of political leanings, was averse to this project, which, perhaps, with a decrease in the cost, is the same proposition that was before the House two years ago. The public viewed the matter with suspicion and distrust to such an extent, that when the Bill was rejected by the Senate, the Government was afraid, as was their constitutional duty, to appeal to the public. So, in the case of the Yukon deal, they were also afraid to make an appeal to the electorate, because they knew the country was against them.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Mr. Chairman, I draw attention to the fact that there is not a quorum in the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will have to take the Chair.

And Mr. Deputy Speaker having taken the Chair, he announced that there was a quorum of the House present.

And the House having resumed in committee,

Mr. BENNETT. I have to thank the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), for he has certainly brought me in a larger audience, and I trust it will be equally appreciative of my remarks as the few who did me the honour of listening before attention was called to the fact that there was no quorum. Two years ago the public regarded this proposition with distrust, and the reason, to some extent, was that this gigantic scheme was launched, not under the protecting wing of the Minister of Railways, but under the protection of the Minister of Public Works. There was a chain of circumstances revealed in connection with the Minister of Public Works' interest in this matter which caused the public to regard the Bill with more than ordinary distrust. I need not dwell upon the statements of the Minister (Mr. Tarte), upon the letters which he wrote in the press, or upon his sworn testimony. Suffice it to say, that no two of them agreed, and this was an additional reason for distrust in the public mind. According to the Montreal "Star," this road has been hawked around the country for $400,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. BENNETT. Just a moment; I am waiting for the chairman to decide who has the floor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have as much right to be here as you have.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not ask the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) to lecture me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. To resume the question why this contract was made, this railway, as was stated by the Montreal "Star," had been offered for $400,000, and I think the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) stated that he had in his possession for some time an option upon it for $500,000. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) stated time and again that parties had approached him when he was Minister of Railways and Canals in reference to the sale of the railway. The debates that were taking place from time to time on this question showed clearly that this Drummond County Railway was not of anything like the value the Government of the day were proposing to give for it. Moreover, it was established that the railway was simply for taking out timber, cordwood and tanbark, and its total receipts were so trifling, compared with its expenditure, that it only showed a cash profit of some $20,000 a year. Yet, in the face of these facts, the Government were proposing to make this enormous expenditure for this railway. Any thoughtful business man would be at once struck with the idea that if this railway could only make a bare pittance from the carrying of lumber, cordwood and tanbark, as the passenger traffic was only trifling, when the forests were depleted, the earnings of the railway would practically cease. Then, it was well-known that Mr. Greenshields, the practical owner of this railway, had become possessed of it at a cost that would bear no comparison with what the Government were paying for it; and from Mr. Greenshields' political position there was at once engendered in the minds of the public a good deal of suspicion and distrust. If the Minister of Railways and Canals had to do with the matter himself, he would have disarmed a great deal of this suspicion; but the

fact that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) had been steering the deal from its inception, caused the public to look at it with a more than doubtful eye, for the Minister of Public Works is practically the master of this Administration. We heard him say so in so many words at the opening of the session, when he stated that if he were desired to place his portfolio in the hand of the First Minister, he was ready to do so at any time; but he added that no Government should be too sure of its position, as men had brought about the downfall of Governments—a clear intimation that if the Government turned him out of his portfolio, he would take a hand in turning some other people out of their portfolios. Then, this matter came into the hands of the hon. Minister of Railways, and he had to deal with it. What was the proposition? On the 2nd of February, 1897, Mr. Schreiber was sent down to look over this Drummond County Railway. Fancy a business man proposing to make an expenditure involving some millions of dollars for a railway, going to look at it in the month of February, when there would be three or four feet of snow on the ground. There were other ingredients in the proposition. We find that on the 25th of March the House was called for busines, and it was to be expected that on a proposition involving such a large expenditure of money, the Government would have taken its own friends into its confidence; but for reasons best known to themselves, they did not see fit to do so. The day before Parliament met, reference to the dates will show, on the 24th of March, the Order in Council was passed, which authorized the Minister of Railways to go into the bargain. Then the House met, and it was not until the 15th of May that the contract with the Drummond County Railway was signed. If it was a business proposition, and one that the Government would commend to their friends, why this delay in signing the contract? But there were more suspicious circumstances than that. It was not until the 11th of June that the contract was brought down and shown to the House. Here was the House meeting in March, and here was a proposition involving millions of dollars; and the Government allow three or four months to pass before they let their supporters see the contract they are entering into. It was not until the 11th of June, in the dying days of the session, that the contract was brought down. But there were more startling things connected with it than that. When the proposition was first heard by the House on the 11th of June, the Minister of Railways and Canals could not make his own followers toe the mark on the statements he had then received; for we find that on the 14th, the 15th and the 16th of June, he was despatching officials from his department to make reports upon this railway. There was

the position of this Bill in 1897, with all these suspicious ingredients incorporated into it, and though it passed by a majority of this House, only two supporters of the Government voting against it, it was summarily rejected by the Senate, and the Government did not dare take the manly course of appealing from the Senate to the people, for the very good reason that they felt they had not popular opinion at their back.

Turn to the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway had their railway running, and their terminals in the city of Montreal, and their bridge across the St. Lawrence, and it is only as business men that they were prepared to accept the best proposition this Government were prepared to make; and, surely, the representatives of the company would have been very remiss in their duty, had they not accepted this very profitable proposition which the Government made them. So, to-day the Grand Trunk Railway are quite willing to go on with the proposition, as it is now before the country. Placing the two contracts side by side, we find that there has been an improvement, to some extent, on the Drummond County Railway deal, but very little difference in the Grand Trunk Railway deal. The grant of $300,000, taken two years ago, towards the Victoria bridge, was made last year by the House, and there is to be a use of the terminals and the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway, as agreed upon two years ago. But there has been a saving of $10,000 per mile in the bargain with the Drummond County Railway. It has been estimated that the saving in this respect and by some other arrangements that have been made, will be between $400,000 and $500,000, and even a larger amount; but it is quite evident that the Government were prepared, two years ago, to accept a proposition which, by the lapse of two years, they have bettered by at least $500,000 to $600,000, and perhaps a longer discussion in this House would lead to a better arrangement and a still greater saving.

A great many adverse statements have been made relative to the proposition. It has been argued by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), from the standpoint of a practical contractor, that the Government are not making an advantageous proposition, but that it would rather be to their advantage to undertake the construction of a road themselves; and it has been pointed out that the question of terminals might easily be arranged in Montreal, owing to the fact that the Government are owners of valuable property there, adapted to the purposes of stations. It has also been argued that such a road could be constructed in a line of country well adapted for railway building, that rock cuttings might be avoided, that many bridges are not required, and that, on the whole, the cost would be about that of building a cheap railway on the prairie. Against this

proposition the Minister of Railways made a very strong speech, in which he argued that the purchase of the right of way would be very expensive. I fear, however, that he has been rather imposed upon by some person, because that argument has been exploded, and, instead of all these town sites and populous villages through which, he said this suggested railway would have to pass, it has been shown that there is but one town site of any value, and that the thriving, populous villages have dwindled down to cross-road villages, so that, practically, the cost of the right of way would be simply that of ordinary farm lands.

The Minister of Railways further declared that very expensive bridges would be required, and, in proof of this statement, he referred to certain estimates made by his engineers. I, of course, have no local knowledge of the facts, but hon. gentlemen in this House who are conversant with the locality, have given estimates which vary very much from one another, and the result is, that we must be left in the dark until we have placed on the Table these statements and estimates of the hon. gentleman's engineers. I have always considered that the engineers and all officials of this country, who are paid by the people, should give their services for the benefit of the people. As he regards these figures as buttressing and strengthening the position he has taken, it would be better in his own interest to lay the statement of his engineer before the House. There can be no doubt that in no uncertain terms the Minister made the statement that his engineer was possessed of the information as to the estimated cost. There is great diversity of opinion as to the cost of these bridges and as to the nature of the rivers to be crossed. Some hon. gentlemen represent the rivers as shallow, offering natural foundations for the abutments, while others say that the rivers are deep and that the expenditure for briding would be large. Be that as it may, the Minister has stated that he has estimates of the probable cost, and if the House is to judge of the question, they should have those estimates also. But the hon. Minister of Railways and the Premier say this has nothing to do with the proposition before the committee. We can hardly decide upon the point until we know what the cost will be. It is true, under this arrangement we are to get from the Grand Trunk certain privileges in the city of Montreal, and it is true that we cannot expect to fix the price for that ourselves. But we have engineers in the department and we have a Minister at the head of the department, and if we have placed before the House an estimate of the cost of the alternate lines including the bridges we can better decide whether we should accept the proposition of the Grand Trunk. Another good point which has been well urged by the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), is that having regard to the large expenditure and the dismal failure of the two years' operation of this road, it would be better not to commit ourselves further but to continue the temporary arrangement. The Minister himself tells us that this scheme is an absurdity on the face of it. He so declared in the city of Halifax. He said that the Government could not but lose money by it, and that the cure for it was the purchase of Mr. Booth's line from Montreal to Parry Sound on the Georgian Bay. Under the present proposed arrangement the Government will be committed to an expenditure of $7,000,000, and the purchase of Mr. Booth's line will run into millions more. You then have a line from Georgian Bay to Montreal to carry the grain coming down the lakes. But you have the Prime Minister declaring that he is giving his best consideration to a proposition to build a canal, which if it is built will carry all the grain from the North-west country, thus damaging the very route which will only be provided at such heavy expense. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated that we should have 14 feet of water in the St. Lawrence Canal, and that he trusted there would be a great increase in the grain carrying trade by the St. Lawrence route, that all that was needed was increased facilities for handling this trade at Montreal. And, if the hon. Minister carried out the proposal which, according to a letter written by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) he made, he will have the St. Lawrence canals competing with this line. In view of the possibility of this immense expenditure and its results would it not be better for the Government to think twice before embarking upon it, and instead of committing the country to a contract for 99 years to continue for some time longer the temporary arrangements that they already have. I recollect that when the Minister of Railways and Canals placed this contract on the Table two years ago, some demurrers were made to it, I think, by even gentlemen on that side of the House. It was suggested that some changes should be made. But the Minister declared that the contract was like the laws of the Medes and Persians, you could not change anything in it; it was a question of take it or leave it. When the Bill went over to the Senate, these hon. gentleman got rebuked there by a gentleman that they continually parade before the people of Ontario as one of the financial giants of the country, and as one of the bulwarks of the great Liberal party. Speaking in the Senate, Senator Cox stated that the arrangement was an absurdity on the face of it in respect to the payment of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of 5 per cent on all improvements. More than that, Senator Cox said: What I think should be done with this contract is this: we should sit down at a table as business men and see where we can improve it. That was good advice, I believe. Now, Sir, the advice of Senator Cox two years ago is just as applicable now as

it was then. A great deal has been said in respect to this whole question of the Drummond County Railway extension by the Liberal press of the country, who have claimed that the Government were amply vindicated in this matter by the inquiry that was held last year before a committee. Well, Sir, that inquiry was not to determine the question of whether this was a good business proposition, that was not the question discussed at all. The question before the committee was altogether of a different nature, and when these hon. gentlemen or the Liberal press point to the findings of that committee there is not a word in justification of this proposition as a business proposition. The time will come when the people will see, if this bargain is carried out, what their experience will be, and if the experience of the next few years, assuming that the line is to be purchased by the country, and assuming that the line is to be similar to what it has been, then it will indeed be a sad one. But it will be a sadder one if we are linked irrevocably to a bargain for 99 years, and if the Senate were so strongly justified in the position they took two years ago in vetoing this Bill, it seems to me that these hon. gentlemen surely must be courting defeat in the Senate in acting in that arbitrary manner in which they are acting to-day.

Surely the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals cannot but expect an adverse verdict on the part of that body, because I presume, the Government will assume after their experience of two years ago that the Senate will not take kindly to this proposition. If the Senate does not demand the information that the hon. Minister claims is in the possession of his officials, as strongly as it is now demanded, I will be very much surprised. I regret, at this early hour to have detained the committee to the length to which I have detained it. I should have preferred to have addressed the members of the committee at a more reasonable hour, but since the Prime Minister has announced that, if any hon. gentleman is to open his mouth on this question it must be done at this unseemly hour, I have taken the advantage of the opportunity of expressing my views upon it. I shall vote against the Bill. Since we had this proposition before us two years ago I have addressed a number of meetings in my own constituency, and whenever I referred to this question of this Drummond County extension, I was endorsed, almost as strongly, I was going to say, as I was endorsed for my vote on the Yukon Bill. I will admit that the Yukon Bill is a much more unpopular measure than this. Should I be a candidate again I shall take advantage of the opportunity of discussing this proposition which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated in January last, if the hon. junior member for Halifax correctly reported him in the newspaper, that it would always be as it had been for the past two years, a sinkhole for the money of the people of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the hon. Minister's explanation as to the basis upon which he came to the conclusion to give $140,000 as rental. There must have been some basis upon which my hon. friend went, and, so far as I am concerned, I have not heard this explained. I think the hon. gentleman will feel it to be a part of his duty to explain to the committee how he came to hit upon the sum of $140,000, or upon what estimate or basis he came to the conclusion that that would be fair rental ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The answer to the hon. gentleman is that $140,000 was not hit upon as he describes it. The amount that was asked by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the first instance was larger, and as the result of negotiations on this proposition it was reduced, and we ultimately settled on $140,000. At the outset of the negotiations the Grand Trunk had put values upon the several sections of their system which we proposed to lease, and at a certain point of the negotiations the Grand Trunk came down to the amount which we concluded would be a reasonable and fair one to pay for the privileges and rights that we obtained. As I have said, not once, but many times, we recognized that the Grand Trunk were not very far astray in the value which they placed upon the station privileges and terminals in Montreal. I laid before the committee, which investigated this matter, the figures and estimates and papers furnished to me by the Chief Engineer who was interrogated in respect to these figures and the sum which he himself had concluded was a reasonable amount to pay was very close to the amount which the Grand Trunk had decided to accept. When it came to the question of the use of the bridge——

Mr. FOSTER. How much was it proposed to pay for the terminals ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As I have said, over and over again, we did not agree upon a total amount of $140,000 as the result of any fixed value upon the different portions. The Grand Trunk, as I have already said, more in detail placed a value of $50,000 upon the use of the bridge ; they placed a value of $37,500 on the basis of an interest rate of 5 per cent on one-half the value of their lines from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. I think this statement of the Grand Trunk was submitted to that committee, as will appear by reference to the record, and there was a reduction made from these figures. We might apply that reduction to the bridge, we might apply it to the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, but we will find that it is not a very material consideration, I should say. The estimate of the officers of the Department of Railways was in excess of that of the Grand

Trunk Railway with reference to the bridge. It was close to the sum which the Grand Trunk itself placed upon its terminal value. and they accepted the value which is placed upon the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert by the Grand Trunk Railway. The total amounts added together which were proposed by the Grand Trunk Railway were reduced, and whether you apply that reduction to one of these sections or the other, is not material. We fixed $140,000 a year as the gross rental.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has not given the House the basis on which they fixed the $140,000, and it is not likely that any two men would sit down and canvas a lump sum between them as to what should be paid each year. It could not be done in that way. There must be some attempt at valuation as to the properties, and that is what the House does not know. This committee of the House is entirely independent of the Drummond County Railway Special Committee. This committee is proposing to pass this Act, based upon an agreement, and the Minister has a right to tell us upon what basis he came to the conclusion that $140,000, in all, should be the rental for these three franchises. He says, that these three franchises are not separated ; but in his speech he treated them as being separate. I suppose the $140,000 was in some way arrived at by a valuation of these different facilities, and then a percentage of rental fixed upon them. So far as the House is concerned, we have no estimate of that at all, and that we ought to have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to treat the request of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with every consideration, but I do not know whether he is serious or not. It would occur to me, that, after all I have said on the subject, he cannot be serious in asking me for a repetition of my statement. I have stated that the officers of the department, the chief engineer more particularly, advised me that the rental which was claimed by the Grand Trunk Railway in respect to the terminals and station privileges, was a reasonable amount, and he stated that under oath.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the basis on which he fixed it ? Surely, he did not just sit down and advise that for the terminals you should pay $50,000 or $60,000 a year. No man would do business in that way. I give the Minister himself credit that he would not do so. He, surely, must have some basis of valuation of the privileges he is getting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A week ago, I asked the Minister for information as to the proportion which the user of the Intercolonial Railway bears to that of the Grand Trunk Railway. I pointed out then that the material for that information must be in his possession, because for more than a year the Intercolonial Railway has been paying the cost of maintenance on the basis of proportion of user, and returns showing that proportion are made each month. The Minister (Mr. Blair) told me that he would give that information to the House, up to the last day on which a return had been received. I was absent for a couple of days, and it is possible the Minister may have done so, but, in looking over the "Hansard," I cannot see it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I brought down the return which I promised you, and it is in the possession of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister no answer to my question ?

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. When a member of this House asks a question, it cannot be disposed of by some one crying out : "Carried." I, for one, will not stand it, and it might as well be stopped now as later. It is simply brutish, and nothing else. These gentlemen will not gain anything by that. I stated here, and I state again, and the right hon. gentleman is bound to accept my statement, that I am not obstructing, but it is my right and I intend to criticise this as long as I think it necessary to criticise it. When the right hon. the Premier accused us, on this side of the House. of obstructing, he accused us of what is not true, and hon. gentlemen will not get far by meeting a demand for information with the cry "Carried."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has no cause to get excited. This is a free country, after all, and, even if there are some signs of impatience at three o'clock in the morning, there is no cause to wonder at that. It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is protesting in vain, when he says he is not obstructing. Even at this moment, if he will permit me to give him my mind, he is doing nothing else but obstructing. He is asking a question which has been answered over and over again. If he remembers a speech made by the Minister the other day, he will find his answer. I remember very well that, when the Minister (Mr. Blair) explained his policy and the reason why he was asking Parliament to vote that sum of money, he divided the road into three sections. The portion from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, then the privileges of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge and entrance, and then the terminals at Bonaventure. He estimated the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert at a certain sum which I now forget ; he said, we had a half interest in the road. He then gave his estimate of the bridge, and I remember very well, and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) cannot have forgotten, that, when the Minister came to deal with the privileges of the ter-

minals at the Bonaventure station, he said he could not value them in money. That is perfectly true. We can hardly estimate the facilities which appertain to Bonaventure station, and if you are to have your stations in the heart of the city of Montreal, at any place where it would be useful, you can hardly estimate its value. We would have to expropriate in the most valuable part of the city, and it would be impossible to do that for four or five or six million dollars. An expenditure of $6,000,000 or even $10,000,000 would not give us in the city of Montreal what we get by this contract. Suppose the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, the bridge and the terminal facilities would cost us $5,000,000, at 3 per cent, you would have to pay as much as a rental of $140.000 amounts to. Let my hon. friend apply his best judgment to this contract; let him take into consideration what we get, the entrance to Montreal, the use of the bridge and the facilities at Montreal, and let him figure if he can what that represents in capital. Why, Sir, at the rate we are paying, we are getting these on the cheapest possible terms. No such contract was ever made at such value to the country. Does the hon. gentleman think that at 3 per cent we could get for $5,000,000 what we are now getting? We could not get them for $10,000,000. It seems to me that in that fact alone the hon. gentleman has an answer.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman think he gets for the $140,000 paid as rent.

The PRIME MINISTER. We get, in the first place, half the ownership of the railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert.

Mr. FOSTER. In 99 years will you have any of that railway at all? Do you get the ownership of a single foot of the railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, we will stop paying the $140.000.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you talk about having the ownership of one-half of all these things, when you do not have them at all? You are simply paying rent.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say we have a joint ownership. The hon. gentleman says we have not because the ownership is terminable. If the hon. gentleman asks the hon. member for Halifax, he will tell him that it is a terminable ownership, but so long as it exists we have the half ownership of the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. The hon. gentleman takes exception to the terms, but I maintain my position just the same. Then, we have the entrance to Montreal by the Victoria bridge, and we have the use of the terminal facilities at Montreal. This is what we get for $140,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why does my hon. friend come forward with a certain clause of the agreement by which it is covenanted that he has to pay in proportion to every wheel that turns?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). We pay upon that basis for the keeping up of the track. It is one thing to buy the property, and another thing to maintain and preserve it, to keep it in repair, so that it will be safe in operating. It is one thing to own the road, and another thing to pay for station officers and trackmen. After that we distribute the cost on the basis of the business done, which can only be accurately ascertained on the basis of wheelage. The Grand Trunk pay their proportion. If they are doing 60 per cent or 75 per cent of the business, they pay 60 per cent or 75 per cent of the cost of employees, trackmen, ballasting and repairing of all kinds. That is what that means. I put it to the hon. gentleman whether, after all, the Government is not in a very much better position to be paying rental, representing their interest in the value of the property, rather than to have paid the principal money and have no interest to pay? We can terminate the arrangement if we choose at the expiration of the lease, if conditions are such that it is not desirable to continue it. All we pay is a fair rental for the use of it. We have not expended capital in its acquisition.

Mr. BERGERON. How many trains a day can you run in and out of Bonaventure station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman, but we can run in and out more trains than are now running or are likely to run for many years to come. There is no limit to our trains. We can run as many as our business calls for. We have as full, ample and complete a user of the bridge and terminals as the Grand Trunk itself.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that specified in the contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is sufficiently provided in the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Suppose that for one reason or another the Government finds that in running the Intercolonial to Montreal the deficit is larger than before, and they find it desirable to discontinue it, would they have to pay the $140,000 a year all the same?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not proposing to trifle or play with the thing. We are proposing to continue the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, not to terminate it.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman surely understands what I mean. I understand that the result may be worse in the first year than afterwards; but there is a deficit of over $200,000, and there are many roads running to Montreal. If the deficit

should increase, and the Government should come to the conclusion that the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal is detrimental, and decided to stop it, would they be bound to pay the $140,000 a year, or could they stop it at any time they desired ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no option under the lease to terminate it at our pleasure, nor have the Grand Trunk. It can only be terminated by the consent of both parties. I trust that my hon. friend has not lost sight of the explanations that have been given with reference to the result of last year. He speaks of there being a larger deficit. I have explained to the committee how the deficit of last year arose.

Mr. BERGERON. I know the explanations which the hon. gentleman gave, and I accept them. But we do not know what the future has in store ; and if it became desirable to stop these arrangements, I want to know whether we would then have to pay the $140,000 a year. There is no danger about the Grand Trunk Railway not fulfilling their obligations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is just as much danger of the Grand Trunk Railway desiring to terminate the arrangement as the Government. This is an arrangement mutually advantageous. My hon. friend speaks of the South Shore Railway, as though, in the event of that being constructed, it would operate in some way prejudicially to the Intercolonial Railway under the existing arrangement. I cannot see that. If the South Shore Railway should be built, it will not be operated in competition with the Intercolonial. I do not know where the competition could come in. We have, along the Drummond County line, a business which belongs to that line, and which cannot be captured by the South Shore.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the South Shore not parallel it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but a good many miles off. It will parallel it a distance which will not enable it to compete successfully with even the local traffic upon the Intercolonial Railway or the Montreal extension.

Mr. CLANCY. If, on general principles, that Drummond County road is exempt from the competition that takes place on all parallel lines throughout the world, what is there that exempts it from the general law ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If he can point me to a case precisely similar, I will say that there is no reason why such a case would not have exactly the same results. We occupy an exceptional position with respect to this piece of road. We have at the end of the extension at Lévis a long mileage of the Intercolonial Railway, and at the other end the Grand Trunk Railway mileage. Now, a small piece of road that may be run in between St. Lambert on the one hand and the Chaudière on the other, will only be in a position to take up just such business as arises on its own line. It cannot hope to carry any traffic for delivery upon the Intercolonial Railway or at either end, unless it is going to some extreme point beyond, and unless it directly arises locally upon its own road. The extension to Montreal has not been acquired from any point of view as a local road, although I think that the business which we have had to date upon it is not to be despised. But it is not, from the standpoint of local traffic that the policy can be justified. It is because the road becomes a feeder and gives to the Government the control of a larger measure of through business, which otherwise it could never hope to do. Even the Grand Trunk Railway line, going around by Richmond to the Chaudière, is not in competition with the Intercolonial Railway. It does not carry one pound of freight from Montreal to the Chaudière for delivery to the Intercolonial destined to points beyond and on the Intercolonial Railway. It is simply by reason of the arrangement we have entered into that they have gone out of the business of carrying freight from Montreal for delivery on any point of the Intercolonial Railway. We carry it. We not only, under contract with the Grand Trunk Railway, get all the western business, which is destined for points on the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal, but we get all the local business which arises in the city of Montreal, and is intended for points on the Intercolonial Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway cannot carry goods which may be shipped by business men in Montreal by their line and delivered to us at Chaudière or Lévis, because, under their contract, they are excluded from doing that and are bound to deliver to us at Montreal every pound of freight we have control over.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that the stipulation in the first agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess that the second traffic arrangement, which is an independent document altogether, makes our position somewhat better in that regard than it was in the first instance.

Mr. FOSTER. In how far ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot just define how far at the moment. There was some misunderstanding between us as to what our first contract meant when we began to operate, and as the result of the experience we had, and with the assistance which our temporary traffic manager, Mr. Harris, rendered us, versed as he was in the Intercolonial Railway and all the intricacies of that descrip-

tion of business, we were led to see where we could make ourselves stronger and safer in the interpretation that we were putting upon the original agreement. We have made it abundantly clear, and it is so regarded by the Grand Trunk Railway without dispute, that all the business, no matter on what portion of its western line, which is destined for any point upon the Intercolonial Railway east of the Chaudière, or for any point on our Montreal extension, which is not served directly by the Grand Trunk Railway, belongs to us.

Mr. BERGERON. And their freight must go straight by the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It comes to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal. It is delivered to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. And the cars are emptied from the one company to the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not empty cars unless in the case of package goods which require to be taken out. If it is a full carload, we take the Grand Trunk Railway car and take it down. They charge us car mileage, and we bring it back.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the difference then? In the first agreement the shipper had the control. Such shipments as were made west of Montreal to points east on the Intercolonial Railway, if the shipper indicated that they were to be delivered at Montreal, they were delivered there. But in the second agreement is it not a fact that that has been changed in this way, namely, that whereas the first agreement allowed the Grand Trunk Railway freight which originated with the Grand Trunk Railway, over which it had control, to be delivered at the furthest point, that is at Lévis, the stipulation in the second agreement is that all the freight that they control shall be delivered at Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that the difference between the two is not so well defined as the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to have the point clear, because I have a purpose in this, and my hon. friend ought to know what the two agreements are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the first agreement here, but I have the second.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire how the hon. Minister accounts for the fact that since this arrangement went into operation, the rates of freight for western shippers to points on the Intercolonial Railway are higher than we paid when the Grand Trunk Railway made its own arrangements and negotiated for freights to be delivered at points on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman assumes that to be the case.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know it to be the case, because I am a shipper to all these points, and I had a 55 cent rate to all points on the Intercolonial Railway. But this year that is cancelled, and our goods are costing us, because we have to prepay freight at all points, considerably more than under the old arrangement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is no increase in the tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know there is.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. Minister say that the people of Canada are getting better freight rates in consequence of carrying through this line from Lévis to Montreal ? When the hon. Minister introduced the scheme, the great object he claimed to have in view was—I do not say that I quote his exact words, but I give the substance of them, namely—to make the two sides of the Intercolonial Railway ledger balance. Will the hon. Minister say that the Intercolonial Railway will pay its way instead of having deficit after deficit as has been the case in so many former years of its history ? And if so will he go further and say that the freight rates will be lower ? If this latter element does not accompany the first, it will not be easy to see how this scheme is in the interest of the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is now three o'clock in the morning, and though I cannot say, perhaps, that we have done a good days work, we have done some work. We will commence with the first item at the next sitting of the House. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and the Committee rose and reported.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns I would ask my hon. friend what he proposes to go on with to-morrow—the same contentious subject ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The same non-contentious subject. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) may make it contentious, perhaps.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.05 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 7th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

W. J. CHRISTIE, INLAND REVENUE OFFICER AT WINNIPEG.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) moved that the evidence being taken in reference to the papers brought down to the House relating to the case of Mr. W. J. Christie, lately an officer in the Inland Revenue Department of Winnipeg, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, be printed day by day for the use of the members of the said committee, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

DISALLOWANCE OF STATUTES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). By command of His Excellency, I beg to lay on the Table certain documents relating to the disallowance of certain statutes passed by the legislature of British Columbia, and with the unanimous consent of the House, I beg to move that these papers be printed at once and the rule suspended.

Motion agreed to.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved that Bill (No. 89) relating to the Canada Life Insurance Company be withdrawn, and the fees paid thereon be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

Mr. GANONG moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 143) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, as respects the sale of fish. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to make the unit of measurement in the sale of fresh herring and sardines correspond with the unit of sale. It only affects probably the county from which I come, and seems to be an absolute necessity there. These fish are principally sold in the United States markets, and the buyers come to our fishermen to purchase them. The unit of sale in these two kind of fish has been what is known as a hogshead, but there is no unit of measurement for that hogshead; and as any hon. gentleman is aware who knows how these fish are handled at the weirs, it is impossible to measure the fish at the weirs in the hogshead. The hogshead is not used as a package in which the fish are sold, but simply as a standard of sale, and the fishermen have been in the habit of accepting what is known as five barrels to the hogshead, but we have no established size for these barrels, so that every time there is a purchase, difficulty arises as to the quantity the hogshead shall contain. All that this Bill provides is that a hogshead shall be the equivalent of five barrels containing twenty-five gallons each.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is very difficult to give an opinion on the measure proposed until it is in print. When it is, I shall submit it to the careful inspection of the officers of the department and see how far it is possible to meet the wishes of my hon. friend. I may say that the purpose of the law, in establishing a department of weights and measures, was to meet, as much as possible, the requirements of the public, and I do not think that in doing so we ought to indulge in too much red tape. Though it appears, at first sight, illogical to be amending all the time the Weights and Measures Act, we must always remember that the object of that law is, as much as possible, to fit the standards of measurement to suit commercial transactions and thus benefit the public in general. On the other hand, we must not be too much disposed to admit changes and thus run the risk of destroying the efforts made hitherto to unify our system. When the measure introduced by my hon. friend is printed, I shall be able, with the permission of the House, to discuss the question with him, and to draw the attention of the House to the advisability or inadvisability of adopting that measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—AMOUNTS ACCRUED TO GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amount has accrued to the Grand Trunk Railway Company since July 1st, 1898, to date, per month as the Intercolonial Railway's contribution to the cost of maintenance of the Chaudière and Montreal joint sections, including terminal facilities, and what has been paid per month?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The following amounts accrued to the Grand Trunk Railway Company since the 1st of July, 1898, as the Intercolonial Railway's proportion of cost of

maintenance of the Chaudière and Montreal joint sections, including terminal facilities :

1898—	
July	$2,336 66
August	1,900 74
September	1,888 08
October	1,521 78
November	2,000 08
December	1,071 52
1899—	
January	482 45
February	488 30
	$11,689 63

The account for March has been rendered by the Grand Trunk Railway and has been checked in Montreal by the Intercolonial auditor. Accounts for subsequent months not yet received from the Grand Trunk Rail way Company.

The payments on this account to the Grand Trunk are as follows. No payments wer made in July, August, September, Novem ber, Decemer or January :

In October	$8,006 29
February	4,087 92
March	3,702 85
April	3,071 60
May	970 75
Total	$19,839 41

The difference between the two totals, $8,-149.78, is payment on account of charges for last fiscal year, which charges had been under investigation.

THE QUEEN vs. COULOMBE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. What steps has the Government taken to enforce the conviction pronounced in the case of the Queen vs. Coulombe and others by Mr. Justice Chauveau, of Quebec ?

2. What instructions have been given by the Government in the matter, and how have such instructions been carried out ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). No special instructions have been given to enforce the conviction in the Queen and Coulombe case, but the agents of the department have general instructions to collect the amount of all judgments obtained.

CARS FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. What company or firm in the United States of America, since July 1st, 1897, have been building cars of any form or description for the Intercolonial Railway of Canada ?

2. Were the contracts given by tender ?

3. If so, to whom were tenders sent, and from whom were they received ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). This question was practically answered the other day. There may be some points, however, in which the question does not correspond, so I will read the answer again. 1. The Wagner Palace Company of Buffalo. 2. Yes, the contracts were given after tenders were invited. 3. The Pullman Company, Smith & Company and the Wagner Company were invited to tender. Before making a contract with the United States manufacturers, the department applied to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, Messrs. Crossen & Company, and Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Company for offers. The two last mentioned firms declined to take their order on the ground that orders they had then from the Intercolonial Railway were all they could fill within the time allowed. The first two mentioned companies would not undertake the work as their shops were overcrowded with their own work.

REPAIRS ON THE LEVIS-STE. FLAVIE DIVISION OF THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

Whether the Minister of Railways is aware that certain repairs on the Lévis-Ste. Flavie division of the Intercolonial Railway, instead of being executed at Rivière du Loup, are sent to Moncton, because there are not sufficient tools and hands at Rivière du Loup to execute the said repairs, the shop being taken up with the ordinary work of the road ?

If so, is it the intention of the Minister, notwithstanding the report of Mr. Johgins, to provide additional tools and a larger number of hands in order to retain at Rivière du Loup the work to which the shops there are entitled ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The main workshops of the Intercolonial Railway are at Moncton, and there are supplementary shops at Rivière du Loup and Halifax. Certain work can always be done to better advantage in the larger central shops at Moncton. There is fully as much work being done at the Rivière du Loup shop now, as in previous years, and there is no more work sent to Moncton from the Lévis and St. Flavie division than heretofore. 2. A steam hammer and a lathe have been asked for as additional tools to facilitate work at Rivière du Loup, but it is not the intention at present to employ additional hands at Rivière du Loup.

SALARIES OF EMPYOYEES OF INTERCOLONIAL AT RIVIERE DU LOUP SHOPS.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

Is the Minister of Railways aware that the best mechanics, engineers, turners, &c., employed in the shops of the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup are leaving the service because their pay is not proportioned to their work and their skill, and finding employment in the shops of the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway at higher wages ?

2. That the Mechanical Superintendent, Alex. Ouellet, has repeatedly urged the Department at Ottawa and at Moncton to raise the wages but that has always met a refusal ?

3. If so, is it the intention of the Minister to grant an increase of pay to the special employees mentioned ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The best mechanics are not leaving the shops at Rivière du Loup; only three machinists have left the Rivière du Loup shops during the last twelve months. It is not known where they went, but it is presumed that they expected to better their condition as men of all classes everywhere endeavour to do. 2. Foreman Ouellette has recommended, from time to time, an increase of wages for some of the men under him in the same way as other foremen make these recommendations from time to time to the mechanical superintendent, and the latter has dealt with Foreman Ouellette's recommendations in the same way as he deals with the others. There are continual applications from all parts of the line for increase of pay, and it is only occasionally that such requests can be granted. 3. It is not intended to make any general raise of pay at Rivière du Loup, as the men are receiving fair wages for the work performed, but each case as it arises will be dealt with on its own merits.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TIME TABLE.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

When will the new summer time table for the Intercolonial Railway go into operation ?

Is the Hon. Minister aware that the Lightning Express is not to stop at Trois Pistoles as in past years ?

If so, will he issue orders that this central point, one of the most important in Témiscouata, shall enjoy the advantage of the fast trains as in the past ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is proposed to put the new time table in operation on the 19th of June instant. The through fast express train will stop at Trois Pistoles for passengers, but not for meals.

MACHINERY FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

Whether the Minister of Railways is aware that Mechanical Superintendent Ouellete of the Intercolonial Railway workshops has applied for a certain number of tools and machines, such as a steam hammer, shapers, &c., and that he has had no reply to his said applications ?

If so, is it the intention of the Minister to comply with the said applications ?

If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Minister of Railways is aware that Foreman Ouellette applied to the mechanical superintendent for a steam hammer and a lathe. The matter has received consideration, and the decision will be made known at an early day.

STEEL BOXES FOR THE INTERIOR OR INDIAN DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HODGINS (by Mr. Hughes) asked :

Were a number of steel boxes purchased for use of the Interior or Indian Departments during the past year ? If so, how many ? By whom were they supplied ? Were tenders called for by public advertisement, or by letter ? If by letter, how many parties were notified ? To whom was the order given ? Why were not tenders publicly invited ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The goods referred to were purchased by the Public Works Department, and I will have to ask my hon. friend to allow the question to stand over for a couple of days.

SPECIAL FISHERY GUARDIAN TO SUCCEED C. E. BOARDMAN.

Mr. GANONG asked :

Has any appointment been made to fill the position of special fishery guardian in place of the late C. E. Boardman, of Milltown, N.B. ? If so, who has been appointed, and by whom recommended ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No appointment has been made to the position held by Mr. Boardman. It is possible that the local fishery overseer may have appointed some one temporarily.

BARTH. BROWN, CAMPOBELLO, N.B.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Is Barth. Brown, of Campobello, N.B., at present in the employ of the Department of Fisheries ?

2. If not, when was he discharged, and for what reason ?

3. Who has been appointed in his place ?

4. On whose recommendation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. No. 2. On the 10th of May, 1899, for inefficiency. 3. Charles Savage. 4. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

JAMES GLASS, FISHERY GUARDIAN, CHARLOTTE, N.B.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. At what date was James Glass appointed special fishery guardian in Charlotte County, N.B. ?

2. On whose recommendation was he appointed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The records show that the employment of James Glass as special fishery guardian was authorized in July, 1889. The Fisheries Departmental files prior to that date were destroyed by the fire of 1897. 2. The then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the request of J. D. Chipman.

W. H. TRUEMAN, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked:

Has W. H. Trueman, barrister, of St. John, N.B., been appointed to a position in the Department of Railways and Canals?

If so, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No.

LONDON LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. BEATTIE asked:

1. Why are the London letter-carriers compelled to walk while carriers of other cities are granted free transportation on street railways, when only one and one-quarter cents per ride is asked for?

2. Does the Postmaster General purpose increasing the salaries of the carriers to where they belong, if their increase has not been stopped, or only grant them one year at a time?

3. Are the letter-carriers to receive their back salaries in a lump sum, which is legally due them?

4. Why should so many of the men be employed in the service without their appointment, thereby depriving them of their annual holidays?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr Beattie) if he could not recast that question so as to make it comply more closely with the rules of the House. I think it is open to objection as containing allegations of fact and also of being argumentative. It is difficult to answer a question of that kind in a fair manner without misunderstanding If the hon. gentleman could recast the question I would answer it to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. I see the point taken by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and would advise the hon. member to recast his question, so as not to make any statements, but only to make inquiries. I desire to repeat my suggestion that hon. members asking questions should always do that. It would much simplify matters.

COMMISSIONS UNDER THE GREAT SEAL.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

When were regulations made, if any, respecting the issue of commissions under the Great Seal, by virtue of chap. 14, 56 Victoria?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). On the 7th September, 1893, an Order in Council was passed, under the provisions of 56 Victoria, chapter 14, regulating the fees to be paid upon commissions. No general Order in Council on the subject of commissions has been passed, under this statute, before or since that date.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

JUDGES AND POLITICS.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

On the 2nd June, instant, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), having made use of the following language:—"I think there is no axiom more accepted than that which says that a judge, when he goes upon the bench, should cut himself clear from all connection with either of the political parties, and that there is nothing more detrimental to the proper administration of justice than that judges, after going on the bench, should enter into bargains with politicians, and say, that at a given time they will come down from the bench and enter into the political arena. I will take occasion to deal with that matter later on, before the end of the session." Who is the judge or judges referred to in such language? Has any official notice been received from any judge or judges by the Department of Justice intimating his or their intention of retiring, for the purpose above set forth?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This question is probably not entirely in order; at the same time, I think it is right that I should take advantage of this opportunity to give my authority for the statement I made. My authority is the Montreal "Daily Star," of Friday, February 10th, from which I make the following extract:—

HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF.

It will be remembered that it became the duty of the "Star" to criticise with severity certain Conservative leaders who during the latter part of his Premiership behaved in a manner that was as ridiculous as it was disgraceful. This was entirely in harmony with our settled policy of freely condemning the acts of any Ministers or Ministries which seemed to us to be contrary to public interest. When Sir Charles Tupper subsequently assumed control of the Government at the request of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, he approached his task with the assurance of ready support in quarters which seemed to guarantee to him, at least, the chance of conferring upon the country a good administration. Some of the best men in public life, judges and other well-placed citizens of the highest honour and ability, promised, in the event of success at the polls, to join his Government. This gave to the prospects of the Conservative party a very bright promise, indeed, of, at any rate, decency and ability of administration when it should come back from the electoral battle.

I presume that the latter part of the question can be best answered by my hon. friends on the other side, as to who these judges were.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I be allowed, by the unanimous consent of the House, to make a remark which seems called for upon the present occasion, and that is, to say, that any statement that I was in communication with, or approached, a single judge in Canada in connection with the formation of my Government, is not true. Not only did I not approach a single judge, but I had no communication, direct or indirect, with any judge, and I did not contemplate under any circumstances that any

judge in Canada should form a part of my Government.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may answer, that I never for one moment pretended to have the hon. gentleman's authority for the statement I made. I had absolutely no authority, except that statement, which I have read, from the "Star."

DAMAGES TO FARM LANDS IN LINDSAY.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Is the Government aware that Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, of Lindsay, extracted from the farmers around Cameron Lake twenty per cent of the sums paid them for damages to their lands through flooding, such sums being out of the Treasury of the Dominion of Canada, and being over and above all fees for legal work?
2. What sums have been paid for damages to land from flooding on the shores of Cameron Lake since July 1st, 1896?
3. What sums have been paid to Mr. McLaughlin direct, over and above the twenty per cent extracted from the farmers in connection with the Trent Canal?
4. Were the cheques in payment for the damages above referred to made payable to the farmers interested, or were the twenty per cent extractions deducted by the Government and the cheques given to Mr. McLaughlin?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think I must ask the hon. gentleman to revise the form of his question.

Mr. HUGHES. No, I shall not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, I will take the opinion of the Speaker as to whether it is put in such a form that it ought to be answered.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be far more correct to put the question in this form: Did Mr. so and so do this?

Mr. HUGHES. I know already that he did.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then, the hon. gentleman's statement of fact may not be within the knowledge of the Minister, and that is a very different thing. If the hon. gentleman would ask if that is true, instead of stating it as a fact, his question might not be open to objection.

Mr. HUGHES. I am asking: Is the Government aware that he did this? I am not asking: Is the Government a party to it?

Mr. SPEAKER. The point is, that it is stating something as a fact of which the Government may or may not be aware.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I am not aware that such a statement is a fact.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will call your attention to the other parts of this question. The first is: Is the Government aware that Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, of Lindsay, extracted from the farmers around Cameron Lake 20 per cent? Well, if the hon. gentleman had asked me, whether I was aware of Mr. McLaughlin having received from the farmers anything, I do not think there would be any serious objection to that, because it would not necessarily involve a reflection upon anybody. But to say that he extracted anything from the farmers is exceedingly offensive, and the hon. gentleman could have asked the question without unnecessarily implying a reflection upon anybody. The third and fourth parts are based upon the assumption that what he has alleged is true, and I cannot answer the question, as he puts it, without being called upon to speak of a fact of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the Minister's objection to the general character of the question is well taken. The question should be recast.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask a question in this connection? Supposing a member on this side of the House asked a question, whether the Government was aware that a public officer was away from his duty; would you rule that out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better, if another question was to be based upon it, to ask the Government, if such an officer was away from his duty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the difference? One is a statement of fact, and so is the other.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not my impression.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know whether this question can be debated here; if not, I shall debate it on another occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. It cannot be debated here.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well, then, I stand to the question.

Before the next Order of the Day was called,

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to call the attention of the House to a little matter in connection with the riding which I have the honour to represent. Upon the shores of Cameron Lake, in my riding, there are a number of farmers whose lands have been flooded. The Liberal candidate in the recent election, Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, whether by connivance with the department or not, I am not aware, went to the farmers and entered into a league with them.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman going to move a motion?

Mr. HUGHES. I will conclude with a motion. He entered into a league with

those farmers that he would get this Government to pay them for the damages to their lands, on condition that they would give him 20 per cent of the amount so received. Now, Sir, Mr. McLaughlin did get the sums paid them. I am not saying the farmers are not entitled to these sums; I know some of the farmers were entitled to more than they got, and some of them did not even get anything. Mr. William Jordan, a good, staunch Conservative, did not get anything, though he claims damages for $700; but he refused to enter into the 20 per cent commission deal. I presume that has something to do with his not having received this sum. Now, I know, for a fact, that Mr. McLaughlin did extract 20 per cent from these farmers, and I know he received it. What I am anxious to know is: Was this Government a party to the extraction? If so, we would be pleased to learn it. Mr. McLaughlin was the Liberal candidate in the recent general election. In addition to that, this gentleman has been paid his legal fees for his connection with the settlement of these claims. He has also taken a very active part in connection with other matters in which the Government is directly interested, and has been charging municipalities and persons for legal fees that any man who professes to act as a politician, invariably would scorn to touch or to charge for. He collected from the farmers and farmers' sons for services that constituted purely political work. I want to know of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), whether the Government is aware that Mr. McLaughlin has taken this 20 per cent from these people; whether the Government paid Mr. McLaughlin this 20 per cent before the cheques fell into the hands of these farmers; whether they made the 20 per cent cheques payable to him, or payable to the farmers, and who endorsed the cheques. I have pleasure in moving that the House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak in harsh terms of the method followed by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to bring to the attention of the House a matter as to which he may be right or as to which he may be wrong. But certainly I would appeal to the fairness and sense of justice of this House that when members are endeavouring to get information, the least we can expect is that they should conform to the rules of the House. The rules of the House provide that nothing offensive should be put in any question, and that no argument should be put in asking any question that is to be answered. My hon. friend has chosen to violate these rules, according to the ruling of the Chair, in putting his question, and when he was asked to modify his question, so as to bring it within the letter of the rule, he would not do so. Then, the hon. member immediately moved the adjournment of the House in order to bring his grievance before the House. I do not say, I do not know, whether the question is right or whether it is wrong. His statement before the House is that Mr. McLaughlin exacted 20 per cent of all claims he settled, and he says it is true. I am not here to pass judgment, nor has the House any power to pass judgment on Mr. McLaughlin, but I say this to my hon. friend, that Mr. McLaughlin has a right to be presumed innocent until he has been proved guilty, and when the hon. gentleman, standing on the floor of Parliament, not being responsible for what he says, and charges a positive dereliction of duty against a gentleman occupying a position in this country, it is nothing less than an abuse of the privileges of this House. My hon. friend is a member of Parliament. As a member of Parliament, for anything he says, he is shielded from responsibility, so that he can slander a man and the man that is slandered has no redress against him. But my hon. friend, besides being a member of Parliament, is a journalist, the proprietor of a journal, and he owes it to his constituents, in my humble judgment, and he owes it to himself, if the statement which he makes is true, to bring it to the attention of the public. That he can do in his paper, but if he does it in his paper he incurs the responsibility for what he says. If my hon. friend believes that the statement which he makes is true, alleging a positive dereliction of duty against a gentleman occupying a position in Lindsay, it is his duty to acquaint the public with it, but if the hon. gentleman chooses to bring a charge against a man who cannot defend himself upon the floor of this House, I leave the fact simply to the sense of fairness and justice of the members on both sides of this House. We know that everybody here is able to answer for himself, but when an accusation is made against a man who cannot defend himself on the floor of this House, I think it is conduct which must meet with the reprobation of every right-thinking man on the floor of Parliament, whether he be on one side or the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with a good deal that has fallen from the right hon. Prime Minister on this subject. But, I think, he is mistaken when he says that the privilege which hon. members enjoy in speaking without the responsibility on the floor of this House, that would attend a similar declaration outside of the House, has a power and influence on the utterances of hon. members who may make statements without exposing themselves to the unfortunate consequences of over-stating the case. It is quite true that members of the House of Commons are privileged, but I know that no hon. member of this House can afford

to make a statement, under that privilege, which slanders a man who is outside of the House, without losing character and without losing standing as a member of this House. It is a mistake, in my judgment, to suppose that there is any immunity enjoyed by members of this House, if they unjustly slander persons outside, by statements made on the floor, which they are not prepared to justify and maintain either inside or outside of the House. I come to the question under consideration, and I do not hold that the attack is upon the person who is named. I draw a distinction between the first and the latter part of this question:

Is the Government aware that Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, of Lindsay, extracted from the farmers around Cameron Lake twenty per cent of the sums paid them for damages to their lands through flooding, such sums being out of the Treasury of the Dominion of Canada, and being over and above all fees for legal work?

Is that statement of facts true or is it false? My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says it is a slander. He says that the hon. member who puts that statement here utters a slander which he ought not to utter under the privilege of a member of the House of Commons.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is altogether wrong. I was going to raise a point of order. When this question was reached it was ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker, after which the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) moved that the House adjourn. He stated in his argument that Mr. McLaughlin had extracted 20 per cent from the farmers. My observations were not upon the question, but upon the statement made by the hon. member for North Victoria in his argument afterwards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not appear to me that that affects the question now before the House. I do not intend to question your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but what I say is this, that I would be glad if Your Honour would carefully reconsider the matter, look into it dispassionately, and see how far this question can be considered to be out of order. I accept the ruling of the Chair, but the Chair is not infallible, and if the Chair, after deliberate consideration, thinks the ruling it has made might be modified, it can modify it. Such a course is open to it, and I am quite certain that the dignity of the Chair would be increased by such a reconsideration. But I am now assuming that the ruling of the Chair is correct. If this statement is a slander the Government have it in their power to put their finger upon it. They have at once the opportunity of vindicating Mr. McLaughlin and striking down the slander. Why do they not do it? If Mr. McLaughlin has not done that, all the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) had to do was to say in answer to the question, "No," and it is disposed of. The question is asked of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals whether a certain statement of a course that is alleged be a fact. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says, that is a slanderous statement as regards Mr. McLaughlin. If so, the Government are bound instantly to use their power of saying, that that statement, so far as they are aware, is unfounded. But when the Minister (Mr. Blair) shelters himself under the rule of the House, as stated by the Speaker, from giving an answer, he does all he can to fasten the charge upon Mr. McLaughlin, if there is any charge. If it was in the power of the Minister to deny that statement, he has done Mr. McLaughlin a great wrong by not denying it. As to the subsequent questions, they could be modified if they are found to infringe upon the rules of the House. The rules of this House are intended to control and maintain justice between the two sides of this House, and between the House and parties outside of the House, and it should be the object of us all to maintain these rules inviolate. I hold that the course pursued by the Minister (Mr. Blair) is a most unfortunate one for Mr. McLaughlin, if he is not open to the charge that has been affirmed by a member of this House, who, I am sure from my knowledge of that member, would not make a statement unless he had absolute evidence that would prove it inside or outside of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would scarcely be possible for the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to state a more unfair and unreasonable proposition in so many words, than he has just now stated to the House. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) would establish it as a doctrine, that all that it is necessary for a member of this House to do in order to force the Government into such action with regard to a question as would leave a reflection behind it, is to put his question in such a form that it would be in direct violation of the rules of the House. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that it is the duty of all mmbers of this House to see that the rules are respected. It would be most lamentable if Mr. Speaker, or if the House, were to encourage a departure from these rules, because they are framed, as the result of years of experience, with a view to the better preservation of order, to the better promotion of public business, and to the engendering of better feeling among the members of this Parliament. When a question is put that is offensive in its application, and not in accordance with the rules of this House, there is only one way in which the order of the House can be maintained, and that is by calling the attention of the gentleman who has put the

question in that improper way, courteously, to his departure from the rules of the House. Then, if the gentleman is well disposed, and has no desire to infringe the rules, and no desire to leave an unfavourable impression on our minds, it is quite open to him to yield to the suggestion and alter his question to an unobjectionable form, so that it will bring the information he desires. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) admits that it should be our object to see that these rules are not violated, and he is also obliged to admit under the ruling of the Speaker, that the rules have been violated in this instance. Under those circumstances, it is unworthy of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to suggest to the House, that it should draw an inference prejudicial to the gentleman whose name is mentioned in the question. It is a monstrous proposition, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) should give his sanction to the drawing of such an inference from that question. I told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) that I thought his question was objectionable, and that if he would vary it so that it would not be an infraction of the rules, I should be very glad to answer it immediately. It is still open to the hon. gentleman to adopt that suggestion. I am prepared to answer the question fully, when the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) will put it in such form as will make it in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has put a charge against Mr. McLaughlin in his question, and there is nothing to hinder the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) to take such steps as are necessary to prove that charge. Mr. McLaughlin's name is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, and why did not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) ask to have Mr. McLaughlin subpœnaed and examined before the Public Accounts Committee. That would be the proper course, and Mr. McLaughlin would have a chance to defend himself. But when you bring the matter up in this form, you are casting a reflection upon Mr. McLaughlin without giving him an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I wish to inquire from the Minister (Mr. Blair) what ruling he is referring to, because I find by the "Hansard" of 1894, page 286, the following question submitted by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin):—

> Whether the Government are aware that Mr. Senator Sanford spent a considerable time at Washington in discussions on the subject of the United States tariff, with certain members of the United States Congress?

There is a question on all-fours with the one now placed on the paper.

Mr. FOSTER. It is worse.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is worse and more offensive. The late lamented Sir John Thompson answered that question in a gentlemanly way; very much different from the treatment that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are now receiving, when new rules are established by the ruling of the Chairman, backed up by the Government and the members of the Opposition, who simply say to us: You have to sit there and put up with whatever treatment we like to give you. The late lamented Sir John Thompson answered that question as follows:—

> Shortly before this session, Senator Sanford informed me that, for certain reasons of his own, it was very important that he should visit Washington in connection with his own affairs, and, as regards expressing approval, I could not do otherwise than express approval of his intention under the circumstances, although, in connection with business coming before the Senate his presence here would have been desirable. I am not aware how much time the hon. Senator spent in discussing the United States tariff question.

I could go through page after page of "Hansard" and find similar questions answered——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), but he must remember that this motion of the hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), which is quite in order, was not moved for the purpose of appealing from my ruling. There is a prescribed time and form for criticising my ruling, or appealing from it, but this is not the occasion. In fact, the hon. member for North Victoria did not refer to my ruling, but he raised a distinct substantive question as to Mr. McLaughlin's conduct, and that is now fully open for discussion. This is not the proper occasion to criticise the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) is answering the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Railways was very general.

Mr. FOSTER. He generally is very general.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) and another hon. gentleman were not quite so much in order as they perhaps should have been. I trust the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) will confine himself to the question raised by the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am now dealing with the Minister of Railways, who attacked the leader of the Opposition for certain remarks which he made and pointed out to him (Sir Charles Tupper) that he was violating the rules of this House. I want to know what rule the Minister of Railways is referring to. I have no reference to the Speaker at all. I am referring to debates

that took place in this House in 1894, and questions then submitted by members of the Opposition and answered respectfully by Ministers of that day. I regret to say that questions put by members of the Opposition now the Ministers will answer respectfully if it suits their convenience, but very often they will not answer respectfully.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman clearly understands the point that was raised and is now under discussion. If the Minister of Railways answered something that was raised by the leader of the Opposition, and both were somewhat out of order, that does not justify any other hon. member in going out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want the Minister of Railways and Canals to tell us what rule he is referring to. He has some book in his hand, and he refers to that and says the rules of this House must be observed. I suppose he means that the leader of the Opposition must give notice before making an attack upon him.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member perfectly understands my ruling.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do certainly, and I will bow to it, but I am replying to the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have said that two blacks do not make a white, and if the hon. Minister of Railways and the leader of the Opposition were not strictly in order, that does not justify the hon. gentleman in going out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I want to know if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was referring to your ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hon. gentlemen will get some business done when they keep order, and not before. If the hon. Minister of Railways will admit to me and to this House that he was referring to the ruling of the Speaker when he was violating the Speaker's ruling, I will resume my seat; but I understood that he was discussing a ruling of this House, and not the Speaker's ruling at all. If the hon. Minister was not out of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot permit this to go on. The hon. member knows perfectly well that no question was raised by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) as to the ruling of the Speaker or the rule of the House. If that had been raised by him, it would not have been regular. Therefore, the hon. member will please confine himself to the question raised clearly and simply by the hon. member for North Victoria. It does not matter what anybody else has done.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, as I understand the situation, it is that the hon. member for North Victoria moved that the House adjourn in order that he might attack the Minister of Railways and Canals for not having answered a question, and that is the subject now under debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Most distinctly and positively, that was not the point raised by the hon. member for North Victoria. He raised a question, not as to a Minister answering or not answering a question, but as to the conduct of a certain Mr. McLaughlin.

Mr. HUGHES. And the conduct of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. And the conduct of the Government too, with reference to Mr. McLaughlin.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that is what the debate is going on about. I cannot see that I am referring to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, in any respect. I am considering the conduct of this Government in answering questions, as compared with the conduct of the late Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. If that were the question raised by the hon. member for North Victoria it would be perfectly in order for the hon. member to continue his discussion as to the general habit of this Government, or any other Government, in answering questions. But that was not the question before the House, and that is the reason why I wish the hon. member to confine himself to the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly will do so, Mr. Speaker, as I have always conformed to the rulings of the Speaker of this House; but my attack is upon the Government for not having answered respectfully questions submitted by members of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I will take an opportunity of reading a good many of them some other day. In the meantime, I hope that what has been said will be taken by the hon. Ministers now controlling the affairs of this country—unfortunately for the country, in my opinion; and that they will be, at least, respectful to the Opposition while they are here.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). It is rather to be regretted, for the sake of Mr. McLaughlin, who is personally known to me as a barrister of the town of Lindsay, and who was one of the Liberal candates in the last election, that this matter should obtain the publicity which it will obtain by the publication in the newspapers to-morrow of the fact the charge has gone without a denial by the Minister on behalf of Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. McLaughlin is personally known to the Minister. I can make that statement as a statement of fact, because on the occasion on which the

Minister was in the riding on an inspection of the Trent Valley Canal, Mr. McLaughlin accompanied the party; and it was due to him as a professional man and also as a party man, that the Minister should embrace the earliest opportunity of refuting this slander, if it is a slander. For three days, at all events, the Minister has had information that this question was to be asked; and, involving as it does the reputation and character and standing of Mr. McLaughlin, it was certainly such a question as should have attracted the attention of the Minister. The Minister was quick to endeavour to prevent any answering of the question, and why? Let a reference be made to the question, and what is in it? If it is untrue, the Minister should have desired that publicity should not be given to it. As to the first question, it is an allegation of fact, the statement being made clearly by the hon. member for North Victoria that Mr. McLaughlin did obtain, whether by way of commission or by arrangement made beforehand, a participation in these funds. The third question I need not particularly refer to. As to the fourth question, had the Minister answered it yes or no, it would either have incriminated——

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to point out that the only questions as to Mr. McLaughlin to which he can properly refer are not the questions on the paper, but the questions raised by the hon. member for North Victoria.

Mr. HUGHES. It is the Government I intended to attack.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not saying whether it was the Government or Mr. McLaughlin. That is not my purpose; but I think the hon. member should leave the details of this matter out of the discussion, and confine himself to the questions raised by this motion.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, my mind shall be a blank as to whether there is a question at all; but I shall be aware of this fact, that the hon. member for North Victoria has to-day charged publicly that Mr. McLaughlin went to certain parties who were interested, and, using his position as having the patronage of that riding, succeeded in obtaining their concurrence to his going into an arrangement by which he participated in certain moneys which they received; and I have knowledge of this fact, that if that statement is true, the Minister of Railways and Canals knew whether or not the money had been paid to Mr. McLaughlin, as had been alleged. How could the Minister have repudiated that presumption? He could have stated: "All moneys paid out by my department in this respect are paid by cheque, and I produce the cheques in support of that statement, showing that the moneys were paid direct to the parties and not to Mr. McLaughlin in the first instance." In this case there is no reason in the world why the moneys should not have been paid direct to the parties who had the claim; and if Mr. McLaughlin had any claim against them for having conducted their cases, he should have dealt directly with them. It is alleged that Mr. McLaughlin received those moneys for his political services; and the Minister, knowing for three or four days past that this question was to be asked, could have cleared Mr. McLaughlin conclusively by saying that the cheques were not made payable to him, but directly to the parties interested. And it is unfortunate for Mr. McLaughlin that the hon. Minister did not answer the question directly in the first instance.

Mr. GEORGE McHUGH (South Victoria). I am sorry to have to trouble the House, but, as a constituent of mine, and a very honourable gentleman, is concerned, I hope the House will bear with me for a moment or two. I know Mr. McLaughlin well; he is a very honourable man, and a barrister of our town, and I know that no charge can be successfully proven that he has done anything that could reflect injuriously upon him in this transaction. He may have been, and I suppose was, engaged as solicitor for some of those men who were looking for compensation from the Government; but I venture to say, that, if this thing is sifted to the bottom, neither the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) nor any other man will be able to find that he charged anything more than his legitimate fees as a barrister acting for a client. I have nothing to say to the hon. member for North Victoria for bringing this matter before the House; but, when he seeks to leave the impression that Mr. McLaughlin extracted from his clients more than a legitimate fee, the hon. gentleman puts the matter in a different complexion; and I may say, that, in so doing, he passed a reflection which a worthy and honourable opponent, such as Mr. McLaughlin is, does not merit at his hands. I have nothing to say either to the hon. member for North Victoria or Mr. McLaughlin. They are both constituents of mine, for, although the hon. member for North Victoria represents the other half of that country, yet he lives within a stone's throw of me, and I do think that I have the right here to defend the character of Mr. McLaughlin, when a charge of that kind is made against him, and when I know, from my thorough knowledge of the man, that no such charge can be successfully sustained. I know that Mr. McLaughlin did act for some men along Cameron Lake, who were seeking compensation from the Government, and I know that other solicitors and barristers also acted for other men seeking redress for their drowned lands, but I do not know of any

barristers or solicitors acting in these matters charging their clients any more than a reasonable compensation for the work they did. I am not going to interfere, any more than to say, that I protest against any insinuations on the character of Mr. McLaughlin without giving him an opportunity of clearing himself.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I wish to congratulate my hon. friend on the position he takes in defending one of his constituents, his friend Mr. McLaughlin; but it would have been a great deal more satisfactory to Mr. McLaughlin, if the hon. Minister of Railways had answered in such a way as to exonerate Mr. McLaughlin entirely from the charges brought against him by the hon. member for Victoria. The Minister of Railways said, that he had an answer to the question put by the hon. member for North Victoria, but that he did not want to answer the question, as put, because it was not put according to the rules of this House. My only object in rising is to show that we are acting entirely differently now than this House used to under the late Administration. It appears that we are not under as liberal rules now as when a Conservative Administration was in office. I would like to read just one small question, which was asked in 1894, on the 28th of May.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. To show how questions were put then, and how they were answered.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, I think, was in the House when I ruled just now, that the question before the House was as to the conduct of Mr. McLaughlin, or of the Government in connection with Mr. McLaughlin, and was not a question as to whether the question put should be answered or not. Any hon. member can raise that other point in the proper way at the proper time, but it is not raised now.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that the hon. member put a question on the paper which the Minister of Railways said he did not want to answer because of the manner in which it was put. Then the Chair decided—and I am not discussing that decision at all—that, in the shape in which the question was put, the Minister of Railways was not bound to answer. A few moments afterwards, the Minister of Railways, having come to the conclusion that it would be a great deal better for Mr. McLaughlin, if he did answer, said he had the answer before him, and was ready to give it, if the question were properly put. But my only object now is to show that a question of a very similar kind was put before and answered. It seems quite clear that we are departing now from what used to be the rule of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. That, of course, is an implication on my ruling, and the hon. gentleman, in the position he occupies in this House, should not be guilty of anything of that kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it is, because it is quite possible that your ruling, Sir, might be strictly correct, and that a similar ruling might have been given at the time the question to which my hon. friend draws attention, was put, had the point been raised; but my hon. friend is pointing out that, when similar questions were put to the late Administration, no objection was taken.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a very interesting question, but it is not germane to the point raised by the hon. member for North Victoria. In order to keep ourselves at all within reasonable bounds, we must confine ourselves to the question raised on the motion to adjourn. I may say, that, if hon. gentlemen would look through the questions and answers of this paper, they would find that, in a great many cases, I have been unable to succeed in having carried out what I think is the proper rule of the House, and that is, that controversial questions of fact should not be stated in interrogatories to the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that the hon. Minister of Railways owes rather an apology to you, Mr. Speaker, for having got you into considerable difficulty in making some very fine rulings. The gentleman who is really the transgressor of the rule laid down by the Chair, this afternoon, is the Minister of Railways, though, no doubt, quite innocently. He went on to discuss the general question of the rules of order, and, by implication of course, he discussed your ruling, after the speech of the hon. member for North Victoria. Had he not discussed the general question of the rules of order, I do not think that Your Honour would have been put to the difficulty you have been put to in deciding the fine points raised.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. Minister of Railways were in possession of information which would enable him to explain or contradict the allegations of fact made by the hon. member for North Victoria—and from his remarks I take it for granted that he is in possession of such information—he should have given it to the House. But he would not take the trouble either to deny the allegations or explain them. And he says: I know from my knowledge of the man that he did not do these things, that he did nothing that was wrong. Now, if this gentleman had done nothing wrong, who could tell that fact better or more directly than the Minister of Railways and Canals, who has the information in his possession? And if he does not come to the rescue of his own political friend, one of the Government can-

didates, what will be the inference drawn by the country? The inference will be that the Minister did not want the facts to be known. In that case, he has done great injustice to his friend, if he is in possession of such information as would relieve Mr. McLaughlin from the suspicion of having done something wrong.

Mr. HUGHES. Perhaps I may be permitted a word in reply to some of the remarks that have dropped from the lips of some hon. members. I must apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, for having got you into this snarl; but your long experience in the Opposition should have taught you that the question I had the honour of putting on the Order paper was tame in comparison with what we of the Conservative party had to submit to for years while we occupied the benches on your right. Nevertheless, had the Minister of Railways and Canals asked me to change any word in the questions, I would have gladly complied with his request. But he did not do so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I beg the hon. Minister's pardon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To set the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) right, I may tell him what I said. I asked him if he would consent to vary his question so as to substitute a less objectionable word. And the hon. gentleman scarcely gave me a chance to get the words out before starting to his feet and declaring he would do nothing of the kind.

Mr. HUGHES. "Hansard" will bear me out when I say that what the hon. Minister asked me to do was to remodel the question, inasmuch as I had made an assertion of a fact in it. I would not submit to that, and I have been ashamed of the members on this side who have submitted to the impertinence—I will withdraw that expression if it is unparliamentary—to the assurance of the Ministers' rising in their places and, with a lordly air, telling the gentlemen on this side of the House to move for a return or to put the question in some other form—acting as though they were the head of some one-horse principality in Europe instead of the representatives of the people of Canada in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) will confine himself within the limits which he himself laid down.

Mr. HUGHES. I will do so, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to give you further trouble The leader of the Government, with the shrewd tact, with the ability in that particular line of which he is master, thought to draw a herring across the track to divert attention from the facts of the case, by suggesting that I was standing here and saying something that I would not say outside of the House. The hon. gentleman does not know me if he thinks I will say here concerning any man what I would not say outside of the House. There is no question as to the facts in the case; the question is, and what I want to know is, whether the Government is a party to this deal. There is no doubt but that Mr. McLaughlin extracted the 20 per cent, or took it, or held the people up for it—I do not care what term you use. As the person who controls the Government patronage, he held these people up for 20 per cent of their money. It is said here in excuse that this was as legal adviser. Is it likely that a Conservative farmer would employ this man in connection with such a case? This work is done by Government valuators and Government engineers, not by Government lawyers. And, Sir, if the Government is guiltless in the matter, their course was clear. If this man extracted this money from the pockets of these people—or, if that expression is a little too strong for the sensitive nature of the Minister of Railways and Canals, if he suggests any other term, I shall be glad to use it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did make a suggestion.

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman had suggested that I should use any other term, I should have bowed to his superior judgment. But I should think, from his long experience, this word would not have been offensive to him. I should have thought it would have passed muster without any hesitation on his part and without bringing the blush to his cheek that I am sorry to see there to-day. This is a simple matter. Is the Government a party to this or not? The hon. member from South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) admits the facts, but he says it was as legal adviser that this gentleman was called in. I say he put himself forward as a representative of the Government in the riding and extracted this money from the people or took it from them. We know that under another Government the license commissioners hold up the hotel men and take commissions from them. We know that in the case of certain appointments under this Government commissions are extracted. What I want to know is whether in the county I have the honour to represent, this Government allows its heelers to practise these methods. If so, I have only to say that they shall not do it with my knowledge without my making known the facts. Our good friend the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), true to his old love, suggests that I should go and look up the Auditor General's Report. I know that the Auditor General's Report does show a considerable amount of pickings for this gentleman as well as others. But the Auditor General's Report is only brought down to the 1st of July, 1898, and considerable time has elapsed since then. I want to know what the pickings have been since that time, and also whether the Government is a party to this commission system

or not. If the Government is not a party to it, we shall know where to place the blame. I will not apologize again, Mr. Speaker, for giving you so much worry. I always like to bow to your decisions and to save you all the trouble I can, because there are so many members of the House who are always getting into trouble and bringing in objectionable questions, a fact which I regret exceedingly. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals must see that it is due to himself to get and answer the questions I have placed upon the Order paper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be glad to do so if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) will strike out the objectionable word in the first section and will eliminate in the third and fourth sections that portion which his own judgment must tell him is not properly there.

Mr. HUGHES. I think if I were to comply with the Minister's request I should be doing an injustice to the House and to the country and to parliamentary government.

Mr. OSLER. Nearly an hour and a half has been taken up in a discussion which, I think, should have been avoided and would have been avoided if the Minister of Railways and Canals had given a civil answer to a civil question. I am not versed in what is the proper mode of putting a question on the Order paper, but the question as put seems a very simple one, calling for a very simple answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Osler) attention to the fact that that was not the point raised by this motion to adjourn.

Mr. OSLER. I apologize. Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about the facts as to Mr. McLaughlin, but the impression made on my mind, and the impression that I am sure must be left on the mind of any one who knows of the refusal to answer this question, is that there must be something that the Minister wants to conceal. I cannot otherwise conceive of the Minister causing a waste of an hour and a half of the time of this House in making necessary this discussion, and the impression left upon my mind is that the question is one that he does not want to answer to the satisfaction of the House.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

STRIKE OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TRACKMEN.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like, in the public interest and in the interest of public safety, to direct the attention of the Government and of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the present strike on the Grand Trunk Railway. To that end I will read a statement that has been made this morning and published in the evening papers in connection with that event:

Mr. H. F. McKenny, of this city, grand secretary of the United Brotherhood of Railway Trackmen, this morning issued the following statement in reference to the strike on the Grand Trunk Railway, which began on May 22nd, and has been in force since, except for a few hours on June 5th. In the course of the circular, Mr. McKenny says:

"During this momentous struggle for fair living wages and humanitarian hours of duty, the men on the Grand Trunk Railway remained true and carefully guarded against any acts of lawlessness or any infringement of the statutory laws of Canada. We believe that they have earned for themselves the respect and admiration of every fair-minded citizen by pursuing this course, and an ultimate victory is now assured; but the trackmen, who, only through long experience have acquired the work they perform, have reached the conclusion that the company is only determined to defeat the union, and is ignoring the prospect of passenger trains becoming derailed, which is likely to occur at any moment, owing to the road being out of condition, while it is not patrolled by the workmen watching for such irregularities.

"Recognizing the great risk that shippers and the travelling public are subjected to, the union submitted a requisition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, asking that the differences between the company and the men be settled by arbitration. It was promised that the best arrangement possible should be made, but Mr. Wainwright afterwards intimated that the company desired to settle. Messrs. Powell and Taylor, members of Parliament, offered to act as mediators, and accompanied the deputation to Montreal, where Mr. Hays, general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, guaranteed that the grievances of the men would be satisfactorily remedied.

"Believing him to be sincere, the men were prepared to resume work, and the requisition for arbitration was withdrawn.

"On Monday morning, when ready to go to work, they were informed that no employment could be guaranteed them except an application was made, and even if this was done certain of them would be dismissed.

"The company now denies any agreement that all the men should be put to work, and the executive has consequently ordered another strike. We leave it to the people to determine whether we are not justified in perpetuating the struggle against a corporation which by word and action shows itself so unreliable."

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an instance where the leaders of a body of men seeking to have decent pay and decent hours accorded to them, say that faith has been broken with them by this great corporation. If that is the case, and the men feel that faith has been broken with them, I think that public safety is doubly endangered, and it is now the duty of the Government, and especially of the Minister of Railways and Canals, to interfere on behalf of the people of this country, and compel that great corporation immediately to consider the grievances of the men and to rectify them. The Grand Trunk Railway put forward the defence now that the men are simply a little out of form. The Grand Trunk

Railway people send me a message that they do intend to do something for the men, and that they do intend to pay them better wages, but that they object to the form in which the men are moving. Well, that is not a fair way to treat the public or the men. The men are only seeking their rights, and if anything is to be conceded to them it ought to be conceded to them now before the public safety is jeopardized. I hope that not only the Prime Minister, whose name is brought forward in this paper, will make a statement to the country to-day, but that also those members of Parliament whose names have been brought into this discussion, and who I am told allege that the Grand Trunk Railway has broken faith with the men, will also make a statement, and that these statements will have the effect of bringing this dispute to an end and guaranteeing safety to the public in travelling over the lines of this company. I can say from my own observation that last week a very distinguished man in this country, who is a great supporter of the Grand Trunk Railway, and who always travels by that line in coming to Ottawa, thought that it was in the interest of his own safety to abandon the line he has always patronized in the past, and to take the Canadian Pacific Railway. I know there are others who feel in the same way. All these things go to show that the public think there is something wrong with the line, and that there is more or less risk. It is time that the Government should interfere. I may say that only last Saturday when I was travelling from Hamilton to Toronto on a crowded train, when some passengers were on the platform, a signal was made to stop the train by people at a way station who had been left there by some mistake. That signal was taken to mean by the engineer and the conductor that a rail had been removed, and that an accident was likely to happen, and a very worthy young man of the city of Toronto was so frightened at what was taking place between the officers of the train, that he jumped and broke his leg in two places. These are only a few instances of the uneasy feeling that obtains in the country over this strike, and I say it is high time that the Government should interfere and that Parliament should interfere, as it is empowered to do, and bring this strike to an end, and restore public confidence in the Grand Trunk Railway. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am somewhat sorry that my hon. friend did not give me any intimation that he would bring up this question to-day.

Mr. MACLEAN. I only saw the paper just now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not make any reproach at all to my hon. friend. But I may say that if he had given me any intimation that he was going to bring up this question to-day and ask me to make a statement, I would have been able to bring with me the correspondence which I have upon this subject, and of which I would have been glad to give communication to the House. But in the absence of this correspondence I will state to the House from memory what took place, not only after but before the motion of my hon. friend from Toronto West (Mr. Clarke), who brought up the question the other day. Last week, having read of the strike which has taken place, I communicated with Mr. Wainwright, the Deputy Superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway, and asked him to put himself in communication with me with regard to the strike that was then taking place. I saw him on Wednesday night, and on Thursday night as well. On the following day I was waited upon by a delegation from the Trackmen's Association, and they placed in my hands the terms which they thought they were entitled to from the Grand Trunk Railway authorities. Of course I promised them that I would exert my best endeavours to promote their views with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I intended to see Mr. Wainwright on that day also, but could not do so. But on the evening of that day, which was Friday, I learned that the same committee had placed themselves in communication with some gentlemen belonging to this House, and I thereupon wired to Mr. Wainwright and asked him if it were true my services would be no longer required. I received an answer from Mr. Wainwright that I was misinformed in some particulars. At the same time I received information that several members of this House had gone to Montreal to interview the Grand Trunk Railway. Therefore, under those circumstances, I sent away by mail the statement which was left in my hands by the committee of trackmen. I sent it to the Grand Trunk, to Mr. Wainwright, with the prayer that he would place it in the hands of Mr. Hays, and I made what recommendation I could as to the prayer of the trackmen, stating at the same time that, if my information turned out to be untrue, if the matter was not settled, I would be happy to resume—I would deem it my duty to resume—the correspondence with the parties concerned. This is the position which, therefore, I took in reference to this matter, and it is all the information I have. It would have been more satisfactory to me, if I could at this moment place on the Table of the House the whole correspondence and read it, so that the House could follow, from day to day, what took place. I have only this word to say, and I have only to repeat what I stated on former occasions, that my sympathies, personally, are strongly with the men who are seeking to better their circumstances on the Grand Trunk Railway. I have nobody to blame in this matter; I do not want to make any

reflections against anybody; but, at a certain moment, the matter was taken from my hands, and, therefore, I did not pursue my endeavours any further. If the trackmen again apply to me to have the influence of the Government in their favour, so that this unfortunate strike can be brought to an end, I shall deem it my duty to exercise this influence, so that at the earliest possible moment this unfortunate condition of things may cease.

Mr. GEORGE E. CASEY (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to these troubles, not only by the press, but by communications from parties living in St. Thomas and other railway centres. I have hitherto said nothing in the House upon this subject, because of the knowledge I had that the matter was occupying the earnest attention of the Government, and that all that could be done, in the way of negotiations, was being done to settle this difficulty. But I cannot allow the matter to go further without saying publicly a few words about it. I feel that this is not merely a question of obtaining rights for the trackmen. Although this is a most serious question, it is not the one with which this Government can, perhaps, directly or officially interfere. It was decided by this House, last year, and in other quarters at various times, that the relations of the employer and employed are within the powers of the provincial governments only. All that can be done, then, between employers and employers on the railways would be what the right hon. Prime Minister has told us he is doing, in offering his friendly services as a negotiator between the parties, and to try and secure as good terms as possible for the striking railway men. But there is another view of it, as to which, I think, the Government is directly concerned, namely, that arising from the fact that the lives and the property of the travelling public are endangered by the present state of affairs. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has called attention to this pointedly. Any man who knows anything of railways, is aware that a very few days of absolute negligence of the track is liable to cause very serious accidents, how serious, we shudder to think. This state of things brings the present situation directly within the official cognizance of the Government. If a railway company does not succeed in obtaining and keeping at work an efficient force of trackmen, there must come a time when that loss concerns those whom the railway company serves. Of course, such a possibility is a very extreme one. It is not to be supposed that a railway company can continue long without a competent staff of trackmen; but the best trackmen they can get are those who know the road, and those who have long been familiar with the different sections of the road, who know exactly where trouble is apt to occur, and how to remedy it. I conclude, putting it briefly, with the hope that the Government will insist upon the railway company taking some means to settle this strike. Arbitration has been proposed; arbitration is a perfectly good method. In a strike in the old country, not many years ago, Lord Rosebery proposed arbitration, and did it successfully. It was carried out as a means of settling that strike, and he obtained thereby great glory for himself and his Government, and great benefit for the public and for the men employed. The Government are in a position to enforce on the company the use of some such means to obtain a settlement, if they cannot secure it by friendly negotiations. I do not think the gravity of the situation can be exaggerated. Every day that this strike continues, and that this road is being operated without the slightest care of the condition of the track, the greatest liability to accident exists.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated to the House the course he has taken, as leader of the Government, in connection with this unfortunate condition of affairs, and, in doing so, has dealt with the case from the standpoint of the trackmen. In doing so, he has satisfied the House, I am sure, that, on his part and on the part of the Government, there is every desire to intervene to the fullest possible extent to which the Government has power and has the means of intervening, in order to insure an early settlement of this trouble. But that is only one phase, I freely admit, of this question. The other phase, which concerns the public more particularly, which concerns the travelling public, and which concerns the protection of life and property, has been adverted to by the hon. gentleman who opened this question (Mr. Maclean), and also by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Casey). Upon this phase of the question, perhaps, the House will allow me to make a remark or two as it is a branch of the question which more particularly comes, and properly comes, under the cognizance of the Department of Railways and Canals and of the Minister of that department. Some correspondence, I may say, was placed in my hands during the pendency of the strike, prior to the intervention which took place in the matter by hon. members of this House. Following up that correspondence, I received some explicit statements from two or three quarters, bearing the signatures of a number of people in each locality, stating from their personal knowledge, there was in their opinion good ground to fear that the running of trains had become unsafe, and that as a consequence, life and property were in danger. Let me say here, that it is the duty of us all, both as members of Parliament and as members of the Government, not to unduly exaggerate a situation of this kind. It would

be certainly attended with very serious results, if we did exaggerate the condition of things, since it would tend to excite fear and alarm in the public mind. I think that we ought, rather, to be disposed to allay excitement in the public mind than to increase it. These statements which were made to me, were made in a specific way, and I felt, that, being so made, it was my duty to take some action in respect to it. I did take action, although I felt quite assured in my own mind, and I think it is only fair that I should say it here, that there is no interest in the country which the travelling public would have, which is greater than the interest that the Grand Trunk Railway itself would have, to see that it takes no risk in the running of its trains, either to the passengers carried or to the property involved. At the same time, there appeared to be a duty devolving upon me, since the complaints were made in this explicit way. These came to my hands on Saturday last, and I immediately notified the Grand Trunk Railway Company that I had these complaints, that I intended to examine into them, and I asked them to facilitate in every way they could my making this investigation. I employed several engineers, and arranged that they should start out on Monday morning, and I may say that the Grand Trunk Company gave me every assistance in the matter. The engineers had actually, I believe, left home for the purpose of going over the points on the railway line to which they had been detailed, when notice came to me on Monday morning; all the public prints contained a notice that the difficulty was over and the men returned to work, and I therefore recalled the engineers. I have not sent them out since, but it may possibly be well that some such examination of the railway as was then in contemplation should take place. I have not had any information which led me to believe that there was any great urgency in the matter, because, as practical men we know that a railway that has been maintained, that is cared for, and is built of the solidity and strength in every particular of the Grand Trunk Railway, does not become dismantled and does not fall into a dangerous condition very speedily.

Mr. CASEY. Spikes and rails may get loose any time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The spikes and rails might get loose, it is true, but the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, in answering my communication to him, assured me most positively that he had a sufficient number of men going over every section of the line to see that anything that might occur, accidental or otherwise, was being looked after, and that there was every assurance given to the public. I think the House may rest convinced that so far as anything in my power is concerned, looking to the safety and security of the public, I shall not neglect my duty.

Mr. WM. B. IVES (Sherbrooke). I am very happy to notice the decidedly changed tone of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) from that which he assumed on a recent occasion whilst speaking upon the same subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Speaking about intervening in the strike was the question that was up before.

Mr. IVES. Intervention by the Government to save the lives of the public if they were in danger, was the question that was being discussed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), on that occasion, evidently thinking there was no particular reason for his taking any other course, took the position that the Government were entirely powerless, and that there was no course in the world that they could take, no matter what happened. On that occasion, I very modestly suggested that the Railway Act gave the Minister of Railways power to forcibly inspect the road, and if he found it to be unsafe, to do any one of several things. He either might reduce the speed of the trains, he might order that a pilot should precede all passenger trains, and that passenger trains could only be run at a certain rate of speed with a pilot in front; or the Minister might absolutely stop the running of passenger trains altogether. I went further and suggested that the Postmaster General might bring a very strong argument to bear, by withdrawing the mail subsidies, but at that time the Minister of Railways took the ground that there was nothing in the world we could do. It was not ten days after that before he acted under the section of the Act, and arranged for an inspection by engineers, and his engineers, he tells us, had actually started out when it was reported the strike was off, and he recalled them. It is important that the Minister (Mr. Blair) is now at least satisfied that he has power to act. The whole matter is in the hands of the Government. The Grand Trunk Railway, like any other railway in Canada, can, under the Act, be controlled by the Department of Railways and Canals. The responsibility rests where I sought to place it; it rests on the Department of Railways, and if the track does run down, if accidents occur and lives are lost, the Government will have to answer to the country for what they do or fail to do in the matter. The men, it appears, were ready to come back to work and thought the strike was settled; but they have been disappointed, and they now feel, whether rightly or wrongly, that they have been taken in by Mr. Hays and the head officers of the Grand Trunk Railway. They were led to

go back to work under a sort of implied promise that their grievances would be redressed, and before they could get back, great pains were taken to inform them that they must return at the old wage, and that the company did not intend to employ those who had been most active in advocating an increase of wages. I say, Sir, that disappointment, and the feeling which naturally results from it, renders the situation more dangerous now than it has been at any previous stage. It was bad enough before; it is infinitely worse now, and the Government will have to watch very closely indeed to see that the public interest is not endangered by this state of things. The trackmen are not capitalists; they are utterly unable to remain without work for any great length of time, they have families to support, and if a compromise is not effected very soon, and if those men are kept out in a semi-starvation condition much longer; it would be a marvel if some malicious interference with the tracks in different parts of the country does not actually take place. The railway company, as the Minister says, will undoubtedly do everything in their power for the safety of the public and their own property, but if the feeling grows sufficiently intense, it will be utterly impossible for the railway company to safeguard the public interest, and then the Government, if they do their duty, must interfere actively and effectively. As a first step, they will have to see that fast trains are not run at all, and that will unquestionably be an effective interference, and it is what the Government will have to do unless the strike is settled.

Mr. ALEX. McNEILL (North Bruce). The question we now have before us is one of the most serious questions to which at the present moment the House can direct its attention. I hope it will be discussed absolutely clear of all party lines, and one reason why I make that statement is that I am going to say a word in disapproval of what the Minister (Mr. Blair) has said, and I wish it to be understood that I do not make that statement with any party bias whatever. I speak of the statement the Minister has made as an individual member of the House, and not as a member of the Government. I regret very much the condition of the mind of the Minister (Mr. Blair) in reference to this question; and I do not think that he realizes the danger that exists at the present time to the lives of the people who are travelling on the Grand Trunk Railway. The principle laid down by the Minister is absolutely unsound. The principle he laid down was that the company was as much interested as any one else in the country with reference to this matter. I do not think so. He said that because the Grand Trunk Company were so much interested, we might be satisfied that they would take care that the track was safe.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said they would have every interest in doing so.

Mr. McNEILL. I quite understand what the hon. gentleman said. That was the basis of his argument, and it was an unsound basis. It proves a great deal too much. If that be true, it is true in regard to every railway. If that be true, all legislation which has been adopted in the mother country, for the purpose of protecting the public against the negligence of railway companies—if I used a harsh word, I would say against the greed of railway companies—is unnecessary. In the mother country, as every hon. member of this House knows, they have been obliged to take this matter up, and say to the railway companies: You must consider something else than merely the profits of your own company; you must consider the public interest and the public safety, and we will not allow you to say that you will stake your profits against the public safety." There is legislation in the mother country regulating the hours of labour on railways—why? Because it is necessary in the interest of public safety that that regulation should obtain. If the argument of the hon. Minister of Railways is correct, that legislation is absolutely unnecessary, because the railways will take care of their own property, and thereby guard the safety of the public. Now, I venture to say that the condition of things on the Grand Trunk Railway system at the present moment is a source of very great danger to the travelling public, and whatever action the Government can take in reference to this matter, they ought to take speedily. There is to my mind a great deal of force in what has been urged by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that the men are now smarting, not only under a sense of not having been treated fairly in the first instance, and not having received, as they ought, living wages, but under the feeling that there has been a breach of faith with them. There may be individuals who are carried away by a sense of injustice at the way they have been treated, and may be impelled to do things which they themselves might perhaps afterwards be the first to regret. The condition of things is, I think, most dangerous, and the Government ought to grapple with it immediately. I should like very much if my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who I think has had a great deal to do with the negotiations that have been going on, would be good enough to tell the House and the country what those negotiations have been, and whether he considers that there has been a breach of faith, so that the House and the country may know really what the position of this question is. At all events,

we know that the men were back at their work or were ready to go back, and now we know that the strike is on again, because they feel that they have not been well treated, and that there has been a breach of faith. I was sorry to hear a few moments ago the statement made by the hon. member for Elgin that this House cannot interfere as between employers and employed on the railways, as this is a provincial question. I cannot believe that that is sound doctrine. If it be a question affecting the public safety, surely this House can interfere.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like the hon. gentleman to say that that remark came from the hon. member from West Elgin (Mr. Casey).

Mr. McNEILL. I said the hon. gentleman who had spoken a few moments ago, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I do not think the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has spoken. I think the question of the hours of labour is one which this House should take up and grapple with very promptly. A statement which I will make in reference to a matter which comes within my own knowledge will be of itself sufficient to show that this matter of the hours of labour in connection with railways is altogether on a wrong basis. I know of railway employees who day in and day out during the week, the same gang of men, have to bring in a train within a few minutes of midnight, often at midnight, and who, after that train comes in, have to do the shunting necessary and to put their engine away, and who cannot as a rule go to rest before 1 o'clock in the morning; and these men, day in and day out, have to be ready with their train to start again at 6 o'clock in the morning, having first done the shunting and made all these preparations necessary to take out the train. That is to say, these men have not more than four or five hours of sleep, generally only four hours, day in and day out during the week. This is surely a matter which affects the public safety. At least, it is so regarded in England, where the Board of Trade have interfered, and have induced the railway companies to shorten the hours of labour, when they were as much as 12 hours in the day, in place of 18 or 19 or 19½ hours, as in the case to which I have referred. If that condition of things exists in Canada, it can only exist at the peril of the travelling public. I have been informed on authority which I do not doubt for a moment—and I have mentioned it in this House before—that engineers have been seen asleep on their engines, simply from the fact that they were overworked, and did not get that amount of rest which human nature requires. These men, who have to work some 19 or 19½ hours a day, are being slowy murdered. No constitution can stand that. It is just as if they were taking a certain amount of poison regularly. That simply means death to these men; it means the breaking down of their constitutions, and it is not only on behalf of the men that I speak—and any person who has a spark of humanity in his breast must sympathize with them—but I speak on behalf of the travelling public, whose lives are imperilled by these things. I am not in the habit of expressing my sympathy for strikes. Perhaps a strike may be a necessary evil; it is a great evil, at any rate. But my sympathies have gone out for these unfortunate men as they have never before gone out to any men on strike, either in this or any other country. I do hope the Government will at once take this matter up, and do what they can to put the men in such a position as they ought to be placed in. I believe that if the Government take the matter up energetically, we can very soon have the difficulty settled by arbitration or otherwise.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I quite agree in the statement just made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that a more critical time has now arisen in the history of this strike than at any previous date. It looks very much as if the Grand Trunk Railway authorities had acted in bad faith towards those who intervened to try and effect a settlement, and I think it is very unfortunate that any such misunderstanding should have arisen and that matters should be in their present complicated state. I understand the right hon. gentleman to say, a few moments ago, that having found that some hon. members of Parliament were using their good offices, he stepped out. I would like to know whether he had intervened before the members to whom reference has been made.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have said that I interviewed personally Mr. Wainwright on Wednesday and Thursday of last week. On Friday a committee of trackmen called on me and placed in my hands that delegation. I expected to see Mr. Wainwright that afternoon, but did not. I learned on that day that certain members of the House and the trackmen were together and were going to see the railway authorities themselves. I wrote then to Mr. Wainwright, stating: I hear you are now negotiating with the men, so, I presume, my services are no longer necessary.

Mr. WALLACE. The statements made by the right hon. First Minister and by the hon. Minister of Railways, when this matter was brought up before, were of such a character that there was not much encouragement to suppose they were prepared to intervene.

The PRIME MINISTER. At that moment I was negotiating with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. WALLACE. That was before this time. In fact they said that the time had

not arrived and that there was no effective interference which they could make. But the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) pointed to the clause in the Railway Act, which gave the Government ample powers to protect the lives of the public, and that the Postmaster General has also great controlling power over the railways with regard to the carrying of the mails, so that in both these ways the Government could have used effective means to put a pressure on the railways and bring about a settlement.

But it appears now that two things have been done. While the men were requested to get back to work, on account of their interview with the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) had with the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and while these gentlemen supposed they had made a settlement that would be satisfactory it is now found that the Grand Trunk Railway are making a selection. It is not that the men are to go back to work, but these men may make application to be taken back, which is quite a different thing, signifying that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is taking this opportunity of making a complete dismissal of all their section and road men, and then selecting those whom they will require. They are adopting a wholesale weeding out process, under the cover of this strike.

Another feature that is of interest to the general public is the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are singling out men who took an active part in the strike, particularly the section foremen, and that these men are deprived of their employment in large numbers and cannot get the jobs they had before. If that is the case, if these members who tried to effect a satisfactory settlement, have been deceived, then the case becomes more serious, the question will be more embittered, and the critical position worse to-day than it was in the earlier stages of the strike.

The public are looking at this matter with a good deal of interest. In the first place, considering the enormous franchises given to railway companies, the great advantages given them, we are bound to see that every effort towards absolute safety that can be devised will be used by them to protect the travelling public and their employees. If eighteen hundred sectionmen are out of employ, that is of greater consequence than if eighteen hundred conductors and engineers and firemen struck, because in the latter case, the trains could not run and the business of the country would be impeded, which would be unsatisfactory, of course, but would not be dangerous to human life. But here we have the engineers and conductors running the trains, but we have not the roadbed and the bridges kept in that order in which it should be kept, by inspection from day to day: and more particularly at this season of the year, when we have had a great deal of rain and there is danger of slides and floods, is this inspection required. Most of the accidents that have occurred in that respect in past years have occurred about this time of the year. We are now without that protection.

Then, with regard to the question as to whether these men have been used well or not, a railway man the other day gave me some particulars. He said that at the town of Meaford, these sectionmen had to take a train at 5.30 in the morning and go to Collingwood, where they were employed during the whole winter, putting up buildings and doing other work. They worked at Collingwood all day and returned by train, reaching Meaford at 9.40 at night, and for all that time they got one day's pay, 97 cents. They were not allowed any living allowance while away, so that these men have pretty hard times, going away in the winter mornings at 5.30 a.m., and returning to their homes at 9.40 p.m,. and doing that day after day the whole winter long for 97 cents a day. That being the case and times having improved, these men had a fairly good ground for asking an increase, more especially as the other great railway company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is giving higher wages for the same kind of work. They went to the company in the manner prescribed by the railway company dignitaries themselves; they laid their complaints before the lower grade of officers, and the answer was given that nothing could be done. They then asked to appeal to the highest authority, Mr. Hays, and Mr. Hays refused to see them. If that is the case, there was nothing left for them to do but strike. That is the way it appears from the information we have from the public press. So, a large measure of sympathy goes out to these railway men from the public because of the hard treatment they receive from the railway companies, and because, when their grievances were brought in proper form before the railway authorities, they were refused that consideration and hearing which every man is entitled to, I do not care what his occupation may be or who his employer may be. So, I hope that the First Minister will be able, notwithstanding that he told us that he found others, and that he retired, to find effective means to act with the authority and power which his position carries with it. I am sure he can act effectively, if he will, in settling the differences between the Grand Trunk Railway authorities and its employees.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, as one or two of the members of the House who have spoken, have expressed a desire, in which many members have joined, that I should make a statement of what took place with reference to the arrangement with Mr. Hays, I shall do so as briefly as possible, and shall confine my remarks as largely as possible to the letters and telegrams I have in my possession.

During the afternoon of Friday last, Mr. Wainwright had some negotiations with Mr. Taylor, the representative of South Leeds—or, probably, it would be better to say, that Mr. Wainwright had an interview with Mr. Taylor. I came along just as the conversation was about ending. The conversation was in regard to a settlement of the differences between the Grand Trunk Railway and the trackmen, and the proposition that was being discussed was, that what I will call a modus vivendi should be established during ten days, during which the strike should be suspended, and that during that time a settlement should be made between the workmen and the authorities of the Grand Trunk, and that the trackmen would be represented by Mr. Taylor and some other member of Parliament. As, during the year 1896, I had in hand the case of the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway, and had agitated an increase of pay for them, Mr. Taylor asked me, if I would go with him and see the gentlemen who were members of the Grand Lodge of the Trackmen's Union, in the city of Ottawa. Mr. Taylor succeeded in getting these gentlemen together, and they said, that they had no authority to accept any proposition, that the gentlemen with authority in the matter were the officers of the union in the city of Montreal. They expressed their opinion, however, quite favourably to the proposition, and, inasmuch as I had acted for them before, they requested that I should go to Montreal, in company with Mr. Taylor, and see those gentlemen of the order who had authority to treat. Consequently Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Taylor and myself went to Montreal the next morning. Immediately on our arrival in Montreal, we interviewed the gentlemen who had authority to speak for the order. They said, that the best thing to do was to see what Mr. Hays was willing to do for them, and, in accordance with their suggestion, we went over to see Mr. Hays. I shall say very little concerning the interview with Mr. Hays, and nothing more than is necessary to the proposition I am going to state. Mr. Hays took this position, firmly and distinctly—that he would not treat with the men, so long as they were strikers, and would make no promise whatever to them until they had returned to their employment, except that he would be willing to meet Mr. Taylor and myself, or any other two members of Parliament immediately after the men's return to work, at whatever place and at whatever time an appointment was made for, and he made the rather peculiar statement, that, if it was necessary in order to keep his appointment, he would walk either to Gananoque or to Ottawa. He would not vary from that or promise anything further than that. We returned and saw the men. There were numbers of rumours in circulation as to there being what we might call a slump of the trackmen, and that many were returning to work, and also that the railway authorities had succeeded in getting a number of men to take the places of those who had gone on strike. After some conversation with the trackmen, in which I gave expression to my opinion that, probably, if they did rely upon Mr. Hays, the best thing to do under the circumstances was to accept his proposition. But I told them that, before accepting it, inasmuch as Mr. Hays's proposition was so utterly at variance with, and fell so far short of, the claims put forward by the trackmen, when they went on strike, they should communicate by telegram with the subordinate lodges, and get their assent before they accepted Mr. Hays's proposition. I then left for Ottawa, which was just as the trackmen's representatives in the city of Montreal proceeded to interview the heads of the order, known as the Order of Engineers and Firemen. I know nothing, except by hearsay, of what took place between these people, but I am informed that the trackmen were strongly advised by the representatives of the other order to accept Mr. Hays's proposition, and the advice was taken. Accordingly, Mr. Taylor, who had remained in Montreal, about seven o'clock sent Mr. Hays a note, which I will give verbatim, as nearly as Mr. Taylor can remember it:

C. M. Hays, Esq., Manager G.T.R.

Telegrams are now being sent to all the men to go back to work at once.

(Sgd.) GEO. TAYLOR.

To that message Mr. Hays made no reply whatever. He did not complain that it was not in accordance to the terms of his proposition. I might say, there is no possibility of there being any error on my part as to the proposition being to take back all the men who had gone on strike. In fact, he requested Mr. Taylor and myself to advise them to go back to work. On my return to Ottawa, I was somewhat surprised, after the advice I had given, to be assured that Mr. Hays's proposition had been accepted without communication with the men or officers of the subordinate divisions of the union. The following morning, that is, Monday morning, there was placed in my hands the following despatch, addressed to W. Pole, who was the head of the order, at St. James Hotel, Montreal:

Have received orders from roadmaster that any trackmen who were not on duty Saturday, June 3rd, will not be permitted to resume work without first making an application and being accepted by me for re-employment. Please wire quick.

For reasons that will be patent to you, in view of the difficulty between the subordinate officers and the company I shall not give the name of the gentleman who signed the telegram. To that telegram I replied by a telegram to Mr. Hays. My impression was, from the date June 3rd being mentioned, that Mr. Hays or some officer of the company had issued an order that no one who

did not report for work before June 3rd, would obtain employment afterwards, and I imagined that this rule stood in the way of the subordinate officers along the line taking the men back. With that impression I sent the following telegram :—

June 5th, 1899.

Charles M. Hays, Manager G.T.R., Montreal.

Have been advised foremen at Bridgebury refused to let trackmen go to work. Please arrange.

(Sgd.) H. A. POWELL.

I have practically given away the name of the man, I cannot recall that. Then after I had sent that telegram another telegram was placed in my hands, addressed to the executive of the order at 193 Sparks Chambers, Ottawa :

Foreman refuses to employ men not working on June 3rd. Answer.

To that I replied by the following telegram to Mr. Hays :—

Charles M. Hays, Manager G.T.R., Montreal.

Further advices state trackmen on system generally who reported for duty are being refused employment, except on conditions. Can't you remove difficulties at once ?

(Sgd.) H. A. POWELL.

To that despatch I received a telegram in reply :

Montreal, June 5, 1899.

Your messages received. You will recall I was particular to have it understood by Mr. Taylor and yourself that I made no promises of any character whatever in connection with the trackmen returning to work. We are re-employing, as rapidly as their applications can be considered, such of the old men as we have work for and whose conduct during the recent strike was not objectionable. You are misinformed about trackmen being refused employment under any other circumstances.

(Sgd.) CHARLES M. HAYS.

To that I replied :

Charles M. Hays, Manager G.T.R., Montreal.

Your telegram received. You made no promise other than to enter into negotiations concerning grievances if strikers returned to work. This applied to all the strikers, and not a part of them, as you know. Your course, if persisted in, will render the situation again critical.

I then wrote a letter to Mr. Hays, which is as follows :—

Ottawa, June 5, 1899.

Chas. M. Hays, Esq., Manager G.T.R.,
Montreal, Que.

Dear Sir,—I received your telegram this p.m., and wired reply, of which doubtless you are now in receipt. The information I received is that you are not taking the men back as a matter of course in pursuance of our understanding. As Mr. Taylor and myself informed you, we appeared on behalf of the trackmen, being asked by the officers of the association to interview you, and as you expressed the desire to have the men back, requesting us to advise them to go back, it is difficult to conceive how any construction could be placed upon your remarks which would limit them to a portion of the men only. Such an important qualification should have been expressly made. You certainly stated clearly and distinctly that it would be impolitic for you to make any promise to the men whatever until they had returned to work, and you declined to make any other promise than this : That as soon as the men had returned you would negotiate concerning their grievances in a fair and friendly manner. Inasmuch as you gave no expression to any idea you had in your mind as to the exercising your discretion in taking back the men, I suggested, and I trust not in vain, the desirability of acting upon the views which both Mr. Taylor and myself entertained, and which we communicated to the committee. Of course, I do not suggest that you take back any who have been guilty of crime by injuring the property of the company. It would really be too bad if a matter which has come so near solution should be reopened for dispute and agitation.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) H. A. POWELL.

Mr. Taylor returned in the evening to Gananoque, and on his arrival at Ottawa on the evening of Monday I showed him the telegraphic communications that had passed between Mr. Hays and myself. Thereupon he sent Mr. Hays a telegram, of which the following is a copy :—

Chas. M. Hays, Manager G.T.R.

Just arrived here. Have seen messages that passed between Mr. Powell and yourself. Saw several gangs of sectionmen on my way down. They all started to work this morning, but roadmaster called them off until they signed new applications, and I hear instructions are that only part of the men are to be taken back. This is contrary to our understanding, and if you carry this into effect I fear the situation will be worse than it was before. I strongly advise you to take all on except violators of the criminal law, and everything will go smoothly.

(Sgd.) GEO. TAYLOR.

I received to-day from Mr. Hays a letter answering both my letter and Mr. Taylor's telegram. You will notice that my communication is solely connected with the proposition that passed between us. The following is the letter from Mr. Hays, which was written yesterday :—

Montreal, June 6th, 1899.

Hon. H. A. Powell, M.P., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your telegrams as well as letter of June 5th, relative to the trackmen, duly received, and both are based on a misapprehension as to the state of affairs existing.

The day following that on which the trackmen quit work I had notice issued to them that all who did not return within 24 hours would be considered as having voluntarily left the service of the company, and that we should reserve the privilege of dealing with them thereafter as we saw fit. During the period in which they were on strike we engaged quite a large number of men to take their places. There were at Kingston, Actonvale and one or two other points on the line, acts of violence engaged in by the striking trackmen or their sympathizers, instigated by the trackmen, which were only quieted by the action of the officers of the law. When the men, upon the advice of their leaders, after your conference with them, abandoned the strike and made application for their places we could not,

as you will well appreciate, treat them on any other basis than that of new men presenting themselves for employment. We could not, with justice to the men who had come to us when their services were needed, dispense with those who were satisfactory, neither could we be expected to give re-employment to men who had been guilty of acts of violence themselves, or of instigating others thereto. With these last two exceptions—and they are not numerous—we are putting the men back to work as rapidly as their applications can be considered. If it should develop that in the pursuit of this policy there has been an injustice done in any specific instance, I shall be glad to give it my personal consideration upon it being brought to my attention.

As Mr. Taylor wired me to much the same effect as yourself, perhaps you will kindly hand this letter to him for his perusal also.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) CHAS. M. HAYS,
General Manager.

I may say that the statement in that letter that a notice had been issued had never come to my knowledge. It had never been mentioned between us that an exception was made of any man or class of men whatever; although, of course, there would be an implied understanding that they were taking back the strikers and not criminals, men who had come within the range of the criminal law.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell), if he understood that there was any order issued on Saturday, the 3rd of June, that the men must resume work within twelve hours?

Mr. POWELL. No; I know or heard nothing of any order being issued as to returning to the work at any time, or on the 3rd of June. I simply imagined that probably that might have occurred. It was simply an inference from the statement in the telegram.

Mr. INGRAM. Did not the general manager know anything of that?

Mr. POWELL. I do not know. So far this was the conclusion, that the men were to go back. There was no qualification in any way. The men were to go back, and Mr. Hays made no promise whatever, except that if they were to go back, he then would immediately treat with Mr. Taylor, or myself, or any other members of Parliament in respect to the grievances that the men had. He advised us that we should advise the men to go back. I may say that since then these gentlemen, the grand officers of the union in Ottawa, applied to me and asked me what it meant. Mr. Lowe came to Ottawa, and I told him plainly that there was no question about the agreement being to take all back. Had I the slightest idea that they would have accepted Mr. Hays' proposition without notifying the subordinate lodges I would have stayed in Montreal, and I would have got the arrangement in black and white if it could have been got in writing. But my coming to Ottawa prevented that being done, if it could have been done. I was told by the head of the order that the committee had issued orders to renew the strike, and had called the men out. This was on the night of Monday, the 5th of this month, and that would take effect yesterday morning. I do not know the state of affairs at the present time, although, last night, I was informed by one of the gentlemen of the union that the men, quite generally along the line, especially in Ontario, were now out on strike, and that to-day the strike would be universal all over the Grand Trunk from Portland to Sarnia. Whether this is true or not I cannot say. When we went down to Montreal on Friday night, Mr. Taylor, myself and Mr. Wainwright being together, Mr. Taylor and myself watched the road from Coteau Junction to Montreal station. It was about 10 o'clock when we arrived at the station at Montreal. On that stretch of road we only saw one man with a shovel fixing a culvert, and another man walking the track. No other human beings were in sight on the track, except two groups of boys, of four and six each, with their books, going to school, I presume.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, as I was one of the parties referred to in connection with this matter I thought it should be right I should say a word or two. The interview, in the first place between Mr. Wainwright and myself, was not of my seeking. About 3.30 on Friday I received Mr. Wainwright's card on my desk, and I met him at the door. The first thing he said to me was to find fault with me for having made a speech in the House on the Tuesday previous, and he inferred that that was the first time that the matter had been brought up in the House. If he will refer to "Hansard" of the 27th of May he will find that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and other hon. gentlemen, made stronger statements than were made by me, when I spoke. If any hon. gentleman will refer to my speech he will see that I neither took sides with the railway company nor with the men. I made a statement of the facts and "Hansard" will reveal these facts. I met Mr. Wainwright and discussed with him, for a few moments, the statement I had made on the previous Tuesday. He referred to me as having made the statement that the road was in a dangerous condition. I asked him why the strike was not settled, and he said: Why do you not settle it? I said I thought I could settle it in twenty-four hours. He said: Go on and do it. Just then the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) came along, and we had a further discussion, the result of which was that I sent down town for the executive of the trackmen. They came up with the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). These gentlemen, with myself and the hon.

member for Westmoreland, had some talk in my room in reference to it. I conveyed to them the statement we had received from Mr. Wainwright. The statement made by the executive was that they could say nothing until they should have met that night at eight o'clock, and they promised that they would come back immediately after their meeting that night. Mr. Wainwright intended returning to Montreal on the 6.30 train. Mr. Powell, whom I will refer to as Mr. Powell, with his consent, and yours, Mr. Speaker, went down to Mr. Wainwright's car at the station and told him of the interview we had had with the executive, that we expected to hear from them again that evening and advised him to remain over until the morning. Mr. Wainwright immediately said: I will remain over, and in the meantime, I will communicate with Montreal. Then, in his car, I prepared what I thought would be a telegram covering the matter, and left it for him to improve upon that he might communicate with Mr. Hays. I understood when he left the car that he had prepared a telegram and sent it to Montreal. Having had our interview with the executive at nine o'clock, we went down again and told him the result of the interview with the general committee after it had met that night. In the meantime he said that he had talked with Mr. Hays and he asked us to go on to Montreal in the morning. We went to Montreal, and Mr. Powell has given the conversation that took place afterwards. After Mr. Powell left for Ottawa on the 5.30 train; he left Montreal for Ottawa during the time that I went to have a talk with other members of the executive board in Montreal in reference to the engineers. I went to see one of the members of the board on behalf of the executive of the engineers, and he strongly advised the trackmen to accept the proposition that the men go back to their places and leave the result to follow the interviews that might take place with Mr. Hays at his convenience. It was strongly and greatly to the credit of the judgment of the engineers that they gave this advice to the trackmen, because I think it was more on the advice they tendered than the advice we tendered to the trackmen that they sent out the telegrams, some 58 in number, which I wrote, to the different secretaries of the order all over the country, containing simply the one word, which was the cipher to the trackmen telling them to return to their work. I took the eight o'clock train for home, expecting that this arrangement would be satisfactory. But on my way down on Monday I saw crowds at the station, and I conversed with the men and as soon as I got here at six o'clock I sent a telegram, which Mr. Powell has read. I said, of course, as the telegram reads, that we did not consider that any person who had violated the criminal law should be taken back, but we expected our conversation referred to all the men. I received two letters on Tuesday morning. I will not give the names or places, but they show the course that was adopted by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in trying to settle this trouble:

Roadmaster —— has refused to allow me to resume duty for interfering with men who were patrolling track during strike. I would like to meet the man who accuses me of this, as it is false and cannot be proven. I interfered with no one, and am now ready to resume duty at once.

This man denies the interference of any one, and yet he is not given the chance to resume work. Here is another communication which I received:

Knowing you to be the friend of the workingmen of Canada, and, as I understand, just now taking up the case of the striking trackmen on the Grand Trunk Railway system, I wish to call your attention to the following message to foremen and men who were ready to resume work on receiving the word from Chairman Pole, of the Executive Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trackmen. The following is a true copy:—

"T.K., a.m., 5-6-1899.—Advise all foremen and men desirous to go back to work must make written application to me."

This was a telegram that came from one of the roadmasters to the men, and it stated that before they resumed work they must make written application.

The press says the men were to go back to their places as formerly, but to my own knowledge one foreman and one man between Kingston and Belleville have been told their services were no longer required. The question I would like to ask is: Has the company the right to ask us to make such application, we having been in the employ of the said company, some of us, upwards of 20 years, until present trouble? Many of the men and foremen fear that advantage will be taken of them if they should make such application, and are not satisfied by any means. Please give us a word of advice in the matter.

To that letter I made no reply, because I had hoped until to-day, until the order had gone to call the men out, that the matter would be settled, and even yet I hope the Grand Trunk Railway, knowing the temper of the men, will come to an amicable arrangement. I say now, as I mentioned in the discussion with Mr. Hays at Montreal, that every credit was due to the striking trackmen, who were two weeks on strike, and yet not an accident of any kind had happened, and nothing was interfered with. There was some little trouble at Kingston, but it was not caused by the trackmen, and I was told by one of the conductors that the trackmen themselves interfered to prevent that trouble.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. All over the line, so far as I can understand, the trackmen did the best they could to preserve and protect the Grand Trunk Railway property. Of course,

if any of them violated the law, no person could justify them, but, as I urged upon the general manager, the men are deserving of every credit for acting as peaceably as they did. I do not know what will be the result if the strike goes on for another two weeks. It is true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) stated, that although the Grand Trunk Railway people say they have any number of men at work on the road, yet they are not to be seen, and they were not to be seen the morning we went down, for from Coteau to the headquarters at Montreal, there was but one man visible. They have men walking the track, but these men have no tools with them and they are simply reporting what they hear with reference to the men. I had hoped, and still hope, that the Grand Trunk Railway authorities will accept the proposition. I feel and do feel, that the trouble in arriving at the settlement was caused by under-officials, and not by the general manager, and not by Mr. Wainwright.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I feel that a little coolheadedness will settle the matter. I know the temper of the men, and I know that every one of them is willing to go back and to leave their grievances for future adjudication. The matter was in a fair way for adjustment, but the under-officials put in hard and fast rules to the effect that the men should go on their knees and make an application for new work. I do not think that was at all necessary. One dollar a day is not a fair wage for a man in this age.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I assure the House, that I have no desire to say anything to aggravate the trouble that exists in the country in connection with this Grand Trunk Railway strike. But, Sir, we must remember that the old province of Canada had $15,000,000 invested in the Grand Trunk Railway, and on that ground alone I consider that this Parliament has some right to speak. We have an interest in that property, and we have the right to demand that not only shall that property be protected, but that the lives of the people who are travelling on that railway shall be safeguarded. I do not regard the inspection of the road by a man sitting in the rear end of a train travelling at the rate of forty miles an hour, as the kind of inspection that is necessary to give confidence to the travelling public, or to afford protection to the property of the Grand Trunk Railway, in which the country has a large interest. The question before us now is, has faith been kept with the men as an outcome of the recent negotiations. From all I can learn, I do not think that the general manager has kept faith with these men, and if he has not done so—and I believe he has not done so—the Government of this country has a perfect right to interfere and to tell the manager of that great corporation that the interests of the 1,800 men who went out on strike must be guarded, and that if he will not instantly take action to grant the relief which is demanded, the time has arrived when the Government must speak.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have but a few words to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend (Mr. Robertson) intends to speak more than five minutes, of course we will call it six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

House proceeded to further consider the proposed motion of Mr. Sutherland for the third reading of Bill (No. 90) an Act respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company; and the motion of Mr. Douglas in amendment thereto.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). When the debate was adjourned the other evening, I was speaking of the evil effects of extending these railway charters. This practice, as followed in this House from time to time, has had an evil effect upon the development of the North-west Territories generally, because settlers were never certain when a road projected to be built through the portion of country where they were settled, would be built. The railway under consideration was chartered 20 years ago under the name of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. The incorporating Act was passed in 1880. In 1884, the company came to Parliament and got an Act changing the name of the railway from the Souris and Rocky Mountain to the Great North-west Central, and an extension of time was granted for the completion of the work. After that, I believe, they built some 50 miles of the road, running from close to Brandon to Hamiota. Then, the work stopped for a long time, and the company got into litigation and could not go on. In 1886 a further extension of time was granted, and the people were still anxiously waiting for something to be done. Now, I claim that the principle of extending these charters is wrong, for this reason. When a charter is granted for building a railway in

a new territory, a land grant of 6,400 acres a mile goes with the charter. At the time this land grant was given, the land was of no value, because it was without railway communication and there were no settlers there. In the meantime, the development of the country goes on, settlers go in, and the land naturally increases in value. In that way the charter becomes valuable, owing to the labour and industry of the settlers. If this sort of thing were allowed to go on, it would come to this stage, that the holders of these railway charters would not do any railway construction until the country was settled to such an extent that it would be a good paying speculation for these people to go in and build the road without getting anything in the way of subsidy. Still they hold a land grant made valuable by the industry of the settlers. That is the case here. Last year these people came and asked for an extension of time; the members from the west opposed that application as long as they could in the dying days of the session, and they at last agreed to allow the Bill to pass on condition that the company would build ten miles last year and ten miles this year. Up to this spring there has not been any of the road built at all, and, consequently, the charter has lapsed. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or the gentlemen who purchased this charter on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, purchased it subject to these conditions, and they should now come to Parliament to ask that those conditions be changed, but they should go on and complete the road. It would be no great thing for a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct 20 miles of a prairie road in four or five months. This road passes through a level prairie country, and I am sure that its construction would not cost more than $8,000 a mile; and if the company wanted to build the road, they could do it as well this year as to wait till next year. We are under the impression that unless the amendment of my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is carried, they will be back next year asking for another extension of time, hoping that more people will crowd into that country, and the lands will become more valuable, and that they will be able to make more money out of the subsidy than it will cost to build the road. The lands in that part of the country are today worth at least $3 an acre. They can realize more at present on the proceeds of the sales of lands than it would cost to build the road, and they should be obliged to go on and build. Just imagine a man living 50, 60 or 100 miles away from railway communication. He might have the finest soil in the world, and be able to raise 30 or 40 bushels of wheat per acre, and it would be impossible for him to haul it in and market it at a profit. This country is not like other portions of the territories, where the farmers can turn their attention to stock-raising. This road runs through a wheat country, one of the best in Manitoba, and, therefore, it is impossible for the farmers to turn their attention to the raising of stock, as they can in some other portions of the territories and in Manitoba, but they have to stick to the raising of grain, and that cannot be done profitably, unless there is a market in the near vicinity. These people are 50 to 100 miles away from railway communication, and 50 cents per bushel for wheat—which was the price paid last year—will not pay the farmer the cost of his labour and his machinery. We are spending an immense amount of money to induce people to come into the country and settle on our land; but, if we refuse them railway accommodation, all our efforts will be in vain, and many of those people who have come will be obliged to leave. The people that are settled in this section are more valuable settlers than those we are getting in now. A great many of them are from the old country and the older provinces of Canada, and the only possible way by which we can keep them in the country is to show them that something is going to be done with this road. It does not matter how little of the road is built this year, if only something be done to give the settlers confidence and encouragement to struggle on some years longer. If the company would only undertake to build 15 miles of a prairie road, that would be an encouragement to the settlers. But, if this Bill is allowed to pass, giving another extension of time, the people will simply conclude that we are to go on continually repeating the same old story that has been repeated since 1880, and that nothing will be accomplished. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway propose to spend $20,000, and they do not tell us how. I am sure they are not going to spend it in surveys. Well, if they would only add $60,000 more and make it $80,000, that would enable them to lay down 10 miles of track, but an expenditure of simply $20,000 will be of no avail whatever. If the Canadian Pacific Railway would even build 5 miles of road, that might give the people some confidence; but they do not seem to indicate that they want to do anything. Their only desire appears to be to obtain an extension of time. There has been a strong agitation all through that part of the country against any further extension. In the district of Saskatoon, there is an extensive settlement, and many of the people went in there on the strength of this charter, expecting that some time in the near future that road would be built. They have erected fine buildings, churches and schools, and have settled that country for some 40 or 50 miles around, and are anxiously waiting for something to be done in the way of railway accommodation. Let us go further, to Battleford, which is a town of some 400 or 500

people. These people went in there far from railway communication, and have built fine schools and churches and other buildings, in the expectation that this road would be built, and all the lands between Battleford and Saskatoon filled up in the near future. There is a tract of territory there, some 100 miles by 90, not a quarter section of which is not capable of sustaining a settler and his family, fine agricultural, wheat-growing lands, with any amount of fine timber for the construction of buildings, and also fine rail timber for the making of fences, and abundant water supply—everything necessary to build up a prosperous agricultural community. The only thing that is required is the railway, and without that railway we cannot expect any advance in settlement. You may send immigration literature and fine views to all parts of the world, and the people will say this Saskatchewan country is a very nice country, but there is no railway. And when they take up the papers of the country they will see this discussion and learn that this road was chartered twenty years ago, but that the charter had been extended year after year and the road has not been built; and that until now the Canadian Pacific Railway, the greatest corporation in this country, has secured control of the charter. I am sure the Canadian Pacific Railway could very easily build more than twenty miles this year if they wanted to do so. They have had enough assistance in various ways from the people of this country; they might take into consideration the settlers who have been waiting so long for this road. If the Canadian Pacific had not bought this charter, several other companies were prepared to take it over and proceed with the work. The Northern Pacific people would have been glad to get the charter, and, instead of building twenty miles, they would have been prepared to build a hundred miles this year. They know that this land grant of 6,400 acres a mile is an exceedingly valuable asset, in view of the tide of immigration flowing in there; they know that it will be worth more than the cost of the road. They know this is a first-class business proposition and they wanted to get hold of the charter. But the Canadian Pacific managed to get ahead of the others and secured control. Had the Northern Pacific secured control, they would not have come to the House to ask for an extension, but would be prepared to carry out the conditions of last year, made when we had the exhibition of Mr. Delap and his friends and Mr. Charlebois and his friends struggling over the carcase. I think the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) spoke of them as vampires or sharks. Now, we have got rid of the vampires and sharks, and we want something done with this road. I hope our friends on both sides will consider the case of these settlers, and remember that they are anxiously waiting for something to be done. It should not be lost sight of either that the building of a railway in that country is not a difficult matter. We are not asking anything unreasonable, when we ask that twenty miles be built this year. In one season the Regina Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, beginning about the opening of the month of June, built 250 miles of road before the snow fell on the prairie. So it is plain that we are not imposing too much on these people when we ask them to build twenty miles. There must be something at the bottom of this effort to avoid carrying out this condition. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway are well able to finance this enterprise, that they could build a hundred miles if they wanted to. It seems plain that there must be a nigger in the fence somewhere, and I think we are justified in coming to the conclusion that the reason for not building this road this year is not that they cannot raise the money but that they want to put it off for another year, leaving us no guarantee that they will not come back and ask for a still further delay next year. Without taking up more time, I declare myself a supporter of the amendment of my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis), who has just taken his seat, has not been listened to with the attention that should be given to a subject of such importance makes it imperative upon me to go into the history of this railway project very carefully. That history extends over a period of some twenty or twenty-two years. I do not desire to weary the House with details, but I ask the attention of hon. members, and I think I will be able to convince them that this is a case calling for action on the part of this House. It will be within the memory of men still living that a considerable number of settlers went into that country as far back probably as 1874. They were led to believe that if they remained in that country and were industrious, a railway would be extended to that section to carry out their produce. Many of the pioneers have died, many of them have grown gray, many of them have left the country, I fear, with a curse, because they have not had railroad communication. Originally this proposed road was known as the Souris and Rocky Mountain road. I think that one of the promoters was the late Mr. Beaty, known to history as "boy" Beaty. You will remember, Sir, that he was said to have made use of the expression with regard to some proposition connected with this road, "there is nothing in it for the 'boy'." This, as it was subsequently explained, arose out of a clerical error, that word written was

"coy." instead of "boy." And, I think, en passant, that it is due to the memory of that deceased statesman that this explanation should be made upon the floor of Parliament, in order that members and the country generally may know exactly what the facts were. I feel and have felt for some time that the memory of that gentleman should be vindicated in this particular.

Now, the House, and the members of the Railway Committee particularly, will remember that for the last four or five years the committee has been appealed to by the promoters of this railway for extensions of time. I do not think that the records of railway construction in Canada show such a case of scallawaggery as we know in connection with this railway. Members from the west, as you know, have been very earnest in opposing the extensions of time and were anxious that the road should be constructed at least before the last of these settlers who went out twenty years or more ago should die. I think it is only fair that these people should be protected. The members from the west have refused on all occasions either to present a petition in favour of the extension or to father a Bill for that purpose. In a moment of weakness, to quote an expression of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), I consented to stand sponsor for a Bill, and when it was printed it appeared in my name, granting an extension to that company. That was the first session that I was here, and I did not understand the practice very well, and when I discovered what the Bill really was, I was obliged to vote against it, for doing which I was commended by the people of that country, more especially the few surviving settlers in that district that this road was designed to serve. Well, it came to such a pass that it was absolutely impossible for these sharks and vampires, as the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) called them, to get anybody from the west to introduce a Bill at all. Now, we have the spectacle of unsuspecting representatives from the east doing so, no doubt without mature consideration, and without realizing the consequences that such action would entail. Well, they introduce these Bills, and we find ourselves obliged at the present time to give all opposition possible to them. I am sure the House will agree with me that the time has come when we should have, at least, a small portion of this railroad built. Year after year we have been promised, sometimes 10 miles, sometimes 5 miles, and sometimes less or more. Well, it has come to that pass up there that the people would almost be contented if they could only see a few stakes along the road; if they could only see a surveyor's flag once in a while set out there it would be some small consolation. But we do not even see a stake driven, nor a surveyor looking over the ground. We think the time has come to insist on something being done in the building of that railroad. We feel that inasmuch as the representatives from that country are unanimous in desiring the construction of that branch, at least their representations should be listened to by the other members of this House. I did not hear the words of the hon. member for Assiniboia the other day in the Railway Committee to which I understood some dissent was taken, but I must confess that I sympathize to a considerable extent with the proposition that when a railway scheme is before a committee of this House it is, at least, a fair thing, to ask that members who represent the district affected should have some consideration given to their statements. We find that notwithstanding the fact that we cannot even get a member from the west to introduce a Bill, or even to father a Bill, the House seems willing to grant the desires of these railway promoters. When it comes to a position like that, it seems to me that it is incumbent on the members from the west to offer all the opposition in their power to the granting of those vast concessions. I may say that a large number of petitions have been sent to me to oppose any further extension; because, you will see, Mr. Speaker, that when a large settlement of thrifty people go into a country like that, railway communication becomes very necessary to them. It is a beautiful country, a rolling country, with hills and valleys, in fact it is calculated to remind one of those lines that are found, I think, in William Cullen Bryant's poems, which members of the House probably remember:

These are the gardens of the desert, these
The unshorn fields, boundless and beautiful,
For which the speech of England has no name—
The Prairies. I behold them for the first,
And my heart swells, while the dilated sight
Takes in the encircling vastness. Lo! they stretch
In airy undulations, far away,
As if the ocean, in his gentlest swell,
Stood still, with all his rounded billows fixed
And motionless for ever. Motionless?
No! they are all unchained again. The clouds
Sweep over with their shadows, and beneath
The surface rolls and fluctuates to the eye;
Dark hollows seem to glide along and chase
The sunny ridges. Breezes of the South!
Who toss the golden and the flame-like flowers,
And pass the prairie-hawk that, poised on high,
Flaps his broad wings, yet moves not—ye have played
Among the palms of Mexico and vines
Of Texas, and have crisped the limpid brooks
That from the fountains of Sonora glide
Into the calm Pacific—have ye fanned
A nobler or a lovelier scene than this?
Man hath no part in all this glorious work:
The Hand that built the firmament hath heaved
And smoothed these verdant swells, and sown their slopes
With herbage, planted them with island groves,
And hedged them round with forests. Fitting floor
For this magnificent temple of the sky—
With flowers whose glory and whose multitude
Rival the constellations. The great heavens

Seem to stoop down upon the scene in love—
A nearer vault, and of a tenderer blue
Than that which bends above our eastern hills.

The country in which these people have settled reminds one very much of those beautiful lines which I have just quoted. If you were to visit that country, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will have an opportunity within two or three years at least of visiting the North-west, you would sympathize with these settlers whose progress is so much retarded by the lack of a railway in that country. They are obliged, as you probably know, to carry their grain in carts, or wagons, or sleighs, some 20 miles, some 30, some 40, and some 50 miles. It is not long since that it cost, at least, one bushel of wheat to send another bushel of wheat to market, and when you remember that fact you will agree with me that it is an additional hardship to force these unfortunate people to draw their grain the distances that I have mentioned. I stand here now in the name of the people of the great North-west to protest against the pursuance of that policy any longer. I am here to demand that the railway company be compelled to build at least 15 or 20 miles this year. It is not a large amount of money to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to expend. If they spend $100,000 or so, it will be amply sufficient. When it is remembered that this Dominion of Canada has given the Canadian Pacific Railway in cash, in lands, and in completed roads, value to the amount of $125,000,000, it is surely a moderate proposition to say that they should at least spend $100,000 in the interests of the people of that country. They have secured this charter from the Great North-west Central people. It is a very valuable charter, because it gives a land grant of some 6,400 acres per mile for its entire length, and I understand it is designed to extend the railway to the Yellow Head Pass in the Rocky Mountains. I claim that the land grant alone will be amply sufficient to build that entire line, and if they should receive $2 an acre for that land grant, a moderate sum, that would give them $12,800 per mile. I am told by competent engineers that that line can be built on the average for $7,000 or $8,000 per mile. So you see that the country is presenting to that company the entire cost of the road, besides a handsome subsidy into the bargain. That being the case, I say it is one of the most moderate demands that can be made to ask them to expend at least $100,000 in extending that road 15 or 20 miles this year. They told the Railway Committee, and the committee believed it, that they would spend $20,000 before the snow flies. I would like to ask any hon. member of this House who may sympathize with the Canadian Pacific Railway, what use will that expenditure of $20,000 be to the settlers in that country. It might be of service on that portion of the road already built, but it would not add one yard to the mileage, because when you undertake grading, you must do it on a more extensive scale than would be involved in an expenditure of $20,000. I am sure I will not appeal to this House in vain in asking that the amendment which my hon. friend has introduced to compel this company to build 20 miles this year, should be carried. There is another point that may be very well considered. I believe, and in this statement I am absolutely serious, that the time has come when the Government and the people's representatives should consider the desirability of, at least, owning the railways which are to be built in the future. I believe the time has come when the people are recognizing this, and the time is coming when that feeling will be much stronger.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, while he has been somewhat discursive, he is now going away from the point.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for going beyond the strict line, because I desire to adhere, most carefully, to the strict line, and I have always bowed to your ruling with the greatest submission. But I was going to point out that the time had come when we should nationalize this road. I believe it would be better if, instead of giving the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other corporation, such valuable considerations this Parliament should cancel the charter and build that road itself. That road can be built for at least $7,000 or $8,000 a mile. The country would own the road and we would have the balance of the land grant free. The policy of this country, as pursued by both Governments, has been to build the entire railways for these projectors, to pay every dollar that is put into them, hand them over, and then allow them to scorch the poor settlers with heavy freight rates. It is a fair proposition, and I feel that the time is now ripe when every representative of the people has to consider for himself whether it is not high time that we should take stock of the position and whether it is not time that, if the country is going to pay for these roads, as it has paid for them in the past, the country should own a railway of its own. It is quite true that we own the Intercolonial Railway and we hear a great deal about the loss on that road. But the country has been benefited, and the people have been benefited by low freight rates. This is an important consideration in that country, as it would be an important consideration in the west if we could get this great Great North-western Railway built by the Government and owned by the Government and make it a colonization railway. The settlers who have grown gray in that country waiting for a railway would then be afforded some measure of relief, and, I think, if we look at this question fairly in the face and if we are prepared to grapple with it, this carnival of handing

over the resources of the country to these promoters and enabling them to fatten at the expense of the public will not go on. I am sure I can appeal to hon. gentlemen, and I am sure they will see the force of the position I take and be disposed to support that position. In connection with this matter there was litigation extending over some five, six or seven years. I am sorry I have not the entire record here to read to the House. It would not take over a year and a half, but I have only been able to secure a portion of the record. I propose to read the portion I have here to-night, and, perhaps, if hon. members will bear with me in patience, I may be able to read the balance, probably, before the end of the session.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is only twelve minutes left.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As you all know this railway got into litigation. There was a man named Delap, a capitalist in England—I do not know that I can select a parliamentary word, but, if I were to say that he was jollied, probably it would suit—with apologies to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) into investing his money in this enterprise by one Charlebois. I think that probably the name of Charlebois is more or less familiar to the people of Canada. It seems to me that I have heard it before. He took the contract, I understand, for building that railway, and he induced Mr. Delap to put his money into the enterprise. Mr. Delap sent his agent, a lawyer named Stevens, out to make the arrangements with Mr. Charlebois, and from the information which has been furnished me, I am led to believe that Mr. Stevens threw his client down and made an immoral bargain with Mr. Charlebois. In that way the case got into liquidation and dragged for some five or six or seven years, and so far as I can understand it is not absolutely settled up to the present time. The Canadian Pacific Railway has now purchased the claims of some of these promoters, I think that of Mr. Delap amongst them, and it is endeavouring to get the project in some sort of shape, and we are extremely anxious that they shall be obliged to build a portion of the road, 20 miles, this year. Coming back to the litigation, the case ran the gauntlet of the Canadian courts and was finally appealed to the Privy Council in England. Let me read a brief extract from the decision of Mr. Justice Gwynne, of our own Supreme Court here, when that court heard the case:

> It is apparent that the company is one of these companies formed, as is not unusual in this country, for the purpose of constructing railroads, not as purely commercial undertakings, and not constructed fully or chiefly with subscribed capital, but chiefly upon the security of Government or municipal subsidies, or both.

So I am able to summon Mr. Justice Gwynne in support of a proposition I laid down some time ago, that the practice in this country seems to have been, and actually is, that these railway promoters have exploited municipal authorities, have exploited the provincial governments and the Dominion Governments, and have got in subsidies more than would build the entire roads. In addition to that, they get permission to issue bonds for far more than the road costs, and in that way they get a large sum out of the railroad, in addition to what they get from the Government. I reiterate, that it is the bounden duty of the representatives of the Dominion in this Parliament to see that the exploiters do not go any further, and that the country gets the benefit of the subsidies that are given. Let me continue reading from the judgment:

> In the present case the subsidy was a Government land grant, which could not be obtained by the company until they should enter into a contract for building 50 miles of the road to be completed by a fixed date.

I am afraid the House is not giving me that attention that is desirable under the circumstances, because it is extremely important that hon. gentlemen should be well versed in the judgment of Mr. Justice Gwynne. He is a very able judge, and anything he has to say on the railway question is of the deepest interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have six minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I shall continue to read from the judgment:

> If Charlebois had agreed with Stevens to pay the shares up in full, so as to transfer them as shares paid up in full, it is plain that he did not do so unless Stevens paid the money upon the shares as a loan to Charlebois, and upon his promise to repay Stevens the amount, which promise Charlebois has fulfilled.

This Stevens is the man I alluded to a short time ago, as having been charged with making an immoral bargain with Charlebois. I thought his name was spelled "S-t-e-p-h-e-n-s," but I find it is spelled "S-t-e-v-e-n-s."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the House will bear with me a second, I will finish this paragraph in the judgment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills having elapsed, the debate will be proceeded with on the motion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), that this House do now adjourn.

STRIKE ON THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TRACKMEN.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Maclean, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. J. ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, this motion brought up by the

hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has, of course, a direct bearing on the strike of the Grand Trunk trackmen. As I understand it, some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House took the advice of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), and tried to mediate in this matter. It looks as if these hon. gentlemen were deceived by the management of the Grand Trunk Railway. I cannot see that a particle of blame attaches to the hon. gentlemen of this House who were good enough to try if they could settle this difficulty. Indeed, they would not have had to interfere, if the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) had hinted, at the outset of this trouble, that the Government could not afford to have the country disgraced by the spectacle of hard-working men, decent Canadian citizens, struggling for an increase in the beggarly pittance which the Grand Trunk Railway Company pays to its trackmen. I suppose that the hon. the First Minister is still waiting for the Grand Trunk Railway side of the story, he having received the trackmen's side of the story to-day. I know his unwillingness to condemn the Grand Trunk Railway unheard, but what evidence can improve the position of these poor men, who have to solve the problem of life for themselves, their wives and their children on a gross income of 98 cents a day? If the Grand Trunk Railway authorities have any evidence which can better the lot of these unfortunate trackmen, General Manager Hays ought to place that evidence at the disposal of the hon. the First Minister, and the First Minister should immediately acquaint this House with any facts which will show the Grand Trunk Railway authorities in a better light.

I suppose there was no precedent which would justify the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) in attempting mediation, when this subject was called to his attention. There was no precedent, Mr. Speaker, which justified the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in attempting to give away one-half of the Yukon to Mackenzie & Mann. The Government cannot find precedents for doing anything it does not want to do, but, when it comes to something it wants to do, it makes precedents as it goes along. It is a pity that the Government did not do what these three members of Parliament tried to do.

And again I say that these three hon. gentlemen are to be praised, not blamed. They acted in good faith, and they could not foresee the perfidy of the Grand Trunk Railway authorities. Perfidy, I admit, is a strong word to use; but what other word will describe the conduct of General Manager Hays and his assistants, who used this conference with members of Parliament to crush struggling men—yes, to work a bunco game on poor trackmen who, throughout this entire trouble, have acted the part of decent, law-abiding Canadians. It has come to be a rule, Mr. Speaker, that a humble member of this House is in danger of having his motives aspersed if he ventures on words or actions which do not meet with the approval of the hon. the First Minister or the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I am not referring to any previous debate; I am speculating as to the possibilities in connection with the question now under discussion. I know that the rules of this House forbid any hon. member from questioning the motives of another hon. member; but when the Government loses its temper, trifles like the British constitution and the rules of this House cannot quench the fiery eloquence of the hon. the First Minister or the silver-tongued orator of North Oxford. It would be a great grief to me, Mr. Speaker, if anything I have said or anything I may say on this question should fail to win applause and approval from those hon. gentlemen, who are first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of their countrymen. I do not care what the hon. the First Minister or the hon. member for North Oxford may choose to say or think about my motives. I can tell the hon. the First Minister that I neither covet his smile nor fear his frown. My motives and my acts alike are subject to the judgment of the people who sent me here. The end of my parliamentary journey is not far off, but while I am here, I propose to follow my own standards of duty, regardless of what the hon. the First Minister may say of me or my motives. It might be as well for the hon. member for North Oxford, his Sancho Panza, not to waste so much of his valuable time and energy in crushing a poor, humble member of Parliament. They say it is a glorious thing to have a giant's strength, but the hon. gentleman should use his strength in battle with great men like Judge Clark of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would suggest to the hon. member for North Oxford that he is apt to give himself a lot of unnecessary concern about the motives of people who are daring enough to disagree with him. I hope I shall not say anything which shall draw him out from among those brilliant flashes of silence which made his reputation among the brilliant statesmen of the Liberal party. I know he considers himself a great weight and authority in his own party. His authority, however, does not reach as far as this desk; and, on this or any other question, I will say what I think, and the hon. member for North Oxford may say what he chooses, and think what he likes—that is to say, if he ever does think.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I remember, Sir, that in the celebrated discourse of Cicero, he tells us how a great orator declared that Tisias did not go to the Campus Martius because he lost one arm. Well, Sir, although one of my arms is disabled, I can assure the hon. gentleman from whom I heard a mur-

mur just now, that with one arm tied up I am still equal to come to this Campus Martius. I have not risen in this debate, Mr. Speaker, to utter one word of adverse criticism in regard either to the Government or to the Grand Trunk Railway ; but I think the country owes a debt of gratitude to my hon. friends the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I rise to say that the correspondence which has been read here to-day, on the face of it, needs some explanation, and I will tell you why. I have a great respect for the ability of Mr. Hays. There cannot be the least doubt that from the hon. member for Westmoreland and the hon. member for Leeds we heard a true account of what took place between them and Mr. Hays. Well, Sir, can you conceive of a man in the responsible position of Mr. Hays, and a man of his ability, making an agreement such as he made with those two hon. gentlemen, intending two days afterwards to take the course he did, thereby placing the undesirable state of things that existed in a far worse position, and making the difficulty that had to be solved still more difficult of solution ? It is not possible for me, Sir, to believe that Mr. Hays deliberately made the agreement that he made with the two members of Parliament, with the intention of taking the course that he took, because he is a clever enough man to know that the moment he took the course that was subsequently taken, the telegram, the debate that has taken place here to-night, and questions in the press, would have followed, demanding an explanation of what could have made him make such an agreement, and two days afterwards break that agreement. So that I say that on the face of this correspondence there is something to be explained. I will now call attention to the letter of Mr. Hays. The agreement is put forward by Mr. McKenny, grand secretary of the United Brotherhood, as he understood it, and it is exactly the same as the agreement that has been described to us to-day by the two hon. members of this House. This is what he says :

> The two members of Parliament reported to us that Mr. Hays had stated to them that if the trackmen saw fit to return to work, the differences between the men and the company would be negotiated immediately by Mr. Hays with two members of Parliament.

Mr. Hays writes on June 5th, after his attention has been called to the conduct of himself and his officials, addressing Mr. Powell :

> Your message received. You will recall I was particular to have it understood by Mr. Taylor and yourself that I made no promise of any character whatever in connection with the trackmen returning to work.

Fancy the conversation that, according to that letter—if that letter were one that had a strictly historical character—fancy the conversation that would take place between the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and Mr. Hays. Mr. Hays would say to these two gentlemen : Now, you will notice that I am making no promise whatever that the men are to go back to work. He does not say, in his letter, that he stated definitely to them : "I am not going to let these men go back to work," but that he said : "I was particular in making it clear to them that I was making no promise." The thing is ridiculous. The letter evidently has the character of an afterthought, and I wish to point out to the House that we have not all the facts, but that there is something behind which we have not got.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I must express my deep regret that this strike should have continued so long, and I do not think we are contributing very much to its settlement by the discussion in this House. In the first place, immediately after the attention of the right hon. First Minister was drawn, some days ago, to the fact that this strike was on, he entered into immediate communication with the heads of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purpose of doing anything that could be accomplished to bring about a settlement. These negotiations were in progress when the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) interfered—I dare say with the very best intentions—but from all I have heard it was very unfortunate that they should have interfered at all, and I am very much afraid that their interference has really injured the condition of the men rather than improved it. Things are back now into a worse hole than they were in before. The Government were superseded by these hon. gentlemen, the job was taken out of the hands of the Government. These hon. gentlemen assumed the responsibility, and I presume that the correspondence between the right hon. Prime Minister and the company then ceased. I think that was exceedingly unfortunate. These hon. gentlemen might have done what they thought best to do, but I am afraid their action very seriously interfered with the Government exercising any influence they might have exercised to bring about a settlement.

I sympathize with the men very much. A dollar a day at this season appears a low wage. I do not know whether the company pay that wage all the year round, but if they do the case is not so bad as if they paid a dollar a day now and possibly something less in winter. You can hire a man the year round for less than you can employ him only in the summer months, because at this season men's wages are higher than in the winter. I think the men themselves are deserving all praise,

at least those of them who have refrained from taking any revenge on the company, and I do hope that when this strike is over every man who has been in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway will be able to prove that he never countenanced or encouraged in any shape any attack on the company's property, or in any way endangered the public travelling along that line. If any of the men have thus acted, I can fully sympathize with the views expressed by Mr. Hays. No man who has secretly attempted to take revenge on the company by the destruction of the company's property or doing things he ought not to do, deserves to be reinstated, and I am confident that no hon. member of this House would take back a servant who had thus acted when out of employment. I do hope that it will be shown that none of the Grand Trunk Railway men have been guilty of anything of the kind. There was an outbreak at Kingston, but it is stated that those implicated were not in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway in that district.

I do hope, in the interest of the men, and the travelling public and the general interests of the country, that this strike will be brought to a satisfactory conclusion before long, and I do sincerely regret that any person should have interfered between the Government and the company, and taken the settlement of this matter out of the hands of the Government.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). It would be cause for deep regret if the speech just made were allowed to go unchallenged Its whole burden was to the effect that while the Government were striving to bring about a settlement of the dispute, members of Parliament deliberately interfered and prevented a settlement being made. There is nothing further from the truth. No hon. gentleman in this House, so far as I am aware, had cognizance of the fact that the right hon. First Minister had written or telegraphed or in any way used his influence with the authorities of the Grand Trunk Railway to bring the strike to a termination. The approaches that were made to my hon. friends from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) were made by an officer of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made a most uncalled-for statement when he alleged that these hon. gentlemen interfered and interrupted and destroyed whatever negotiations were going on between the First Minister and the Grand Trunk Railway authorities. But if the action of these hon. gentlemen, taken in good faith with the sole object of putting a stop to a condition of things deeply to be deplored, failed, surely that is all the more reason why the greater influence which hon. gentlemen opposite, the Premier and his colleagues, can exercise, should now be brought to bear. Not one moment should be lost in bringing all the pressure the Government can bring upon the Grand Trunk Railway to put an end to the condition of things existing on their line to-day; and from what I know myself of the conversation that took place with my hon. friends from Westmoreland and Leeds, I have no hesitation in taking the responsibility of saying in my place in the House to-night, that deception has been practised on the men, and that they would never have returned to work unless they had reasonable assurance that their case would be submitted to arbitration and their condition ameliorated. The fact that these men are compelled to work in all weather, is in itself a reason why they should receive higher wages in winter, because of the severity of the climate in that season. The fact, too, that they are compelled to work for 98 cents a day is in itself sufficient to justify me, at any rate, and the great majority of the members of the House in saying that they have a legitimate grievance against the authorities of the road. And in view of the relations between that road and the Government of this country, the Government have a right to step in and demand that the condition of the men shall be ameliorated. I would not have risen but that I desire to enter my protest against the attempt made, wilfully or unknowingly, by the hon. member for North Wellington to bring discredit upon my colleagues, whose action in this matter was straightforward, whose action was above-board, and whose effort was to settle the strike, after appealing to hon. gentlemen opposite to settle it, and when that appeal, so far as my hon. friends knew, had fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I do not rise for the purpose of taking part in the discussion but rather for the purpose of making a practical suggestion. No good purpose will be served by discussion along the lines upon which it has been conducted. To debate whether the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway have observed good faith or whether the hon members who interfered were actuated by proper motives will result in no practical good. What we ought to do in this case is to follow the precedent laid down in a similar condition of affairs in England. In 1893 there was a strike of some 200,000 miners, the public safety became endangered. Mr. Gladstone interfered because public safety was endangered; that is conceded on all hands to be about the only ground on which the Government ought to interfere. They should never interfere until that time arrives. Well, the modus operandi was this: Mr. Gladstone wrote to the representatives of both the miners' associations and coal owners, and invited a conference between the parties under the chairmanship of Lord Rosebery. This conference was held and terms of settlement were arrived at. Representatives from each side were chosen to arbitrate. An outside chair-

man or umpire was to be selected. If they could not agree on the man he was to be nominated by the Speaker of the Commons. Well, this court of arbitration was constituted and a complete settlement effected. We ought to follow in the line of that precedent. The leader of the Government should enter into communication both with the representatives of the railway company and the employees. I understand the employees have an organization that extends from one end of the track to the other, and that they have men authorized to speak for them. Therefore, conditions are favourable for a settlement and the demands of the men are reasonable. I would suggest, therefore, that letters be despatched at once with a view to a conference to be held under the chairmanship of one of the members of the Government. I do not wish to make invidious distinctions, but if I were asked to make a selection, I would choose the tactful and peace-making Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). The conference should be held and proceedings taken along the line followed in England. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that I am not allowed to move a resolution in amendment to a motion to adjourn. If it were parliamentary, I would move a resolution in some such words as the following :—

Resolved, that the leader of the Government be requested to enter into communication with the representatives of the Grand Trunk and of the employees of the said company now on strike, with a view to arranging a conference to be held under the chairmanship of a member of the Government, for the purpose, if possible, of amicably settling disputes now pending between the parties.

I do not agree with the suggestion that has been made imputing improper motives to the members of this House who tried to make a settlement of the strike. They made the effort, I believe honestly, and honourably. They failed, but that was not their fault. The Government, however, has greater influence in settling matters of this kind than an Opposition, I think, therefore, that this is a matter that ought to be undertaken by the leader of the Government and his colleagues. The safety of the travelling public demands and necessitates this interference.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not rise to make any remarks, but simply to ask the First Minister whether he has with him now copies of the correspondence he has held with the general manager or other officers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company referred to by him to-day, and, if he has, will he lay them on the Table ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will have the correspondence here to-morrow.

Mr. J. D. REID (South Grenville). Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that I trouble the House, but I ask the indulgence of hon. members for a few moments that I may be heard on this subject. So far as this strike on the Grand Trunk is concerned, I claim that it is not a political matter. It has been stated in the House that the men are receiving 98 cents per day. I claim that the statement ought to be made that the men receive $1 per day. The fact of stating it at even 2 cents less than the dollar makes it appear smaller than it really is. There is no man, I believe, who receives $1 a day but willingly pays the 2 cents per day for the benefit he derives from the insurance fund to which it is contributed. Therefore, I ask, in justice to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that the rate of pay per day that the men are receiving shall be plainly stated. In speaking of this matter I wish it distinctly understood that I have no axe to grind, that I am merely looking at it in a fair, honest manner. As to the wages that the men are receiving, I believe they are far too small, and that the demand the men have made for $1.25 per day is fair and reasonable in the present condition of things in this country. I think there is nothing unreasonable in the men's demands. But I think the Grand Trunk Railway and the men should be allowed to settle this dispute unless public life or property is endangered. And until this House or the Government has information that public life and property are in danger, I believe that the Grand Trunk Railway should be allowed to run its own affairs, and that they and the employees should be allowed to settle the strike. If that is done, I believe that the parties would settle the strike far better in the end for the men, with whom I sympathize greatly.

Now, I have never met the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway; I would not know him, if I met him. But I have met the superintendent, Mr. McGuiguan, and I believe that he would try and do what is in the interests of the men. The officers of the Grand Trunk Railway hold a position of responsibility and trust, and I believe that they must be allowed to settle this matter themselves. I have, as I said, a great deal of sympathy for the men ; I hope that they will win, and I wish them every success. But I believe that, from the shape this matter has got into now, we are in danger of injuring their position, and, if the strike continues, loss of life may ensue. In reference to the part that several members of this House took in trying to secure a settlement, I think that they deserve a great deal of credit. But I think it is very unfortunate, both for the men and for the company, that, when these gentlemen made such an important arrangement of that kind, they did not put down in writing the terms agreed to, and take it to the representatives of the men. I do not believe that either the representatives of the men or the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway

would go back on one word of what they had agreed to. I do not think that Mr. Hays, occupying the high position he does, would want to go back on one word of what he has said. This is a dispute between the Grand Trunk Railway and the men, and it is better to let them settle it between themselves. Had the representatives of the men and Mr. Hays settled this matter themselves, we would not be in the position that we are in to-night. I believe the Government has power to interfere, when life and property are in danger. I do not know whether the Government have been served with any notice that life and property are in danger, but, if they have been so notified, it is their duty to take action at once. If any accident should occur on any portion of the Grand Trunk line, there is no question that the Government would be held responsible, as soon as they are notified of the danger. The Grand Trunk Railway is a large corporation, and General Manager Hays and his assistants are responsible for the running of that road, and for the protection of life and property entrusted to their care. Now, I wish to say, in concluding, that I am in sympathy with the men. I believe every man in this House would like to see those men, who are hard-working and honest, receive more wages. I believe that is the wish of every person, and I hope that everything will be done by both sides of the House to try and get this matter settled to the satisfaction of all. But let us not make it a political matter, as the consequence then might be detrimental either to the cause of the men, or to the property of the Grand Trunk Railway, in which so many shareholders have invested their money.

Mr. JAMES KENDRY (West Peterborough). I deeply regret the strike that has taken place on the Grand Trunk Railway, and I think it has now reached such a point that it is the duty of the Government to take hold of it at once and settle it. I heard the Minister of Railways and Canals say, that the track was in good order. Well, I know, as a matter of fact, that in the section of country where I live, no one is looking after the track at all, and it is a mere matter of chance, if an accident does not take place. I say, the Government should take hold of this and compel the Grand Trunk Railway to settle the strike. We know that these men are scarcely getting $1 a day, while on the Canadian Pacific Railway, I believe, their trackmen are getting $1.25 a day. Now, why should the Grand Trunk Railway pay only $1 a day, when the Canadian Pacific Railway pay $1.25. I say these men have been deceived by the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway: I say, that Mr. Hays, who is president of that road, has deceived them. Some of these men live in my riding, and I know, as a matter of fact, that they would not have gone to work unless they believed that this thing was settled. I am glad to know that some hon. gentlemen in this House have interceded in behalf of the men, and I think they deserve the thanks of this House for so doing. As to the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, if his word is not as good as his bond, then he is not fit to manage that road. When these men went home, having the assurance of the manager that he would settle the difficulty, no matter whether he gave that assurance in writing or not, he should have settled that strike. Hereafter, the business people of this country will not be in a position to take the word of the president. I think, however, the man who is chiefly blameable is Mr. Wainwright. We know that he is the lobbyist of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I think he has misled the men in this strike. Surely, these men have a right to be paid the same as the trackmen on the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other road in this country, and I say, that 98 cents a day is not enough to keep them alive. We have all heard a great deal about the growing time. Well, if we have growing times, these men are entitled to get $1.25 a day or whatever other roads pay. In this House we are the guardians of the people; the Minister of Railways and Canals has control of the traffic of the railways, and I think it is time that the Prime Minister should compel the Grand Trunk Railway to settle this strike. A storm is going on at this moment, and, when you consider the expansion of the tracks of the road from the heat, and the wash-outs that may take place from the rains, you can easily understand the increased danger there is of accidents. I have every confidence in the First Minister that he will exert his influence and his authority to compel a settlement.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I would not undertake to say anything more on this question were it not for the change of circumstances that has occurred since the question was last discussed in this House. We have the statement of the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway to the effect that he will not deal with the striking trackmen of that company, and we have the statement of those who are guarding the interests of the trackmen to the effect that their men have been ordered out. Now, this is the stand that the two parties concerned in this contest have taken up. We have the evidence of the assistant to the general manager discussing the settlement of this question with two members of this House, and we have had the conversation that occurred at that time. These two gentlemen proceeded to accompany him to Montreal and make an effort to bring about a settlement. This is an evidence that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and those that are concerned in the strike on behalf of

the men, are agreed that it would be well to try to bring about an arrangement between the two parties by arbitration or negotiation. Therefore, I think, we have evidence that it should induce the Government to interfere in this matter. In this connection we find the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) sending out his engineers to investigate certain complaints. I understand that from north of Toronto certain complaints have been sent of the state of the track in that district. The papers in that district circulated the report that the Government had sent out detectives for the purpose of investigating that matter in that locality. I am not aware whether it is the case or not, but I am aware according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, this afternoon, that engineers have been sent out. I do not know what their report is; the hon. Minister did not say what they had reported to him. He did not say whether the complaints, as sent in, were justified or not, but the hon. Minister did make a statement that I entirely disagree with. He said that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had their track in such a condition that it was impossible for the track to get out of repair in the short time since the strike occurred. I know that statement not to be correct. In this country, whenever we have excessive heat or excessive cold, the railway tracks contract and expand, and it is a common thing, on our railways, to find freight trains out on the main line trying their best to get into a side track in order to let a passenger or other trains pass, and it is necessary for the trackmen to examine these roads every day and examine them very closely during the season of excessive heat or cold. So, I say, there is not a railway in this country but must be properly looked after every day, both in winter and summer. We have the statement of the management of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that 1,800 trackmen left the service of the company, that about 800 men have been re-employed or engaged in the service of the company, leaving them about 800 or 1,000 short of their full complement. In that case the works of the company are disorganized, and will any hon. gentleman pretend to say that where large works become disorganized they are in a safe condition? No man will say that they are safe. The general manager said to these gentlemen, and we have no reason to doubt these gentlemen, that if these men will return to work, in the course of ten days they will be in a position to negotiate, and, perhaps, bring about a friendly agreement. He has apparently gone back on that statement, according to the documents read in this House to-day. We have the statement made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) to the effect that the general manager would walk to Gananoque or Ottawa in order to bring about some kind of an arrangement, that he would take back all the men, but now we find that he repudiates that statement. As one who knows something about trackmen and something about the service of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I know perfectly well that in every branch of the service of that company there are men who have been there for long years, until they have arrived at the age of 45, 50 or 55 years. It may be the view of the general manager that these men have lost their usefulness to the company, and it may be that they are taking this means of removing the old men, the men who have been long in the service of the company. We have hon. gentlemen making statements to this House in respect to the dollar a day. I have seen the statement made by the management of the company that it is not correct, and that they have men in the employ of that company who are receiving $1, $1.10, and so on up to $2.50 daily, engaged in the track service of the company. But the great bulk of the men are the men who are receiving $1 a day less two cents for insurance. What is the position of those men who are receiving a low grade of pay? Every railway company in this country is supposed to have its section gangs, numbering five on every section. When it comes to the cold weather, or the winter season, all these companies lay off two or three of these men from each section, and it is the men who are receiving the low grade of pay that are laid off. Consequently, these men are not in a position to provide for their families, and now they are losing valuable time. It is valuable time because this is the season of the year when they make their income, and it is on this season of the year that they depend on making sufficient to keep themselves and their families during the winter season. So, I say, for that reason and for others, the Government should interfere in this matter. Surely there can be no harm if the right hon. leader of the Government, as suggested by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Bell), should intimate to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that one or two members of the Government are prepared to treat with the general manager and the employees engaged in this conflict. Why? Because the general manager has stated that at Kingston and Actonvale, damage has been done to the tracks of the railway company. If that be true in regard to the first strike, what are we liable to expect now when the men have been called out again? There will naturally be a few sympathizers with the men who may not be discreet men, who may do violence to some of the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and, if that happens, what might be the result? We might hear, to-morrow or the next day, of a very serious accident occurring on the Grand Trunk Railway Company's property in which valuable lives might be lost. So, I say, that it is not the time to lock the stable after the horse is stolen; now is the time to try to bring about an arrangement whereby the loss of life may be prevented. The

hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said that these men who have done damage should not be taken back. I have yet to learn that any trackmen, engaged by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, has committed any violence by injuring the track the cars or anything else; but, I say that if any employee has so far forgotten himself as to do violence to the company's property, the management would be justified in not re-engaging him. Fault has been found with the two hon. gentlemen who took part in this struggle. I cannot see, after what we have heard, how these gentlemen, having any concern for the welfare of the country, could refuse the encouragement they received from the representative of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, how they could refuse to accompany him to Montreal. When the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had prepared a telegram and submitted that telegram for the consideration of Mr. Wainwright, who either improved on it or sent it to Montreal as he found it, it seems to me that these gentlemen were quite warranted in going to the general manager and trying to bring about a satisfactory arrangement. That being the case, I think Mr. Hays, instead of taking the arbitrary ground that he would not arrive at any conclusion with these men, that the statement should go forth to the people of this country that he was granting or guaranteeing nothing to the men at all, should have acted in a fairer spirit. What does he say? He says: let the men come back unconditionally. Now, if he was eager to bring about a settlement, if he could forget his vanity for a moment, he should have put in black and white some sort of a statement which would have been signed by these two gentlemen, and if that had been done, no doubt a settlement would have been arrived at. If we are to have this question brought up in the House almost every alternate day for the purpose of urging the Government to effect a settlement, would it not be better that the Prime Minister should take the matter in hand, and if the right hon. gentleman does so, Conservatives and Reformers alike in this country will give him all the credit he deserves.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). I may state, Mr. Speaker, that coming as I do from a railway town, although I have not many railway men in my constituency, my sympathies are largely with the railway men, in relation to their request for an increase of their wages, and their request to get pay for overtime. I am, in fact, with the men in everything but their action in going on strike. I have always been opposed to strikes of any description, because I feel it is dangerous to the community that a large body of organized workingmen should be ordered to strike, and thus paralyze the business of the country, at the beck and nod of one or two leaders who may or may not be responsible men.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) object to the way the railway companies amalgamate?

Mr. HUGHES. I have always taken a stand against combines of any description for any illegal object. I believe they are against the interests of the public, and I trust I shall not change my views on that matter. The railway men in the community whence I come will bear me out in the statement that again and again in matters of dispute the men have come to me and I have acted as an intermediary, and in every single instance the men and the company have been satisfied, and the rights of the men have always been guarded. That has been the case on more than one occasion. This question of increasing the wages of the Grand Trunk trackmen came before me as far back as February last, when it was suggested to me by certain officers of the company—not the head officers of the company by any means—but by officers of the company who should have been in a position to understand the matter, that they thought possibly the company would be willing to pay $1.10 a day as the minimum wage, and to remove certain disabilities in the way of not paying for overtime. I was then led to believe that the head men of the labour organization would be satisfied with nothing short of the rate paid on the Canadian Pacific Railway, namely, $1.25 per day, and would permit of no settlement on any other basis. I will say here that take them all in all, the striking trackmen are as fine a body of men as you can find in any country, but it is unfortunate that they should be led by one or two men who assume to direct their action. What has been the history of strikes? I venture to say that three-fourths of the tramps in Canada and the United States are tramps because they were at one time strikers. They lost their positions when they went on strike, others took their places, and although the head centres continue to draw their pay, the unfortunate men were forced to travel from centre to centre looking for work, until faint and heart-sore, they gave up hope and became a burden on the community. It was my privilege to be on the staff ride between Toronto and Hamilton during the Queen's Birthday week, and I told many of these men whom I met that if they went back to work and asked the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition to mediate a better solution could be brought about than could possibly be obtained by their remaining on strike. Again, I recommend to the heads of the strikers' organization that course. I know, Sir, that there are not 5 per cent of the men who would not rather be at work than

on strike, and I know that if the leaders of the organization adopt my suggestion, before three weeks are over the men will be in a better position than they otherwise would be. While the position of some few may be improved by the strike, I say that a large number of these men will never get back to the positions they have recently left if they persist in continuing on strike. I know the feelings of the heads of the company towards the men, and I know they have the greatest sympathy with the men. It has been charged against the company that they do not look after the interests of Canadians, but I could point to several Canadians who have been sent across the line by the company to occupy high positions on the Chicago and Grand Trunk Railway, and I know on the other hand that very few Yankees have been brought in here. Mark you, I have every sympathy with the men, and I have in the past taken occasion to have their pay increased, and I shall be glad to do so again, but I stand here to-night to condemn in the strongest manner possible anything that savors of a strike until all other means fail. With all due deference to the leaders of this strike, I do not think they exhausted every other resource, although of course I may have been misinformed as to that. I again make the suggestion that the leaders of this strike should order the men back to work, and that they should ask the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition to act as intermediaries between the men and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If that be done, I venture to say that a satisfactory settlement will be arrived at in very short order.

Mr. GEO. McHUGH (South Victoria). I feel a strong interest in this matter, Mr. Speaker, for I believe it is a question which concerns more than the two struggling parties to the issue, because the travelling public as well are very much interested. I might say in reference to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that I have a very strong sympathy with it. It is the only railway system that passes through the section of the country which I have the honour to represent; it has done us a very good service, and I should not like to see any barriers placed in the way of its continuing to render that good service; I know well many of the employees who are out on strike; I know they are hard-working, honest, industrious men, and I know that they have given good and faithful service to their employers. I know also that it was because they felt that the wages they were receiving were scarcely adequate to support themselves and their families that caused them to go out on strike, and it was not any mere matter of sentiment. I would like to see both sides of this House treat this matter, not from a political point of view, but as a matter that very much concerns the people of this country. I take for granted that any hon. gentleman who occupies a seat in this House has more or less influence with the railway element in the section from which he comes. They look to him at times for advice; and if both sides used their advice in an effort to bring about a conciliatory settlement of this difficulty, I think the result would be more likely to be brought about than if one party or the other tried to make political capital out of it. The right hon. the Premier said to-day that he had the matter in hand and was trying to bring about a settlement until he thought the matter was taken out of his hands. This is one of those unfortunate things that sometimes happen, when people, in acting from the best of motives, make a fatal mistake. If both parties took hold of this question, without any desire to gain a political advantage the one over the other, but simply with the object of doing what was in the best interests of the country, I believe they could do a great deal towards bringing about a settlement of this unfortunate affair; and if they do that, I am sure the two struggling parties will very much appreciate their action. I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I know that the question has been discussed, perhaps more than it should have been, but I thought that before the discussion closed, I would say just a word on behalf of these men, who I think cannot be blamed by any person for having gone out in the hope, not of tieing up the railway, but of bettering their condition. We all must admit that the pittance they were receiving was not sufficient to support themselves and their families, and, whether they have been mistaken or not, I am sure that this House and this country will sympathize with them in their efforts.

Motion negatived.

QUARANTINED IMMIGRANTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Government whether they have any information in respect to the steamship "Lake Huron," which is said to be detained at Grosse Isle with 1,000 Doukhobors on board, among whom two cases of small-pox broke out yesterday and eleven to-day?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The only information I have is what I have just been told by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who I am sorry is not in his seat. The ship is detained with small-pox on board, but to what extent I have no information.

RECIPROCITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE BRITISH WEST INDIES.

Mr. N. C. WALLACE (West York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I

would like to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister to some despatches that have appeared in the Chicago "Record." There is one dated Washington, D.C., May 31, which says:

All of the British colonies in America——

Meaning the West Indian and South American colonies—

——are about to send agents to the United States to negotiate reciprocity treaties, and the first delegation is expected this week. This is done, of course, with the consent of the mother country, which claims the right to control and conduct all relations between her colonies and foreign countries, and Mr. Tower, charge d'affaires of Great Britain in Washington, will be present at the interviews to represent the person of Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. No attempt will be made to apply the reciprocity section of the Dingley Tariff Bill.

Then it goes on to say that the matters that will come up will be the duties on those products which Canada supplies to a considerable extent to the British West Indies, and which Canada can still further supply. It says:

One of the most important concessions to be demanded will be a reduction in the duty on flour. In Jamaica it is 8s., or $2 a barrel; in St. Vincent, Grenada, 4s.; in St. Lucia, Barbados, St. Kitt's and British Guiana, it is 4s. 2d. In the Virgin Islands, Antigua and Dominica it is 5s., with 12½ per cent ad valorem additional. In Honduras it is 2s. 1d.; in the Bahamas 2s. 6d., with 10 per cent ad valorem; in Turk's Island 3s. 9d.; in Trinidad 3s. 4d., and in Montserrat it is 2s.

Now, there has been a good deal of discussion in the press and elsewhere about a proposed alliance or annexation of the West Indian possessions, or some of them, to Canada, and I would like to know whether, in the face of the conferences that are being held between the Government of the United States and these colonies, the Government of the Dominion of Canada are watching these proceedings, and whether they have taken any steps in connection with them in the interest of Canada, or whether they propose to do so. In my opinion, if a reciprocity treaty be made with the United States, it will be most injurious to the interests of this Dominion. The British West Indies and the British possessions in South America——

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot make a discussion now.

Mr. WALLACE. I was calling the attention of the House to an important matter. If it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman would have no right to move a motion now.

Mr. WALLACE. Why?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Because a similar motion has just been dealt with.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But other business intervened.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The question raised by my hon. friend is a very important one, and if he makes a brief statement, I am sure the House would not be disposed to press the rule.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has made his statement.

Mr. WALLACE. I just call the attention of the Government to this matter. I do not wish to discuss it further than to say that it is the duty of the Government to watch closely the trend of affairs there, and to see that the interests of Canada are protected.

The PRIME MINISTER. We are watching closely the interests of Canada in that respect. So far as the Government are concerned, we have received no information whatever of the statement contained in the newspaper from which my hon. friend has just read.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to the incomplete state of a return which he promised to this House some time ago, and which he laid on the Table a few evenings ago. I refer to the papers connected with the dismissal of a fishery officer in my county, Mr. Lenoir. The principal paper on that file is an allaged report of the Commissioner of Fisheries, Prof. Prince. In the return furnished to me, there is no report from Prof. Prince. There is a memorandum which cannot be properly designated as a report. It is headed as follows:—"Report from the Commissioner of Fisheries to the Minister as to the record of fishery officer Lenoir." Then what purports to be the report says: "Lenoir's record not satisfactory." There is no date to this or signature, and it is evidently no report. I ask, therefore, that the report upon which the hon. Minister dismissed Mr. Lenoir be furnished to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman is altogether astray. This matter was brought up last year by Senator Miller, who thoroughly examined into it, and took the trouble to come to the department and see all the papers. The hon. gentleman has every paper in the record.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know what you would call a report. There is a statement given by Professor Prince to me, that Lenoir was not an efficient officer. That is all there was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no signature to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. GILLIES. This is not a report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know what the hon. gentleman calls a report. That is the report given me by Mr. Prince, and on that report Lenoir was dismissed.

Mr. GILLIES. Do I understand the Minister to say, that the paper I have in my hand, containing simply these words : "The record of Lenoir not satisfactory," without any signature or date, is the only report he has from the fishery commissioner, Professor Prince ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is all there is.

Mr. GILLIES. And upon that report Lenoir was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Precisely.

Mr. GILLIES. We will have something to say on this, when the hon. gentleman gets to his estimates. If that is the way he governs his department, I am not at all surprised at the indignation of the public.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE—APPEALS FROM THE CHAIRMAN.

On motion of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that the House resolve itself again into committee on Bill (No. 138) to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER said : With the permission of the House, before we proceed with the consideration of this Bill, I would like to make a full statement, in view of what occurred last night.

With the view of preventing any such misunderstanding with respect to the procedure on the questions that arose during yesterdays sittings in Committee of the Whole, and on the appeal to the House from the decision of the Chairman of the committee, I may state that I have referred to the authorities on such subjects, and find the following rules laid down authoritatively :—

1. If the committee wishes assistance or information on a point of procedure which they are in doubt, or on which the chairman has not expressed or does not wish to express an opinion, they may ask the advice of the Speaker. But, as a rule of practice, the chairman alone is responsible for the business of the committee, and no appeal can be made from his decision on a point of procedure except to the House.—(Mr. Speaker Brand, "Blackmore's Decisions," p. 21, "Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure," p. 483.)

2. In the former case, where the committee refers to the Speaker for advice, progress is reported on motion duly made, and when the Speaker has given his advice, the committee resumes in accordance with the regular practice of the House.—(Bourinot, Idem, p. 483.)

3. In case of an appeal to the House, there is no such motion made, but the chairman leaves the Chair immediately, and refers the point in dispute to the Speaker, so that the House may decide thereon.—(Bourinot, Idem, p. 482 and note, Rule 76 of the House.)

4. If the Speaker is absent, and the Deputy Speaker has to take the Chair in case of such an appeal, it is in accordance with regular practice of the Canadian as well as English Commons, for a member to take the Chair of the committee for the moment, and make the report of appeal to the Deputy Speaker, who will thereafter submit the question to the House for a final decision.—(May, 191 ; Bourinot, Idem, p. 482 and note p. 487.)

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—AGREEMENT WITH THE G. T. R.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I asked last night for the basis on which the hon. Minister arrived at the $140,000 which he pays as a sort of rental. The hon. gentleman was looking over his papers in order to get those estimates, but some other question arose, and he did not give the committee that information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I knew that I had given the special committee a full, detailed statement, which hon. gentlemen will find in the report of that committee, but was not able at the moment to lay my hands on the precise page. It will be found on page 11 of the report, filed as exhibit No. 15, being the statement furnished to me in February, 1897, by the chief engineer, giving his views as to what would be a reasonable amount for the Government to pay for the use of the station and terminals. He makes up the amount in this way, and I will read his estimate to the committee. He has estimated that these 4 miles of railway—that would be 4 miles of the terminals which we are to use—might fairly be called our portion, not, as he and I understood it, that we are to imply that there were any particular 4 miles which we would use of the many miles constituting these terminals ; not that we would be limited to the use of any 4 miles of them, for they would all be open to us—but that, as a means of arriving at an estimate of a fair rental, it would not be unreasonable to ascribe to the use by the

Government 4 miles of those terminal lines of railway. He put this at $320,000, and took one-half of that amount, $160,000. He estimated that there would be 10 acres of land for terminals at $2 per superficial foot, $871,200. The passenger station, if we were starting to build, would cost $100,000, and the Grand Trunk, for the purpose of this calculation, paying one-half, that would amount to $50,000. Then, for tracks, at $4,500 per mile, $18,000; freight sheds, $30,000; engine-house, $30,000; proportion of workshops, $30,000; sundries, $50,000, a total of $1,239,200, which, at 5 per cent, would represent $61,960 per annum.

The amount claimed by the Grand Trunk Railway, as the value of the proportion of the terminals that the Intercolonial Railway would use, was $62,500. Then, a further statement was prepared by the chief engineer in the same month, February, 1897, and was furnished to me. I will refer to a memorandum containing the statement which appeared at pages 13 and 14 of the Report of the Drummond County Commission:

> The cost of the construction of this bridge——

That is, the Victoria bridge.

> ——was, I think, $10,000,000. It could probably now be completed for $6,000,000.
>
> For the use of this bridge by the Intercolonial Railway, a fair rental would appear to be about $60,000 per annum.

Those who recall the actual figures, will remember that, if you divide the $140,000 in three sections we would give practically $40,000 for the use of the bridge. Accompanying and forming part of this memo. was an estimate of tolls over the Niagara bridge, on the basis of the number of passengers, number of locomotives, and so on, making a total of $247.50 per day. This, multiplied by 313 days, gives a total of $77,467.50. Such is the calculation he made for my use, applying the figures on the basis of the rates which now obtain, and had obtained, over the Niagara River bridge, which, as the chief engineer stated, and which appeared the other night in the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson), to be, I think it was, one-thirteenth of the length of the Victoria bridge. These are the two statements.

Mr. FOSTER. So, what my hon. friend has taken, as the basis of his calculation, is to estimate the cost, and take half the cost, and allow a permanent rental of 5 per cent on that half.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the principle, but it will be seen that I have not allowed that always.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is the principle. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, how it is that the deputy seems in one case to have taken half the value, and in others the whole value. For instance, when he estimates the 4 miles of railway at $320,000, he takes half of that as the amount on which 5 per cent is to be paid. But when you come to 10 acres of land for terminals, the whole amount is put in and 5 per cent calculated upon it. In the same way, with all the other things, except the passenger stations. So, except for the passenger station and the 4 miles of railway—I suppose, from the bridge to Bonaventure station—nothing is divided.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will observe that this statement contains an estimate of 10 acres. Of course, one at all familiar with the character of the terminals, would know that it would be impossible to lay down the tracks for the various descriptions of traffic upon such a limited acreage as that. This is, of course, largely, if not altogether, a matter of conjecture, not at all easy to figure upon. But this was, at all events, the mode which the chief engineer adopted, according to his best judgment in forming an opinion as to what these rentals might reasonably be.

Mr. FOSTER. Did my hon. friend ever contemplate the view, that, having made your valuation—however at hap-hazard it seems to be made, and without principle, and because half is taken in some respects, and the whole is taken in others—it would have been much cheaper for the Government, if they once ascertained the cost on which they were to pay interest for ninety-nine years, instead of paying an exhorbitant interest of 5 per cent, for the Government to borrow the money and pay it over, seeing that they can borrow at 2½ per cent, or a little more than half of 5 per cent? This would save an immense amount in the course of ninety-nine years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Such a mode of effecting an agreement would not have been practicable.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could furnish the hon. gentleman with more than one reason; but one, I think, will satisfy the committee. It would not have been open for the Government to buy from the Grand Trunk the privilege of using the terminals and paying cash, representing the capital value at the rate of interest agreed. We could not do it, in view of the mortgage obligations of the company, in such a way as to relieve the property from these obligations. I at once admit, there is not much practical danger of the encumbrance on the company's property being foreclosed; still, we should have been unable to come to Parliament and defend ourselves against the criticisms that the hon. gentleman and his friends would have offered. That was entirely out of the question.

Mr. FOSTER. The ground upon which I understand the hon. gentleman to say, that

this course, not the other, was pursued, is, that these terminals and buildings are under mortgage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, mortgage after mortgage.

Mr. FOSTER. But, if the Minister would be in danger of having this foreclosed, under the terms I suggest, he runs the same risk under the arrangement he has made. But the hon. gentleman has bound himself to pay $2,500 a year for ninety-nine years, and he has not lifted the mortgage. The mortgage remains exactly as it was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has not, I think, as clear an apprehension of the difficulties which I am trying to point out as he would have if he were a professional man. We do not have to face the possibility of a foreclosure of these mortgages because we are only under obligation to pay rent from year to year. The moment that any legal procedure were taken to foreclose these mortgages, and the Grand Trunk Railway ceases to be in a position to continue us in the possession of the property, our obligations to pay rent ceases, our lease is at an end. We are not called upon to pay one moment longer than the Grand Trunk Railway is in a position to continue to us the use of their property in accordance with the terms of the lease.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose my hon. friend contemplated that as an eventuality.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not, I do not think that would be likely to occur. But this I do know, that we would be laughed to scorn, not by the hon. gentleman alone but by every member of this House, if we had come to Parliament with any such proposition as to purchase the terminal rights. We would have been asked the question: How is it that you undertook to pay the capitalized value of this property to a company whose property is subject to mortgage, when to-morrow you are liable to be deprived of the use of that property? You parted with this enormous sum of money, $4,000,000, represented by these rentals, and you have not a thing to show for it. Why, I would have been ashamed, and Parliament would have been ashamed, of any such transaction. My hon. friend will see that there was only one way in which, under existing circumstances, we could have acquired securely and safely the right to use this property, and that was by paying a rental for it, a fixed annual amount for the time that we may be allowed to occupy it under our lease.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend did not do that, because there was no legal difficulty in the way, otherwise the assumption is that he would have taken that method, and, consequently would have saved to the country the difference between $36,000 a year and $62,500 a year, in perpetuity, you may say. I think that is a fair inference. Now, I want to put this question to the hon. gentleman: If there was merely this legal question in the way, why did not the hon. gentleman make this bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway upon this basis: There is a valuation, you agree to it, and I will agree to it, and I will pay you the current rate of interest thereon, that is, the rate at which the Government can get money. If the hon. gentleman had done that, he would have made exactly the same saving, and the inference is that he did not do it because of the legal difficulty which the mortgages impending upon the property placed in his way. There is no reason why the hon. gentleman should, for perpetuity, pay 5 per cent upon one-half of the large valuation of these properties. Although the lease is only for 99 years, it is practically in perpetuity. Well, the credit of the country is improving, 50 years from now it may be better than it is, and 100 years from now, still better. But without anticipating any better credit, at the present time money is worth 2¾ per cent; yet my hon. friend for 99 years pledges himself to pay 5 per cent interest on this great valuation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not drawing a logical conclusion from the facts as they exist. He does not imagine that it rested with us to say what the Grand Trunk Railway should accept. It did not rest with us to say what the Grand Trunk Railway Company should dispose of these privileges for. True, it rested with us whether we would give the amount which the Grand Trunk Railway Company exacted. The hon. gentleman's inference is that it was in our power to go to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and tell them: We are prepared to give you so much, we are prepared to give you a rental upon what we consider to be a fair value for such proportion of that property as we are going to use, and we put that rental at such a rate of interest as we choose to fix, and you must accept it. The hon. gentleman ignores the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway had resolved not to part with the privileges which we desired to acquire for any less sum than $150,000, and that altogether outside of any question of the rate of interest. The very best reduction we could secure from them was to reduce the sum of $140,000. Now, it is entirely immaterial how you figure that out, whether the Grand Trunk Railway were to get 5 per cent upon a proportionate valuation such as we make here, or whether you make the valuation higher and the rate of interest lower. The least sum for which we could get the privilege was $140,000. As I have said, we got the amount down until we reduced it to $140,000. That was not done by any process of calculation, but it was the

result of a good deal of negotiating as to the final maximum that the Government would be willing to pay. Finally the Grand Trunk Railway came to the conclusion that they would accept that amount, but not one farthing less. You have got to look at the question from this general aspect, look at all these privileges and their enormous value to us. I say that you cannot estimate within many millions what the value of that property is. Of course, we are only going to use a small share of it relatively with the Grand Trunk Railway, and it is not worth so much to us as to them, but we are getting it at a price which, I think, no man can gainsay is a reasonable and fair price. We are getting the use of splendid facilities, of magnificent terminals, of all that we could desire in order to get into the city of Montreal, and we are getting it at a gross capitalized value of $4,500,000, figured out at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. Before the committee the other night, going over all these different provisions which constitute the whole series of railways that we are acquiring, I put a fair and reasonable valuation upon them. You can absolutely throw away millions even then, and after you have dropped these millions from the fair and reasonable value of the whole, you have then got only 3 per cent upon $4,500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend constitutes himself a splendid advocate of the Grand Trunk Railway authorities when he goes to make a bargain with them on behalf of the country. The Grand Trunk Railway, probably, knew the gentleman with whom they had to deal. Instead of going as the representative of the people of Canada, he seems to have gone rather as the advocate of the Grand Trunk Railway itself. There was no difficulty in making a bargain. The hon. gentleman stated that he could not make any better bargain, and it is not on record that he tried to make any better bargain. It is not on record that he tried to make a better bargain, and he plumes himself because in the whole transaction he just got $10,000 a year off the amount that was formerly asked. Is it that the Grand Trunk Railway Company sets its foot down and says: We will take that or nothing. The hon. Minister says that the facilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are large: there is no doubt about that. The fact that the hon. Minister gets an entry by this railway and gets a 5 per cent user of these terminals does not abridge one iota the benefit of these terminals to the Grand Trunk Railway. The fact that the hon. Minister pays for the maintenance besides all this, does not compel the Grand Trunk to abridge, to the least possible extent, any of the privileges or the share that the Grand Trunk has of these terminal facilities. They have property of immense value; the Grand Trunk have all the use of that property and they get $140,000 in cash for which they do not bridge themselves by one single facility or privilege or bit of the user that they will make of these terminals. Then the hon. gentleman pays for the maintenance on the basis of user. When the bargain first came down it was a bargain very much harder than this. The points will be brought out as we go through it. We have brought out one of them already. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, which set its foot down, and which would not take one cent less, actually has given to the hon. gentleman, under Senatorial pressure, the sum of $6,000 a year in perpetuity. That is a neat and handsome sum. Then there is the 5 per cent section, to which we will come by and by, in which a very material change has been made. What I want to call the attention of the committee and of the country to is this: There were two parties to be benefited, and the Grand Trunk having those expensive terminals there with these facilities for the use of which the hon. Minister was bound to pay—a mortgage as he says, although that does not make any difference—the Grand Trunk Railway Company is getting the use, without the abridgement of one single bit of these facilities, and in addition to the use $140,000 a year based on the valuation of one-half of that with an interest rate of 5 per cent per year. What I think the hon. Minister should have done was not to accept the valuation which the Grand Trunk made, not to undertake to pay for a user which he did not need, one-half when the user was only 5 per cent. He would have good reason for saying: I will pay you interest at the rate at which the Government can get this money for. If he had done so he would have saved the difference between $36,000 and $62,500 a year, and in 99 years he would have saved an immense sum to this country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have had occasion to make several statements on this subject. I have stated to the House on every such occasion that I had an opportunity that these negotiations occupied a good deal of time, that I devoted my best attention to them with the assistance of my officers. I approached the Grand Trunk Railway Company in respect to it in the most earnest and sincere and devoted way, the standpoint of the public interest, the best arrangement I could for the country. I have stated that. I need not repeat it. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) accepts that statement or not is to me—I wish to say to him now—a matter entirely immaterial. I have put the statement before Parliament, I have put it before the country, and I am content to leave the result of the negotiations as they are embodied in the contract, as evidence which will, I think, amply support my action in the matter. I repeat again, what I said a moment ago, that it is perfectly idle to talk about getting the use of this property from the Grand

Trunk Railway Company on the basis of any valuation we chose to put upon it and agreeing to pay them at the rate of 3 per cent a year. The Grand Trunk Railway Company would not dream of it. I started in the first instance with what they thought too low an amount. I told the Grand Trunk Railway Company that it ought to be done for about $110,000. They would not dream of it. They told me there was no use of talking about it. I went up a little, and they came down and we got together at $140.000. At one point it was a question whether or not the negotiations should terminate, and the whole arrangement be at an end.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) permit me to ask if, when these negotiations took place, with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the hon. gentleman had committed himself to the purchase of the Drummond County Railway or was it afterwards ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, Sir ; the Government were not committed, in the remotest degree, to either of these propositions until we knew with confidence that we could carry them both out.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman occupies a still less defensive position than if he had the excuse of saying that, having been committed to the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, he found himself in the hands of the Grand Trunk.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says that he was not in that position. It makes his position all the less defensible than if he could plead so paltry an excuse. The hon. gentleman with his eyes opened, and not committed to any scheme, went into this arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. He has admitted that he could make no better terms. The hon. gentleman had the other alternative, and that was not to touch it at all. Then the hon. gentleman himself was in doubt. He said that he declared to the Grand Trunk that about $110,000 would be ample.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CLANCY. Did not the hon. gentleman commence with that proposition with the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, I tried to make the best trade I could. I tried to get the railway for the least rental, just as any business man would do in purchasing a piece of property. I did not jump at the proposition of the Grand Trunk the moment they presented it, and say, Yes, we will take that. There was a great difference of opinion, and during the negotiations there were two or three occasions when they came nearly ceasing altogether.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what was the basis of the calculation of making $110,000 offer to the Grand Trunk ? Was it a simple gamble, to use an expression employed by the hon. member himself ; was it a mere gamble ? The hon. gentleman declares that he went over $110,000 without taking into consideration anything rather than whether the Grand Trunk Railway would take that sum or not. He declares that there was a property of immense value belonging to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but he has failed to state, that while it was valued by the Grand Trunk Railway Company it had not that value to the people of Canada who are asked to make this vast expenditure for the purpose of carrying out the hon. gentleman's scheme. It does seem that the more the hon. gentleman discusses this question the more does it become apparent that he had set his mind upon carrying out this scheme, and that no matter what objectionable features there were to that scheme, he was bound to go through with it. Under these circumstances I do not think that the people of Canada will be disposed to take that view of it. In the first place the hon. gentleman has not shown that it was necessary to entertain a certain offer and the hon. gentleman has no justification for the ground that it was necessary for him to come to such terms as the Grand Trunk would exact from him. Suppose the Grand Trunk Railway asked the Minister for $200.-000 would he have acceded to that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will draw an inference. The Grand Trunk Railway offered to take $156,000, and they did not get it. It is not reasonable to ask, would I give $200,000 when I would not give $156,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the negotiations have ended there if they refused to come down, and would the whole scheme have fallen through ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, if the Minister's last limit was $140,000, he must have had some basis to guide him in that, and he should have stated it to the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood from the Minister last night that certain returns had been laid on the Table, but I have been unable to procure them so far.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were in the hands of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I spoke to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) about it, and

I spoke to the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) about it, but they state that the documents referred to did not contain the information I asked for. This agreement provides that the cost of maintenance shall be fixed on proportionate user, and that returns shall be made for that purpose. These returns would readily disclose to this committee what the proportionate user is. I think the hon. gentleman stated that the user of the Intercolonial Railway was about 5 per cent compared with the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The statement which I laid on the Table shows a percentage larger than that. I think it averages 20 or 25 per cent. It varies, of course, by reason of the circumstances which would be disclosed in the return which I brought down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) that the relative proportion is about 20 per cent, or one-fifth ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think it fully amounts to that with the business we are doing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, my hon. friend will bear in mind that it is only a small portion of the terminals which is being used by the Intercolonial Railway, or will be used for a great many years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be used in a sense just as much as a terminal as if we were doing ten times the business. We have to go over the tracks, but we do not go over them as often as if we did a larger business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it might be well to bear in mind what Mr. Wainwright stated about this. He deposed before the committee.

By Mr. Borden :

Q. Your use of these terminals would be very much larger than anything the Intercolonial could make ?—A. Certainly.

Q. What proportion ?—A. That would depend upon the business they do. The position is this : the agreement provides that we have the use of those terminals in common. I have shown in this plan that it involves the use of 40 miles of sidings, feight sheds, round-houses and all appurtenances. It is very much like going to a man who owns a palace, with my wife, having married, and asking him to give me his whole house. Of course, I can only use one room, but in a few years there may be a large family. I do not know what proportion will be our use and what will be theirs.

Q. How long do you think it will take this Intercolonial to have a family large enough to occupy this palace of the terminals ?—A. I think it will not take them long, and I think the proposition to extend the road to Montreal is one of those things that will add materially to the traffic.

Q. You have something of an idea of the business that came over the Intercolonial before they connected with Montreal ?—A. Yes.

Q. You have an idea of the relative proportion which your business at Montreal bears to that business ?—A. Well, it is very large, of course, in comparison.

Q. Could you give any idea of the proportion ? —A. No, because it varies materially.

The family does not seem to have increased very largely during the past year. I am a little surprised that the proportion should be so large as 20 per cent, because Mr. Wainwright would not undertake to say that the use would be one one-hundredth. This is Mr. Wainwright's evidence :

By Mr. Haggart :

Q. Is it a 100th ?—A. I would not like to make a positive statement. While they have in common the use of these facilities they only pay according to wheelage.

Q. Are there any other roads that have the use of your terminals in Montreal beside the Intercolonial ?—A. The roads that are running into Montreal, of course, with cars——

It is unfortunate that we have not the return which my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) did lay upon the Table, as he says, but which I have not been able to obtain access to.

Mr. FOSTER. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) had these papers, I had them, and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) had them as well. They came into our hands as we were at the time making some criticisms and investigations. Now, there was nothing in these papers at all to show what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) wanted, and what we have asked for repeatedly, namely, that during the months which the Intercolonial Railway has been using these terminals, and the Grand Trunk Railway as well, what proportion existed between the two users. For instance, if there are a thousand cars of the Grand Trunk Railway that used these terminals for a certain length of time, but only one hundred cars of the Intercolonial Railway used them, then we could get the proportion. The Minister gave us the amount we paid for user, but that does not answer the question of my hon. friend at all. It is as wide from it as it possibly can be. The only way in which the question of comparative user can be concluded is to let us know just what has been the proportionate user by the Grand Trunk Railway and by the Intercolonial Railway during the nine or ten months they have been operating it together. The return my hon. friend did not bring down. What he brought down was the amount the Intercolonial Railway has paid, but that does not show the proportion of user.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman will see, on reference to the question asked by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and on reference to the Journals of the House, that the return asked for by the hon. gentleman was brought down, and just as

he asked for it. I handed the memo. to my officer; he procured the information as I suppose, and placed it in my hand, and I brought it to the House and laid it on the Table. While I did so, I am free to confess that the statement was not worked out month by month in such detail as the hon. member now asks for. It gave the payments of the different months, and the amount was totalled.

Mr. FOSTER. Of money simply. Does not my hon. friend see that that does not give us the total user by the Grand Trunk Railway of these terminals for that time? It simply gives us what we were charged for our use during that time. We cannot get at the truth in any other way than by getting the user of the Intercolonial Railway on the one hand, and the user of the Grand Trunk Railway on the other, so that we can compare the two.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never brought in the information in the form in which the hon. gentleman has stated it. The way this matter is disposed of is this. The Grand Trunk makes out its claim month by month, and, before settling the account finally, the general manager sends up his auditor, who goes over the Grand Trunk books and ascertains whether the amount that has been charged, is accurate or otherwise. There are some considerable sums, which I know, from statements I have received, are still in dispute between the Grand Trunk and ourselves; but we are not furnished, nor do I think the general manager is furnished, with a statement from the Grand Trunk Company of their number of cars, the quantity of freight, or the number of passengers, or whatever may be necessary to arrive at a conclusion. They simply make out their claim for the money due on account of the Intercolonial, and the auditor goes through the books for that month, and verifies the correctness of the statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend does not seem to understand that I asked for the information which I really did ask for. I am certain my hon. friend understood it at the time, because I made it so plain that a child could understand it. I referred to section 3 and section 33 of this agreement, and I pointed out that the cost of maintenance was to be based on the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial trains bore to the total combined engine and car mileage running over the joint sections each month; and I pointed out that, under section 33, "Her Majesty and the company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs and other returns to be made as under these presents." So that, if this agreement is carried out, as we must presume it is, my hon. friend must have in his department the information showing precisely what the proportion of the Intercolonial engine and car mileage is to the combined engine and car mileage over those portions of the Grand Trunk terminals which are used by the Intercolonial, and my hon, friend will see that it is extremely important that we should have that here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to see where the importance of that comes in, unless the hon. gentleman thinks that the officers of the Intercolonial are going, with their eyes open. to pay more money than they ought to pay.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend, or any other member of this committee, must see, without any explanation from me, how extremely important that is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess, I do not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are we not dealing here with the question, whether this is a fair rental or not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; you are dealing with the principle—with the question, whether it is fair for one company to contract to pay the other, which maintains and supplies all the staff, and keeps the road up, according to the proportion of business which each does.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let us not confuse maintenance and rental. I am not finding fault with the basis of maintenance. I cannot think my hon. friend is really so difficult of comprehension as he seems to be. I want the proportion of cost of maintenance for the purpose of comparing the user of the Intercolonial with the user of the Grand Trunk, and for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not $140,000 a year is or is not a fair rental. Surely, my hon. friend does not find that so difficult of comprehension as he seems at first to find it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess, I cannot see the relevancy of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I regret that my hon. friend cannot. I will go on and see if I cannot make him see the relevancy of it. I do not despair of doing so. Suppose the Grand Trunk uses these terminals 100 times as much as the Intercolonial. Then, you have this state of affairs, that, if the Grand Trunk were leasing and paying on the basis of their user, they would be paying 100 times the $140,000, or $14,000,000. Does not my hon. friend see that it is most important to know just what user we are making of these terminals, as compared with the Grand Trunk Railway? I think my hon. friend should bring down the information which I asked for two weeks ago. I pointed

out the very sections of this agreement under which the return was to be made. I pointed out to him that his officers were entitled to receive, and must receive, under the terms of the agreement, at the end of each month, the precise information I desire. I brought that question to the hon. Minister's attention last night, and he told me he had brought the information down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did you find the statement? I told you I handed it in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not find it. The information I asked for is not there, and I looked carefully for it with the clerk.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I furnished the statement long ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On that I join issue with the hon. gentleman. If he will refer to "Hansard," he will see that I asked him exactly for what I have asked to-night. I pointed out then these two sections, under which it is apparent the information must be in his department at the end of each month, and he said he would bring it down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I handed the request to my officer at once.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If he did, and if, as the result, we have the document he refers to to-night, he handed to his officer something which did not correspond with what I asked.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What date was it?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). About ten days ago, just at the conclusion of a debate upon the Drummond County Railway resolutions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will look it up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that I have very much further to say until I get that information. It seems to me——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can argue it on the one per cent basis.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to do that. I want to argue it on the real basis. This is not an academic discussion, I suppose, altogether.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It is only twenty after eleven.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what my hon. friend means by that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hour is early.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Solicitor General seems to think this is a somewhat humorous phase of the matter. He thinks, I suppose, that to pay $140,000 a year for a one-hundredth user of these terminals would be perfectly just on the part of this Government.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You are not arguing it seriously, because that would be wasting your time and ours.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sorry my hon. friend regards it in that light; we cannot all of us bring to this matter the ability and learning of my hon. friend,——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not ability that is lacking on the part of my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). ——but he should not, from the height of his knowledge and great ability look down upon the humble efforts of hon. gentlemen on this side to throw some light on the question. We are endeavouring, in all seriousness, to show, what ought to be apparent to hon. gentlemen opposite without any argument, that if the Intercolonial Railway makes only one-hundredth part of the user of a portion of the terminals which the Grand Trunk Railway does, $140,000 a year is an absolutely excessive price. If my hon. friend the Solicitor General thinks this is not a serious proposition, let him get up and show that it is not an excessive price, under the circumstances. And, perhaps my hon. friend, the Postmaster General, who seems also to regard this matter from a somewhat humorous standpoint, will be good enough to enlighten the committee and show that the argument I am making is not a good one. I venture to think that any hon. gentleman would find it a very difficult proposition to show that if, as the hon. Minister of Railways says, this is to be argued on a basis of one-hundredth part of the user, $140,000 a year is not only an excessive, but an absolutely scandalous price. That is the reason why I asked the Minister of Railways ten days ago to bring down this information, which we have not yet got, and which, I supposed, from his statement last night, had been laid on the Table.

Mr. BRITTON. Do you not accept the hon. Minister's statement when he says that it is nearer 25 per cent than 20 per cent?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am informed by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) that the Minister said to him in this House that the percentage was about 5 per cent. He said that to me only to-day, and I venture to submit to my hon. friend from Kingston, who is a reasonable man, that when I asked for this information ten days ago and the Minister of Railways told me he would bring it down, and when I was informed last night that it had not been brought down, it is nothing unreasonable on my part and nothing to provoke the hilarity of hon. gentlemen opposite, to inquire why it has not been brought down. Does the hon. member for Kingston think that I am taking any unreasonable view?

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think that the rent we are to pay for these terminal facilities depends upon the amount of the user.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not depend upon it altogether ?

Mr. BRITTON. Certainly not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not depend on it at all ?

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think so. If we get an undivided half of all these terminals, year after year, the basis of computation as to the amount we are to pay does not depend on the amount of user we make of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will bear this in mind, he will see to what his argument will lead him. If we require to use simply one mile of those forty miles of terminals, and if we use that one mile to the extent only of one-thousandth part of what the Grand Trunk Railway uses it——

Mr. BRITTON. In that case you would not have rented it at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)——his argument would be exactly the same. Under those circumstances, we might require to use a part for the purpose of making connection at Montreal, and it would be more relevant to inquire, first, what is the value of the portion of those terminals as compared with the remainder ? Second, what user do we make of that portion as compared with the user of the Grand Trunk Railway ? Both of those circumstances, while they would not absolutely control the amount of rental we should pay, would, nevertheless, be perfectly relevant matter to consider. At all events, they would be sufficiently relevant to justify my asking the Minister of Railways to bring down information upon those points which, under the terms of this agreement, must be in his possession.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was going to ask my hon. friend a question, if he will allow me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was going to ask whether it would be a fair proposition to say that we would set on one side the amount of user which the Intercolonial Railway would make of this railway and its terminals, and on the other the amount of user which the Grand Trunk could make even if it had a great deal more business than it has now ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. Minister to repeat that, as I was interrupted and did not understand him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not putting a very serious question to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) takes an interest in this matter, and I desire to lay before him his responsibility in regard to it. I do not think the hon. member can have retrograded so far that he has no regard for the pledge of a Minister whom he supports. I refer to the Minister of Railways and Canals. We have a perfect right to ask for the information upon which certain sections of this agreement is based, information which it is enacted here shall be furnished to the Minister of Railways and Canals. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to think that we of the Opposition have any right to the presentation of our views to the country at all. Leaving all the other points aside, have we not a right to such information as will enable us to show our position and the grounds for it first to Parliament and afterwards to the country—because the arbitrament must finally rest with the country ? Our contention is this : You are giving $140,000 a year for rental, we want to know the proportion of user. This information must be in the hands of the Minister if he has carried out the agreement under which he has been working. We asked ten days ago that this information should be laid before the House. The Minister took note of it and promised to bring the information down. He was reminded last night that it was needed for the discussion of this schedule. and replied that he had laid it upon the Table. We come now to this conclusion, and my hon. friend for North Wellington will not dispute it—that the information has not been brought down, and, consequently, we are absolutely deprived of the ground for argument as to our position in regard to the inordinate payment of $140,000 a year for rental. The Minister of Railways and Canals deliberately violates his promise and is backed up by the Prime Minister in doing it, and is backed up by the hon. member for North Wellington in doing it, and he is backed up by the member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). Notice was given ten days ago that this information would be required, yet he has not the information here to-night, though we are going over the items on which that information was required. The hon. Minister himself acknowledged that the information is not here. Now, I put it to the hon. member for North Wellington : If he were on the Opposition side and was making his argument to the House and the country, would he not think he had a right to the information promised by the Minister and that must by this time be in his hands? And would he not have firm grounds for saying that as the Minister had not implemented his promise and brought down the information, it would be better to leave the matter over until the information is before the House ? The hon. member has taken that position over and over again as a fair-minded man and relying on his rights as a

member of this House. We might be this night on the third reading of the Drummond County Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gives one of his laughs, one of his superior kind of laughs which indicate to himself, if not to others, the supreme contempt in which he holds any one who would make an utterance which would provoke in him such risibility. But we might be to-night on the third reading of the Drummond County Bill, and I have asked the Minister of Railways and Canals, over and over again, until I am tired for the engineer's report on the state of the road before it was taken over. I have not received that information. And if we were reading the Bill for the third time, I should have come to the final conclusion of this question without having the information to which I have a right and which the hon. Minister has promised. Likewise he has promised the other which we require particularly at this stage of the measure. The Minister of Railways and Canals has the very grave idea of the question, that it does not matter. He said at one time that our proposition of user was 5 per cent, and he says to-night that it is 20 per cent. How does he know? He could only say that, if it is a true statement on the basis of information which he has in his possession. And then he said to the hon member for Halifax (Mr. Borden): You can make it one per cent if you like. That is his view of his promise to give the information and of the importance of the information itself. Now, I am coolly and calmly putting this to the members of the committee who are present. I think this is not proper treatment, and I think we have grounds for saying until the Minster brings down the information which he promised and which ought to be given, we ought to intermit the discussion.

THURSDAY, 8th June, 1899.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have found the reference of exactly what I did say on the occasion referred to. It was on the 20th May. I quote from page 3866 of "Hansard":

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair)) to one piece of information which he might afford to the House, and which must be very accessible. Under the third clause of the agreement of 1898, the cost of maintenance of the Montreal section and the Chaudière joint section is to be apportioned. The share of the Intercolonial Railway on the one hand and the Grand Trunk Railway on the other is to be in proportion to the engine and car mileage that each road bears to the total combined engine and car mileage. By the 33rd clause of the agreement, Her Majesty and the company are to furnish to each other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs, and other returns to be made as under these presents. Therefore, the Minister (Mr. Blair) must have from the Grand Trunk Railway Company returns and information which indicate exactly each month, what the proportion of user, made up in that way, by the Grand Trunk Railway and by the Intercolonial Railway respectively is. I venture to submit that information of that kind will be very useful to the House at some stage of the proceeding. It has not been brought to the attention of the House so far, as I understand, and it will be clear to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that it might at least be useful to some hon. gentlemen in the House for the purpose of making up their minds as to whether the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway was a fair arrangement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) himself, in giving evidence before the committee, stated what is, of course, the case, that the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company is so necessarily connected with the agreement now brought before the House by these resolutions, that the two must be considered together. I would like, therefore, if the hon. gentleman will, before this vote is taken, or before the Bill founded upon this resoultion is brought down, be good enough to furnish that information to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be no difficulty, I think, in furnishing that information, if the hon. gentleman desires it. Does he desire it for the whole period that the arrangement has been running?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to put the hon. gentleman to any unnecessary trouble, but I thought it was probably easy to furnish it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there will be no difficulty so far as I am aware in furnishing it down to the last date we have received a statement from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It will, I should think, be furnished before the introduction of the Bill or before the Grand Trunk Railway matter is disposed of.

Last night I brought the matter to the attention of my hon. friend once more, and I stated explicitly, because I was anxious that there should be no misunderstanding:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A week ago, I asked the Minister for information as to the proportion which the user of the Intercolonial Railway bears to the Grand Trunk Railway. I pointed out then that the material for that information must be in his possession, because for more than a year the Intercolonial Railway has been paying the cost of maintenance on the basis of proportion as user, and returns are made each month. The Minister (Mr. Blair) told me that he would give that information to the House, up to the last day on which a return had been received. I was absent for a couple of days, and it is possible the Minister may have done so, but in looking over the "Hansard," I cannot see it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I brought down the return which I promised you, and it is in the possession of the House.

It turns out that no such return has been brought down. I do not suppose that any hon. gentleman opposite believes that I went to the trouble of bringing that to the attention of the Minister without entertaining a very strong opinion that the information asked for was relative to this question. I submit to the Minister of Railways and Can-

als that he should, in pursuance of the pledge he made to me, bring down that information before seeking to go further with this Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What objection is there to bringing down these papers? It does appear to me to be treating the House with scant courtesy, when information is promised and it is not brought down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There would be no objection to furnishing the information at once if I had it. My hon. friend has not thought it worth while to take my statement into his consideration, a statement which I have already made to the committee more than once, as to how the accounts were made up. The Grand Trunk Railway will send in a claim at the end of each month of the amount which they demand from the Intercolonial Railway. The general manager, having received that demand from the Grand Trunk Railway, sends his auditor up to Montreal, and he goes over the books. My hon. friend is under the impression that the Grand Trunk Railway transcribes for the Intercolonial Railway all the books of the company for the month, showing what their business has been and what our business has been over the joint section. But they do not do that. They make out a claim, and the auditor examines into their books to see whether the claim is correct. In doing that he satisfies himself from the company's books what the amount of tonnage is, what the number of trains are, or whatever facts it is necessary to ascertain in order to determine whether the charge is proper. I spoke to Mr. Schreiber on the subject, since the hon. gentleman mentioned it the other day, and I have information from him as to how the accounts are investigated and certified by the auditor of the Intercolonial Railway. We do not receive any statement from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of the amount of business which they do; we do not get anything showing what the hon. gentleman claims this statement ought to show.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But you can get it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume we could.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has paid accounts on it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have paid accounts on the report of our auditor.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the Grand Trunk Railway will be complimented by the haze which the hon. gentleman throws over their methods of keeping accounts. The hon. gentleman knows that the manner in which the Grand Trunk Railway is run guarantees that they know exactly every one of these items, and the hon. gentleman could get them in a few hours, if he wanted to get them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What the Grand Trunk Company is able to furnish us promptly would be a statement of the outlay made by them in respect of the whole line, including the terminals, and then a statement as to how much they charge us. Whether our proportion is stated correctly by them, whether they have overcharged us or not, would at all times depend upon the result of the investigation of the company's books made by the auditor of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not seem to understand the point that we are making. Let me read, for his information, the third section of his own schedule:

> That Her Majesty shall and will pay to the company a share of the cost of maintenance of the Montreal joint section and the Chaudière joint section, including tracks, bridges, switches, sidings, signals, appliances of all kinds, platforms, water-tanks, water supplies, fuel stations, fences, crossings and all other appurtenances and appliances used by it jointly with the company, and upon the two joint sections it has the right and privilege of usage included in this demise; such share of the cost of maintenance——

Which has been paid now for about thirteen months. This arrangement has been going on since March, 1898; payments have been made since then. Now, what is the basis of the payment:

> ——such share of the cost of maintenance of each joint section to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains made over each of the above mentioned joint sections bears to the total combined engine and car mileage running over each of the above mentioned joint sections during each month; every engine, passenger and freight car counting each as one car.

That is the very basis of the charge that is made, and the payment that has been made by the Intercolonial Railway is on the basis of the proportionate user of the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway, compared with the combined engine and car mileage of the whole. So that no payment could have been made without first having ascertained the cost; that is the very basis of it. For thirteen months the arrangement has been in operation, and these payments have been made. It was just thirteen days ago that the hon. Minister of Railways said that that could be easily given and should be given. It was to be given before the resolutions were passed. The resolutions have been passed, and we have not that information. We are now at the only stage when we can have committee discussion upon this measure. The hon. Minister has not brought the information that we consider vital to the discussion of this matter. Surely, because we are two parties, pitted against each other, we are not

going to withhold what is fair-play from one to another. The hon. gentlemen who are in majority to-day may be on this side of the House afterwards; but whether they are or not, the fact that they are in the majority is the best of reasons why they should be fair and not, with the power of their majority, seek to prevent members from having the basis that they require and the information which they ought to have. I would like the hon. Minister to say whether he proposes, under these circumstances to press the matter further to-night when we have not the information we should have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member asks me to furnish, and he now interprets the request, as made before, as a request to furnish a statement which will show what the engine and car mileage of the Grand Trunk has been for that period per month on these sections, as compared with that of the Intercolonial.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We want the gross.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) has in "Hansard" what we want, and it was placed there and put before his eyes thirteen days ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated to the hon. gentleman that the Grand Trunk Railway Company does not furnish, nor has it furnished, as I am told, such a statement. I have certainly never received such a statement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are compelled to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND AND CANALS. They are not compelled.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, by the 33rd section.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the hon. Minister read the 33rd section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know what it contains.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) permit me to read the 33rd section:

> That Her Majesty and the company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs and other returns to be made as under these presents.

How is the hon. gentleman to make a computation of the Intercolonial Railway share unless he has this information furnished him by the Grand Trunk?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The officer goes to the books.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has made an appeal to me, and I will endeavour to meet him as far as I can, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is willing to bring that information down we can go on and come to a conclusion and get through with this business. The object of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), who made this request the other day, is to have the information upon which the payments are made by the Intercolonial Railway to the Grand Trunk for the use of their road.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I asked for was the information showing the exact proportion of user. I asked distinctly for what my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will find at page 3866 of the "Hansard," for information showing the exact proportion of user. This bears upon the section which makes the cost of maintenance payable on that basis, and in regard to which returns must be made monthly by each railway to the other. This information, which is relevant to the matter. It is quite true I did not make any argument on the subject then. I did not state what the argument was that I proposed to base upon that information, and I would not have thought it would have been necessary to have asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to bring it down.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps there is a discrepancy between the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) as to the exact information which is wanted. But we can now come to a conclusion. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals tells you that he has information as to which statements have been made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company monthly, showing the amount which is due under this agreement. This statement is audited every month by the auditor of the company. He has that in his office and he tells you that it is all the information upon which he proceeds. My hon. friend is quite willing to bring that down. I will undertake to have it on the Table of the House to-morrow, and we may go on with the business before us. Will that be acceptable?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like hon. gentlemen to understand that I cannot furnish at this moment what I have not got, and I have not got the information that the hon. gentleman desires. The officers tell me that they never have received from the Grand Trunk Railway Company a statement of the total engine and car mileage except that month by month the auditor of the Intercolonial Railway, for the purpose of verifying the accounts, goes over all the station books and other books of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They do not require them to transcribe these accounts, but they open and exhibit their books to the auditor of the Intercolonial. He goes over them and finds out from them whether or not the propor-

tion charged of the whole cost of maintenance is correct according to the contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not inclined to be otherwise than serious about this. I am not sitting here until twelve o'clock at night for fun. I do not want any information that the hon. Minister cannot furnish. Notwithstanding what he has said, I do not see how it is possible that the information cannot be in the office of the Department of Railways and Canals. If it is not there and cannot be obtained within a reasonable time, within ten days after I have asked for it, I am not going to press for it. I asked for it; I gave reasonable notice, and if it cannot be furnished we will say no more about it, but I did ask for it in time and surely the hon. Minister will not say that we are unreasonable in desiring that the further consideration of this Bill shall be deferred until it can be brought down. I can assure the hon. gentleman as to the relevancy of this information, and that we are serious in asking for it. How is it possible that the auditor, or some official of the Railway Department, is not in possession of this information? The proportionate cost of maintenance can only be arrived at by first ascertaining what the user of each railway is. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to tell us that he has an auditor in his office who, after going down to investigate these accounts in the books of the Grand Trunk, will come back without being able to tell the hon. Minister what the proportion of the user was? The hon. gentleman will not admit that he has an officer in his department so inefficient as that. This officer must have ascertained the very thing that we want to know, and if he came back from the Grand Trunk books without that information all I have to say is that he is not fit to hold his position.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is my opinion and that is the statement I am prepared to make. I cannot bring myself to believe that the hon. Minister is correctly informed when he states that this information is not in his department, because the first thing that he must ascertain is the proportion of user. That I asked for ten days ago.

The PRIME MINISTER. Whether the auditor is competent or not is a question as to which the hon. member (Mr. Borden) may have his opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is merely an illustration.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I do not criticise the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) at this moment. His object is to have certain information, and the Minister (Mr. Blair) tells him that he has information in his department which is not exactly the information which the hon. gentleman asks, but whatever it is he is ready to bring it down.

Mr. WALLACE. He says he has no information.

The PRIME MINISTER. No. The Minister says he has the monthly account given by the Grand Trunk Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. Then he has the fact that these accounts have been audited by the auditor, and whether the auditor should have taken an extract of the books as is contended by the hon. member for Halifax, or whether it would be sufficient for him to make a general report, is a question that in future may be open to debate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The 33rd section of this Bill provides for returns.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have never been made such as the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If they have not been made the agreement has not been carried out, and I was proceeding upon the assumption that the agreement had been carried out. The agreement says that each railway shall furnish to the other the necessary returns for the purpose or determining the proportion of user.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the language.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then I will read it:

> That Her Majesty and the Company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs and other returns to be made as under these presents, and Her Majesty and the company mutually agree to give the necessary facilities, including access to the books and papers to the auditors of the Intercolonial Railway and of the company respectively to enable them to verify the accounts under this agreement.
>
> That all traffic balances, charges and shares of cost, and other returns to be made under these presents, shall be made monthly, and Her Majesty and the company mutually agree to promptly audit and pay each to the other each month the total amount chargeable against the other for the month immediately preceding.

That is to say, each party has to render accounts to the other at the end of each month, and then access to the books of each railway is to be afforded to the other for the purpose of verifying these accounts. The sending of the auditor is for the purpose of verifying the account which has first been received from the Grand Trunk Railway. If that course has not been pursued, then the agreement, it seems to me, has not been carried out.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be or it may not be; it is a question of opinion.

I imagine that perhaps railway companies who have a great deal to do, and who transact enormous business each day, are not so particular as to the form of doing business as perhaps a gentleman versed in the law would critically require. Agreements of that kind have been made before, and I imagine that railway companies are in the habit of rendering these accounts after the usual manner they adopt. The moment the Minister says: I have not the information which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) asks, but I am willing to bring to the House to-morrow the information as to how we have been carrying out the contract, the hon. gentleman should accept that, and he will see afterwards whether that satisfies him or not. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to proceed with the business of the House in view of the undertaking of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair), that he will bring down to-morrow what information he has received, and the accounts rendered to him and audited by our auditor. That should be satisfactory.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It appears to me that the Prime Minister is anxious that this information should be given, but that the Minister of Railways is not so anxious.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are quite in error about that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If I am in error I accept the correction. The Prime Minister says that the Minister of Railways has certain information in his possession and that information will be given to-morrow. But a moment afterwards the Minister says: The Grand Trunk Railway sends us an account and we audit that account, and that is all we have. That is not the information that has been asked for by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that perhaps a little carelessness is practised in connection with furnishing these returns.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say "carelessness."

Mr. MONTAGUE. The "Hansard" will show what the right hon. gentleman did say. He said they might be too busy, they had a great deal of work to do, and these matters might be neglected.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not what I said. I said that probably railway companies, having a great deal of business to do, did not render these accounts in the critical manner in which a counsel learned in the law would expect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then there has been neglect.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not necessarily.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not only neglect, but a direct want of observance of this agreement. If ever there was a case in which the greatest possible care should be exercised in furnishing this information, this is the case. The right hon. gentleman knows that this matter has been discussed in Parliament before, and that this is an arrangement made by the Government with the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of seeing how it would pay. It is a sort of trial trip, so to speak.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said not a bit of it, but such the country understood it and such this Parliament understood it last year. It is a temporary arrangement, the Minister of Railways told us, for the purpose of showing that it was a good arrangement to be made permanent by the House. Such being the case, the greatest possible care should have been exercised in getting every possible information, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) knew the House would require before this Act was passed. There are two things required from each of the railways under the 33rd section. The first condition is, that the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of cost, shall be given in a series of returns by the Grand Trunk Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. I am not a lawyer, but if that is not declared in that 33rd section, I do not think my judgment is worth a cent, or the judgment of any other man who reads it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Be easy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is impossible to be easy when hon. gentlemen opposite, either are colour blind and absolutely unable to see anything, or are not willing to see anything. I challenged the Prime Minister to read that 33rd section, and to say to the House that it is not contemplated by it, that the Grand Trunk Railway shall give all that information to the Intercolonial Railway as the basis upon which the charges shall be made. That is the first thing required by the 33rd section, and the next thing required is, that the books of the Grand Trunk Railway shall be open to the inspection of the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, in order to see whether these returns are correct, and whether the proper proportion has been charged up against the Intercolonial Railway. If that is not implied in the 33rd section, the hon. gentleman made a stupid bargain, a careless bargain, one that no Minister of Railways should ever make. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that information is obtainable. He knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway separate their roads into their various divisions, and are able to tell to an exact nicety just the train mileage and the earnings of every particular branch. If they were not, their accounts would get into a

very serious mixture. If the hon. gentleman has not got that information, he can get it, and the Prime Minister, instead of asking us to go on with the work of the session, should promptly, candidly, and openly say to the House: We will get that information, and we will allow the Bill to stand until that information is got. Now, I ask the Prime Minister to say whether that 33rd section does not contemplate that the very fullest possible returns are intended to be made by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial every month for the purpose of arranging a settlement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me——

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Prime Minister understands the question very well, and if he will pay me the respect and the House the respect of giving an answer to that question, we would like very much to have it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Prime Minister will give his answer later, if he chooses. I would like to mention to the hon. gentleman one fact, and I would ask him to test the soundness of his own proposition by inquiring into the fact. I will venture to say—though I do not know, never having been so told by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or by the Grand Trunk Railway Company—that if the hon. gentleman chooses to telegraph to either of these companies, he will be told that the Canadian Pacific auditor goes to the office of the Grand Trunk, when he receives his account for the Canadian Pacific proportion of charges for the month, and he examines the books, which the Grand Trunk throws open to his inspection, and he simply reports whether the charges are correct or not; and it will end there.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Minister answer me one question? He stated to-night in the hearing of the committee, that the user of the Intercolonial of these terminals was at least 20 per cent. On a previous occasion, some weeks ago, he stated that it was 5 per cent. I would like to ask him on what basis of knowledge he makes the statement that we have a user of 20 per cent. He must have some basis, or else it was a guess. He now says he cannot give the proportionate mileage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the question was first asked me, I had not made any inquiry upon it, and I stated that I thought it was about 5 per cent. I asked my deputy what he thought was the amount, and he told me he thought it was over 20 per cent. He also stated, as I have said here to-night, that there were not furnished any copies or transcripts of the Grand Trunk books, and that it was the auditor of the Intercolonial who examined the account and verified its correctness; but he did not furnish us with any statement such as the hon. gentleman asks for, of the gross amount of engine and car mileage of the Grand Trunk as compared with the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOSTER. The auditor must have a test when the Grand Trunk bills are presented for payment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He looks over the books and finds out.

Mr. FOSTER. When he looks over the books, there is a test by which he finds out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He finds out what the gross engine and car mileage of the Grand Trunk has been, and what the gross engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial has been, as shown in the books.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the auditor has it. That is all we want.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said he does not have it in the sense contended for.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, the Minister has just stated that the auditor has it. He must have it, or he cannot pay the bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what all this has to do with the ratifying of the lease?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell you. This is a matter of detail altogether; it is a matter that can be adjusted afterwards; it is a matter which the lease provides for. If afterwards the auditor of the Intercolonial or the Minister of Railways is not satisfied with the claim presented by the Grand Trunk, under the terms of the lease, he has a right to challenge its correctness, and the Grand Trunk must prove that the Intercolonial is indebted to them in a certain amount, or they need not pay the money. That is an after consideration. I contend that the arguments that hon. gentlemen opposite are presenting have no right to stand in the way of the ratification of the lease. The lease provides that in proportion to the car mileage made by the Intercolonial in Montreal, they shall pay their share towards keeping the track in order. That is the arrangement. Up to the present time, the auditor of the Intercolonial has gone over the books of the Grand Trunk Railway, and he has reported what the percentage was, and that percentage has been paid. If that system is not satisfactory, hon. gentlemen may next year, or the year after, demand, not only that that statement be produced, but that the Grand Trunk Railway be called upon to furnish the car mileage on their own line.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They cannot do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. They can do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister says they do not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Grand Trunk Company can furnish their car mileage and the Intercolonial can furnish theirs. That is only a question of detail, and should not stand in the way of the ratification of the lease. I hold that hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to go into the question of the settlement of the account between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial in dealing now with the principle of the lease itself. For instance, if hon. gentlemen choose to summon the auditor of the Grand Trunk before the Public Accounts Committee this year, they can examine him on oath as to the basis on which the account is made up. Very well, while you have the power in your hands to regulate the payment, not only now but every year to come, for the 99 years, why should that stand in the way of the ratification of the lease ? It is only a matter of detail.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask the hon. Minister a question ? What is the information necessary to arrange the proportion of this cost between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, which the auditor has to have ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has to go to Montreal——

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the information—not about going to Montreal—what are the figures ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has to find out whether or not, in the first place, the gross charges upon the road made by the Grand Trunk Railway are correct. He has to look at the vouchers, to see the vouchers, on the one hand ; then he has to ascertain whether or not the amount which the Grand Trunk Railway charge against the Intercolonial Railway is correct, and, in order to do that, he goes over the books of the Grand Trunk Railway, which are thrown open to his inspection, and satisfies himself whether that charge is correct or excessive. That he does, unquestionably, by seeing what amount of engine and car mileage, on the one hand, is Grand Trunk Railway, and what portion, on the other, is Intercolonial Railway. But he does not make any return of that. He simply reports to the general manager whether the account is correct or not, just as he finds the facts to be. Is it not, now, grossly unfair for hon. gentlemen to pretend that it is any part of the business of the Minister to busy himself about whether or not the auditors of the Intercolonial Railway are doing their duty ? Is he not clearly justified in assuming that the general manager and the other officers who have the supervision of these matters, are doing their duty, and not paying one cent more than we are entitled to pay under the terms of the agreement ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. What the hon. gentleman has said is, that, in order to reckon how much ought to be paid by the Intercolonial Railway and how much by the Grand Trunk Railway——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Grand Trunk Railway pays the whole of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But you pay your share. In order to reckon how much should be paid by the Intercolonial Railway, it is necessary for the auditor to have the car and engine mileage, the cost of maintenance of that section of the line. Is not that information necessary to a reckoning of the proper share of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now we have it clear. Let me read the thirty-third section, remembering what the information is that is required for a proper settlement of the account. The thirty-third section says :

> That the companies shall furnish, each to the other, promptly each and every month, all the information necessary for the ascertaining, &c.

That section requires that that shall be furnished, and the Minister says it is never furnished.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you will apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has a precisely identical agreement, I am satisfied they will tell you that they do not ask the Grand Trunk Railway, nor is it according to railway usage that they should, transcribe all their books and hand over a copy of that transcript. They simply open their books to the auditor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why, when I asked the question, the hon. Minister said, referring to the returns made up to the last day of each month :

> I think there will be no difficulty, so far as I am aware, in furnishing down to the last date we have received a statement from the Grand Trunk Railway.

That is inconsistent with the statement now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I made the statement to the hon. gentleman in good faith, supposing the information would be forthcoming ; but I tell the hon. gentleman now the full extent to which it is possible to get it, unless you take the time of getting an abstract from the books of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). It has been evident all along that the Minister of Railways has got into a question that is too deep for him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALLACE. But, when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) gets on his feet and tries to elucidate and elaborate this statement, he is a sight for the gods. He was completely in a labyrinth of his own imagination, which is not very extensive at any time. He said: What have we to do with the lease? Why, if I understand it rightly, it is the lease we are to consider.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I said: This is a matter of detail; that we should ratify the lease, and this was a matter of detail, to be dealt with afterwards.

Mr. WALLACE. What I have in my notes here is, that the hon. gentleman said: What have we to do with the lease; it is a matter of detail? Well, it is the details we are considering. It is the lease we have before us now; the lease is the bargain made between the two parties; and, if ever there was a precious lease, without beginning or end, made in the interests of the party of the second part, it is this lease between the Government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway. Why, the hon. Minister of Railways, when asked by the ex-Minister of Finance, whether 5 per cent of the traffic that came on this road was Intercolonial Railway traffic, or 20 per cent, he said he could not tell, that he had not his mind directed to that subject. But Mr. Wainwright, who, probably, knows more about it, and who had his mind directed to that subject, which was, in fact, the subject he had to consider, fixes the figures at nearer 1 per cent than 5 per cent or 20 per cent. If it is 1 per cent, it is a most extraordinary bargain, that, for 1 per cent of traffic, we are paying for one-half of the road.

Take another and a very important aspect of the case. You rent a road, and you pay for it how much? You pay for 35 miles from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal a rental of $140,000, or $4,000 per mile. Supposing you rent a farm for $4,000 a year, and you get about 1,000 acres of good land for $4 an acre, and supposing, as in this case, the Minister made his boast that the income from the whole was $2,740 per mile over this railway, that is, the total income over each mile of road for which he pays $4,000 a year rent per mile. According to the boast of the Minister of Railways, the total receipts per year on that mile is $2,740. And the average expenses per mile about balance the receipts. They are about $2,750 a mile, against receipts of $2,740 a mile. And in addition to these expenses you are paying $4,000 rent per mile of road. Then, when we say: perhaps this part of the road is more valuable than the other and we wish to have the figures to decide that, the Minister of Railways and Canals has not a single figure to submit to the committee. The country have been looking with suspicion on the Drummond County deal and have been demanding to know the true inwardness of what are considerd to be very peculiar transactions. But though the Government have been operating this road for two years, the only thing the Minter tells us is that his mind has not been directed in these channels and he cannot give us information. And the hon. member for North Wellington tells us that the rents which we are considering is a matter of no consequence and that "we"—that is, these big-headed statesmen, these intellectual giants—do not bother themselves with the paltry details of a lease, that the bargain is made, and you simply give to the other man what he wants. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that, allowing a wide latitude in every direction, there are millions in this bargain for the country, that it is the wisest bargain that can be conceived by great statesmen, and the hon. member for North Wellington, parrot-like, says "hear, hear." But when it comes down to figures he says we pay $140,000, and when an hon. member on this side asks what he would do if it were $156,000, he says, We would not accept it. The payment of $156,000 means ruin for Canada, but when the payment is $140,000 that is a bargain in which there is millions for the country. What an absurd statement that is. We want the information to guide us in coming to right decision on this question. Two years ago the Government could only say: We anticipate that the renting of the road by the Government will produce certain effects. But since that time we have had a trial of it, they have been running the road under a temporary agreement. They should be prepared to come here tonight and tell every month's receipts and every month's expenses. But, instead of that, we get nothing. I voice the opinion of this House and the country, yes, and the opinion of many hon. gentlemen on the other side, when I say that we have found that the Minister has come here, so far as information is concerned, dumb as an oyster, as void of any knowledge of the matter as if he had never been Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Thank you very much.

Mr. WALLACE. Do not thank me; my duty is to tell the truth, and that is what I am doing. Then, they tell us that the auditor who goes over the books of the Canadian Pacific Railway has access to the books and can challenge any account, and that our auditor will do these things. Then, Sir, the auditor has been doing these things for two years. But where is his report? The Minister will give us no information,

he says his mind has not been directed to these subjects. Where, then, has it been directed to ? And what assistance does the Minister get from his friends. None, except from the hon. member for North Wellington. Where are the Minister's colleagues ? Where is the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), with his clear and lucid mind ? Why is he not assisting to explain what he knows requires explanation ? Where is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) ? Slumbering in his place—"dreaming the happy hours away." Where is the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), that he gives his colleague no assistance ? Why, even the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is dumb to-night, contrary to all precedent. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), whose face we have hardly seen for weeks and months, since the plebiscite on prohibition, is here to-night. I suppose his very arduous duties down at his farm, with his valet to assist him, prevent him from attending to his duties in this House. But, though he is here to-night, he does not come to the assistance of his colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals. There is not a word from the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Stubbs), who votes with the hon. gentlemen opposite every time. They have gerrymandered him out, and he will be as subservient after the operation, if it ever comes into effect as he has ever been. The Minister of Railways and Canals likens this case to one going into a palace ; and he says that if you go into such a building you have to pay your expenses, that you have to pay for half the building if you own half. But that is not a parallel case. This is like a man going into a hotel. He has all the conveniences of the hotel. He can go to the bar and quench his thirst, he can go into the lavatory and perform the necessary operations of nature. He can go into the dining-room for a meal. But he does not pay half the cost of the hotel, he pays about $3 or $4 a day. According to the analogy of the Minister of Railways and Canals he must rent the hotel, but you do not require to rent the hotel, you pay for what you get. Now, in this case we want the returns of the business that has been done on this part of the Intercolonial Railway system, we want the figures which will justify the Government in adding this piece of road to their system. They have now had some experience in the running of that road, and we want the figures to show that it is a profitable undertaking to pay $4,000 a mile per annum as rent, then to pay $2,750 per mile expenses, and then to get receipts of $2,740 per mile, or less than the running expenses, and you are the $4,000 rental out of pocket every year. The Minister of Railways and Canals in his speech says :

> We all know that times are not better in the maritime provinces to-day than they have been at almost any period during the last ten or twelve years. I would be very sorry indeed, if I were required to make a positive statement on the question, to say that we are enjoying greater prosperity in the province of New Brunswick in the last year or two than at any period during the ten years preceding. What inference do I draw from that ?

Well, the inference I would draw from it would be that they had been humbugging the people. If they say that business is no better there than it has been at any time during the past ten years, they have been misleading the people, for they have been telling them about this growing time, and about the great efforts the Government are making to promote the prosperity of the people. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we are entitled to the fullest information regarding this arrangement before we launch out into an expenditure of seven or eight millions of the people's money in an enterprise of this kind. The people require some arguments that will justify it. We cannot go back to the people and say : Well, we opposed it, but we could not get the information. They would ask us : Have you exercised the full rights of an Opposition to obtain this information ? And if we go back to them and say : No, that we have not done our duty in this regard, that we have permitted the Government to railroad these matters through, why, Sir, they would relegate us to the Government benches, or some other place. We must do our duty as an Opposition, we must show to the Government and to the country how utterly ruinous and fallacious are the plans and the programme of the Minister of Railways and Canals. But perhaps we are doing an injustice to the Minister of Railways and Canals, because it is said, and believed, that he is merely a puppet that is moved, and that the inspiring motive behind the Minister of Railways and Canals is another Minister who is not present to-night, but who is known to have made his boast that he was the man who manipulated these matters. When the Government thought that a railroad was required in the Yukon country, it was not the Minister of Railways and Canals who sent up his engineer, but it was the Minister of Public Works who sent up his engineer. Now, how was it that in this case the Minister of Public Works has been permitted to make this bargain and to plan this thing out ? He is like the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) who, a year ago, when he had got up a scheme for building a railroad fraught with loss to the people of Canada, the most wild-cat, impacticable scheme that ever was proposed to this House, compelled the Minister of Railways and Canals to get up and present it for the consideration of Parliament, though the Minister of Railways and Canals had refused to sign his name to it, and his name does not appear to the docu-

ment to this day. He steps out, and another Minister steps into his office and signs as acting Minister of Railways and Canals. The Minister of Railways and Canals apparently had a little conscience when his colleagues, his wicked partners, were entirely void of it. Now, I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, if he has any conscience left, to come down and say what we already know, that this scheme is not a good one for the people of Canada, that it is not one that he himself had planned out, but that it was forced upon him by that dominant power whose motto is "business is business," and of whom the Premier stated "nothing is too good for Tarte."

Mr. R. R. McLENNAN (Glengarry. There was a good deal of discussion yesterday about some bridges connected with this road. I promised the hon. Minister of Railways that when I got further information, I would furnish it to the committee. I am sure he would be disappointed, if I did not do so. The hon. Minister said that the bridge across the Yamaska River would cost $300,000, and that the bridge across the Richelieu would cost $400,000. I made an estimate, which was questioned and criticised. Since then, I have taken the trouble of sending an engineer down there to examine the place more carefully.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What did you do?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I sent an engineer there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is his name?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). In giving my estimate of the Yamaska bridge, I estimated the spans at 100 feet. I find that they are a little longer than 100 feet. I said that there would be the same number of piers and abutments, but, owing to the additional length, the superstructure would cost a little more than my first estimate. I put it at between $40,000 and $50,000 yesterday. The estimate of the engineer I have in my hand. This bridge at Yamaska has two piers, composed of 13,860 cubic feet. The masonry consists of two abutments, which are even larger than the piers, being 19,504 cubic feet. Added together, there are 33,364 cubic feet, or 1,250 cubic yards, which, at $15 per cubic yard, amounts to $18,750. We find that masonry was contracted for in that locality, on another road that was built at $13 per cubic yard. The masonry on the swing bridge at Sault Ste. Marie cost $12 per cubic yard, and I say, that $15 per cubic yard is a good price, as any man who understands this work will admit. There are 381 lineal feet superstructure at $50 per lineal foot, although the price I got from the bridge company was $45; but, as the piers and spans are a little longer, I put it at $50. That would be $19,050, or, together $37,800 add for contingencies $2,500. This makes the total cost of this bridge, that was estimated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals at $300,000, to be $40,400. Now, in reference to the bridge over the Richelieu, there are five piers, comprising 28,000 cubic feet; then, there is a pivot pier, there being a swing, in which there are 16,000 cubic feet. There is another pier on the highway, which is additional and which amounts to 3,920 cubic feet. The abutments amount to 10,880 cubic feet, or, altogether, 58,800 cubic feet, equal to 2,200 cubic yards, which, at $15 per cubic yard, would make $33,000. The superstructure, 1,112 feet, at $60 per lineal foot, amounts to $66,720. It is considered by the engineer that $60, $15 more than the price which I quoted for 100 feet spans, should be sufficient for the superstructure, and the difference in the price would cover all the superstructure, including the draw. So that, altogether, for this bridge, that was estimated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals at $400,000, this engineer estimates, would cost $99,720. He had added for contingencies $2,500. He says, that there is a good foundation; that it is very near the rock, and that there would be no difficulty in getting a good foundation. Though it is a little longer, he estimates the cost of contingencies, foundations, &c., the same as he does the other. Thus, these two bridges would cost $40,400 for the Yamaska, and $102,220 for the Richelieu,There is a crossing a short distance from the present bridge that, if we were building a new road, it might be located there, and it would cost much less than the present bridge. The prices I gave to this House could be depended upon, as they are very little different from the estimates I had made in the first place. The prices I gave in the first place would be sufficient, taking into consideration any change that has taken place since, or any estimate that has been made to carry out the work, as I gave it to the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. If anything more was required than the speech we have lately heard from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to convince us that he is early to be transferred to the Senate, I would like to know what it is. That hon. gentleman has always been looked upon as the economist of this House, but, after the statement he made here to-night, he never intends to face the electors of North Wellington again. Here we are discussing a question, a proposition to place upon the people of this country, and upon their children and their children's children, an annual charge of $140,000 for ninety-nine years. The hon. gentleman is going to blindly commit the country to this payment of $140,000 for ninety-nine years, and asks the committee to get the details afterwards. He says: Confirm the lease now, and bring down the papers and discuss the detail as to whether the bargain is a good one or not, afterwards. That is, practically, the whole ex-

tent of that hon. gentleman's speech. He thought he had done such a big thing that the Ministers and other members of the House would smile on him, and, because they did not do so, he got up and paraded himself before them to solicit applause for the way that he had put it. According to him, we must not question whether it is a good bargain or a bad one: we will simply vote the money, and settle the details afterwards.

The Minister (Mr. Blair) made the statement that it would require $700,000 to build two bridges, and my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), a gentleman of experience, pledged his honour as a member, that he could build the two for $150,000 and to-night the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) produces an estimate from a competent engineer saying that these two bridges could be built for $144,000, which the Minister said would cost $700,000. No doubt the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would say they would be cheap at $700,000, although they can be built for $144,000. But more than that, the hon. gentleman (Mr McMullen) does not want the Minister to keep his faith with the House. Ten days ago the Minister (Mr. Blair) promised to bring down the documents which the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Borden) asked for; but to-night he comes here without the documents, and word came to the Opposition when the House met at 8 o'clock, that the Government were going to force this Bill through if it took until daylight. They arranged to get the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who used to be one of the greatest economists who ever entered Parliament, to say it was only a question of discussing the lease, and thus deceive the people of the country. Sir, we want the people of this country to know now, that this is one of the most outrageous bargains ever introduced into Parliament. This Government is compelling the people of Canada to pay $140,000 a year for 99 years, for a privilege that could be got for $30,000 a year, if there had not been a job perpetrated by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) long before this Bill was ever introduced. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows that he has a pledge from the Government that they will send him to the Senate, so that he will not have to face his constituents, and he approves of this deal. He knows very well that he will not have to go before the electors again, and so he says to himself: Let the other fellow that will follow me take the chances.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We were talking about some information which the Minister (Mr. Blair) seems to be now gathering from the columns of "Punch," paying no attention whatever to the debate. I am very sorry that the Minister (Mr. Blair) is deeply engaged, but I suppose it cannot be helped. If the Minister treats the House in that way, the Government cannot wonder that public business is being delayed. I do not think there is any desire on this side to lengthen the debate unduly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am glad I made that remark, because it excited the risibilities of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and awoke the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), so that now, whether he is receptive or not, he at least can hear what is being said. As to the lengthening out of the debate, I do not think the hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, if they were here, would allow this lease to be ratified, without the information which has been asked time and again from the Minister, and which time and again has been promised by him. Every time the debate lulls upon this side of the Chamber, the chairman (Mr. Campbell, of Kent) begins to get his papers together for the purpose of carrying the Bill. The chairman, whom I know very well, knows his business, and while he is doing that, I do not see the Minister (Mr. Blair) rising to make any promise with regard to this information. We have had promises from the Minister in the past, and even if we cannot get the information, it would be pleasant to get another promise from him. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) would even say he would try to get the information, it would make us think we had accomplished something. The Prime Minister, who seems exceedingly anxious to get the Bill through—because, no doubt, it is a stumbling block in the session—promised us whatever information there is, but immediately that he has won us with his sunny smiles and winning ways, the Minister of Railways declares that there is no information. If the Minister cannot give us this information let him give us a promise of it. We have sufficient confidence in his promise that we will agree to leave the Bill over until he fulfils his promise. Now, I think that is a very reasonable proposition.

The CHAIRMAN.—Shall this first clause be adopted?

Mr. FOSTER. Carried.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You cannot carry it in clauses; the Bill has to go as a whole.

Mr. FOSTER. We have been taking it by sections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can read it by sections, but the Bill must be carried as a whole.

On section 3,

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I would like to ask the Minister (Mr. Blair) to give us his opinion with reference to that clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What clause?

Mr. FOSTER. The third clause which ha just been read by the chairman, while the

Minister very courteously had his back to the chairman and to this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) better not be impertinent.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, while the Minister had his back to the Chairman, a feat which he is more able to perform with despatch than to bring down information which he deliberately promised to the House and as to which he deliberately broke his promise to the House. The Minister of Railways is of course responsible to the hon. members on this side of the House as well as to the members on his own side, for the delay of business which has occurred. It was the obstinacy of the Minister of Railways and Canals which kept us here yesterday until three o'clock in the morning on one particular point. That was this, that in order to influence the House and the country, under his weight of ministerial responsibility, the Minister of Railways and Canals came gravely before this committee, and, as an argument why the committee should pass this arrangement, declared that to build a bridge across the River Yamaska $300,000 would be necessary, and to build a bridge across the Richelieu $400,000 would be necessary. That was challenged by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), who is a practical man, and who had made an estimate that the bridge across the Yamaska could be built for $40,000 and the bridge across the Richelieu for one-third of the estimate of the Minister. When this statement was made, the most natural conclusion was that the Minister would give the House his reasons for his estimates. When he was questioned, he said that he gave these estimates based upon memoranda and calculations that had been given to him by his engineers, not yesterday nor the day before, but preliminary to his recommendation of this scheme to his colleagues; and when we asked, in order that we might have the information at hand, as he had, the memoranda and figures given him by his engineer, he flatly refused to give that information to the House. He refused it on the ground that it was derogatory to his dignity to be asked to give it; and so he did not bring down the information. The prolonging of the sitting until three o'clock in the morning was not the fault of the Opposition; it was due to the obstinacy, pure and simple, of the Minister himself. The Minister has had a bad education. On a previous occasion he undertook to institute a comparison between his bringing up and mine, much to my detriment. I am sorry my bringing up was not in accordance with his view of what a bringing up should be; but we will let that pass; I did not criticise him much in that respect. But the hon. gentleman is now showing to this House the results of his education in another sphere—not a family education, but a political education. The hon. gentleman, while Premier of the province of New Brunswick, always carried his measures through in this way. It was foreign to him, during his incumbency of that position, to give any information to the House. When he had thought out his scheme he brought it to the House and asked the House to pass it. When asked for information, he simply laughed in the faces of the members, and said: "What you are to do is to pass the measure that I bring down." This practice for many years has ingrained itself into the constitution of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he brings the same habit to this Parliament. From the very first moment that he attempted to put legislation through this House to the present time, he has proceeded on the assumption that it is not necessary to give information to the House, but that after he has talked the measure over with his engineers and brings it here, all the House has to do is to pass it. The hon. gentleman sits there under the weight of a promise he made to myself, that he would give me the report of his engineers on the Drummond County Railway, in order to give me the opportunity to have the information before the discussion period passed; and where are we with reference to that matter? The resolutions in the committee have passed, the second reading of the resolutions have passed, yet the report is not down; the Bill is introduced and read the second time, and the committee stage is through, and yet we have not got the information. The hon. gentleman has not had the honour or the manliness or the simple carefulness of a Minister, to give that which he promised over and over again and which it is my right and the right of the House to have. There is not a man in the House who can deny my right to that report or that it is the duty of the Minister to bring it. But when we are face to face with the third reading of the Bill, he may bring that paper and fling it on the Table of the House and imagines that he has fulfilled his promise. What chance does it give for consideration or discussion if a report or a series of reports are thrown on the Table at such a time for me to digest in order to help me to a conclusion in reference to the Bill? Does the Minister deny that he has done that? He cannot deny it; it is plain and patent; it is on the records of the House. Does the Minister of Customs approve of that? Would he treat a man in that way? Does he think it would be fair to treat a member or the House in that way? The Minister of Customs will not get up and say that he thinks it would. Let him ask his colleague, and if his colleague will tell the truth, he will say that he did promise this information. If his colleague will not tell the truth, I can turn up "Hansard" and show where it was promised. Will the Minister of Agriculture say that I had not the right to have the Minister's promise implemented days ago, when we were at the com-

mittee stage? He will not, because he would not hazard his reputation as a fair-minded man by making any such statement as that. He is in the same boat with this Minister who promises and does not perform, who absolutely is false to his promises in this House over and over again, who systematically breaks his promises in order to prevent information coming to the House. That is the Minister of Railways, who leads these gentlemen behind him. That is the kind of constitutional treatment these gentlemen have to swallow, and they do it. They know it is not right. They know this Minister is not doing what a Minister ought to do, and yet they swallow it. They will swear about it, some of them, amongst themselves; but they will not venture to get up in the House and say to the Minister: Why don't you do what a white man ought to do? Why don't you do what you promised? Why are you false to your promises over and over again, written in "Hansard"? Men sit behind the Minister who has been false to his promises over and over again. No man can contradict it. You all sit there and hear me say that, and you know it is true. Not one of you would hazard your reputation by getting up and saying that the Minister of Railways is right when he promises and absolutely refuses to fulfil his promises.

When he tries to put this measure through and absolutely will give no information such as every member of Parliament has a right to, they sit there, they swallow it all, and they are not growing fat upon it. But every day they sit there and qualify that by their silence, the process of deterioration is going on in this House, its tone being lowered, constitutional and parliamentary usages are being made a by-word and reproach—simply what for? That the Minister of Railways may carry out his old process, and be false to his promises in this House, as he has been in other Houses. We have always been taught to think that truthfulness is what a Minister of the Crown especially ought to possess. There has generally been a pride among private members, who sit behind a Minister, in the thought that he will not lie. There can be no longer any such pride on that side among members sitting behind this Minister, because he will make a promise to this House and fail to keep it, which just means exactly the plain English I have used. There is not a man among them who will get up and justify his conduct. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell), who is an honest business man, will not get up and say that the Minister of Railways is doing what he ought to do. Then the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), unregenerate as he is, will not stand at the back of the Minister of Railways on this occasion, and I do not think that the hon. Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) will get up and back the Minister of Railways in exhibiting himself to this House, over and over again, as the Minister who breaks his promises absolutely, time and time again, and cares no more for them than the idle wind. That is a fine education for the country. Generally the citizens of Canada have had pride in their Parliament, generally they have had pride in the members of the Government that for the time being had the administration of their affairs. They can no longer have this pride, because at least one of the Ministers systematically withholds information and shuffles and twists in the meanest and most undignified way to prevent information coming to the House; and actually gets up, as a Minister, in his place, and makes promises which he subsequently fails to perform. There is no doubt about that, these hon. gentlemen know it, they sit there and neither dare speak in favour of his Minister nor get up and say to him that he ought to do his duty. Now, I ask the hon. Minister of Railways, and I want his attention, or otherwise I shall move that this committee rise——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I question much whether the rude and insulting language the hon. gentleman has used entitles him to any notice from me, even though he is a member of this House and I am a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. FOSTER. I am obliged to take the methods which alone can have any effect at all on the Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can take any methods you like.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask why he has not given us the report of his engineers, which he promised me days ago, on the Drummond County road. Why has he not given that report to me? He dares to get up and say that I am rude when he actually made a promise and failed to fulfil it. Yet he thinks he ought to be treated as a white man. Will he answer that question? Why should he not give us that report? The hon. Minister is as dumb as he is apt to break the pledge which he makes before his colleagues in this House. He has no reason for not bringing it down.

(The Minister of Railways and Canals left the Chamber.)

Mr. FOSTER. As the Minister has gone out, I move that the committee rise.

Motion negatived: Yeas, 19; nays, 37.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to have the opinion of the Minister of Railways on the clause I have just read, the third clause, and it is impossible for us to go on with this measure unless the Minister who has charge of it is in his seat. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance who, I suppose,

is leading the House, whether we can proceed with this measure when the Minister in charge, from whom we require explanations, is not here. Are we to have another breach made in parliamentary practice? I want the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government to understand that we are not going to be just played with on this side. I want them to understand that they are dealing with men who propose to be dealt with as men, and who, when promises are made, are not going to be put off with lies. We are being put off with lies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. We are being put off with lies, and hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches must understand that they are not going to play with us as though we were boys. We want the Minister here who has charge of this measure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Minister in charge has been in constant attendance for many hours.

Mr. FOSTER. So have we.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether the hon. gentleman's attendance was necessary. Perhaps some of us may think it is not. All the hon. gentleman has just said is a repetition of what he said when my colleague was present, and in his absence I shall not undertake to reply to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no one to answer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The Minister of Railways has explained it a dozen times.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister has never once explained that clause, and, when the Prime Minister himself is asked to read that clause and give his opinion upon it, he refused to do so. The point I want to understand in that clause bears on the information that the Minister of Railways and Canals promised thirteen days ago, and that he said last night was down, when it was not down, and he knew it was not down, I believe. And it is not down yet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has answered the hon. gentleman time and again. He has said, that he has brought down all the information that is necessary, and he is willing to bring down anything more that there is in his department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to judge of what is necessary?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Railways and Canals has told the hon. gentleman that he has brought down everything.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Prime Minister, a while ago, made a most magnanimous proposition. Go on, he said, and pass this Bill, and the information will be brought down to-morrow. This after we are through the committee stage. And the Minister of Railways and Canals says, that he has not the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How can he bring it down, if he has not got it?

Mr. FOSTER. But he said, at one time, he had it, and would bring it down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not the information you are now asking for.

Mr. FOSTER. He said, at one time, that he could bring it down, and then he said he could not. Which are we to believe? I would like the legal ornament of the Cabinet, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a lawyer with a reputation——

An hon. MEMBER. Try the Solicitor General.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, after we exhaust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Solicitor General might try his hand. I want to ask the hon. Minister with regard to the third clause in conjunction with the thirty-third clause. I will read it for the benefit of my hon. friend. The third clause has reference to the cost of maintenance:

> That Her Majesty shall and will pay to the company a share of the cost of maintenance of the railway between and including Ste. Rosalie and Bonaventure station, and Chaudière bridge and connections, including tracks——

And so on.

> ——such share of the cost of maintenance to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains made over each of the above mentioned joint sections bears to the total combined engine and car mileage running over each of the above mentioned joint sections during each month; every engine, passenger and freight car counting each as one car.

Now, section 33 provides for the return, and says, that it shall be monthly. The inference is, that no single monthly payment could be paid or audited, unless that combined car mileage and mileage of the Intercolonial Railway is returned, as the basis for that payment. If the payments have been made for twelve or thirteen months, the statement as to car mileage must be made for those months. It is not necessary for me to carry that further. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has declared that it is so in one breath, and in another has declared that it is not. I would like some information on the subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have nothing to add to what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has just said. This very point has been threshed out for the last three or four hours.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister must see that certain things are called for between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway in this agreement. The Minister, surely, understands that before the charges against the Intercolonial Railway can be properly adjusted, there must be a basis ; and that basis is the car mileage, as the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well. I think he will go with me that far. Am I not right ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am listening to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, has the department of Railways and Canals paid even a single month to the Grand Trunk without having these facts before it ? Under the section, it must have had these facts. The Grand Trunk were bound to give that information. I venture to say, that the Solicitor General will not stand up here——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman cannot draw me out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend the Solicitor General says, I cannot draw him out ; he is not in this business. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said, the Minister of Railways and Canals has explained this matter, and the Minister of Railways and Canals, when he is asked, will not explain anything ; and the Prime Minister, when he is asked, whether this clause does not compel the giving by the Grand Trunk to the Intercolonial Railway of the very information we are asking for, refuses entirely to answer.

Mr. MORIN. They are all alike.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Morin). I do not believe they are all alike. I do not believe the Solicitor General, who has listened to this debate, thinks that the Minister of Railways and Canals is taking proper ground. The Solicitor General knows perfectly well that, if this agreement is carried, that information must be, month by month, in the Department of Railways and Canals. He will not deny it. Nor, will the Prime Minister or the Minister of the Interior, who is also a lawyer. Then, it must be assumed, either that the Minister of Railways and Canals has paid monthly charges to the Grand Trunk without having the information by which the same could be measured, or else that that information is in the hands of the Minister, and he will not bring it down. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as a lawyer, knows perfectly well that the position taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals is untenable. I say, with all respect, the Minister of Railways and Canals is simply trying to bull this measure through the committee without giving proper information. We are told that, if we do not pass this measure, we may stay here till morning. That may not have been said publicly, but it has been told to me that the Government intend to put this through, if it takes until morning. It will take a great deal longer than morning, if the information is not forthcoming. We do not need to go back many years to recall when gentlemen who are now on that side, were in Opposition. And I am not overdrawing the picture, when I say, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when in Opposition, would have got in such a state of rage and excitement that the very galleries themselves would have trembled, if information had been refused by the Minister of Railways and Canals, as at the present the Minister of Railways and Canals refuses it to us to-night. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he would not have allowed a proposition like this to go through without that which we are asking for, was supplied him. How can we tell whether this is a good bargain or not, when the very foundation of the bargain, the figures upon which we alone can come to a conclusion, are refused to us ?

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), because he is the keeper of the purse strings, a question. In adjusting the accounts between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, are they kept, especially the mileage, in the Intercolonial Railway, or is the Govment dependent upon the Grand Trunk Railway to keep the mileage both of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway ? I ask that question because the books of the Grand Trunk Railway, for the purpose of an audit, are not conclusive. It is an easy matter for the Grand Trunk Railway to do a good deal of padding.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot supply the information. The arrangements between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and how they keep their respective accounts, are some thing with which I am not familiar.

Mr. FOSTER. We are in the committee stage of this Bill, and there is no one here who will attempt to explain a single section of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways and Canals has spent hours upon hours on these very points.

Mr. FOSTER. We are now in the committee stage, going through item by item, where every man has a right to ask questions and to receive answers, yet there is no Minister who will answer a single question with reference to it. The Prime Minister said : We

will go on and pass the Bill, and the information will come down to-morrow. That does not suit us. This is the committee stage, and we want the promised information at this stage. I say that the treatment that has been accorded to us is simply outrageous—I do not think that is too strong a term—and we are determined to make our protest against that outrageous treatment. Until we have the information that has been furnished to us 13 days ago, we are not justified in passing the committee stage of this measure under the indefinite promise that any information that can be obtained will be brought down to-morrow. If this is to degenerate into a contest of strength, let it come ; we cannot help it. This is a Parliament, and there is a constitution and parliamentary rules, and we are not going to be trodden upon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may state that before this matter came up for discussion, the ex-Minister of Finance came to me and suggested that we would facilitate as far as possible the passing of this Bill upon the understanding we then had from the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals last night, that the information which he promised to me on the 26th day of May would be brought down. We came here to-day and asked the Minister of Railways and Canals for the information, and we learned that this information had not been brought down, and further that the hon. gentleman does not propose to bring it down. I venture to say that under these circumstances we cannot be blamed for exercising our right of insisting that this information, which was promised so long ago, should be brought down before this Bill goes any further.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is merely repeating the statement he made at least four hours ago, and he was answered by the Minister of Railways and Canals that he had brought down all the information in the possession of his department ; and he told him further that the special information which he sought to get could not be obtained. The Prime Minister intervened and stated that any information which was not brought down and which it was possible to bring down, would be brought down. If all the information which the Minister of Railways and Canals has is already put before the hon. gentlemen, what more can they want ?

Mr. FOSTER. He can get it if he wishes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Railways and Canals says he cannot, and I prefer to believe the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a question of taste.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a question of taste, and I am proud to say that I arrange myself on the same side as the Minister of Railways and Canals. When he tells him that he has not this information and cannot bring it down, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that if it is not brought down your Bill cannot be put through, it looks as if the hon. gentleman was simply obstructing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This agreement says distinctly that this information is in the Department of Railways and Canals. The 33rd section shows that this information must be in the possession of the department. No hon. gentleman on either side of the House can read that clause without coming to the conclusion that, if the agreement has been carried out, the information is there. I asked for that information on the 26th of May, and the Minister of Railways said it would be brought down. He has conveyed no intimation since that it would not be brought down. Under these circumstances it does not seem worth while for the hon. Minister of Railways to say that the information cannot be brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISERIES. Did the hon. gentleman not hear him say that the information could not be brought down ?

Mr. WALLACE. It seems to me extraordinary for the hon. Minister of Railways to say that he cannot tell us the amount of the money that has been paid out every month for the last thirteen months under clause 3 of this contract as our share for running over this road from Ste. Rosalie into Montreal. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us that this information has been furnished. I want to know how much money has been paid out. We have not had a particle of the information which is necessary to enable us to come to a correct conclusion as to this enormous contract. We cannot consent to pass this Bill until we have this information. It may be that, under the terms of this clause 3, as Mr. Wainwright has indicated, we do one per cent of the business. If that be the case we would only pay one per cent of the running expenses. But, if that be the case, where is the sense of being half owner of this road ? The right hon. Prime Minister told us yesterday to take it at a valuation of $140,000 a year, the amount that we pay as rental for the half ownership and fix it at any rate of interest we please. Three per cent on that $140,000 would represent a capital of $4,666,000, and he says that we have a splendid bargain. The right hon. Prime Minister says that we might double that which would give $9,300,000, or, as he says, call it $10,000,000. If we had to purchase $10,000,000 worth of property in order to become the half owners of a road 35 miles long where would be the profit in the transaction ? Yet the right hon. First Minister says : Put it at $10,000,000 and we have millions and millions to spare ; we have a tre-

mendously fine bargain. We do a business there of $2,740 a mile. That is the highest amount of business that the hon. Minister has been able to point to, and that was done at a cost of $2,750 a mile, so that we cannot pay our expenses. It cost the Grand Trunk about 60 per cent of its receipts to run the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway has 1,000 miles running through a wilderness, where there is scarcely any traffic, and where there is no business to develop. Another portion of that road runs through the mountains of British Columbia, and another portion runs through the North-west, which is not settled and which has no traffic that will develop into any kind of magnitude; yet they are running their road for 60 per cent of the cost.

The Intercolonial Railway takes on an average about one hundred cents to collect a dollar, as compared with sixty cents on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The Government tells us that such a heavenly born bargain as this never was thought of before, but we want the details of it which the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) with that audacity which characterises him above all other members of the Government, tells us have been furnished time and again, when we know as a matter of fact they have not been furnished. The Prime Minister disappeared from the House to-night because he is disgusted with his colleagues not coming before the House in a businesslike way. It was humiliating to Alexander Mackenzie to find out he had to run the whole Government himself and it must be humiliating to the Prime Minister to see the way the Minister of Railways disappears from the House when he is asked to give information about his department. We demand that the Minister of Railways should be here. We want him here even though he sits dumb, because we think we will be able to ram some solid facts into his pericranial concavity. The Solicitor General says he cannot do that, but I have not so low an opinion of the Minister of Railways as he has.

An hon. MEMBER. You will have the Minister here soon.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, trot him out, and we will adjourn the House until he comes.

An hon. MEMBER. Here is the Minister (Mr. Blair) now.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister (Mr. Blair) has just entered the Chamber, and if he knew with what painful anxiety his supporters were waiting for him he would not have deprived them of his presence so long. We are delighted to welcome him back to the House, because if he does not give us the information, it will be our duty and our pleasure to convey to him some information as to how a Minister should conduct his department.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Railways is not listening to you.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is engaging in conversation the Minister of Railways, and I will proceed as soon as the Minister of Agriculture gets into cold storage, or turns the best part of his person around, because his face is not too good for this side of the House, and as soon as he observes some courtesy——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) should discuss the question before the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and, Mr. Chairman, when we are addressing the Minister (Mr Blair) on an important point with reference to his department, and we find another Minister of the Crown standing with his back to you, Sir, and to the members of the Opposition, and engaging in conversation, it is high time that you should call order to these gentlemen, and not to those who are transacting the business of the country.

An hon. MEMBER. Go ahead.

Mr. WALLACE. I am waiting for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to observe these courtesies which gentlemen recognize, but I am afraid I will have to wait in vain. As the Minister (Mr. Fisher) knows he cannot get figs from thistles. There are some people whose hide is as impenetrable as a rhineoceros, and who have not the slightest idea of the courtesy which characterizes gentlemen, and which conduces to the rapid conduct of public affairs. After all the time we have been waiting for the Minister of Railways and Canals to hear our words of wisdom, it is highly improper for him to turn, not his rear, but a kind of a side-wind to the House. After waiting his royal pleasure so long we can fairly ask the Minister of Railways to give a little attention to the House. We want an explanation of this third clause of the agreement, and we want to know what proportion of these expenses are paid by the people of Canada and what proportion by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. One mile of travel by the Intercolonial cars for every hundred miles travelled by the Grand Trunk cars—that is the rough estimate of Mr. Wainwright. If the Minister, out of the 13 months for which he has returns, will bring them down for one month, that will satisfy us, because it will be a fairly good index of what has been the result for the 13 months.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I will do. I will wire to-morrow morning to the Grand Trunk Company to send here a statement of the total car mile-

age of the Grand Trunk and the total car mileage of the Intercolonial for any month the hon. gentleman names.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, we will adjourn the House until he does that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. WALLACE. Surely the Minister does not want us to pass the Bill before furnishing us with the information. The payments made each month are made on these figures, which the Minister must have in his department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The figures of the payments have been given to you, based on the car mileage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If any hon. gentleman would look at the statement filed and in "Hansard," in answer to a question of the ex-Minister of Finance to-day, he will see there stated every dollar of the amounts paid. After the answer was given, it was handed to the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. WALLACE. That makes it more extraordinary still. This information, which we should have had elaborated and placed on the Table of the House, had to be asked for, and the Minister tells us that he answered that question to-day. I would like to ask him why he would telegraph to Montreal if he has answered the question?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He said he would telegraph for the car mileage.

Mr. WALLACE. The payments made are based on the car mileage. Under clause 33 of the agreement the statements are to be made precisely on the first day of every month. We want one of those statements. This has been going on for twelve or thirteen months under this agreement, and we ask the Minister to let us have these statements that have been presented monthly. They will give us the information we want in order to form a conclusion. The Minister shakes his head; what does that mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I mean that it would not give you the information you are demanding now.

Mr. WALLACE. That is all we are asking. We are easily satisfied.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was given to you to-day.

Mr. WALLACE. No, it was not given to us, as the Minister of Railways knows.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The car mileage was not given, but the amounts paid were given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How do you get at those without the car mileage?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that we are to pay a proportion of the cost of maintenance dependent upon the car mileage; and under the 33rd section the Grand Trunk are to give us whatever information is necessary in order to enable that to be ascertained. The Minister of Railways explained to-day, not once only, but ten times, in my hearing, that in the first place the account is rendered by the Grand Trunk against the Intercolonial, which account they make up from the car mileage. Then the auditor, with his account in his hand, goes to the Grand Trunk office, the books are opened, and he verifies the correctness of the account, and ascertains that the charges are for the proper car mileage, and then the account is paid. But the Minister explains that the car mileage itself is not in the department. It is simply verified by the auditor of the department in an examination of the Grand Trunk books.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman say that when the Grand Trunk puts in its bill to the Intercolonial Railway, and gives the Intercolonial Railway auditor the opportunity of examining its books, it is doing all that is required by the 33rd clause?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps it is not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What sort of excuse is that to come to Parliament with? The Minister of Railways and Canals knows as well as any man in this House that under the 33rd clause of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is compelled to give to the Intercolonial Railway officers every information—to furnish a return.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It does not say so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It does not say train mileage; but I ask the Minister of Railways what is necessary to figure up the amount paid by the Intercolonial. First, they must give the engine and car mileage. They give them a complete return, which it is necessary to have before the matter can be figured up, and after they have done that, under this clause, they open their books to the audit of the Intercolonial Railway to see whether their statement is correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You say what you think they ought to do; but you cannot say they do that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is getting through what appears to be a very small hole. He admits that he made an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway, which was a trial agreement, to see

how the arrangement would work. The arrangement was rejected by the Senate. The hon. gentleman promised every information, and now he has to admit that clause which compelled the Grand Trunk Railway to give to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway essential information has been disregarded absolutely by the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then if it has not, he has the information in his office. If he has, why does he not bring it down. If he has not got it, then he has allowed the Grand Trunk Railway to disregard an essential portion of the agreement necessary for the protection of the interests of the Government, and that had to be carried out, if he intended to fulfil his promise to give us all information.

Mr. TAYLOR. The ex-Finance Minister put this question on the paper to-day :

What amount has accrued to the Grand Trunk Railway Company since July 1st, 1898, to date, per month, as the Intercolonial Railway's contribution to the cost of maintenance of the Chaudière and Montreal joint sections, including terminal facilities, and what has been paid per month ?

The Minister of Railways says that he laid the statement on the Table to-day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, he answered the question, giving the dollars per month that was paid. Will he tell me that he cannot go over to his auditor, who went down there when the Bill was presented to the Intercolonial Railway for a certain amount of money, based on the mileage, and obtain from that auditor how many miles of mileage were used by the engines and cars of the Intercolonial Railway to produce that amount of money. He will not say that his auditor cannot tell, from the number of dollars, what mileage was used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You must not say that I will not say it, because I have said it, and do say it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman speaks for himself, but I make this statement that there is not an auditor or accountant in this country, who cared a fig for his reputation, who would allow any gentleman to make the statement that he cannot tell the number of miles used by the railway, when he has the amount of money that was paid for the use of that mileage. I asked the hon. Minister a question yesterday :

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire how the hon. Minister accounts for the fact that since this arrangement went into operation, the rates of freight for western shippers to points on the Intercolonial Railway are higher than we paid when the Grand Trunk Railway made its own arrangements and negotiated for freights to be delivered at points on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman assumes that to be the case.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know it to be the case, because I am a shipper to all these points, and I had a 55 cent rate to all points on the Intercolonial Railway. But this year that is cancelled, and our goods are costing us, because we have to prepay freight at all points, considerably more than under the old arrangement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is no increase in the tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know there is.

Will the hon. gentleman lay the two tariffs on the Table so as to verify his statement ? I am in a position, from my personal knowledge, to know that since the arrangement before the House was entered into, the same class of goods that formerly were charged a 55-cent rate to all points on the Intercolonial Railway, are now charged on an average 60 cents to 85 cents. What benefit is it to Ontario manufacturers, who have to ship goods to the maritime provinces, to commit this country to a payment of $140,000 a year for ninety-nine years and have the railway tariff raised besides from ten to twenty per cent ? The hon. Minister contradicted my statement, and I ask him now to lay on the Table the tariffs which he must have in his office, so as to decide between us. I maintain that there has been an increase in the tariff. The hon. gentleman says there has not, and I ask him to bring down the two tariffs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said I was not aware, and I do not think that there has been any increase.

Mr. WALLACE. You know that the Harris tariff is very much higher.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know it. All I know is that in the Harris tariff, there were some trifling alterations made in the classification. Some classes of goods that for instance were in number nine were put in number eight, and some that were in number ten were put in number nine ; but in the examination of the classification sheet, as it came in and was submitted to the Governor in Council, the hon. Minister of Finance, whom I asked to go over with me, and myself were disposed not to allow of any increase, and we were assured by our officers that there was nothing in it but a removal of some inequalities. There were some articles included in one classification which ought to be in another, and I was advised that the transfers I have mentioned were necessary in order to make our classification uniform with that governing the western railways. It is pointed out by our officers that the fact that we had one classification and they another was going to militate against general uniformity and make it exceedingly difficult for us to make our through rates work harmoniously and satisfactorily. But there has been no such thing

as a general increase or any substantial increase on any of the articles. If there was, it was not done knowingly, and I do not believe it was done at all. I do not undertake to question what the hon. gentleman said, but that is a matter that probably will be susceptible of explanation when the information is had.

The hon. gentleman is entirely overlooking the fact, when he speaks of having shipped goods before the arrangement was made, that he was then shipping over the Grand Trunk Railway for a part of the mileage, which is now part of the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway tariff, as applied to the Montreal extension, may have been somewhat different from the Grand Trunk Railway tariff as applied to that end, before the change took place. I do not believe that the Grand Trunk Railway rates have been wholly or in the main better than the Intercolonial Railway. I rather think the Intercolonial Railway rates have been lower.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that by this arrangement, all freight taken by the Grand Trunk Railway west of Montreal, as soon as it reaches Montreal, is handed over to the Intercolonial Railway and has to conform with the Intercolonial Railway tariff. Arrangements, of course, are made on through freight. I have the two tariffs, and, before this Bill is read the third time, I shall have them here. The Grand Trunk tariff gives the rates, and the rate to Intercolonial points is 55 cents per hundred pounds. As soon as this arrangement of the hon. Minister came into operation, that was cancelled, and they sent a new schedule, mentioning every station, and to none of them is the local rate as low as 55 cents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) suggest that the rate was the same, say, to Rivière du Loup as to Halifax ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I say.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is entirely incorrect; that would be unreasonable.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will stake my reputation, as a member of this House, against the hon. gentleman's reputation, as a Minister, that I will produce the document which shows the rate on goods from our factory to all points on the Intercolonial Railway is 55 cents per hundred, and it makes no difference whether it is Halifax or any other point. That has been cancelled, and we are paying now from 65 to 80 cents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if he thinks that is a common-sense arrangement ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That was the arrangement with us and with others in my town, and, I believe, that every manufacturer in Ontario——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the hon. gentleman: Does he think it would be fair to charge a man the same to Rivière du Loup as to Halifax ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That has nothing to do with it. I am telling the hon. gentleman what the arrangement was. The hon. Minister says, that this scheme of his will be better for the people of Ontario, and we find it is worse. It is worse for the manufacturer, and it is decidedly worse for the consumer, because, of course, we have to add the extra freight charge on the goods, and take it out of the consumer. The hon. gentleman wants to know, if it is fair to charge the same rate to Rivière du Loup as to Halifax. That is the railway business. To secure our business, they gave us that rate, and they had their arrangement with the Intercolonial Railway. But, as soon as the present arrangement with the Grand Trunk was made, they began to quote us a rate to Montreal, and told us we must pay, besides, the Intercolonial rate to the point of delivery. These are the arrangements we are working under now, and it costs 20 cents per hundred more on our goods than formerly. I ask the hon. gentleman to lay the tariff on the Table, and he will see that his own statement is not correct. Then, as to the dollar value of the Grand Trunk Railway account, and the idea that from it a statement cannot be made out, I will guarantee that the auditor, if he has not the miles down, will soon work it out from the number of dollars. Any accountant will do that; I will undertake to do it myself. If I know that $500 represents, for instance, a mileage of 40,000 miles, I will be able to figure out the mileage represented by $600, or any other sum. If his auditor cannot do this, he is not worthy to stay in the Department twenty-four hours. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) asked for this information ten days, and the hon. Minister said he could have it, but now he seeks to get out of it by saying that it cannot be done. I think it is not fair to his auditor to say, that he cannot make up a statement of this mileage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It varies every month.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the number of dollars varies accordingly. And, by the number of dollars, he can know the number of miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not mistaken. I have had as much to do with auditing accounts as my hon. friend (Mr. Blair). An auditor who could not make up such a state-

ment, would not be worthy to audit the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway, or any other railway.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the auditor's report is filed each month with the Department, and becomes departmental record thereafter. Also, whether the auditor is furnished with the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway kept separately, or whether he proceeds upon the blank statement that so much mileage is due. In a sense it might seem idle to ask such a question, because if the mileage were given it would be easy to learn the sum of money due to the Grand Trunk. I do not like to ask too many questions, but I would like to know also whether there is any provision in the agreement for a check on the part of the Government as to the expenditure that must be made in maintaining that part of the road in which we hold in joint ownership, or whether it is in the hands of the Grand Trunk without check or provision beyond the mere statement of the accounts. If the hon. Minister will give this information, he will at least throw some light upon the matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume the hon. gentleman would be ready to acknowledge that no Minister living ought to be expected, with the other overwhelming duties which he has to discharge, to follow in detail and to know how the under officers of the railway service work out minor but still important matters. I confess that I have never had the time, I have never felt called upon to take the auditor of the Intercolonial Railway and accompany him in the performance of his duties to see how he did it, to trace out the results and determine whether his system was accurate. I have taken it for granted that whatever was necessary to be done by the subordinate officials of the department, under the general manager and under the chief engineer, would be done. When this matter came up I had occasion to make inquiries regarding it, and I was told that the officers of the department did not furnish, either at Moncton or here, any statement which would show the amount of engine and car mileage of the respective railways upon the Montreal extension.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman think that an absolute requisite to a proper keeping and checking of the accounts ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. According to my judgment I do not think that it is at all necessary, I do not think that it is a matter of any substantial importance.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.). What check have you on your officers under these circumstances ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have the assumption that the officer, when he examines these books, will be convinced that the accounts have been properly made up or he would not approve them. Surely you do not imagine that after the accounts are rendered to the department and placed in the hands of the auditor in whom you have confidence, that you need some one else to check him.

Mr. CLARKE. What information has the auditor in his possession other than that supplied by the Grand Trunk Railway authorities ?

Mr. IVES. Let me add another question to that one. We understand that the account is rendered monthly or periodically by the Grand Trunk Railway in connection with this mileage. Now, will the hon. gentleman say what the character of that account is ? Of course certain things must be known to enable the auditor to check the account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never seen one of these accounts, they have never come before me. But I will tell the hon. gentleman what I judge would be the nature of that account. The account would state what the gross payments were which have been made by the Grand Trunk Railway on the road in the way of maintenance and repairs for the month, giving them in detail. The auditor would examine those items and see whether they were charges of a nature proper to be included in such an account. Then he would examine the vouchers and see whether they correspond with the items contained in the account. He would have access to the company's books of which there must be a great many, because the books of every station would have to be examined There would be a page for every day of the month, which would contain a list of the engines, the number of the engines and number of the cars, with the name of the cars, if they had a name. Every page would contain all these particulars, and that page would be multiplied for each day by the number of stations on the whole line. By toting up that page you would see how many engine miles there were, and how many car miles there were on that day. In that statement, I presume, you would see whether it was a Grand Trunk Railway engine or car, or an Intercolonial Railway engine or car. The auditor would examine all these books which will be put in his hands for the purpose. We will say that there are 40 or 50 stations, then there will be 40 or 50 books, each book would be examined by him, and he would tote up all these particulars. He would not make any copy or any abstract of the books, but he finds out in that way what proportion the total car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway bears to the total car mileage of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the engine mileage accordingly.

Mr. IVES. Do I gather that the Grand Trunk Railway agents keep both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway mileage ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They keep both.

Mr. IVES. They are the joint officials of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and they keep the whole account, both the mileage of the Intercolonial and the mileage of the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is my belief, I cannot see how it could be done otherwise.

Mr. IVES. It seems to me that the Grand Trunk Railway, in rendering an account to the Intercolonial Railway or to the Department of Railways, for this monthly maintenance account, would state the total amount expended, with the car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway and the car mileage of the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told that that has not been the custom.

Mr. IVES. Then they do not give the data the auditor must have ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it will be very easy to verify it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. First of all, the Grand Trunk Railway has to make up the account. Now, do they make it up by having the train and car and engine mileage ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed they have not been doing it that way. They have their books which show how much has been expended on that section or on that division for that month. The items which constitute that account are made up and handed to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway. I presume that is the way, I have not seen one of them, but I presume that is the way in which the accounts are furnished. They render an account containing the gross expenditure for the month in detail, then they say that the proportion of the Intercolonial Railway is so much.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How do they figure that out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By examining their books and taking the proportion. If there are 10,000 engine and car miles of the Grand Trunk Railway and 1,000 engine and car miles of the Intercolonial Railway for the same period, they would know that the Intercolonial Railway bill would be one-tenth.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) shakes his head.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, that is just what I have said all along.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is just what I was arguing, that before the Grand Trunk could make any charge against the Intercolonial they must know the engine and car mileage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course they must.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, now, it would not take the Minister fifteen minutes to get that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are wrong about that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the Minister if this account is not just the same as an account for furniture. It is an account the Government owe for value received. Does the hon. gentleman intend to say that he would accept an account for furniture or for furnishings for $20,000 without the items ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does he say that he will accept that en bloc and send his auditor to go over the account afterwards. No, he will not. He will demand the items.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am doing that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, then in this matter you are not doing that; that is just exactly what you are not doing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They do not understand him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think you can or you would not ask these questions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was so wholly stupid as to think that we did not understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentleman is not nearly as acute and bright as I thought he was. I submit to the merest page in this House that the hon. Minister of Railways does not understand this question or he would not refuse to give this information to the House. It is as clear as the nose on the face of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the account rendered by the Grand Trunk Railway, is either en bloc or in items.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It must be in items.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is in items so far as the amounts which make it up are concerned, but the basis upon which these amounts are charged ought to be there if it is an account which can be adjudged as to whether it is correct or not. My argument was that before it could be made out by the Grand Trunk they ought to have the basis for that account which is the engine and car mileage, and I submit that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, before he would send his auditor to examine these accounts, ought to have these details, if not for his own information, for the information of the Public Accounts Committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you suppose that it is possible for me to follow all these details? That would not be possible if there were five Ministers in the department instead of one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How long will it take to examine this; it will not take the fifteenth part of a minute.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who says, oh? The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals knows what that account is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never saw one of them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I submit he ought to have seen them before he came here and asked that this bill be passed. He ought to know what the basis is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know the basis.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the basis.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a wheelage basis.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the wheelage basis? Is it one to five or one to ten or one to one hundred?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell you.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He knows it is a wheelage basis, but he does not know whether it is one to five, one to ten or one to a hundred or one to a thousand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not audit the accounts on the Intercolonial.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, we had better get the auditor here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You had better get the whole staff in here and swear them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no use of the hon. gentleman getting abusive.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We are asking for reasonable information upon this subject. We are asking for information that the hon. gentleman could get in fifteen minutes if he wanted to get it. If he has it in his department he could give it to us in fifteen minutes. He ought to have it. He had a right to demand it from the Grand Trunk, and the Grand Trunk had a right to give it to him, and if he has not got it he could get it in half an hour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not get it in that time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It could be got.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt it could be got. It is not in the department, and I do not believe that it is in the department at Moncton.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the train mileage that the hon. gentleman is speaking of?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the engine and car mileage.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the officers of the Intercolonial could not furnish the mileage, and that the Grand Trunk did not furnish the Intercolonial mileage over their lines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said they opened this book to us.

Mr. INGRAM. Never mind about their opening their books. Am I correct in my understanding?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are not correct, if you mean by that that they do not afford the auditors of the Intercolonial the fullest information on the subject. They throw open their books. Let me say here what occurs so that I will not be misunderstood. I have stated that the Grand Trunk Railway Co. keep, themselves, in their books, the record of every mile that is travelled by their own engines and cars and by the Intercolonial engines and cars. I am not sure but that the Intercolonial keeps an account of its own mileage. I am not sure that it does; I think the chances are that it does furnish that information, but it is put in possession of an account of the whole amount containing the items which go to make up the expenditures for the month, and they furnish to the officers at Moncton a statement of what proportion of that amount is payable by the Intercolonial. Then I have told you that the officers of the Intercolonial are sent to Montreal, and they satisfy themselves and so report whether that proportion is accurate or is not.

Mr. CLARKE. Do they depend entirely upon the information supplied by the Grand Trunk?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am under the impression that they do not. They must depend upon the Grand Trunk books for information as respects the engine and car mileage of the Grand Trunk, but I think there could be no more conclusive evidence as to what the car mileage would be than these books which I do not think could be misleading.

Mr. IVES. Are these monthly accounts or statements not allowed to remain in the department as vouchers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They remain at Moncton.

Mr. IVES. I think from what the hon. gentleman says now——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that all along.

Mr. IVES. I understood that these accounts contained the amount of the claim which the Grand Trunk asked the Government to pay as their proportion of the mileage. If we have the total expenditure for maintenance and the proportionate amount which the Grand Trunk ask the Government to contribute, under this arrangement, we could ascertain what the proportion of the Government is and what that of the Grand Trunk is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I told hon. gentlemen that long ago, but it was not satisfactory.

Mr. IVES. That would furnish the information we really want, which is the proportion of the car mileage of the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says that he can get this information from the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can telegraph for it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister could have saved this debate by getting it thirteen days ago. He assumes a different position now from what he did before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Exactly the same.

Mr. MONTAGUE. "Hansard" will show that the hon. gentleman said he could not get this car mileage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "Hansard" will show that assertions were made in this House that I had all this information in my department and under my hand, and that I affirmed I had not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister does not desire that we should pass this Bill without this information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no reason why you should not take it on the third reading.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It does not refer to the Bill at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I never saw the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) so complacently accept everything, as he does from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). The Minister seems to be a decided admirer of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. FOSTER. Doubtful.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think it is doubtful.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We usually admire each other.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think you could help it, for if there was ever a pair of twins in stupidity as to not understanding what we want to-night it is you two. Now the Minister of Railways and Canals knows that we know he is not stupid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do know that you know you are only having a little fun.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all. We are most serious, and the Minister (Mr. Blair) takes this expenditure of this too large a sum of money, without any degree of seriousness whatever.

Mr. INGRAM. Up to the present I have refrained from saying anything with respect to this deal. Now, I am not asking the question I shall ask for the fun of the thing, but I am doing it in all seriousness, and I trust the Minister will treat me in that way. I ask the Minister (Mr. Blair) if any employees of the Intercolonial Railway are in control of the cars or trains passing over the Intercolonial Railway and into the terminal points in Montreal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Invariably.

Mr. INGRAM. Whom do they report to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These officers are joint officers of both roads, and they must report at the different stations and their destinations.

Mr. INGRAM. Every man who is in charge of a train makes his report at the end of his trip whether it be in Montreal or at the end of his division. In that daily report is the mileage of the engine and of every car on that train.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The driver does not make it to the head office but to his divisional point.

Mr. INGRAM. I differ from the Minister again. There is only one head office on the Intercolonial Railway system and that is at Moncton. It does not make any difference whether there are three or five divisions, all these reports must go to Moncton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The reports which are made by the driver or the conductor at these divisional points, are I suppose sent to Moncton ultimately.

Mr. INGRAM. Again I must differ from the Minister. That is not the practice. The practice is that there is only one head office for the conductor, no matter what division he is on, and all the reports go to the head office which is at Moncton. Now, I never was in Moncton, but I know what the system is on the Intercolonial Railway as on every other railway. That is the means by which the railway finds out the mileage of the different cars no matter to what line they belong. At the expiration of the month the mileage of all these cars is figured up, and the business-like way would be that the car mileage office at Moncton would report to the Government at Ottawa, the total mileage run on the Government railways. Now, that I presume is done on the Intercolonial Railway as it is done elsewhere, and there is no doubt that the Minister can get his mileage at Moncton or in his own department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is no doubt that the Intercolonial Railway has the account of its own mileage, but that would not do because you have to get the Grand Trunk Railway mileage too.

Mr. INGRAM. The Government must keep track of the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway cars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never disputed that, but that is only a small portion of the information asked for.

Mr. INGRAM. It was asked here to-night what the mileage of the Intercolonial cars at the Grand Trunk Railway terminal points was. I understood the hon. Minister to say that he had not the mileage or that his officers told him they could not produce the mileage. That cannot be so, for it would be a very unbusinesslike method of carrying on business. If the hon. Minister inquires this morning in his office, I am sure that he will find that my statement is correct, and what my hon. friends here are complaining of is that he has not produced the mileage.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the merits of the Drummond County purchase. What has struck me in this long debate has been the fact that the Ministers, either through ignorance or wilfully, have been withholding proper information. The information asked for on this side of the House has, I think, been entirely reasonable. It is information that should have been supplied to this House to enable the members to form anything like a correct judgment as to the merits or demerits of this bargain. I think it has been a very humiliating scene to-night, to see the surly manner in which Ministers have evaded answering questions. Promises, as distinct and straight and square as promises could be made by one man to another, have been given by Ministers, and have not been kept. It is a very serious and very humiliating thing to find Ministers of the Crown taking that position. One of two things must be the case, either that the Ministers themselves do not know the bargain they have made, or that they have found that it is so bad that they decline to give the House the information which they must have in their possession. I think the inference to be drawn is that they went into this project, as they went into the Yukon Railway project, without any knowledge of what they were doing, and that they asked the solicitors of the other side to draw an agreement with them. The agreement presented here has evidently been drawn by the Grand Trunk solicitors and the Drummond County solicitors, and the Ministers apparently know very little about it. It involves millions of dollars. The rental is about $140,000 a year, which capitalized means a very serious sum. I did not intend to speak on the subject, but I must say that the impression left on my mind by this debate is that the Government, either from want of knowledge or wilfully, have endeavoured to keep back information which they ought to have given to this House, and which they promised they would give before the Bill was passed.

Mr. McMULLEN. As hon. gentlemen appear to be a little tired out, I will assist them for a few moments.

Mr. FOSTER. You have a large reserve fund, you know.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw attention to this point on which hon. gentlemen have been harping for the last six hours. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) four times to-night has demanded that the Minister of Railways and Canals should comply with a certain promise which he made in answer to himself on the 26th of May, that he would do certain things. What was it? Here is what the hon. gentleman asked:

> Therefore, the Minister (Mr. Blair) must have from the Grand Trunk Railway Company returns and information which indicate exactly each month, what the proportion of user, made up in that way, by the Grand Trunk Railway, and by the Intercolonial Railway respectively is.

The hon. Minister said:

> There will be no difficulty, I think, in furnishing that information, if the hon. gentleman desires it. Does he desire it for the whole period that the arrangement has been running?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to put the hon. gentleman to any unnecessary trouble, but I thought it was probably easy to furnish it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there will be no difficulty, so far as I am aware, in furnishing it down to the last we have received a statement from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It will, I should think, be furnished before the introduction of the Bill or before the Grand Trunk Railway matter is disposed of.

Now, the hon. Minister tells you that he went to his Department and thoroughly investigated all the papers and documents relating to this matter, and he has come back and reported to the House that there were no documents or papers in his Department that would enable him to give the hon. gentleman the information he asked for.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did he promise it ?

Mr. McMULLEN. He did not promise it. He said he thought there would be no trouble in furnishing it. He turns to his Department and asks his officers about these papers, and they say they are not there. Then he says the matter is settled every month ; the auditor of the Intercolonial goes to Montreal and goes over the accounts from beginning to end, and is in a position to certify that the charges made by the Grand Trunk are correct, and on the basis of that certificate the Intercolonial is called upon to pay its proportion. Is that not right ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is right.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yet the hon. member for Halifax claims that the hon. Minister has broken his promise ; the ex-Minister of Finance and the ex-Minister of Agriculture have done the same thing. They have been demanding that he should produce what he has told them he has not in his office, and he has explained distinctly and clearly the way in which the accounts are made up. Now, what do these hon. gentlemen want ? We know perfectly well what they want : they want to take up time, in the hope of making an impression on the public mind that the Minister is not acting properly. This whole question over which hon. gentlemen are delaying the House is a side issue altogether, a matter of detail, and not one that affects the lease at all. It is merely a matter of adjustment of accounts between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and ought to have nothing to do at all with the ratification of the lease. The Grand Trunk Railway has to satisfy whoever is at the head of the Intercolonial Railway that the account is right before they can get a dollar ; and if the Minister of Railways should demand an account in a different shape, the Grand Trunk Railway would have to comply with his demand or go without their money. These hon. gentlemen are trying to make a mountain out of a mole, and if they want to waste time they are succeeding admirably.

Mr. BERGERON. If there ever was an occasion on which the saying : " Deliver me from my friends " would be applicable, it is the present one. The hon. Minister of Railways might well repeat that exclamation after the manner in which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) showed up his incapacity. It is quite evident that if the hon. member for North Wellington had been promoting this measure himself, he would have taken an entirely different course to that followed by the Minister. What is the hon. gentleman's excuse for the Minister? He said that if the Minister of Railways and Canals had done his duty—for that is the only conclusion to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks—he would have given us just what we have been asking for.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and not only what we have been asking for, but what the Minter promised us. The hon. Minister promised us everything before he would introduce this Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. Everything in his department.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend need not interrupt, for he will have every chance to reply, and I must say he is a great acquisition to us just now. We know how intensely he has been suffering of late years through not being able to ventilate his opinions in this House, but if he will only stay with us now and give us occasionally some explanations, he will help us in a most effective manner. He has just proved that the Minister knows nothing at all about the lease. The hon. Minister promised to give us certain information which my hon. friend has just declared it ought to be easy for him to give. Will the hon. member approve the conduct of the Minister who, for thirteen months, has been paying the Grand Trunk Railway rental on this line, without knowing what he has been paying for. What would be the state of any clerk who would pay out money without getting vouchers in return and who, when asked by his employer : Why did you pay this ? What proof have you that it was due ? would say : I know nothing about it, but you can take my word that it is all right. The position of the Minister of Railways is exactly the same. He told us that there would be no difficulty in giving a report of the mileage from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, but when we want that report, he says he cannot give it. My hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is a man who knows a great deal about railway operations and my hon. friend from Toronto, who has just spoken, knows something about them, and they know, as we all do, that any railway company can, at the end of every month,

give a complete return of the car mileage which has been used on their line.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) And every car separate.

Mr. BERGERON. But here we have the admission of the Minister that for thirteen months the Dominion has been paying the Grand Trunk Railway money without having the first proof that the money was due, and that he cannot give us the proof. The right hon. First Minister told us that if we would let the schedule go through, this information, which the Minister of Railways says he cannot get, would be laid before the House. Which are we to believe ? This is a sample of the way we have been treated since this measure came before us. Some hon. gentlemen opposite say this is obstruction. The new members say so, but the old members, for instance, the hon. member for North Wellington, know that it is not. If these gentlemen were in Opposition, and a similar course were pursued by the Minister in office, my hon. friend from North Wellington alone would keep the Government for six months. He could not allow—and he would be right—a Bill of this kind to go through Parliament in the form in which it is brought before us. We have had two occasions to doubt the, well, I will say sincerity so as not to use any other word, of the Minister of Railways and Canals in bringing this measure before Parliament. We sat here until three o'clock yesterday morning. Why ? Because the hon. Minister, in answering the argument of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), declared that he had in his possession figures from his chief engineer showing that it would cost $300.000 to build a certain bridge. The hon. member for Glengarry, who is a pratical man, had figures to show that it would cost $50,000. Here was a large margin of difference, and we asked that the Minister lay on the Table the figures which he said he had from his chief engineer. We know Mr. Schreiber as a man with a reputation to sustain, and any statement of his we could discuss. But the Minister refused to bring down those figures. Why ? My impression is that the people of Canada know to-day that the Minister could not bring down a statement signed by Mr. Schreiber to uphold his argument. If this be so, we have a Minister of the Crown trying to put through a measure which was before Parliament on a previous occasion and could not command the confidence of Parliament, and making statements to support it which he knew he could not substantiate by the signature of a responsible engineer. To-night, we are on clause 3, which speaks of the car mileage as the basis of the payments made by the Dominion of Canada to the Grand Trunk Railway for carrying the Intercolonial Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. Is it not absolutely necessary that we should have here the reports which must be in the hands of the Minister—for I cannot imagine that the head of a department would have paid large sums of money to the Grand Trunk Railway without having in his possession these returns. Another thing that makes me believe that he has these returns is that he promised to bring them down. But to-night he refuses to bring them. Why does he refuse ? Can there be any reason but that they tell against the running of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal over this line, and he prefers to stay here obstructing the business of the House—because it is not we but the hon. Minister who is obstructing, for we are only asking for information to which we are entitled—rather than give the information ?

Now, I desire to ask the hon. Minister a question which I think is a very pertinent one. How about this Jacques Cartier Junction branch ? If I understood him, well, he spoke about having the right of carrying the Intercolonial Railway trains over that branch of the Grand Trunk Railway system to Montreal. How will he bring his cars over the Jacques Cartier branch unless he makes a special provision, for that is not the mail line of the Grand Trunk Railway over which the Intercolonial Railway cars will come into Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contract provides for that.

Mr. BERGERON. No. Well, will the hon. gentleman explain how ? I am asking for information ; there is no obstruction in this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that over the Jacques Cartier Junction line connection can be made with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. But it is far from Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is about 15 miles from the bridge, I believe. This matter is expressly provided for in the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. I doubt it, and I wish the hon. Minister to explain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman is serious in asking the question ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then the 9th and 10th lines of the first clause will give him the information he desires—I do not mean the recital, but the first clause of the contract at the bottom of page 2.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that is quite an answer. I have read this clause to

which the hon. Minister refers. If I merely wanted to take up time, I could easily do so by reading this section; but I do not wish to take up the time of the committee for nothing. This branch to Jacques Cartier Junction is not part of the main line which the Intercolonial Railway will use.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But it is one of the lines of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. But the Intercolonial Railway comes in by the St. Henri Junction and this is above that. How, then, will he carry on his arrangements for that branch?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is not a branch to Jacques Cartier; it is the Junction of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Pacific main line being intersected there by the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. But the Jacques Cartier line does not stop at Jacques Cartier Junction, but goes on behind the mountain to the parish of St. Laurent. What is called the Jacques Cartier Junction is not merely a switch from one road to another, it is a little line that goes from Montreal to St. Laurent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is part of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway, it was built to enable the Grand Trunk Railway to get a carload of freight to and on the Canadian Pacific Railway line.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Railways and Canals, in order to get a line into Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway, got it by paying, if I may put it that way, half what the line cost, or upon the basis of half ownership, and he pays by reason of that, $140,000 a year for the privilege of using this line to get his cars into Montreal. That is one part of the bargain; the other part is as to maintenance. Now, he does not make a stated agreement as to what his share of the maintenance should be, but that share is to be computed upon the basis of the car and engine mileage, or, in other words, the Intercolonial Railway has to pay according to the extent to which it uses that line into Montreal. Now, he pays the half on the basis of half the cost, or on the basis of half the usage, when he pays for the privilege of getting in. But when he comes to pay his share of the reparations, his share of the maintenance on that line, when he comes to have that reckoned up, instead of being one-half, it will be about one-twenty-fifth, or one-twentieth. In other words, he has purchased upon the basis of a half the right to get into Montreal on a line as to the user of which he will only stand in relation to the whole usage of the line to the extent of one twenty-fifth; in other words, he has paid too much for his privilege of getting into Montreal as one twenty-fifth stands to one-half. If the hon. gentleman had paid upon the basis of user, which was the proper basis, it would have been a good scheme to have got one twenty-fifth of the railway and to have gone in on that. Of course, I am guessing at the figures, but if I am wrong, will the hon. gentleman state what the figures are. But the hon. Minister does not want to bring down those figures because they give away the whole bargain from beginning to end.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the lecturer of the Government side, undertakes to lecture us when we are trying to get information. Perhaps the hon. gentleman forgets what he used to do when he occupied a seat on this side of the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is not what you want.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say, why does he not get up like a man and say it? Probably he does not understand anything more about this question than the member for North Wellington does.

Mr. McGREGOR. If I did not know more about it than you do, I would sit down.

Mr. INGRAM. If you would think more and talk less you would act the part of a gentleman, and that is what you are not doing now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman knows that he has no right to use such expressions.

Mr. INGRAM. What expression did I use that was out of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression in which he said that the hon. member for Essex was not acting as a gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. I said that if the hon. gentleman would think more and talk less, he would act the part of a gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows that such an expression is never used in Parliament. It is absolutely against the rules of debate, and I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression.

Mr. BERGERON. We have the same rules in committee as they have in the House. Nobody can interrupt unless he is allowed to do so. The hon. member for Essex has been allowed a latitude that would not be allowed in any other place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), who knows very well that the ruling has been given.

Mr. BERGERON. You were too quick, Mr. Chairman; we had not time to discuss it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. INGRAM. I have nothing to withdraw. What I said was that if the hon. gentleman would think more and talk less he would act the part of a gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). And you went on to say that he is not doing so now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Chair has ruled that it is out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) was not a gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, you did.

Mr. INGRAM. What I said was that if the hon. gentleman would think more and talk less he would act the part of a gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman added that the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) was not acting the part of a gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What he said was that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) was not carrying out that precept of thinking more and talking less. He was talking more and thinking less.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is the hon. gentleman going to obey the Chairman?

Mr. INGRAM. I fail to see where I am out of order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Chair has ruled that you are out of order. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the hon. gentleman withdrawing.

Mr. IVES. I think when the hon. gentleman who interrupted, declares that he is a gentleman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) ought to accept that.

Mr. INGRAM. I have not said that he is not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is out of order for the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) to interrupt.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No interruptions should be made except with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor. At the same time the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) was out of order.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the statement?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the statement in which he said that the hon. member for Essex has not acted as a gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Chairman, you entirely misunderstood me. I will stand by the statement, although if the statement is unparliamentary, I am willing to withdraw it. I think, Mr. Chairman, you misunderstood the statement I made. If it be true, as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said, that the Intercolonial Railway has no means of keeping an account of the mileage, how did the auditors, engaged by the Government know whether the Grand Trunk accounts are properly kept? This is one of the complaints we have, because we would like to know on what basis we are paying this $140,000 to the Grand Trunk for using its tracks, whether it is on the basis of 100 cars a day or 500 cars or 1,000 a day? It is very important to know that, because if the Intercolonial do not intend to use the tracks to any great extent the amount to be paid the Grand Trunk would certainly be smaller, whereas if the Intercolonial were going to use them to a greater extent the amount would be larger. I think I can guess very fairly the reason why the mileage was not given to this House. I met Intercolonial Railway freight agents in the west between Buffalo and Detroit. I found that they were putting forth great efforts to secure traffic for this new line to show the people that this is a good Bill. I understand now that there is a decrease of about $200,000 in the receipts of this railway. That would be shown by the mileage over the line, and that is the reason why these figures are not brought down. They would show that the bargain with the Grand Trunk is not a good one. More than that, they would show that the deal between the Government and the Drummond County Railway Company was a bad deal. The Opposition have to do their duty, and if it takes from now until to-morrow night they must persist in getting the information which is so important in considering a Bill of this kind.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I find that there is an absolute determination on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that he will conceal from this committee the information that is necessary to enable us to determine whether the contract is a reasonable one or not. I said, last night, that I was not in sympathy with the arrangement which the Government had made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Drummond County Railway Company, because I did not think it would be in the interest of that part of the country which I have the honour to represent that such an arrangement should be made. I gave very potent reasons to show that we were handicapped in business by reason of this new arrangement instead of being bettered. If we are going to have forced upon us an

arrangement that is opposed to our best interests then we ought to make the best out of a bad bargain. I am sure that we would be willing to assist the Government, and it seems to me that assistance is required by any suggestion that we could possibly give, that might enable them to improve the bargain which they have made, but we must trust to the Government to give us some data which can assist us in coming to a conclusion.

I understood that the $140,000 is considered as half the rental of that portion of the road, which is being used by the Intercolonial Railway, and that would give $280,000 as a total rental. The only way we can arrive at what would be a fair rental for us to pay is by ascertaining what proportion of the user the Intercolonial Railway traffic bears to the joint traffic of the two roads. Suppose our share is 1 per cent of the user, then our share of the rental would be only $2,800, and the 99 per cent which should be paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on this joint rental would be $277,200. If we use 2 per cent our share of rental would be $5,600 and the Grand Trunk Railway's share would be $274,400. Let us take 10 per cent as our share of the user, and the Grand Trunk Railway share at 90 per cent. I question very much whether the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, as compared with the Grand Trunk Railway, has amounted to more than 10 per cent of the traffic, and if it does not, our share would be $28,000 and the Grand Trunk Railway's share would be $252,000, instead of our share being $140,000 as it is now and the Grand Trunk Railway's share being the same. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) rose from his seat tonight and became communicative, and as he had been a short time before in communion with the Minister of Railways in the corridor, I thought perhaps he would give the House the benefit of the information we need. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) did not do so. I will not insist upon getting the exact figures, but surely the Minister (Mr. Blair) can give us within 5 per cent of what our share is for the 12 months which this road has been operated jointly. If we could arrive at that, we would be able to go back to our constituents and defend our course in allowing this Bill to pass. We must obtain that information in order to show our constituents that we have been doing our utmost to prevent a very bad bargain from being made. We are not obstructing on this side of the House; the obstruction comes from the Government benches; because if the information which was promised and to which we are entitled had been given by the Minister (Mr. Blair), this Bill would have been passed by the House now and have gone to the Senate for discussion. I have a sincere desire to get information, and if the Minister does not give it I can assure him that I am a stayer. I am not particular whether I go to bed at all or not, and the Government will not frighten me. I can sit up at night as well as any man, and when the interests of my constituents are at stake, and when the Government proposes to waste millions of dollars of the money of the people of Canada, I am going to watch on the walls and do everything I can to prevent that waste of the people's money. I hope to be able to show my constituents that I have done my part at least. Now, I believe that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows more of this matter than he has admitted, and I think it would be a wise thing for him to disclose the whole thing. I am perfectly satisfied that the Minister (Mr. Blair) can tell us all about these facts, and I appeal to him to keep the House waiting no longer for them. I look upon the Minister (Mr. Blair) as an intelligent man, as a man who knows what he is about and I give him credit for a great deal more common sense than he would lead the House to believe he is entitled to. It is a humiliating position for the Minister to assume when he comes before this House and states, that he does not know the very essence and basis of a contract to which he has committed the country for a term of ninety-nine years. We cannot possibly suppose that the man who has been selected by the right hon. First Minister to occupy the position of Minister of Railways and Canals actually knows so little about his department that he cannot give us the data on which he makes this calculation. I am satisfied that he knows it, but I am afraid that he has discovered that he has made a very bad bargain for the country, and for that reason he does not want to disclose to the country the nature of the bad bargain he has made until he gets the measure through the House and it becomes law. Then he can snap his fingers at us, and can say. "Gentlemen, I can tell you now that it was only 5 per cent."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is quite entitled to enjoy the opinion he has expressed and to declare it with all the freedom he chooses. He is quite free to say that he thinks I have put myself in a humiliating position in respect to this matter; but I take leave to say in all courtesy to my hon. friend that there are humiliating positions and humiliating positions. I think I would much sooner take the humiliating position described by the hon. gentleman than be in a position which some hon. gentlemen occupy. I have before me an instance which I think worthy of note, and I will mention it to the hon. gentleman. I can recollect an hon. gentleman stating in the House someting which, if true, would be calculated to have a very injurious effect upon the Intercolonial Railway business. I think a member of this House, even though a member of the Opposition and intensely anxious to discredit the Government of the

day, might, at the same time, occasionally have in his mind the fact that statements which he is making in his desire to prejudice the Government, may and often do operate most disastrously to the interests of the country. And a statement such as an hon. member of this House made the other evening was calculated to do a great deal of harm. If it was not true, it was most unfair and indefensible. The statement made was that since the Intercolonial had been extended to Montreal, in the months of April and May last goods were shipped from Acton and other places in the neighbourhood to points on the Intercolonial —to Halifax, Westville and Yarmouth, which is not on the Intercolonial, and that it took these goods from the 23rd of April to the 26th of May to reach their destination. The statement was that that happened, not only once, but several times, and the hon. gentleman would lead the House and the country to believe that it was a matter of common occurrence. Now, I take occasion to say that the hon. gentleman ought to have fully informed himself of the accuracy of his statements before he gave them the wide currency which they must necessarily have received, coming from a member of Parliament. It has gone abroad all over this country, that the management of the Intercolonial is so pernicious, is so defective that it is not wise for a man to send his freight by that route, to reach any point in the maritime provinces, because when it should go in two or three days, it would not be likely to reach its destination in five weeks. That was the statement the hon. gentleman put forward. It startled me when made, and I tried to get from him some assurance as to whether he had inquired where the delay had taken place whether on the Intercolonial or on the Grand Trunk. The hon. gentleman was very positive that it had not occurred on the Grand Trunk, although he made no inquiries on the subject. He preferred to assume without making any inquiry that the Intercolonial Railway was not managed so as to justify people in doing business with it. I inquired by telegram this morning of the General Manager. I have not a copy of my telegram, but the answer will show what the inquiry was. I wired to the General Manager saying that a member of Parliament had made this statement in the House last evening, that goods had been shipped from Acton to Halifax, he believed they were gloves, and that it had taken from the 23rd of April to the 26th of May to reach their destination. I received the following reply:

Moncton, June 7th.

I have telegraphed to the stations about the delay of goods from Acton. Delays of that kind are very unusual, and there must be some special circumstances about them. As a rule, freight is taken over the Intercolonial more rapidly than over other railways of the same mileage. The average time of cars from Montreal to Halifax in May was two days and twenty-three hours, and from Montreal to St. John two days and six hours.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I am glad that the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up in this way, because it gives me the opportunity to emphasize a little more than I did last night the statement I then made. I tell the hon. gentleman that I have the information on the most reliable authority, and I care not what any manager of the Intercolonial Railway may say, he cannot deny the fact which I have asserted. I did say that a case of goods which had been shipped from Acton on the 25th of April to a gentleman named Ross in the city of Halifax, only reached there on the 22nd of May, or in a month less three days. It was given to me unsolicited by the accountant of the firm which shipped the goods, who knew what he was talking about. That is only one instance. Other instances have occurred in other parts of the province. I stated:

From Acton a short time ago goods were shipped to Westville in Pictou county; they were shipped on the 4th of May, and they had not reached Westville on the 2nd day of June.

Whether they have reached their destination yet or not, I do not know, but I am prepared to furnish the most undoubted testimony on the subject. If necessary, I will get affidavits to prove what I say, and I will take no statement of the Minister's, obtained from any of his officials, who do not know what they are talking about, and do not know whether the goods have arrived or not. So that the statement made by the Minister is not a contradiction of what I said, and I think the Minister, in challenging the remarks made by me, should at least have before him some kind of evidence to show that the goods are even there yet.

Mr. BERGERON. He does not deny it.

Mr. HENDERSON. He certainly does not. I say it is a disgrace to this country that we should be called upon to spend millions of dollars in obtaining a railway that is going to treat the shippers of western Ontario in that manner. If that is to be the management of the road, I would prefer throwing up the whole thing. Unless a better system is adopted than that, the whole interprovincial trade of the country will be destroyed. Travellers are sent down to take orders, and the goods are shipped, but the people cannot get their goods. We could send goods to Victoria or Vancouver and have them sold and the money in the bank almost before you could get them to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick over the Drummond County Railway. I thank the hon. Minister for having brought this matter up because it gives me the opportunity of

reasserting what I said on a former occasion. The information was given to me by the shippers, and given in a way which showed me there was something radically wrong with the whole system. I am quite sure the hon. Minister will withdraw his charge against me of insincerity because I assure him I am most sincere in this, and make my charge on the strength of information from a gentleman whom I have known for a great many years, and who, I know, would not give me a statement that was not absolutely correct.

Every session of Parliament we are bonusing railways for the purpose of creating railway competition. Only a few days ago a deputation was down here from New Ontario seeking a large bonus in order to create competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. For what purpose was that competition desired? In order that the public might get better rates. But in this case, instead of bonusing a road to get better rates, we are actually bonusing a road to destroy competition. We are paying the Grand Trunk Railway a large sum every year on condition that it will refuse to take goods from Montreal, which are intended to be shipped to points on the Intercolonial Railway. So that we are really bonusing a road to destroy competition. If we are going to adopt that system, we should cease bonusing railways to create competition. The whole purchase of this road is rotten from beginning to end, and I hope this Bill will never become law.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.). It strikes me very strongly that both sides of this House are acting as so many children. I do not think that there is anything to be gained by this discussion. If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has information which the Opposition require, and he has told us that it can be got at Moncton——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say it cannot. They tell me they have not got it.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows very well that there is not a car running a mile on the Intercolonial Railway or any other railway, of which there is not a record kept in the books of the railway. Is there any good reason therefore why the Minister should not get the information we desire. There is no great urgency required in the passing of this Bill. There is plenty of time to pass it in the next two months. The Opposition do not want to keep it from passing, but want certain information, which can be easily furnished by the Minister, and which, I think, in his own interest, he ought to furnish. The best thing he could do would be to adjourn the House and get the information, and the Bill would then go through without any trouble.

Mr. FOSTER. It is now half-past four o'clock. Of course assertions on one side or the other may be taken for what they are worth. We came here yesterday afternoon without the least intention of doing anything like obstructing the Bill. As an evidence of that, let me say that I had a conversation with Sir Charles Tupper before he left the House. I said to him that we had nothing to gain by staying late to-night, and that I thought we ought to get away by twelve o'clock, and get through with our criticism on the measure. The committee have heard what the hon. member from Halifax has said. I went back and spoke to him and we both came to that conclusion, and we came to that conclusion on the ground that we had the information which each considered vital for the presentation of our own argument. There is nothing more vital to the presentation of the case from an Opposition standpoint, than that we should know exactly, from practical work, the user of the Intercolonial Railway of those lines and facilities in proportion to the user of the Grand Trunk Railway. If we do not have that information, we are robbed of what we consider as our right on our appeal to the country. No gentleman on either side will contend for a moment that it is not possible to get in a short time the entire car and engine mileage and the proportion of that which belongs to the Intercolonial on these lines and in these terminals.

The Minister himself has not undertaken to say that this cannot be got. Now, on the 26th of May this information was asked for, in no casual manner, but in a most explicit and definite manner, and the Minister gave the questioner an answer that the information could easily be got and would be brought down. Last night, to prevent mistakes, the same matter was brought up by the member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and with the same detail, or nearly so, with which he first asked for the information. The Minister said the information had been brought down. The hon. member from Halifax rested content with that. But to-day—or rather yesterday—he found that it had not been brought down. Now, this is a vital point for the Opposition in the discussion of this question. It is for the members of the Government, if they choose, to keep this an enduring session. They can keep it, if they wish, until 12 o'clock on Saturday; they cannot keep it longer.

Mr. McMULLEN. All right; go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I am talking to the members of the Ministry who, I trust, have a greater feeling of responsibility——

Mr. McMULLEN. We have something to say.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope I shall have order for a moment. I am putting forward frankly the facts of the case. I say this point is vital to the Opposition.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not suppose there is any use in attempting to argue with a kicker like that. However, that is the Opposition opinion, that it is vital that we should have this information, and, I believe we ought to have it. We asked for it in plenty of time. Between the 26th of May and to-day the Minister could have communicated with Moncton, with Montreal, with every point on the system and had this information ready to hand. But not only has he not got it, he absolutely refuses to get it. I want the members of the Government who are present to think it over and decide whether they will prolong this struggle. It is not a matter of moment whether this Bill passes to-day or whether it passes to-morrow. There is plenty of business for the House to take up. It is simply a question whether the information shall be given and the business go on, or whether this struggle is to be kept up. My own advice and desire is that the information should be had and the committee stage should not pass until that information is given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has referred to me, I desire to say a few words. I am bound to accept his statement that he and his associates did not intend to obstruct this measure; but he will pardon me if I say that if they had desired to obstruct they would have proceeded on the very lines they have followed. The idea of our going on in this struggle, as he suggests, is not creditable to either side. There is something in what the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald) said that there is a good deal of childishness in the whole proceeding. Within the last four hours —without being discourteous, I may mention the fact—there has not been a new thought advanced. Hon. gentlemen have gone on repeating what they had already said. They had a right to ask for information, but, not meeting with the response they desired they have repeated again and again what they said in the first place, so we are about where we were at nine or ten o'clock. This is not the final stage of the Bill. Why not agree to let the Bill go through the committee stage? Hon gentlemen have the right on the third reading to raise every objection they wish. In the meantime, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has stated that he will give hon. gentlemen opposite any information in his power. It is not for me to say what that information is, he must answer for that himself. He said that the information asked for is not in the department, but that, what information he can procure he will produce. I agree that any information that can be obtained ought to be obtained. But we cannot gain anything by sitting here and repeating what has been said again and again. I would suggest, as a fair and reasonable adjustment of the differences, to pass this Bill in Committee of the Whole, hon. gentlemen opposite reserving their right to deal with the matter on the third reading, if the Minister has not, in the meantime, produced such information as they think they should have.

Mr. FOSTER. What we ask is simply the recognition of the right to have the information for the full discussion on the committee stage of the Bill. There is no doubt about that right, and my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) understands that. I say that should we forego that right for information which can be had, it will not facilitate public business in the least. There is other public business waiting our attention, so that even if we do not go on with this Bill immediately there need be no delay in our work. Now, we have our rights, and one of them is to have this information at this stage of the Bill. I do not think it is fair or right for the Government to try to press us to forego the freedom of discussion in committee and press the Bill forward to the third reading stage. If it could be shown that there is any public business which was being impeded by the delay, then there would be a strong argument against our position. But the road is working and will be working, just as it has been for the last twelve or thirteen months. There is just this one question, I would say to the Minister of Finance, whether we shall have this information and be able to present our arguments with that information before us. Outside of that, I do not think, speaking for myself, and, I think, of my friends, that it will take five minutes to dispose of the rest of the schedule. But this is our vital point. You may say that we are all foolish and stupid in considering this our vital point; but that is the way we look at it, and we have a right to whatever we think is the strongest presentations of our position.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not germane to the passing of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. If the ideas of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) prevail we will not talk about it any more.

Mr. WALLACE. To my mind, the proposition of the Minister is the most extraordinary one. He says that we are to go through the committee stage and then, at a later stage, the Minister of Railways and Canals will give us what further information he may —and the Minister of Finance does not say what that information is to be. That is not the way parliamentary business is conducted and no one knows it better than the Minister of Finance. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that for two years they should have been preparing these statements that we are asking for. But they are purposely withheld, and withheld for certain reasons. It was almost pathetic to listen to the hon. member for North Wellington. What did he tell us? He said that the Minister went to

his department and spent many weary hours looking over the records——

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said the Minister went all over the documents. Then he says the auditor goes down to Montreal. What is the use of talking that way to this Committee? What does clause 33 say:

> Her Majesty and the company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of rates, fares, charges, charge of costs and other returns.

That is all we want. That is the statement prepared by the company, and which is prepared by the Intercolonial Railway the 1st of every month. We want these statements, they are withheld, and they are withheld for a purpose. And what is the purpose? Why, it is because the Government are afraid to show the state of the comparative business of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. They have got that statement, they get it every month. Why don't they present it to this House?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are asking for information that we have not got.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the Minister tell me that he is working under an agreement for fourteen months, and that the very essence of that agreement is being violated every month? Because that is what he means when he says that he has not got the information. His own clause says that Her Majesty and the company should each furnish to the other every month all the information necessary. Has that been done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The auditor is satisfied.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister is trifling with the intelligence of the Committee in resorting to such a subterfuge. We did not ask him if the auditor is satisfied. We want to be satisfied ourselves. The fact is that in every month but one there has been a tumble down in the share that the Intercolonial Railway has to pay. In July their share to pay was $2,336; in August, their share to pay dropped to $1,900; in September, their share to pay dropped again to $1,880; in October, to $1,521; in November, it increased to $2,000; in December it dropped to $1,071; in January, to $482.45; in February, it increased a little, being $488.30. There is the record, and there is the reason why the Minister dare not furnish that statement presented to his department, and which he has in the department, but which he dare not lay on the Table of the House. But it would be still more damaging if we could get further information relative to the proportion of the expenses to be paid by the Grand Trunk Railway, and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by the Intercolonial Railway, because it would annihilate the proposition that we are to pay for one-half of this. Even the hon. member for North Wellington will admit that we are entitled to this information. But that hon. gentleman, looking to his future prospects, is always ready to come to the rescue of the Government, not with argument, not with logic, but with a hungry growl that we hear issuing from the depths.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Am I not hungry at this hour?

Mr. WALLACE. I am hungering for a little information, the smallest quantity of information will satisfy us. We may hunger and hunger apparently still unsatisfied. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said to-night in answer to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that they did not increase the tariff of rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think we did.

Mr. WALLACE. Does not the hon. gentleman know that he was going to revolutionise the affairs of the road; that he appointed Mr. Harris who presented a new schedule of rates for the whole of the Intercolonial system? Does the hon. Minister not know that when these rates had been submitted to him for his approval and that when they were put into force in the maritime provinces it almost raised a rebellion, and that it would have upset the Government if it had been persisted in and continued. The Minister knows that he had to dismiss Mr. Harris, withdraw his tariff and practically revert to the old tariff. The hon. Minister says he does not recollect much about that. Nobody knows better than he does that he was deluged with letters of protest against this high tariff which had undoubtedly increased the receipts of the Intercolonial. Are we not justified in our suspicions as to the course of this Government when they refuse to give us information. Do we not know the history of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway? Do we not know that, without the authority of Parliament, and without a contract, the Government undertook to run the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and that they ran it at a loss of $36,000 or $37,000? I say in the face of facts like this we are justified in demanding all the information and not scraps of information. When we ask for the documents the hon. Minister says that the auditor goes down to Montreal, and he is perfectly satisfied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I said he came up to Montreal.

Mr. WALLACE. Worse still; we supposed that we had an officer of the Government who would examine into these accounts but now we find he comes up from

Montreal which, I presume, means that he is the auditor of the Grand Trunk Railway, that he says to the Minister that it is all right and the Minister is satisfied. If that is the way things are going on it is on a par with the Yukon Bill, with the extravagant bargain of the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway in building the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and with what is looming up in New Brunswick where the Minister had to say that the Government were not committed to the acquiring of the Great Eastern Railway, but that he himself, as a private individual, expressing his views to his fellow-citizens down there, which he said was not binding the Government. But the machinery is at work to accomplish his desires in that direction. We want the information and I can tell the hon. Minister that we are going to have it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will have to wait until it can be got.

Mr. WALLACE. We do not begrudge the time. We will wait. We want to go on with the business; we will go into supply or anything else. I would appeal to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) to give us that information that we desire so as to enable us to proceed with the business of the country and not assist his colleagues in obstructing and preventing due progress being made in the conduct of the public business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no refusal on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to give information, so that a very large part of my hon. friend's speech was wasted. The Minister says he is willing to give it. There is no other business that can be satisfactorily gone on with. Going into supply has degenerated into a mere form, and we can make no progress in that way. If this information which cannot be got at present can be got before the third reading the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will give it, and then hon. gentlemen opposite would be in as good a position at the third reading as they are now.

Mr. FOSTER. No, we will discuss it now.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Possibly the Minister would be correct in saying that the information desired is not in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nor in Moncton either.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the Minister say that the information upon which the auditor based his certificate to the Government is not here nor in Moncton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not in writing.

Mr. CLARKE. How are the payments made? The Minister stated that these payments were made on the certificate of the auditor, and the auditor must have some papers before him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had the books.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway provided——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been so interpreted. They did not make a transcript and copy thousands of pages.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody asks that, and you know it as well as any man in this House.

Mr. CLARKE. Did not the auditor visit Montreal at the end of the month and make a statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He never made a statement to me; I never heard anything about it.

Mr. CLARKE. But he must have made a statement upon which your accounts were paid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He examined the books and certified as to the sum to be paid out.

Mr. IVES. I understood the Minister to say that these accounts were in the department at Moncton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have stated over and over again that I presume these accounts rendered by the Grand Trunk Railway against the Intercolonial Railway are there. That is a matter of inference simply.

Mr. IVES. Do they not show the cost of maintenance and the proportion the Intercolonial Railway owes to the Grand Trunk Railway on its wheelage basis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume they do.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the name of the auditor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have two or three.

Mr. BERGERON. What are their names?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know them by name, but I will get their names for you.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no use in the Minister trying to fool the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should be so insulting.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give expression to my opinion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall decline to notice his in-

quiries if he does not make them in proper terms.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I shall appeal to my benevolent friend the Minister of Customs. There is no use fooling about this matter. The Minister knows that he can get the combined car wheelage of the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk Railway for any month simply by asking for it, and he can have it here inside of an hour if he wishes. Whether that mileage be in Moncton or Montreal or elsewhere, the Minister can telegraph and get it. He knows we have the right to that information, and whether we stay here a week or a month we will have to get it. Why not give it and let the Government go on with the business. There is the Redistribution measure, there are nine-tenths of the Estimates to be passed, there is the Senate Resolution and the Prohibition Resolution, and you cannot make progress, even if you attempt to keep us here until Saturday night without giving us the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that that has nothing to do with the passing of this Bill. He can bring these men before the Public Accounts Committee and examine them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that he is only fooling, humbugging, and nothing else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nonsense.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am surprised to hear the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) making such an extraordinary statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not want to see them making an exhibition of themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a fine thing you cannot see yourself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can see you.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am at a great loss to understand what the Minister of Railways can possibly mean when he assures us on his honour as a Minister that neither in his department at Ottawa nor in the Office at Moncton are there any statements on which these accounts are based.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not state it any more broadly than I have stated it. I have stated that I am assured by the officers of my department that there are not here in Ottawa nor at Moncton any accounts or statements showing what the proportion of the mileage is between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The Minister does not state this on his own authority. He simply states that the officers of his department have assured him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How could I ? I say I have never seen such a statement; but I stated to the committee that I would wire to the Grand Trunk Company, and I have no doubt that they would as expeditiously as possible furnish me with the information.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The House is bound to accept the statement of the Minister ; but what then becomes a most puzzling question for the House is how these figures are arrived at, if there is not a knowledge of the mileage of the Intercolonial and the mileage of the Grand Trunk. Would not the auditor obtain these ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never seen the auditor that I know of. I certainly have never spoken to him on this subject.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman must have seen some figures. First of all, the Grand Trunk furnishes an account showing the amount in detail ; then, having the amount in detail, and the gross sum ascertained by addition, the figures we have can only be arrived at by a sum in proportion. For instance, the sum of $2,230 for July represents the Intercolonial proportion of the gross outlay of the Grand Trunk.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unless that payment is short of the full amount, because sometimes items are in dispute.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It is true, in order to arrive at these figures, the Grand Trunk must have known exactly the proportion of mileage which the Intercolonial bore to that of the Grand Trunk.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, they must have had it before them.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). And the auditor obtained access to those figures. We have arrived at that point that the Grand Trunk know exactly what proportion existed between the gross mileage of the Grand Trunk and the mileage of the Intercolonial. That information must be in the Grand Trunk office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes, I take it that the Grand Trunk could furnish that. But I could not say how long it would take them to furnish it. They could easily make it up.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is it not certain that the Grand Trunk must have those figures in the office ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly they have.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The figures showing not only the gross outlay for maintenance, but also the percentage for mileage. Therefore, it strikes me that all the Minister has to do is to telegraph to the Grand Trunk.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have had enough experience to know that when you expect as a matter of course that railway accounts are going to disclose such and such things, you must not be too confident about it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). There is not the slightest doubt that the hon. Minister can get the information desired if he wishes to do so, and he ought to be aware that he cannot coerce the Opposition into consenting to let this discussion cease before we get information which we deem vital to a proper understanding of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The suggestion of the Minister of Finance, it seems to me, was a very fair one. Differences have arisen as differences have arisen before and will arise again, but I do not see why the committee stage should not pass and the Bill stand for its third reading. By arrangement with the leader of the Opposition, instead of taking the vote on the second reading, it is to be taken on the third reading, and at that stage my hon. friends can make all the discussion they choose on the point they have now raised. The hon. leader of the Opposition said plainly that the Bill would probably pass in five minutes and that he had no points to raise.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). There is so much more advantage in discussing this matter in committee that I do not see how we could consent to let the Bill pass that stage, unless we get the information the Minister has promised us and failed to bring down.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is all very well to say: Let the Bill go through committee, and we will give the information on the third reading. But we have been trying thirteen days to get that information. I asked the leader of the Opposition if he proposed opposing this Bill at any length, and he said no, that it was his intention to let the Bill go through with moderate discussion, but at that time he expected that the information promised would be brought down. It has not been brought down, and the Minister of Railways and Canals has not the remotest intention of bringing it down, although he knows that all he has to do is to apply to the Grand Trunk Railway office to get it. What is the reason that there is so much anxiety to get this Bill through before this information is given?

Mr. McMULLEN. Humbug.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will have to withdraw that remark before we proceed any further.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is a word very frequently used though not in good taste.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not out of order.

Mr. BERGERON. Nobody knows better than the hon. member for North Wellington that this expression is unparliamentary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Landerkin). Shall this clause be adopted?

Mr. BERGERON. There is a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have not heard it stated.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for North Wellington has addressed to the hon. member for Haldimand the epithet "humbug."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He could not do that, he is bound to address the Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. But it is because he does what he is bound not to do that he is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear the point discussed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Brodeur) took the Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. In case you may not have understood the point, Mr. Chairman, I may explain that the hon. member for North Wellington addressed to the hon. member for Haldimand the epithet "humbug."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BERGERON. I am putting the case as I understood it.

Mr. COWAN. You were asleep.

Mr. BERGERON. After I have put it, we can discuss it; we are here for that purpose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the statement is disputed. I would ask the hon. gentleman for North Wellington if he used that expression concerning a member of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. While the hon. member for Haldimand was speaking I declared his argument was humbug.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must hold that the expression is not out of order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am bound to say if we had a Minister of Railways and Canals who knew his duty as well as the Chairman of the Committee knows his, we should not be here at half past five in the morning asking for information. I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the manner in which you have contributed to the good order, elegance and language and gentlemanly conduct among the members of the House. I shall make an argument applying the elegant language which you have now decided to be part of the language of Parliament——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. For the information of the hon. gentleman, I must draw his attention to the fact that the word "humbug" applied to a member of the House,

and "humbug" applied to language are not the same. That is the difference as I draw it from Blackmore's decisions. I do not say that the word is polite, but it is not unparliamentary.

Mr. BERGERON. We knew before that it was not polite.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose, Mr. Chairman, I should characterize your decision as humbug, how would you take it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. You would take it as a compliment, no doubt. I was going to say that no greater humbug of argument was ever presented to this House than that of the Minister of Railways and Canals. It was a concoction of humbug throughout. I am not in the habit of using this language, but as it has been added to the polite and elegant language of the House I may use it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Chairman said it was not polite.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But he said it was parliamentary, and what is parliamentary is supposed to be elegant, and what is elegant is polite, and what is polite on one side of the House is polite on the other. I bow without humbug to your decision; but I say with all respect that I trust you will see, after a while, that it is better to revise that decision; that it is better for the preservation of elegance of language, good manners and kindly feeling that when a member is endeavouring to get through the thickness of his brain——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All this, of course, has a direct bearing on the Grand Trunk contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When a gentleman is endeavouring to get through his thick brain as I was an expression of opinion on the Grand Trunk question, to be told by the elegant, eloquent, learned and polite gentleman from North Wellington that I was talking humbug was a pleasant change in this long sitting, and I am glad that it is one that the House enjoyed. Now, I want to analyse what the Minister of Railways has said in the light of your ruling. Thirteen days ago he promised to give us certain information. He has not done it; he has humbugged the House. Last night he told us that the information was down; the statement was a humbug. He now suggests that this Bill should go through the committee and bring down the information at the third reading; that is an attempt at humbug. He is attempting to humbug the House and what we on this side propose is that he shall not humbug us any longer as he has done for the last thirteen or fourteen days. Now the hon. gentleman has time and again told this House that it was impossible to get the information that the Opposition asked for, and he won't deny that. I have heard him say: You are asking what I cannot get.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I have not got.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If he knew that he could get it, why didn't he make an effort to get it? We know perfectly well why that information was not brought down. The hon. gentleman knows just as well as he knows that he is sitting in one of the front seats, that he can get that information in an hour, and his colleagues know it perfectly well. The hon. gentleman has a reason for not bringing it down, and that reason is that it will show that his whole arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway is a humbug, because he is paying at the rate of a half ownership for that railway, while his user of it is only about one 25th. Mr. Wainwright himself says that we are going to be a user of it to the extent of 1 per cent. There is the reason this information is not brought down, and there is the reason that this side of the House proposes to get that information before this Bill gets into the stage where we have not freedom of debate.

Mr. F. A. MARCOTTE (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I think it my duty first, to offer my thanks to the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Malouin), for the hearty way in which he greets me, when rising in my seat to deal with a question of such vital importance to the country a contract to which the Government proposes to commit the House for a term of 99 years. What has struck me in this long debate has been the fact that the Ministers, either through ignorance or wilfully, have been withholding proper information in connection with a matter of such vital importance as the construction of a railway from Montreal to Quebec. In France and in other foreign countries, whenever they have to deal with a railway question, and to figure at the cost of a railway question, they do not make their valuations at haphazard and without principle as they do here; they do not bring down fanciful and chimerical data as those given to the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentleman came gravely before this Committee and declared that to build a bridge across the Richelieu, $300,000 would be necessary, while an hon. member, who is a practical man, stated that that bridge could be built for $60,000. Now, when statements like those are made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, although I feel inclined to give the preference to the estimation of the hon. gentleman on this side of the House, and I believe that such a bridge could be built across the river Yamaska for $60,000, instead of $300,000, as figured out by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Still, I say that, being in the dark, as we are in such matters, the Opposition are only exercising their just rights when demanding that full information be brought down, before committing the province of Quebec and the country to such a contract; and that the Government are

bound to furnish us with that information, unless they intend to favour certain private interests, as was the case in several instances, since they came into power.

We are entitled to get information as to the cost of the Drummond County Railway from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. We want to get full information on the cost of a new line of railway and whether the Government will have to bonus a new line.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). (Translation.) I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that it was the understanding of the Committee that the contract was to be taken clause by clause ; now, as clause 3 is under consideration, the hon. gentleman will please confine himself to that clause.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, while you were absent from the House, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated that you could not carry the Bill in clauses, and it had to go as a whole.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). (Transtion.) Then I shall have to read the whole schedule, section by section.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Yes, that is the most regular proceeding ; but the Minister of Railways stated that it was not to be taken by sections, and that it must be carried as a whole.

(The Chairman proceeds to read the Bill in English, clause by clause).

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It was the understanding of the committee that the whole question of the schedule would be discussed, but at the same time it would put the matter in order and facilitate the business of the committee if I should read the whole section which I shall do except the reading be dispensed with.

Mr. FOSTER. When did the Chairman come to that conclusion ? It is now six o'clock in the morning and we have been discussing the question since nine o'clock last night. It seems to me that every method that possibly can be taken in order to thwart the Opposition is being taken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I think that when the House was in committee before it was distinctly declared from the Chair that the whole schedule would be put as one motion and not clause by clause.

Mr. FOSTER. When my hon. friend (Mr. Marcotte) proposes to discuss the whole of it he is stopped.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I will have to read this whole schedule in order to bring the matter properly before the committee. We are supposed to be on section 3, and the discussion has been confined to matters relating to the third clause.

Mr. MARCOTTE.

Mr. WALLACE. The third and the 33rd clauses.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I drew the attention of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) that it was necessary that the whole schedule should be read so as to place the matter properly before the committee. I think it is better to read it unless the committee is willing to dispense with the reading.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would be more regular, Mr. Chairman, that you should read it. My hon. friend expressed the idea that it was not to be taken article by article, and when the point of order was taken I said to the Chairman in French that the understanding was that we were dealing with the whole thing. So as to make it more regular, I think the Chairman should read the whole schedule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is the only regular proceeding.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not hear the sixth clause read.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is the sixth clause I am reading.

Mr. BERGERON. But you stopped about the middle of it.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, you have just read the Bill in English ; but I believe that we, as French-speaking members, have also certain rights and privileges here, and that you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the hon. members of this House, will see to it that those rights and privileges are respected. I am glad to see that the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet) is of my opinion ; and I hope he will support me in my demand that this Bill be read in French. I am happy to have the support of such an able and prominent colleague as the hon. member ; when I insist upon the exercise of one of the most unquestionable rights and privileges claimed by the French-speaking members, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to read this Bill in French.

I have, on previous occasions, called attention to the fact that the French language was overlooked in this House, but I am happy to be able to say, Mr. Chairman, that you always read in French the motions before the House.

Now that the Bill has been read in English, I think I am perfectly entitled to demand that this Bill be now read in French, as it is most desirable that the rights of the French language, as an official language, should be upheld in all their integrity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The Clerk informs me that he has got no French copy of the Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Here is a French copy of the Bill.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I hope the Chairman will not hesitate a single minute to read the Bill in French, for the benefit of the members who do not understand English. Why, Sir, shall it go down to history that under this Liberal régime, with a French Canadian Prime Minister as leader of this House, a fact the hon. gentlemen opposite take such a pride in, the Chairman hesitated to read this Bill in French, after having read it in English? I hope at least the hon. members from the province of Quebec behind the Treasury benches will raise no objection to my demand.

If I insist upon the Bill being read in French, it is not only that I claim it as a right, and for the information of the House, but also for the sake of your personal dignity, Mr. Chairman, and in order to secure for the French language in this House the respect it is entitled to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I have no objection to reading the Bill in French, but the only official copy at hand is the one I have just read.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) The copy I have just handed you is official.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I am bound to furnish you with a French copy of the Bills before this House.

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) As a French-speaking member who has sat here for several years, I wish to say that, within my recollection, the Bills before the House have always been read in French, when the members insisted upon it.

Mr. BERGERON. It is unjust to treat us in that way. The two languages are official in this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is there a rule which would oblige this to be read in French?

Mr. BERGERON. There is a rule, and the hon. gentleman, as a Minister of the Crown, ought to know it. When we had a Speaker that could speak the two languages he did it himself, and when we had a Speaker that could not speak the two languages the Clerk was ordered to read in French.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is there a rule of the House requiring that every Bill should be read in both languages? If so, it would seem to be in order that we could make every member speak in both languages as well.

Mr. BERGERON. We have here the official use of the two languages and everything that comes before the House we have the right to have put by the Chair in the two languages.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman cannot ask to have the whole Bill read in French, but only the motion before the Chair. He cannot ask to have the two clauses already passed read in French now. The demand must be made at the moment. We have passed two clauses, and no demand was made to read them in French, and you cannot ask to have these two clauses read in French now.

Mr. FOSTER. For the first time in this House is the right denied, and that by a Liberal Government, which has always been recognized of having proceedings given in the French as well as the English language.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentlemen forgot their duty to the French language when they allowed motions to pass without being read in French, and they have just now awakened to a sense of duty.

Mr. BERGERON. I can ask that a motion be read in French at any stage.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But not a motion that is already passed. The hon. gentleman cannot ask to have the motions of last week read in French. He has the right to have the schedule read in French.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not asking for anything else.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Rule 33 of the rules of the House and Bourinot's work are very clear on this point, that all motions before the House shall be put in both languages.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member for Champlain to ask that the whole Bill be read in French.

Mr. MARCOTTE. No, all I desire is that the schedule be read in French.

Mr. BERGERON. And that was refused.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not refuse to read the schedule in French.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker then proceeded to read the schedule in French.)

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have to offer you my congratulations for having consented to read in French, in such a rapid and expeditious way, the Bill now before the House. I have a few remarks to offer in connection with the trouble we have experienced in getting that Bill read in French. After it had been read in English, I asked the Chairman to read it in French. I am astonished that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who claims to be French and who descends from an old French family, well known for its patriotism, and whose grandfather fought for the upholding of that language, is found to-day among the hon. gentlemen who seem to object to my demand——

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order in mak-

ing comments on the question connected with the reading of the Bill in French ; he ought to confine himself to the Bill under consideration. I protest against the manner in which the hon. gentleman deals with the issue now before the House. We are not dealing now with the official use of the French language, but with an altogether different matter.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I say that the hesitation shown by some hon. gentlemen opposite, when the question of reading the Bill in French came up before the Committee, is not creditable to them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is out of order in referring to that matter. He cannot indulge in such remarks, when a question of order in raised.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) Order. I have already told the hon. gentleman that he cannot refer to that matter. He cannot impute motives to those who differ in opinion from him. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, you ought to make known your ruling to the House.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) You might as well ask the Chairman to translate into English and French speeches delivered in this House, for the information of those who are not conversant with that language.

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) As the hon. gentleman who presides over this Committee is a French Canadian, I think he ought to be held responsible for what the hon. member for Champlain has said——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I call the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) to order. Under no rule of this House am I held responsible for the statements of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte). I repudiate any such responsibility.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would respectfully ask Mr. Deputy Speaker to give us that ruling in English.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think I am obliged to translate my ruling. But as a favour to the hon. gentleman, I may tell him that I had to call the hon. gentleman to order for referring to a certain vote which was given last year in the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. If there is a ruling from the Chair, we are entitled to have it in English as well as in French.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As a question of parliamentary procedure it is undoubted that the Chairman of committees is not bound to make his ruling in both languages. If the hon. gentleman merely asks me what I said, I am willing to tell him ; but if he makes his request as a matter of right, I think he is going too far.

Mr. MILLS. You rule, then, that the Chair is not obliged to give his ruling in English ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. By the rules of the House we have a right to use either language in asking questions, and if the Chairman of committees is not familiar with one of the languages, then the Clerk has to translate the question. But as regards the rulings of the Chair, there is no rule by which a Chairman is bound to repeat in one language what he says in another. But if the hon. gentleman wants me to repeat in English what I have said in French, I have no objection to do so as a matter of favour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding.) The point of order should be stated in English also by the member who is speaking, in order that we may understand the ruling.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Chairman of committees has the same privilege as any other member in the House, to speak in whichever language he chooses.

Mr. BERGERON. No, the Chairman, I submit, is obliged to answer in whichever language he is requested to answer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am sure that there is no rule by which the Chairman of committees is bound to give his rulings in both languages.

Mr. BERGERON. In the Act providing for a Deputy Speaker, it is clearly stated that if the Speaker is of one language the Deputy must be of the other language. The reason was that any member of the House is entitled to hear in his own language anything that may fall from the Chair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no such rule.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Some hon. gentlemen opposite seem disposed to trifle with the matter now before the House. They are not arguing it so seriously as the importance of the matter warrants us to do. As I have already stated, we are destitute of information on the subject of the Drummond County Railway, because the hon. Minister of Railways has declined to bring down any data on the matter. As I said, in France and in other civilized countries of the world, whenever some railway contract is submitted to the Chambers by the Government, the members of Parliament are given all the desirable information, from a financial standpoint, as also from that of the public interest. The Government furnished the minutest details as to the con-

struction of such railways, they even figure out the cost by inch and foot.

Mr. H. S. HARWOOD (Vaudreuil). (Translation.) In France they do not figure out by feet and inches, but they use meters and centimeters.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Yes, but the hon. gentlemen opposite are far from figuring out the matter so accurately when they endorse a wild-cat scheme like the contract now before the House. Take the case of the Yamaska River bridge. An hon. Minister declared on the floor of the House that to build a bridge across the Yamaska River, $300,000 would be necessary, while an hon. gentleman on this side of the House challenged that statement, and made an estimate that the bridge across the Yamaska could be built for $60,000. Nobody knows what that bridge is going to cost, even if it were built by some private company. Some hon. gentlemen opposite laugh, but I think it is nothing unreasonable on my part, and nothing to provoke the hilarity of the hon. gentlemen opposite, to ask for accurate data, when the public interests are at stake. And, if I am not mistaken, the province of Quebec may call the Government to a strict account for trifling in that way with such a grave matter, and for making an estimation at haphazard, as to the cost of those works. I appeal to the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) whether he knows what that bridge on the Yamaska River is going to cost? The hon. gentleman does not vouchsafe an answer.

The contract now before the House is a matter of the utmost importance, from the standpoint of the general interests of the country, involving, as it does, the expenditure of a large sum of money for a term of 99 years. The hon. gentlemen opposite seem amused with my remarks. These ironical cheers and laughter, from the other side show that those hon. gentlemen are lacking in public spirit. There is no fooling and humbugging about such a serious matter. The hon. gentlemen laugh and make merry, when the country is going to the dogs, when the country, I say, is on the verge of bankruptcy. The hon. gentlemen are here to protect the interests of their constituents, and they think perhaps they are discharging their duty to their country when they laugh in my face, or if they do not laugh, they sleep in their seats, while, we, on the Opposition side, we are watching on the walls and doing everything to prevent that waste of the people's money.

I have asked the Minister of Railways and Canals several questions, without that hon. gentleman condescending to give an answer. The inference to be drawn from his silence is that he cannot reply to my statements. In passing this contract, the Government have not taken into consideration the interests of the country at large. Here again I call the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the Government have acted in the matter recklessly. Last year, they brought down a Bill dealing with the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. What is the difference between the scheme brought down last session and the Bill introduced this session? I appeal to the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) whether the measure presented this year to the House is not better and more advantageous to the country than the Bill of last session? The hon. gentleman is silent. I ask the hon. gentleman to vouchsafe an answer. You are silent, because you cannot vindicate your course.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should address the Chair.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am trying to impress upon the House the importance of the matter under discussion, and nobody vouchsafes a reply to the question. I have asked, this is no question of detail. And in this connection, let the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet) allow me to congratulate him on the vote he gave last session.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) It was not last session that I gave that vote. Therefore I call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman ought to know the difference between that contract and that now before the House.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) The question now before us is as to the lease of the Grand Trunk Railway, and not as to the purchase of the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) It comes to the same. I have to congratulate the hon. gentleman on the stand he has taken——

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." The hon. gentleman ought to infer from that Latin sentence, as applied to the contract now before the House, that, after having feared last year to vote on that question, he ought to have the same fear this year. Mr. Chairman, I hold again that there is not a single gentleman opposite who can say that the contract introduced this year is not better than that of last session.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) If the contract now before us is better than that of last session, that is no reason why we should vote against it.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) It is a reason why I should congratulate the hon. gentleman, should he vote, as he did, last

year. "Timeo Danaos." He should fear, this year, as he did last year, to vote in favour of this measure, but it is likely that party spirit will prevail this year. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, whether the contract before us is not better than that of last session? The Minister does not answer my question, and I infer from his silence that he has no good reasons to offer the House, and that it is impossible for us to have a reply in French from a Minister of the Crown. Among the Ministers I now see on the Treasury benches, there is probably only one who understands French.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur.) (Translation.) I am sorry to have to call again the hon. gentleman to order. We are now in Committee of the Whole on a Bill, and the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the question, without entering into considerations foreign to the debate.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Has not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) the right to interpellate the Minister? He asked the Minister a question and he should have the right to expect an answer from him.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am trying to show, Mr. Chairman, that the present contract is better than that of last session, and I want an answer from the Minister of Railways and Canals. When I address the hon. gentleman in French, I cannot get any answer from him; that is the reason why I protest.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) By dint of protesting you will pass for a Protestant.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Here, the Ministers decline to answer the interpellations of members, on very important questions, while in France and other foreign countries, the Cabinet furnishes the House with the minutest information about the construction of railways. Here the Minister of Railways and Canals refuses to give us any information and does not even condescend to answer the question I asked him. And I say that it is the duty of those who wish to protect the public interests, and to prevent the waste of public money, to enter here their protest against such a course. I say again that this bargain is better than that of last year. Last year, you acted foolishly, recklessly——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I call again the hon. gentleman to order; he should address the Chair.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I accept your ruling. If the bargain they now propose is better than that of last year, the inference to be drawn from that is that they were prompted to vote merely through party spirit, and that they voted in favour of that measure, without taking into consideration the interests of the country. I may also infer that they did not act as intelligent representatives of the people, that they did not bring their judgment to bear upon this measure after a careful analysis of the data which they should have had to enable them to reach a fair conclusion. The Senate thought it their duty to reject that scheme, which was worse than this one, and the Senate deserves credit for their action, although you now talk of abolishing it.

I ask the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet), who wants to do away with the Senate, whether his vote does not justify the stand taken by that body——

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is completely out of the question; I call him to order. The vote of the Senate has nothing to do with this debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the last section of the Bill. That is the section now under discussion, and I invite the hon. gentleman to return to the question.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am dealing now with the question of principle. I wish to obey your ruling, Mr. Chairman, still, I cannot help saying that such a ruling tends to banish from the debate the teaching of history. The beacon light of history illumines the future. Must history be eliminated from the proceedings of this Committee, and more particularly when the Ministers obstinately refuse to throw any light upon the debate and to elucidate our doubts? The Minister of Railways declines to answer our questions and to give us any information. Let him procure us reliable data, and all the information we want. Let him give us a carefully prepared estimation, so that we may figure out the matter.

Can the hon. gentlemen opposite tell us whether it would be more cheaper for the Government to build a bridge at Quebec? The hon. gentlemen seem puzzled by this question. They do not know whether it would have been preferable to make an arrangement with the Great Northern Railway Company or with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, from Quebec to Montreal. They do not know whether it would be cheaper for the Government to choose that line or to build a railway on the south shore, from Montreal to Quebec; and, by the way, it should not be forgotten that the Government promised to build that railway. The hon. gentlemen cannot give us any information about that; they are absolutely ignorant.

Let us go a step further. They do not even know whether it would be cheaper for the Government, if they once ascertained the cost on which they were to pay interest for ninety-nine years, instead of paying an exorbitant interest of 5 per cent, to borrow the money and pay it over to the Grand Trunk, seeing that they can borrow at 2¾

per cent, or a little more than half of 5 per cent. The Government would thus have saved an immense amount of money in the course of ninety-nine years. Now, I ask the hon. gentlemen, whether they do not think that the Government have acted recklessly in the matter. I woul like the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to tell me what he is now saying to his neighbour.

Mr. BOURASSA (Labelle). (Translation.) I say that what the hon. gentleman says is dull enough, to be sure.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it is not given to everybody to be eloquent, and to have read many philosophical works. Some have nothing but their own stock of intelligence to draw upon, while other gentlemen borrow from other sources their wisdom, and are literary thieves. The question is to be able to make out the difference between 2¾ per cent interest and 5 per cent, on a capital of $140,000. Can the hon. gentleman from Labelle figure that up? Perhaps he had better consult his hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Savard) to give more weight to his arguments.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) That shows you the importance of having an intelligent man on this side of the House.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) If he wants to lend weight to his case, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) should apply to his neighbour (Mr. Bergeron).

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay is a man of importance, as every one knows; as to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) he is a man of note, an intelligent man; he is the leader——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is out of order. I have to invite him again to confine himself to the discussion of the schedule of Bill No. 138.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am sorry to see that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has left the House, the more so, as I had a few questions to ask him.

I say again, that the hon. gentlemen opposite know absolutely nothing about the question under discussion. I appeal to the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Malouin) to tell me whether this bargain is apt to secure the building of the Quebec bridge? He ought to be able to tell me whether it would not be cheaper for the Government to build that bridge and to pass by the north shore, entering into arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, instead of purchasing the Drummond County Railway. On the other hand, would it not have been a wiser policy for the Government to build the South Shore Railway instead of leasing the Grand Trunk Railway, and paying such exorbitant interest as they are proposing to pay by this scheme? There is not one single gentleman opposite who knows anything about these questions; and I challenge them to answer my question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I must again tell the hon. gentleman that he is wandering from the question before the Committee.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I think, Mr. Chairman, that I am perfectly within the question. I do not wish to disobey your ruling, but I cannot help saying that the hon. gentlemen opposite have not sufficiently pondered the consequences of this Bill. I appeal again to the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Malouin), whether he has no opinion to express upon such an important question as the construction of the Quebec bridge. It is impossible to go into the merits of this question without dragging in other questions which are closely connected with the subject-matter. I am not travelling outside the four corners of the question when I bring in the matter of the Quebec bridge, as it was propounded by Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Opposition, that great statesman whom the country is so pround of. Let me say here, by the way, a word to his address, that great politician has surely——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I must tell the hon. gentleman that he is not equal to his own record in this House in straying in the way he does from the question at issue. As I have previously told him, the debate is simply on the schedule of the Bill under discussion. I think the hon. gentleman is not doing justice to himself, in acting the way he does.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The fact is, that as we have no information, I have to look for arguments wherever I can find them, and that is why I have to resort to comparisons.

Mr. Chairman says I am not equal to my own record. I have the honour of representing here the electors of Champlain, and I am doing my best to serve their interests. If I resort to comparisons, it is only to elucidate the measure now before the Committee, and I am doing my utmost to throw some light on the subject and to call the attention of the Committee to some important facts.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) at this moment addressed the House in Gaelic.

He was answered in the same language by Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton).

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Guysborough knows perfectly well that there are only two official languages in this House, French and English. He knows that I have a right to participate in the debate on this Bill. Because

I speak French, I do not see in that fact anything to excite the risibilities of any hon. member. For, such is the meaning of the interruption of the hon. member for Guysborough, and I did not hear the Chairman calling him to order. I await the ruling of the Chairman in connection with the words uttered by the hon. member for Guysborough.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. L. P. Brodeur). (Translation.) I have no opinion to express on the matter.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, as we cannot prevail upon the hon. gentlemen opposite to answer our questions, nor upon the Minister of Railways and Canals to give us any information, I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen whether it would not be a wiser policy to wait another year before adopting this measure. We have engineers who are paid large salaries, and it is a question whether it would not be cheaper for the country to have them figure out exactly the cost of a railway, whether it were built by the Government or leased from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I want the House to give me information. I ask whether it would not be cheaper to build a railway, with its terminals either at Ste. Cunégonde or at St. Henri. True, that is not very near Montreal, but if a station were built at St. Henri it might acquire a great value later on. Every one knows that when it was built, the Grand Trunk station was not in the centre of Montreal. Why, I ask, when the Government decided to extend the Intercolonial to Montreal, did they not appeal to the engineers who are in the Government service? There are among them able men who are paid by the people to give such information to the Ministers. They could have perhaps propounded schemes calculated to elucidate our position. Those are the problems yet unsolved and which claim the attention of all public men, and of all those who are interested in the future of our country; and as we have not yet been supplied with all the necessary data in this connection, the inference to be drawn from that is that statesmen are scarce in the ranks of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

There is yet another question I wish to approach, and it is that of modern progress and of the advancement which is taking place everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the land. I see with pleasure that the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), who is an intelligent man, understands the drift of my remarks. I say to the Ministers: "You should not commit the country to a contract for a term of 99 years, for the lease of the Grand Trunk from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, because no one knows to what an extent science may progress during that time. We all know that the province of Quebec is bound to play an important part in connection with the application of electricity. The future of that province is bound up with electricity. Now, I ask, is it a sound policy—when one knows the marked difference there is between the cost of steam and that of electricity, and that the latter power is much cheaper than steam—to block the progress of the country by committing the House to a contract for ninety-nine years?

Electricity, which costs almost nothing, could supercede steam which is in use now, and our hands would be tied for ninety-nine years. This is an important consideration which commends itself to all scientists, and to the attention of all those who have at heart the good of the country. It was on good ground, as you see, that I said that the hon. member for Berthier fully realized my meaning. I say to the Government: "It is an unwise policy for you to tie the hands of the country for ninety-nine years, it is a serious mistake——

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) And an unpardonable one.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Yes, an unpardonable fault, as just remarked by the hon. member for Beauharnois. The least I can say, without wishing to be offensive, is that the proposed scheme is inimical to the future progress of the country.

The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is amused at my remarks; can he deny that electricity is destined to play a great part in the future? Can he deny that within those ninety-nine years, our whole system of transportation may be revolutionized? We should not, therefore, tie the hands of the country. Instead of paying a 5 per cent interest to the Grand Trunk Company for the lease of their road from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, would it not be cheaper, I ask, for the Government to borrow the money and pay it over, seeing that they can borrow at 2½ per cent on the English market or elsewhere?

Would not 1 per cent on such a considerable capital as $140,000 contribute materially towards the redemption of our public debt? Can the hon. gentleman figure out the product of 1 per cent of the price paid for the lease of the railway from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal? Not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite can answer my question, because there are no data before us. There is nothing in what I say to excite the hilarity of the hon. gentlemen. I challenge them to figure out the product of that 1 per cent on that capital, for 99 years, as a contribution towards the sinking fund.

I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this matter. Let us take the bargain with the Drummond County Railway people, by which we were to pay $64,000 as a yearly rental. That sum represents a respectable capital; now, supposing the hon. gentleman had gone to England and borrowed money on the English

market, he could undoubtedly have got money for 3 per cent, instead of 4 per cent, which he proposes to pay now. Now, 1 per cent would have contributed nearly a half towards the redemption of the whole debt. I shall bring out those figures later on. We can now get money at 2¾ per cent. The question now is, Mr. Chairman, what have been the receipts of the Intercolonial from the Grand Trunk Railway, since this trial agreement was made, after the Senate —that Upper Chamber which is respected by all right-thinking men in the country—had thrown out the Drummond deal. Last year, a fabulous sum was placed in the Estimates, with a view to ascertaining how this trial arrangement would work, for the twelve months. Those twelve months have not yet elapsed, and we have no satisfactory result. We are now invited to vote a considerable sum for the purchase of the Drummond Railway. As the trial agreement agreed upon by the House last session is not yet through, it is but fair to ask whether the hon. gentlemen are trying to deceive the House or have failed in their experiment? I am inclined to think that they have failed. They should at least wait till the twelve months' experiment is through. The hon. gentlemen are ready to vote in favour of a new arrangement, without ascertaining, first, whether there is an increase or a decrease in the receipts of the road. In using the word increase, it is likely enough that I am saying a useless thing, but I use it purposely, to show the House that I am free from prejudices and ready to consider both sides of the question.

The country is being deceived by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I make bold to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that they shall be called to a very strict account at the hands of the people. There may be some gentlemen of good faith among them. I see the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) in his seat; and let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I believe in the sincerity of that young man. Last year, he voted in favour of that trial agreement, to see how it would work for twelve months; but, I ask, why does he not wait till the trial period has elapsed? I cannot help telling him that he is inconsistent.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) The Estimates have not yet been voted, and when they are passed, the twelve months will have elapsed.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Let my hon. friend allow me to tell him that his remark is quite illogical. Last year, you voted a certain sum for a trial arrangement of twelve months.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is out of order. He should address the Chair. He should make a serious discussion, based upon the schedule now before us.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I do not think that I am not seriously debating the question. I am bringing down data and statistics, based on the experience of last year, which defy contradiction from hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I can fairly be charged with not discussing seriously. A trial agreement was made last year, in order to see how it would work. Now, the hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to vote in favour of this new agreement, without taking the trouble of ascertaining whether the former experiment will result favourably, and I draw the inference that they are acting inconsistently. Will the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me tell me whether, last session, he was sincere or not?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I am always sincere.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) If so, why, then, does he not wait till the twelve months have elapsed, in order to see whether the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal is going to be productive of the anticipated good results? If they are not willing to wait, then I have a right to infer that the hon. gentlemen are not sincere, and that they have no good reasons to urge. After voting in favour of that trial agreement, the hon. member for Two Mountains show a lack of consistency in endorsing another measure, without waiting for the results of the former experiment. Are the hon. gentlemen opposite truly actuated by public spirit? Were they, then, really in earnest and sincere? Their present attitude shows that they did not act inconsiderately last year.

The extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal must necessarily create competition from the Grand Trunk, and should the Government build the South Shore railway, you will have three parallel lines, the Grand Trunk, the South Shore line and the Drummond Country Railway.

During the electoral contest at Nicolet, we had an opportunity of discussing that question of building the South Shore railway. I see on the opposite side of the House the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mignault), who takes an interest in that railway. Who was it that promised to build that railway? It was the hon. gentleman himself. I call to witness the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) whether they have not pledged themselves to build that railway? Is the House going to sanction a new procedure by which the hon. gentlemen will be allowed to prove false to their promises? If the hon. gentlemen are willing to build the South Shore Railway, as they have pledged themselves to do, let me tell them that it will prove injurious to the Intercolonial. We will then have three lines, three powerful competitors, the Grand Trunk, the South Shore Railway and the Intercolonial.

I attended the Bécancourt meeting at which the Prime Minister declared that he was in favour of the South Shore Railway.

An hon. MEMBER. What year ?

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman knows so little about the question that he asks when that promise was made. That railway line is a most important one and runs through a densely populated country. As to the date of that promise, let me refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) to the hon. member for Yamaska who made that promise.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) You ought to know it, as you attended that meeting.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I was at Bécaucourt.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) You were not at Yamaska.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I know that that promise was made at Yamaska first. Did not the hon. gentleman pledge himself to have that railway built ?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I call the hon. gentleman to order. He should address the Chair. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the South Shore Railway has nothing to do with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) When we are asked to vote $140,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway and $1,600,000 to the Drummond people, I think we are entitled to refer to the competition which will be created by this new road. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. O. S. Talbot) is amused at my remarks, I see, but I am afraid he is in the same boat as his colleagues and has nothing to say on the question. I am sorry the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. S. H. Leduc) is unavoidably absent from the House ; because he could tell you that if you buy the Drummond County Railway, you prevent the building of the South Shore Railway. In a large country like ours, where we need so many railways for colonization and other purposes, that it is not desirable to build too parallel railways like the Drummond and the South Shore, about four or five miles distant from each other. I think the Government ought not to buy two railways so near each other. They ought to build the South Shore Railway and drop the Drummond deal altogether, because the latter will lead to a deficit. There is a decrease, they say, of $209,000 in the receipts of the Intercolonial, instead of $150,000 last year ; that is a large deficit, and it will go to swell our public debt which is already increasing at too rapid a pace. Before coming into power, the hon. gentlemen had pledged themselves to reduce the public expenditure. But now they laugh when you remind them of their promises, and of the interests of the province of Quebec. They have humbugged the province of Quebec. This is a most serious question and I defy the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me to contradict any statement of mine. I am happy to see the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) who is one of my friends, in his seat. I may, perhaps, give him some useful information on the matter, if he is not quite conversant with the details of this Bill. The hon. member for Two Mountains laughs. But in order to go to the root of the matter——

An hon. MEMBER. (Translation.) Is it a Greek root or a square root ?

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Let the hon. gentlemen laugh, if they like. In spite of their ironical cheers and laughter it is none the less true that they have pledged themselves to build the South Shore Railway and that a powerful railway competition will thus be created with the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) I call the hon. gentleman to order. He is altogether straying out of the question. The Bill which is now engaging the attention of the committee is an Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway for the lease of a portion of their road from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. Therefore, the South Shore Railway has nothing to do with the matter and is altogether foreign to the debate. I want the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the matter under consideration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) ought to confine his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I have never wandered from the debate. I think when we are discussing the Drummond deal, we are entitled to get information on such an important matter——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I have to call again the hon. gentleman to order. The Bill which is now engaging the attention of the Committee is not for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, but for the lease of a portion of the Grand Trunk road between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal. The hon. member cannot contradict my statement, because it was at his own request that I had to read from beginning to end the Bill under discussion when I temporarily presided over the Committee, a little while ago.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am very much obliged to the hon. member from Chicoutimi and Saguenay, for having read in extenso the Bill, although he has been rather expeditious. He did not dwell long enough upon certain important clauses, and

that is why I have to emphasize those points. The question is about the lease of the road for 99 years. Did the hon. gentlemen figure out the profits of that undertaking, and ask themselves whether it would result advantageously to the country? On the other hand, should they fulfil the promises made during the Nicolet election, did they ask themselves whether in building the South Shore Railway, they would not create a ruinous competition with the Intercolonial? In order to show that the deficit will only go on increasing, I have only to refer to the competition which will be created with the Intercolonial, from the South Shore and the Grand Trunk. My conclusions are grounded on all those facts.

It must be borne in mind that we have to speak on a question about which we have not even a scrap of information. I challenge the hon. gentleman to contradict my statement, when I say that it would be cheaper for the Government—if they once ascertained the cost on which they were to pay interest for ninety-nine years—to borrow the money and pay it over, seeing that they can borrow at 3 per cent instead of paying 4 per cent, and they would thus save 1 per cent per year. Could the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) tell me what would be the product of 1 per cent for ninety-nine years?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I do not feel disposed to educate the hon. gentleman on the matter.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman might derive some benefit from my education. Can he deny that the Government would save 1 per cent per year in borrowing money and paying it over to the Grand Trunk? Now, let the hon. gentlemen laugh if they like, and make merry. I could understand their hilarity if the interests of the country were not at stake.

An hon. MEMBER. (Translation.) Order.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am perfectly in order.

An hon. MEMBER. You are altogether straying out of the question.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) If the hon. gentlemen do not know anything about the railway competition which will be created with the Drummond County Railway, no wonder they take so little interest in public affairs.

The Minister of Railways refuses stubbornly to give any information to the House. He wants the hon. gentlemen behind him to vote this year, as they voted last year, blindly, without judgment or reflection. They voted for the building of a railway of 750 miles, granting the company a subsidy of 7,750,000 acres of land, without knowing the value of those gold-bearing lands. While, to-day, you see a company building the same road without any Government subsidy, without a cent of public money.

With precedents like those in view, it is high time we should ponder and pause a little before blindly voting, like the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ETHIER (Two Mountains.) (Translation.) The hon. gentleman was never in the Yukon country that I know; how, then, can he say that he knows more about those gold fields than the members on this side of the House.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Two Mountains will not set the St. Lawrence on fire. Last year, the hon. gentlemen opposite voted in favour of the Yukon deal, without knowing anything about it. The hon. Minister of Railways could not explain his bill.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Could the hon. gentleman tell me what county the Minister of Railways represents here?

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The mountain brought forth a mouse, they say, but the one just brought forth by the hon. member for Two Mountains is still smaller. On a question of such moment, he is shifting and using subterfuges. The hon. gentleman and his friends may laugh, if they like, but they cannot contradict my statements. Their incapacity, their impotency are well known. They do not take into consideration the interests of the country at large. They are so short-sighted that we will have to lend them a telescope in order to allow them to see, in round numbers, the immense sum of money saved by the members on this side of the House, with the help of the Senate.

I do not intend to protract the debate at any further length. And why so? Because the Minister of Railways is unable to give to the House any information, so as to allow us to conduct this debate in an intelligent way. We have to consider, first, the interests of the country; we have to bear in mind the results of the vote we are to give on this question. That is the reason why we want full information on the matter.

When the Government decided to purchase the Drummond County Railway, they sent down an engineer——

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is wandering from the question at issue, when he refers to the visit of the engineers. The debate is now on the lease of the Grand Trunk by the Government.

Mr. MORIN. (Translation.) That is the business of the Chairman, to call the hon. gentleman to order, and not the business of any one of these fellows.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I protest against the rude and improper term used by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Savard). (Translation.) The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) ought to be called to order for applying the term "fellows" to the hon. gentlemen. He should not use such an improper term. The Chairman has already given his ruling on the question of order, and the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) has been called to order ten times for the same breach of the regulations of the House. The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the question before the Committee.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Were we to bow to the ruling just made by the Chairman, the freedom of debate in this House would no longer exist. We are destitute of any valuable information bearing on the question at issue, and when we ask for further information, they try to close our mouths by calling us to order. I see the hon. member—I was going to say for One Mountain, but, to be parliamentary, I should say for Two Mountains, seems to be greatly disturbed over this question. One would think that the hon. gentlemen opposite are feeling the reproach of their conscience in face of the public interests they are sacrificing; their better feelings prevail over their partisanship. One would think that the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Savard) still retains some of his former Conservative ideas, which were good.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the question at issue; he is altogether out of order. I need not insist any further on the matter, because the hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware of the rules. Let him confine himself to discussing the question before the Committee.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I bow to the ruling of the Chairman; but, on the other hand, when one is interrupted, he has to refer to matters more or less foreign to the question at issue.

Before resuming my seat, let me sum up my statements. The proceedings in vogue here are altogether different from what prevails in England, in France and other civilized countries of the world. In those countries, whenever the Government wants to build railways, they have reports from their engineers with full data bearing on the proposed works. Those governments summon to their aid experienced men, when the interests of the people are at stake. It is quite different with us here; we are destitute of all desirable information, and we are, as it were, shut in within a circle.

Then, as to electricity. I hold that the Government should bear in mind that the future of the country is bound up with it. Before the ninety-nine years have elapsed, electricity will be the motive power in vogue in Quebec, where there are so many natural resources and wealth. It will aid in developing our trade and commerce. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that by committing the country to a contract for a term of ninety-nine years, they are tying our hands, and handicapping at least three generations, and jeopardizing the future of the country. The hon. gentlemen have reached power through false pretenses; they have falsified their promises and deceived the country. And not satisfied with deceiving the present generation, they want to deceive three more generations, with this contract for ninety-nine years. I call your attention to this fact, Mr. Chairman, and I insist upon the Bill being postponed for further consideration till next year. We may, perhaps, thus save any other large sum of the public moneys; and any gentleman who takes that stand, will have deserved well from his constituents and from the country.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The Bill which is now engaging the attention of the committee is an Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway, and to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Rail way. The Minister of Railways and Canals has been unable to explain to us the manner in which the cost of user was apportioned between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Act provides that it should be in proportion to the respective mileage of the cars and engines belonging to the Intercolonial Railway, and running over the several sections of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the total traffic of all kind. For some reason and by some person or persons unknown, the Minister of Railways and Canals has been prevented from obtaining that knowledge concerning this Bill which he naturally would be most desirous of possessing, and which he would be only too glad, I am sure, to communicate to the House if he were permitted to do so. But since the hon. Minister does not possess the information, I thought we had made a reasonable proposition when we ask that we might suspend proceedings until he could secure it, but as he has not seen fit to accede to that proposition, of course we are bound to conclude that it was not a reasonable one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would my hon. friend pardon me, if I should leave the Chamber?

Mr. BELL. Is the hon. gentleman going for the information? Otherwise I should regret very much his departure. The return brought down by the hon. Minister yesterday shows that not only have the accounts been rendered monthly by the Grand Trunk Railway, but have been audited by the auditor of the Railway Department, and it is fair to assume that the auditor of the department was satisfied that these accounts were correct. It is then very difficult to account for the fact, stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals, that he has never seen these returns, that he does not know

of their existence, that no man in his department has seen them, and that, so far as he can learn, they are unknown to the officers of his department either in Ottawa or Moncton. This is indeed a psychological problem worthy of special study and rivaling in complexity even the famous fifteen puzzle which occupied peoples minds some years ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The bargain which the Minister of Railways and Canals has made with the Grand Trunk Railway consists of two parts. First, he took a lease of a certain section of the Grand Trunk Railway for 99 years, upon the basis of paying the Grand Trunk Railway $140,000 a year, which is 5 per cent upon half the cost of that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway line. He therefore really purchases the half of that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway line, though he does not own it, since he only gets the lease of it for 99 years. Then the Minister of Railways and Canals made another arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway which was that he was to bear a proper share of the maintenance of the track over which his engines and cars run. Now, that share of maintenance is to be figured out upon a wheelage basis. What this committee wants is to get the relative wheelage of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway over that line. It has been stated in this committee that the wheelage of the Intercolonial Railway as compared with the Grand Trunk Railway is only one to twenty, whereas the amount which the Minister of Railways and Canals has really paid to the Grand Trunk Railway is half the cost of the whole line. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals has stubbornly refused to bring down that wheelage; he has refused to bring it down because it would give away his whole case, for he will not be able to convince a single Canadian taxpayer that this is a good bargain.

There is no use in trying to bluff us. We are anxious to get on with the business. Therefore, last night the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who has just entered the Chamber, arranged that the debate should be closed and that the Bill should pass with very moderate criticism. That moderate criticism was being proceeded with when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals refused absolutely to give the information to the House. My hon. friend the Liberal whip (Mr. Sutherland) shakes his head. If the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals were now in the Chamber and the right hon. the Prime Minister asked him if he had tried to get that information he would be compelled to say that he had not turned a finger to get it. He never tried to get it, but last night he made the statement that the information had been placed on the Table of the House. Upon that understanding the hon. leader of the Opposition and those more particularly interested in the matter, decided to allow the Bill to go through and not to prolong the debate. I think the right hon. the Prime Minister should step in between the House and the Minister of Railways and Canals and that he should have this information brought before the House instead of keeping the House here. Instead of the charge being true as against the Opposition that they are obstructing in this matter, it is the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals who is obstructing by refusing to give that very reasonable information which any deliberative assembly would require before passing a Bill such as this.

Mr. SPROULE. During this discussion the Opposition, in this House, have been endeavouring to acquire that information which we regard as essential to enable us to do our duty. At the beginning we intimated to the hon. Minister of Railways that it was most desirable that certain data should be furnished to this House. Although the members of the Government might be disposed to take upon trust any statement that might come from the high authority of the hon. Minister of Railways, we who are in Opposition, are not so confiding and so respectful of his judgment. We regard it as a matter of great importance, as intelligent representatives of the people, that we should bring our judgment to bear upon this question after a careful analysis of the data which we should have to enable us to reach a fair conclusion. We have repeatedly intimated that the information was desirable, not only that it was desirable, but that it was not being furnished, and that in the time to come our demands would be made even more imperative, that if the information was not furnished to the House we should not be disposed to go on with the consideration of the measure and allow it to pass. In view of the action of another portion of this Parliament in refusing to accept a similar measure, two years ago, because of the refusal of the hon. gentleman charged with that responsibility to furnish information, and in view of the fact that at some future day the Government intended to submit a further measure for the consideration of the House, one would naturally have expected that these hon. gentlemen would have fortified themselves with that which would be required by Parliament, the data which Parliament should have to enable it to do justice to this measure and to the people they represent. We naturally ask ourselves why it is that the hon. Minister of Railways should refuse to give us this information. Who is the hon. Minister of Railways? Is he a man eligible for the position, possessed of the ordinary qualifications which we would expect to find in a gentleman occupying that position? Is the hon. Minister possessed of the ordinary intelligence of humanity? If I were to bring my anatomical knowledge to bear on his

brain and I would judge it to be beyond the ordinary measure—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think this is a subject to be discussed on the Bill in committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit to your consideration the fact that we have not been furnished with information upon this question, and we naturally ask ourselves what is the composition of the man who is responsible. Is he possessed of the intelligence, or the willingness to satisfy our demands. We naturally go further because we are reasoning human beings and inquire into the composition of the man. We have to satisfy ourselves before we pass this Bill. That leads us to say that we admit that he is possessed of natural intelligence. Then, has he had the experience which would teach him that this information is desirable? We know that he has had parliamentary experience, not only as a member of this House, but in another Parliament, and that he has had the opportunity of learning what are the duties which would be expected of a Minister of the Crown. We will naturally admit that he is a man of parliamentary experience, which will exonerate him from any blame in connection with that. Was he aware of the fact that such information would be expected by the House before they would deal with this question? His long parliamentary experience ought to have made him aware of that fact. Why is it not forthcoming? This naturally leads to the inquiry, can the information be got, and we conclude that there is evidence that this information is available. The hon. Minister was not a member of the Joint High Commission, therefore he had plenty of time to perform his duties in his department, and he had employees at his disposal and under his command who could have collated the information which we know is accessible, but he did not take the trouble to collate it, which leads us to the conclusion that there must have been absolute carelessness on his part in the discharge of his duty or a determined refusal to comply with the wants of Parliament. We have satisfied ourselves so far with regard to these questions, and I proceed with the inquiry. First, Parliament needs the information; second, the Minister is possessed of ordinary average intelligence to enable him to understand that. Then, he has had sufficient time since the last Bill was thrown out of the Upper Chamber to get the information and a large staff at his disposal for that purpose. Then, why is the information not here? We have the direct statement of the Minister that he has not got the information and will not get it. What is the cause of this stubbornness on his part? This leads to an inquiry into the composition of the human brain, the organ of the intelligence and the memory. This opens up a very wide and interesting field for inquiry, especially to the medical man. We know that there are anomalies in human nature that cannot be accounted for by any of the known sciences at our command. Is it so in the case of the Minister of Railways? If so, we should be charitable enough to excuse him. Judging of the composition of the brain from the conformation of the head, I should say that it was a natural brain discharging the natural functions of a brain. But we are confronted with the fact that it is not discharging those functions, and we ask ourselves the reason why. This leads us to consider the composition of the human brain. It is composed largely of albumen, which may be present either in deficiency or excess. In this case I should say there is a superabundance. Then, we may inquire what is the physiological action of the human brain. This cannot be accounted for by any of the known laws. The human brain is not only the seat of intelligence and memory, but the seat of the enervation of the human body. If there is a want of nerve power, there will be a comparative paralysis. Sometimes the paralysis shows itself suddenly, sometimes gradually. In this case the paresis, while coming on gradually, reached its culminating point last evening at about 11.30 o'clock, and all the efforts of the medical profession could not drive it back.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That does not speak very well for the profession.

Mr. SPROULE. The profession has not reached the limit of its power. We might naturally suppose that the Minister of Railways had reached a time when the action of the memory would be weakened; but we find that his memory is tolerably good on all other subjects. Then, it is an axiom that when we cannot account for an action on rational principles, we are bound to follow out the inquiry. Some distinguished men say that the action of the human brain is subject to planetary influences. Zadkiel said that the position of the planetary bodies had some peculiar influence over human nature, and often accounted not only for the good nature but the crassness or obstinacy of human nature, both in individuals and in nations. May it not be possible, therefore, that the conduct of the Minister of Railways is brought down by some influence over which he has no control? If that is the case, we are obliged to excuse him. If I should judge by his conduct in this debate, I should say that he was labouring under the influence of some great planet. I have been thinking during the last twenty-four hours whether it would not be in the interest of this country to call in the celebrated astronomer, Dr. Wiggins, to give his opinion whether or not that is the case. We might also call to our aid the services of the biologist and of the microscope in this inquiry. Then, it is said that there is a strange resemblance between the lower and the higher orders of living beings.

Darwin says that every man hath his counterpart in the monkey or in some other of the lower animals. As good Presbyterians we believe in the law of foreordination and it may have been foreordained from the foundation of the world that the Minister of Railways would be possessed of the brain of some lower order of being, and therefore would not be responsible for his actions. It is said that there are two things in life which, once they take hold, will never let go. The question being once put to Sir John Macdonald, he said they were a Scotch Tory and an English bulldog. This led me to examine into the Minister's genealogical tree, but I could not get much information there. I have been told that he once had the peculiarities of a Tory; if so, he has them no longer. There is one lower animal which I think may be said to be his counterpart. That is the badger, which runs to its hole, and will do nothing but snap and show bad temper. His conduct here leads very largely to that conclusion. Now, after following out this inquiry, I am as much in the dark as when I began, but I intend to continue it until I satisfy myself of the cause of the anomaly which we have in the conduct of the Minister of Railways.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The questions that have arisen in this committee are interesting and important. I understand that the sections that have been under consideration are sections 3 and 33. As I understand it, the Minister of Trade and Commerce practically takes the position, at one time adopted by governments in England, that when the Government assumes responsibility for a proposition, it is not the function of the House of Commons to inquire too narrowly into the details, but to leave these with the Government—that it is for the House to consider questions of policy. While this view at one time prevailed in England, the development of parliamentary government in the mother country has gone on until this view no longer obtains, and on every proposition that involves the expenditure of a large sum of money the British Governments of the present day are only too anxious, especially in the common stage, to give all the information at their command. In this connection nothing could be more valuable or instructive than to consider what the best authorities have to say upon the right and duty of the House to have before it such details as may be necessary to arrive at a judicious conclusion as to the soundness or otherwise of the proposition submitted by the Government. We must not forget that the Minister of Railways and Canals himself, as will be found at page 4264 of "Hansard" of 1897, declared that he did not pretend to have experience in railway matters, and was not versed in the details of railway management. This was on the 16th June, 1897. It is evident that his experience has not increased his knowledge since the time when he made that candid confession. May points out that Parliament has no direct control over any single department of the State, but that it may order the production of papers and may express its opinion, but it has no power to give instructions privately to any officer of the Executive Government, that its power in this respect is exercised through the responsible advisers of the Crown. In this case, we cannot send the order direct to Mr. Schreiber, the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, or to Mr. Pottinger, the Superintendent of the Government railway system, but we can request the hon. Minister who is in control of these officers, and who is the servant of Parliament during the session of Parliament, to obtain that information, and in the light of the authorities, he has no more right to refuse Parliament or this committee such information as we consider necessary and as it may be possible to obtain, than his own officers have the right to refuse him. There is one exception to that general proposition, but one not applicable to the management of the Government railways, and that is the case of information, the production of which would be prejudicial in the public interest. Todd in one passage tells us that the House of Commons has become the dominating power in the legislature. I call attention to that as illustrating the change brought about in legislation in England. Where once the Crown was the dominant power, and the opinions of the people's representatives counted for very little, we now rejoice under a system of government under which the Chamber made up of representatives of the people is the dominant power in legislation. He tells us also that since the Reform Bill of 1867 the House of Commons has shown a disposition to encroach more and more upon the sphere of Government, and now claims to have a view on every subject, and cites the increase in the number of questions asked of the hon. Minister as an instance of this tendency. I defy the Government and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to point to a single instance where the Government in England in recent years has refused the fullest information at their command in the consideration of any measure involving the expenditure of a large sum of public money. Todd says: "It is imperative that Parliament shall be duly informed of everything that can be necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the Government." This is the system that has developed in England, and that we enjoyed here until we came face to face, as we find ourselves now with a Government that cares little if anything for precedents in England, and relies simply on the power of a silent but willing majority. We find this Government, time after time, resorting to the illegal use of Orders in Council to do as it pleases, whether Parliament is sitting or not, relying not upon argument or upon the

merits of the case, but simply on the strength of numbers. To understand how extraordinary it is that this information is not willingly given by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, it is worth while to consider his attitude in 1897, before such a flood of light had been thrown upon this transaction. On the 20th of May, 1897, he declared he had no wish to conceal anything from the House, but a desire to put the matter in a form which it should be properly presented. This was before he saw how vulnerable he was, how easily his businesslike methods could be exposed, how difficult it was to justify the policy to which he had committed himself and the Government. He is not now willing that we should have the means to consider this measure fairly, but stubbornly refuses to place upon the Table information which is at his command and which he could get by telegraphing to the proper officers. On the same day, the 16th June, 1897, he asked us to take time to consider the question in all its bearings, and said that as they were considered the Government propositions would "justify themselves." But now, when we seek to now look behind the bald proposition that the hon. Minister lays before us, we find a stubborn refusal, contrary to all precedents to the spirit that ordinarily actuates a Minister who has the sound proposition to make and one that will command the confidence of the country, to give us the information necessary to an intelligent consideration of the question. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, speaking on the 16th of June, 1897, said :

> I am willing, as a member of this Government, to take upon myself, if it were necessary, the entire responsibility of having initiated this policy, of having it pressed upon the consideration of my colleagues. There is nothing in it, I tell these hon. gentlemen, upon which they can found a suspicion of jobbery, there is nothing in it that will not stand the test of critical examination by the business men of the country.

It is clear that this magnificent proposition that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is boasting about was capable of being improved. I think the right hon. Prime Minister will admit that we have not before us a proposition which is an improvement on the proposition of which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was so proud.

The PRIME MINISTER. Better pass it, then.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Adopt it blindly because we have found out that the hon. Minister of Railways did not know what he was talking about on June 16th, 1897, when he said that this was such a magnificent proposition. The right hon. Prime Minister has practically admitted that the action of the Senate has given the country a better proposition, no matter how bad it may be. The hon.

Minister of Railways and Canals dare not give the information that he has at his command. He dare not carry out our instructions to the officers paid by this country to give us such information as they are able to give. The reason is obvious and this action reflects no credit on the Government. After the hon. gentleman spoke in 1897 in connection with that suspicion of jobbery he found that that suspicion had not cleared away. He changed his base, hoisted the white flag, showed cowardice in the extreme, and has not allowed this matter to be probed any further than he could avoid. The conduct of the Government in committee has been disgraceful and the action of the Opposition, if required to be vindicated, has been vindicated. In June, 1897, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals asked : Where are the figures on which you can hang a suspicion of jobbery ? We answer : Gives us the figures. The Minister is afraid to do it. He knows that they would be injurious to the Government in a political sense and injurious to their character. On June 24, 1897, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in explaining the vote in the Estimates for the purpose of running the Drummond County Railway and the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, said that it was desirable that an experiment should be tried for a few months with the object of seeing what would be the result of extending the Intercolonial to Montreal. We are asking, when they say that they are warranted in making the temporary arrangement permanent, that the facts, figures and details that have come to their knowledge and to the knowledge of their officers, as a result of the temporary arrangement, should be furnished to us. We can hardly imagine upon what ground this Government could refuse that information. At another period in the history of this case the position of the hon. Minister of Railways was entirely contrary to what it is now. I find that on April 30, 1897, he promised to present the whole matter to Parliament in connection with this principle for which I have been contending. He said :

> Some of the important details of the negotiations are not finally agreed upon. We are making all possible speed in bringing matters to a head, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that there will be no unnecessary delay in presenting the whole matter to Parliament.

Now is the time when it is most important that we should have the whole matter before us. We have a proposition, as I have said, involving an enormous amount of money. In order to come to an intelligent conclusion, as business men, whether it be a good policy or a bad policy, in which we could justify ourselves in whatever course we took with the business men of the country, it is necessary to have

this information. The Government refuses to put us in possession of the information without which no business man in this country would venture to enter into a business arrangement. The position is an extraordinary one, and it has become the duty of the Opposition to protest in such a manner as will receive the attention outside as well as inside of this House. In doing this, they feel that they are fairly performing the important trust that devolves upon them.

Mr. DAVIN. Looking at this agreement, I think that under ordiinary circumstances our contention would commend itself to the judgment of the country. Before this matter came before the House for the first time, the Government in making an agreement like this, practically occupied the position of an agent, and this House, as the principal, wants an explanation as to the cost in a very important particular. We want to know how the burden will fall upon us by and by. If this were before us for the first time this would be a reasonable request. But the position we are now in is not an ordinary one. It is is an extraordinary one, because we know that when this proposition came before us in its original shape the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals betrayed the same characteristics that have distinguished the treatment of this matter this session, in fact, the characteristics that have distinguished that hon. gentlemen pretty well in regard to everything that he has been responsible for. The hon. Minister has never brought forward a proposition in regard to which he did not wish to keep back some information, which, in a great many cases, he has been forced ultimately to give. What possible information have the members of this committee as to the proportionate user of this line. It seems to me that if the hon. Minister had made a bargain that he thought would reflect honour on the Government he would be forward to place in the hands of the committee all the information that they require. The information asked for has reference to the details of a great agreement without which the Opposition cannot intelligently vote upon the measure. It does seem to me that the Minister of Railways is sacrificing the reputation of the Government by the obstinacy which he is displaying. I am astonished that members behind the Minister do not come forward and insist on his giving the House this information. How are we to understand their silence in view of their history in Opposition for eighteen years, during which they insisted on the Conservative Government laying before Parliament every detail, large and small, relating to every Government contract? Never could an Opposition spend its strength with more faithfulness to its duty than on an occasion of this sort, when a Government is trying to hector Parliament to carry through a contract without laying before them the information to which they are entitled. Suppose it went forth that the Government succeeded in tiring out the Opposition in this contest, it would be one of those victories which are worse than defeats. It is possible that the information might entirely alter the attitude of the Opposition. It is possible that it might lead to another alteration of the contract that would put half a million dollars into the pockets of the people. It must be remembered that this information is such as cannot always be kept from the people, and when it becomes known, whether it justifies the contract or not, its publication will be a condemnation of the Government and a supreme justification of the course of the Opposition. Now that the Minister of Railways is here, I sincerely hope that, after having slept over his determination, he will decide to afford the House the information which is necessary to enable us to give an intelligent vote on this matter.

Mr. JOHN B. MILLS (Annapolis). I have listened with patience to this debate, and the more I have heard the more I have been impressed with the reasonableness of the stand taken by the Opposition as contra-distinguished from that taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The contract, section 3, which we are now discussing, has been in force for months, and it must be that the officers of the department have gathered the information that is necessary to its administration. Why, then, is not that information brought before this House? Since I entered this House in 1887, in every case there has been a demand for such facts to be placed before the House as would enable the House to come to a reasonable decision upon the question now before it, and those facts have invariably been given.

But, perhaps, we are treating this matter too seriously. Perhaps the hon. Minister is attempting to hoodwink Parliament or to bulldoze Parliament in reference to this matter. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) considered the action of the Minister from one point of view. I do not know whether he was serious or not, but there was good deal of common sense in what he said notwithstanding that he was called to order by the chairman. His point was that, perhaps, there was something strange in the make-up of the Minister that led to his conduct and caused him to be recreant to his duty to bring down these papers. The Minister has come in after refreshing himself with sleep. I thought, perhaps, he had gone out to get the information that is required by this Parliament, but it seems I was mistaken. Since the hon. gentleman came back to his seat, I have been considering him phrenologically, I have been taking a glance at his cranium to see if, considered in the light of phrenological science, I could learn

from it the reason for his extraordinary procedure. For I hold the hon. Minister to blame in this matter. No one can blame the Opposition, they are simply doing their duty; and if they neglect that duty, they would be held responsible by the people whom they represent. I have sent to the library and procured a work upon phrenology, which, I think, may help us to explain this block to the work of this Parliament. I find that the depth of the head as shown above the ears indicates high ambition as regards affluence, social position or political power—perhaps, all three combined. I see that this development is very large in the cranium of the hon. Minister. I see also that the organs of selfishness and greed are large, indicating that a hand is continually and systematically held out somewhere for a good deal of something "for the boy." The organ of spiritualism and veneration is fairly large, but is overpowered by this selfishness and greed and this inordinate ambition to which I have referred. This indicates that the Minister of Railways and Canals, like the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), thinks that elections are not won by prayers alone, that something else is needed to win stepping stones to affluence and power. Another organ that was very prominent in the hon. Minister is secretiveness. I think, probably, this is the main cause of the block in the proceedings of this Parliament, causing the long sessions we have had since yesterday—and, judging from what I see in the hon. gentleman's cranium, likely to cause it to last until Saturday night. I see by this authority on phrenology that "secretiveness is situated in the centre of the lateral portion of the brain just above destructiveness and below cautiousness." It should be understood that there is no such thing as a bad organ in anybody's head. Secretiveness properly used is necessary and good, for people should be as wise as serpents, though as harmless as doves. In some cases this organ of secretiveness is inordinately developed. Secretiveness, in excess, manifests itself externally, or by a natural language, in a variety of ways. When you see an individual taking a side glance and working his head round à la Grimaldi, as we have frequently seen the Minister look at his followers behind him, you may be sure the possessor has very large secretiveness. Where secretiveness predominates over all the other powers, the individual's sole delight is in plotting. Pope, we are here told, took so great a delight in artifices that he endeavoured to secure all his purposes by indirect means. Lady Bolingbroke said, in the French phrase, that he played the politician even about cabbage and turnips. Here the Minister is playing the politician, not about cabbages and turnips, but about the Grand Trunk and Drummond County Railway arrangements. As was said by Lord Vargrave, who was a personification of secretiveness in excess, so it can be said of the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair). He loves intrigue, for intrigue sake. He loves to surround himself with the "most complicated webs," to sit in the centre of a "million of plots." He cares not how wild some of them are. He relies on his own ingenuity, promptitude and habitual good fortune to make everything he handles conducive to the purpose of the machine, self. Secretiveness disposes to be secret in thought, word and deed. It makes the fox careful not to be observed, the dog to hide its bones it cannot pick, the cunning man to conceal his intentions and sometimes to profess opinions opposite to those he really entertains, and the Minister of Railways to keep back and conceal data necessary to enable the House and country to intelligently grasp this railway scheme.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. MILLS. Let the hon. gentleman go down to "Coontown" and he will learn "why." He is more interested in leg shows than he is in the business of the country. That is the reason "why." I am afraid he has not been asleep since he was there last night; I am afraid his mind is still wandering on the sights he saw there, and he is asking himself, "Why?" The matter which is before the committee is one which was of interest to every well-wisher of this country. It is not only important on account of the financial consideration involved, but on account of the precedent to be established. Shall it be established as a precedent, that a Minister of Railways, or a Government, can bring before this House a large undertaking without giving the necessary data whereby those called upon to vote are enabled to make up their minds intelligently? If they are mere voting machines and are bound to support the Government in any event, no information is required, but we, who are voting against the Government, contend there is not reason why we should not have this data. If we allow this matter to go through without the necessary data, we will be establishing a precedent for all time to come, and Governments will refer to this as a precedent whereby they can put through any deal and conceal their facts.

Mr. GILLIES. As a member of this House, I deeply regret the course which is being pursued by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to this transaction that we are now deliberating upon. In criticising this proposition, it is necessary that we should investigate and analyse the two propositions put before Parliament. The proposition which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals presented, with a considerable flourish of trumpets, last year, under which the Intercolonial was to be extended from Lévis to Montreal, involved a payment of $64,000 a year for ninety-nine years, which amount, capitalized, would represent $2,100,000. That proposition was abandoned by the hon. Minister of Railways, and he sub-

mits this year a proposition to acquire the property for $1,600,000 cash, and the saving to the people of the difference of $500,000 between these two amounts is an ample and abundant justification of the patriotic action taken by the Senate last year. An amendment has been made in the proposition now before the committee, by which, instead of paying 5 per cent upon one-half of the cost of improvements made by the Grand Trunk on their line between Ste. Rosalie and Bonaventure station, we are to pay upon our proportionate user, based upon wheelage. In order to consider this contract intelligently, we must have the proportion of user brought down to the House. The third section of the agreement, as clearly as it can be written, defines what share of the cost of the maintenance of the railway and terminals between Ste. Rosalie and Bonaventure station shall be borne by the Intercolonial and by the Grand Trunk respectively. Then, the thirty-third section definitely specifies at what periods of time returns shall be sent to the Department of Railways, which is at the end of every month. It provides that the books and accounts of each of the two parties to this contract shall be open, each one to the other, and that returns shall be furnished by the parties to this contract. This contract has been in operation for some time past between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Has that section of the contract been observed by the Minister? Has he seen that our proportion of the user of this property was regularly filed every month, as ordered by that section? If he has not, then, I say, there has been remissness on the part of the Department of Railways which is nothing less than culpable. If the department has lived up to the terms of this section, the information is in the possession of the Minister, and should be laid on the Table of the House. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), on the 26th of May, drew the attention of the hon. Minister to the necessity of having this information brought down. That was on the 26th of May, and here, on the 8th of June, the information then promised has not been brought down. It is no wonder that members on this side of the House have become alarmed at the awful indifference exhibited towards the interests of this country by the Government in this matter. The conduct of the Minister, in withholding from this House information to which it is entitled, is an insult to the people of this country, degrading to Parliament, and a disgrace to the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, I have been stating to hon. gentlemen opposite that I would make the necessary inquiries, and would obtain, if possible, from the Grand Trunk Railway Company a statement of the particular facts which they desired. I have received by wire this morning from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and it has been typewritten and placed in my hands, a statement for the last six months for which the information is obtainable, and I am now prepared to furnish it to the committee for its information. Before I do so, however, I wish to avail myself of the present opportunity of saying to my hon. friend from the city and county of Halifax (Mr. Borden), that I would be very loath indeed to treat any request which he might make to me with the slightest disrespect. I entertain too good a feeling for the hon. gentleman, and too high an opinion of him, to treat him in any way that would savour in the slightest degree of discourtesy. If he infers from anything which has occurred that such was my purpose or intention, I can assure him that it was not, and I know him well enough to know that he will accept my statement to that effect without hesitation or qualification. The hon. gentleman might perhaps have been justified in thinking that I had been remiss, from the fact that he had called my particular attention to the particular information which he desired, and that it had not been furnished. But the hon. gentleman knows very well that any Minister, and particularly one who has charge of the Department of Railways, is at times completely overwhelmed with the calls which are made upon him. I may be wanting in some of the necessary qualities which a Minister of this department should possess, because I admit it is not possible for me always to carry in my mind an accurate and specific recollection of all the matters which hon. gentlemen from both sides of the House from time to time call my attention to. At the time the hon. gentleman made his request, he did not make it in writing or in the form of a question of which he had given notice, but rose in his place and stated what he desired just as the House was adjourning: and, although I took a memorandum of his request at the time, and forwarded that memorandum to the Deputy Minister, it passed out of my mind, except that there had been a request for information. I called on the responsible officer in my department to know if he had the statement prepared for Mr. Borden, for the hon. member's name was on the memorandum. It was handed to me, and I brought it to the House, and until the hon. gentleman called my attention to it yesterday by his reference to "Hansard," I did not carry in my mind that what he desired was the particular class of information which he asked me to furnish. I say this much to explain why it was that the papers which he received and which I assured him yesterday contained the information he asked for, did not appear to contain that information. Now, there is nothing in this information, as hon. members will see when I lay it on the Table of the House, that anybody would hesitate to furnish, or that could have any prejudicial

effect on the question before the committee; but, on the contrary, there is everything in the statement which would tend to strengthen and support the proposal which we have submitted. There are gentlemen who thought they could judge what the percentage would be. One hon. gentleman, who is now in my eye, did not hesitate to inform the committee last evening that when this information was obtained it would be found to be of such a damaging character—showing the precentage not greater than 3 per cent or 4 per cent, or perhaps even less—that the committee would then see the reason why the Minister of Railways had refused to furnish the information. You will soon be in possession of this information, and then you will observe how completely it will upset the conclusions which the hon. gentleman drew from the imaginary facts he presented. This is the first moment of time in which the statement I am about to present has been in my hands or in the department, so that I could not have furnished it before, and it has been obtained upon telegraphic communication with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The statement, which bears the signature of the Deputy Minister, is stated to have been received from the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the 8th of June. It is headed "Montreal Joint Section—Combined Engine and Car Mileage," and it is for the last six months—November, December, January, February, March and April. I need not go over all these figures. There is a column showing what the Grand Trunk totals were, another showing what the Intercolonial totals were, another showing what the two together were, and an additional column showing the Intercolonial Railway percentage. I will read the Intercolonial Railway percentage of combined engine and car mileage for the six months I have mentioned, for the different sections:

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY PERCENTAGES.

—	St. Lambert and Point St. Charles.	St. Hyacinthe and St. Lambert	Ste. Rosalie and St. Hyacinthe.	Chaudière Joint Section.
November	12·82	20·90	22·13	68·39
December	10·46	16·20	17·13	70·93
January	9·42	14·88	15·69	69·65
February	10·65	17·19	18·39	68·62
March	11·62	18·45	19·49	68·64
April	16·81	29·73	30·70	70·81

Now, if you will combine these percentages over the whole of the divisions, you will find that the combined car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway system upon these sections, instead of being 3, 4 or 5 per cent, averages over 25 per cent, the average being, I think, some points over 25 per cent. I have a statement, which I obtained since yesterday evening, showing the actual cash amount. This statement is under the heading, The line from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, which, as hon. members will recollect, is the only portion of the railway over which we have acquired the title to half the property:

Line from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, 1st March, 1898, to 1st March, 1899.

Maintenance and repairs	$56,133 32
Intercolonial Railway proportion	13,143 26
Intercolonial Railway percentage of the whole—23·41-100.	
Operating stations (including salaries)	$16,961 39
Intercolonial Railway proportion	5,413 16
Intercolonial Railway percentage of the whole—31·91-100.	

This does not include anything west of St. Lambert, viz., bridge or terminals. That does not cover all the charges which are paid and adjusted in account between the two railways. There remain the station expenses, &c., including the salaries along this joint section.

St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie.

Intercolonial Railway proportion—	
Total for twelve months of maintenance and repairs and station expenses	$18,556 42
Total including Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railway proportion—	
Total for twelve months of maintenance and repairs and station expenses	$73,094 71

These are the statements, Mr. Chairman, which I offer to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I suppose it would be hardly regular to lay them on the Table, as we are in committee. I can hand them to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), which will be the same thing.

There has been a disposition on the part of some gentlemen in committee to say, that the Intercolonial Railway ought to have on record all these particulars, ought to receive, month by both, these various details, and that the Minister of Railways and Canals was remiss, in that he had not made it a point to follow the action of his subordinate officers at Moncton and see that they procured this information from the Grand Trunk, to be preserved of record in the Moncton office. I am not going to controvert that view, at least that portion which involves the statement that it would have been possible for the officers of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton to procure this information from time to time and have it on record. I can see, after what has occurred, that it would have been a great convenience, if that had been done. But I am not willing to accept any blame because I have not followed this up and seen that it was done. The possibility of any question arising in Parliament, requiring that this detailed information should be forthcoming, did not occur to me. I do not think it occurred to any officer of the Intercolonial Railway. The course pursued, I

may be permitted to repeat, was to send the auditors of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, on receipt of these monthly statements, and have them go over the books of the Grand Trunk, and verify, by such examination as they felt necessary, the correctness of the accounts rendered. That the auditors did not carry away and preserve the statements is, as I understand, the gravamen of the complaint that is made. But you can well understand, Mr. Chairman, that these officers might naturally feel that, their business being to audit the accounts, it was not necessary for them to make abstracts from the Grand Trunk Railway books, having verified the correctness of the figures by a personal investigation. On their certificate that the account was correct, the amount was paid. These accounts did not come under my eye, did not require my sanction; they have been going through the same channel year after year, as they will go through for years to come, as part of the regular procedure in the department. The details of our railway system are too multifarious to pass under the eye of any Minister. The hon. leader of the Opposition, if he thinks it worth while to make any reference to the subject, will be fair enough to me, I am sure, to say, that it is unreasonable for any hon. member to think that a Minister could give his personal attention to all these multitudinous details.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot but say the Minister is to blame for this position. In my remarks asking for papers to be brought before the House, I asked for these percentages. The hon. Minister said he thought he had brought them down. I saw him afterwards, and told him that the percentages were not among the papers, and he said he was aware of it, and would telegraph to Moncton and get the information at once.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the information was not in hand.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand that. The amounts are paid upon a mileage basis. If the officers had not the figures, they could at once telegraph, to the Grand Trunk and get them. For the discussion of this question, it was most important that we should know the percentages, for it was on that basis we were paying. The hon. Minister says, that the Opposition were calculating it at 3 or 4 per cent. The hon. Minister himself gave us what he said to be as close an estimate as he could give, naming 5 per cent; and all our arguments have been based on that verbal statement of the Minister, that the user by the Intercolonial Railway was 5 per cent of the whole.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad that this question has assumed a shape at last that enables us to hope to bring this long debate to a conclusion. I left the House last night, but, before going conferred with the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who, in my absence, was leading this side of the House; and I understood from him that he expected that by twelve o'clock, at latest, this measure would be passed through committee. I was greatly surprised this morning to find that, owing to an unfortunate misunderstanding—which I do not intend to go into, as it arose in my absence—the debate had been so much prolonged. With the information that the hon. Minister has now laid on the Table, the difficulty seems to be entirely removed. I am quite sure that every person will admit that the Opposition were only exercising their just rights, when they required that this informtion should be brought down. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has frankly admitted, in the explanation he has offered to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden)—which, I am sure, will be accepted—that his inability to comply with his first engagement arose from the fact that the officials at Moncton had not the reports in their possession. When this clause of the agreement came up, it was absolutely necessary for its intelligent consideration that that information should be had, and I am glad that the hon. Minister has, through communications with the Grand Trunk, been able to furnish that information. I hope that we shall now make more rapid progress with the public business. I do not see any reason to suppose that we shall not be able to run through the remaining clauses without occupying a great deal of time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I accept, in the most unqualified manner, what the hon. Minister said, and feel that he has expressed himself in a very courteous way with regard to myself. There was no feeling on my part that any disrespect was intended. I recognize that the hon. Minister is a very hard-working member of the Cabinet, probably none more engaged than he. I can readily understand that a memorandum taken down, as this was, during a sitting of the House, might be in such a shape that what was desired might not be fully understood at the time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As a matter of fact, I found that the memorandum could not be furnished me; they could not find it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope the hon. Minister will accept my assurance——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—that I was acting in all sincerity. I am sure that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and others believed that we could get home at a very early hour last night.

Mr. POWELL. I may say, that I see nothing here about the terminals in Montreal.

Has the hon. Minister any explanation concerning that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not received that, but it may be forthcoming. They brought the statements over as they got them. The terminals are differently circumstanced from the other items, because we pay a fixed rental for them.

Mr. POWELL. The Minister, I think, said that the average. as shown by these figures. was about 39 per cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said, that about 27 per cent would be the average over all.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister must see that he is mistaken. The majority of the percentages are on the section between Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, though the Chaudière section runs up to 66 per cent ; but that is a very small proportion of the whole.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the general statement shows a total of about $73,000 expended by the Grand Trunk, of which $18,000 or $19,000 was paid by the Intercolonial Railway.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think we might as well take recess now, considering the arrangement I have just made with my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper). The committee might rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again ; and, this afternoon, we could give an hour to these resolutions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Mr. Chairman,——

The PRIME MINISTER. Of course, if that is not understood——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My judgment, from what I could learn from my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who was leading this House in my absence, is, that an hour would dispose of the rest of the Bill. I do not myself see any reason why this should not be sufficient for the discussion of the whole question, when we meet again.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask, whether the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is going to furnish information called for by clause 33.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not have that in mind at this moment. I understood, from hon. gentlemen opposite, that, even if I got one or two months, that it would help. I asked the Grand Trunk to send the last six months, and I thought that would furnish a fair average for the year.

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking, not of the number of months, but of the character of the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know of any other information that I have been asked for.

Mr. WALLACE. I refer the hon. gentleman to section 33 :

That Her Majesty and the company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges, shares of costs and other returns to be made as under these presents.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood, if my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) would allow me, that the hon. Minister has given all the information on this subject that he is able, at the present moment, to lay before the House. and I think it is sufficient to meet this particular case. If there is any further information required. I would suggest that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would furnish it before the third reading of the Bill, so that any question arising in regard to the information necessary may be at hand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there is anything I am asked to do which I can do, I will be glad to do it by the third reading. I suppose we will report the resolutions now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I understood the suggestion made by the Prime Minister. it is, that, practically, the Chairman should leave the Chair until three o'clock, and that then we should resume and dispose of the whole subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would have been disposed to propose that the committee should rise, and that, when we meet again, we should give an hour to this matter. But I was met, at the very moment when I proposed that, by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) asking for more information. Unless the Opposition are able to agree as to what they want, we shall have to go on.

Mr. WALLACE. According to the right hon. First Minister it is a crime to ask for any more information. We must not open our mouths. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals gives us more information which is fragmentary and not full, and then the right hon. First Minister says that if you do not accept that you will not get any more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not understand it in that way at all. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has stated this is all the information he is able to furnish, and he says that, anything further it is possible to give, he will give. I think the proposition made by the right hon. Prime Minister is one that both sides of the House is willing to accept.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, it is understood that we will give an hour more to this resolution, after which the committee will rise and pass it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. With the general understanding of the committee, I will leave the Chair until three o'clock.

The PRIME MINISTER. Resuming at three o'clock and giving an hour to these resolutions.

At Three o'clock the committee resumed.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the Bill ?

Mr. HAGGART. Before the third reading of the Bill, the hon. Minister will bring down the further information we asked for, namely the percentages at the terminals at Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the hon. Minister to say that if there was any further information that was available, if members would suggest it previous to the third reading, it would be submitted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. This morning at half-past eight, I sent a telegram to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, of which the following is a copy :—

Chas. M. Hays, General Manager G.T.R.,
Montreal.

Will you kindly have sent me by wire as speedily as possible statement showing us for last six months detail of Intercolonial Railway engine and car mileage, and that of the Grand Trunk, per month. We have had an all-night session of Parliament, and are still sitting in committee on Grand Trunk contract. Opposition demanding information in respect to Montreal under third clause of contract, which I am unable to furnish unless I receive the same from yau.

In answer to that, they sent me the information I have already given to the House. I dare say that at the present moment the terminal percentages may be here also. They are not on the same footing as the other percentages, as for these terminals we are paying the company a fixed rental. If the statement is not at hand, I will ask for it and will have it here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Just one moment, in which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to a matter which was mentioned last evening, but which was not dealt with very fully; that is, whether or not the connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway is really included in the demise of this lease. The clause in the agreement proceeds in this way :

Now this indenture witnesseth that the expression "Montreal joint section," wherever used in this indenture shall mean the company's line and connections at Ste. Rosalie, and the whole line and branches and appurtenances hereby demised from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and the Victoria bridge, together with the terminals at Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal and at Point St. Charles, St. Henri and between Point St. Charles and the Bonaventure station, and also with the Canadian Pacific Railway via Jacques Cartier Junction.

It may be that the true construction of this will include the connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it does not say so. The last word to which grammatically you can refer the word "with" is the word "terminals" ; you have not the word "connection" there. The hon. gentleman will further observe that although these two joint sections are defined as having a certain meaning, yet when he comes to the demising part of the lease, the expressions "Montreal joint section" and "Chaudière joint section" are not used, but a particular description of what is demised is attempted in these words :

An undivided one-half share interest, right and title or interest in the company's line of railway——

And so forth. Then, further down it says :

——and the use of the Victoria bridge across the River St. Lawrence as it at present exists or as it may at any time during the subsistence of this lease be improved, reconstructed, enlarged or extended, and over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria bridge and into the Bonaventure station into the city of Montreal and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the company hereinbefore more particularly described.

I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will say that refers you to the beginning of the paragraph ; but when thrown back to that, you have not the word "connection" used with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway via Jacques Cartier Junction. It may be that the point I am making is too critical ; but it was pointed out by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), and if there is any doubt about it the hon. gentleman might make it clear by a short supplementary agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is no ground for apprehension on the score pointed out by the hon. gentleman. You will observe that the clause goes on to describe what is meant by the Montreal joint section. What does that mean ? It includes all the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway at Montreal and one of the terminals in the junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Jacques Cartier Junction. It does not appear to me to admit of any doubt ; but with a view of making the matter abundantly plain, we go on to say by a later clause :

The above joint sections are all shown on the plan annexed hereto, the portion of the Montreal section from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert station being shown in red, and from St. Lambert station to Bonaventure station, and intermediate connections, and Jacques Cartier Junction, being shown in green, the Chaudière section being shown in red.

If you will look at those plans, you will see that the company's lines in the terminals, extending to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Jacques Cartier Junction, are coloured green, as described in this portion of the agreement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is quite possible that the plan, which we have not had an opportunity of seeing, may make it perfectly plain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And even without the plan. The plan is particularly valuable, because it shows us all the tracks laid down which we have the right to use. Every track which is put in that plan passes under that contract. It may be that the general words "all the terminals at Montreal," if Jacques Cartier Junction had not been mentioned, might have been claimed hereafter by the Grand Trunk Railway Company not to include that particular portion of the terminals, but it being mentioned, you can only give effect to the reference by recognizing that the Jacques Cartier Junction and the tracks connecting therewith come within the terms of the conveyance.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister would have made himself more clear if he had mentioned it in the demise of the two joint sections, because in a dozen places afterwards in this agreement the joint sections are mentioned as the Montreal and the Chaudière joint sections. It refers to the two joint sections, and the percentage we have to pay upon them. But there is no mention in the demise of this joint section, and the only possible connection that can be made between the demise of the two joint sections is the company's line, hereinbefore described, and the terminals and connections hereinbefore mentioned. Whether that would cover the two joint sections, I do not know, my opinion is that it does not. I was particular in asking the Minister whether, in his opinion, and in the opinion of the Department of Justice, these words covered the two joint sections, and covered the junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway via the Jacques Cartier section, and he thought they did. There has been a plan furnished to the department; is a copy annexed to the indenture?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The copy of the plan which was signed by all the parties when the contracts were executed, was carefully looked over. I cannot say that I have looked over the present copy myself, nor can I say that I have had any officer of the department look over it. The Grand Trunk officers sent it in as an exact copy of the plan which is attached to the original contract, and I believe it to be an exact copy.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the Minister be kind enough to get an officer of his department to look over the plan and see if the plan laid upon the Table of the House is a copy of the plan which is attached to the indenture?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, if the hon. gentleman desires it. I think the hon. gentleman has not had in his mind, in examining the different clauses of the contract, the fact that we are only taking a conveyance from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of the Chaudière joint section and of that portion of the Montreal joint section from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert; we are getting a half interest in those sections. The language which the hon. gentleman finds somewhat ambiguous is language which is employed to express a different interest, a right to the user, and not a conveyance of one-half the property, as in the case with the portions of the line which I have mentioned.

Mr. McDOUGALL. With a view to the consideration of some arguments that were imported into the discussion which took place on the subject of this Bill some days ago, I asked the following question from the Minister of Railways and Canals:

> What was the regular tariff collected per car-load on flour carried between Chaudière and St. John, Halifax, Pictou and Sydney, over the Intercolonial Railway, in June, 1896? What was the tariff between the same point in June, 1897, and 1898? What was the tariff between Montreal and the same point in June, 1898?

The Minister of Railways and Canals answered:

> I have to ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return in this case, as the answer will be voluminous.

Now, I did not move for the papers, because I felt satisfied that I could not get the information. The information sought by me could have been put in two or three lines. I asked what was the rate charged per car-load on flour from Chaudière, in the first place, to St. John. The Minister could have answered that by saying $50 or $60, or whatever it was; and the same way in respect to Halifax, Pictou and Sydney. I simply asked for the car rate according to the Intercolonial Railway tariff on that particular date, and also for the car rate the succeeding year. I am satisfied the Minister can get that information in a few hours at least; if he has not got it at hand, he could get it by telegraphing to Moncton. I want to know whether the Minister will favour the House with an answer to these questions before the Bill comes up for its third reading. My object is to range these facts to bear upon the consideration of the argument presented by the Minister as to the advantage gained to the Intercolonial Railway system by the extension of the road to Montreal. I want to compare the charges made by the Intercolonial Railway in carrying flour from Chaudière to the eastern points, with the rate made at present over the same distance, and from Montreal. The Minister has only to get his officer to refer to the tariff in operation at those dates to give him the figures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the hon. gentle-

man to take my statement as accurate, that the information is not capable of being furnished in such a small compass as he imagines. I will undertake to secure it for the hon. gentleman if he will simply move for a return. It is unreasonable to ask Ministers to stand up in answer to questions and read column after column of figures when a motion for a reutrn would only involve a few days' delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest that the hon. member for Cape Breton should give the hon. Minister a memorandum in writing of what he wants.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If he will give me a memorandum of what he wants, I will hand the information to him in writing.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister has not explained the effect of the traffic arrangement which is a sequence of the resolutions. It does not appear in resolutions at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a reference in the schedule to this arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. But the arrangement itself is not in here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a reference in the schedule, section 40, which is as follows:—

In consideration of the rents and covenants herein reserved and contained, Her Majesty represented by the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway of the one part, and the company by its general traffic manager of the other part, have entered into a mutual traffic arrangement in writing of even date herewith, which traffic arrangement is hereby declared, covenanted and agreed to be and form a part of and be supplemental to this contract, and shall be read herewith and shall be binding upon all parties hereto during the continuance of this leasing contract, except so far as the same may be altered with the mutual consent of Her Majesty and the company. When and if the traffic arrangement shall be so altered from time to time, such amended supplemental contract shall be substituted for the supplemental traffic contract of this date.

The difference between the supplemental arrangement and this one is that there is withdrawn from the former contract all reference to matters which are purely of a traffic character. Except a clause of the contract which relates to traffic for ocean points. I furnished the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), if he will remember, with a copy of the traffic arrangement.

Mr. HAGGART. The traffic arrangement was furnished to the committee which investigated this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was furnished to the House. Does the hon. gentleman not remember having had it in his hand?

Mr. HAGGART. The traffic arrangement which was attached to the indenture was furnished to the Committee of Inquiry, and if the hon. Minister remembers he was examined upon it. I have not seen a word of it in the resolutions, and as it is a sequence of the resolutions the hon. gentleman should have explained it as part of the indenture.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) does not controvert the statement that I gave him the papers, and that one of the papers which he had in his hands was a copy of the traffic arrangement. I think there must be some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who remember as to that.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no doubt about it. I think the papers were handed to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who immediately handed them back.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that was the original contract. I refer to the supplemental traffic arrangement which accompanied the papers laid on the Table. The original contract was not laid on the Table; I handed it to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). I am asking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) if he does not remember having received this other paper and having examined it?

Mr. HAGGART. No, I never saw it. However, I may tell the hon. gentleman that I saw it, and read it, and know all about it, because it was furnished to the committee that inquired into this matter of the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that it was not only furnished to the committee that was appointed to investigate into this matter, but that it was furnished to this House at the time the papers were laid on the Table. It does not come properly as an attached paper to the schedule and does not require to be passed upon in the same manner by Parliament. Of course its confirmation in effect follows with the confirmation of the contract agreed upon.

Mr. POWELL. Why does the hon. gentleman not put it in the schedule here? If it were incorporated with an Act of Parliament we would have the whole thing together. It is true the contract says that this would be subject to change, but it is a statutory recognition of the power to change it. Would it not be better to add the supplementary agreement to the schedule?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not seen the necessity or advantage of that. The hon. gentleman has anticipated what I was going to say. It is an agreement which is liable to be changed

from time to time according to circumstances as they may arise. Therefore, it does not seem necessary that it should be incorporated in the legislation. It might have a misleading effect, because a person who would see it in the statutes might think that it was a final arrangement, whereas in six months we might change it. This contract reads in the following terms:—

This supplemental and traffic agreement, made this first day of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight:

Between Her Majesty, represented herein by the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, of the one part, and the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, represented herein by the general traffic manager of the said company, of the second part:

Whereas an agreement has been entered into between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, of even date herewith, for the leasing of the said company's line between Ste. Rosalie and the city of Montreal;

And whereas, for the better interpretation of certain clauses in the said leasing agreement, the parties hereto, represented as aforesaid, have agreed to enter into this supplemental and traffic agreement, which shall be taken to be incorporated in and read as part of the said leasing agreement.

Witnesseth that the said parties contract and agree each with the other as follows:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in any agreement between Her Majesty and the company heretofore made and now existing, it is agreed between Her Majesty and the company that during the continuance of the contract to which this is a supplement, percentage divisions via Chaudière Junction shall be suspended, and that with respect to all traffic originating throughout the company's system, or connections west of Montreal, and offered for shipment to any point on the Intercolonial Railway, or reached by its connections, Montreal shall be the junction point, and the company undertakes to route all traffic destined to points on the Intercolonial Railway and its connections, via Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend explain the points of difference between that agreement and the one that existed before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The meaning of that clause is that Montreal becomes the junction point instead of Lévis or Chaudière. The old contract between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial not only contained provisions in respect to the acquiring of that railway, but it contained a provision having reference to traffic matters and making Lévis the junction point. That means that this is really the point of connection between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Railway. And this is the point at which the Grand Trunk receives from the Intercolonial and delivers to the Intercolonial the exchange traffic which is to take place between them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is plain, but I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understood what I wanted to know. I want to know in the first place, what is the betterment of the present traffic arrangement, which he read, as compared with that of 1879, but more especially what is the betterment as compared with the hon. gentleman's agreement with the Grand Trunk presented in 1897?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is only one point: I do not know whether what I have already said would be regarded as a betterment. Here is one feature of it which I think is a distinct improvement on the other arrangement, and it is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are bound to route over the Intercolonial Railway and deliver at Montreal all freight taken from the west and destined for points on the Intercolonial Railway. Under the agreement, I admit that this business will come to us notwithstanding the fact that we may not solicit it. It comes to us without any special effort upon our part. It is only fair to say that while we are receiving that advantage, and in that respect this present traffic contract is an improvement upon the one which was included within the contract first entered into between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in 1897, there is, on the other hand, as a compensation, as it were, or a quid pro quo for the advantages we receive, a corresponding advantage which the Grand Trunk Railway receive in that we are obliged to deliver to the Grand Trunk Railway all unrouted freight, all freight, rather, that is under control, originating on the Intercolonial Railway. We have the two corresponding conditions. They give us all freight coming from the west at Montreal. We give all freight that we have control over, and that has not been routed by the shipper by any other route, to the Grand Trunk at Montreal. There is that difference, if that will be called a betterment.

Mr. POWELL. There is no question about that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I appreciate is as such, and I think the Grand Trunk Railway recognized, when they were making this concession, that they were conceding a point to us.

Mr. FOSTER. I see by the agreement of 1897, that according to the 40th section, all that the Grand Trunk Railway bound itself to do was that in case of any freight from points west of Montreal, the shipper's wishes were to rule as regards through routing to Montreal, but I think it gave the company absolute option of making a transfer, in all cases of freight originating on their system, at Lévis instead of at Montreal. The present arrangement seems to make it obligatory to make the transfer at Montreal of all through freight originating west of that city. The shipper, I suppose, still holds the right to say that the goods shall be interchanged at Lévis instead of

Montreal if he chooses, but of course that will be a small amount.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In a sense, probably that might be sustained, although we know that in the practical operation of the railway such cases are not likely to arise.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the absolute right rests with the shipper always.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Possibly so, but it is entirely immaterial to the shipper whether the shipment comes to the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis or at Montreal, and I do not think that any question can be at all likely to arise, as between the shipper and the Grand Trunk Railway, in respect to that freight. The Grand Trunk Railway could say: We will take your goods and deliver them to the Intercolonial Railway, and provide for their delivery to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal; or they might say: We cannot arrange in any other way because we have contracted with the Intercolonial Railway to deliver them at Montreal, all freight which may be destined for points on the Intercolonial Railway east of Montreal. While not prepared to discuss the academic question as to what might possibly be the legal effect, if a controversy were to arise between the shipper and the Grand Trunk Railway, I do not think it will become a practical question.

Mr. POWELL. Look at the first section. Apart from the academic question as to whether or not the Grand Trunk Railway might not be forced to take freight having been routed that way, yet for the purposes of this agreement the junction point is Montreal, so that in the division of rates the Government road get from Montreal down, no matter who hauls the freight.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is quite right. In adjusting the proportion of freight over the whole line, from the point of receipt to the point of destination, we would get such proportion as is calculated upon the basis of Montreal delivery.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a through freight arrangement for which an allowance of some 40 miles odd was given to Halifax.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (reading):

In connection with the import and export traffic via Halifax and St. John, or any other port in the maritime provinces that may be selected, it is understood that during the life of this agreement, the Intercolonial Railway will accept 425 miles on Halifax, and 375 on St. John. The St. John rates are to be the same as those quoted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to and from that port or west of St. John, and the same as then quoted by the Grand Trunk Railway to and from Portland. The Halifax rate to be one cent per 100 pounds on all classes and special class over the rate to and from St. John or Portland, on both exports and imports, the company to have as its proportion the mileage as per the various routes west of Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the mileage to Halifax?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Eight hundred and forty-eight.

Mr. FOSTER. What would be the purposes of shortening the real mileage to about one-half?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The object is this. Hon. members know that full ocean freights at ports to the east or the north of Boston, New York and Portland, are controlled by the prevailing rate at these points. From any point in western Canada, I take it that the rate to New York is identical with the rate to Boston and the rate to Portland. The three rates are the same, and New York must necessarily govern. No railway company which drains a producing country in Canada could get a higher rate for carrying goods—I am speaking now of the general rule—for carrying tonnage to Boston than a railway company would carry the same tonnage to New York for, so that there are always the freight rates which control the rates of ocean shipments from Canada. With that knowledge, it can be seen very clearly that neither the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John nor the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax could get a higher rate of freight than the shipper can secure the carriage of his tonnage for to one of the United States ports. That I put forward as a general rule. It was deemed desirable to arrange with the Grand Trunk Railway for freight which was destined for Atlantic ports for shipment to European ports not served by the existing lines of freight steamships between Portland and European ports. No railway company in the position of the Intercolonial Railway could expect that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would give any portion of the tonnage which originated on its own line to another road as long as it had its own line upon which to carry such tonnage. It has the port of Portland, and it has certain lines established between Portland and certain European ports. It has a line established with Liverpool, it has a line established with Bristol, but there are other ports which we have subsidized lines of steamships running to St. John and Halifax, and to which ports the Grand Trunk Railway has no line steamship running from Portland, viz., Belfast, Manchester and Dublin. Now, any freight on the Grand Trunk Railway line intended for either Manchester, or Belfast, or Dublin, we could reasonably arrange for, if we desired to do so, from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We could say to them: Under this contract we desire you to deliver to us at Montreal such tonnage as your shippers wish consigned to either of the ports to which you have no line of sea-going steamships.

Mr. POWELL. Under what section can you claim that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the clause I have just read in connection with the import and export traffic via Halifax and St. John. What the hon. gentleman refers to is that portion of the traffic arrangement which fixes the mileage proportion between us and the company. You must necessarily, if you are to have a traffic agreement at all for the class of ocean business to which I have referred, some understanding with your connecting railway as to the percentage of rates which they will allow you. We call a specific mileage an arbitrary. They say to us: We will divide with you our whole rate from the point where the business is received by us to your point of shipment, upon the basis of an allowance of 425 miles from Montreal to Halifax, and 375 by St. John.

Mr. HAGGART. You say that the arbitrary that is allowed by the Grand Trunk Railway, if the goods are sent via Halifax, is 425 miles; if it is originated the other way is there an arbitrary allowed to the Intercolonial Railway as against the Grand Trunk Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The arrangement is that, taking the whole mileage over which the goods will be carried from Halifax, if that be the point, to the western point of delivery, that portion of mileage which is to be allowed to the Intercolonial Railway as between Halifax and Montreal will be only 425 miles. It works undoubtedly both ways. We could not get paying ocean business unless we did have such understanding, could not make any arrangements for carrying freight coming from the ocean to points west unless we had an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway or some other company to carry it for us when it reached the end of our line. They have agreed here: We will allow you your proportion of freight from Halifax to the western destination on the basis of 425 miles for your portion of the distance.

Mr. POWELL. Taking the freight, which is the basis of the freight charge from Montreal to Portland, as being reasonable, bearing in mind the fact that through freight rates are very low, does he not think that the Intercolonial Railway, in only getting one-half that amount is losing money on every tonnage of through freight that it carries under that agreement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will not be justified in assuming that the Intercolonial Railway is going to haul very much freight, even under this clause, unless it can find its profit in that haulage for the whole line, upon being paid on a basis of 425 miles, and it will not do business unless it does.

Mr. IVES. I understand the arbitrary is allowed the Grand Trunk Railway on business that it originates intended for the ocean and which is carried over the 425 miles. The Intercolonial Railway allows an arbitrary on the difference between 425 miles and the actual number of miles. That is the advantage given by the Intercolonial Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway for the Grand Trunk Railway origination of business. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals says it works both ways, but I think it works both ways against the Intercolonial Railway in respect of freight brought by ocean steamships to Halifax and taken over the Intercolonial and delivered to the Grand Trunk Railway at Montreal for the west. Then what I want to know is: Where does the arbitrary of the Intercolonial Railway come in? Does the Intercolonial Railway get its full mileage on that traffic, or does it have to haul for the 425 miles maximum? If so, it does not work both ways, but the arbitrary is in favour of the Grand Trunk Railway, whether the freight originates on the Grand Trunk Railway or on the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contract includes both import and export traffic, and the hon. member must be aware that the rate of land carriage upon these shipments, and the whole arrangement, in fact, is practically settled with the shipper abroad. We have no agents in Europe to look up business for us, it would scarcely be worth while to incur that expense. But when business does offer which we are willing to take, we know what we are to receive under this arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway—we are under no compulsion as regards import business—but if we take export business we can fix what the rate shall be, and such rate is proportioned upon the basis of the mileage which the Grand Trunk Railway hauls, allowing 425 miles for our portion of the haul. This is not, however, by any means a leading feature in our contract, or in the supplemental contract, but something of the kind has always been included in any traffic arrangement in times past between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. IVES. Is your general manager, without consulting the Grand Trunk Railway, at liberty to make through rates as to export or import freight which comes to Halifax?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so, any more than the Grand Trunk is allowed to make a rate without consulting us.

Mr. POWELL. Do you not consider that on this ocean freight, on the terms of this division, the Intercolonial Railway would be hauling at a loss?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so. If rates were high, it is quite probable we would be able to get a sufficient proportion on this basis

to pay us a little margin, although, perhaps, it would not be very much.

Mr. POWELL. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) think that the present traffic arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, by which the Intercolonial Railway had an arbitrary mileage of 303 miles for 274 real miles between Halifax and St. John, would be a great deal more in the interest of Canada than the arrangement he is now making, which involves a loss on every ton of freight we take over. We haul on this 425 miles for nothing. Suppose the charge on through freight is five-tenths of a cent per ton per mile—which would be a fair rate on a road like ours—we have to haul this through ocean freight for half that, and it involves a loss.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not agree to that proposition.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Wainwright swears to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot help that; you are asking my opinion.

Mr. POWELL. I may compliment the Minister on the scheme he has adopted of having these large engines, but nevertheless you cannot haul freight on a road like the Intercolonial Railway below three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile without a loss. If instead of hauling your freight to Montreal at a loss, you gave it to the Canadian Pacific Railway on the interchange of traffic at St. John, on the basis of the existing traffic agreement by which they give you 303 miles on an actual mileage of 274, the Minister will see we not only have the Canadian Pacific Railway rate, but we have, in addition, the advantage afforded by this arbitrary mileage. Thus, on a thousand tons of freight coming to Halifax, the Intercolonial Railway would be in a large amount, by shipping it via the Canadian Pacific Railway, and interchanging traffic at St. John; whereas if you ship it to Halifax, its destination being west of Montreal, there would be an actual loss. This boasted arrangement which the Minister has made, and his decrying of the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, is a direct reversal of the actual conditions of trade as they are. I have in my possession the proportionate division of rates on two car-loads over the Intercolonial Railway, since this traffic agreement was entered into, and exclusive of this extra provision made in case of trade going to Halifax. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Intercolonial Railway was only allowed two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where did that freight come from?

Mr. POWELL. One car from Hamilton, and another from St. Catharines, and it was an actual loss.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not agree with you that it would necessarily be an actual loss.

Mr. POWELL. On canal or prairie level roads, with these immense trains, they could haul at a rate of two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile or less, but as the hon. gentleman ought to know, you cannot do that on a road like the Intercolonial Railway. I submit that this arrangement is a great detriment instead of a benefit to the country, and the rescision of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway would be a great detriment to the country, when you compare it with the adoption of this agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is embarking upon a subject which is largely technical, and about which he has much to learn. It is a subject which only men of experience understand in all its bearings. I will indicate the weakness of the position of the hon. gentleman in one particular. He says that the arrangement which we are seeking to annul between the Canadian Pacific Railway and ourselves, under which the Canadian Pacific Railway allows us a fixed mileage of 303 as compared with the actual mileage of 274, is a more beneficial arrangement with the Intercolonial Railway than is the present clause. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway brings no business to Halifax that it can possibly divert to St. John.

Mr. POWELL. That applies to the Grand Trunk Railway. They will not bring any to Halifax if they can take it to Portland.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not interrupt my argument, if you please. That has nothing to do with the question. I point out that the ocean-borne tonnage which the Canadian Pacific Railway either takes to or brings from the west, reaches its own line by St. John in 999 tons out of every one thousand tons carried. It is vital to the Canadian Pacific Railway that it should drop the western freight at St. John, and it will not carry any freight beyond St. John than it can possibly avoid. Its agents on the other side make arrangements with the shippers, and these shipments are about all brought by the line of steamers to St. John. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) has said with regard to the additional mileage allowed by the Canadian Pacific Railway when it carries tonnage between St. John and Halifax has no application. As to ocean-borne freight, the additional mileage allowance does not apply. It applies to local inland tonnage chiefly, and in its application it deprives the Intercolonial Railway of earnings which rightfully belong to it.

Mr. POWELL. I will give the hon. gentleman Mr. Wainwright's testimony on that point :

Q. As a railway expert, what on ordinary freight is the charge per ton per mile that would pay expenses ?—A. That is a very difficult thing to answer, as it depends a good deal upon the description of freight, the quantity you can carry and the distance of haul. In carrying coal, for instance, we do not calculate at a rate per ton per mile ; we calculate what we can carry a train-load at. It is carried in train-loads, and we afford to carry it very much cheaper per ton per mile than in the case of other classes of freight.

Q. Take hauls of 400, 500, or 1,000 miles, for instance, what would you regard as a satisfactory charge ?—A. We look upon half a cent to five-eighths of a cent per ton mile as satisfactory.

Q. That is a satisfactory rate ?—A. It is a covering rate, if carried for some distance in train-loads.

Q. And there is a fair profit in that ?

Mr. Haggart.—It is according to the distance altogether ?

The Witness.—Yes, entirely.

By Mr. Powell :

Q. I am asking about long distance train-loads. As a supplementary question, let me ask you what proportion would be profit and what proportion expense ?—A. That goes into the question entirely of working.

Q. Well, ordinarily, there must be some recognized figure on long hauls ?—A. The working of the railway may be expensive or it may be economical.

Q. I understand all that. Take a fairly economically managed road, take the Intercolonial, for instance, what do you think would be the cost per ton per mile over that for long hauls, under favourable conditions ?—A. I could not tell you as to the Intercolonial. On our own road at half a cent per ton per mile, under most favourable conditions, we should not make more than one-tenth of a cent per ton per mile.

Q. Railway experts have informed me that, on these long hauls, the cost ordinarily would be three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. I should like to ask you if that would be a fair estimate of the cost of the transportation of freight ?

Mr. Morrison objected to the question on the ground that it was going beyond the scope of the investigation.

Question allowed.

A. It would depend upon the construction of the railway and the grades. One road can be worked very much cheaper than another.

Q. I recognize all those things ; but would that be a fair rate on a perfectly level road without any drawbacks at all ?—A. That is about the mark, everything being favourable.

Now, you are hauling it for half of the rate which Mr. Wainwright says would be satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You do not know.

Mr. POWELL. Well, I do know, because I have the division of rates and the proportional allowance on two cars. I may say that this clause will mean a loss to the revenue of the country, and if the Minister cannot get a better arrangement, it would be far better for him not to dabble in ocean freight at all, but let it go by way of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we are originating traffic 1,000 miles west of Montreal, on the Grand Trunk Railway system, and supposing that is going through as an export from the city of Halifax, who fixes the rate on that export freight which is originated at that point a thousand miles west of Montreal ? Is it done by one road or is it done after consultation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has to be done by agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway traffic officers and our officers.

Mr. FOSTER. After it goes a thousand miles to Montreal and 800 miles to Halifax, and gets on the ocean, when you come to divide the rate, does the Grand Trunk Railway get its proportion for a thousand miles ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Intercolonial Railway, which carries it 840 miles, gets its proportion on the arbitrary 425 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is largely an advantage which is given to the Grand Trunk Railway, because it orginates the traffic. Now, when we originate freight, say, in London, if it comes to Halifax—I hope the Minister will arrange for that business as well as for the business of the west—and we carry it eight hundred odd miles, and we give it to the Grand Trunk Railway, to take it one thousand miles west of Montreal, to the point of distribution, are we paid the rate that is agreed on, on the 800 miles, or on the arbitrary 425 miles ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If we agreed with the Grand Trunk Railway to carry that freight from Halifax and deliver it to them at Montreal for western destination, the rate being fixed to our satisfaction, I think under this clause the proportionate tons would be for the 425 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. When it reached Montreal and was transferred to the Grand Trunk and then carried a thousand miles west, they would get their proportion on that thousand miles, that is there is no arbitrary in favour of the Intercolonial Railway even when we originate the traffic. I am glad to understand that. Now, one other point : Will my hon. friend explain why he is so very anxious to take everything away from the city of St. John——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will not make any point there.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope I have not misunderstood the hon. Minister's proposal. But before he answers that, I want to ask how this arrangement under the supplementary

traffic arrangement varies between St. John and Halifax. This is a local question, but one of some importance. In this, has the hon. gentleman not given Halifax the advantage over St. John in the matter of the arbitrary ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How it will work out I can better answer, and my officers can better answer, after the experiment is tried——

Mr. FOSTER. So my hon. friend first makes an arrangement——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish what I was going to say. My own view would be that the difference between the two mileages allowed here is not prejudicial either to St. John or to Halifax. We agreed upon a difference in mileage, which, I think, experience justified the officers in recommending, seeing that Halifax is some 100 miles further from the west than St. John and the difference allowed to them being 50 miles. Both are practically on the same footing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I figured it out and found that 425 bore the same proportion to the actual distance to Halifax as 375 bore to the actual distance to St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. But the city of St. John has a much longer sea voyage, has it not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Considering that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) and some others have been assailing the Minister of Railways and Canals for doing some great injustice by his general policy to the city of Halifax, it is refreshing to have the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) intimating that by his present policy the hon. Minister is taking trade away from St. John to Halifax. It balances the argument in a very convenient way, and I thank the hon. gentleman for it.

Mr. FOSTER. You are welcome.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I assure the hon. gentleman it will be found of great value in answering some of the statements made on the other side of the House. I would like to say a few words in answer to what was stated by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I understood his argument on the probable loss on the traffic to be based on figures given by Mr. Wainwright to the committee. He argued that half a cent per ton or five-eighths of a cent per ton was the lowest rate at which the traffic could be carried. When asked directly about the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Wainwright did not answer.

Mr. POWELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. Mr. Wainwright said that would be a fair average rate for the traffic, but if the actual cost was considered, he would make a reduction to about three-tenths of a cent per ton.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) will, perhaps, allow me to remind him of something about this traffic. Mr. Wainwright could not answer about the Intercolonial Railway, but my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) assumed that the statement regarding the Grand Trunk might apply to the Intercolonial Railway, because they are roads of a similar character. Therefore, it is fair to assume that if the traffic is carried at rates very materially below that given by Mr. Wainwright it would be carried at a loss. For many years the Intercolonial Railway has been carrying a large portion of its traffic at three-tenths of a cent per ton.

Mr. POWELL. Coal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A very large portion of its traffic—not export traffic, and it is the universal practice of railways to make better rates for export traffic than for local traffic or for through traffic that is not for export. If twenty years ago we could carry coal at three-tenths of a cent a ton without loss—and that was the claim made by hon. gentlemen opposite—they always said that while they were carrying it at a close margin——

Mr. POWELL. What was your claim about it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said it was not too low for a long haul. But I did claim in one case that it was too low for a short haul. If we are right in assuming that three-tenths of a cent per ton which was the rate for many years on coal traffic, while not very profitable, was a paying rate, a rate which guarded against loss, surely with the facilities and improvements since then in the form of larger cars, more powerful engines, better tracks and other things that have cheapened transportation, it would not be an extreme stretch to say that you could carry it for two-tenths of a cent per ton to-day. So I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) has established that there is any loss on the traffic. This, perhaps, is a fair matter for debate. It is a question where somebody must be given the benefit of the doubt. The Minister of Railways and Canals has given the benefit of the doubt to the maritime province ports of St. John and Halifax. He is not absolutely sure that he can do this traffic at a profit, but he is willing to try. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) says that this is bad business, that the Minister is going to make the trial first and see if he can make money by it. I think that the idea that this is a concession to the Grand Trunk is a mistake. Whatever concession is made regarding ocean traffic is made to the ports of St. John and Halifax and not to the Grand Trunk Railway. The whole country is interested in having the traffic carried through the lower provinces, and if there is a doubt in the matter surely it is wise to give the benefit

of the doubt on that side. We are spending vast sums of money in opening up and providing facilities for transportation from the west, by the construction of railways, the deepening of our canals and otherwise, measures which are practically approved of on both sides of the House. It is recognized that this transportation problem cannot be viewed from a narrow standpoint, but you must take a broad view of it, you must have with regard to it what may be properly called a National Policy, to carry the traffic of Canada to Montreal and Quebec in summer, and to Halifax, St. John and any other ports that may be opened up in the winter. Therefore, what the Minister is doing, where the absolute cost of transportation is open to doubt not to give the benefit of it to the Grand Trunk—because the Grand Trunk does not want to take away traffic from Portland—but to the maritime ports of St. John and Halifax. And in the carrying out of this policy, I think hon. members should give their support and commendation.

Mr. POWELL. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Fielding) has the slightest confidence in his own argument.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. I almost doubt it. The hon. gentleman is too good a logician for that. The point I made was not as to helping or hindering the ports of St. John or Halifax with regard to the trade of Canada. I say it would be better to build them up, but I say you will better build them up by the existing arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Under that arrangement, the country would be making something; there would be no likelihood of the deficit of the Intercolonial Railway being increased by haulage for nothing. If the trade came to Halifax, would it not be in the interest of the country to have it transferred at the port of St. John or at the union station of St. John rather than take it to Montreal by the Intercolonial Railway at a loss?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I may deal with the Halifax end of the question, I think the Minister of Railways and Canals has answered that by showing that the trade is not taken to Halifax by the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have every interest to take the traffic from St. John and not to take it over the Intercolonial Railway at all, and that is what is happening and will continue. Whatever may be thought of the hon. gentleman's argument elsewhere, I feel confident that he will not get the support of the hon. member for Halifax or of any man who is interested in Halifax.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) must know that under this arrangement you cannot hope for one ton of traffic that originates on the Grand Trunk system.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not correct, because they have engaged to give us any freight which may be intended for ports in Europe with which they have no steamship lines connecting.

Mr. POWELL. I do not think so; I think you had better look that up. So far as Halifax is concerned, it may expect to get freight, oceanic freight, that is routed by way of Halifax, but what possible interest would prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from hauling freight from Montreal to St. John. The only case in which Halifax might expect to benefit would be in the case of freight originating on the Grand Trunk Railway and routed by way of Halifax for foreign ports. In respect to that freight the Intercolonial would be carrying it at a loss, and it would be better for the country if the Intercolonial had made this arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway, of course, would carry all the freight for shipment to St. John, and the Grand Trunk, for the same good reason, would carry it to Portland.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in assuming that all the expectations of the city of Halifax in reference to this matter are from freight coming from Europe. The commercial bodies and others at Halifax hope and expect that traffic will come from the west and be shipped from Halifax. Time alone will show whether this expectation is correct, but it is the expectation of the business people of Halifax. It would not be wise to assume that there is no expectation of Halifax securing a share of the traffic of the west.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish to be understood as accepting the statement of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) as to what will be the lowest rate at which we can carry freight over the Intercolonial for shipment to Halifax or St. John. There are too many varying conditions enter into the question to enable the hon. gentleman to make any calculation which would be accepted as applicable even in a general way.

Mr. POWELL. Would not the climatic conditions affect the question? In winter they would be most unfavourable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The climatic conditions do not enter into it to any great extent.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, if there is a snowstorm the cost is increased.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt winter storms do make the operation of the Intercolonial more expensive than some of the western roads. But the Intercolonial can add to its general tonnage without materially increasing the cost

over that of carrying the same tonnage on other lines. You have to have your staff and equipment so as to keep the road clear in the winter, but when once clear you can add to your tonnage and thereby reduce the percentage cost for the whole quantity carried. There are few railway men who will tell you what the cost of carrying freight over their lines is. They are not going to give you the lowest limit. I do not know that I would care to do it even if I were in possession of any information which would enable me to do so. There are a lot of considerations that we must not forget in figuring upon the question of cost. We would require a very much larger rate to carry coal from Sydney or Pictou to Montreal if we had to take back our cars empty, than if we could get return cargoes. We made arrangements, during the last winter, under which we were able to get loads for all the empties which were brought to Montreal, and we brought many thousands of tons of coal last winter to Montreal. The fact that we are able to get return loads materially reduced the cost. This is a consideration which must be taken into account before coming to any conclusion as to the cost. Then, if you take an ordinary railway company which has to pay interest on its bonds, and which is expected to pay dividends upon its stock, you are dealing with a different problem than when you have a Government railway which has not to pay interest on the capital with which it has been constructed.

Mr. POWELL. What is the return freight ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have carried a good deal of flour to maritime province ports. We get a large amount of coal from Springhill, which was brought to Montreal, and we carried. I think, as much as 100,000 or 125,000 barrels of flour as return cargoes.

Mr. POWELL. That would be practically the limit of the return freight.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be the limit, perhaps, of the flour that was sent to Springhill, but there is New Glasgow, Pictou and Sydney, to which the amount of freights that are sent is increasing every year. The amount of the tonnage we carried this present year is at least 200,000 more than was carried two years ago. My hon. friend will remember that he pointed with scorn to the calculations of the officers of the Intercolonial when they said that, when we should get into Montreal, we would be able to add 200,000 tons to the tonnage. Taking ten months of business, and adding to the ten months a reasonable addition for the increase between this year and 1897, and it will be shown that we carried very close on 200,000 tons more.

Mr. POWELL. How much of it is Springhill coal that goes to the Canadian Pacific Railway in St. John which did not go before, but went by means of barges ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the figures at hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As some reference has been made by several hon. gentlemen to the city I represent, I wish to say, that I did not understand myself as assailing the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. What I ventured to do, on the occasion referred to, was to point out that, if the Intercolonial was to compete with the Canadian Pacific, they had better take the freight to the city of Halifax than to St. John. By carrying the freight 97 miles further, they save 250 miles of an ocean voyage ; and it was conceded by the Minister of Railways, in the Drummond County inquiry, that the advantage of Halifax over St. John and Portland, as an ocean port, was very considerable, and it has been considered in the agreement we are now discussing, as equivalent to 1 cent per 100 pounds on all classes. In reference to what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said in regard to the competition by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had running powers into the city of Halifax on such a basis as was urged on the Government by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, or, to put it in another way, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had a line from St. John to Halifax, I have not the slightest doubt that it would be better for Halifax to compete by that line for the trade of the west, because it would be a shorter line. Under the existing conditions, no doubt, the observations of the hon. Minister of Finance have weight ; but, if you had proper running powers for the Canadian Pacific Railway, so as to put that railway in the same position as if its line were extended to Halifax, I think he will agree that Halifax would have a better chance for competing for the western business, via St. John, over the short line than over the Intercolonial Railway. We have not that, however, and I am willing to accord my support to the Minister of Railways in endeavouring to secure as best we can that business for Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. Minister of Railways said there was a large increase of coal carried by way of Chaudière during the last year or two. I have the figures, and I find that for the year 1897-98 there was carried by way of Chaudière only 9,084 tons. The heading of this table is as follows :—

The following table shows the number of tons of coal carried over the Intercolonial Railway from the Nova Scotia collieries to Chaudière Junction and St. John for points west thereof, and to local stations in each year since the road was opened as a through line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is this intended to prove?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wanted to prove that the statement made by the Minister to the House was not in accordance with the facts, when he said, that last year the coal carried——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not speaking of last year, but of the present year, only ten months of which have expired, and I estimated the remaining two months.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think the hon. gentleman is not correct. In 1893-94 there were carried 102,273 tons. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that the increase during the present year will come up to that, or to anything like what it was in 1889-90, when it amounted to 164,453 tons? This table shows an increase in the local traffic in coal. I am aware that there was a very large increase on the division of the Intercolonial Railway on which I reside, and that is not attributed to the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal, nor is it that he was able to use box-cars for taking coal from the Sydney collieries to New Glasgow. This year, for the first time in the history of the Intercolonial Railway, he got return cargoes. How can that be attributed to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal? The traffic in coal, delivered at short distances, amounted last year to 351,069 tons; the year before that, to 331,469 tons, and, the year before that, to 369,708 tons. I understand that there was a falling off in shipments from the Springhill colliery, but there was a large increase in the shipments from the Cape Breton collieries. More than that, there was a large increase in the freight rates charged on these short sections. I know that there used to be charged 40 and 50 cents a ton, where we now pay 75 cents a ton. I know this fact from personal experience.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the hon. member for Halifax states that if we had running powers for the Canadian Pacific from St. John to Halifax, that would be the best line we could have for the development of the western trade, it is enough to say that we have had such an arrangement for many years, and it has been so favourable to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has taken exception to it, and, yet, so far as freight traffic is concerned, it has not given satisfaction to the people of Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It was not such an arrangement as the people of Halifax desired.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Canadian Pacific Railway have had everything their own way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well we will not agree in that. Just a word to the Minister of Railways and Canals. It is apparent that the statement he has brought down does not touch the terminals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have stated that I will get that. I will have it to-morrow without fail, I imagine.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Minister of Railways, when he brings down that information, to bring this also. Supposing two cars start from Hamilton, via Montreal, one for Halifax and one for St. John, will he give us the total freight on each, with the amount paid to the Grand Trunk and the amount paid to the Intercolonial Railway? The hon. gentleman stated that the railroad on which the freight originated, had not the arbitrary power of fixing the rates on the Intercolonial. I am aware that the Intercolonial specially exempted itself from having the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway make through freights over its lines. As a general rule, they can do it, because the railroad on which freight originates, can make the rates over their own line and the connecting lines. I wish the Minister to be certain on that point. But, surely, he is mistaken in reference to ocean steamers. They have an arrangement with nearly every railroad on the continent of America, under which they can quote rates for passengers or freight to any part of the country, and their proportion is an agreed percentage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is surely in error in that. I know that the steamships which sail from Halifax and St. John, are practically in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and have almost refused to enter into contracts.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me altogether. I am talking of every steamship company that has agents in Europe for the purpose of carrying passengers and freight to this country. They have a common arrangement, by which they can quote rates by the Intercolonial, as well as by every other railroad, and the percentage to be paid to the railroad is fixed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They cannot really do it, because the ship-owners will tell you that they are squeezed by the railroads, unless they have been able to compel or induce the railway companies to agree to give them an outward freight, and stipulate as to the rate for the inward freight.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When a shipper in England asks a shipping agent, what it will cost to deliver goods in Toronto from Halifax, for instance, surely, the agent must depend upon a rate supplied to him by the Intercolonial Railway. It will be for the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk to divide the amount they get for the delivery of the

goods at Toronto between themselves; and what I understand the ex-Minister of Railways to ask is, what proportion the Grand Trunk gets, and what proportion the Intercolonial gets, for carrying that freight.

Bill reported.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to inquire again what progress has been made with the evidence in connection with Mr. Ogilvie's report?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I think I will be able to lay it on the Table to-morrow.

THE CASE OF MR. BOWER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman had time to look into the case of Mr. Bower, the surveyor who went up for examination, and whose letter I handed him across the floor of the House some days ago?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gave instructions to my deputy to see the chairman of the Board of Examiners and endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes, if possible. I have no reply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With regard to the return ordered in connection with the New Westminster Crown and Timber Office, and my request for a preliminary return, showing the correspondence leading to the commission and the commission itself, when can we have that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I inquired yesterday, and think it will be ready to-morrow.

Mr. PRIOR. Will it be long before the returns are brought down with reference to the Songhees Indian reserve, and also the claims for compensation for lands taken for fortification purposes at Macaulay Point?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If there has been an order for that return, it has not been called to my attention. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to send me a memorandum, giving the page of "Hansard," on which the order is recorded, and I will have the matter looked up at once.

Mr. PRIOR. Page 207 of "Hansard."

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

(In the Committee.)

Steamboat inspection.....	$27,200
Inspection of Dominion steamers and fog alarms	1,300

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That item 207 stood, subject to the understanding that the committee would be free to consider as well as any item in No. 208. I wish to call attention to a return which the hon. Minister of Marine was good enough to expedite in connection with the appointment and dismissal of Mr. Russell, inspector of steamboats, and his recent reinstatement in the public service. There seems to be an absence of some material papers in that return. The first part of the return, which leads up to the dismissal of Mr. Russell, appears to be all right, but the second part does not contain any paper, except one, bearing on the order for papers in connection with his reinstatement to the public service and for all communications concerning this officer since he has been discharging duties in the Yukon district. The only paper in that part of the return is a letter in which Mr. Russell forwards some views of Dawson City, and a sketch of the Yukon River.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I understand that there are some communications which the hon. gentleman thinks have been forwarded to the department, respecting Mr. Russell's conduct since his re-appointment. These are probably not on the files at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is an omission, no doubt inadvertently, because this return contains no information whatever, showing how Mr. Russell came to be ordered to go to the Yukon, although it was clear that he was up there, since he forwarded to the department some views that he had taken. I call attention to some important papers in connection with this officer since he was reinstated and which are missing. In the first place, he was dismissed on complaints in my time, and these are in the returns; but, as the hon. gentleman admitted a few nights ago, there were complaints also in his time, which he investigated and dealt with. None of these complaints appear. On page 3159 of the unrevised "Hansard," the hon. gentleman is reported as having said:

> I wrote Mr. Russell, the inspector, calling especial attention to these complaints.

But there is no communication whatever to Mr. Russell on this subject here:

> I also wrote my collector of customs, requesting, &c.

There is nothing of that here, though, of course, it might well be out of this return, strictly speaking.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had no reference to complaints against Russell.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The complaint was the way vessels were running there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It had nothing to do with him personally?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. But at page 3160 the hon. Minister said:

In fact an investigation was made under my own management, and while a great deal of evidence was given,——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is some mistake there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I took part in this discussion, and "Hansard" carries out exactly what I founded my request upon and pressed the hon. gentleman so much about this return for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was no investigation made by me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister so stated.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There must be an error.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is the whole sentence, and perhaps the Minister will have his mind refreshed by it:

Yes, I did look at the record.

I was referring to the old investigation, and knew nothing about this, and I asked the Minister if he had looked at the record to see if this would warrant the officer's reinstatement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is all right. I think the hon. gentleman will find a letter from me in the return brought down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is, to Russell?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister says:

In fact an investigation was made under my own management, &c.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a mistake in reporting. There was no investigation under my management.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister's memory must have been at fault either then or now, because he particularizes what the complaints were, and they are not what I had in my mind. He says there was a complaint of intemperance.

Russell had discharged his duties for some months. Then complaints were made to me that his habits were not what they ought to be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These were personal complaints.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but official. The hon. Minister goes on:

I made inquiries,——

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Of course, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

——and found that there was a time when that was so, but that he had reformed, and they were now all right.

This is most important in connection with this subject. For what was the point I was raising? This is a subject, perhaps, too large to enter into now, but one that I will enter into at some fitting time. Here was an officer dismissed by the Governor in Council for very grave cause, he not only having violated positive instructions but violated a statute which had been called to his attention. Contrary to instructions he persisted in having financial transactions and relations with these men whose work he was instructed to inspect, having these men in the position of his debtors in connection with the very work he was inspecting. The law forbade it, his instructions forbade it, and surely there could hardly be more serious charges. In connection with the whole subject and this officer's conduct there was his misrepresentation of the facts to the department and his exceedingly improper conduct, when he was dismissed from the service, in getting him out of his office and getting him to obey an Order in Council that provided for his dismissal. My point was that it was an extraordinary thing that a man like that should be taken into that very service again as inspector, when the law requires on its very face that the man should be above suspicion, should be wholly untainted with anything that would suggest that he was other than a man of complete independence in relation to the proprietors of steamboats. This officer having failed in that regard and having violated his oath—because there is an oath of office required under the statute—was dismissed, and afterwards reinstated. And the Minister admitted that he had not very closely investigated his previous record, because he did not recollect very serious charges against him. But he went on to state that there were complaints against him in his own time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand it thoroughly now. If the hon. gentleman will refer first to page 3160——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am referring to page 3159.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman referred to the statement that I made:

I know that other officers on the coast had charges made against them in connection with property that they were surveying, in fact an investigation was made under my own management——

That was against other officers, not against Russell. I refer particularly to the inspector

of hulls at Victoria. This is not misreported when taken in its proper connection.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have accepted the hon. Minister's statement as at page 3160. I am now dealing with that at page 3159, where it is made clear that Russell was a man whose conduct was investigated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries after a complaint had been made, and whom the Minister found guilty but forgave.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is the hon. gentleman's language:

> Russell had discharged his duty for some months, when complaints were made to me that his habits were not what they ought to be. I made inquiry and found that there was a time when that was so, but that he had reformed, and that they were now all right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had my attention called to Russell's conduct by some hon. gentlemen. I do not now recollect exactly. I mean my attention was called personally and verbally to the statement that this man Russell was in the habit of drinking. I spoke to the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) on the subject, and he gave me the assurance that while there might have been some truth in the statement at one time, he was able to assure me that Russell had reformed and that I need not trouble myself. And nothing further was done than that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the hon. Minister's statement as to the facts, but surely it is a most extraordinary proceeding in connection with an office of this character, when complaints are made that they should be disposed of in this summary and casual manner, no inquiry held and no record made in the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I spoke to the hon. member for Burrard.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think that this is the way to conduct public business or that it is the way the hon. Minister usually conducts public business. If an officer in such a position is reported to him by a member of Parliament to be conducting himself improperly, I think the matter should not end there. The Minister has officers in his service, he has an agent for the province, and there should be some official investigation ordered of the complaint thus made. I accept the hon. Minister's statement that there is no official correspondence touching these complaints.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no recollection of any.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but, now that he puts it in that way, of course with the understanding that he will look into it. I call his attention further to the extraordinary absence of any instructions to this officer in regard to his performing any duties in the Yukon district. There is not a line showing the assignment of this officer to a particular district. The Act provides that the officers are appointed for such district as the Governor in Council prescribes. The Order in Council prescribes that this man shall be appointed inspector for the province of British Columbia, and the Minister put through an Act last year giving him some powers in regard to the North-west Territories and the Yukon district, and by an assignment of powers, an officer could be told off to perform special duties. But there is no authority of that formal character, and there is no letter beyond this one of the 27th of April, 1898, assigning to him the duties of hull inspector for the Skeena River and the northern part of British Columbia, and of boiler inspector for the province, by virtue of section 4 of the Act of 1878. But there is no authority in these papers for this officer to act in the Yukon district and the North-west Territories, although the Minister tells us that he was the officer who was assigned to perform those duties. After his return he writes:

> I took the liberty a few days ago to send you a photograph of Dawson City, which I procured whilst I was there.

That was written October 1st, 1898. The Minister told us in committee that this was the officer who was performing the duties of steamboat inspector in the Yukon district, and to confirm that regulation there is this communication. It is clear this officer must have made some report, or there must be an extraordinary state of affairs in the department. It was his duty to report in connection with all the work he did in the Yukon district, to report the name of every vessel that he inspected, and the Order in Council called for all communications from this officer since he has been discharging such duties in the Yukon district.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you think it covers the official reports? I do not so read it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly, I do not think it could be made plainer. The clerk who prepared these papers evidently read it in that way. This officer went up there as steamboat inspector, but he was not vested with any authority. Of course, if the Minister states, after investigation, that he was not invested with any authority, and that he did not inspect any ships, of course I accept it. I have looked through the returns, and while it appears that certain vessels plying in the Yukon waters were inspected, some of those vessels were inspected in Vancouver and some in Victoria previous to their voyage north. But

my point is as to whether this man performed any duties in the Yukon, and if he did, that would be shown by an official report which will give the names of the vessels that he inspected, and the work that he did.

Mr. TAYLOR. In this item for fisheries and fishery protection service, I see there is an increase of $5,000. I want to know why this increase is necessary. In my opinion it is quite unnecessary; and if the Minister and the Government would conduct the business of this country as they promised to do, that is to say, on business principles, instead of increasing this item by $5,000, they would have decreased it from $95,000 to $75,000. I will refer to a few details to show how they are throwing away the people's money for the benefit of their political friends. In the Auditor General's Report for 1897-98, K-96, I find the name of F. F. Courtney, of Halifax, who received $241 for supplies for one of these steamers. Among the items charged the hon. gentleman will find two bushels of pease, at $2.50 a bushel. Well, pease were sold last year all through the country at 60 cents, that is what we paid the farmers for them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is beans, not pease.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, beans are the same price; they were sold last year for 60 cents a bushel. Now, we will come to Charlottetown, to friends of the hon. Minister, Davidson & Co. He had to give them something, and they put in a bill for $464. Among the items they supplied to the steamer were 120 pounds of beans at 3 cents a pound; that is equal to $1.80 a bushel. Twenty pounds of cheese at 14 cents per pound; we all know what cheese was worth last year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Eight cents per pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cape Breton says it was worth 8 cents per pound down there.

Mr. McMILLAN. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that cheese is selling for 14 cents per pound in Ottawa to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not talking about to-day. I am talking about what is contained in the Auditor General's Report. The next item I take up is four cases of condensed milk, which is made in that country. It is charged at from $7.95 to $9.60.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not made in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, but it is made in Truro, and my hon. friend says that it is sold in Victoria at $5.60 per case. Five barrels of flour at $6.50 per barrel; four pounds of currants, 10 cents per pound. Every person knows that you can get three pounds of currants in any retail store for 25 cents, but the hon. Minister has to give his political friend in Charlottetown 10 cents per pound. The next item is a case of lobsters, $12. Some of my hon. friends from the maritime provinces will be able to tell what these are worth.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They are worth $7 to $8 per case.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) from Cape Breton says that they are worth from $7 to $8 at the outside value.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will this friend of yours enter into a contract to furnish them at that price?

Mr. TAYLOR. He is talking about last year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is when these articles were supplied.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from West Huron, to help to strengthen the case of the Government, stated that cheese was selling at 14 cents per pound in Ottawa. The price of cheese to-day in Ottawa is 8 cents per pound.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was in a store in Ottawa to-day and saw cheese retailed at 14 cents per pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. The next item is fifty pounds of split peas at 5 cents per pound. If my hon. friend will turn to the Auditor General's Report, I—19, Kingston Penitentiary, he will find that my friend James Crawford supplied the Kingston Penitentiary with 14,833 pounds of split pease at 1¾ cents per pound. Yet my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) pays his friend in Charlottetown 5 cents per pound, or 300 per cent profit.

Mr. ELLIS. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) would not feed the Canadian navy on the same food that he would give to convicts.

Mr. TAYLOR. We all know what split pease are. They are just the same pease that go to the Canadian navy or to Her Majesty that are supplied to the convicts. They are grown by the farmers, and they are put into the machine and split. We will now go back to Halifax. One of the steamers in the service required some repairs and the hon. Minister gave the job to Longard Brothers, of Halifax. These men had some repair work on one of the steamers, and they sent in a bill for 7½ days' labour at $5 per day, 228¾ days' labour at $4 per day, and 87½ pounds of solder at 35 cents per pound. We all know what solder is worth. I would ask my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) what solder is worth?

Mr. WOOD. Tin has gone up, you know.

Mr. TAYLOR. Longard Brothers supplied men at $4 per day to do the work on this steamer, when they perhaps hired these men for $2 per day. I see another amount where the same prices are charged by political friends who supplied labour at 20 per cent more than they could have hired it for. Longard Brothers got altogether $1,729. Then we have Archie Currie, of Souris, P.E.I., who presented a bill for $947 for supplies for one of these steamers. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) will find it at K—104 of the Auditor General's Report. One item there is four bushels of green apples at $2 per bushel. Some of my hon. friends will know who Archie Currie is. As I am informed, he is one of the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Another item is 170 pounds of beans at 4 cents per pound, another 44½ pounds of cheese at 14 cents per pound; four barrels of flour at $7 per barrel; fifty gallons of coal oil at 30 cents per gallon. Coal oil, we know, is worth 19 cents to 20 cents per gallon, sold down there by the barrel. Another item is fourteen pounds of rope at 12 cents per pound, 6½ cords of wood at $5 per cord. What is wood worth in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. ELLIS. I pay that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think you would get wood in Prince Edward Island for very much less.

Mr. McDOUGALL. You can get lots of it for $3 a cord.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is quoting cheap prices when he is not supplying the goods himself.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I could supply all the cordwood the hon. gentleman wants at $3 per cord.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) would invite tenders for his supplies he would not have to pay such prices. This gentleman supplied 175 pounds of beans at 4 cents per pound, equal to $2.40 per bushel. Then the hon. gentleman had another friend at Halifax, and he had to have a little patronage. There was W. C. Anderson, of Halifax, who received something.

Mr. MILLS. He is a Grit.

Mr. TAYLOR. He puts in a bill for $126.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What page is that on?

Mr. TAYLOR. Page K—92. I intended to draw the attention of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) to these matters, but I see he is in the gallery entertaining a number of his friends. As his constituents know, when he was running an election, he scored the Government for having paid too much for jack-knives, and small articles of that kind. If the farmers of Frontenac knew that the Government were paying these prices they would catch these Patrons by the neck, and ask them why they did not get up and criticise the Government for paying such prices. W. C. Anderson of Halifax, supplied 120 pounds of red onions, equal to two bushels, at 4 cents a pound, or $2.40 per bushel.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They were sent from Montreal to Halifax and sold at $1.25 and $1.50 per barrel.

Mr. TAYLOR. And yet, here is Mr. Anderson of Quebec paid $4.80 for 120 pounds of red onions. A. Chouinard & Co. of Quebec had to receive a little pap out of this $5,000 extra which the Minister asked for. They got 15 cents a pound for 28 pounds of biscuits, and $2.40 a dozen for condensed milk, and $9.60 for two cases of condensed milk; when my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) away out in Victoria, B.C., sells milk made in Nova Scotia at $5.60 for two cases. But Mr. Chouinard has to be paid for his work for the Liberal party. Then here is Kirouac & Fils who were paid for two bushels of beans at $1.50 a bushel, $6.50 a barrel for two barrels of flour——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am told that beans were sold in car-load lots at $1.15 per bushel in Halifax, and if they charged $1.50 by retail it would not be a very large profit.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why should you allow them to buy at retail prices anyway?

Mr. TAYLOR. This fellow was not so bad about his beans as some of the others.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, you give up the beans.

Mr. TAYLOR. By Auditor General's Report at page K—94, we find they have another friend at Quebec whom they have to provide for. Louis Marois had a little account of $302 in which items occur such as these: Apples, $7 a barrel; two bushels of beets at $1.50 per bushel; eleven bushels of carrots at $1.50 per bushel; and two barrels of onions at $5 a barrel. Is there a farmer in this country who produces these articles that will approve of such prices?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What time of the year was that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not care if they were kept on cold storage from the fall till the spring, the price is too high. Will the Minister attempt to justify such prices at any season of the year? They have another friend at Quebec, Mr. Charles A. Parent, who is an active supporter of the Prime Minister and his friends, and he had a little account of $1,363.35. Let me ask my hon.

friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) what is the price of axes?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It depends on the make.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the best axe-makers in Canada as well as in the United States and I know the prices. Parent supplied four axes at $1.10 each.

Mr. WOOD. That is cheap.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you sell cotton waste for?

Mr. WOOD. It depends on the quality.

Mr. TAYLOR. The quality that is used by an engineer for cleaning his engine.

Mr. WOOD. There are several kinds.

Mr. TAYLOR. Parent charged 8½ cents a pound for 251 pounds of cotton waste, and 10 cents a pound for 100 pounds——

Mr. WOOD. I consider it very cheap.

Mr. TAYLOR. You do, but you sell it at 1½ cents or 2 cents a pound.

Mr. WOOD. Nonsense.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am in the manufacturing business, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. WOOD. I buy hundreds of bales of it, and I never can buy it for that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Tell me what you paid for it.

Mr. WOOD. Oh, that is private.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That cotton waste was only purchased after samples and prices had been submitted to the agents, and the samples approved of.

Mr. WOOD. Was it white or coloured?

Mr. TAYLOR. One hundred pounds were white, and the other was coloured. We will take something that every one knows the price of. Here is a gentleman named Trumble, at Quebec, that supplied the steamer with bread. He sold 170 loaves at 20 cents, 260 loaves at 18 cents, 212 loaves at 16 cents per loaf, and, if you turn to K—108 you will find that the steamer "Petrel" was supplied with bread at Owen Sound by W. T. Bell at the following prices:—350 loaves at 6 cents, and 464 loaves at 5 cents. Bread is bread at Quebec or Owen Sound, and it is supplied to the steamer at Owen Sound for 5 cents a loaf, and to the steamer at Quebec for 18 cents a loaf.

Mr. FOSTER. They must be sweetbreads.

Mr. McGREGOR. They are four-pound loaves at Quebec, and two-pound loaves at Owen Sound.

Mr. TAYLOR. How do you know?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Where is that item for bread at Quebec?

Mr. TAYLOR. At page K—95: W. Trumble & Co.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That must have been under the old regime, because he is a good Tory. It is a legacy from the old system.

Mr. TAYLOR. No matter what the people did, if my hon. friend the Solicitor General will apply his eyesight to the Auditor General's Report, on page K-95, the fourth item from the top of the page, he will find that W. Trumble & Co., of Quebec, supplied 170 loaves of bread at 20 cents, 260 loaves at 18 cents, and 212 loaves at 16 cents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How many pounds to the loaf?

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the 4-pound loaf, the largest loaf we have.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, a 6-pound loaf.

Mr. FOSTER. No, never.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, take the steamer "Petrel." When she went to Owen Sound her people were told to obtain supplies from a political supporter, and they went to F. N. LePan & Co., who put in a bill for 12 gallons of boiled oil at 75 cents a gallon. If you go down to Chown & Co., of Kingston, you will be able to get boiled oil at 44 cents a gallon. LePan & Co. got 14 cents a pound for cotton waste, and 8 cents a pound for red lead.

Mr. WOOD. Was that genuine or No. 1?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not care whether it was genuine or No. 1, or the best white lead.

Mr. WOOD. Was it brown or dry?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will rise and tell this House what he supplies the best quality of red lead or white lead for, I will accept his statement.

Mr. WOOD. I am not in that line just now.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, do not contradict me.

Mr. WOOD. I am merely asking you the quality.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I say that at 8 cents a pound there is 50 per cent more profit than there is on the best white lead. I went into a store down here and asked the price of the best white lead, and they told me $6 a hundred. Hon. gentlemen have another friend up in Owen Sound, and they could not give all the trade to LePan & Co., because the other man would be mad. So they go to Mr. J. W. Redfern and they get raw oil from him, but he does not charge more than 70 cents a gallon. His conscience was not as strong as the conscience of LePan & Co. He charges

6 cents a pound for red lead. These are just a few of the items I have selected that go to show why the hon. Minister is asking for an increase of $5,000 on this item. He claimed that the department, if run economically, could reduce very materially the prices charged by the late Government. Why do these hon. gentlemen not do what they promised to do—run the affairs of this country on business principles? Here is the Minister asking for $100,000 to be expended on the fishery protection service. The great bulk of the money is to pay for men and supplies on these steamers, and there is not a single article purchased except from political friends, who are permitted to charge whatever prices their conscience will allow them to charge. For instance, take condensed milk made at Truro and sold at the next port at $9 a case, when it can be taken over to Victoria and retailed there at $5.60. The steamer "Quadra" is on the coast at Victoria, or I believe she is engaged at present in cruising with a pleasure party, and we will not see the items of her supplies for this year until the next Auditor General's Report is presented. But on page K-18 of the Auditor General's Report for last year, it will be found that Fell & Co., of Victoria, supplied condensed milk at $5.60 a case, when the hon. gentleman pays at Charlottetown, Halifax and other places in the maritime provinces from $8 to $9 a case. I do not know who Fell & Co., of Victoria, are ; but my hon. friend from Victoria says that the supplies out there were bought by tender, which makes the difference. Fell & Co. supplied coffee at 25 cents a pound and cheese at 10 cents a pound. I presume my hon. friend the Solicitor General will endeavour to say that the old Government did the same thing. I say that makes no difference. The members of the present Government, when in Opposition, condemned the late Government, and said, "When we get into power, we are going to run the country on business principles."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You have to convert the people around. They have been spoiled.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend admits the truth of my statement. They have to convert the people, and the way they do it is by purchasing supplies and paying them two and three prices for them. That is an admission from the Solicitor General which ought to damn the Government in the eyes of all honest men.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Perhaps we ought to have adopted a more speedy method of conversion by cutting the heads off the Tory contractors.

Mr. TAYLOR. I venture to say that if the inspectors are put on the stand, they will tell you that they have nothing to say in regard to these supplies ; they are simply told that Mr. So-and-so will furnish them. Now, I quoted a few moments ago the prices paid last year for flour—$6.50, $6.75 and $7. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's Report at page I-25, he will find that last year the contract for flour for St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary was let by tender, and the price was $3.49 a barrel.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the honest department.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the honest department of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. I want to draw attention to the prices, where large quantities of goods had to be let by tender for supply the year round. The prices charged was $3.49 for supplying the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary with flour, and just to show you the difference, when purchased without tender, as compared with goods purchased by tender, why you paid for baking soda for the steamers, 59 pounds, in one of these accounts, at 50 cents a pound, and for baking powder supplied by contract by Crawford & Co., at Kingston, 12½ cents per pound.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What brand of baking powder was that ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many pounds of cotton waste were bought ?

Mr. TAYLOR. 249 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. I protest against the Solicitor General giving 249 cotton waists for the use of his department.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a waste of the people's money.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis), a short time ago, discussing the question of beans down there, said that $1.50 per bushel was not too high, yet at Kingston, Crawford & Co. supplied them at one cent per pound. Currants, that run all through the accounts I have been reading, are charged at 10 cents per pound, whereas in Kingston they are supplied at 5½ cents per pound. Pease are supplied at 1⅝ cents per pound, equal to 82 cents per barrel, yet $2.40 are charged in these accounts I have been reading. Cheese was supplied at Kingston during the same year at 9 cents per pound. In one of the accounts I have just read, you will find 50 pounds of sago and tapioca charged at 8 cents per pound, but according to the Auditor General's Report, page I-19, 4 cents was charged to Kingston per pound for sago and tapioca. My hon. friend, therefore, just paid 100 per cent more to his political supporters down there for the items of sago and tapioca. This was at Charlottetown.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much is sago and tapioca worth at Charlottetown ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I really cannot tell.

Mr. TAYLOR. Eight cents per pound are charged for these articles at Charlottetown by his political friends. No doubt on the line of conduct advocated by the Solicitor General, in order to convert these people into supporting the present Government, and so long as they get these prices they will in all probability continue to support it. I ask hon. Ministers how are they going to account to the people for this failure to redeem their pledge that they were going to conduct the affairs of the country on business principles. What will the farmers think of these prices, who are purchasing the greatest proportion of the goods I have been reading? How will they measure up this Government, which is paying three or four times what the goods are worth, for the purpose of converting the people? I fancy that when they come to cast their next ballots, many of them will not do as they did before, but will say: We elected this Government, thinking they were going to save 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the people's money, as compared with the late Government; thinking they were going to do business on business principles, but in place of that they are spending $100,000 on what under the late Government cost only $95,000. And for aught we know the Government will come down with Supplementary Estimates to make up any further deficiency arising out of these big prices. The hon. gentleman has no right to ask for an increase of $5,000 this year for goods that could be supplied at $5,000 less, and that, if tenders were called for, could be supplied at $10,000 less, taking the quantity of supplies required. If he would call for tenders from Conservatives as well as Reformers, this saving would be effected. I have no fault to find with the Government for giving their political friends the advantage, all other things being equal, but they have no reason to give their political supporters double prices for everything they supply.

I have two or three other tables to refer to, and when the hon. Minister of Militia submits to us his estimates, he will have not only to do as well as the Minister of Marine but go one or two better, because I can show that he has paid prices for goods that are utterly exorbitant.

For the benefit of my hon. friend from Hamilton, who is an authority on hardware, I would ask him to refer to the "Maritime Merchant, Halifax and St. John," in its issue of Thursday, 9th June, 1898, page 58, in which he will find quotations for white lead:

> Pure is now selling at 6 cents, and No. 1 at $5.50 for ordinary size packages, and smaller packages half a cent higher. Brandon's B.B. No. 1 at $6 a 100.

If these hon. gentlemen read the newspapers they will find in them quotations for all staple articles, flour, cotton, nails, paint, and the farmers know whether they are paying too much for these goods or not. The farmers of this country know whether they are paying too much for these goods or not. I asked the Prime Minister the other day what the binder twine made in the penitentiary was sold for? He said it was sold, but he could not give the prices, because the parties had not disposed of it. Binder twine is one of those articles the price of which is published every day. However, I will discuss that point when we come to the penitentiary accounts. The wholesale prices of all these staple articles are published, and the farmers know whether the merchants are taking advantage of them or not. Now, I hope that in concurrence on this item the Minister will ask the House to be divided, because I will move that it be reduced by $5,000. Our constituents will, I believe, feel that we are not doing our duty if we allow $5,000 more to be given for this service this year than last year, considering the exorbitant prices that have been paid for supplies.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to an item that was brought up on a notice given by me some weeks ago. I asked the following questions:

1. Who was the purchaser of the fishery cruiser "Dolphin"?
2. Was the sale by public auction, public tender or by private sale?
3. If by public tender or public auction, in what paper or papers did the notices appear inviting such tenders or announcing such proposed sale?
4. For what figure was she sold, and who was the purchaser?
5. What was the cost of repairs and fittings of this boat for the years 1895-96, 1896-97, 1897-98?

To this the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries replied as follows:—

1. H. B. Harrison, of Owen Sound. 2. Private sale, first having been offered to the Government of Ontario for $600 and declined. In 1893 the department offered her for sale for $700, but could not get a purchaser. 3. Answered by No. 2. 4. $700. H. B. Harrison, of Owen Sound. Repairs and fittings: 1895-96, $414.08; 1896-97, $346.64; 1897-98, $335.22.

I could not get the original cost of this boat, but I think it was something like $3,000. She was in the service some time and needed repairs. I have been told that the money spent on her repairs in the last three years had made the boat almost as good as new. I am also informed that if notice had been given in any paper published in Owen Sound, Meaford or Wiarton that the vessel was for sale she could have been sold for $2,000. But no such information was given to the public and the first intimation that the people had was that she had been sold to Mr. Harrison for $700. I believe that Mr. Harrison supplied the lumber for the repairs and his bill represented a very large proportion of the sum for which she was sold. The boat was sold to a political friend of hon. gentlemen

opposite, and I call attention to this to show what has been done by these gentlemen for their political friends. I have a letter from a party saying that he would willingly have taken the boat at $2,000. It seems to me that the hon. Minister has been guilty of squandering public property.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A short time ago I explained this matter at some length. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was then in his place. If he will look at the observations I made then, I think he will be satisfied, I think he will say the public interest was excellently well safeguarded in this case.

We have now been six days on the Estimates of the Marine and Fisheries Department. There were some explanations I intended to give in reply to my hon. friend's (Mr. Taylor's) observations—which they deserve—which will show that the prices paid are such as must meet with the approval of every reasonable critic. But, as I believe the House is willing to give me the vote to-night, I will not take up time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

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

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Prime Minister say what will be the Order for to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. We intend to take up the Drummond County Railway Bill and other Bills.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 p.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 9th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REDUCTION OF QUORUM OF PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE.

Mr. SCRIVER moved:

That the quorum of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills be reduced to ten members for the remainder of the session, in accordance with the recommendation contained in their fifth report.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, do you not think it is rather an unusual thing to change the quorum of a committee at this stage of the session? Standing committees usually abide by the quorum that is given to them when they are struck.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill F (No. 144)—from the Senate—for the relief of Abraham Aronsberg.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

STRIKE OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TRACKMEN.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would take the opportunity of asking the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether he is in a position to lay upon the Table of the House, as he promised two days ago, the correspondence in connection with the trackmen's strike on the Grand Trunk Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have all the correspondence in my hands, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will permit me, for reasons which seem wise, I would prefer to wait until Monday before presenting them.

CHARGES AGAINST GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN YUKON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved:

That leave be granted to lay on the Table of the House copies of the commission issued to William Ogilvie, Esq., under the provisions of Chap. 144, Revised Statutes of Canada to hold an investigation and take evidence under oath in regard to certain charges against certain officials in the Yukon territory, together with a copy of the evidence taken under such commission, that the same be printed and that Rule No. 94 be suspended for that purpose.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government to use what influence or pressure they can in connection with the printing, as I have myself been waiting for some time in order to bring forward an important portion by which I propose, on my responsibility, to challenge the administration and the Government in connection with the Yukon.

Motion agreed to.

I. C. R. RATES ON FLOUR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) asked that a return be brought down showing the regular tariff rates collected on each car-load of flour between Chaudière, St. John, Halifax, Pic-

tou and Sydney over the Intercolonial Railway in June, 1896, and between the same points in June, 1897-98, and between Montreal and the same points in June, 1898. I am unable to give him any tariff between Chaudière and the points named, because I am informed by the general manager that there was no such tariff, but I am furnishing him with the rates on car-loads of flour in the years 1896, 1897 and 1898, from Chatham to these different points which he has named, and from Montreal to the points named.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Cannot the Minister's officers give him the proportion that was paid to the Intercolonial Railway out of the car rate from Chatham to Halifax? I refer to the apportionment between the two railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. member will look over the sheets I have here, he will see if the information contained in them will answer his purpose. If there is any other information which I can get, if he will send me a note I will try and get it. I beg to lay on the Table, Mr. Speaker, the combined engine and car mileage in connection with the Montreal terminals.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I call the attention of the Government to the Votes and Proceedings, page 402, where there is a return in connection with the telegrams and correspondence with Archer Martin, and another in connection with the correspondence with Frederick Peters. The report recommends the printing of the papers, and though it has not been adopted, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the incompleteness of both of these returns. The date of the telegram received from Mr. Peters and the date of the telegram sent him are omitted. Possibly owing to the fact that Mr. Archer Martin's name alone was used, there is not included the correspondence with Archer Martin, as Martin & Langley.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). With reference to the telegrams, I have laid a memorandum on the Table. It was handed to the clerk and I saw the clerk hand it over to the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has not reached me, and according to the Votes and Proceedings it has not reached the Clerk of the House. It would be obviously unfair to print these papers until they are completed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At all events, I have laid the memorandum on the Table of the House. As to Mr. Archer Martin, the return brought down includes all the correspondence that can be found in the department. If the hon. gentleman can give me any information which will enable me to trace up any other correspondence, I will be happy to try and do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I refer to the Orders of the House, both of which passed on the 24th of April. Of course, if the hon. gentleman tells me that there is no correspondence with Martin & Langley in regard to liquor permits, I will accept his statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None that we can find; that is, with reference to the permit to Mr. Macaulay; that is what the hon. gentleman meant?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. I happen to know that there is further correspondence in connection with Mr. Macaulay, but it may not be possible to find it, and of course I accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

MR. BOAZ GROSS, OF HILLSBORO, N.B.

Mr. McINERNEY. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may expect the papers in connection with the case of Mr. Boaz Gross, who had been harbour master at Hillsboro', N.B., until he was dismissed by this Government notwithstanding the protest, I believe, of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Lewis), who supports the Government. There was an investigation into Mr. Boaz's case before a commissioner, and the papers can be prepared in a very short while, but, while that Order passed the House on the 24th of April, they have not been brought down yet.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I thought the papers had been brought down, but I will make inquiry about it.

MR. McNEILL, OF RICHMOND, N.S.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a request which will now be a daily one until it is granted. When will the papers in connection with Mr. McNeill, late lighthouse-keeper in my county, be brought down? On the 19th of May the Minister promised they would be brought down on the 25th, but that date is now long past, and I want to know why the papers have not been laid before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I think they were brought down, and if they have not been I will see about it.

Mr. GILLIES. I never heard of them having been brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, I will inquire about it.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—PURCHASE OF DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY.

On the order,

Bill (No. 133) an Act to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.—(Mr. Blair.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my hon. friend will not go on with that today, for two reasons, one of which I think he will understand is a very good one. Some days ago I asked the Minister of Railways for the reports of his engineers with reference to the condition and status of that road at the present time, or when it was taken over. Those reports have not been brought down. Then, with reference to the Grand Trunk agreement, what I propose to do, as to any remarks I may make, is to make those remarks on both measures at one time, instead of making two sets of observations. The terminal proportions have just come in at this moment, and I have not had any opportunity of looking over them. Under these circumstances, I would suggest to my hon. friend that this might be left over say till Tuesday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I thought my hon. friend had exhausted all the criticisms he could offer on this subject. I am afraid they are inexhaustible. We have already spent a very long time on this Bill, and I suppose that the House will agree with me that it is important that we should dispose of it. There is no objection to letting the Bill stand over till Tuesday, with the understanding that we will dispose of it then.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make no objection, with the exception that I would like the Minister to bring down that report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am really not aware what report the hon. member for York refers to. We have had a considerable number of reports furnished to the House from time to time with regard to that road. These reports were submitted to the investigating committee which sat last year. That committee examined them, the engineers were on the stand and they were questioned day after day, and I do not really know just what reports the hon. gentleman refers to that have not been furnished.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the first point, information that goes before an investigating committee of this House is not information which is brought before the House, and which the House requires for the discussion of the measures which the Minister brings before it. But I have not been able to find any document of the kind I refer to, in the records of that committee even, and I am quite certain it has not been brought down to the House. What I refer to I explained in detail the other evening, I think, on two occasions, and it will be found in "Hansard." In brief, it is the report of the engineers approving of the road, and on the condition of the road which is taken over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engineers who satisfied the department that the road was in condition were brought before that committee, and gave evidence under oath, and the report of the committee is in the hands of every member of this House. I do not know how I could possibly supplement the information which has been already supplied. I will have the reports which have been furnished to the department gone over, but I imagine it would be quite an undertaking to have them copied again; and while the officers and employees of the department are all very much engaged, I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to put them to the necessity of copying these again. If there is any one report which the hon. gentleman is satisfied has not been furnished, or any two or three, I would be very glad to get them; but I am not really aware of any.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think the Government will lose anything by delaying the Bill until Tuesday.

The PRIME MINISTER. We do not want to have any delay; we want to favour the business of the House as much as we can. I am willing to let the Bill stand till Tuesday, but I hope it will be understood that the debate must be concluded at the sitting on Tuesday.

Mr. FOSTER. The road had to be bettered, so far as one portion was concerned, and the subsidized portion had to be built. I have never yet seen the reports of the engineers as to the condition of the road or the report which recommmends the taking over of the road, upon which alone the department take it. These reports are not voluminous and are not many, and they are easily got at in the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a fact known, I think, to every gentleman who has followed the Drummond County transaction down to the present time—that the engineer of the department reported when he was satisfied that all the requirements of the subsidy contract had been complied with. We had to be satisfied as to that, and the Auditor General had to be satisfied before the subsidy could be paid. The Auditor General was satisfied of that, and he paid the subsidy. In addition to that, under our arrangement with the Drummond County Company, we required that certain additional things should be done. Our engineer reported that they could be accomplished by the expenditure of $100,000. We took the road off the hands of the company under the arrangement that we would expend that sum on the road through

our own employees. We did not get any reports as to that. We put our employees on the road to do this work, under the engineer at Moncton, and he has had the work done under his eye, and knows what is required, and he pays the men as the work goes on. I understand that we have expended $100,000. I brought down a return the other day showing that we had. The work has been going on, and has been done, I judge, from what has come to my knowledge; but we have no reports in respect to that from our engineers, any more than from any other work done on the Intercolonial. So that, I do not know what report my hon. friend has particular reference to. I will bring down again the reports we received from our engineers, and under which we agreed to deduct the $100,000 from the purchase money, if rent had not accrued over that sum.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I want, if the hon. gentleman will bring it down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has all been sworn to in the evidence in the hon. gentleman's hands.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not a member of that committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have the report in your hands.

Order allowed to stand.

DEALINGS IN LAND BY GOVERNMENT AGENTS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to bring a matter of some importance to the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and, if necessary, I will conclude the few remarks I propose to make with a motion to adjourn. The case in question refers to the land department under the control of the Minister of the Interior, and if the facts are as stated in the press, they reflect very seriously upon the manner in which the land department is administered by certain sub-agents of the Government under the immediate jurisdiction of the hon. Minister.

I am not personally cognizant of the case, but my attention has been drawn to a report in the Winnipeg "Telegram" of an interview had with a gentleman from the town of Glenboro', which reveals, if true, gross official misconduct on the part of some land agents, accused of speculating in lands, to the detriment of bona fide settlers, by utilizing the information which they, as Government officials, obtain. The hon. Minister of the Interior, after his experience with the Yukon officials, and the notoriety, unenviable as it was, which they obtained by grossly abusing the privilege afforded them of entering into unfair competition with the bona fide miner, in staking claims, by availing themselves of information which no outsider could obtain, and which abuse became so gross that it received adverse criticism, not only by the press of Canada, but throughout the world, and the hon. Minister was compelled by the pressure of public opinion to prohibit the officials in the Yukon country from staking claims in the future. This mode of procedure is equally as imperative in the land department as in the Yukon district. Our agents should be prohibited obtaining lands themselves either indirectly or directly, at the Government price, and then selling at a profit, to the detriment of bona fide settlers. I will read the interview, so that the hon. Minister may have an opportunity of making a thorough investigation into the case, and, if the charge be true, bringing the guilty to justice, and thus preventing a practice, which, if persisted in, will undoubtedly result in undermining all confidence in the administration of our lands and bring our officials into disrepute:

YUKON TACTICS.

A Strange Method of Transferring Land.—An Agent gets Himself into Trouble with an Icelander.

A gentleman in the city from Glenboro' gives an account of a land deal which took place between John Harrower, a Government land officer of Baldur, and an Icelandic farmer, named Arni Sveinsson. It appears that the latter, wishing to buy a certain quarter section, which he understood was Government land, went to Harrower for it, and was told to come again, as he would have to look up the records and ascertain whether any one else had previously purchased it. Harrower then bought the land in the name of a friend, Mr. Hyllard.

When Sveinsson returned, Harrower resold him the land for the sum of $1,120, part of which was paid in cash. Upon finding out the fraud, the purchaser obtained the arrest of Mr. Harrower on the charge of obtaining money under false pretenses. Mr. Sveinsson's contention was that the agent made him pay the cash for land which his sons had a perfect right to obtain by homesteading. It was, he claimed, land which had been thrown open for homesteading some years ago, but had been given mostly to political friends of the Government during the past three years.

Mr. R. A. Bonnar appeared for the prosecution, and Ald. Mathers for the defence. The case was tried on Friday and was dismissed with costs to each, as it was held that the actual transaction between Harrower and Hyllard had not been fully proven.

In speaking of the case, the gentleman from Glenboro' stated that it was well known among the people of that section that the Icelanders had often been deceived in this manner by land agents, and that the present instance was only another example of the Yukon tactics which had been adopted in that district. The Icelanders, however, are now becoming fully aware of the dealings of the agents, and are now on their guard against such frauds.

It would appear from this interview that the Icelander applied at the land office for a certain quarter section, and was put off by the agent on the plea that it would take him

some time to hunt up the records and find out whether the land was really at the disposal of the Government. Had this Icelander possessed the knowledge and experience of the average Canadian, he would have known that the land agent could have given him the information within five minutes, by turning up the books in his office. But apparently, if this report be true, the land agent saw his opportunity to make a little money on the quiet, and, in the absence of this Icelander, had the land purchased for himself in the name of one of his friends, Mr. Hyllard. The Icelander found out this deception, and brought the land agent into court, and a noticeable feature of the case, to a lay mind at any rate, is that, while the charge was dismissed, each party had to pay his own costs, thus implying reasonable foundation for the charge. It was dismissed solely because the Icelander was unable to actually prove, to the satisfaction of the court, the arrangement that had been made between the land agent and his friend.

It is charged that this is but one of many such cases in that district; and, if that be true, it is really too bad, because these Icelanders are among our best settlers——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROCHE—hardy, industrious, thrifty, and I am sure the Government are anxious to encourage that class of settlers; but, if such a practice as I have pointed out, is allowed to continue, those settlers will write home to their friends, and the result will be very detrimental.

I bring this to the hon. Minister's attention that he may have an opportunity to inquire into the case, and, if this fraud has taken place, purge the service of the official who committed it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The matter which the hon. gentleman has brought to the attention of the House was not in any way made known to me until he rose to speak, and his remarks are the first information I have received upon the subject. If I understand the statement correctly, it is to the effect that a land agent of the department caused to be purchased a certain piece of Government land in the name of somebody else. The hon. gentleman will see, of course, in such a case it was impossible for the superior officials of the department to know that anything wrong had been done, and, in the absence of any complaint to the department, it would be impossible for the fraud, if such there was, to be checked. I am afraid that my hon. friend has been misled, to some extent, by the report he has read, but I cannot pretend to make a full statement from memory about a land transaction of that kind, and prefer replying at the next sitting of the House, when I will give a statement of the facts, so far as I can procure them from the department; and, if any wrong has been done, will have an investigation, and see that it is righted.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the First Minister to the intimation given that the Government have determined upon a policy with regard to all the applications before Parliament for the construction of railways in the Yukon. I would like very much, if the right hon. gentleman would state to the House what the policy of the Government is in that regard, and on what grounds it is based. I have a very strong opinion myself, and should be glad to have an opportunity of pressing some of the reasons—and, perhaps, I had better do it in advance—for questioning the wisdom of the policy which I understand the Government have arrived at.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can hardly do it just now. He cannot do it, because the motion to adjourn has just been put and lost.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Then, Mr. Speaker, deferring that, I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend to a statement which is made on the authority of the Associated Press on a very important subject, and which appears to conflict with the statement made by my right hon. friend to the House based on the information he had down to the time when he spoke. I read from the Montreal "Gazette" of to-day:

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

A Compromise Arrangement said to have been Effected in London.

London, June 8.—It is learned by the Associated Press that United States Ambassador Choate is hourly expecting the consent of the authorities at Washington to a compromise arrangement of the Alaskan question on the lines of a prospective settlement and for carrying on the discussion in the high commission. While yielding in certain matters, it is understood Mr. Choate has been able to effect an arrangement satisfactory to the United States. He has been largely helped by the reasonable attitude assumed by the Canadians during the past week.

The Canadian High Commissioner, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, and the Marquis of Salisbury, are agreed on the lines of the compromise.

Washington, D.C., June 8.—It is learned at the State Department that while a sensible advance is making towards the arrangement of a modus vivendi for the regulation of the Canadian boundary question, a conclusion has not been reached. Expert geographers are being consulted on the exact location of some of the boundary points, though as far as the Dalton Trail is concerned the definite point has not been located.

London, June 8.—The correspondent of the Associated Press learns, upon high authority,

that the Alaskan modus vivendi does not imply that the boundary question has been settled or compromised, but simply that a temporary boundary has been arranged, and will be preserved for two years, which interval will be available for the settlement of the main question at issue.

My object, and my only object, in drawing the attention of my right hon. friend to this matter is to learn whether anything has transpired since the communication he was good enough to make to the House upon this subject ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) that nothing new has taken place respecting this question since I addressed the House on the last occasion. There must be some confusion in this report between the permanent settlement of the boundary and the modus vivendi. I stated, when I last addressed the House on this subject, that we had reached an arrangement for a provisional boundary line on the Dalton trail. Everybody is aware that on the Chilkoot Pass and the White Pass, the Summit has been recognized as the boundary for the last two years, being accepted by both the Canadian Government and the American Government. We did not come to any definite arrangement, that is to say, of a provisional nature on the Dalton Trail. We have been treating upon this subject, and as I said the other day, we have come to the conclusion that we can adopt a provisional boundary upon the Dalton Trail which, I think, will be acceptable to both sides.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the right hon. gentleman state at all definitely where the provisional boundary is ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I should be glad to state to my hon. friend what the boundary is, but I am afraid I cannot do so unless I have formal authority from the Imperial Government. I have every reason to believe that this provisional arrangement will be accepted ; but we have not been notified yet of its acceptance, and, pending that, of course, I cannot speak on the subject. With regard to the settlement of the boundary generally, I have nothing more to say. The attitude of the Canadian Government, which is said by the correspondent to have been reasonable of late, in our judgment has always been reasonable, and I do not see any variation in anything we have done recently to justify our action at different times to be differently characterized.

DEADMAN'S ISLAND.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that telegrams received from Vancouver, B.C., state that Mr. Ludgate, to whom the Government gave a lease of Deadman's Island, has given up his lease and left the country and has no intention of carrying out the terms of the lease. Has the Government any information on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). None.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the Government whether the Government are taking active steps to promote the fast service across the Atlantic ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We are taking active steps about that all the time.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY COMMUNICATION WITH THE CANADIAN YUKON.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). moved that the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I am glad to avail myself of this opportunity to refer briefly to a subject to which I attach very great importance. It will be within the recollection of the House that last session the Government introduced a Bill for the purpose of providing for the construction of a railway from Glenora, or from the Stikine waters, to Teslin Lake. That measure, which passed this House, was not approved by the Senate, and, of course, fell to the ground. When that measure was pressed upon the House—I shall not do more than simply refer to the fact—the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) declared that it was of the greatest possible importance that it should pass without delay, as matters of very great moment relating to the safety of life and property in Dawson were involved. I confess that I was greatly surprised to find, under these circumstances, when Parliament decided that the work could not be proceeded with as proposed, the Government, for reasons which I have never yet learned and now confess myself entirely unable to understand, determined that no further charters should be granted to enable parties who had Bills before Parliament to carry out a project of railway connection with that country. The importance of the most rapid and perfect railway communication between the Canadian Yukon and the outside world does not require a single word to accentuate it. I have never been able to learn, and confess myself quite unable to form any conjecture, on what ground the Government, having attached such immense importance to this matter of railway communication should have used their power and authority to prevent such a work being carried out by parties who were ready to promptly engage in the work—who had, in fact, spent a large sum of money in prepa-

ration for it—and who were not only ready to build rapidly a line of communication on the Dalton trail to the waters of Fort Selkirk, but were ready and offered to deposit the sum of $250,000 in the hands of the Government as a guarantee that they would actually complete that work within eighteen months. The representative of the Government on the Railway Committee, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), took the ground that the Government could not accept of this deposit. But it was promptly offered as a guarantee of bona fides, and of the prompt and rapid completion of an important line of railway, and that without asking the Dominion of Canada for any assistance whatever in completing the work. That was suspended, but I am advised that the parties who made that offer and who were prepared to deposit in the hands of the Government $250,000 as a guarantee that they would complete that work within eighteen months if the charter was granted—I am advised that they expended no less than $40,000 on a survey, and have their plans and everything in a position to submit them now to the inspection of the Government. I take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the Government to this matter as one that strikes me as of great importance, and in connection with the intimation that it is still the policy of the Government not to allow any further charters to be granted or any progress to be made with the extension of railway communication into the Canadian Yukon, or to connect Dawson City with the outside world. I do not require to say anything to convince hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that the whole country is deeply interested in having the most complete and rapid communication between the Canadian Yukon and the other portions of Canada, and I may say the other portions of the world. Therefore, unless there be some reason, of which I have no conception, why the Government should interpose to prevent parties spending their own money in constructing lines of communication so deeply important, I had hoped that they would reconsider that question in the light of the suggestions which I am venturing to make, and give it, at all events, their closest consideration before arriving at a conclusion so entirely adverse, in my opinion, to the interests of the whole country. The right hon. gentleman knows that it is not merely a Canadian question, he knows that there is a large amount of British capital already invested and being invested in that country, he knows that it is important that British capitalists of standing and character should be induced to assist in the development of what is now one of the most important sections of the territory of Canada. I have felt this matter of sufficient importance to warrant me in saying these few words across the floor of the House, and to intimate my deep concern in this matter. There are four or five different projects, some applying to one section of country and some to another, some applying to the Atlin Lake and some of them, I believe, even to the Teslin Lake line, and there are a number of applications; and I was in hopes that the Government, when not enforcing the prohibition which prevented action being taken last year, would have been disposed to allow these others to be carefully considered by a special committee of the Railway Committee, with a view to arriving at a policy that would be best calculated to promote the interests of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for bringing this question to the attention of the House. There is no question, at this moment, which, in my estimation, has so importnat a bearing upon the future of Canada as the very question which my hon. friend has referred to. I may say at once that it may, perhaps, seem a little strange to the public at large that we should refuse at this moment to grant any charter to a railway from the waters of the Pacific to the Yukon country. I may also say at once that we do not object, and would not object, to any scheme to build a railway from waters that are absolutely and without doubt in Canadian territory to the Yukon country. But we have a decided objection, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me when he gives his attention more closely to the matter, to granting a charter to a line into the Yukon from the disputed territory between Canada and the United States. At the present time most of the charters which are asked for are to build a railway on the Dalton trail, that is to say, from Pyramid Harbour towards Dawson City. At the present time Pyramid Harbour is in the disputed territory; we claim the ownership of it and the Americans claim the ownership of it—and they have at present practically possession of it—as they have of the Lynn Canal. Well, if we were to grant a charter, and I believe it is so provided in the charters which are asked for, they would have to be supplemented by American legislation, and so we would be providing for railway communication from the waters of Pyramid Harbour, which are practically now in possession of the Americans, towards Dawson City; if we were to grant that, we would only be complicating the question of determining the boundary between us and the Americans. If we were to grant the charter which is asked for, and under which, as I understand, the sum of $250,000 is already laid down, we would build up an American city Pyramid Harbour and make it all the more difficult to get back what we claim belongs to us, that is to say, to establish the boundary where

it ought to be. At the present time the question between us and the American authorities is the location of the boundary on the Lynn Canal. I have stated before what our contention is, and I may state it again. We claim that the boundary is at the entrance of the Lynn Canal, and that consequently the whole of the Lynn Canal belongs to us. The Americans claim, on the other hand, that the boundary passes around the Lynn Canal, that they should have all the shores around it, that is to say, that they should be confirmed in the possession of Skagway, which they now hold, of Dyea and of Pyramid Harbour. Now, I think it is clear that Parliament acted with questionable wisdom when, in 1897, we granted a charter to the British Yukon Railway Company, because this company is acting under a Canadian charter and an American charter, and the consequence is that we have contributed to build up Skagway, an American city, between which and Seattle there is a great and increasing trade. American interests have been established there, and are increasing all the time, and we have met, and are constantly meeting, and will constantly meet, until this question is determined, the antagonism of powerful American interests which have been built up at Skagway, to our contention for the settlement of the boundary. If we were to grant this new charter from Pyramid Harbour we would create on the other side of the Lynn Canal another American city; and there being an American city at Pyramid Harbour and another one at Skagway, it is clear that when we come to the point of settling that boundary, those powerful interests will weigh enormously at Washington against our contention of what is the true boundary. Therefore, under these circumstances, we believe that we ought to delay the granting of these charters from Pyramid Harbour to the waters of the Lynn Canal until the question of the boundary has been settled in some way or another, as we believe it will yet be settled by the recognition of our contention of what is the true boundary line. When it is settled, as we believe it will be, that the Lynn Canal belongs to us and that Pyramid Harbour is ours, then we would be in a position to grant a charter from Pyramid Harbour, as being in Canadian territory, and there would be no need for an American charter. We had better wait for one or two years, and have the certainty of having a Canadian city at Pyramid Harbour, rather than build now and having it made an American city. Under such circumstances, I put myself in the judgment of the House, and I call the attention of my hon. friend to this view of the question, which, perhaps, has escaped him up to this moment, that it is in the best interests of Canada, as a whole, not to allow more American cities to be built on the Lynn Canal, but to wait until the question of the boundary has been determined. I may say, further, that if it be determined afterwards by the arbitrators that the Lynn Canal does not belong to us, but that it belongs to the Americans, then the policy of Canada will be to get access to the Yukon, not by the Lynn Canal, but by building railways from the waters of the Pacific, from a harbour on what is indisputably Canadian waters, to have a railway built, though it would, perhaps, be longer, from Observatory Inlet, or some other point, through the Cassiar district, the Atlin district and Yukon district. That is the view that we have adopted. I know that, as a general rule, it is, perhaps to some extent, an invidious task to prevent the building of railways in this country; it may be a still more invidious task to prevent access to the Yukon by the building of railways, but the reasons seem to be so strong and overwhelming in favour of staying our hand and in favour of waiting until we know whether the harbours on the Lynn Canal be Canadian or American, that in the meantime we throw ourselves on the judgment of the House and on the judgment of the country, as to whether it is not advisable not to allow any more charters to issue for railways to be built on the Lynn Canal until this question has been determined.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, by the common consent of the House, I may be permitted to add a single remark. I fail to see how the construction of a railway from any one point to any other point is going to determine the settlement of the boundary that has to be determined, if it ever is determined, by independent international experts. The only question that could arise is one that could not arise in this case, but might in reference to Skagway or Dyea. It could not arise in reference to any settlement made now, because, if a railway were built, and the commission decided that it was to be Canadian territory from the waters of the Pacific to Fort Selkirk, the question would be disposed of just as completely, whether the railway was in existence previously or not. I would also remark to my right hon. friend that in reference to the proposed construction of a railway from the waters of the Stikine to Teslin Lake, the contract provided that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann might build this line from Pyramid Harbour to Fort Selkirk. There was no boundary question to be determined then; that question was still an open one, perhaps more so than now, and I cannot see, if that were the case, when that authority was given, why the same reason should not exist now. I do not want to say a word further, because I am quite certain that the right hon. Prime Minister has arrived at the conclusion which he has, believing it to be a necessary conclusion in the interest of Canada; but it does not appear that that would

conflict in any way with the ultimate settlement of the boundary. At the same time, I agree with the right hon. Prime Minister that the construction of a railway is important for the settlement of that country, and, if the ultimate decision of the boundary should say that Skagway, Dyea and the Lynn Canal are in United States territory, I quite agree with the Prime Minister that we must then have, as promptly as possible, a direct communication from a place undoubtedly on Canadian waters through the country to the city of Dawson. As no subsidy is asked, it does not appear to me that the grounds stated are sufficient to prevent the construction of the railway at the present time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I do not imagine that there is anything that I can add to what the right hon. Premier has stated which would convince the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Tupper) of the strength of the case against our granting further charters at the present time, if what the right hon. Premier has said has not convinced him, as it does not appear to have done. I can call the hon. gentleman's attention to one reason which he has alleged against the action which the Government has taken in this matter, or against the conclusion which it has arrived at, which has not, apparently, been in the hon. gentleman's recollection. He points to the fact that, as part of the arrangement which was entered into with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and as one of the conditions of the charter which was to be granted for the construction of that line, it was proposed that the railway might be built through the Chilkat Pass from Pyramid Harbour and into the Yukon country. That is quite true. But my hon. friend has forgotten that that was to be a subordinate undertaking, that the line from Glenora to Teslin Lake was the primary undertaking of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. As to whether or not the line from Pyramid Harbour into the Yukon should be constructed by them was a matter resting entirely in the discretion of the Government, and before building which the Government's consent was to be obtained. The power which was conferred on Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann was held in suspense and was entirely conditional upon the Government consent. If the question should be raised by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, the Government would be free to consider whether, under the then existing circumstances, it would be wise to authorize the construction of that line. So long as the conditions exist as they exist today, the case seems to be clear, beyond all question, that the true policy, in the interest of Canada, is to stay our hands and grant no further legislation as respects, at all events, the building of a railway through the Chilkat Pass. There is no doubt that there are only two routes—one through the White Pass, and one through the Chilkat Pass—which would be available for the purpose of railway construction. I think we all agree that it was the misfortune, rather than a matter of mere carelessness, that we should have, as a Parliament, chartered the White Pass Company, because it is a fact, as the Prime Minister has stated, that it has, in a measure at all events, weakened our position. It may not be, as a matter of law, that by reason of the building up of these towns at the terminus of this railway our position, from the legal point of view, has been impaired; but we know, as a matter of fact, that it has immensely increased the strength of the antagonism which has been aroused in all parts of the United States against any arbitration which would involve the handing over of these towns to Canada, should they be found, in a friendly negotiation, to be in Canadian territory. Let me say a word further in regard to the other route. There are four or five Bills now before the Railway Committee which cover legislation for railways into the Yukon. Four of them, I think, apply to the Chilkat Pass, and one, or possibly two, provide for the construction of railways from some point on the Stikine River or from some point on the Pacific coast below or in British Columbia.

Now, the impression that strikes my mind very strongly is, that at the present moment it is undesirable that we should grant any charters for the construction of a line by that route at present. When, as the right hon. the Prime Minister has stated, it is definitely determined where the Canadian and American boundary is to be, and if it should be decided against us, then it will be a very important question for the Government to take up the matter of railway legislation passing through entirely Canadian territory; instead of granting charters now, which might prejudice our action, which might not conform to the ideas we will then have when we consider the question further, and which may not be for the public interest when we have had our surveys completed. It is certainly unwise at this stage that we should grant any charters in that direction. No great harm can be done to the interests of the people of the Yukon, because they have access now by the White Pass line to the waterways and can get down the river during the summer season. That road will answer every useful purpose, at all events for the present. For these reasons, I being authorized by the Government, intimated to the Railway Committee this morning that these charters would not be favoured by the Government, and that if they were pressed we would have to ask Parliament not to sanction them.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) The question which has been raised is an important one, and worth considering entirely apart from any party basis. For my own part I would like to give all the weight that

is possible to the consideration which was urged by the right hon. the leader of the House, I have no hesitation in saying, that the ground upon which the Government adopted this policy would be a patriotic and a good ground, provided that it actually existed. But we must be pretty certain that there is strong force in the contention, and I think there are some other things on the opposite of the question that will have to be looked into, as a compensation. The leader of the Opposition has brought to the attention of the Government, the fact, that in their proposed legislation of last session, they proposed to build a line of communication through American territory, from a point where, certainly both sides of the River Stikine are in the disputed territory and may belong to the United States or may belong to us. At all events, they occupy exactly the same position in that respect, as do these places on the Lynn Canal. The Government had then no hesitation in attempting to push that line of communication and giving an alternative power to build from Pyramid Harbour to the same contractors. It is not possible to contend that the disputed boundary was not a question then, just as much as it is now. It has been under active discussion for the last eight or ten years, and for the last six or seven years especially, continuous efforts have been made by both the United States and the Canadian Governments to have the disputed boundary settled. Preliminary work had to be done, and the result of that preliminary work is now in the hands of the Government as contributory to the ultimate settlement of the question. Therefore, the very same objection could be urged with reference to the legislation undertaken in the Mann & Mackenzie proposals. The argument now used is, that if a town is built up at Pyramid Harbour as at Skagway, it might add strength to the opposition against the Canadian contention and in favour of United States contention. I believe that the whole business interests of the Pacific coast, and the prospective profits and prospective trade for which they are looking, will be just as strongly against the Canadian contention, as if these towns were established. I believe that the Prime Minister will not weaken the United States case nor strengthen his own, by now announcing in Parliament that he proposes that no more American towns shall be built up along the disputed territory, at all events, with the aid of a charter granted by this Parliament. There is, I think, an argument on the other side which my right hon. friend may find quoted against him, and that is, that the Canadian Government has not that strong faith which it ought to have in the possibility, nay, in the probability of this disputed territory belonging to our own country. If our contention with regard to it is just, we should hope that any body of experts would recognize its justice and give that territory to Canada. It therefore shows a want of full confidence in the Canadian contention, that the Government should announce that they are adverse to fostering trade and commerce in that territory, for fear it may be built up with United States towns, and that the pecuniary and trade interests of these United States towns may be used to defeat the Canadian claim. That does not give much credit to the international experts who are to decide the question, if we ever get it as far as arbitration before a tribunal, and it does not show a very strong faith by the Canadian Government in their own contention. There is another point which may be looked at. Whether fortunately, or unfortunately—very unfortunately I think for this ground now taken by the Government—the Parliament of Canada, having the disputed territory question well before its mind, has granted one charter at least, and I am not sure that we have not granted two. That charter has progressed in its execution so far that the road is now becoming an active participator in the trade. This present action of the Government is an immense leverage for the success, to the point of making inordinate profits of that railway company which received its charter only two years ago from this same Canadian Parliament. The statement made by the Government to-day, that they have put their foot down against the establishment of any alternate routes into that country—by the Dalton trail for instance—will certainly have the effect of making a complete monopoly of the road which has already been constructed under a charter which has been given by this Parliament. If the stock of that railway company was worth 50 per cent two hours ago, it is now worth 100 per cent, by virtue of this statement which has been made by my hon. friend and it will not only engender very much bad feeling, but, I think, cause a very great deal of grave talk, that a road which members of Parliament are interested in and have worked for, in which they are to have prospective gains, has been put in a position, and a very strong position——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What members of Parliament does the hon. member refer to?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe there are members of Parliament interested in that road.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so—very much interested in getting the charter for that road through the Railway Committee and through this House, and I think they must have prospective property in that road.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name them.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if there are not, that was my impression.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You stated there were.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You are always stabbing some one in the dark.

Mr. FOSTER. If there are no members of Parliament interested in it, my statement will not go any great distance, but I understood there were.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was stated, not as an understanding, but as a matter of fact.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated my impression of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Your impression does not create a fact.

Mr. FOSTER. No man's impression can create a fact but a man may have an impression that a certain thing is a fact. If no members of Parliament are interested in this road, that part of my argument goes; if they are, that part of my argument is very strong. At any rate, that part of my argument is very strong with reference to those fortunate persons who have the charter; for this change certainly has the effect, so far as it goes, of giving them a monopoly of the railway facilities into that territory. These are considerations of some little weight which militate against the idea that my hon. friend has introduced. I do not think there is so much force as he thinks in his contention that to allow of the extension of railway facilities would prejudice the Canadian case. I believe the Canadian case is strong on its own merits. If the question is decided at all, I believe it will be decided by an international arbitration of experts, who would certainly not give away the case against Canada, because of the chartering of more railways under circumstances where railway facilities are so much needed for ingress into that country, and for the development of the country. These are some views which occur to myself with reference to this matter, and I think there is some weight in them.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, will you permit me—because I happen to have introduced the particular Yukon railway Bill referred to—to make one remark. If the hon. gentleman has any reference to me because I did introduce that Bill, I want to say that he had better be a little more sure hereafter of there being some fact to his fancies. I introduced that Bill at the instance of a friend in Nova Scotia, who was interested with certain English capitalists, in the regular way, and I helped to get the Bill through, for which I received nothing. I have not, never had, and never will have, a dollar of interest in the British Yukon Railway; and there is no member of Parliament here who has ever had or will have, so far as I know, any stock in it, unless he goes on the stock exchange and buys it. If the hon. gentleman meant me, because I introduced the Bill—and he could have referred to no one else—all I have to say is that it is quite gratuitous on his part even to throw out the hint. I have never had and never will have—I could not afford to have—a dollar of stock, present or prospective, in that company.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite frank to say exactly what was in my mind and how far it went. I was told that the hon. member for Guysborough was a director of that company.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am not even a stockholder.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the impression with which I rose to my feet. It is no argument and no charge against a member of this House that he is a stockholder or a director in a railway company in this country; and it is especially none if he is a stockholder and director in a road which does not come for a subsidy and does not get a subsidy from this Government or this Parliament. Members of Parliament are perfectly free to become stockholders in railway companies if they choose. They are perfectly free to become stockholders in companies which get subsidies, and it is a fact that they often are. But what I intended to add when on my feet was that, under the circumstances, when the Government interposes its veto against any other road being built into that country, then it became a question whether any member of Parliament who is a director in the company should not resign his directorship. That is what I meant to say and all I meant. It implied no charge or disgrace.

Mr. McGREGOR. You said the legislation along that line would make him rich.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it do him any harm if it did?

Mr. FOSTER. I certainly said—and no person in this House will contradict me—that if the stock of that railway, when it was open to competition, was worth 50 cents on the dollar, and the Government declared that no other road could be built for one, two or more years to come, the result would be that its stock would be doubled. Is there anything wrong in that? I have no hesitation in saying that if Parliament, by its veto in a case like that, stops railway construction into that country and makes this a monopoly road, members of Parliament, who were free to go into the company when it was not under these conditions, would do better to get out of it. If there is anything implied in that, my hon. friend may take it to himself. There is nothing implied, and I intended to make the second statement when I made the first. If the hon. gentleman is not a stockholder or a director, my impression and information were wrong.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I think it

will be felt by members on both sides that the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been peculiarly unfortunate from beginning to end. He attempted to base an argument against the Government for refusing to grant any more charters through the White Pass or the Chilcoot Pass, on the alleged fact, which he stated with all the authority of an ex-Minister, that certain influential members of this House were largely interested in the present Yukon charter, and he inferentially argued that the policy of the Government was dictated or influenced by that fact.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him. I made no such inference. I do not think my words would carry such an inference, and I certainly had no intention that they should carry it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman may have had no such intention, but I am sure that the members of the Government and hon. gentlemen sitting around thoroughly understood him in that sense—that we were influenced in our policy by the fact that influential members held stock or were interested in this railway. I have no hesitation in saying that this matter has received the closest attention of Her Majesty's Government, and that the conclusions which they have reached have been reached solely on patriotic grounds. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who sneers at that, evidently does not think so. He measures corn by his own bushel, and feeling that no such motives would influence him if he were a member of a Government, he cannot understand how they would influence any Government; but such is the fact, nevertheless. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) refers to the fact—and it is one that we cannot ignore—that Parliament did, in 1897, grant this charter to the White Pass Railway, and that the refusal of a charter to another company will very largely appreciate the value of their charter. But the hon. gentleman will recollect that this House consented to the passage of that charter at a time when the value of the Yukon gold district was quite unknown, and I venture to say, that, when the White Pass Railway charter was being considered by the committee in this House, no one had any conception of the value of our gold territory in the Yukon. If we had then the knowledge which we subsequently possessed, that would, no doubt, have materially influenced the action of the Government and Parliament. The hon. gentleman will recollect that, when the Government brought on its policy last year for the building of a railway by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, they took special care that it should entirely run through British territory. They expressly provided that a terminal at Glenora, on the Stikine, should be established for the time being, and the road afterwards carried down to Observatory Inlet. Our main object was, that the trade of the country should, as far as possible, be kept within our territory, and that, if there was to be a great city built up on the Pacific coast, that should be a British, and not an American city.

I do not think the hon. gentleman was happy, either, in intimating that the members of the Government have not faith in Canada's case by submitting this policy. He is not aware of the position taken by our adversaries, the United States. The contention they put forward is, that, no matter where the line may run, no matter whether, according to the Canadian contention, it may run across the mouth of the Lynn Canal, following the range of mountains, or in any other direction, the settlements they have upon tide-water shall be preserved to them, irrespective of whose territory those settlements are built upon.

There would be a very strong argument advanced by them, if we granted a charter for the construction of a railway to Pyramid Harbour, and in a year or so Pyramid Harbour grew to be a settled town. They would say: Here is a great American city, built on this territory, on the supposition that it was American territory, and it would be outrageous to transfer that to British jurisdiction.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. Minister allow me to put him a question? He was one of the negotiators at Washington, and is it not a fact that the granting of a charter to the White Pass would operate against him, as one of the negotiators?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not going to make any statement in addition to that which the right hon. First Minister was authorized to present on the reading of the protocols. The hon. gentleman knows that I am not in a position to say anything about what took place. I am simply presenting the argument which the Americans have insisted on all along, as appears by the papers published, that settlements along the sea-coast shall belong to them, no matter where the arbitration may put the line; and I say, that if we now were to grant a charter there and the result was the building up of a large town, they would contend most strenuously that that town should belong to them for all future time, whatever compensation the arbitration might allow to us. And we desire that if a town be built up, it should be built up on British territory.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). As one of the Bills on the Order paper stands in my name, it is only proper that I should make a few observations on the question before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will try and avoid discussing that Bill.

Mr. GILLIES. I propose discussing only the general question before the House. It

will be in the recollection of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine that a certain section of the schedule attached to the Mackenzie & Mann contract, and which is a part of that contract, provides :

The Government shall submit to Parliament at its next ensuing session a measure for the necessary Act confirming this agreement and authorizing the Government and the contractors to perform and carry out the same, also incorporating the contractors and such others as may become shareholders into a company under the name of the Canadian Yukon Railway Company or other name approved by the contractors (hereinafter referred to as the contractors' company), with power to acquire and perform and carry out this agreement, and with all necessary provisions in that behalf, and with all necessary powers to build and operate the railway above mentioned and an extension thereof northward to Dawson City or thereabouts, and an extension southward to a point in British Columbia to be designated by the Government and capable of being made an ocean port, also a line of railway from the waters of Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk or thereabouts by way of Chilcat Pass, also branch lines of railway from any points on the company's railways to any property owned by the company, also lines of railway from any navigable waters to any property owned by the company ; provided that the power to build said line from Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk, and said branch lines, and said lines from navigable waters shall not be exercised without the consent of the Governor General in Council.

The right hon. First Minister has said, that the provision securing to Mackenzie & Mann the right to extend the railway from the Lynn Canal to Selkirk was to be a matter of subsequent legislation. Such is not the case. The Government committed themselves, the moment they signed this document, to the policy of giving Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann the right to build from the Lynn Canal northward to Selkirk. Therefore, the very question before us now, namely, the policy of incorporating a company to build from the waters of the Lynn Canal to Selkirk, was adjudicated upon by the Government themselves last year in their dealings with Mann & Mackenzie.

As this subject is one of supreme importance to the Dominion, and as I am talking altogether in a non-political sense and non-partisan spirit, I hope that the right hon. First Minister will understand that I am endeavouring, as a true Canadian, to take such a course as will in every possible way assist him and his colleagues in the negotiations now being carried on. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will pardon me, when I state that he may not be as intimately acquainted as I am with the applications and the terms of the applications that have been made to this Parliament for the building through British territory of a railway from the waters of the Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk, in the Yukon country. I was approached last year by a number of wealthy gentlemen, and asked to put before this Parliament an application to incorporate them and give them power to build from the international boundary line between Canada and the United States, or the waters of the Lynn Canal—should that be found in Canadian territory—a railway by the Dalton trail to Fort Selkirk. I was not representing paper men in this matter. I was sent for, and, in consultation with them, I told them honestly and frankly that the Government had submitted a policy to Parliament under which they proposed to have a road built through that country. I told them that the parties with whom they were dealing had to deposit with the Government, as evidence of their having the capability in that regard, the sum of $250,000 which was to be absolutely forfeited unless the terms and conditions of the contract they were entering into were fully carried out. I am now referring to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. I told my people that before I would submit a line in the way of a charter to this Parliament, they would have to make the same deposit with the Government as a guarantee of their good faith, and that the deposit was to be made before a charter was granted. The parties did not want an acre of land or a dollar of money. They were not, as I said before, mere men on paper ; their names are well known some of them known throughout the continent as men of wealth and position. After consulting upon the terms, that would confront them here, I went to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), who is now in his place and will corroborate every word I say. I told the Minister of Railways and Canals frankly and squarely my position in the matter and told him what my people were prepared to do as to deposit. I saw the situation as it stood ; with Mackenzie & Mann before Parliament, nothing in the way of legislation that I proposed would go through if that Bill became law. But I said : If I remain inactive until the fate of the Mackenzie & Mann Bill is decided in Parliament, I shall be out of court, because the time will have run so far that I shall not be able to apply for my charter. The Minister of Railways and Canals heard me out and suggested that I should go on and make my application, and, of course, if the Mackenzie & Mann Bill were defeated, the road would be clear for me. I did so. I did not interview the Prime Minister. I was dealing with the Minister of Railways and Canals who, I felt, would communicate to his colleagues the proposition I had made to him. Now, I will read two sections of the charter that I submitted to the House last session. I do this for the benefit of the Prime Minister, because I feel absolutely certain that up to this moment he had not been aware of their existence. The 12th section of this Bill—the Bill was in Mr. Belcourt's name—said :

The railway hereby authorized to be constructed shall be commenced within three months and be fully completed and put in operation within eighteen months from the passing of this Act.

I may say that that eighteen months was afterwards changed to two years. The 13th section provides:

The company shall deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General the sum of $250,000 as a guarantee for the commencement and completion of the said railway within the times above mentioned, and the said deposit shall become absolutely forfeited to and for the use of the Government of Canada if the said railway shall not be so commenced and completed within the periods aforesaid; and upon the completion of the said railway within the periods aforesaid, the said deposit shall be repaid to the company with three per cent per annum added thereto.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the right hon. the Prime Minister would at once admit the soundness of my financial position the moment I made this proposition. Before this was approved by the Governor in Council, I said, I will deposit $250,000 with the Finance Minister which shall be absolutely forfeited unless the road is commenced within three months and completed within two years. I was not asking for the charter first and to make the deposit afterwards. If that had been the case my position would not be so strong. A stronger proposition than that never was put before any Government in Canada. The Bill went through stage by stage and we went before the Railway Committee. The Minister was withholding the policy of the Government respecting the construction of railways in the Yukon and the incorporation of companies for the construction of railways in that territory. We then proposed to the Minister of Railways and Canals, who was at the Railway Committee, that the charter should be passed by the Railway Committee, and should be reported to the House upon the declaration of the Government's policy. On the 28th May, 1898, that charter was put through the committee. As you will see by referring to the Order paper, Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Alaska and Northwestern Railway Company stands for report. On the 2nd June, 1898, the Minister of Railways and Canals declared the policy of the Government to be to disallow any railway legislation affecting the Yukon for that year, alleging the negotiations that were about being entered into between the two countries respecting the boundary line. I then withdrew this Bill, in obedience to the declaration made by the Minister and stated before the Railway Committee that I would be before them at the ensuing session. So this year we gave the necessary notices, and reintroduced the Bill, exactly as it was passed by the Railway Committee last year—word for word. Now we find that the Government at this stage announces—and I hope they have not come to a final decision in the matter, but are open to further argument, because a Government ought to be like a court, ready to hear matters brought before it—announces its policy to be the continuation of the stand taken last year.

Mr. GILLIES.

Now, let me tell the Prime Minister that the parties I represent have made an actual survey of that territory from the waters of the Lynn Canal right through to Fort Selkirk. The engineering corps was in charge of a well-known railway engineer, Pierre Humbert. I have the original plans here in my possession, and I am ready to submit them to the Railway Department at any moment. The plan for the distance between the waters of the Lynn Canal and the international boundary as claimed by us and the Americans were deposited at Washington on the 11th May, 1898, the very day the Bill was brought down in Congress, that is, the Homestead Bill enabling railways to be built in that country. We have our plans filed in Washington, and we have our plans here, and we have the surveys from water to water. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how the chartering of a railway corporation within our own territory can in any way operate adversely to our interests in any negotiations that are being carried on between Canada and the United States. The international boundary may be far south of the point where the Americans contend it is, and I hope it will be found to be where we claim it should be. If so, and if we begin our operations, how can it complicate the question in dispute between us and the Americans. Obviously, we cannot charter a company to build in American territory, we can only charter a company to build on our own side of the boundary line, wherever that may be. Now, if the boundary line be where we claim it is, how can that be held by the Americans to be a giveaway upon our part of any of our rights, more particularly in face of the fact that a railway has already been chartered by us in 1897, when we chartered the British Yukon Company to build a railway through the White Pass from the waters of the Lynn Canal, or from the international boundary right through? Under those circumstances, how can it be alleged by the Americans that we have given away any of our rights if we charter another company to build from the international boundary line, wherever it is found to be, through to Selkirk? I am now before the Railway Committee with this Bill, it is one of a number of Bills to build railways into that country. Every statement I have made in this House is absolutely correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to make one observation. In a portion of his statement he intimated that he had spoken to me when the Mackenzie & Mann question was pending, and that I advised him to introduce his Bill, assuring him that there would be no objection to it. I do not think the hon. member intended to convey that impression. But he is quite correct otherwise in stating

his conversation with me, and I think he will say that my suggestion went no further than that if his Bill was introduced, it would then be in a position to receive consideration.

Mr. GILLIES. I did not say that, because that would be going too far. Before introducing my Bill, I went to the department, and submitted it to the Minister of Railways and Canals, as I have outlined it to-day. I told him that I knew exactly the position of matters, and that if the Mackenzie & Mann Bill went through there would be no room for any other legislation. I suggested to him that I could introduce my Bill, and allow it to proceed concurrently with any other legislation, and the Minister advised me so to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a most important matter to the people of Canada; I feel that it cannot be too highly appreciated. In making this application to build this road I am representing parties who are putting their money into it, and who have authorized me to make this application. We only ask that the House give us the right to build through Canadian territory, and that is the only power that they can confer upon it. I am confident that my appeal to the Government will not be made in vain, especially when I expressly state that it is not made in any political or partisan spirit. I am representing parties who are deeply interested in this matter, largely Canadians. If the Parliament of Canada, controlled as it is by the Government, turn us down at this stage, and turn us out of Parliament, they will be committing, in my opinion, a grave wrong towards the people of Canada, and one which they will regret themselves for many a long day.

Mr. J. DOMVILLE (King's, N.B.) There is no doubt a good deal in what has been said with regard to the principle of building up American ports, but I think there is a broader principle than that. My hon. friend says there is a railway built from the White Pass down to Bennett. We all admit that Bennett is in Canada, you cannot stop goods going there, you cannot stop ships going through the Lynn Canal, and you cannot stop this railway chartered by the Government taking stuff from that point and carrying it across into Canadian territory. Put aside the question of going down to Pyramid Harbour. Many hon. gentlemen in this House have had but little chance of learning the history of this matter, and may have formed a wrong judgment from what they have heard. But unless you are on the spot yourselves, as two or three gentlemen in this House have been, it is impossible to arrive at a correct impression of the requirements of that country. Let us leave aside for the moment this international boundary question, never mind about Pyramid Harbour or the Lynn Canal, but let us suppose that we start to open up the great Yukon territory from Canadian territory. Now, they talk of the Dalton trail. Those who have been on the Dalton trail, like myself, know that it is not a bridle-path, it is a wide territory, it is, in fact, marked all over on the map as a prairie country. When you are going to Selkirk, after leaving Bennett to the left, you pass through the White River district, with its gold, and what is supposed to be a large copper area, on the Nordenskiold River, where there is a great unknown country to be opened up. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, I see, is amused, nevertheless that is a fact. Now, if I want to start to-morrow from Bennett, in Canadian territory, what has that got to do with the boundary dispute? If I am going to the White River to the left, or to the west, if I am going down to the river where there is supposed to be a large copper area, what is to prevent me from doing so? What is to prevent a policy of starting from Bennett with all these branch railways? I do not think that has got anything to do with the international boundary question. It is simply locking up that country, and how anybody who has been out there and seen the money invested and the people going in, and the necessity of opening up that country rapidly—I cannot understand why, under these circumstances, anybody should object. I can understand the reluctance of the Government entering into any engagement which may contribute to building up towns in territory which the Americans now claim as their own. I can readily understand the Government's reluctance to enter into any engagement which might be considered as conceding anything in regard to Pyramid Harbour, but they certainly ought to grant charters to companies which, perhaps, wish to get to the water. They cannot get to the water now, to Pyramid Harbour, because there is nothing at Pyramid Harbour to go to, and there is no certainty that there will be, because if it follows that, as a matter of course, it is American territory and that you cannot build it up, then these railroads cannot go to it, but there is the other alternative of building through what is Canadian territory. I think that we are all Canadian enough to want to build railways through our own territory. I think we would all be satisfied to see the Government liberally assist a railway which is going through British Columbia; wherever it may be located we cannot yet say, because no survey has been made. A progressive Government, such as we have to-day, should desire to open up that country. And I think, we are all patriotic enough to wish, irrespective of party politics, to see that country opened up. I am not finding fault with the Government, but I think they should hesitate and consider before it is too late whether they should not grant charters from Lake Bennett to rail-

ways that wish to go through to the Yukon territory. To my mind, it would seem as if we were locking up that country against all comers, although I do not suppose the Government intend to convey that impression to the House now. I merely point this out because I am pretty conversant with that country. I have said very little about it, although I was there; I have rather listened to those who have never been there and who have given us such wonderful impressions as to the results that we may anticipate from its development. I speak, not with the view of censuring the Government, but I ask them to reconsider before their policy is too firmly fixed, to grant charters from Lake Bennett or Atlin or anywhere else in Canadian territory from which railways might be pushed forward. I ventured to point out last year, in a friendly way, that the Stikine route was impossible. I spoke from data and I was correct. Everybody else, who differed from me, was wrong as to the best way of getting into the Yukon. I took advantage of the opportunities I had while out there of learning the country, and I was satisfied that it is an absolute impossibility to get in there by that route. I am satisfied that there is only one correct way of getting in there from a Canadian standpoint, but it would be at an immense cost and take a good many years. I refer to the construction of a railway from Edmonton through the Cassiar district, working its way westward, and opening up the new gold districts as it goes. Pending that, there is only one way and that is by way of the Lynn Canal, where ships can get deep water right up to the wharfs. It is thirty or forty miles to get across from Skagway to Lake Bennett; some call it 42 miles and some 36, according to the straightness of the line. Having got across through the pass, the route lies down the rivers in the summer. By way of the Dalton trail, if other railways were shut out, there would only be one bridle-path or one company, which would be a great mistake in the interest of opening up that country. I think that we might fairly ask the Government to reconsider the matter, and that if they decide that they will not charter a railway to come down to Pyramid Harbour, at least they can allow gentlemen to have charters to go from Lake Bennett, or whereever they might wish to push a railway, which will open up the country, which will return a profit to the Government and make a way for the sale of the goods of Canadian merchants in that country. Possibly the Government, in looking at this great question, happened to look at that side of it, and I hope that they may see their way to chartering railways having for their object, not so much getting down to the water, but to open up the country from such a point as one like Lake Bennett. It is called the city of Lake Bennett, Atlin on the right, and White River on the left. I do not think we should drag in the name of any gentleman in this House, as some of them do, as being interested in a railway, because, if we do, I am afraid we should have to exclude a great many members who are interested in all sorts of things, mines, railways and many other projects. So long as they do not ask for Government assistance, so long as they are not receiving any Government aid, and are in no way entrenching on the public treasury, I think the least we can do is to allow every citizen of Canada, even if he is a member of Parliament, to contribute his quota to building up the best interests of the country. Therefore, I trust the Government will reconsider this matter so far as it concerns branch roads going into the Yukon, leaving aside, for the present, the great question of how it is going to be approached from the Lynn Canal. A railway has already been chartered from the Lynn Canal. The White Pass Railway is already 16 miles through the Pass, and had reached the summit when I left; so that, whether the Americans give us a part of that territory or whether they establish their claim as to the Alaskan boundary, there is one unalterable fact that this Parliament cannot change, that neither this or the other side of the House can change, and it is that goods being imported into that country will go by the Lynn Canal and will go over the White Pass, or over the Chilcat Pass from Pyramid Harbour. They will go in by way of the Lynn Canal because it is the only way of getting into that country.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). Mr. Speaker, in listening to the discussion on this very important question, I may say that I was deeply impressed with the statement made to the House by the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It seemed to me that he advanced arguments of very great weight in support of the position that the Government had taken. I am not quite satisfied, as I think has been conceded on this side of the House, that the course that the Government have taken in reference to this question has been inspired by patriotic motives, and I can very well understand that, having been engaged, as they have been engaged, in discussion and in controversy with the representatives of the neighbouring friendly state, they should feel how important it was that their policy should, at least, give to their opponents no possible peg on which to hang a sound argument. I say I was very deeply impressed with what the right hon. Prime Minister said on that subject, but, I confess, that when I heard what was advanced by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) I was very much impressed with what he said. I listened very carefully to the discussion which has taken place since, and I have not heard, so far as my humble judgment can enable me to form an opinion, an argument advanced which displaces the arguments adduced by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I have not heard an argument advanced which to my mind meets the point, that this is a question which is to be left to arbitration by experts. If it were a question to be decided by compromise, I could admit the force of the arguments that have been adduced on the Government side of the House, but if it be a question to be left to experts, I cannot see that the arguments that have been advanced by the Prime Minister, and by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, carry very great weight. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) spoke of American citizens building up, what he called a city, on this territory; but what we would scarcely expect to be a city before this question was decided, unless indeed it grew very rapidly. What force is there in the contention that these people would have any right to object to the decision of the arbitrators, if they go there deliberately, knowing that the territory is in dispute, that the arbitration is pending and that the arbitrators may decide that it is Canadian territory. I do not see where the Canadian case could in any way be weakened, or the American case in any way strengthened, by men settling on territory when they know that it is in dispute and the subject of arbitration. It may be the weakness of my comprehension that is at fault, but I confess that I absolutely fail to see where the strength of that argument comes in. If the question in dispute were to be decided by the commissioners there might be some force in the contention (although even then there would not be very much), but if it is a question which is to be decided by experts, I cannot imagine that these experts will be swayed from what they consider to be a just decision, by the mere fact that these individuals chose to settle on the territory at a moment when the question was about to be arbitrated. Under the circumstances, the Government should take this matter further into consideration and see whether, after all, the arguments which are adduced in favour of refusing these charters are not overborne by the arguments which are adduced in favour of granting them. I do not mean to say there may not be some objections to granting the charters, but it is a question as to on which side the weight of objection lies. It is a very important matter for Canada, and the question is whether there are greater objections to the granting of the charters than to the withholding of them. I have listened with as open a mind as possible to the argument on this question—which I am glad to say has been entirely removed from party bias, and I have come to the conclusion that the weight of objection is to the withholding of the charters. I hope the Government will reconsider their decision.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I was not in the House when the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) spoke, but I understand from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) adverted on the supposed fact, that supporters of the Government were interested in the White Pass, or more correctly speaking, the British Yukon charter.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) can hardly put it in that way. I did not use the words, nor did I mean to use the words "supporters of the Government." I said: "members of Parliament." I stated at the outset that I was not going to discuss the question on a party basis, and I did not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was understood by members on this side to draw the inference which he has now repudiated, that the Government were led to a conclusion on this subject by the fact that supporters of theirs were interested in the charter. As my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) states he had no intention of leaving that impression upon the mind of the House, nothing further need be said about it. It seems to me proper, when a statement or rumour is referred to in the House to the effect that members of Parliament are interested in this charter, that a statement of any knowledge the Government may have upon the subject, should be made. I have to say, that I do not think it would be possible that members of the House of Commons could have in any way communicated any information of the kind to any member of the Government without my having been advised of it, and I state upon my responsibility as a member of the Government and as a member of this House, that so far as I am concerned—and I believe I can speak for my colleagues—we have no knowledge that any member of Parliament on either side of the House, is directly or indirectly, in any way, shape or form, interested in the British Yukon charter. If any such interests exist, it is without the knowledge of any member of the Government, to the best of my belief.

Now, my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) appears to be in such a frame of mind, that I think there is a chance of getting him over to our view on this subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid you do not know him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think he may be regarded as being open to conviction, although, he may be like a countryman of mine who said he was open to conviction, but he did not think any man alive could convince him. My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) was impressed with the statement of the Prime Minister, but that impression seems to have been removed by a statement made by the leader of the Opposition to the effect, that inasmuch as the boundary question was one which would be

settled by international experts upon the strict rights of the case, therefore, the question of whether a town was built up within the disputed territory, would in no way affect the settlement.

Mr. McNEILL. Built up, pending the arbitration.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A moment's consideration will show, that although that statement appears plausible, yet as an actual fact, in connection with international negotiations no such proposition would stand the test of examination. If it be necessary to prove by actual fact that such is the case, we have only to refer to what has already taken place in connection with these very negotiations. I am not at liberty to say anything whatever as to what took place which is of a confidential character, but I am at liberty to discuss that which is of public notoriety in connection with the proceedings of that commission. It is known that when a rumour went abroad that a proposition was being considered, whereby Pyramid Harbour shall be given to Canada—I am not now speaking of the correctness of that rumour as stated in the newspapers—immediately upon that being known the towns on the Pacific coast called public meetings, and tremendous pressure was brought to bear upon the United States Government and upon the United States commissioners, and such a feeling was created in the United States, as resulted, I have no doubt, in what I conceive to be the unreasonable position which was subsequently taken by the United States in connection with these negotiations. We had such a result brought about by the fact that there were two towns upon the Lynn Canal, and that the trade connections of these two towns were able to affect the negotiations in such a way that we were subsequently placed in an unfavourable position. I give that fact for the consideration of my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill). I say it is a fact, that when any negotiations of the kind are taking place the parties will not be guided altogether by the hard and fast mathematical lines by which a court of law would be guided. It is a case of negotiation, and when the parties come to decide what they will agree to, the first thing they consider is what will be the result of this agreement if it is carried out. I apprehend that I have only to appeal to the common sense of the House when I say that the United States commissioners, finding such a condition of affairs as exists there—towns being built up and improving in commerce, trade connections and population, and considering that those places might possibly be transferred from the jurisdiction of the United States to the jurisdiction of Canada, would be most likely to refuse to agree to any proposition that might be made which would be likely to have that result. Now, my hon. friend says, and with some degree of plausibility, that he supposes the question will certainly be settled before the railroad would be built, or before any town would grow up upon the Pyramid Harbour as a result of the construction of a line of railway over the Dalton trail. But my hon. friend would be the first man who would condemn this Government if, because we believed it probable that a settlement would be arrived at in a few months, we committed ourselves irrevocably to something which would have the effect of placing us in a false position. I say that would be an incautious thing to do.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend did not quite catch the argument. I did not say that the town would not rise up before the railroad was built. I did not wish him to understand that. What I did say was that I thought there could not be a very large city created or grow up there before the arbitrators had decided. I was not using the argument in the sense in which my hon. friend imagines.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I apprehended what my hon. friend said correctly. Perhaps I have not made myself clear. What I understood my hon. friend to say was that it would not be a good reason for not chartering this railway that we were afraid of complicating the boundary question, because there could not be a place of any special importance built up upon the Pyramid Harbour as the result of the construction of the railway, or granting the charter for the railway, before the boundary question would be, in all probability, settled.

Mr. McNEILL. If my hon. friend will just add to that, and if there were, I did not consider that the arbitrators would regard that as of much importance, in view of the fact that this settlement had been made by men who knew that the arbitration was about to take place.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is another point, of course.

Mr. McNEILL. That is part of my argument.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is becoming convinced, and is trying to strengthen his former conviction.

Mr. McNEILL. I am only asking my hon. friend to do my argument, poor as it was, justice.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am striving to meet the argument of the hon. gentleman, as he presented it. I could not convince him, of course, by misrepresenting his argument. The hon. gentleman will remember that the city of Skagway, having 14,000 or 15,000 inhabitants and a

city organization, was absolutely unknown a year and a half ago. When towns and cities spring up so rapidly as they do under these circumstances, it would be, in my judgment, manifestly unsafe for the Government, if they considered that point of importance, to pass it over for the reason the hon. gentleman presents—that the arbitration would probably be settled before the town sprang up. I venture this statement, that if a charter were granted for a railway over the Dalton trail, and active work were begun by a company known to possess sufficient capital to carry it to a conclusion—which I presume is the case with the company represented by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies), a town of 10,000 or 12,000 inhabitants would spring up within six months from the time work was begun. Any one who has followed the negotiations from the time the boundary question commenced up to the present time, must be convinced that the arbitration would be most materially affected by the fact that such a town was there. I do not see how my hon. friend, knowing what has happened, can come to any other conclusion than that the existence of such a town would most materially affect the situation that would have to be dealt with by the arbitrators. I do not intend to spend any special time in the discussion of the question further than to point out that my hon. friend from Richmond, in giving the account of his proceedings, has not stated anything which it is necessary for the Government to controvert. He stated that he had brought this matter forward in good faith; nobody disputes that. He stated that the proposed corporators were men of substance; nobody disputes that. The bona fides of his proceedings is not in the least doubted. Nor do the Government find it necessary to question the solvency or the financial ability of the men he represents. The Government are treating all parties alike, whatever be their political relations, whether they are friendly to the Government or not. My hon. friend would possibly have some good ground of complaint if we had selected some of those interested and had said to them: We will give certain gentlemen a charter for a railway over this line, but we will not give you one. But we have not done that. We have not taken a course which would leave us open to the imputation of being actuated by favouritism; but we have decided that no charter shall be granted for the present over this line, and that decision applies to friends and foes alike. Therefore, I do not think we are open to the charge that we are actuated by any other motive than that stated so fully and fairly by the Prime Minister. Let me call attention to another fact, which has been adverted to, but which I do not think has been placed clearly before the House. It was brought out in the course of the debate that in the charter which had been brought down to the House last session, for the proposed Stikine-Teslin line of railway, there was a provision that Mackenzie & Mann, the incorporators of the company, might build from the Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk. But clause 11 of that Bill distinctly shows that the idea which the Government had at that time was the same as it is now, although it works out in a different way and causes different action at this time.

> The company may lay out, construct and operate the lines of railway, and extensions and other lines mentioned in clauses 1 and 2 of the said contract, provided that the power to build the line from Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk and the branch lines and the lines from navigable waters to property owned by the company shall not be exercised without the consent of the Governor in Council.

So that the question of policy was still held by the Government within its own control, just as it is at present.

I desire to say nothing further, except to advert for a moment to the remarks of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville). It will be manifest that the point brought up by the leader of the Opposition is different altogether from that discussed by the hon. member and the arguments used in support of the position taken by the members of the Government who have spoken and in support of the position taken by the right hon. First Minister, do not apply at all to the question of internal lines within the Yukon district. Therefore, I am not discussing that point, and I do not desire that the reasons given should be taken as intended to apply to charters over lines of railway within the Yukon district, except those which may run to the coast.

Mr. McNEILL. Is this policy to last only until an arbitration is finally arranged? My right hon. friend has argued all through on the view that this may interfere with the negotiations. But the only negotiations at present are concerning the appointing of a board of arbitration. Is it only until that is settled that this policy is to apply? If an arbitration be agreed upon, are the charters then to be granted?

The PRIME MINISTER. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." I confess that the position might be seriously affected, if the matter had been referred to arbitration. When it is referred to arbitration, then we may consider the question again. I do not wish to say in advance what we may do, but I say this, that the weight of the objection would be very much less, which at present seems to me insurmountable.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I think the Government have come to a decision very late in the day. They have granted charters to railways to go into that country on the line they now refuse.

They gave permission to Mann & Mackenzie, the contractors, to build a railway in there as a portion of their line, if they desired. Owing to the course which the Government have taken, two very considerable cities have been built on the American coast, which would have no existence there to-day, if it were not for our railways in our Canadian territory. Those cities have been built up entirely by the trade in furnishing supplies to Canada. I think it very unfortunate that, whatever the course the Government desire to take to keep the resources of Canada for ourselves—which is the line they are taking to-day—they did not come to that decision before, because, now that these cities are established, our present policy will simply have the effect of giving them greater importance in consequence. Another point that strikes me is: we are told there is to be a modus vivendi for two years in another portion of the disputed territory, and that modus vivendi gives the United States full control. I think that will be quite unfortunate, because, the moment you hand over possession and control for to-day, and cities are built on that disputed territory, you will find it most difficult to resume possession; and the arbitrators, in the face of the fact that the Canadians have handed this territory over and invited, as it were, the Americans to go in and build cities, under their control and management, will find it difficult to hand that back to the Canadian people. So that, I think, in that regard, it would be unfortunate to have a modus vivendi for two years. I think that we should not give up any of our rights, but insist on exercising our claim to all the territory we believe is ours.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has told us that the Americans have been most unreasonable and most unfair——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. Not in just so many words; but the hon. Minister said that they were very difficult to deal with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I even said that.

Mr. WALLACE. He said a good deal more than that, and put it a good deal stronger than that, as the "Hansard" report will show.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The best way would be to tell me what I did say.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not take it down exactly, but it will be seen in the "Hansard" report.

The PRIME MINISTER. Better wait, then, until the "Hansard" comes down.

Mr. WALLACE. I can give the substance very well, and it is this, that the American Government have been very unreasonable very hard to deal with, and very unfair in coming to any agreement on these matters between Canada and the United States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, he must surely be thinking of some language used by somebody else on some other occasion, for certainly I did not make any such statement. The hon. member is in error.

Mr. WALLACE. I made no mistake. I was listening, and the "Hansard" report will show that I am right; but, if the hon. gentleman denies having made the statement, I need not pursue it. But I say, that I quite cordially agree in that statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps you think I ought to have made it, and, therefore, conclude that I did.

Mr. WALLACE. I was pleased to hear those gentlemen who, in the years gone by, told us how easy it would be to deal with the people of the United States if there was a proper spirit exhibited by the Canadian people, but that the Canadian Government of those days were very unfair to our friends south of the line, and that if there was any spirit of fair dealing on their part at all, they would find the Americans ready to meet them half way. Those gentlemen on the Treasury benches were never done preaching that doctrine. Now, when they come to deal with them themselves they find, apparently, a different state of affairs, as has been confessed by the Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon, and as has been felt by all these gentlemen when they tell us that the proposal on which they separated from the United States commissioners was of such an unfair character, so thoroughly unreasonable, that they not only refused to consider that matter, but dropped all negotiations on the other questions, because the United States commissioners were so exceedingly unfair and selfish with regard to the settlement of the Alaska boundary question. Now, the Government are confronted with the same difficulties as the former Government had been in the past, the unreasonable desire, the selfish desire, I must say, of the people of the United States not to deal fairly with the people of Canada in these matters. These gentlemen say to-day that they are not going to build up American cities or do anything that will contribute to the prosperity of the United States settlements along the boundary. Why, Sir, we were told only a short time ago that the Yankee dollar was so much better than the English shilling that we should rejoice whenever Americans came to deal with us, that we should meet them more than half way, and that we should have that reciprocal spirit which would con-

duce to the prosperity of both countries. But they are finding out now by experience that it will pay Canadians to look after their own business, to protect their own interests, and that the Yankee can be very well left to look after his own affairs. I am glad to see a spirit prevalent to-day among these gentlemen, that did not exist in the past, of having a little more regard for Canadian interests and a little less for those of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals how long they intend to continue this policy in the event of failing to reach a settlement with the United States, because they have kept it up for two years, and it would be satisfactory to know how long that country is going to be shut up for the want of railways?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the Premier has already practically answered that question. Personally, I am confident there will be no disposition on the part of the Government to keep the country shut up one hour longer than is necessary. We will determine that question when the field is clear of existing difficulties.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the First Minister to say that he has determined on this policy now because he hopes to have a settlement inside the next two years; but he did not say, in the event of a settlement not being reached, what other policy he would adopt.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would not this be a good time for the Government to consider the building of a railway through Canadian territory from Edmonton or from some point on the Canadian Pacific Railway? We want a line that will give a market for the products of Manitoba and the North-west provinces, and to keep the market in the Yukon for ourselves instead of giving it to the Americans. When we find these obstructions put forward by the Americans to our getting into our own territory, why not build up a Canadian route from some point like Edmonton, or some point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and forever hold that market for Canada without paying any regard to the Americans?

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say in reply to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that if we cannot settle that question so as to have access to the Yukon from the Lynn Canal, then our policy will be to build a railway down to a harbour which is in Canadian territory. In regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), to build a railway from Edmonton, that is a matter that must be considered by itself.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Excise, $462,095—

Salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, and to provide for increase depending upon the result of excise examinations	$315,395

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). In that item there is an increase of $10,318.75. I move that the item be reduced by $3,000, so that the increase will then be only $7,318.75. Since the estimates have been prepared, we find that we can reduce the amount.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue if he has made any appointment to the excise office in St. Thomas?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not yet.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has received recommendations, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think I have received a few.

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation from the Minister of two things: First, as to what causes the increase, and secondly, as to why he has reduced his first estimate by $3,000?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hold in my hand a list of all the factories and other establishments in the Dominion which are under the control of this department, they number 637. In the current year no less than 96 new ones have been established. When it is considered that in the excise department the duty of the officers is not only to gauge and to measure the goods once they are manufactured and ready to enter into consumption, but that they are obliged even to follow the process of the manufacture of those goods from the beginning, and to attend to every step connected with the distillation from the moment the grain is brought into the distillery, and so with other goods, one can readily understand that this increase is necessitated in order to pay our officers. One can readily understand that an increase of 96 in the number of these establishments will necessitate an increase in the vote.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the nature of the increase?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are 20 more brewers and maltsters, 20 cigar factories, 5 tobacco factories, and 42 bonded warehouses, and the increase is continuing, especially in British Columbia and the North-west. I have a list here of recent increases, in bonded warehouses, and I find among the names of places in which these have been established, Vancouver, Trail, Victoria, Kaslo, Lardner, and so on. I thought at first we should require an increase of $10,000, but I find there is a hope of reducing the increase to $7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman employ new officers or officers already in the service, and add to their present duties?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That depends on the circumstances. In some cases the officers already in the service will have time to attend to the new establishments, but in others new officers will have to be appointed. For instance, there is to be a new distillery in Berthier, in the province of Quebec, which will require two new officers. We are notified also of the building of a distillery at Beauport, Que., which will require at least two officers.

Mr. FOSTER. How does my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) select these officers—for instance, take Berthier?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We need one experienced man at least. We are obliged to bring in a man from Ontario, as we have had no distilleries in Quebec and have no experienced officers. We have brought Mr. Taylor from Windsor, an experienced officer in the business of distilling, and he will teach the other officer, whom we employ in the neighbourhood of Berthier.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not make the new man a full-fledged officer, I suppose, until he has experience?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is appointed at $500, and will be promoted as he gains experience.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that at first he is a probationer and does not go on the regular staff until he has passed certain examinations?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is appointed a deputy collector of the lowest class—class B.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he have to pass any examination?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. Probably my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is aware that in our department the only officers who are not obliged to pass examinations are the deputy collectors.

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

After Recess.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

The House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Sutherland for the third reading of Bill (No. 90) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company; and the motion of Mr. Douglas in amendment thereto.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, when the hour for private Bills expired last Wednesday, I think it was, I was endeavouring to give the House the history of this Bill from its beginning, some twenty or thirty years ago, down to the present time. I greatly regret that I was unable to cover the entire ground that day. I was especially unable to do that as I desired to give the House the history of the litigation in connection with that same Bill. It seems to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has secured control of this charter, or is about to secure control of it, could very well afford to give the people of that country an extension of, say, 20 miles of the road this year. The members from the west met together and discussed the matter very fully with the very able solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and they came to the conclusion that they could not possibly agree, in view of what the interests of the people of that country demand, to allow this Bill to pass unless the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should see its way clear to construct, at least, 15 miles of the road this year. In the course of some five or six weeks this charter will expire and I am disposed to think that, unless we can get some portion of the road constructed this year, it will be better, in the interest of all concerned, that the charter should expire. The members came to the conclusion that the very least they could agree to, in respect to construction this year, would be 15 miles, and I think that was an extremely moderate amount. The statute-books are loaded up with legislation, passed during the last 15 years, in regard to this railway and the record has been one that is a disgrace to the people of the Dominion. We feel strongly, that we surely do not appeal to this House in vain when we are asking it to insert a clause in this charter that, at least 15 miles shall be built this year. The company that now controls the road announces its willingness, and has agreed to the insertion of a clause in the Bill, to expend $20,000 this year. The House will understand that it would be just as desirable, in the interest of the country, to agree to the expenditure of 25 cents during the present year for any benefit that will result to the settlers. It seems to me, in view of what has been done for the Canadian Pacific Railway, in view of the land grant which this charter carries, it will be as little as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could do to expend $100,000, or $150,000, which would build 15 or 20 miles of the road this year. Every person familiar with railway construction in the North-west will understand that it is simply a matter of grading 15 or 20 miles, and the rails can be laid two or three weeks after the grading is done. If the House can see its way clear to put a clause in this charter to compel the company to build 15 miles this year, I believe it would be an inestimable boon to the settlers who would be enabled to

get their wheat to market much cheaper than they are able to do at the present time. My impression is that the land grant carried by that charter is probably the most valuable land grant that will ever be given to any railway company in this country. At the present time, the land is pretty well exhausted. It will be almost impossible for the Government, or Parliament, to confer on any corporation such a land grant as this. This land is worth, at least, $2 per acre. As the charter carries 6,400 acres per mile, it is worth $12,800 per mile, and when you estimate a mileage of 700 or 800 miles, which will carry the road to the Yellow Head Pass, you will begin to understand the great value of this land grant. My belief is that it would be in the interest of this country and of the North-west if that charter were allowed to expire, as it will expire, in five or six weeks, and that the Government should take control of the land grant. The value of the land is infinitely greater than the cost of the road will be. The Government will be able to build the road itself and have a surplus of probably $3,000 or $4,000 a mile, enough to pay for any loss that might be sustained in operating the road until the country is well settled. It seems to me that this is a reasonable proposition and the time is coming when the Government, and when Parliament should consider this question from the economic standpoint. The time will come, and that before very long, I predict, when the Government will be forced to take control of the railways, and it seems to me, that there should be inaugurated, at the present time, the policy of the nationalization of railways. We, at least, could commence with the new ones that are to be built and inaugurate a policy that will ultimately lead to the nationalization of the entire railway system of the country. I am going to explain that, in connection with this Bill, the company has power to bond to the extent of $35,000 a mile. That will result in a very large fixed charge being imposed on this railway, and I cannot better illustrate the disadvantage of having large fixed charges against any railway than by reading you, very briefly, the experience in connection with two North-west railways. I quote from a very clever pamphlet, written by Mr. Willison, the clever editor of the Toronto "Globe." Although he does not arrive at any particular conclusion, still, many of his facts are interesting:

> The history of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway is faithful to the details of American railway methods. More than $3,500,000 was received from the sale of bonds. The road cost for construction and commission and disbursements in connection with the sale of bonds probably $2,500,000. Rolling stock and terminus were supplied by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The road received also a land grant of 1,400,000 acres and a cash subsidy of $80,000 a year. It was leased for six years to the Canadian Pacific Railway without rental, and this lease has just been renewed. But the original promoters got a million or two out of the speculation.

This is the point I have been seeking to illustrate. The promoters make vast sums of money and the public pay for it. In connection with this enterprise, would it not be well for Parliament to take a lesson from this experience and say that, instead of speculators making a million or two out of these enterprises, the people themselves should make a million or two. I am quite prepared to admit that it would be a shocking precedent to establish, that the country itself should make a dollar out of any of these enterprises, but things have gone so far in the opposite direction, that it would not be a bad idea to try it for once, and if it should prove an utter failure, we, I suppose, must return to the old methods which have proved such a curse to Canada, and especially to the North-west Territories. Let me give you, briefly, the history of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company:

> The Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company was incorporated in 1890. The length of the road as projected is 340 miles, of which 295 miles has been constructed. The promoters received the usual land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, and mail subsidy of $80,000. The subsidy is to be paid direct to the London agents, as trustees for the bondholders. The bonding powers given to the company were to the amount of $25,000 per mile. With this the enterprise was launched. Almost immediately the road passed under the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

That is the worst of it in that country; pretty nearly every railway that is built there gets under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if we allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to take over control of this territory, and if the report that the Canadian Pacific Railway is about to secure the control of the Northern Pacific system be true, then we will indeed have a tremendous monopoly established. If the House does not throw this charter out, I hope it will at least see the necessity of protecting the interests of the people. If the entire railroad interests of the North-west Territories are to be controlled by one company, let this Parliament at least see that that company shall afford proper accommodation to the people. I appeal to the House, and I hope my appeal shall not be in vain, that they shall insist that this company be compelled to build fifteen miles of the road this year. I continue to read:

> Many of its promoters were closely identified with that company. At the session of Parliament of 1891 the Canadian Pacific Railway obtained permission to issue its own 4 per cent consolidated debenture stock to the amount of $20,000 per mile of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway. This was stated to be for the purpose of "satisfying or acquiring obligations entered into in respect of the acquisition, construction, completion or equipment of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway." The 295 miles of the road were

opened in October, 1892, the Canadian Pacific Railway agreeing to operate it for the first five years, furnish the rolling stock and retain all income other than the subsidy. To estimate correctly the resources which from various channels has been provided for, the construction and operation of this 295 miles of prairie road is scarcely possible upon the information available. But a more or less close approximation may be calculated from the above facts. Railways sometimes calculate their land grant upon a business of $3 an acre.

I have valued the land grant at only $2 per acre.

The Calgary and Edmonton Company will not say that half that figure is an excessive basis. That gives $2,832,000 under that head.

If you estimate the land grant for 800 miles you will see what a tremendous subsidy we are giving to the company to build this road. In view of that tremendous subsidy, amounting to eight or ten million dollars—I am sorry I have not had time to figure out the exact sum—surely it is not asking too much to insist that they shall expend $100,000 to extend that road during the present season.

To this amount must be added the road's bonded indebtedness, consisting of $5,458,940 first mortgage 6 per cent twenty year bonds. It may be that these bonds were subjected to a discount, but the measure of guarantee which was given them by means of the mail subsidy no doubt materially strengthened them. Roughly speaking, therefore, and leaving out of the addition the mail subsidies, the promoters raised upon the road in bonds and land the amount of $28,000 a mile.

Just think of it; raising $28,000 per mile on a road that did not cost more than $8,000. That is the most vicious part of this railway policy as it has existed in Canada. It is on a parallel with this: A man builds a house for $4,000, and then he comes to Parliament and obtains power to raise $10,000 on it, constituting himself a joint stock company, and taking in his wife and a child or two in order that he may evade individual responsibility, and in that way he makes money at the expense of others:

The cost of the road according to the company's own figure has been $3,717,882, or $13,000 a mile.

According to the company's own statement the cost of the road is only $13,000 per mile, and yet the Parliament of Canada gave power to the company to bond at $28,000 per mile; more than double what the road cost on the company's own estimate. It seems to me that members of Parliament have never yet wakened up to the actual facts in connection with the bonding of these railways by the companies.

Actually, however, the construction probably did not cost more than $7,000 a mile. The road-bed is now in very poor condition. At this rate the total cost was $2,065,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

That is Mr. Willison's estimate and I think it is a fair estimate for these prairie sections. Yet, despite these facts, we, the representatives of the people in the Dominion Parliament, enable them to bond the road for $28,000 a mile. This is such an outrageous proposition that it does not need to be restated in order that the members of this House may understand its enormity. Just listen to the words of Mr. Willison:

The road-bed is now in very poor condition. At this rate the total cost was $2,065,000. Over against this is a bonded debt of five and a half millions, and the 1,888,000 acres of land grant. In view of all these facts we should make it an inflexible feature of our future railway policy that we shall not vote public money for the construction of parallel roads, that we shall rigidly limit issues of the stock and capital, and force railway construction and railway operation down to business principles. It is time we learned something from a very instructive experience.

Indeed, it is time that we should learn something from the very instructive experience of the past. If we allow this company the privilege of bonding to the extent of $35,000 a mile, it will be quite plain to the people of Canada that we have not learned anything from our very instructive experience in the past. I appeal to the House that this Parliament should preserve the rights of the people by inserting a clause that the company should at least build fifteen miles a year. The settlers went into that country with the promise that the railway should be built, and they look to the Parliament of Canada to protect their interests. A large number of them have passed over to the great majority; a large number of them have grown gray waiting for this accommodation, and not a few, I believe, have left that country with a curse. This is the kind of thing that has helped to mar the fair prospects of the North-west in past years. It is because of the experience of these settlers that I rise to protest against that policy being continued; it is because of this that I rise to-night to ask that the members of this Parliament consider the interests of the people, and not the interests of the railway company. We are sent here to represent the interests of the settlers and not the interests of the railway companies. I appeal to the House to insist that this clause be placed in the charter and that some semblance of good faith be kept with those settlers after twenty years' delusion and bad faith.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Vote.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that, on a momentous occasion, such as this, when the interests of the great North-west are at stake, the members from Manitoba and the North-west are ready to go to a vote on this Bill without stating the views they hold. If they will not state the case, I will try and say some-

thing on behalf of the North-west; and I am sorry that, when I say this, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways are not in their places; but I am glad to see that the Minister of the Interior is here, and I hope that, after he hears what I say, he will at least give his colleagues some advice as to what they ought to do in regard to this question. For years the question of railway reform has been before this country; for years the members from the North-west have come down to Ottawa; for years they have filled their newspapers with editorials claiming that the North-west was ground down by a grasping monopoly, created by the Conservative party and known as the Canadian Pacific Railway. Yet to-night we hear an hon. member from the North-west, who has been known there as the champion of the people in railway matters, saying that he will be satisfied, if this great railway monopoly is allowed to take over this road and build 15 miles this year. I say, he should have come out strongly and said, that, as a supporter of the Government, he would decline to support them, if they did not take such measures before this Bill went through, as to protect the people of this country, and especially the people of the North-west. There is only one way to bring about railway reform in this country; that is, by insisting on some kind of concession being given with each railway Bill, as it goes through. If the people of the North-west to-day have any advantages in regard to railway rates over what they had years ago, it is because the Government got certain concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was chartered, two years ago. If the people of the North-west have anything else to thank this Parliament for, it is the concession that was obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the time their monopoly was bought out, some years ago; and the only way we can get concessions for the people is to insist on some concession in regard to each railway, as its Bill comes before this House. If the people of the North-west have railway grievances, as the Winnipeg "Tribune" says they have, as the members from the North-west say they have, why do not these hon. gentlemen come forward to-night and say, that this Bill shall not go through until those grievances have been amended? Some of the grievances of the people have been amended in the past by compelling railway companies, when they come before Parliament, asking for privileges, to give some concessions to the people in return. What was done in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Bill, two years ago? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company asked Parliament to give them a large grant of land, a large sum of money, a railway charter, and practical control of one of the only two remaining passes of the Rocky Mountains. Parliament gave that franchise to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; but what did Parliament exact from that company in return? The concessions granted by the Canadian Pacific Railway in favour of the people of the North west, at the instigation of the present Government, were as follows:— (1) rates to and from points on the Crow's Nest line to be taken out of the 10 per cent clause and to be subject to approval by Governor in Council or a railway commission; (2) reduction in rates on west-bound traffic originating east of Fort William, on certain classes of goods, of from 10 to 23½ per cent; (3) reduction in rates on east-bound traffic originating west of Fort William, grain and flour, of 30 per cent; (4) the Railway Committee may give running powers on terms fixed by the committee; (5) the Crow's Nest line and extensions in British Columbia to be subject to the Railway Act; (6) the price at which the company may sell the Crow's Nest lands to be regulated by the Governor in Council; (7) 50,000 acres of coal lands to be handed over to the Government.

If valuable concessions, such as these, could be obtained by the Government from the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the Crow's Nest Bill went through the House, why are not valuable concessions of the same kind going now? And why are not the members from the North-west insisting on the Government they support getting similar concessions? Why are they allowing this Bill to go through without demanding concessions? What is the Minister of the Interior here for, unless to demand those concessions? Why are not the members of this Government who opposed the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly, insisting on concessions for the people now? This charter, which is being extended to-day in the sole interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is a most valuable franchise. We have been told to-night that it gives the Canadian Pacific Railway Company 6,400 acres of land per mile for almost 800 miles of road—for 400 miles at least—and what is the value of this land? The Reform party, when in Opposition in this country, valued that land at from three to five dollars an acre. Surely, it is worth at least that amount to-day. Six thousand four hundred acres per mile, at $3 an acre, is equivalent to almost $20,000 per mile: and we have been told to-night that this road can be built for $7,000 a mile, and I believe it can. Then, why is the Minister of the Interior not insisting, on behalf of the people of the North-west, on getting the same concessions now as were got at the time the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was chartered? I will not consent to this Bill going through, until we have some explanation in that respect. In 1884 the members from the North-west came down here and

said, that the crying evil of that country was the monopoly enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. They aroused such an agitation here that at last the Dominion Government, under the leadership of Sir John Macdonald, had to buy out the monopoly clause for the Canadian Pacific Railway in return for which the Government guaranteed the interest on the company's stock for a great many years. That interest is now being paid, and the country has sustained no loss. On that occasion the people of the North-west got a concession from the Canadian Pacific Railway in return for the franchise given to them. Why is not a similar concession being got now? This is a valuable franchise, not only conveying a large land grant, but, I believe, granting to the company the last of the existing passes through the Rocky Mountains. If you insisted on concessions to the people two years ago in return for the Crow's Nest Pass, why are you extending this franchise without protecting the people? I say, that the North-west members will not be doing their duty, if they do not insist, and especially if the Minister of the Interior does not insist, on getting for the people of the North-west on this occasion the same concessions as were got for the people two years ago. The right hon. gentleman who leads this House, in 1884, when the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly was before the House, spoke of "the many obnoxious clauses which the people of Canada were subjected to under this instrument." Two or three of these obnoxious clauses have been got rid of. The one in regard to the construction of other railways has been got rid of, but there are many others. I will tell the North-west members a most objectionable thing in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter to-day, that is, that the company are entitled to a 10 per cent dividend on what the road was supposed to cost. The North-west members ought to insist on the surrender of that 10 per cent clause or this Bill shall not pass. But I have not heard one of them say that.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. You have not been in the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. To-night I insist that this concession, so valuable as it is, giving so much land to the Canadian Pacific Railway, going so far to strengthen its present monopoly, should not be granted unless the legislation I call for be inserted in the Bill.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Spend the summer here and know a little about it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have read the speeches of the hon. gentleman and others about this grasping monopoly, but now he seems to be the apologist of that corporation, and desires to see the people of the North-west kept under the grasp of that monopoly. He is now willing that the company should be allowed to take advantage of that clause and earn 10 per cent on inflated capital before they can be called on to pay any share of taxation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I rise to a question of order. There is one hour for private Bills, and there is a large number of very important private Bills on the paper. I do not think that this discussion is either germane to the Bill or the amendment, and should not be allowed to interfere with the progress of business.

Mr. HENDERSON. With reference to the point of order, I would just say that the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has very little reason to complain to-night. He allowed the whole hour the other night, without any objection, to be used in discussing this Bill in a manner not calculated to throw any light on it whatever. I understand it was the hon. gentleman himself who caused the obstruction on that occasion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I spoke but a short time, three or four minutes, and that in favour of the Bill passing, and against the amendment. I am not objecting to opposition by the hon. member for York (Mr. McLean) to the Bill, but I think that his argument ought to be germane to the matter under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House seems to be a very restricted one, and I do not think it allows a discussion on all the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with the North-west. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to matters connected with the extension of time on this railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will you, Mr. Speaker, read the amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know that that will afford the House very much more light. The amendment is by Mr. Douglas:

> That the Bill be not now read the third time, but referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend it by striking out section 3 and substituting the following:—
> "Section 5 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the words '1st day of August' in the seventh and eight lines thereof and substituting the '1st day of December.'"

Whatever that may mean, it cannot give rise to a discussion of the whole affairs of the North-west and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACLEAN. With all due deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that this company is asking for an extension of its charter, and that is really the clause under discussion, and I am giving some reasons why the extension should not be granted. And especially as the hon. gentleman who pre-

ceded me went over the whole range, I would ask the indulgence of the House on this, the first opportunity I have had, through no fault of mine, of discussing this measure, to give my views upon the question before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please confine his argument to the question of extending the time of the charter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As my hon. friend was not here on a former occasion when this Bill was reported from the Railway Committee, I would tell him that other hon. gentlemen, of course in the exercise of their right, spent a great deal of time in talking out the hour and preventing the vote being reached. I am quite sure that the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) does not wish to follow that course, and as there are a number of very important Bills on the paper, I hope that he will be sufficiently brief to enable a vote to be taken and other Bills reached.

Mr. MACLEAN. I understand the Bill to be for an extension of time for this railway charter, and that the amendment bears on that question. I say that this extension should not be granted for the reasons I have just urged, and which, I think, are quite germane to the question before the House. It is not in the public interest that a great monopoly such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has been condemned from time to time in this House as a grinding and grasping monopoly in the North-west, should be given this extension and this franchise unless they give the same concession to the people which it gave in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass charter. The North-west to-day has substantial grievances against the Canadian Pacific Railway. The people there are calling for a railway commission to remedy these grievances. Then, I say, do not give this additional franchise to that company, do not strengthen this monopoly, unless it will consent to the establishment of a railway commission and the surrender of that 10 per cent clause. Hon. gentlemen say theoretically that the Canadian Pacific Railway are in favour of a railway commission. But I would have concessions insisted upon before giving it any further favours. The people are sick and tired of giving and giving to the railways and getting nothing in return. You can get something if you stand up like men and insist on getting it, just as you did get something in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass charter.

An hon. MEMBER. No, not a thing.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Railways said that he had got concessions, substantial concessions, and the people have obtained reductions in freight rates. In that Crow's Nest Pass charter a clause was inserted providing that it be taken out of the 10 per cent clause, so that the 10 per cent clause does not govern in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Do you not want to obtain that concession for the North-west people? If you do, you must insist on getting it just as you did in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The House has perfect power to amend the Railway Act in such a way that the 10 per cent clause will not apply, without any concession from this company.

Mr. MACLEAN. That does not meet the case at all. Either substantial concessions were got in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass charter or they were not. If the hon. Minister of the Interior says that the concessions obtained were not substantial, he is going against the Minister of Railways, who said that they were, and who justified that charter on that ground. I am told that the hon. Minister of the Interior has a very extensive proposition to submit, in a very short time, in connection with the Rainy River Railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not touch upon that.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am speaking directly to the question of the extension of time and explaining why it should not be granted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The 10 per cent clause does not apply to this charter.

Mr. MACLEAN. It does. It applies to all the rest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I say: Do not give them this concession until they waive their right to that 10 per cent clause over the entire system. It may not apply to this particular charter, but it does obtain all over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is not the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the hon. gentleman know where the 10 per cent clause is to be found?

Mr. MACLEAN. I understand perfectly what I am talking about. I say that the grievance of the North-west to-day is this 10 per cent clause which obtains over the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Do not give the Canadian Pacific this additional concession unless they withdraw the 10 per cent clause which now obtains over the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was going on to say that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in connection with Mr. Greenway of Manitoba, we are told, has made some arrangement in regard to the Rainy River Railway. The province of Ontario has given immense sums to that railway. This Parliament of Canada, I am told, will, in a few days, be asked to give large sums to that railway. The province of Manitoba is pre-

pared to vote large subsidies to that railday. And the justification of these subsidies is that concessions will be demanded in the interest of the people of Canada generally, that freight rates will be regulated, that running rights will be accorded to other companies over this railway, and everything done that it is possible to do to protect the rights of the people. If this is to be done, with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, who claim to be rivals of the Canadian Pacific Railway, why should not the same be done in connection with this road, which is not Mann & Mackenzie's, but, I am told, belongs or will belong out and out to the Canadian Pacific Railway? I think these are all reasons why this extension should not be given to-night. These are reasons why the North-west members should insist that every concession that was given to the North-west and British Columbia in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass, and which we are told are to be given in connection with the Rainy River road, should be given in connection with this Bill. For seven or eight years I have been a member of this House, and during that time I have studied the transportation problem and tried, in my humble way, to get some sort of practical reform. I have agitated in the newspaper and in this House and in the country. I have come to this conclusion—that there is only one way to secure railway reform in this country, and that is not by large and sweeping and general measures, but by taking each Bill as it comes up, by following each franchise as it is given, and demanding in return for it some kind of concessions to the people. The hon. gentleman who last spoke says he is in favour of the nationalization of the railways. I also am in favour of that; but it cannot be secured by any sweeping measure, but must come by degrees. The Government should maintain the railway system they have and expand it gradually, get running rights here and there, and in that way, be a competing road to the two great monopolies in this country. You will never get out nationalization of the railways with any one measure—it is too big a problem for that. But if you go to work seriously and take up each franchise as it comes before us and insist on some kind of protection to the people, you will gradually get it. Why, in another place, a railway measure was under consideration, and it was suggested that the concessions should be given provided the railway would give something in return, say a two-cent passenger rate. To get cheaper fares for the people we should take each railway Bill as it comes up and tell the promoters: You can have your franchise if you will give a two-cent passenger rate. If one road gave that rate, as in the State of New York, every other road in the country would be compelled to follow the example. But if you say you must not interfere with vested rights, that you must not treat one company in this way because some other company was treated differently in the past, you will never get it. If the members from the North-west—and I appeal to them especially—desire to see railway reform in this country, they must band together and take these Bills one after the other and see to it that they provide substantial protection for the people they represent. It will not do for them to say, as the hon. member who has just taken his seat said, that they will be satisfied if the Canadian Pacific Railway will build 15 miles of this road this summer. That is no concession to the people of the North-west. They should insist on the same concessions as were given to the people in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I trust that the hon. members from the North-west, before this Bill is allowed to go through, will press upon the Minister of the Interior to do for the North-west what he did for British Columbia in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass road. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish further to take up the time of the House. But there is another amendment, and it may be necessary to speak on this Bill again in order to bring out further the views I hold in regard to this whole railway problem. I do say that this is the opportunity of the Government and of the Liberal party which condemned that Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly as no other monopoly ever was condemned in this country, to compel the company as they are well able to do, to do something for the people of the North-west. And especially is it the duty of the Minister of the Interior, who sits here as the representative of these prairie provinces, to insist on having the same rights for his provinces as were given to British Columbia two years ago.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I desire to say only a word or two, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) assumes the right to lecture the members of the North-west on what constitutes their interest. I am inclined to think he would do better to acquire at least an elementary knowledge of the subject before he discusses it. The 10 per cent clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway has no existence as applied to this charter.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say it had.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will listen, he will know more about this subject than he does now. The 10 per cent clause is a clause in the original Canadian Pacific Railway charter. It was put there, as the hon. gentleman can easily find out, and as old members of the House will remember, to override the 15 per cent clause in the General Railway Act of Canada. There is a 15 per cent—not 10 per cent—clause which applies to all these charters; and it is in the General Railway Act, so that it does not constitute a corporate

right on the part of any particular railway company, but may be amended from time to time by this Parliament without respect to any concession to any company. So if my hon. friend desires that Parliament should retain power to do away, not with the 10 per cent, but with the 15 per cent clause, his desire is already gratified. I think I know something of the desires and wishes of the people of the North-west in connection with this charter, and I say that the wish of the people is that the road should be built. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has moved a resolution requiring that as a condition of this Bill, 15 miles of the road shall be built this year. That is what the people who are interested desire, and I shall have much pleasure in voting for my hon. friend's amendment.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I agree with what my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has said in regard to monopolies in general. But in regard to this railway, I happen to have particular knowledge. It has been subjected to, perhaps, the largest suits in the courts of law that we have had in this country during the last five or six years. The company was in such an impoverished state by reason of this litigation that the enterprise could only be carried on in some such way as this. It was open to anybody to purchase the charter, but the only people who would buy it were the Canadian Pacific Railway. The litigation prevented its being built and this extension of time is only fair and reasonable. I agree generally with what the hon. gentleman says concerning monopolies, but in this case, where the request is fair as between man and man, I believe that the extension should be granted.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I wish to take the opportunity for one minute to point out to the House that we ask for a vote here to-night for the purpose of keeping faith with the settlers of the North-west along the line of this 20 miles of road. Last session, owing to the stand taken by the hon. members from the North-west, an arrangement was made, an agreement was entered into and a charter given whereby 20 miles of railroad were to be built before the 1st of August this year. The settlers along that piece of road had the right to believe that this Parliament would see to it that this portion of the road would be built by the date named. These settlers have made their calculations accordingly. We have reason to believe that men have gone into that country on the strength of that understanding. When the Canadian Pacific Railway bought out the rights of the North-west Central, they bought them subject to that understanding, and we ask you now to say that that understanding shall be carried out, and that there shall not be a breach of faith on the part of this Parliament towards the settlers in any part of this country, even though they are so far away as the North-west. There are vested interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway, I mean the vested interests of the people in that particular part of the North-west through which this railway runs. I say that the men who have invested their time, their labour, and their money, and who have spent their lives in the development of that country, are entitled to the consideration of this House, above and beyond even the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is for their interests we ask protection.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Douglas):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Christie,	Mignault,
Davin,	Oliver,
Davis,	Proulx,
Douglas,	Richardson,
Erb,	Roche,
Fielding,	Rogers,
Johnston,	Rutherford,
Macdonell (Selkirk),	Semple,
Maclean,	Sifton, and
McLennan (Inverness),	Stenson.—21.
McMillan,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain,	Ingram,
Beattie,	Joly de Lotbinière
Bell (Pictou),	(Sir Henri),
Bethune,	Landerkin,
Borden (King's),	Mackie,
Bourassa,	MacPherson,
Campbell,	McAlister,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McCarthy,
Casey,	McDougall,
Clancy,	McGregor,
Clarke,	McHugh,
Cochrane,	McMullen,
Costigan,	Martin,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Maxwell,
Dobell,	Mills,
Earle,	Morin,
Ellis,	Morrison.
Foster,	Prior,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Ratz,
Frost,	Rinfret,
Gauthier,	Sproule,
Gillies,	Sutherland,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Haley,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt, and
Heyd,	Wallace.—51.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time and passed.

STRIKE OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TRACKMEN.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a letter of some importance in my hand which I want to read and place it in the hands of the Premier. The letter is from the treasurer of the township of Leeds:

Lansdowne, June 9th, 1899.

George Taylor, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I thought I would drop you a line this a.m., and to tell you how matters are going in Lansdowne with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway strike. The first of the week the company sent a car here with a number of men to go to work. Among them is a half-negro, who, I hear, has been telling around of his fighting qualities with fist or revolver, saying that he could make short work of anybody. The gang went to work during the day (Wednesday). The same night, between 11 and 12 o'clock, as I and my family were going to bed, we heard a shot fired from the car. I looked out from my bed-room window to see if I could see or hear any party. Immediately there was another shot fired, and I heard the bullet strike near me, followed in a short time by more shots from the same direction. I think altogether there were five or six shots fired. After a while we all retired. Next morning there was a good deal of talk about the shooting, and of the character of the men sent here. In the evening (last evening), about half-past seven, I went upstairs in my store, and found a bullet hole through one of the east windows, which passed along striking the wall, tearing the mortar and lodging in the floor. My bed-room window is about 10 feet further east from the line of the shot, appearing as if the parties shooting were trying to shoot where they saw the light. On finding matters as stated, I asked some parties up to show them what had taken place the evening before. I then went to our magistrate and had him come and see it. We then went over to the car where the men were stopping, bringing back with us their foreman, and showed him what had been done, and also some bullet holes in my neighbour's drive-house. The result is that five or six of them were arrested and locked up. The case will be heard this afternoon before Justice Mulvaugh. I may also mention that we were waked up by two more shots fired about six. Now, we, as private citizens, believe that it is high time, when our lives are in danger, for the Government to take hold of this matter of the strike and have it settled at once. I thought it was well enough to let you know how matters are here.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) G. F DEANE.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries of Officers, Inspectors of Excise, &c. $315,395

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Minister of Inland Revenue to explain more fully this increase of $10,000 in the item for salaries of officers and inspectors of excise.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know if my hon. friend was here before six o'clock when I attempted to explain that increase. It is not $10,000 but $7,000. When the amount was given to the printer, there was a mistake made. I explained before dinner the wonderful amount of increased business we have over last year. We have now 637 different licensees, distillers, maltsters, breweries, cigar and cigarette manufacturers, bonded warehouses, vinegar factories, &c. Only last year the number of the licensees was increased by 96. As I explained before dinner, our work has not only to do with gauging, measuring and testing the products of all these factories, but we have actually to take a share in the manufacturing of them. We have to watch them from the beginning. In the distilleries, we have to see the grain coming in, to see it weighed, locked up, taken out, placed in the mash, test the force of the mash and follow the different processes of distillation and to test the different degrees. In all the distilleries, breweries, cigarette, tobacco and vinegar factories, we must keep a continuous supervision of every act, from the beginning of the manufacturing of these products until the processes are perfected. Not only that but we must watch the product, while it is kept in our stores, and until the duty is paid on it. An increase of 96 of these factories in one year out of a total of 637, is an increase of nearly one-seventh of the whole, so that one can readily understand that would necessitate an increase in the staff of our offices. Furthermore, in Quebec, where there were no distilleries, before this year, they have already established one, and they are establishing another one near Quebec. Each one of these distilleries requires, at least, two officers. It appears as if this were an increase over last year, and so it is an increase, but I have a list of the salaries paid in the excise branch of the department for the past ten years. By following it up one will be able to observe the gradual increase, and to show how little it has been increased this year. When you take the year 1896-97, you will see that we asked for $311,000. This year we are only asking for $312,000, or $1,000 more. It is true that last year we only asked for $305,000. We have been trying, as much as possible, to reduce the expenditure, but, after all, there is no such elasticity in our funds as there is in the spread and multiplying of the factories. We have, therefore, been obliged to admit that we have reduced too much our estimate from the year 1896-97, which was the first year I had the honour to be in charge of this department. Ever since I have been trying to reduce the estimates from $311,000; I reduced them to $307,000 and to $305,000. We are finding an increase in the work, especially in the North-west and in the Kootenay district in British Columbia. Every month we have been called upon to appoint new officers in the Kootenay district. It is developing with such rapidity that the officers we have there are not sufficient, and we have to increase their number.

Preventive service $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. Here is an increase to be explained.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is an increase of $3,000. I have a list here of the amounts voted for preventive service, and one will see that I have been too greedy in trying to make economies in the

expenditure. We have come to the point where we must admit that we are, to a certain degree, incapable to carry on satisfactorily the preventive service, since the increase in the duty on spirits and tobacco, it is well known to every one that smuggling has very much increased, and that it requires the interference of a larger preventive force than before. I might read the amounts voted for the past ten years and compare them with this $15,000 that we are asking. In 1889-90, the amount was $15,000; in 1890-91, it was $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you giving the sums voted or the expenditure?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The sums voted; sometimes we do not expend them at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be better if we knew the sums expended each year.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am very sorry, but I think, in the supplementary estimates for this year, we will have to acknowledge that we have overdrawn the account. This year we are obliged to ask $1,000 more in the supplementary estimates. When we are called upon to put down smuggling and illicit distilleries, I think I can safely appeal to the committee to help to obtain the amount sufficient, at least as much as was required for so many years when there was not the same damage done by smuggling.

Mr. CLANCY. How many new officers have been appointed and where, under this additional expenditure of $3,000?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They are not appointed yet. This is for next year. We have to pay not only the salaries of the officers, but their travelling expenses too, and, naturally, the more means we have at our disposal, when they can be employed usefully, the more work we can do.

Mr. FOSTER. How can my hon. friend explain that last year he only expended $13,000?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I did not spend as much as I would like to have expended.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that with my hon. friend's disposition to spend money it is dangerous to put too much money in his hands. He has enunciated a very dangerous and pleasant principle for a spending department. Thirteen thousand dollars was the limit spent last year, and how does the Minister propose to spend $2,000 more this year?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think we deserve the title of the spending department, because I think the Minister of Customs and I deserve a better title. We are both contributing very largely to the revenue, and we ought to be encouraged in every way. On account of the increase in customs duties on liquor and tobacco, our expenditure needs to be increased to protect the revenue. I am constantly receiving information that there is illicit distilling in such and such a place, and we are hampered for want of money.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose, besides being hampered in protecting the revenue, the Minister finds that he is hampered by certain demands made upon him in the interest of the revenue of private individuals.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVEUNE. I do not know, but I suppose that was the experience of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

To pay collectors of customs allowance and duties collected by them for 1898-99 ..... $5,500

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister had a conference lately with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on the iniquity of paying civil servants from more than one source. I am sure he is contravening the doctrine that is held so strictly by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), who is not present.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My conscience prevents me from having too many conferences with my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) who is now absent, but I am sure that it will be admitted that this item is amply justified, for, by utilizing the services of the customs officers, instead of appointing special officers, we save a great deal of money.

Commission to sellers of stamps for Canadian twists tobacco $100

Mr. WALLACE. I have a letter from a tobacco dealer in Ottawa, who makes the complaint that the Minister has remitted fines that have been imposed by the courts, and he also complains that the Minister permits a $2 license to be given to some men in Ottawa, while this gentleman is charged $50 for a similar license. The $2 license is given to a farmer, who presumably makes his own tobacco, and the $50 license is charged to the man who manufactures the Canadian tobacco into twist. I think that complaint should be investigated by the Minister.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) had been kind enough to send me that letter, he may be certain that I should have looked into the matter at once.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall send the letter.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The only way that I can remit a fine imposed by the court is by Order in Council. Farmers have been fined $50 for exposing a few pounds of twist tobacco on the market, and in many cases I thought the ends of jus-

tice would be served by diminishing the amount of penalty, and I have asked for an Order in Council. In other cases, farmers come into market without having the twist tobacco stamped, and I personally feel that the ends of justice would be served by not insisting on a too heavy penalty, and I have power to use my judgment under the Act. There are a great many cases in which I feel a great deal of satisfaction in being allowed to go into the merits of the case, instead of applying the letter of the law. Especially is that the case in instances where a man takes a few plugs of tobacco and exposes them on his shelves. In that case we give a strong warning, and sometimes impose a little fine, and perhaps confiscate the tobacco. There are many cases in which one must look at the intention rather than at the letter of the law, at all events in the case of those who offend against the law in ignorance. In such cases I feel that I have a right to exercise my judgment, and, where the law allows it, to deal with them as leniently as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. This commission on stamps seems to be a practice not very widely extended. Is it an old custom? It is a small amount of money, and seems to be confined almost to one locality.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We only send the stamps to postmasters, and only in the province of Quebec. The farmers who grow tobacco, and who want to dispose of it on the market, make it into twists, and, in order to prevent frauds, we require them to put the stamp inside the twist at the time they make it. If they were allowed to put the stamp on the outside of the twist, it could be removed and used again; but they are obliged to weave the stamp with the twist, so that when the twist is opened the stamp is torn. It is a very simple way to prevent the stamp being used twice.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not an answer to my question. I want to know why this commission on stamps is confined to so small an area? I find that this is confined to about three localities. Surely twist is made in more than three localities in Canada.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. All I can say is that these stamps are supplied to postmasters in Joliette and Montcalm—in two or three counties where the farmers grow tobacco and put it into twists. Farmers can procure the stamps when they go to town, from our regular officers; but in a few cases they are supplied to postmasters for the convenience of the farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not yet got what I ask for. The question I ask is how do you account for these sales being confined to so small an area? The stamps are really all sold in two places, St. Eustache and St. Alexis. Do they not make twist in other places than these in Canada?

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am explaining that these stamps are supplied to postmasters for the convenience of the people.

Mr. HEYD. I understood the Minister to state that fines were collected from merchants for exposing tobacco for sale outside of the boxes. What good object is served by that?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I said I did not wish to take up the time of the House in explaining why that regulation had been imposed. I must say that at first sight it appears rather tyrannical. When I took charge of the department, there were many things in the regulations that struck me as being tyrannical as well as useless; but I have since learned to appreciate the necessity of these regulations. It is so difficult to discover frauds that one must not neglect any means in order to discover them. For instance, when a man buys a box of tobacco at the factory, say 50 pounds of plug, he brings it to his store; and on that box he will see printed that he is not allowed to sell the tobacco outside of that box. There is the same regulation on cigar boxes in regard to the sale of cigars. They must be sold from the box in which they were placed by the manufacturer. It appears at first sight to be an absurd regulation, but you must remember that these boxes bear the stamp of the department. As each cigar and each plug of tobacco cannot be stamped separately, the box is stamped. If the people would always sell directly from the box, it would very much facilitate the work of our officers. A revenue officer goes into a store, and begins to handle some of the plugs in a box. He is sufficiently acquainted with the mode of manufacture to know that the box comes from Tuckett or from McDonald, and if he finds in the box a plug which has not been manufactured by Tuckett or McDonald, he will say: You have no right to have that plug there; it has been smuggled or manufactured illicitly; it has not been manufactured by the man who sold you that box." One can readily understand that what appears at first sight to be an unusual or even a harsh or tyrannical precaution, will help in a considerable degree in the discovery of frauds. What would prevent the sale of plugs which had been smuggled or illicitly manufactured if the sellers were allowed to lay them on the shelves of their shops? But the moment they are obliged to put them in certain boxes bearing the name of the maker, the revenue officer, if he is well acquainted with his business, will at once find out if anything is placed in that box which has no right to be there.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there any case of tobacco manufactured in Canada being illegally sold?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, we have not found any boxes of to-

bacco illegally manufactured in Canada, but have found cigars.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister said that there was plug tobacco illegally manufactured in Canada.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I was under the impression that there was, but Mr. Gerald, who is thoroughly acquainted with the business, informs me that so far we have not discovered any illegal manufactured plugs, but we have cigars. We have got a case in Ontario in which we obtained judgment against a man who manufactured cigars without taking a license, and put them in old boxes which had been stamped.

Mr. HEYD. I wish to draw attention to a considerable hardship with reference to this tobacco business. If the object is to protect the revenue by insisting that the tobacco must be sold from the boxes that originaly contained it, the law does not accomplish its object. Under the law the grocers are obliged to sell direct from the box. Although a box may contain fifty pounds of tobacco, he must continue selling from that box, even when only three or four pounds are left in it. That is very inconvenient and embarrassing and does not prevent fraud, because there is nothing to prevent a grocer breaking open a box without touching the stamp and putting the tobacco into a box of the same kind standing on the shelves. That subjects the trade to great inconvenience and does not protect the revenue.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. HEYD. You are not in the business, as I am.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). What is to prevent a dealer from taking a box that was never stamped, breaking the cover, taking the plug of tobacco out, and placing that tobacco into a box stamped, which had been opened, and out of which the contents have been sold?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Where would you get the tobacco from?

Mr. McDOUGALL. There are tons of tobacco smuggled into the country that never pay any duty.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Suppose a man buys a box of tobacco from Mr. McDonald, of Montreal, the name of McDonald is upon it and the Government stamp. On opening the box the stamp is destroyed. If when that man has sold all the tobacco out of the box, he fills it again with smuggled tobacco, any one of our officers who happens to come in and examines the contents will know at once that it is not McDonald's tobacco which is in the box. If the officer does not know that, he does not understand his business. This is why the traders are compelled to sell the tobacco from the box, and I do not see any hardship in that. The box is opened, and his customers can see the tobacco and buy as many plugs as they like. But if smuggled tobacco is put into the box, any officer who examines it will soon detect the fraud.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is there to prevent anybody buying boxes of tobacco from Mr. McDonald, of Montreal, and sending them out of the country, say, to St. Pierre Miquelon, and then smuggling them back, and putting the tobacco into empty boxes of the same kind that had been previously opened, and from which the duty paid tobacco had been sold? If I understand aright, it is through the excise authorities that the stamp is put on tobacco manufactured in this country.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That stamp has to be marked under customs authority as well as excise when duty is paid on it. If the tobacco was sent out of the country and brought back again, it would have to undergo examination by the customs authority. The tobacco sent out of the country is not liable to the inland revenue duties no more than customs. For instance, you can go to St. Pierre and Miquelon and buy there at 25 cents a pound tobacco that would cost you 50 cents a pound here; and if you can smuggle it in, you can sell it at half the price at which you can sell it if bought under the laws of the country. What I contend is that there is nothing to prevent a man taking the contents of a box of tobacco he has smuggled from St. Pierre and putting it in the box from which he had sold tobacco by the pound on which he had paid duty in the regular way. I am quite sure that has been done in a great many cases, in hundreds of cases. If it were not for the opportunity thus offered, there would not be so much smuggling going on. These people who are importing smuggled tobacco and selling it under the noses of a preventive officer and the excise officers, could not dispose of the tobacco without being detected, unless they had some such means as this of carrying on their operations. Now, another question—there are many cases in which small traders buy less than fifty pounds. Take a case like the Joliette factory, the smallest package of black plug tobacco that these people make is twenty-five pounds. The little traders who come from the towns and villages cannot afford to buy twenty-five pounds, so they buy smaller quantities, carry their purchases to their little stores and retail their tobacco by the plug. These people are breaking the law. It is impossible for the small traders to carry on the business of selling tobacco under the present arrangement. I do not mean to

make this a complaint against the present Government, because the management of the department in this respect is not different from what it was in the past. As a man engaged in business in the country, I have had experience in finding people selling tobacco by the plug and by the pound over the counter at less than I was obliged to pay for it by the half ton and quarter ton. How could these people do that unless they were smuggling their tobacco, or getting it in other fraudulent ways? It is not forty miles from my door where tons and tons of tobacco have been smuggled and disposed of in this way. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue ought to know it, the hon. Minister of Customs ought to know it. The Minister of Customs had many cases before the courts in my constituency in the last two years, as well as in other parts of Canada, and his officers ought to be able to inform him how to detect these frauds.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. What does my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) suggest?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not mean to suggest anything. It is not for me to suggest anything; it is for me to show the hon. Minister and this House that the law is ineffective.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Everybody knows that, but we are doing our best to prevent these illegal acts.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me it ought to be the duty of the Minister, when I make a statement of this kind, to try to invent some way in which the law can be carried out with more effect. It seems to me that some better system could be adopted. I would not like to make suggestions on the spur of the moment; it is not my business to do so. I point out to him the consequences of the present law. Not only is the law not carrying out its object, but it is an injury to honest business people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not showing that there is anything wrong in the law; he is simply saying that in spite of the law smuggling goes on. Of course, we must acknowledge that. The regulations are all right as far as they go, but, apparently, the hon. gentleman wants them more stringent——

Mr. McDOUGALL. But they are worthless.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are the same as have been in existence for many years.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not deny that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose we should learn to improve as the years go, but how can we do better than by employing vigilant officers to detect and prevent these frauds? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall)—of course I do not suggest that he should do it now—could give the Minister of Inland Revenue the names of some of these people who are selling smuggled tobacco, I will guarantee that within forty-eight hours there will be preventive officers after them. Of course you cannot make a law that will entirely prevent smuggling; the ony thing you can do is to keep it in check. You cannot have a perfect guard upon our seacoast, particularly in view of the difficulty we always have with regard to St. Pierre. They may take the tobacco out of Canada in bond, then smuggle it back into Canada and put it into these boxes which contained tobacco on which duty was paid. The only thing you can do is to watch incoming vessels as closely as possible, and then, if you find a man selling tobacco at less than it can be bought for in the regular way, there is a strong presumption that somebody has been guilty of smuggling. I think the hon. Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue have been particularly vigilant. I can safely say that in the maritime provinces the general opinion is that the customs and excise laws are more thoroughly enforced than they ever were before.

Mr. McDOUGALL. With regard to giving names I have not them now, and if I had I would not retail them before this House. I refer the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to the hon. Minister of Customs, who had his officers engaged in carrying on many prosecutions in my county, prosecutions which went to prove that a large quantity of tobacco had been smuggled and that smuggling had been going on for some time. I think if the hon. Minister of Customs will consult the papers in his department, they will fully corroborate the statements I have made with regard to the facilities that are afforded to carry out this system of fraud in connection with the importation and sale of tobacco.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I think the Minister of Finance is the chief sinner in this regard. Two years ago he put a duty on tobacco——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There may be something in that.

Mr. WALLACE—that had the effect of encouraging those who carry on this midnight work to carry on with increased vigilance by affording them larger profits. But the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue tells us that they have these regulations about boxes, which regulations, I agree with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) are most harassing for dealers, and which, I venture to say, very few dealers rigidly observe. These regulations do not answer any useful purpose. If it were necessary for the protection of the revenue, if these rules did their work effectively, I would say that every one is bound to put himself

to a little inconvenience to protect the revenue, and see that the business is carried on properly. But the regulations do not succeed in that. Take, for instance, Macdonald's tobacco—one of his expert officers or one acquainted with the goods, can tell at a glance whether it is Macdonald's tobacco that is in the box or some other. But take another case. The gentleman to whom he refers as T. and B., whoever he is—and the Minister of Inland Revenue seems to be quite familiar with him—makes a very fine brand of tobacco, which is sold all over Canada. Mr. T. and B. has a similar factory in the state of Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR. Taylor Brothers.

Mr. WALLACE. Taylor is the boss, I guess. They have a factory in the United States, and Mr. T. & B. tells me they make precisely that same plug in the United States from the same leaf, of the same weight, the same shape, the price stamped on it, and everything. Now, the excise duty on the Canadian tobacco equals 39 cents a pound, 25 cents excise, and 14 cents additional that the Government have put on. The excise duty in the United States is 6 cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The war tax is higher than that, is it not?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think it is higher than 6 cents; I think the excise tax is just 6 cents a pound. That is an advantage of 33 cents a pound. They can pay the American excise duty, and bring it up to the Canadian border, and have it exposed for sale, and still sell it for 33 cents a pound less on the American side than it is sold on the Canadian side. There is a strong inducement, therefore, to take a 20-pound caddy across the border line, and make $6.60 out of it. Then, they take that tobacco out of a caddy that is exactly the same size, and has the same weight of plugs, the same number of plugs in it, and they put it into a Canadian caddy, and sell it here. Now, the Minister of Inland Revenue sends his expert along. His expert is not clever enough to tell whether that is made in the United States or Canada, nor can that be told. Mr. Tucker tells me that they make precisely the same article in the two countries. Therefore, if they choose to bring it in and put the smuggled tobacco into that same caddy, they are getting a certificate, in effect, from the Minister of Inland Revenue that that smuggled tobacco is all right, and he has certified to a wrong, because he and his agents are not able to detect the difference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would there not be the same difference. If there were no regulations about quantities?

Mr. WALLACE. He is telling us that he makes this regulation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It does not prevent it in that particular case, but in many cases it does.

Mr. WALLACE. In that case they practically get a certificate that it is all right. If there were no such regulations, they would have to prove their case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would not that be very much worse?

Mr. WALLACE. It could not be worse. In the one case it comes in free; it is smuggled and put into that box, and then it is secured by the certificate of the Minister of Inland Revenue that it is all right. In the other case there are no such regulations; they would have to prove their case; there would be no certificate from the Minister that it was all right. They destroy the American box and put it into the Canadian caddy. I am certain that that is done. The member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) tells us, what I am sure is a great grievance in his part of the country, that tobaccos are sent across here. It is a round-about process—a good deal of risk in it. But tobaccos come across the boundary line of the eastern townships; they come across the boundary line all along, and there is no way of preventing those tobaccos from coming in and being consumed in Canada, especially that "T. & B." The Minister cannot by any machinery of boxes and caddies that he has detailed to us, provide one particle of protection to the revenue in that regard, but, on the contrary, he is rather giving a certificate, when the man gets the tobacco across and gets it safely taken out of the American caddy and put into the Canadian caddy, that everything is all right, because there is the plug tobacco made by T. & B.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It would be exactly the same, if there was no box.

Mr. WALLACE. If there was no box, there would be no certificate from the Inland Revenue Department that everything was all right; everything would be open to suspicion, and would require proof. But the moment the Minister permits without detection that caddy of tobacco to be taken across and taken out of the American caddy and put into the Canadian one, then he has thrown the mantle of his protection over that caddy, and says it is all right, our officers must not touch it, because there is the "T. & B." box, and there is the "T. & B." tobacco. The Minister of Finance says no law can prevent smuggling.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not absolutely.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is a question. A law, well administered, can either prevent it or reduce it to a minimum. You cannot, perhaps, prevent crime by making a law against the crime, but you can punish individuals and preserve good order in the community. But, if the smuggling has increased, as I learn from the Minister of Finance that

smuggling has increased, and is increasing, largely, and that they require more officers to protect the revenue, then I say, that we ought to examine the question, whether the duty they are imposing on tobacco is not too high. In my opinion, it is too high. People pay more for their tobacco, and we get no more revenue. Besides that, I think it is not a fair principle to say, that a man who smokes tobacco should pay so high a tax. Good tobacco can be purchased for 25 cents a pound in bond; you put a duty of 33 cents a pound on that tobacco, equivalent to 156 per cent. It is unjustifiable to put that rate of duty on tobacco. They say, that tobacco is a luxury, and that we are justified in putting as high a tax on luxuries as we like. But tobacco is a necessity, as well as a hundred other things that people use. One man uses no tea; he prefers to drink water. Another man will not drink coffee; he prefers to drink water, while another man says: I do not take tea or coffee; I consider it necessary to life to have a smoke of tobacco. You make tea and coffee free and you put 156 per cent duty on tobacco. This is an unfair distribution of the taxes upon the people of the country. When the 25 per cent limit was reached, I think that was more than could be justified, but when you add to that 56 per cent, I think you are going quite beyond the limit, and experience has proved that you have to employ a large staff to protect the revenue, while you have a good deal more smuggling. Smuggling is demoralizing. They smuggle whisky and tobacco in. The smuggling of whisky is the greater evil, because it encourages the drinking habit amongst those who would not acquire it otherwise. In addition to that, you get the spirit of smuggling abroad. It exists particularly in the lower provinces from the Island of St. Pierre. You have a spirit of lawlessness prevalent, and you have the drinking habit acquired by those who would never have acquired that habit were it not for this liquor being smuggled in. In the case of tobacco, a large additional tax is imposed that the law-abiding people have to pay while the Government are reaping no benefit from the burden that is placed upon the people. I think the Government should reconsider their position in this matter. They should reduce the duty on tobacco. The expenses would naturally cut themselves down, because the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue would not require this enormous staff of detectives that are so absolutely necessary. I believe that the practice is spreading over the country and that it will spread; liquor will be brought from other places, tobacco will be brought in on account of the Government's high taxation. We thought that they were a Government who were going to abolish all taxes. They were free traders, I believe, in theory, and now we find them increasing the duties upon those articles that are luxuries to some and that are really necessaries to others. All those who use the weed find it a very pleasant article, but the Government are grinding those who use it beyond all reasonable limits. But the point is that the regulations should receive revision. The hon. Minister says: What do you propose to do? Well, I do not think that is fair.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would be glad to take the advice of any hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I know that no one on that side of the House is more gracious in receiving proposals than the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue or more willing to pay attention to them. But we are busy members of Parliament; sometimes we are up all night doing our duty to our country; we have to attend committee meetings, we have to attend to our correspondence, so that we have not time to sit down and figure out a scheme for the Minister who has a capable and clever staff of assistants and who should promulgate his scheme for the consideration of Parliament.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is what he has done, but you will not accept it.

Mr. WALLACE. That is what he has done, but that is what we take objection to. My own experience has been similar to that of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). We all see that these regulations are harassing and not effective in producing the results they are supposed to produce. I ask the hon. Minister to give his attention to the revision of these regulations so as to make them effective and less onerous upon the people.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to say a word in regard to one branch of the regulations to which I referred a few moments ago. The hon. Minister was kind enough to ask me for a suggestion. As my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has stated, I think it is very unfair to ask this side of the House for suggestions as to how to improve on the present law. It is the duty of the Minister to suggest these things. I believe that we go far enough when we point out the inefficiencies of the law, the extent to which the present law fails to carry out its object and the extent to which it is an injury to the people who have to meet that law. In regard to one branch of these regulations I may say that my sympathy is very strongly with the small traders, stronger than it is with the people who are more largely engaged in the trade. For that reason I would make a suggestion here in regard to that class of small traders who find it inconvenient and, I may say, impossible, to keep their little stores in the country supplied with tobacco, and with such other articles as they are required to keep with their small means. To be compelled to do without tobacco or

buy 25 pounds, which is the smallest package that is put up now of black plug tobacco, is a hardship upon them. I am not aware that there is any smaller package put up. If a preventive officer, or a detective, goes into one of these small trader's store and finds ten pounds of tobacco, he finds that tobacco without the original package, because the man who sold it had to keep the original package himself in order to carry out the law. He could not give the package to the man who bought ten pounds because he had the 30, or 40 pounds remaining, to sell to some other person and he had to keep the original package for that purpose. This is a hardship on the man who has fifty pounds of tobacco to dispose of, because he cannot have the custom of the small trader in the country who only wants ten pounds. I would suggest to the hon. Minister, as a better plan than the present one, and a plan that will work more conveniently with these small traders, that instead of making the small trader liable to the confiscation of that ten pounds of tobacco and to a fine because he cannot produce the original package and cannot produce any proof that the tobacco had paid duty, instead of having the law enforced as against the small trader, that the regulations should be changed in such a way as to let that small trader off when he produces an invoice sworn to, or a certificate from the person from whom he purchased the tobacco. If the officer who finds the document in the possession of the small trader, has any reason to doubt the correctness of the invoice, or the certificate, he has the option then to go to the man whose name appears on the invoice as having sold that ten pounds of tobacco, or whatever quantity it is, to the small trader. He can bring him into court and make him prove, under oath, whether or not he sold that tobacco. That is a regulation that might be somewhat difficult for the Government to carry out, but I venture to say that it would not be any more difficult to carry out than to go through the process, that they have to go through, to prove that a man in whose possession they find ten pounds of tobacco is guilty. If they take the course that the law requires they must subject the man, with whom they find ten pounds of tobacco, to the wrong of taking that tobacco from him and fining him besides.

I do not think there is any member of this House who will maintain that it is proper to have a law that operates so unfairly against the small trader who tries to do an honest business, in preference to some such law as I suggest. Many of these small traders know that they are violating the law, and the tobacco is put away perhaps when the officer comes around. If they could carry on their trade in a proper way there would not be half the fraud which now exists. We all know, as the Minister has admitted, that since the increase of the duty, smuggling is carried on to a greater extent than before. We have only to look at the increased number of people who are hauled up for smuggling to prove that. We find that those who try to carry on business honestly and under the law are not doing as large a business as they did when the duty was lower. If the Minister woud adopt some suggestion as I have made, and also reduce the duty on tobacco to what it was before he raised it, he would find there would not be as much loss of revenue nor as much fraud as there is under the present system.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have in some places asked the storekeeper to make a solemn declaration where it appeared likely that he was in ignorance of the law. I have done everything I could not to apply the law harshly. My hon. friend said that the small storekeepers cannot buy large boxes of 25 pounds, but the law is perfectly clear that the manufacturers can put up packages of any size from 1 to 25 pounds.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But the smaller the package the greater the price.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is very natural. But in order to encourage the practice of putting the tobacco into small packages, we allow a drawback of five per cent on the value of the stamps used.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) do not live on the frontier as I do, and they are not aware of the extent of the smuggling and the extent of the injury done by the Minister in increasing the tobacco duties, as I am. From Kingston to Montreal the storekeepers along the St. Lawrence and frontier, have practically lost their tobacco business. The people can cross on the ferry boat and by buying even fifty cents worth of tobacco they can save the cost of their fare. The retailers along the frontier have had to give up the tobacco business to the Americans. The Minister asks $15,000 of an increase, and it simply means that he is spending that amount in providing some of his friends with jobs, and taking the increased cost out of the consumers of the tobacco in Canada, who are largely the farmers. Let the Minister reduce the tobacco duties to what they were before, and then the smuggling will be done away with, and he will have no use for this large staff of preventive officers. It is largely tobacco that is being smuggled to-day. There are petty pedlars who cross the frontier, and buy two or three dollars worth of tobacco, and supply the Canadian farmers with it. I know several who are making a little money out of the business.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Will you give me their names?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I will not give you their names, because they are political friends and supporters of your own, and you would not interfere with them.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not want dishonest men as my supporters.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it because they are Liberals that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) wants to shield them?

Mr. BAIN. That is too thin.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that in my locality the men engaged in that business are supporters of the Government. This Government promised to reduce the duties on the necessaries of life, and tobacco is just as much a necessary of life to the farmers as tea and coffee. The hon. Minister increased the duty for the purpose of providing positions for his needy supporters as preventive officers, and these officers are simply interfering with the Canadian storekeepers and not preventing smuggling across the frontier. They may be taking a dollar at Cape Breton, where they are not close to the frontier, and where they would have to smuggle from Boston or St. Pierre. But with us any man may smuggle who pays 10 cents for a trip across the river. He can carry a supply of tobacco back in his pockets, and no one will interfere with him. If my hon. friend wants a suggestion that is practical, it is to put the duties back so that our Canadian merchants can compete fairly with American merchants, instead of offering a bonus to smugglers and then spending $15,000 this year more than he did last year in the preventive service to prevent smuggling. That is the solution and the only solution of the difficulty.

L. A. Frechette, for special translation.... $100

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We require some one to meet the technical difficulties of translation, in both English and French, in our pamphlets and circulars. We really need a man who is able to handle the two languages correctly.

Salaries of officers, inspectors, assistant inspectors of weights and measures... $46,860

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think I must make an explanation in this case. Since I have had the honour of being in charge of this department, I have worked with the hope of being able to make a considerable diminution in the expenditure. In 1896-97, the first year in which I was in charge of the department, the salaries for this service amounted to $56,850. For the last eight or ten years they have averaged about $56,000. In 1897-98, my estimates were reduced to $49,000, a reduction in one year of $7,500. In the following year I reduced them to $42,000.

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see you are going rapidly back again?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This year I am asking for $46,860, which is still nearly $10,000 less than we asked for 1896-97. I find that I have been a little too greedy in my reductions.

Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for gas and electric light inspection, including salaries in connection with the inspection of electric lighting and the purchase or repair of instruments $9,000

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that this item includes some items of stationery, among which the hon. Minister has purchased a book entitled: "Be Your Own Lawyer," or rather three of them—one for each department. I presume that is in the interest of economy, and I will not comment on it. I see that he has also purchased "The Administration of the Old Regime." I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is following in the footsteps of the old regime, and if that is the reason he wanted that treatise? I presume it is the regime of the late Government that is referred to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was got for the purpose of contrast.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 12th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 145) to amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company with the Canada Atlantic Railway Company under the name of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

PROVISIONS OF CHAP. 19, R.S.C.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Has the Secretary of State, since 1886, caused to be prepared for the information of the Parliament of Canada, within fifteen days after the opening of every session thereof, a detailed statement of all bonds or securities registered under

the provisions of chap. 19, R.S.C., and as required by the said provisions ?

2. If not, why not ?

3. If not, will he cause such statement to be laid before Parliament forthwith, covering the cases within the said statute of officers employed in the public service in the Yukon ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The answer to the first branch of this question is "Yes." The others consequently do not require answers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the Prime Minister permit me to call his attention to the answer given by him, and which I know happens to be accurate. If the officer of the department looks, he will see that last session there was no such statement laid on the Table within the period named.

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer which I have given is certainly from the State Department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt. There has been a mistake somewhere.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will call the attention of the department to the remarks of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

MR. BUSBY—CUSTOMS OFFICER AT SKAGWAY.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked :

Has Mr. E. S. Bresby, ex-president of the Protestant Protective Association, been appointed by the Government Canadian customs officer at Skagway ? If so, when was he appointed and what salary is he to receive ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). No person by the name of Bresby has been appointed by the Government Canadian customs officer at Skagway. The only customs officer at present at Skagway is one Mr. Busby, Mr. Busby was for some time acting as Canadian customs officer at Boston and Portland, in the supervision of goods in transit to Canada, his salary being paid by the railway companies. On the 3rd May, 1899, he was transferred to Skagway to perform similar service there. His salary, which is $4.50 per day, is paid by the railway company. This amount includes his living expenses.

JOHN TANNER—CLAIM AGAINST SPANISH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. RUSSELL asked :

What progress has been made in the prosecution of the claim for outrages alleged to have been committed by officers or agents of the Spanish Government against John Tanner, mate of the schooner "Ida," at Porto Rico in 1897, and the claim of the owner of said schooner for her detention ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). On the 18th January last a despatch was received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the effect that "After careful consideration Her Majesty's Government do not consider the case of John Tanner to be one in which a claim for compensation can be made upon the Spanish Government." This information was duly communicated to the parties interested. Nothing further has been heard from the Imperial authorities on the subject. In view of the foregoing, and in the absence of new facts, it is felt that any further representations would be useless.

POINTE CLAIRE WHARF.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the wharf at Pointe Claire been entirely completed ?

2. If not, then is it the intention of the Government to finish the said wharf immediately ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes, the wharf proper is completed. There are repairs, however, required to the approach and shed to be built on the wharf. These will be attended to.

DISMISSAL OF W. A. GALLANT.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. How long was N. A. Gallant engineer of Point Lepreaux fog-alarm ?

2. Has he been dismissed ; if so, when ?

3. Were any charges preferred against him, and if so, by whom ?

4. Was an investigation held, and if so, by whom ?

5. How long has he been paying superannuation, and how much has he paid in ?

6. Has he been allowed these payments with interest thereon ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. 27 years. 2. Yes, by Order in Council of the 20th May, 1898. 3. The lighthouse and fog-alarm buildings were destroyed by fire owing to neglect of duty on the part of Mr. Gallant and complaints as to the fog-whistle not having been sounded on different occasions were made by pilots and Captain Cook, of the steamship "Springhill," and Captain Pike, of the SS. "State of Maine." Complaints also made of absence from duty without leave. 4. Yes, by F. J. Harding, agent of the department at St. John. 5. For twenty-seven years. Paid $105.52. 6. No.

MILITIA CLOTHING CONTRACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What are the names of tenderers for the contract for clothing for the militia last received ?

(a) Whose tender was the lowest ?

(b) Who got the contract ?

(c) Has Mr. Mark Workman, of Montreal, a contract for clothing ?

(d) If so, what was his tender, and what were the amounts of other tenders, if any, for the same work ?

(e) Who recommended him as fit and responsible person for the work, if any one ?

(f) Is he a British subject by birth or naturalization ?

(g) Is the Government aware whether or no Mark Workman operated his factory for seven days in the week in the execution of a Government contract ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. The names of the firms who last tendered for militia clothing are :

Messrs. W. E. Sanford Mfg. Co., Hamilton.
" Marsolais & Monday, Montreal.
" J. A. Seybold & Co., Ottawa.
" W. & C. Silver, Halifax.
" J. W. Peck & Co., Montreal.
" H. Shorey & Co., Montreal.
" Doull & Gibson, Montreal.
" Mark Workman, Montreal.
" Philip Jamieson, Toronto.

(a.) The department, when inviting tenders, stipulated they should be subject to the provisions respecting "sweating" contained in the contracts that would have to be signed. Two of the firms named above, Messrs. H. Shorey & Co., and Messrs. Doull & Gibson, notified the department before the tenders were opened and scheduled, that they would not sign a contract including the "sweating" clause ; their tenders, therefore, were irregular, and were not entertained. Mr. Mark Workman's tender was the lowest for artillery cloth pantaloons, artillery cloth trousers, cloaks and great coats. Mr. Philip Jamieson's the lowest for shoulder pads, and Messrs. W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Co.'s the lowest for all the other descriptions.

(b.) The W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company put in two tenders covering the same articles ; one being the regular tender for a contract containing the "sweating" clause, and the other, an alternative tender for a contract omitting said clause. The latter tender being the lower. This company, however, addressed a letter to the department to the effect that if they were awarded not less than 64 per cent to 80 per cent of the whole value of the contract for which tenders were asked they would agree to accept the lower prices for most of the articles. On examination it was found that under this offer they would receive considerably over 64 per cent of the whole amount, and a contract was accordingly awarded to them. Messrs. W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company, Mr. Mark Workman, and Mr. Philip Jamieson were awarded contracts.

(c.) Mr. Mark Workman, of Montreal, was awarded the contract for artillery cloth pantaloons, artillery cloth trousers, cloaks and great coats ; his contract is being carried on satisfactorily.

(d.) The tenders for clothing furnished by Mr. Workman, were :

Names.	Art'y Cloth Pantaloons.	Art'y Cloth Trousers.	Cloaks.	Great Coats.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
Mark Workman	4 35	4 36	8 40	6 74
W. E. Sanford Mfg. Co..	4 45	4 42	8 60	6 80
J. A. Seybold & Co.....	4 81	4 11	8 47	7 59
John W. Peck & Co. ...	.....	4 60		
Philip Jamieson.....	.....	4 61½		
Marsolais & Monday	...	...	9 20	6 85

(e.) No recommendation was required and no one recommended. The certified cheques accompanying all tenders are prima facie, sufficient guarantee of good faith.

(f.) The department is not aware whether Mr. Workman is or is not a British subject either by birth or naturalization.

(g.) The department is not aware that Mr. Mark Workman operated his factory for seven days in the week in the execution of a Government contract.

LACHUTE AND ST. ANDREWS RAILWAY.

Mr. T. CHRISTIE (Argenteuil) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, contracts, reports, &c., in connection with the chartering of railway companies to build, construct and operate a line between Lachute and St. Andrews.

He said : In making this motion, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and of this House to the fact that the people of St. Andrews are suffering a very substantial grievance, perhaps I should say a great wrong, in the fact that this railway, which has been largely subsidized, has not been operated for several years. In 1890 a subsidy of $22,400 was granted by the Dominion Parliament to a company on condition that it would build a railway from St. Andrews to Lachute, a distance of seven miles. It was especially agreed and stipulated that the road should be properly built, well equipped, and continuously operated. A subsidy of $36,750 was secured from the Quebec Government on the same condition, and the corporation of St. Andrews also contributed a bonus of $10,000. The road was built, partially equipped, and operated for a short time ; but for reasons best known to the parties who were responsible for its operation, the road has not been operated for three or four years, and the people of St. Andrews have in consequence been subjected to great loss and inconvenience. They feel that they have been very badly used in this matter, and they now appeal to the Government, in the hope that the Government will interfere and see that justice is done to them. They feel that these parties which have received subsidies to the amount of $69,000 or $70,000, should be compelled to

fulfil their obligation to operate the road. I hold in my hand the conditions of the agreement, which it is hardly necessary for me to take up the time of the House in reading. I may just read an extract to show exactly how the matter stands:

Now, this agreement witnesseth, that in consideration of the cash subsidy to be paid to the manner aforesaid, the Great Northern Railway Company covenants and agrees to and with Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, in the manner following, that is to say:

That the company shall and will well, truly and faithfully make, build, construct and complete a railway from St. Andrews, in the county of Argenteuil, in the province of Quebec, to the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at the town of Lachute, seven miles in length.

That the company will, upon and after the completion of the said line of railway and works appertaining thereto, truly and faithfully keep the same, and the rolling stock required therefor, in good sufficient working and running order, and shall continuously and faithfully operate the same.

I also hold in my hand a letter from the mayor of St. Andrews, from which I will read a very short extract to show exactly how the people feel in reference to this matter:

Dr. Thos. Christie, M.P.

Dear Sir,—I have read your answer from the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I am surprised.

The sixth clause of the contract, of which I mail you a copy, says that the company, after completing the line, shall continuously and faithfully operate the same.

The Dominion Government granted powers to the Great Northern to build a railway from St. Andrews to Lachute; they also chartered the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, and the Atlantic and Lake Superior, and they each in succession obtained control of the road, and by so doing led the people of St. Andrews to believe that those companies were composed of reliable men. In this faith the parish voted a bonus of $10,000, expecting that the Great Northern would fulfil their part and give us railway facilities, and you know how we have been treated. The amount is a heavy burden on the parish, and the people feel their position keenly, and we are looking to the Dominion Government to protect us. We know they have the power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not further trespass upon the time of the House, as I am convinced that the Government will do all that can be done to remedy the grievance to right this great wrong; but I will simply move for all the papers relating to the matter, seconded by Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There will be no objection whatever to the adoption of this motion, but I would like to add a word or two in explanation of the situation, which may perhaps not be fully understood by the constituents of my hon. friend or that particular portion of it interested in this railway. The railway was, in the first place, constructed, with the assistance of the town of St. Andrews, by the Great Northern Railway Company, and one of the clauses of the contract provided for its continuous operation. Unhappily, however, some arrangements took place later between the Great Northern and the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, or the company which is now practically the Atlantic and Lake Superior, under which this piece of road was transferred to the latter. The road has not been operated for a very great while owing to the financial condition of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company. That company is not in such a position that it can be compelled to carry out this clause of the contract, and by reason of the transfer to it, under the express authority of Parliament, it is doubtful whether the Great Northern Company could be compelled to execute what it contends has now ceased to be an obligation upon it. I have been obtaining the opinion of the Justice Department and doing everything possible to find a means of affording relief to the people in the locality. But down to the present I have not succeeded in satisfying myself that we have any means whatever of compelling the company which now owns the road to operate it. If the company had any means, or were at all responsible, there would be no difficulty, but unhappily they are not in that condition, and a good many localities, as well as St. Andrews, find themselves in a similar predicament. I do not think that any legal provision which could be inserted either in the subsidy Acts or the charter, would provide any remedy. However, my hon. friend is having these papers brought down, and if he or anybody else can suggest any means by which the Government can compel the railway company, which now own the road, to operate it, he will have every assistance on my part.

Motion agreed to.

WORKING EXPENSES, GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What were the working expenses of the Government railways for May and June, 1898, respectively under the several heads: Locomotive power, car expenses, maintenance of way and works, station expenses, general charges? What is the same information in reference to the Intercolonial division of the Government railways?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The following are the figures:—

Working Expenses of Government Railways and Intercolonial Division of Government Railways for May and June, 1898.

Government Railways.

Month.	Locomotive Power.	Car Expenses.	Maintenance of Way and Works.	Station Expenses.	General Charges.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
May	94,178 15	72,135 49	105,294 41	36,090 79	20,776 68
June	101,983 47	70,087 69	166,024 31	40,801 31	24,840 63

Intercolonial Division.

May	90,678 37	68,778 46	97,606 75	33,781 25	19,962 10
June	99,000 84	66,426 20	152,613 70	38,353 55	23,857 11

ENGINE AND CAR MILEAGE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Have returns or statements as provided for in the thirty-third clause of the agreement contained in the schedule to Bill 138 been made by the Grand Trunk Company to the Government or Department of Railways? If so, for what months, and where are these returns or statements kept on file?

Do these returns or statements show the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains and the total combined engine and car mileage running over each of the joint sections referred to in section 3rd of the above mentioned schedule?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Returns and statements, under clause 33 of the agreement contained in the schedule to Bill 138, have been furnished the Department of Railways for all the months since the Montreal extension was opened, and are on file in the Department at Moncton, but such statements have not shown the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk Railway, respectively, over any of the sections, until the same was received on application to the Grand Trunk Railway on Thursday last by the department here at Ottawa. The statements on file at Moncton contain the accounts for each month, showing all payments made by the Grand Trunk Railway and amounts charged by the Grand Trunk Railway against the Intercolonial Railway. The statement received from the Grand Trunk Railway on Thursday last was for six months only.

MR. A. R. MACDONALD.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. McDougall) asked:

1. Was Mr. A. R. Macdonald, late assistant superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, suspended some time before his services were dispensed with by the Government?
2. If so, at what date was he suspended?
3. At what date were his services definitely dispensed with?
4. Was his salary paid to him while he was so suspended?
5. If so, what total amount was so paid to him for salary?
6. Was any further amount paid to him while he was so suspended, for travelling expenses, board, &c., and if so, how much?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, Mr. A. R. Macdonald was suspended some time before his services were dispensed with. 2. He was suspended on the 24th of January, 1897. 3. His services were definitely dispensed with on December 31st, 1897. 4. His salary was paid him while suspended. 5. The amount of salary so paid him was $1,590.25. 6. $71.25 was paid him for travelling expenses and board.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. McDougall) asked:

1. Was an official investigation held into the conduct of Mr. A. R. Macdonald, late superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, before his dismissal?
2. If so, by whom was it held?
3. How long did said investigation last?
4. Did the Government pay counsel representing Mr. Macdonald?
5. If so, by whom was he represented, and how much was paid such counsel?
6. How many witnesses were heard in the course of such investigation?
7. What total amount was paid by the Government to the witnesses?
8. What total amount was paid to the commissioner, J. E. Bédard, Esq., Q.C.?
9. Was the Department of Railways or the Government represented at such investigation by counsel, and if so, by whom?
10. What total amount was paid to such counsel?
11. What total amount was paid for stenographer's fees?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, an official investigation was held into the conduct of Mr. A. R. Macdonald, late Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, before his dismissal. 2. It was held by J. E. Bedard, Esq., Q.C. 3. The investigation lasted sixteen and one-half days. 4. The Government paid counsel representing Mr. Macdonald. 5. He was represented by Mr. Charles Langelier, who was paid $120, and by Mr. L. B. Dionne, who was paid $40. 6. Ninety witnesses were heard. 7. The total amount paid to witnesses was $310.28. 8. The total amount paid J. E. Bedard, Esq., Q.C., was $408.36. The Department of Railways, or Government, were not represented by counsel at such investigation. 10. Therefore, nothing was paid. 11. The total amount paid for stenographer's fees was $82.50.

DUTIES UPON TOBACCO.

On the Order being called,

That, in the opinion of this House, the present high duties on tobacco should be reduced.—(Mr. Gillies.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will have to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) to allow this to stand. A number of gentlemen wish to speak upon it, but they are not yet prepared to do so.

Mr. GILLIES. I do not object to the question standing, providing an opportunity be given me to bring it forward.

The PRIME MINISTER. Next Monday.

DISMISSAL OF WILLIAM D. McMILLAN, WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions, reports and all other papers in connection with the dismissal of Mr. William D. McMillan as light-keeper at Wood Island, in the province of Prince Edward Island, and the appointment of his successor.

He said : I desire to say a few words with regard to this dismissal. Mr. McMillan was dismissed from his position in the fall of 1898. There had been an investigation in 1897. After the investigation was held, Mr. McMillan was kept in his position for over a year. It was assumed that, having been kept in his position that length of time, he would be continued in office, especially because, in dismissing Mr. McMillan, the Government practically dismissed their own appointee. Mr. McMillan's father was appointed to this particular lighthouse in the year 1876, under the Mackenzie Government. Though a strong Liberal he was continued in office by the Conservative party as lighthouse keeper, until his death in 1896. His son was appointed by the Liberal-Conservative Government to succeed his father. The son served faithfully and well as lighthouse-keeper, and gained high recommendations for efficiency in the discharge of his duties, including one from Commander Spain. Mr. McMillan was not an active politician ; he had only polled one vote in his life. Yet, forsooth, we have been told that he was dismissed for offensive partisanship. He was dismissed like others, all over Prince Edward Island, to make room for the heelers and followers of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and his political friends, and I think it comes with ill-grace, after keeping this gentleman in office a year and three months after the investigation was held, to dismiss him. And that this widow and her son should be turned out of house and home in the fall of the year, at the approach of the inclement season, is a most shameless transaction. And I have reason to believe, from some correspondence which I have in hand, that Mr. McMillan's dismissal was owing to the fact that he would not yield to some pressure which was brought upon him at the local election of 1897 to vote for the Liberal candidates in his district and not for political partisanship. To prove that, I have here a letter from a gentleman living in Mr. McMillan's neighbourhood, dated Wood Island, P.E.I., January 10th, 1899 :

Dear Sir,—I would inform you of the use made of the Dominion Government patronage here previous to the last local general election. During that canvass one of the most active Grit agents told me to inform William D. McMillan, light-keeper at Wood Island, that if his office was worth anything to him he had better come out on the day of the election and give H. C. McDonald, the Liberal candidate, a shove. He said : " It makes no difference to me ; but I'll tell you that's just how it is." I informed him that William D. McMillan never polled a vote in his life at any local election, and that he did not have a vote. He then said : " You tell him to come out, and that will be made all right."

That is, his vote would be made all right, though he had no vote.

Now, sir, William D. McMillan did not go out to the election, and since then he was dismissed. Although his notice of dismissal did not state any reason for his dismissal, I take it he was dismissed because he did not take part in politics.

I presume that is the reason why he was dismissed. If not, how is it that when an investigation was held the year previous if found guilty of offensive partisanship, he was not then dismissed ? One year and a half later when pressure was brought upon him to vote in support of the Liberal party in the local election, he had the manliness to refuse, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) clubbed him, and off went his head. In this House the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that he assumed the responsibility of the dismissal of Mr. McMillan. But if the hon. gentleman would allow me to read some correspondence which he had with some of his (Mr. McMillan's)

friends down in that province, I think I could show this House that he did not remove Mr. McMillan on his own responsibility, but that he placed the responsibility of his dismissal upon other shoulders altogether, in fact, he placed the responsibility on the shoulders of the Liberal candidate himself in whose interest Mr. McMillan was asked to vote. So it appears that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had to succumb to the entreaties of the candidate for whom Mr. McMillan refused to vote, he had to accede to the entreaties of Messrs. H. C. McDonald and George Forbes, the candidates who were running their election there in 1887. I have letters here showing that the answer he gave this House that he assumed the whole responsibility, was contrary to the facts. But these letters are marked private, as it appears to be usual with members of the Government to mark letters now in order to cover up some doubtful transaction; but if the hon. gentleman will allow me to read some of them, of which I have a copy, they would prove what I have stated, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not shoulder the responsibility himself, but that he placed it on the shoulders of others. I think this is a case of peculiar hardship. There is, besides, this interesting features in regard to the matter. The gentleman who was appointed to succeed Mr. McMillan, I think I am correct in saying, is over 60 years of age, and the Minister has evidence in his department to show that. I do not know if the rules of the department permit a gentleman over 60 years of age to be appointed a lightkeeper, and, under these circumstances, I do not think he can continue that gentleman in his position.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why do you not read the letters?

Mr. MARTIN. Those letters being marked private, unless I have the consent of the hon. gentleman, I do not feel myself at liberty to read them, but if he gives me liberty to read them, I will do so. I may say that intense feeling has been created in that part of the province by the action of the hon. gentleman. I am sure that his friends down there do not approve of his turning a poor woman and her son out on the roadside in the month of September or October, without anything under heaven to shelter them. I am sure that the hon. gentleman himself must be by this time ready to reinstate Mr. McMillan in his office, and I think he will to some extent redeem himself in the eyes of all right thinking people if he does so. I may say that this is on a par with another dismissal the hon. gentleman has made. Not far from Wood Island there is another lighthouse where the hon. gentleman proceeded in a similar way, and in that case also put a woman and her son out on the road, and in that case also he did it in order to give the position to a friend of his own, to a gentleman in that part of the province in the employment of a near relative of his own.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will try to keep to the question raised.

Mr. MARTIN. I am trying to do so, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to follow a line of argument to show that this dismissal is on a line with some other dismissals which have been made in that province, and that they have not been made because of offensive partisanship at all, but in order to provide situations for the heelers of the hon. gentleman, who had raised high expectations in the minds of his followers and his heelers, and when his party got in, he had not places for half of them. In this case, and in some other cases, he has done things which I am sure that he would not do in his sober moments, unless he was pressed very closely by his political camp followers. In order to show that in making these dismissals he was moved with a desire to make room for his heelers, I have only to allude to the appointment of the captain of the dredge "Prince Edward." A competent official who had been in charge of that dredge for some years, was discharged merely to make room for a gentleman who had been useful to the party during the general elections, and the only qualification he had to succeed Captain McDonald on that dredge was that he had been the petitioner in an election petition against Mr. Hackett, who sat in the House for some time. I will read an extract to show the qualification of the successor of Captain McDonald, taken from the evidence taken at the trial of the petition in the case of Mr. Hackett. Here is a question put by one of the lawyers, Mr. Quarrie, to William Sharp Larkins, who is Captain McDonald's successor on the dredge "Prince Edward":

> Did you get any whisky for distribution at the last elections?
>
> A. I got a barrel at the station, in Tweedie's name, at Alberton. I got it by an order endorsed to me. Came to order. I took it home, marked "groceries." I cannot say Tweedie requested me to take it to my place. Whisky in the package—3 to 5-gallon kegs—might be 10 gallons. I took this to Tweedie's. This was in May—I think early in May. I delivered it in 48 hours.

It did not take long to get rid of those ten gallons of whisky.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would really like the hon. gentleman to say how this particular election trial is connected with this particular dismissal, because we must confine our debates, especially at this stage of the session, as nearly as we can, within the proper rules of the House. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to go all over the island.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am merely showing that these dismissals are made in the interest of the party heelers in Prince Edward Island. These followers of the party in Prince Edward Island were led to believe that when the Liberal party came

into power every one of them would get a position——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, when called to order, must pay some respect to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN. I bow to the ruling of the Chair. As your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is that I must stick more closely to the question, I may say further that a dismissal had been made under that hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) of the light-keeper at Fish Island.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is that this case?

Mr. MARTIN. No; but they are nearly similar cases.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure the hon. gentleman perfectly understands that this is out of order.

Mr. MARTIN. All I have to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I bow to the ruling of the Chair. I am not anxious to take up unnecessarily any of the time of the House. All this session, and in other sessions, I have abstained, as much as possible, from going into discussion of these questions. I had expected that the demands of the followers, in Prince Edward Island, of the hon. gentleman who has charge of that department (Sir Louis Davies), would be lessened, and that these dismissals would cease. I find, after two years of the party being in power, it is breaking out again, and that these followers in Prince Edward Island are urging the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make more dismissals. After the statement which I have made in regard to the dismissal of Mr. McMillan, I think the only way he can adopt to put himself right is to reinstate Mr. McMillan. As you say, Mr. Speaker, if I were to go over all the dismissals in Prince Edward Island——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All the shady ones.

Mr. MARTIN. All the shady ones—it would take up a great deal of the time of the House indeed, and with these few remarks, I will conclude, trusting that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will reconsider this cold-hearted dismissal of an efficient public servant, whose only sin appears to be that he could not vote for the Liberal candidates in the provincial election of 1897.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Mr. Speaker, I need not say that there is no objection to bringing down these papers; I would only be too glad to bring down the papers. They will show substantially the information given by me to the House on the 1st of May, when the hon. gentleman put a question to me relating to the dismissal of Mr. McMillan. The hon. gentleman evidently felt that he had no case against the Government, or he would have confined himself to the discussion of this case, and not have wandered away to other cases in the hope of making a case in reference to other dismissals. There was no attempt to arbitrarily dismiss McMillan. An investigation was properly held, evidence taken, and he himself refused to make any statement on oath with the view of contradicting any statement made against him. The commissioner who investigated the case found him guilty of the charges.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What were the charges?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Offensive partisanship, canvassing against the Government and using offensive language towards the Premier.

Mr. FOSTER. Against the local government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it had nothing to do with the local government. He was charged with offensive political partisanship, attending caucus meetings of his own party, and denouncing the Liberal party.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that enough?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He attended caucus meetings of his own party; he was guilty of offensive partisanship and canvassing against the Liberal party. I was sorry to dismiss him, but there was nothing left for me to do. He refused to give evidence. However, I will be glad to bring the papers down, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) will see, I am sure, that I am not to blame in regard to the matter. The hon. gentleman speaks of his dismissal because he would not yield to some pressure in local matters. This is the first I ever heard of it, and I beg to say, so far as the local government were concerned, they never mentioned the case to me.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman state whether this dismissal, for which he assumes responsibility, was made on the recommendation of the Attorney General of the province, and of Mr. George Forbes, the candidates for whom Mr. McMillan refused to vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will bring down all the papers which the hon. gentleman asked for. I assume the responsibility of recommending the dismissal of Mr. McMillan. I have to do that. It was on my recommendation that my colleagues acted. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries assumes the responsibility. The papers will be brought down, and they will show the hon. gentle-

man what the facts were and whether or not it was one of those cases in which I was justified.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you going to have some more Estimates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. We will take it up then.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he has departed from the rule which obtained in the Department of Marine and Fisheries for many years, in my time, respecting the age at which lighthouse-keepers may be appointed. I understand the man who was appointed to succeed this lighthouse-keeper was something about sixty years of age. For obvious reasons in connection with the safety of life, or with the assistance of ships in distress, at that time or in the future, the rules of the service required a man to be forty years of age unless under extraordinary circumstances, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether that rule has been departed from.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There has been no departure from that very proper rule, and I have had, in many cases, to decline nominations sent to me of gentlemen beyond that age.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was this man sixty years of age ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know. In this case, the papers came back showing him to be of a proper age, and when my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) brought to my attention the fact—or I do not know that it was not before he brought my attention to the fact—that he was said to be beyond that age, I had an investigation into the matter. I am not sure whether the investigation was reported or not, but, so far as the department is concerned, it was reported to us that the age was correctly given, and an investigation is now being held into that.

Mr. MARTIN. Has not the Minister the information in the department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may ; I will look and see.

Motion agreed to.

TORONTO AND GEORGIAN BAY SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, applications, correspondence, charter and reports with reference to the Toronto and Georgian Bay Ship Canal Company.

He said : Now that attention is being revived in the question of our inland navigation, the people of Ontario are beginning to take a lively interest in this matter. Twenty-five years ago the Government intimated that until the Welland and St. Lawrence Canal system was deepened from nine or ten feet on the water sills to fourteen feet, they would not pay attention to other proposed canal routes. That scheme is now about being completed, and next year will see a depth of water of fourteen feet from the upper lakes via the Welland and St. Lawrence canals to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ocean. We know that the freight from the western United States in which we have a lesser interest, and the freight from Manitoba and our own North-west in which we have a vital interest, has increased enormously, year after year, for the past twenty years. Twenty-five years ago there was no expectation that there would be such an enormous product of grain and cattle from our own North-west Territories, and indeed at that time the estimates made, applied only to the products of western Ontario and the products of the United States. To-day we find that our own western provinces are producing an enormous quantity of grain, cattle and other products, and we find to our dismay, so to speak, that these products are being carried to the English markets by the United States routes. We claim that we have the shortest, the most direct, and the most natural route, but, because we have not availed of these advantages, either from lack of enterprise or other reasons, we find that not only are American products, but that a large portion of our own North-western Canadian products are being shipped to Buffalo and Ogdensburg, and thence by the Erie Canal or by rail to New York for export to Europe. We believe that if the country takes proper steps we can secure a large portion of that freight for our Canadian route. That idea prevailed years ago when the project of the Huron, Ontario Canal, or the Toronto and Georgian Bay Ship Canal was a live question. But until the Welland and St. Lawrence Canal system was improved and until railroads were built, this project had to take a back seat. Of course we know that railroads are of prime necessity as they reach all parts of the country, and so are better calculated to develop the resources of the Dominion generally. We are now, however, coming to another era in the transportation history of this country, and these schemes that were set aside a quarter of a century ago, are now looming up as practical subjects. This scheme to which reference is made in my motion of a canal or ship railway purposes to cross a narrow neck of land 70 or 80 miles from the Georgian Bay into Lake Ontario by the direct route, or 122 miles on the old route of the Georgian Bay Ship Canal coming up the river and through Lake Simcoe and down a rather

circuitous route. If that were constructed there would be only 40 miles of a canal required as there is about 80 miles of waterway of sufficient depth, or nearly sufficient depth, now in existence. Since that ship canal was first proposed science has made great advances. They have improved the system of hydraulic lift lock to such an extent, that it is said, that this project could be carried out for about half the cost it would have entailed twenty-five years ago. A later scheme, however, has loomed up in this ship railway which has received the endorsement of eminent engineers. Mr. Kivas Tully, of Toronto, who was engineer for the Ontario Government for many years; an eminent hydraulic engineer, a man of great ability, has made a report in which he gives his full endorsation to the scheme of the ship railway, by which vessels would be carried on a specially constructed railway from the Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario and vice versa. This scheme would be less expensive than a canal, because in the construction of a canal there is the height of land to be reckoned with, but even that would not be such an expense as should deter Canadians from going into the enterprise, because recent inventions which have been successfully carried out in England and elsewhere have made the cost of such work comparatively inexpensive. Mr. Tully in his report estimated the cost of the canal, for vessels of 1,000 tons burden at $22,170,000. But that has now given way to the project of a ship railway which Mr. Tully at present advocates, and with regard to which he says:

> In 1885 the question of a ship railway between Lake Ontario and Georgian Bay was submitted by me to Captain Eades, and his reply was as follows:—
>
> "I have carefully examined the profile and route for the proposed ship railway from Georgian Bay to Toronto, and from the information you gave me personally, and from the result of your surveys over the route, I am not only satisfied that the ship railway is entirely practicable over it, but that it furnishes one of the most remarkably favourable locations for such a construction of which I have any knowledge. The grades are very low, and you will be able to secure a practically straight line from end to end, which will enable you to work the line with a degree of economy which will surprise the public. I should think, from Mr. Corthell's investigations of the cost of transportation on the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads, that from 15 to 20 cents per ton would cover the entire cost from lake to lake."

That is the opinion of a gentleman who is now dead, but who had the reputation of being the most successful and most able of all the great hydraulic or canal engineers. There was a charter procured from this Parliament in 1874 by Mr. David Blain, then member for West York, for the construction of such a railway from the Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario. In 1897, the time was extended to 1902. According to the provisions of the Act, power was given "to construct one or more tracks of railway for the purpose of carrying passengers and freight and conveying vessels, barges and other water craft and their cargoes from the upper lakes to Lake Ontario, in the vicinity of Toronto." The cost of a single track, Mr. Tully says, would be $3,000,000, and the distance between Collingwood and Toronto 74 miles. They proposed further on to build three tracks when the business would warrant it. This project, if successful—and we have the opinion of these men that it would be successful—would create a revolution in the transportation of the merchandise of the west, and provide a route through Canadian territory, which is what we all desire to have. With regard to other lines of transportation that are proposed, I have nothing to say, only this, that before an Ottawa ship canal would be completed and made useful, the probabilities, in fact, the certainties, are that the trade of the North-west would have so increased, doubled and quadrupled, that there would be more than ample trade to fill all these lines of communication, and to make them all successful, if they could be made a success. This scheme, with its short route of 74 miles, would shorten the distance from Chicago to the ocean, either at New York or at Montreal, by at least 370 miles. In fact, this estimate was made on the calculation of a ship canal which would be 48 or 50 miles longer than this; so that there would be an actual shortening of the route by 418 miles, which would give an enormous advantage to vessels going this way. I think the matter is one that should engage the attention of the Government, now that they are considering schemes for the development of the country—now that they are more especially claiming to develop the waterways and the railways so as to procure the carriage of our own freight through our own country to our own ocean ports. I think that we in the past have not, perhaps, realized the full importance of this question, or, if we have, we have not been able to accomplish as much as we would desire. This ship railway, if completed for that short distance of 74 miles, shortening the distance to the ocean by 418 or 420 miles, and giving a through route by a line that could be completed in a short time, unlike some of these others that would require almost a lifetime to complete them and make them effective, would, I think, especially commend itself to the people of this country. We are told that the Government are anxious to increase the transportation facilities. We know that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has gone round to every place in the country which he could reach, and has told the people that he is anxious to give them every kind of facility they could think of or desire, and that he would help every scheme everybody proposed. This is a scheme that would not commend itself to him, I suppose, because it is a practical scheme—one that has the

commendation of engineers of the highest authority, and one that will promote, and rapidly promote the development of the country if it can be accomplished. I therefore move the motion.

Motion agreed to.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR PRODUCTION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved :

That having regard to the large importations of sugar into Canada for home consumption, amounting to 239,670,038 lbs. in the year 1898, at a cost of $4,868,956, and that it has been demonstrated beyond a doubt that the cultivation of the sugar beet in the Dominion is not only feasible but is being successfully grown in many parts of the country at present ; therefore, in the opinion of this House, in order to stimulate the farmers of Canada to engage in the growth of this valuable product, and also to encourage the establishment of beet-root sugar factories, a bounty should be offered for all beet-root sugar manufactured in the Dominion during the next ten years, and that the machinery necessary for such plant not made in Canada be admitted free of duty.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it is the duty of the Government to so direct and assist the pursuits of the people that they may be as far as possible self-sustaining and labouring for each other. I think that that is the first duty of any Government in any civilized country, because when this is done, not only will labour be economized, but be as far as possible self-sustaining. Whenever the products of the country from any source enable the people to utilize their labour so that one is working for the other, the people will be kept employed and obtain productive remuneration for their labour, and if it can be shown that a new industry is capable of being established in the country, which will give profitable employment to labour it is the part of wisdom to give that industry every assistance in our power. It is a proposition no one will reasonably deny that it is the duty of the Government to, as far as possible, give assistance to every industry in the country that will employ labour profitably in the interests of the people. That being the case, when we find that the annual consumption of sugar in Canada is about 150,000 tons a year, nearly all of which is brought from abroad, when we find that the nature of our climate and the productiveness of our soil are such as to enable Canadians to employ their time and labour profitably in growing beets for the manufacture of sugar and supplying sugar for the needs of the people at home, it must be admitted that it is the bounden duty of the Government to give that industry every encouragement. There are about $13,000,000 worth of sugar consumed annually in Canada. I assume that if we should succeed in satisfying the Government, especially the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), that this sugar could be profitably made in Canada, providing the Government give a little assistance to the industry, there can be no doubt as to the wisdom of giving that assistance.

The question may fairly be asked : Are the soil and climate of Canada suitable for the successful growth of the sugar beet of average good quality ? And then comes the question : Will the beet yield sufficient sugar to keep up the industry ? For the purpose of answering these questions, I shall take up a pamphlet, which I have before me, written by Mr. Robert H. Lawder, who has given more attention to this subject than any other man in Canada. He has been endeavouring, by every possible means in his power, to promote that industry, and succeeded in getting the Government to commence the experiment of raising beets in the country and having the beets analysed, to determine whether the percentage of sugar they yield will warrant the industry being gone into. I take up that pamphlet, and may say here that I feel extremely grateful to the writer, because there is a great deal of information contained in it that could not have been available to me had he not kindly furnished me with everything in his possession bearing on the subject.

Have the experiments already made been such as to justify the statement that beets can be grown successfully here and that they contain a sufficient percentage of sugar to justify their growth ? Let me give a synopsis of the reports of the Department of Agriculture, which show that during the years 1889, 1890 and 1891 experiments were made in the cultivation of sugar beets in the different sections of the province of Ontario, average samples of which were forwarded to the laboratories at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa and the Ontario College Farm at Guelph for analysis by the professors of chemistry. Among other experiments the Ontario agricultural experimental farm cultivated one acre of sugar beet in each of these years. In 1889, Mr. C. C. James, a professor of chemistry, analysed and reported on 26 samples obtained from the farm there and from different parts of the province. In 1894 he reported on 117 samples. In 1891, his successor, Mr. A. E. Shuttleworth, analysed and reported on 32 samples. Nearly the whole of the expense of distributing and collecting and analysing the roots was defrayed from the liberal grants of money obtained through Hon. Chas. Drury, Minister of Agriculture to the province of Ontario.

The result is shown by the following table, which gives separately the average for 1889, 1890 and 1891, and the average of these three years together. In 1890 the 26 samples analysed show that the beets averaged two pounds two ounces, which is a fair size. They gave 18·95 per cent solids in juice, which is a high average, and 14·35 per cent

sugar in juice, and sugar is successfully made in many countries where the average is between 11 and 12. The average 75·70 purity of juice.

The following table gives separately the averages for 1889, 1890 and 1891, and the average of these three years together :—

—	Number of Samples.	Average Weight.		Solids in Juice.	Sugar in Juice.	Purity of Juice.
		Lbs.	Oz.	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Average of results for 1889	26	2	2	18·95	14·35	75·70
" " 1890	117	1	4	17·12	13·58	79·32
" " 1891	32	2	2·8	16·76	13·53	80·35
	175	1	13·6	17·61	13·82	88·46

Following this, Mr. Lawder gives a table, showing similar averages of the Ontario experimental farm product, comparing these averages with the Ontario average, in which the Ontario Experimental Farm product is included :

—	Number of Samples.	Average Weight.		Solids in Juice.	Sugar in Juice.	Purity of Juice.
		Lbs.	Oz.	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Average for 1889	1	2	1½	21·50	18·00	83·70
" 1890	1	1	0½	18·03	15·08	83·64
" 1891	5	1	10·7	18·12	14·94	82·48
Average for 1889-90-91	7	1	12·9	19·22	16·01	83·27
Average for Ontario, 1891		2	2·8	16·76	13·53	80·35
" Ontario Experimental Farm, 1891		1	10·7	18·12	14·94	82·48
" " 3 years		1	13·6	17·61	13·82	78·46
" " Experimental Farm, 3 years		1	12·9	19·22	16·01	83·7

Mr. Lawder proceeds to say :

The analysis of this year's product sustains the conclusion of former analyses, that the percentage of sugar in Ontario would, under proper cultivation, be as high as in Europe.

In support of his conclusion, there was a three years' average of 16·01 per cent sugar in juice, with a purity of 83·27, in the Ontario Experimental Farm product, grown under proper cultivation ; and the Ontario average was 13·53 per cent in 1891, against 13·58 in 1890, of sugar in juice, with 80·35 in 1891 against 79·32 in 1890, purity.

In regard to the yield per acre, there is difficulty in obtaining reliable data. Calculation for one or two areas are not satisfactory. In the Ontario Experimental Farm, the average, 19·9 tons per acre, may be calculated as possible ; the lower average for the province being due chiefly to non-compliance with some of the conditions of cultivation, indicated by the large beets and the great amount of green matter on many of the samples shown.

In looking over the averages from other countries, I find that it is very much lower than this. If I may be permitted to cite a few facts in regard to the way these experiments are carried out, it will give the idea that suitability of soil and climate are not confined to one section alone. I find here that the first experiment was carried on at Dunnville, the second at Deseronto, the third at Dunnville, the fourth at Stratford, the fifth sixth and seventh at Goderich, the eighth, ninth and tenth at Hastings, the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth at Oshawa, the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth at Harwood, the twenty-first, twenty-second and twenty-third at Plainfield, the twenty-fourth at Cobourg, the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth at Peterborough, the twenty-seventh at Marden, the twenty-eighth at Guelph,—and so I could go over the whole list and show that these experiments were carried on at places scattered all over the province of Ontario.

Mr. PRIOR. Any in British Columbia ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have no figures here respecting experiments in British Columbia, but know that that province does raise fine beets. In all parts of the province of Ontario and in many parts of the province of Quebec,

where the experiments have been carried on, it has been demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt, that beets can be grown of average size, of good quality. The average yield per acre is between eleven and fifteen tons—probably twelve and a half tons per acre is a fair average. The percentage of sugar in these beets is over 13½, which is higher than in Germany, where it does not go beyond 12 per cent. The purity of the juice in the Canadian beets, an average of 83 per cent, is higher than in Germany, where the average is 79 per cent. In every one of these experiments it is shown that the beets raised in Ontario and Quebec are as valuable for the production of sugar and afford the growers as reasonable a hope of a profitable return for their labour as is the case in any other country. Now, with regard to the yield of beets in Ontario, the experimental farms showed a yield of over 18 tons, and, in one case, 19 tons per acre. Some individual farmers raised as high as 15½, 16½ and 17 tons. Considering that our yield per acre is greater, that the percentage of sugar is higher, and the quality of the juice better, it seems plain that our farmers could engage as successfully as the Germans in the cultivation of this crop. And there are other reasons why we should be more successful than the Germans. The land engaged in the cultivation of the beets in Germany is worth about $10 per acre per year of rent, whereas in Ontario it would not be worth more than from $2.50 to $3.50 per acre. While human labour is cheaper in Germany than with us, it is found that the great expense in the cultivation of the fields is in the use of animals —horses—and the work of horses can be had here more cheaply than it possibly can be in Germany. The probability of success here is indicated by the fact that while in Germany they can sell their grain at higher prices than we can and raise quite as much per acre, they abandon the cultivation of grain and turn attention largely to the cultivation of the sugar beet. Why is this? Because the beet gives them more than double the returns for their labour that would be yielded if they devoted themselves to the cultivation of grain. I have here some facts and statistics with regard to the cultivation of the sugar beet in Germany:

> Germany furnishes the most complete statistics of the beet sugar industry that are obtained from any country. It is not only the largest but the cheapest producer, and affords reliable data for comparison as to the cost of beet sugar as compared with cane.

I may say that a memorial was sent to the Minister of Agriculture asking him if he would recommend to Council that assistance be given to this industry, and one of his reasons for refusing, as I understand, was that we could not compete with those making cane sugar. The following are some of the statistics of this industry, for the campaign—that means the season of 1897-98:—They had 402 factories in operation. The area of beets under cultivation was 1,092,935 acres; the quantity of beets worked in tons of 2,204½ pounds, was 13,697,891. They produced, of sugar, 1,852,857 tons. The quantity of beets worked for factory was 31,723 tons. The weight of beets required for 100 pounds of sugar was 738 pounds. Yet the Ontario beets will turn out more than that. The quantity of sugar obtained from a ton of beets was 298 pounds, the percentage of sugar obtained being 13·53. Ontario, as I have said, has shown a percentage as high as 17½ and an average of 14½ per cent. The cost per acre of beets and manufacture of sugar was $73, and the cost of all the sugar produced at the factory was $79,784,255. Now, this shows most plainly that they could not employ their labour in that country to better advantage than in carrying on that industry, and the result is that they have gone into it to the large extent that I have already mentioned. I find that this industry is being transplanted to this continent. In the United States they have ascertained that their country is suitable for this culture and they commenced business there a few years ago. The report of Dr. H. W. Wiley, to the Secretary of Agriculture, which he gave a short time ago, shows the total quantity of beet sugar made in the United States in 1897 to have been 45,245,835 tons. The average yield of sugar per ton of beets of 2,000 pounds, was 232 pounds, which is below what it is in Germany where they are manufacturing beet-root sugar successfully. The average percentage of sugar in other places is 11·6, while ours runs as high as 13·53. The report goes on to say:

> This is a less percentage than is obtained in Germany (12·84 in 1897-98), but considering the newness of the industry in this country, it is sufficiently encouraging. Reliable information shows that there will be in operation in the United States, in 1898, 17 factories, new factories being located: In Utah, 1; California, 4; Oregon, 1; Michigan, 1; New York, 1. It is safe to say that at least 80,000 acres will be planted in beets during the season of 1898. The yield may be expected to be nearly 8,000,000 tons and of sugar about 90,000 tons. The enlargement this season is not less than 70 per cent.

That is what they are doing in the United States. I may state that experiments have been carried on in Manitoba also, and the climate and soil were found to be admirably adapted for the cultivation of the sugar beet, the same as they are in Ontario. I believe it may be taken for granted that any land that will grow turnips will grow sugar beets also. We have been growing sugar beets so many years in Ontario that every person knows that to be a fact. I may say that at the present time there are hundreds of farmers actually growing sugar beets in Ontario, to feed them to their cattle and their swine, as well as for other purposes. This year I know some farmers who have one, two, and even three acres in sugar beets, and year after year they find this one

of the most successful roots that they can cultivate.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) wished to be satisfied whether we can grow sugar beets and manufacture sugar from them and compete successfully with cane sugar. Now, I take the following countries where they have been making sugar from cane. I find in Java it costs £8 12s. 6d. per ton; Sandwich Islands, £8 4s. 4d.; Queensland, £8 15s.; Egypt, £9 10s. 11d.; Barbados, £9 15s.; Trinidad, £10 19s. 11d.; Demerara, £12 18s. 10d.; French Antilles, £14 6s. 9d. In Robisdorf, Germany, where beet-root sugar has been successfully cultivated, it only costs £9 6s. 3d., which is lower than in any one of these countries except the first three. These figures prove that beet-root sugar can be made successfully and compete successfully with cane sugar that is made in any other part of the world. In countries where they have been manufacturing cane sugar they are now turning their attention to growing beets, and find it more successful to make beet-root sugar; they find the profits are quite as large and in most cases larger than they have received from the manufacture of cane sugar. Now, when we come to examine the United States where they are making beet-root sugar, we find they are succeeding very well. There is no doubt that their experience has justified them in going into that industry in many states. I find in a publication in Michigan, called the "Sugar Beet," of January, 1889, the following facts:—

> The Wolverine Sugar Company, of Benton Harbour, capital $200,000, has been incorporated. Prominent in the localities where arrangements are being made for the erection of factories are: Bay City, Pontiac, Benton Harbour, Cairo, Mount Clements, Rochester and Saginaw. In most of these places contracts have been made with farmers for large crops of sugar beets. Monroe, Lapeer, Ann Arbor, East Tawas, Richmond, St. Clair, Alma, Detroit, Port Huron, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Wayne, Utica, Flushing, Sebewaing, Ypsilanti, Owosso and Sad Axe also are agitating for factories. Farmers seem to realize more and more that they must have some other crop than the staple product. It is stated in the press that Bay City had to canvass ten counties last season to obtain sufficient acreage of beets for the season's operations, but this season can better obtain their full supply from the county in which the factory is located.

In New York they have two factories, one at Rome and one at Binghampton. They are also starting factories in several other localities in New York. In Oregon they are agitating for several factories there. In Illinois they are building two factories at the present time. In Nebraska they have two factories in operation, and are thinking about several others. In New Mexico they have one in operation.

It gives the history of these factories. In Wisconsin they are preparing to erect four or five factories at the present time. In Minnesota they have erected some, and are erecting more. In Iowa they are preparing to erect two factories. I find from this statement generally that the business is going on rapidly in almost every part of the United States. I will give you the results of the operations of one factory in Watsonville, California, which has been going on for some length of time. I may mention that the operations in California are no more successful than they are in Michigan, right across the border from Ontario. During the ten years from 1888 to 1897 the total number of acres cultivated was 57,238—I am now speaking of Watsonville, California. In 1888, 2,100 acres were in cultivation; in 1891, 1,443 acres; in 1896, 11,017 acres. Now, the average number of acres in those years was only 572, and the average yield per acre was 10·84 tons, which is a low average. The smallest yield per acre was in 1890, 6·13, and the largest was in 1896, 14·6. In this country the yield has reached as high as 18 tons per acre. The average price paid for beets was $4.47 per ton. The lowest price paid was in 1896, $4 per ton; the highest price was $5 per ton. The average price paid per acre for beets was $49.58. Now, that was given for the purpose of enabling the farmer to determine whether he can profitably cultivate beets for $49.58 an acre. The experiment made in California justifies the conclusion that there will be an average return to the farmer of between $50 and $60 per acre from the cultivation of these beets, taking into account the percentage of sugar in the beet, the yield of beets, the number of tons and the success of the cultivation. The campaign began on August 29th, 1897, and continued until December 29th. They only ran their factories for an average, for the whole period, of one hundred days, hardly that, the campaign that year being 118 days. In the year 1890, it was as low as eighty-two days. The raw sugar produced, when they ran 118 days, was 14,888 tons; where they ran 170 days it was 19,528 tons; where they ran eighty-two days it was 2,127 tons. The tons of beets used to one ton of raw sugar produced was 7·4; average tons of beets worked daily, 1,075 tons. The ordinary factory would work an average of 500 tons of beets a day, but if you increase the machinery and use 1,000 tons of beets a day, which you could easily do at a small additional cost, you would get a larger consumption of beets, a larger output and a larger profit. The average weight of raw sugar worked daily was 144 tons. The result of the experience of ten years justifies the conclusion that sugar beet can be cultivated successfully, that the farmer is enabled to get a return of $49.58 per acre from the cultivation of the beet, and that the manufacturer has got a return as high as 49 per cent on his money. I think this justifies the conclusion that the business can be successfully carried on. That is the history of the industry in the United States.

What profit would it be to Canada if the industry were established in this country? it would have the effect of putting a larger amount of money in circulation in this country, and it would give employment to hundreds and thousands of our people in Canada, that would enable them to supply themselves and their families with the necessaries and comforts of life. It would open a field whereby the farmers of Canada would realize a very much larger return for their labour than they are enabled to do in the ordinary pursuits in which they are engaged to-day. There is no doubt of that, because it becomes plain when you make a comparison. If a farmer has a successful crop of oats, with an average yield per acre, he will not get as large a return as that which I have mentioned. An average crop of oats, at 30 cents per bushel, will amount to $9.90 per acre. Assuming that the straw is worth $2 more, that would make $11.90 per acre as the most that he will receive. If he raises wheat, it will yield probably $14 to $18 per acre, and if he raises pease, it will yield about $13.50 per acre. If he turns around and raises beets and gets $55 or $60 per acre, then, I submit, that he will be satisfied that he has made a much larger profit than he could in other lines of agriculture. But I will be told that it requires more labour to cultivate the beet than it does other crops. I admit that it requires more labour, but it is largely in machinery and horses; the machinery will always be available and the horses he has, so that he could put them to useful account. It is said it takes up all the profits to market the product. This is the only additional item of labour to which he will be subjected. After carefully investigating this subject and inquiring into a great many experiments which have been made, I can give the following figure as indicating the cost at which it has been found, in California, sugar beets can be successfully cultivated, of the highest quality, and marketed within a reasonable distance of the farm. It will only cost $35 an acre. At the lowest price which beets have realized in the markets where they have been sold —in Germany, if you like—$4 a ton, the farmer would realize $50, $55 or $60 per acre, after all his labour is paid for, when the cost of his machinery is taken into account, together with the cost of his time, the cost of marketing. After all these things are paid for, he has a profit of the difference between $35 and $50, or a profit of $15 per acre over labour and everything else. If a farmer could realize this profit out of his labour he would turn his whole farm into it. It is susceptible of demonstration as anything can be, that if the average farmer in the country turned his attention to cultivation of sugar beets, if he had a market for them, that is the return that he would get for his labour.

There is no doubt about that, because it has been proven beyond all possibility of dispute. But it is said that this cannot be done unless we have the factories. It is true it cannot be done unless we have the factories. It has been said that it cannot be done unless we can give assistance to the factories for a few years. That is admitted. The first few years the farmers who go into the industry unacquainted with its special requirements, there are items of loss. It requires intelligent labour to carry it on, and until they have qualified themselves by the experience of a few years, it will require some assistance. During the first few years, it will not be quite so profitable to them, and they will not go into the cultivation of the sugar beet as largely as they would otherwise. The result will be that those who are engaged in the sugar beet industry will find that they are obliged to aid the farmers by distributing the seed free for the first few years, and that they will require to buy all the beets that are raised, whether bad or good, in order to encourage the farmers to produce a product of a high quality, but in a few years, after this is done, the farmer will be enabled to go on himself and get a large return without assistance being given in this way.

No country has succeeded in establishing a sugar beet industry without assistance being given by the state in some way. I will take some of the countries where it has been established. In Germany, Belgium, Austria, France, Hungary, Russia, and in the United States, they have assisted it, and the industry is being successfully carried on to-day. It is said that there is a necessity for the bounty, because no man who has money to invest will be likely to invest it where he can get no assistance when he might invest it in another country which gives assistance to this industry. The state of Michigan gave 1 cent a pound bounty for all the sugar manufactured in the state on condition that the farmer should receive $4.50 a ton for his beets. Hardly a state in the Union but what gives assistance to this industry. California, Oregon and Nebraska give assistance, and Illinois proposes to do so. It has been the universal experience with all new beet sugar factories that there are many difficulties in starting the business. There is, first, the difficulty in inducing the farmers to engage in the cultivation of beets.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) said, that in the state of Michigan they pay a cent a pound duty on beets.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I said, a cent a pound on all sugar manufactured from beets grown in the state.

Mr. COWAN. I think the hon. gentleman said, that they gave a cent a pound duty on the beets.

Mr. SPROULE. I thank the hon. gentleman for correcting me, if I said that. They pay a cent a pound on all sugar of a certain grade, and containing a certain amount of saccharine matter, as determined by the polariscopic test. To accomplish this, special inducements have had to be offered to farmers, such as grants of seeds free of charge, payment of the freight on the roots from outlying stations to the factory, and agreement to accept all the stock, irrespective of quality. The first item will cost about $5,000, the second item $15,000 or $18,000. The third item will vary greatly. It is absolutely necessary to give aid for a few years to this industry, but the aid need not be continued after that, because the farmers will get to understand better how to raise these beets, how to grow a larger crop to the acre, how to get a larger percentage of sugar to the beets, and how to house them and deliver them, so as to obtain a larger return. That has been the experience of the past in all these countries. I say, that Canada is bound to give some assistance to this industry, for, otherwise, we cannot hope to get it established in this country.

The question is a very important one, as to whether this industry will be established in Canada, if assistance be given. I have the authority of Mr. Lawder, who has taken a great deal of trouble in this matter, and who has submitted a proposal in my county —and he and his men were there to look into the situation—that they will establish a factory, if this assistance is given. Experts who have thoroughly investigated the province of Ontario, as to its suitability for the purpose of beet-growing, state that, after five years, they will be able to manufacture sugar as profitably without a bonus as they would be able to do in the first year with a bonus of $1 per hundred pounds. Mr. Lawder says, that the conditions in Ontario appeared so favourable that definite propositions have come to him, both from Great Britain and Germany, that they will establish beet sugar factories in Canada, if the proposed bounty be granted.

Mr. COWAN. Who is Mr. Lawder ?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Lawder is a gentleman in Toronto who has brought out two or three representatives of Scotch firms, several years in succession, to look into the quality of the beets grown in Canada, the percentage of sugar obtained from them, and the conditions with regard to climate, soil and everything else. They have made a similar examination in the province of Quebec, and, notwithstanding the unfortunate results of the operation of the Berthier sugar factory, these gentlemen have offered to establish a factory in Quebec, and in the county of Grey, at Owen Sound, and other factories elsewhere, at any time that a bounty is granted. They are willing, indeed, to establish one or two factories in Ontario, and factories in Quebec, if the Government will only guarantee a fair bounty on the amount of sugar they turn out ; not a perpetual bounty, but a bounty for a very few years. The class of factories proposed to be built are such as will have a capacity of about 500 tons of beets each day of twenty-four hours ; the buildings are to be of the most substantial character and as nearly fire-proof as possible ; the machinery is to be of the very best description found in any factory ; the buildings and machinery to be of such construction as to admit of extension to a capacity of 1,000 tons daily ; extensive cattle-sheds are to be built in connection with the works, capable of containing 3,000 head of cattle, to be fattened on the residuum of the beets. Each factory is estimated to cost about $500,000. The enlargement and extension of the works, including cattle-sheds, will cost $225,000 more. They would employ a large number of men, and they would expend at least $500,000, chiefly in the locality where they have established these factories. This, I submit, would be a great boon to the people of the country.

The question, as to what amount of assistance they would want, is a very necessary one to put in this connection. We have a standing offer from one German and two Scotchmen, who are already engaged in the business, that they will start these establishments, if the following assistance is given. They would need a bonus for the first year, say 1900, of $1 per hundred pounds on refined or granulated sugar of a good average quality. Practical men, largely engaged in the beet sugar industry in Europe, advise that it is useless to expect foreign capital to be furnished to the industry here, unless a bounty is granted to carry it over the first few years of risks and difficulties. As these difficulties diminish every year, they suggest that the bounty should be on a sliding scale of 100 pounds of 100 degree sugar for :

1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.
$1.00	$0.75	$0.50	$0.25	$0.25

Average for the five years, 55 cents per 100 pounds. An advantage of the sliding scale is, that the earliest factories, which incur the greater risk, will get the larger bounties, while other companies, which may wait until the success and practicability of the industry are ascertained, with little less risk, and get less bounty. This is a lower bounty than is given in most other countries, and we have the example of the United States before us, where they gave a bounty, and have successfully established the industry.

Mr. COWAN. Would that bounty cease in 1905 ?

Mr. SPROULE. They say they would be satisfied to allow it cease in 1905, because they believe that after that, in view of the improved quality of beets, the larger crop,

the larger scale of manufacture they would enter into, and the consequent larger profit, they would require no further assistance. Now, what would be the advantages to the people of Canada? It would require thirty large beet sugar factories to turn out what sugar we consume in Canada annually. If you take the lowest average of $500,000 for each factory, it would give you an expenditure of $15,000,000. It would give employment to labour to the extent—I was going to say, of hundreds of thousands, but certainly to the extent of tens of thousands of people. It will increase the consumption of coal, lumber and lime, and, therefore, give a market to the producer of these articles. If we have thirty factories running, say for one hundred days in the year, and using 500 tons of beets a day, they would consume 1,500,000 tons of beets in the year. This, at a cost of $4.25 a ton, which is a very low average, would return to the farmer directly in cash $7,500,000. One of the important considerations in connection with this industry is that about 60 per cent of all the money expended in it goes to the farmer who raises and delivers the beets. It would mean the fattening for each of these factories of at least 3,000 head of cattle during the season, or what they call the campaign. That would enhance the value of cattle in the country, and in that way also secure a largely increased return to the farmers. But would culture of beets be more profitable to the farmer than the growing of grain? Most assuredly it would, because if the farmer had a yield of 15 tons to the acre, which the Ontario experimental farm demonstrated would be quite possible, with intelligent labour, and if he sold the product at only $4.25 a ton, he would get a return of $63.75 an acre; whereas oats yield from $9 to $10 an acre, wheat from $14 to $18, and pease from $15 to $16.50 an acre. I have gone into the question with sufficient care to convince me that the figures I have submitted are fair averages. I have taken them from the report of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario. What is the result? Wheat, with an average yield of 25 bushels to the acre, and selling at 70 cents a bushel, would produce $17.50 an acre; put the straw at $2, which would bring the figure up to $19.50. Oats, yielding 33 bushels to the acre, and selling at 30 cents a bushel, would produce only $9.90 an acre; allow $2.50 for straw, and you would have $12.50. Pease, at 25 bushels to the acre and selling at 60 cents a bushel, would produce $15 to the acre; add $1.50 for the straw, making $16.50. And these figures are to pay for labour, profits and everything. Then turn round and take an acre of beets, producing $63.75 an acre, out of which to pay labour and to give a profit as well. Therefore, if beets can be successfully raised in Canada, and if we had a market for them such as could be obtained if the Government granted the assistance asked for—for we have the standing offer of these people to come to Canada and establish the industry—is it not worthy of the consideration of the Government whether it would be not only the part of wisdom but their imperative duty to give this very moderate assistance to secure this very important industry for Canada. There is not a part of Canada where sugar beets have not been successfully grown. In British Columbia, in the North-west Territories, and in Manitoba they have been successful. In Ontario they have been pre-eminently successful; also in the province of Quebec. All that is wanted is a market to consume the product of the farmer, and the Government have it in their power to start the industry, which would give employment to labour, promote the distribution of money in the country, and especially benefit the farming community. Is it not worth their while, then, to give this industry the encouragement asked for? I think the Minister of Agriculture a short time ago said that there might be some justification in giving assistance to industries which have been established under the fostering care of the National Policy, but that there is no excuse for giving assistance to a new industry. Now, I hold that that is not correct. I would be as ready to support the starting of any new industry, if the conditions were such that after that industry were properly established, it would continue to grow and prosper in a few years without assistance, as we are to give a bounty to stimulate the production of iron. Look at what we do for other industries; and here are the great bulk of the population of the country, the farmers, struggling without any direct material assistance, while the Government have it in their power to give them that assistance by supporting the manufacture of beet-root sugar. I ask them to take the subject into their careful consideration; and, if they do, I feel confident that they will submit to the House a proposal, if not this session, at least next session, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of this industry in the country. I feel as certain as that I am standing here to-day that if this industry were successfully established it would yield the largest return to the people of any industry in which they are engaged. After being assisted for the first few years, it will be self-sustaining. Therefore, on behalf of the great agricultural classes of this country, I ask the Government to take this matter into their serious consideration, notwithstanding the failure in the province of Quebec, which, if I had time, I could show was not owing to any conditions of soil or climate, but to other conditions which were in their nature accidental; for the beet sugar industry can be as successfully carried on in Quebec as it is in Germany and the United States.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman has given us an account of the bounty-raised sugar in the United States. Would he be kind enough

to tell us what proportion it bears to the total consumption in this country ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have not got that, as I was getting the figures at such great length. The first factory was started in California only ten years ago, and there were only four factories in the United States three years ago ; but the development from that time to the present has been such that to-day they are producing from five to ten per cent of all the sugar they consume, and they expect in a few years to produce from 75 to 100 per cent.

Mr. COWAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I was not in when he commenced his speech. Did he or can he satisfactorily explain how it was that the beet sugar bounties which were granted by this Parliament in 1891, and under which one or two large factories were started in the province of Quebec, which were also, I am advised, assisted by the Quebec Government, did not make these factories a success ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am informed that they suddenly went down for the want of capital.

Mr. McGREGOR. The percentage of sugar in the beet was not as strong as it is with us, in the west.

Mr. SPROULE. The figures I have given show it is quite strong enough to warrant the industry being carried on successfully. They had one or two unfortunate years, and the banks suddenly came down and practically closed them up ; but, if they had had sufficient capital, they would have gone on and succeeded.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say, that a farmer cultivating beets, after paying all labour and expenses, would have a net profit of $15 an acre ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, at $50 an acre, which is a low price.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then, if there are such profits in the business, why should the people be called on to pay a bonus ?

Mr. SPROULE. Because we cannot get any markets at present without assisting those by bounty who erect the factories, for the first few years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I was in hopes that some hon. gentleman on the front benches would have favoured the House with his opinion. I am sure that the House is very deeply indebted to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) for having so carefully studied this question and placed it before us in such a clear and convincing manner. I am sure that those who have followed him, have arrived at the conclusion that he has not only given this question a great deal of investigation, but that the facts he has brought forth are such as to demand the careful consideration of the Government, who are, necessarily in a position to give efficient aid and support to such a measure.

I do not rise to attempt to add anything to what the hon. gentleman has so well said, because he has covered the ground so completely as to make that unnecessary. But it does seem to me that, taking the immense consumption of sugar in this country and the large expenditure of money sent out of the country to bring the sugar in, we ought to be in a position to deal with a question of this kind in such a way as to greatly promote our interests. When I asked my hon. friend, what the results were of the experiments in Manitoba and the North-west, I did so because it appeared to me that there was no part of the Dominion more calculated, from the character of its soil and the rapid growth of its products, to generate a large quantity of sugar in the beet root. There is no class of immigrants that could not very soon acquire all the skill necessary, under competent instructors, to enable them to use their labour more profitably than by engaging in other enterprises which require more knowledge of agriculture than such a simple process as the cultivation of the beet root.

A very pertinent question was put by an hon. gentleman opposite, who asked why, if the facts stated by the hon. member for East Grey are so clear and conclusive, former attempts in Canada—and attempts that received some aid from the Government did not result more successfully. There may be two reasons. There may be that stated by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor), that the western country is more fit for the growth of that product, because of the greater percentage of sugar to be found in the beet root cultivated there than in that grown further to the east. Then, there are the financial difficulties. Every person is well aware that, however valuable an enterprise may be which requires a considerable amount of capital, it will fall to the ground unless that capital can be obtained, so as to operate the industry in such a way as to give it every opportunity for becoming a success. However, I think sufficient has been said by my hon. friend from East Grey to convince the Government that this is a question well deserving their attention. Anything that will promote the great agricultural industry of the country—the greatest of all industries in the country—demands the most careful attention of this House and the Government. And, if it should be found that there is a large field for the creation, by a moderate amount of Government assistance, in the first instance, of a great industry that would extend over large sections of Canada and be profitably carried on, the Government ought to give the subject their careful consideration. While on my feet, I may draw the attention of the Government

to another important fact, which, no doubt, has not escaped the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance in connection with this sugar question.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) brought forward a proposition some time ago for the purpose of promoting trade between Canada and the West Indies, and if possible relieving the West India Islands of the difficulties that have overtaken them in consequence of the cane sugar being placed at such a disadvantage by the competition of bounty-fed sugar. Of course, it was dealing with this subject from an entirely different standpoint from that from which it was regarded by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The proposition of the Minister of Finance was to give certain advantages to sugar grown in the West India Islands over that which was grown in foreign countries, for the purpose of supplying Canada and at the same time in improving the condition of that part of the British possessions. Now, that policy, to a large extent, has failed, and it has failed mainly, I think, because the United States, adopting the principle of countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar, are in a position to give a much greater preference and advantage to the sugar grown in the West India Islands, or to cane sugar, than is given by us. The time, I hope, will come—although it is a very controverted question—when Great Britain will feel it to be necessary to take steps to meet the difficulty that has overtaken the West India Islands and other countries raising cane sugar, and, if necessary, will adopt the same principle of countervailing duties that has been adopted in the United States of America—that is, putting an additional import duty equal to the bounty that is given in the country of production. I draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to this matter as one that seems to be of a good deal of importance, because Great Britain has almost been obliged to promote reciprocal trade between the British West Indies and the United States of America, in the endeavour to relieve those islands from the deplorable condition into which the sugar industry has been forced by the competition of bounty-fed sugar. Now, I think it is a most unfortunate thing that Great Britain should be in a position that she does not adopt other and different means to meet that difficulty, but should take any steps to promote reciprocal trade relations between the West Indies and the United States of America that, in fact, make that portion of the British Empire dependent on a foreign country rather than upon some other portion of the Empire. I mention that particularly at this moment, and draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to it, because I feel there are no countries in the world that could better to be able to have reciprocal trade arrangements with each other than Canada and the West Indies. Everything that the West Indies require to import—I am speaking of the great bulk of their imports on better terms, in my judgment, than they can obtain it in any other part of the world. Therefore, if measures cannot be taken for making the political relations closer between the British West Indies and Canada, I would say why should we not be in such a position as to give such advantages to the West Indies—buying as we do such an enormous amount of cane sugar—and secure from them reciprocal trade advantages and thus draw these important parts of the Empire much closer together? I believe this is a subject well worthy consideration of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and of the Government; and I am quite certain that those who know the effect of close commercial intimacy between different countries are well aware that there is some danger—there is a great deal of danger, in my judgment—in the British West Indies being thrown upon a foreign country like the United States of America for the purpose of establishing such commercial relations as will relieve them of economic difficulties; danger that the close commercial relations may lead at no distant day to political relations, which no one, I am sure, would wish to see established between any portion of the British Empire and any foreign country. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House longer, but I felt that the time was not inopportune to draw the attention of the Government to this matter. The import of sugar into Canada is large, and I have no hesitation in saying will rapidly expand. The present extremely progressive condition of Canada, the immense prosperity that now attends every section of this country is such as to lead us to believe that we must rapidly increase in our population, and not only that, but, with our rapidly-increasing wealth, the consumption of sugar will be infinitely greater than it is to-day. I believe, therefore, the time has come when the Government may well turn their attention to this question, not only the question as touching the great agricultural interests of the country which my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) raised, but also the question of the depressed condition of the British West India Islands, to see whether with our great and rapidly-increasing consumption of sugar, we cannot adopt such measures as will greatly conduce to the still greater prosperity of the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Only with regard to that portion of my hon. friend's (Sir Charles Tupper's) remarks that relate to the West Indies do I wish to say anything. I am sure that we all appreciate fully the importance of cultivating the most intimate trade relations with the British West Indies. The Government, I am glad to say, with the unanimous approval of the House, mani-

fested their good-will towards those islands in the amendment they made in the tariff. I would not go so far as to say, with my hon. friend, that the preference given to the West Indies has been a failure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that it had been entirely a failure, but that, to a large extent, it had failed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I admit at once that our expectations in regard to it have not been as fully realized as we could wish; but I think it will be found, when the figures are published, that there is some improvement in the West India trade. And, even if there had been no improvement, it is some satisfaction to know that the state of decline that had set in was checked by the operation of the preferential tariff. It is, however, a fact that the advantage given by the United States to cane sugar under their system of countervailing duties, really amounts to more than our preference. But as my hon. friend admitted, this question of countervailing duties is one of the most controversial subjects in the political economy of the day. So far is this true that in England, in regard to the British West India sugar question, it is stated by some eminent authorities that even if England adopted a system of countervailing duties, it would not meet the difficulties in the West Indies. However, I wish to say to my hon. friend that the attention of the Government has been called to the fact, we have observed from time to time the manifestation of a desire on the part of the business men of the West Indies to establish closer trade relations with the United States. We have been watching that movement very closely, and I can assure my hon. friend that nothing will be left undone on the part of the Government that we can reasonably do to inquire into that matter, and to see that whatever is possible for the cultivation of better trade relations between Canada and the West Indies should be done with all possible despatch.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I think the House fully appreciates the extended statement the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has made on this very important point. For my own part I am quite wiling to encourage anything that will tend to improve the condition of the farming community, and I am sure the Government have an eye open in that direction. Still, I think that in this matter we should go slowly, and only take a step in advance after careful study of all the facts. I admit that a number of these establishments have been recently built up in the United States. They have there, of course, a very large population in the first place; and in the next place, they can afford, perhaps, to take larger risks in going into these ventures than we can. We are not in a position in this country to go into this business until we are sure of our ground. For my own part I would have no objection to a bounty system encouraging any industry. A bounty is not, in my opinion, a protection, for the simple reason that if you encourage the production of any commodity out of the general revenue of the country, every man in the country has to contribute; it is an additional tax upon every taxpayer. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition would grant a bounty, for instance, on the production of pig iron, when every man in the country has to contribute a certain percentage to the production of pig-iron; while if you merely protect it by duty, then it is only the man who uses the iron that pays the duty. So a bounty is a very different thing from a duty. I would have no objection to encouraging a system such as is proposed, if we can go on sure and certain ground, knowing that it is to be an advantage to the farming community. But before the Government venture a step in this direction, I think they should make a thorough and exhaustive investigation into the results of these institutions, for instance, in Michigan, and fully satisfy themselves with regard to the condition of their success, in order to find out whether we are in a position to take advantage of our conditions in this country in a way that we may fairly hope for success. The Government should not jump to the conclusion that the establishment of institutions of this kind would be in the interest of the country, and thus induce farmers and others to put their money into them when, after two or three years, the whole thing might collapse. I fully sympathize with any effort in the direction of helping the farming community, and I would gladly vote for any reasonable scheme that would promise any fair means of success. I do not say but that the production of beet-root sugar in Canada may eventually be found to be a desirable industry. As the hon. member for East Grey has told us, a good many of these industries have lately been built up in the United States, and I think it would be well that our Government should take steps to gather all the information available with regard to the working of those institutions, and if, after careful deliberation, they found facts justified them in so doing, then would be the time for the Government to take steps for the purpose of starting that industry in Canada. I am glad the hon. member for East Grey has presented his statement to the House, it is worthy of consideration, and I am sure both sides of the House will be willing to join in any movement that will improve the condition of the farming community.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The leader of the Opposition rose a few moments ago, saying he was sorry that nobody on the front benches had taken up this question. I am glad that I did not

speak on the question before the hon. gentleman himself undertook to do so. He advocates the principle set forth in this motion, of estabishing the beet sugar industry in this country by the aid of a bonus or bounty; then he went on to draw attention to the fact that the West Indies were not yet able to supply us with the sugar which we annually consume, which we have to get from abroad. The hon. gentleman must be well aware that the present condition of the cane sugar industry in the West Indies is due to the existence of the bounty-fed beet sugar industry in other parts of the world, and while he is asking us to do what we can to aid the interchange of commodities between Canada and the West Indies, the only commodity which the West Indies can possibly send us, to any extent, being cane sugar, he is supporting a measure here which, if successful, must necessarily do away absolutely with any chance of our importing sugar from the West Indies. The two positions seem to me to be so utterly inconsistent that I must suppose the hon. gentleman himself was not aware of it when he spoke. However, this is beside the question. I was very much interested in the proposition laid before the House by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He has evidently made a great study of this question, and has carefully investigated one side of it. The hon. member's remarks carry me back in memory to a period some 25 years ago, when this question was first brought before the farmers of the province of Ontario. At that time the industry was pointed out in the same roseate hues to the farmers and to the capitalists with which the hon. member for East Grey has surrounded his subject today. The result was that in the province of Quebec a large number of capitalists and a large number of farmers were induced to put their money into the erection of factories and the production of beets for the purpose of making sugar. The hon. gentleman himself has alluded to the failure there. I, perhaps, am a little more familiar with the facts in regard to that failure than he is, or than the majority of the members of the House may be, and it may not be out of place for me to give a brief history of that experiment. As a matter of fact, between 20 and 25 years ago, something like $2,000,000 were invested by capitalists in beet-sugar factories and in the production of beets in the province of Quebec. That money was absolutely and entirely lost, the people who put their money into that enterprise lost every cent of it. The reasons for that were pointed out at the time and they seemed obvious.

Mr. McNEILL. How much did my hon. friend say?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the neighbourhood of $2,000,000 were altogether invested in the factories and in the production of the beets. There was one factory at Farnham which cost nearly $500,000. There was another at Berthier which cost something like $350,000. I am speaking from memory, but I think that was the amount. There was another factory at Coaticook, and there were similar sums invested in another factory, the exact locality of which I do not remember at the present moment. In addition to these sums, which were invested in buildings, machinery and organization, the farmers of the country put a great deal of money into the cultivation of beets, most of which money was lost. I think, at the time it was said, that, in that enterprise, in the course of the few years it was continued, about $2,000,000 was sunk and absolutely lost. At the present time there is not a single beet sugar factory running in the province of Quebec or in the Dominion of Canada. There are no sugar beets raised for the purpose of being manufactured into sugar in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. There would be a great deal of them raised, if they had factories to consume them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Farnham factory was resuscitated by Mr. Musé, who came out from Belgium thoroughly conversant with the industry, who, after running it for about two years without making any money, gave it up, and left the country. Mr. Scaife undertook to resuscitate the Berthier factory, and failed. Mr. Scaife was thoroughly acquainted with the operations connected with the manufacture of beet-root sugar and with the cultivation of the beets. Since that time no efforts have been made to resuscitate the industry.

Mr. BERGERON. It was Mr. Lefebvre who was at the head of the enterprise at Berthier.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes; I think Mr. Scaife was the manager of the factory. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is quite right. Mr. Lefebvre was at the head of the company which undertook to work the factory. I had forgotten his name at the moment. The fact is, that some seven or eight years ago, after earnest attempts to run this industry successfully in the province of Quebec—attempts which were founded upon information gathered from all parts of the world by Mr. Barnard and others, attempts which have been carried out by men thoroughly acquainted with the industry in every way and shape, men who had come out from the countries where it is successfully carried on—the enterprise has been a failure. It is nearing Six o'clock, Mr. Speaker; but before you leave the Chair: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has intimated, in the general trend of his remarks, and at various places in his remarks, that there is no place in the world where the beet sugar industry is carried on

without substantial aid from the government of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) will excuse me, he has misunderstood what I said. What I said was, that it was never started in any country without substantial aid at the beginning.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will supplement what the hon. gentleman says, by saying, that there is no place on earth to-day where it is being carried on without substantial aid from the government of the country in which it exists. The hon. gentleman pointed out—and the remark which he has just made shows the trend of his argument—that, if the industry is aided at its inception, it may become self-supporting and self-sustaining; but the hon. gentleman cannot at the present time point to any country on the face of the earth where this condition of affairs has been reached.

Mr. BERGERON. I think this condition has been reached in France.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is entirely wrong. France is to-day paying large bounties for export.

Mr. BERGERON. But the help of the Government has decreased a great deal on sugar, other than export.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has; but it is, at the same time, very large indeed. I have some figures to show the bounties paid at the present time. The American Consul at Ghent states the present bounties per ton in different countries as follows:—

Germany, 6·03 to 8·44; Austria, 7·24 to 8·85; Belgium, 7·90 to 11·39; France, 21·71 dollars.

Mr. BERGERON. Francs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statement I have does not say. They are given as dollars here.

Mr. BERGERON. It is francs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The last amount, then, should be $4 and some cents.

Mr. BERGERON. That is on export.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes; but the hon. gentleman will not pretend to say, that, though it was on export, it would not be a substantial aid to the industry.

Mr. BERGERON. The help from the Government has been decreasing every year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only state that the information I have received is, that there is no place to-day on the face of the earth that I have been able to find, where this industry exists without substantial aid from the government of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. In speaking of France, I spoke of beet sugar for export, and not for home consumption.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes; but that is substantial aid to the industry, and, as a matter of fact, without that aid the industry could not exist. It being Six o'clock, Mr. Speaker is about to leave the Chair; but I hope to be able to go on with this subject further.

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

After Recess.

HURON AND ERIE LOAN AND SAVINGS COMPANY.

The House again resolved in committee on Bill (No. 74) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Beattie.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). All the sections of this Bill were passed some days ago with the exception of section 2, which was left over in order that it might be made to conform with similar sections in other Bills. I move to add the words:

Provided that the company shall not invest in or lend money upon the security or stock of any other loan company.

The promoters of the Bill are satisfied with this amendment, and it will dispose of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADA PERMANENT AND WESTERN CANADA MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

The House again resolved in committee on Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. Osler.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In this case also, all the clauses of the Bill were passed excepting clause 6, which was held over in order that the clause might be made to conform with the proposed Government Bill, since introduced in the Senate, dealing with this matter generally. The promoters have agreed that that clause in the Government Bill shall be accepted. I therefore move that the following clause be substituted for section 6:—

The company shall have power to carry on the business of lending money on the security of, or purchasing or investing in, mortgages or hypothecs upon freehold or leasehold real estate or other immovables, the debentures, bonds, stocks and other securities of any government or of any municipal corporation, or school corporation, or of any chartered bank, or of any incorporated company, if incorporated by Canada, or any province of Canada or any former province now forming part of Canada, but not including bills of exchange and promissory notes, provided that the company shall not invest in or lend money upon the security of the stocks of any other loan company.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed in committee on Bill (No. 93) respecting the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Mr. OLIVER. When the House was before in committee on this Bill, an amendment moved by me to clause 7 was discussed.

On section 7,

Mr. THOS. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I have pleasure in supporting the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver), for the reason that I believe that prior to granting railway charters, this Parliament should give protection to the people who have built up towns and invested their all in property there. In the case where what we call Boomsters go west when a charter has been granted, and locate a townsite ahead of railway construction, I do not for one moment say that it would be well to compel the company to build into that town site, but where people have built up these towns years in advance of a railway, I think they should be protected. This has a good deal of bearing on the development of the west. If people who build up towns are not protected, by compelling the railway company to run into these towns, there will be no inducement to them to invest their capital in permanent buildings at points in the North-west Territories. In a country as large as that, it is impossible to have railways at all points before settlement goes in. In the territories, the railways in every case have followed the settlement, and the railways have found before them good large healthy towns, with public buildings, with fine stores and churches. The people who get a charter for a railway in the North-west are getting a valuable franchise; and even if they are not getting a subsidy, they should be compelled, in the case of a town like Fort Saskatchewan, which is an incorporated town, to build the railway into that town. This clause says: "a point in or near the village or settlement of Fort Saskatchewan." What does that mean? The settlements in the North-west Territories extend for 50 miles around a town; so that if the railway only came to within 12 or 15 miles of the town, its promoters would be complying with this provision. Then they would come and negotiate with the people of the town, who have put their capital there, to get a portion of the town before they would come in. That has been the case with many towns in the North-west. It is the case with my own town. The railway came to the edge of the town, and its promoters then came in and negotiated with the people, telling them that if they did not give them a large share of their town, they would build another town close to them, after getting more money and lands from this country than would build the road. As the people did not want to be ruined, they agreed to the terms of the railway company, and gave them about half the lots in the town. I take it that this is a case of the same kind. They have the clause worded in a vague way, so that they will not be bound under it to come into the town. Now, there is no reason in the world why they should not build the road into the town of Fort Saskatchewan. There is no obstruction in the way; the town is built on the south side of the river, the country is level, and there are no ravines of any consequence. Across the river there is a settlement of French people, who have been there a great many years, and who have built up a small town, which is connected with Fort Saskatchewan by a ferry. All the trade of the surrounding district settles in Fort Saskatchewan. Therefore, I submit that these people should be compelled to build the railway to that town, and the hon. member for Alberta is only doing right in moving this amendment. Some gentlemen who are opposed to this Bill have tried to make out that Fort Saskatchewan is not a town. I can say that it is a town—an incorporated village, with fine buildings, which have been built a great many years. I hope that hon. members on both sides of the House will see that the people are protected in this matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, its promoter was unable to state that the character of the country was such that it was possible to build the railway into the village of Fort Saskatchewan. For that reason the committee decided, at my suggestion, to change the wording of the clause from "in or near the village" to "as near as practicable to the village of Fort Saskatchewan." But as the promoter of the Bill desires to strike out these words, and make the clause read "in the village of Fort Saskatchewan," I am satisfied to adopt the words he suggests. He is taking the responsibility of saying that it is possible to build the road into the village of Fort Saskatchewan; and, as he,

being the promoter of the Bill, takes that responsibility, I will certainly vote for it.

Mr. G. E. CASEY (West Elgin). My hon. friend who has just sat down is naturally misled by the peculiar appearance of this case. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is the promoter of the Bill, in the sense that his name is attached to it as the introducer. But in saying that the railway can conveniently or practically go into Fort Saskatchewan without unnecessary cost, he is not speaking for the promoters of the Bill. The people who are interested in the building of this railway, who intend to build it, who are financing with that object, are opposed to this. It is such a very unusual transaction for a gentleman who introduces a Bill to move amendments to it contrary to the wish of those for whom he is supposed to be acting, the railway company that wishes to be incorporated, that I am not surprised that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) is misled by the surface appearance of the matter. As a matter of fact, the railway company for whom the hon. member for Alberta is supposed to be acting, for whom he did act when he introduced the Bill, claim that it is impracticable without very undue cost, without a cost which is not justified by any of the circumstances of the case, to get actually into the village of Fort Saskatchewan with this road; and they are totally at variance in this respect with the hon. gentleman who has charge of their Bill. They are quite satisfied with the decision of the Railway Committee to accept the words suggested by my hon. friend who has just spoken; and I am here to ask him to adhere to his former decision as a member of the Railway Committee. This matter was doubtless threshed out in that committee. I did not happen to be there, but such matters are usually threshed out in that committee, where both sides are heard, and where a correct decision is much more likely to be reached than in the House on an evening like this, when very few members are present. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and my hon. friend from Alberta also, found fault with the word "settlement," speaking of it as if it were intended to make the matter very vague, and to allow the railway to go anywhere within the neighbourhood of Fort Saskatchewan. Well, I do not think any court, or anybody else, construing the language of a Bill, would give that word the vague and wide meaning which these hon. gentlemen refer to. There is no doubt that the word "settlement" is intended to be a synonym of the village of Fort Saskatchewan. At all events, that was the intention of the real promoters of this Bill, the railway company. They desire to come as near as they can to the existing settlement. If the word "settlement" is thought to be too vague, I do not see any objection to striking that out, and leaving it simply "the village of Fort Saskatchewan." If it is an incorporated village, as my hon. friend from Saskatchewan says—I did not know before that it was—that will be definite enough, for the company are prepared to say that they will come as near as practicable to that village. Now, my hon. friend from Saskatchewan is not, I think, correctly informed when he says that there are no obstacles to the railway coming to the actual settlement on the river. According to the Government map which I hold in my hand, there are obstacles in the shape of streams, which form large shallow coulées, extending for a considerable distance on both sides, and which would require either to have trestles or to be bridged, and in the shape of muskegs and great inequalities of the ground. The natural course of the railway passes not far from the outskirts of the village of Fort Saskatchewan, which appears to reach about a mile back from the river, according to this map. I do not know that the promoters can say how near they can come without encountering these obstacles; but it is their intention to come as near as they can in order to establish the connection. What they ask is to be relieved from the necessity of going into a little town plot, as the amendment of the hon. member for Alberta would compel them to. According to this map, which is drawn to scale, it appears that to take the route suggested, the company would have to cross a coulée, 650 feet broad and several feet deep in one place, and 15 to 20 feet deep in another, and another coulée 750 feet wide, in order to go into the village of Saskatchewan.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How far are these coulées from the town?

Mr. CASEY. The nearest would be about a mile and a quarter from the corner of the town plot. To go to the town plot they would have to cross these coulées down near the river, where the coulées are deeper and broader. Their intention is to go into the country where the coulées are not so broad or deep and turn into Fort Saskatchewan as near as they can. But to compel them to go into the village would involve them in very considerable and unwarranted expenditure.

Mr. CLARKE. How near do they propose to go?

Mr. CASEY. They think they can get somewhere within a mile and a quarter or a mile and a half of the river, and probably half a mile or a quarter of a mile from the outer edge of the town, and within perhaps half a mile of where my hon. friend wants to force them to come. Of course, I am speaking in general terms. They do not profess to bind themselves to do this, because their route would depend on a later and more accurate survey, but it ap-

pears from the map they can go near to Fort Saskatchewan without any great expense. If they are forced, however, to actually go into the village, they will have to divert their line over a country where it is very expensive to build. If this condition should be inserted in the Bill, they might put a little spur into Saskatchewan, but that is not what they want. They want to get the trade of that place as fully as possible. So much for the intention of those who really wish to get this charter. No doubt, my hon. friend would wish to please his constituents who live in Fort Saskatchewan, but I think we can go too far in forcing railways to go into every man's backyard, and this matter might well be left in the terms in which the Bill was amended, as suggested by the hon. member for Halton.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to place myself right in the matter. I was guided by the best information we could get in the Railway Committee, when this question came up, and this seems to be the only solution we could find out of the difficulty. But I beg to draw attention now to the fact that the clause, as worded, is not in the shape in which the Bill was amended or proposed to be amended, by the Railway Committee. The intention was that before the resolution was printed these words, "as near as practicable," should be inserted before the name of each town or village which the railway was to pass, and there are four other places besides Fort Saskatchewan. We have not the Bill before us now, as it was intended to be amended by the Railway Committee, and I think action should be deferred and the Bill sent back to the committee, as it is important that the intention of the committee should be carried out.

With regard to the other point, I will only say that if the provisional directors thought fit to place this Bill in the hands of an hon. member who is not in sympathy with them and in that manner mislead the House, I am not responsible for that. The moment I discovered that the promoter of the Bill was in favour of striking out the amendment, I thought there was no reason why I should oppose it, because I thought he lived in that section, and three of the directors lived in his own district, and that that was the conclusion they had arrived at, and the whole scheme was feasible.

Mr. CASEY. In this particular clause, the amendment has been made. The Bill has not been reprinted.

Mr. HENDERSON. The amendment should be made to apply to the four other places.

Mr. CASEY. As far as I understand, the promoters are willing to have that correction made here without any reference to the Railway Committee at all. They agree, in that proposal, to insert the words, "as near as practicable," at all these points I would remind the House that these companies have to negotiate for funds, and this company is at present negotiating for the moneys required, and is anxious to make a start this summer. Every day's delay, therefore, counts, and this would mean a postponement for a week and thus lessen their chance of getting funds.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to draw attention to the fact that in the maps at the registry office all the land within twenty miles of the town are described as the settlement.

Mr. CASEY. On this official map the surveyed town plot at Fort Saskatchewan is described as the Fort Saskatchewan settlement, limiting the terms to this actual spot —two miles one way and five or six the other.

Mr. DAVIS. If any one will look at the plans in the registry office, he will find that within a circuit of twenty miles is described as a settlement.

Mr. CASEY. Leave the word "settlement" out.

Mr. DAVIS. But we are fighting for the principle that where these towns were established these corporations should be forced to go into them. Unless you do that you will never get a town built in the west at all before the railways are built in. I understand that the Minister of Railways has a Bill to amend the Railway Act in this particular, but that would only apply to a road already built. He would force the railway companies to establish a station in a town, but not to divert their roads so as to enter the town. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said that the hon. member for Alberta had been trying to please his constituents. That is all the greater argument in favour of the amendment. All the people of the constituency the hon. member represents wished to have this thing done. He has been in that country and knows this town, and he has seen these ravines that the hon. member for West Elgin speaks of. I know all about the Saskatchewan, and I know that there are no such obstacles to railway construction as my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) mentions. The gist of this thing is that there is a good crossing of the Saskatchewan River, the best crossing in that portion of the country, and the idea is that if the railway will only cross there a large town is going to be built up, and they want to get the town site. They evidently want to get the land outside of the town and ruin the investments that are made at the present time. I hope that the people who are there will be protected.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I wish to correct a very specific statement made

by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) on the strength of having in his hands a Government map. But, in the first place, I may say that in the Railway Committee, it was not that I was not able to assure the committee as to the formation of the country there, but I was not sure as to the extent of the limits of the town. It is because I have received information by telegram and now by mail as to the actual limits of the town, that I presume to bring the matter before the committee of the House, and take up their time for a few minutes. I hold in my hand a Government map showing the settlement of Fort Saskatchewan and the surrounding country, and I have to assure the members of this committee that when the hon. member for West Elgin, holding in his hand a map, pointed to a mark saying that was the surveyed village of Fort Saskatchewan, he was pointing to a place which, according to this map, is not less than four miles from the surveyed village of Fort Saskatchewan. When he says this part of the settlement is Fort Saskatchewan town site, he says what is not the fact by about four miles, and I have the map here to prove it. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman would so far mislead the House, or attempt to do so. In regard to the creek valleys, I say again, on my responsibility as a member of this House and as representing the people of that country, that there are no natural obstacles to prevent the road being built into the corporate limits of Fort Saskatchewan. I ask this House to treat my word as quite as credible as a pencil mark on a sheet of paper brought here by a gentleman whom they do not know and who has not the responsibility before this House and before this country that rests upon me. Any gentleman coming to this House and claiming that natural obstacles exist, should have the report of an engineer on that point.

Mr. CASEY. Here it is—the report of a Government engineer.

Mr. OLIVER. I say these gentlemen have not the report of an engineer, and it is my word as a member of this House, if you like to put it that way, against the word of a gentleman who is not a member of this House, and when it comes to a question of that kind, I ask this House if I am not of sufficient credibility for them to believe my word. This expression "at or near" a village is the weapon with which railways hold up villages and destroy them. I have here the town plot of the village.

Mr. CASEY. What map is that ?

Mr. OLIVER. The map of the incorporated village of Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. CASEY. By whom is it issued ?

Mr. OLIVER. By the town site company.

Mr. CASEY. Is that a Government map ? Will the hon. gentleman tell me from the map in what section and in what township that town site is ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is referred to here as lot 11, Fort Saskatchewan settlement. There is no question of getting into the valley, we only ask that they be compelled to build into the town. We do not ask anything impossible. I may say that I was not sent here by railroad incorporators to forward their interests against the interests of the people. I am sent here to uphold the interests of the people. So far as the interests of railway incorporators are in accord with those of the people, I support them also, but no further. I ask the House to protect the investment of one roller mill of fully $20,000. Another roller mill is being built by the farmers of the district, involving a similar investment. There are three general stores, a large hotel and other general business places. There are also two churches. This is a well estabished village, the beginning of which was put there 20 years ago. It was not put there for speculation or to head off the railroad.

Mr. CASEY. Who owns the town site ?

Mr. OLIVER. A number of people own it.

Mr. CASEY. Is it not owned by Ellsworth Bros. ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not that I know of. It is like every other town site, it is an original claim which has been cut up into town lots and bought up by private parties.

Mr. CASEY. My information is that this village or town site, which is an incorporated village, was owned by speculative gentlemen who have been holding it for years and trying to boom it, but not very successfully. This alleged town plot at Fort Saskatchewan is not co-terminous with and does not mean the same thing as the old town settlement along the river bank. That settlement on both sides of the river is several miles long and about a mile deep and this village site is about the middle. There is a considerable stream running down through it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) talks about the use of maps and attempting to mislead the House. The hon. gentleman must take it back. I have shown here the Government map drawn to a scale. What he cites is an advertising prospectus got up by speculators to boom the town site.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask your protection.

Mr. CASEY. The map I have shown was issued by the department in 1893.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask the hon. member for one moment——

Mr. CASEY. To interrupt me—no. The only map I have called attention to is the Government official map. The one the hon. gentleman is showing is one published by

the owners of the town site. I see on his desk another small map which looks like the Government map on a small scale. The map which I have shown is drawn on a scale of 40 chains to the inch, and shows the width of all the gullies, drains and so on to be crossed. I will not go into the detail of the whole matter, but I will remind the House that all the essential facts of the case were before the committee. As my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has pointed out, the committee reached a clear decision, and if the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) wishes to buck against—to use a slang phrase—parts of the Bill which he was asked to introduce, that is no reason why the House should go with him. His professions of alone representing the people and "having all at stake" are pardonable in a young member of the House; they would not be pardonable in an old one. My only interest in the matter is to see fair-play done to the gentlemen who are going to put their money into this thing, and to have it fairly constructed.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say, again, that I hold in my hand a part of the Government map of that settlement and district, received from the Deputy Commissioner of Public Works of the North-west Government, upon which is marked the particular part covered by the town site. I say, again, that the map shown by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) does not show any part of the town site of Fort Saskatchewan, nor anything within 3 miles of that town site. The map itself says, that it is a map of part of Fort Saskatchewan settlement only. The hon member, I say, has been deliberately attempting to mislead the House.

Mr. CASEY. I must ask the hon. gentleman at once to take that back. I insist upon that rule being enforced. There is a limit to the cheek which is allowed in this committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is going a little too far.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, here is the map I hold in my hand. The hon. gentleman holds a map in his hand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman said, that the hon. member for Elgin had "deliberately attempted to mislead the House." I do not think that expression should be used in this House, and I would like the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg the Chairman's pardon, and I beg the pardon of the hon. member for West Elgin. I do take it back, so far as the rules of Parliament require me to do so. I merely ask the members of the House to compare the two maps.

Mr. CASEY. There is no excuse for the hon. gentleman in thinking that I wanted to mislead the House. The map that I showed you shows the Fort Saskatchewan settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. Does it show the town site?

Mr. CASEY. I do not wish the hon. member to interrupt me any more, or to give me any more cheek. I say, the Government map shows the Fort Saskatchewan settlement. There is nothing on that map to show——

Mr. OLIVER. I ask, if the hon. member is allowed to use the word "cheek" in respect to myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not a very polite expression.

Mr. CASEY. I will take off the "cheek." The Government map shows the Fort Saskatchewan settlement; no Government map shows any town site at all there. How am I to know what particular spot of that settlement, about 4 miles long, these people choose to call a town?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I participated in this debate the other evening, and I think the members of the committee will agree with me that, after all, this is not so much a matter of maps as it is a matter of justice to the people of that town site. I have already told the committee the experience of many towns in the North-west and the way in which they were treated. I was able to show that, even in my own constituency, no less than four towns were held up by the railway company, and were absolutely side-tracked, and new town sites were purchased by the company in order that they might procure the advantage of the sale of town lots, and entire towns were compelled to move bodily over to the new town site. I was able to point out to the committee that, even in the case of Winnipeg, that great city was once threatened with being side-tracked by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I think that this committee should profit by the experience of the past and protect these pioneers, who certainly have vested rights in that place. They have invested their money, they have built saw-mills and churches, and it is only fair that, inasmuch as this charter says the road is to run at or near this place, that we make it specific, and compel them to run to this town. Surely, it is a fair proposition that this committee should accept the words of the hon. member who represents that district. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has assured us that he has visited that district; he gives us his word of honour as to what he knows about the conformation of that country, and I think it is only fair that this committee should accept his word. We are not here to protect the interests of these railway promoters, but the interests of the settlers, and I think it is only fair that we should accept the word of the hon. member for Alberta,

and put it in the bond that this railway should run to the village of Saskachewan.

Amendment (Mr. Oliver) agreed to : Yeas, 40 ; Nays, 23.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the intention of the Railway Committee should be carried out, and that this change should be made all the way through the section. The chairman and the clerk were to have the words inserted, so as to make it apply to the various towns and villages mentioned in the section.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. member will notice that we have now negatived what the Railway Committee did : we have struck out the words " or as nearly as practicable to," in this clause.

Mr. HENDERSON. But only in the first instance, not in the others.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to support what the hon. member has said about his motion in the Railway Committee, and which was adopted by the committee. The reason I did not take any active steps to follow out that motion in the rest of the clause was because there has not been at these other points the same investment of capital that there was at Fort Saskatchewan. I did not recognize the necessity of fixing on a point of location so rigidly at those points at Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. HENDERSON moved, in amendment to section 7 :

That the words " as near as practicable to " be inserted in place of the word " near " in the third line, before the words " or near " in the fourth line, before the words " or near " in the sixth line, and before the words " or near " in the seventh line.

This is to carry out the decision of the Railway Committee.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the Sudbury and Wahnapitae Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Railway Company.—(Mr. Poupore.)

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1899.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented to the House a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1899.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ended 30th June, 1899, and in accordance with the provisions of " The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House.
Ottawa, 9th June, 1899.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that His Excellency's Message, together with the Estimates, be referred to the Committee on Supply.

Motion agreed to.

STRIKE OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TRACKMEN.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood it was the intention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House today, certain correspondence which had passed between him and the management of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, respecting the dispute between the company and their trackmen. I do not know if the right hon. gentleman has done so. I also wish to ask, has any reply been sent by the Prime Minister to the request of the Trackmen's Union, asking him to interfere with a view of settling this strike ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The trackmen have placed in my hands a request for interference on their behalf with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. At this moment, negotiations are going on with the railway company, and I think it would be preferable not to bring down anything on this subject until these negotiations have been concluded.

I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—PAPERS ASKED FOR.

Mr. FOSTER. As the Minister of Railways is not here, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the information which was laid on the Table the other day in connection with the 3rd and 33rd clauses of the schedule to Bill (No. 138). On the first day a part was brought down, and on the last day of the session of the House the figures with reference to the terminals were brought down, but the car mileage with reference to the Victoria bridge has not yet been brought down, and the statement is therefore incomplete. I wish my right hon. friend would bring that to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. Also, there is one cash statement brought down with reference to the line from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie, but there is no cash statement of the mainten-

ance and repairs and operating expenses for the terminals, for the Victoria bridge or for the Chaudière section. I may also state that I have not yet received the engineer's reports with reference to the Drummond road.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall make a note of the hon. gentleman's request.

DAMAGES BY WATER ON BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON. As the Prime Minister seems to be taking the place of the Minister of Railways to-night, I wish to call to his attention a serious accident which happened the other day on the Beauharnois Canal, and which will probably entail heavy damages as the water has inundated several farms. I wish to ask that the Minister should take immediate steps to insure that the engineers of the department will ascertain at once the amount of damages to the farms, so that when the time comes for settlement they may be known. On former occasions this has not been done, and there has been considerable difficulty afterwards in arriving at the amount of the loss. If it had been done on previous occasions, as I am suggesting now, it would have been a great deal easier to settle the damages when they came up for adjustment.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 40) to amend the Criminal Code (1892), with respect to combinations in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 31) to amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Fortin.)

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Poupore for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before the House all petitions, applications and letters in relation to the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, when the question of the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal was under the consideration of the House last session, it was my privilege to offer some remarks on the subject and I did so, I confess, with some enthusiasm. I desire to assure the House, however, that I shall to-night, as I did then, endeavour to treat the project in a serious and sober manner, and if I indulge in a little enthusiasm on the subject, it is because I feel very deeply and very sincerely the great advantages and the immense importance of this undertaking. I can at once assure the House that any statement which I shall make I shall support with authority; and I venture the opinion that when hon. gentlemen compare my statements with the opinions which I shall quote, they will admit that my enthusiasm, if any of it is displayed to-night, will have ample justification. With my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) I entirely agree, that this is not a question of party politics, that it never has been such, and that it ought not to be such. The question is too important, too far-reaching in its consequences, to be circumscribed by the limits of party politics. I hope it never will be so circumscribed, but that in discussing it we shall always rise above party interests. Like my hon. friend the hon. member for Pontiac, I have no personal motive in this matter. My motives are purely patriotic. I have no other incentive than a desire to do my duty towards my constituents in particular, and towards what I consider to be the best interests of the whole Ottawa valley.

When the matter was up the last time, I was proceeding to lay before the House the advantages, agricultural, industrial and commercial which, to my mind, this project offers. Referring to the first aspect of the question to which I had begun to address my remarks, I desire to say a word or two in addition. With reference to the agricultural features of the scheme, I want to remind the House that it will help in the colonization of fertile lands as large as the whole of the New England States, and as large as one-half of the whole British Isles. This waterway traverses immense valleys, which surround Lake Temiscamingue and Lake Nipissing and the district of Algoma. These districts are tributary to the Ottawa waterway, and there are in that section, I am told, 2,000,000 acres of fertile lands. These lands are sold to-day for 50 cents per acre. I submit to the House, as a reasonable proposition, that if this waterway were constructed and in operation, these lands would increase at least ten times in value, and would be readily taken up, because they are fertile lands. Those who had an opportunity of visiting that district lately no doubt witnessed the immense developments which have taken place. Wheat which was not grown there until a few years ago, is now being largely harvested. It seems to me that if the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal had no other object than the opening up of these vast lands in the interior, and the bringing about of their immediate settlement, this alone would warrant the expenditure in view.

I want to refer for a moment to the industrial advantages which the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal would bring about. It would, to my mind, at once give the greatest impetus to the lumbering and mineral industries of that vast region. There are, as every one knows, millions of cords of pulpwood in the vicinity of the Ottawa valley. The Sturgeon Falls district has already produced a very large quantity of this article, which has become the subject of, perhaps, the

greatest industry in Canada at the present time. At the head of Lake Temiscamingue, I am told, there is a practically inexhaustible supply of pulp-wood; and experienced men who have gone into the subject assure me that if a waterway were constructed there would be a saving of from $1 to $2 on every cord of pulp-wood coming down this waterway. I have no doubt that it would lead to the establishment of flour mills, pulp mills, rolling mills and smelters, and that cities and towns would spring up along its course.

The mining development which would follow its construction would be almost as large and encouraging. We all know that the Ottawa valley is rich in all sorts of minerals—iron, nickel, copper, galena, lead, zinc, mica and phosphates, as well as marbles, and other building materials. Quite recently, too, gold-bearing quartz in large quantities has been discovered close to the banks of the Ottawa River, within 15 or 20 miles of the city of Ottawa, and several mines are now being developed and put into operation. With reference to the mining industry, I want to remind the House of a fact, which is well established on the other side of the line, that is, that water transportation alone has made possible the iron developments of Michigan, Wisconsin and Lake Superior. When we remember that the lumbering and mining industries constitute most of the wealth of the Ottawa valley, and when we remember that 75 per cent of the marvellous traffic of the great lakes and the interior of this continent, depends upon the lumbering and mining industries, we shall at once see the tremendous advantages which this waterway would afford to those two industries.

With reference to the electrical development to which some reference has been made I would ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the opinions of experts on this subject, which will show clearly the tremendous advantages which industries in general would derive from the development of electrical power along this waterway. I want to give you first the opinion of Mr. T. C. Clarke, the eminent engineer, who, referring to the water powers of the Ottawa, and the benefits to be drived therefrom, in a report made in February, 1898, expressed himself as follows:—

> The dams designed by me * * absolutely necessary to give sufficient depth for navigation, will also be the means of developing and controlling water-power for electrical appliances. I can state unreservedly that I know of no other place in any manufacturing country—Niagara Falls not excepted—where there is such an amount of water-power as this scheme can make available, both for manufacturing purposes and possibly for moving vessels rapidly through the locks. * * * Adding that available on the Mattawa and French rivers, there will probably be, at a minimum, not less than 700,000 horse-power. The average discharge of the rivers would give not less than four times this amount. All this can be made available by the comparatively small expenditure necessary for flumes and the foundations of penstocks and turbines.

Mr. Walter Shanly, whose opinion I quote with a great deal of confidence in a matter of this kind, says:

> Its water-power is not only unlimited in capacity, but available to its full extent at numberless stages along the route. By the opening of the projected navigation this great manufacturing agent would be brought into comparative proximity to the granaries of Lake Michigan, and would immediately be turned to account in preparing the cereals of the west for the markets of the east. With such a combination of advantages in possession or prospect it is surely not difficult of belief that the valley of the Ottawa is destined to be not only the workshop of Canada, but one of the chief manufacturing districts of America

Mr. Higman, who is an authority on electricity, has also given us an estimate of the value of this water power. The figures are very large, and I shall not weary the House with them, but refer the House to what Mr. Higman has said on the subject.

Then, I come to the commercial feature of the undertaking, which is the most important one, because it includes all the others. In fact, the others are mere accessories to it. We know that cheap transportation is the great commercial question of this continent—admittedly the question of all questions. To get to the seaboard the traffic and the produce of the interior is a question which for many years has engaged the most serious attention of economists and men of business and finance throughout this continent. It is a question upon which depends the ultimate commercial supremacy of the two nations that inhabit the North American continent. I venture the opinion that the growth and enrichment of Canada will follow the solving of that problem. A single glance at the map ought to convince everybody that this Georgian Bay route is the quickest and cheapest from the interior to the seaboard. I shall not trouble the House with the figures adduced on a former occasion, giving comparisons of distances from different places, but shall content myself with reminding the House that this route, when constructed, will be from Duluth or Chicago, 900 miles shorter to Liverpool than by way of New York. If it is the shortest and most direct, it must in time, if not at once, become the cheapest, and then the problem of cheap transportation from the interior to the seaboard will be solved. I believe that when this canal is constructed, it will offer the cheapest route from Duluth, Chicago or Port Arthur to Montreal, and thence to the ocean. I have before me the figures given by Mr. Clarke himself as to the cost of transportation from the points I have mentioned to Montreal, and I wish to refer the House to his report, made in June, 1898, on the subject. The result of his figures is that when this route is constructed the grain which now costs from 5 to 6 cents on board ship in the port of New York,

will be transported from Duluth, Chicago or Port Arthur to the city of Montreal for 2¼ to 2½ cents, thus reducing the cost of transportation one-half. In 1898 nearly 250,000,000 bushels of wheat reached the city of Buffalo, and only 35,000,000 reached the city of Montreal. We naturally ask ourselves why that is the case. Well, two reasons are given. One is the want of harbour facilities in Montreal. No doubt, that has been a very potent factor in depriving Canada of the trade to which it is entitled, but that difficulty is now in a fair way of being removed. The Government has entered upon, and intends to prosecute with all diligence, the thorough equipment of the harbour of Montreal with all necessary modern facilities. The other reasons given is the great influences of the cities of Buffalo and New York. But I submit that when Canada affords the great lakes a cheaper way, the cheapest on this continent, for transporting grain to an ocean port, the influences of these cities will soon disappear. This is not a question of sentiment, but of dollars. It is a question of commerce. Whether the ships sailing on the great lakes fly the American or the British flag, they will seek the cheapest and the shortest route, and that route is the Ottawa River to Montreal. One of the great objections urged against the Georgian Bay Canal is that it would compete with the St. Lawrence canals. I do not think so. A great many experts, men who know and have given the matter their best thought, assert that it will not be a competitor at all, but there is one thing which I think I am safe in saying, and that is that if the development of our North-west goes on, as we have every reason to hope it will, the St. Lawrence canals will, before very long, become utterly inadequate to handle the freight from the North-west, and that traffic will tax to their fullest capacity both the Georgian Bay Canal, when constructed, and the St. Lawrence canals.

On a former occasion I cited to you, Mr. Speaker, the opinions of our most eminent public men in the past—Sir John Macdonald, the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie—and also the opinion of Sir William Van Horne, and many others. I also cited the opinion of Major Symons. I would like now to give the views of a few more prominent men who have delivered themselves on this subject. First of all, I want to call your attention to a very remarkable statement made long ago—remarkable not only because of the deep thought and foresight which it displayed, but because it was made so long ago, and may be called a prophecy. I wish to refer you to the opinion of Sir John Michel, who was at one time commander-in-chief of Her Majesty's forces in Canada. This is what he said, many years ago, when addressing a public meeting in Ottawa:

I believe that the ties which happily unite Great Britain and Canada will be closer drawn by the opening of this route. I believe that the commercial development which would be produced would be incalculable. I believe that America and Canada, and consequently Great Britain, will be so commercially allied by the opening of this route that the grand object of all true lovers of either of these countries would be attained, namely, the certain peaceful dispersion of every little cloud that might arise in the political horizon of North America.

Speaking of the position of the city of Montreal he added:

You are placed in a position held by no other city I know of in the world. You are placed on the only spot on a vast continent which can be made the receiving-house of one-third a continent's exterior trade, and able to despatch that third to Europe. But you are unsafely situated. The grand route to the sea by the Ottawa and French rivers should, as soon as possible, be undertaken, giving you a back-bone of military strength, and bringing to your doors the vast trade of the vaster west.

These seem prophetic words uttered so long ago—words which I trust are about to be verified.

Mr. Walter Shanly also expressed himself at one time in this way:

To those who have made the laws that govern the movements of western traffic their study I leave it to estimate the height to which Canada will be elevated in commercial importance by opening through the heart of the Dominion a continuous navigation, the shortest water communication that now does or ever can exist besides between tide-water, whether in the Gulf of St. Lawrence or in the estuary of the Hudson, and the broadest extent of grain-growing country in the world.

An American engineer, of considerable repute, said the other day considering the Georgian Bay Canal:

My conviction that the Ottawa River offers the best opportunity on the globe for a well-planned ship canal is a fixed one.

Our own press throughout Canada have almost continuously discussed this matter. The "Trade Bulletin," in a recent issue, expressed itself in this way:

One great desideratum in our canal system will be felt until the Georgian Bay Canal is built, and all who have the best interests of the Dominion at heart should put forth every effort to further the completion of this shortest of all water routes connecting the big traffic of the Canadian and American North-west with the foot of ocean navigation at Montreal. Then, instead of doing a business of 38,000,000 bushels of grain in a season, we could easily overtop the 100,000,000 bushels mark, and eventually double it. Imagine the large increase in the number of ocean vessels which would be attracted to this port, and the additional import trade which would arise therefrom. If the present Government were wise they would raise an everlasting monument to their beneficent rule, by lending their aid in commencing the construction of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal at as early a date as possible, as it promises to be one of the greatest commercial projects on this continent.

Not only has the Canadian press given the matter its serious attention, but we find that every English paper of importance has, within a year or so, taken it up and discussed it repeatedly. I have read a great number of articles, the best of the great newspapers in England advocating the construction of this waterway. Not to weary the House, I shall content myself with quoting one opinion, which is as recent as the 20th May. I have here an article in "Black and White," a very remarkable article and one which I would ask every hon. member of the House to read. I will only read a few extracts on this occasion. "Black and White" compares the project with Cecil Rhodes's great Cape to Cairo Railway, and states that in the writer's opinion the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal is of far more Imperial importance even than that great railway, and has in it the possibility of greater commercial advantages to England. It then goes on:

The dependence upon the United States of America of all Canadian means of transportation, whether by water or by rail is immaterial, is the most prominent and most serious characteristic of the transit question in the Dominion, and one which makes the construction of any line of communication, which would be identified with the sole authority of Great Britain, of the most supreme importance, elevating the entire undertaking beyond the regions of commerce, and mere economical and ethical qualities of such an object, to a position which is in analogy with the projection and possession of a new Imperial measure for defence. The arrangement between America and Canada is not calculated to be disturbed so long as Great Britain and the United States remain upon terms of amicable indifference; but the advantages to Canada, even in time of peace, of possessing an inland waterway, immune from any international contingency, are not to be lightly appraised. Nor is such a fatality liable to happen, for the canal has already been the subject of a special commission of inquiry by the Dominion Senate, and something more definite than an interchange of opinions and views has taken place between the War Office and the Federal Government since Canada made representations upon the subject to them.

The anomalous position in which Canada is placed by the exercise with America of a joint paramountcy over the transit of Canadian commerce is owing, in no small degree, to the motives which actuated British policy to surrender Maine to America in the early history of the rise of that Republic to power. By the surrender of Maine an "all-red" line of railway between Halifax and New Westminster, between the east and west, became virtually impossible, since the Canadian Pacific is compelled to cross American territory in the most important, and at the same time most vulnerable, section of its transcontinental route. Thus does posterity reap the sins of its progenitor, and Canadians to-day are bitterly repenting this blunder of an earlier generation.

With reference more particularly to the construction of the canal, the writer goes on to say:

The completion of the canal should inaugurate an epoch of much greater prosperity throughout the Dominion, more particularly in those parts which are contiguous to the great lakes; almost two million square miles west of Chicago and Duluth will become dependent upon it. Montreal and Quebec will become distributing centres for trade and freight between the west and Europe, while the difference in time and in the rates of insurance—from which is implied the greater security of the new route—will cause an immense traffic from the grain-growing areas and cattle-raising districts of the North-west to be shipped by the "all-red" canal. Montreal and the adjacent provinces can hardly escape from the prosperity which will accrue from this augmentation in existing trade, while the splendid opportunities which Montreal and Quebec will present as depôts for the commerce of the northern states of the American continent cannot but seriously affect New York.

Such is the opinion of "Black and White." This, I believe, is a fair sample of the numerous articles that are appearing in the press of the mother country concerning the Georgian Bay Canal. My hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) has referred to the great number of resolutions passed by boards of trade and chambers of commerce along the route from the Georgian Bay to the city of Montreal. As representing the Capital I have much pleasure in laying before the House, as requested, the resolution passed by a mass metting of the citizens of Ottawa, held on the 24th January, 1899, on this subject. I shall not read it, because it is very much on the lines of those that have been already read. This project is not only engaging the attention of the Canadian and English people, but it is also engaging the very serious attention of our friends across the line. Not only is it engaging their attention, but I assert with confidence—and I have a number of authorities to back up what I say—that it has aroused their envy, their jealousy and their dire fear. If time permitted, I could read to the House various statements that have appeared in their newspapers and magazines recently on this project. These would show the House at once with what fear and envy the Americans look forward to the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal. My hon. friend from Pontiac quoted the opinion of the "Tribune." I shall now, with your permission, quote the opinion of a gentleman well known in the United States who has made a reputation for himself as a strong advocate of railways as against canals, a gentleman who does not believe in waterways but does believe in railways. In an article that appeared in the "North American Review," of February, 1898, Mr. Latcha, an authority on the subject, said:

It is not denied, but is asserted, that a ship canal, if built of the width and depth of the Baltic Canal, whether by New York State or by the St. Lawrence River, will greatly benefit portions of the North-west. But is all-important to know what portions of the North-west would thus be benefited and what would be the result of building that canal to our nation at large. To determine this we must go to the foundation of the question at once.

You will see that this gentleman indulges the hope that Canada, including the North-west, will one day be part of the United States. I mention that to show that his opinion upon this subject must be taken as absolutely sincere.

More than one-third of that vast territory is arable,——

Speaking of our own North-west.

——and when thoroughly developed would produce annually from 500,000,000 to 750,000,000 bushels of wheat, while the wheat crop of the entire United States does not now average more than 500,000,000 bushels annually. The Dominion Government a few years ago expended thousands of dollars in transportation and supplies to aid settlers upon those lands. The serious decline in prices of all grains rendered it impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to transport the crops from that territory to market at a rate which would leave income sufficient to support the producer. The result was, the settlers who were able to leave deserted the country. With a ship canal, however, which would permit the largest ocean steamers to go to and from the west end of lake Superior,——

Of course, this is an error. The promoters of this waterway do not entertain the opinion that a ship canal of the depth mentioned here is at all necessary.

——wheat could be grown in that vast region and be marketed in Europe at prices which would utterly destroy the wheat and corn markets of the United States; for nothing can be more evident than that if the British North-west produce millions of bushels of wheat in excess of that now grown in the United States, the price of that cereal would fall, and corn would accompany it in its downward course. But that wheat will not seek Duluth for market, much less would it seek Chicago. The Canadian Pacific Railway would extend branches throughout that territory and control the carriage of the grain to water, and their water port would be Port Arthur. That grain would not seek New York city for a market, but would traverse the natural water route to Montreal, which would be the great financial centre controlling that commerce, destroying the grain export business of New York city.

When the writer was building the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic Railway, the Dominion Government began the construction of its ship canal around Sault Ste. Marie on its own territory. At that time, it was repeatedly stated, a principal reason for building that canal was to prepare for diverting the milling business of the North-west to the Dominion side of the Sault Ste. Marie. The vast power which could be developed at that point must be apparent. While our wheat supply comes from Dakota and Minnesota, Minneapolis can control that business. But the day a great ship canal is built from the ocean to the British North-west will see the milling interests removed to the Canadian side of the river, destroying the Minneapolis milling business just as certainly as that of Rochester was destroyed by the development of our western fields.

When the British North-west can raise and ship by canal 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, British capital will build the Georgian Bay Ship Canal, and every ton of traffic from the Lake Superior regions to the ocean will traverse British territory, leaving Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland and Buffalo hundreds of miles from the direct route to the ocean. The bulk of the traffic of the great North-west will be carried on British vessels, manned by British seamen, and destined largely for British ports. The truth of this must be obvious, because it is well known that but one distinctively American steamship line is engaged in carrying the world's commerce between the United States and Europe, while a dozen such lines are operated by British, German, French and other European companies. With free access for British vessels to our great lakes, American shipping would be drowned in those waters; the low wages paid seamen by Great Britain would drive our seamen from our inland seas; the ship-building industries at Detroit, Cleveland and other great lake cities would be seriously crippled or destroyed. But more disastrous than all these, the agriculturist in the United States would be hopelessly impoverished. Our Canadian neighbours are able diplomats and keen business men; they know precisely what they want, and hope and believe they can induce us to bear the cost of satisfying their wants. Thus far their waterway conventions at Toronto, Cleveland and elsewhere have amply met their most sanguine wishes. But should we build that canal before the British possessions become part of our territory, we would perpetuate the monumental folly of all ages, a folly only exceeded by the Trojan's theft of the Grecian horse.

This opinion does not by any means stand alone in the United States. In the April number of the "Anglo-American," under the heading "From the Great Lakes to the Ocean," there was an article by a civil engineer, named Gilmore. After referring to the shortness of the route and the reduction in the rate which this Ottawa waterway will of necessity bring about, this gentleman goes on to say:

These figures proclaim the superiority of this over existing routes more forcibly than could the most impassioned appeal or the most flowery rhetoric. That terse maxim which the sporting man loves to enunciate: "Money talks," is the maxim of business. It has been ascertained that this canal is feasible and will save time. Time is money. Therefore, it will be built; of that there is no doubt. But upon what scale? Shall it be a 14-foot bargeway, a 20-foot ship canal, or a 30-foot waterway for the largest ocean steamer? The cost of this last will be very considerable, and beyond the means of Canada alone at present. The first at least is certain of accomplishment. The advisability of a betwixt-and-between compromise is questionable.

I do not wish to weary the House at any great length with these citations. I have given a number of them because I think the language is much more terse than I could use, and because they express the opinion of men who are absolutely disinterested, and whose opinion should have great weight with us. I find another very strong evidence of the envy, and jealousy, and fear with which the Americans look upon the construction of this waterway. I am sure every hon. member read a suggestion made some time last November, while the International Commission was sitting in Washington, a suggestion which was made in a number of American newspapers, that, in addi-

tion to the questions then engaging the attention of the Commission, the question of an International canal was also deserving of their consideration. I have no doubt that the conception of an international canal by our friends to the south was prompted by the fear that this Georgian Bay route would be constructed. I have not the slightest doubt that they feel that, when this canal is constructed, the enormous traffic of the great lakes will be diverted, and brought down by the Ottawa route. It was because they felt they were likely to lose this traffic, that they suggested that a canal should be built by way of Lake Champlain to Montreal, the suggestion being accompanied by another suggestion, that this International canal should be under the joint jurisdiction of both Governments. Another evidence of the danger which the Americans see in the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal, is a suggestion made some time ago to construct a canal from Albany to Buffalo, in order to cover the whole distance by water from Duluth, or Chicago, through to the harbour of New York, and to avoid transhipments at Buffalo and Albany. I submit that every one who will look into this question without prejudice, who will examine it seriously, will be struck with the immense advantages, commercial and national, which it offers to Canada. I was glad indeed to hear the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), at least on one occasion, express the opinion that this would be indeed a very great and potent factor in bringing through our country the great traffic of the west. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), whose opinion my good friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) quoted the other day, is also of the same opinion. I believe, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), on some public occasion, not long ago. also expressed himself in the same way. The leader of the Opposition, and many gentlemen on the other side of the House, also entertain, I know, the belief that this route must, and will soon, be constructed. It seems that the greatest difficulty in the way of the Government at the present moment giving the guarantee which is sought by the capitalists who are prepared to go into this matter, is a doubt whether this enterprise is feasible, and whether, when constructed, it will be of commercial value to those who will invest their money in it. With your permission, I shall briefly address myself to these two points, and endeavour to show that, not only is the canal feasible, not only is it practicable, but that every opinion which can be formed at the present moment is to the effect that this canal will be a paying venture to those who will invest their money in it.

With reference to the feasibility of the scheme, I want to remind you that, as far back as 1880, engineers, like Mr. Shanly and Mr. Clarke, were instructed by the Government to make surveys and to examine the country between Georgian Bay and Montreal. At that time, I believe, a complete survey was not made between Ottawa and Montreal, but a survey was made between Ottawa and the Georgian Bay, and it is embodied in the report made by these gentlemen. That report covers a great many pages. I think that every member in this House is confronted with the difficulty with which I was confronted myself, on account of the matter contained in that report being to a great extent technical. One who is not a professional engineer, is appalled by the figures which are there given. But I am satisfied that there is in that report all the data upon which an estimate may be made as to the cost of the work, and by which a conclusion may be arrived at as to the feasibility of the project. I shall not endeavour, of course, to criticise or go over the items of this report, but I invite the attention of every hon. gentleman who wishes thoroughly to inform himself upon the subject, to the reports of Mr. Shanly and Mr. Clarke. I desire, Sir, to put on "Hansard" the report of Mr. Marcus Smith made on the 30th December, 1898, because it is of very great importance and because, I believe, the report was procured largely to remove the doubt which existed in the minds of some as to the feasibility of the Georgian Bay Canal. In that report, which is addressed to Mr. McLeod Stewart, Mr. Marcus Smith, amongst other things, says:

> Estimates have been made for the construction of this work on a scale of 10 feet depth of water on the mitre-sills of locks and 12 feet in canal, river and lake channels. But it is now required that the depth on mitre-sills of locks shall be 14 feet, and in canal, river and lake channels 15 to 16 feet, according as the bottom may be rock or earth.
>
> The question has been raised whether there is a sufficient supply of water and depth in the channels of rivers and lakes to maintain these dimensions throughout the season of navigation? From my knowledge and judgment I should answer in the affirmative, but for the information of yourself and others I submit the following:—

Then follows a great many figures and details mentioned by Mr. Smith with which I will not trouble the House. He comes to this conclusion as to that part of it:

> There is ample depth of water in Trout and Turtle lakes, so that when lowered to the adjusted level of Lake Nipissing there will be more than sufficient depth left for navigation on the scale required.
>
> The excavation for the canal between Lakes Nipissing and Trout, and in deepening the river at the east end of Turtle Lake will be heavy; the quantities can be calculated from the plans and profiles of the Government survey. Thus the great body of water in Lake Nipissing will occupy the unique position of the summit level of the whole scheme, so that its waters can be directed westward to Lake Huron or eastward, co-mingling with those of the Ottawa to Montreal.

On this arrangement Mr. T. C. Clarke remarks: "The waters of Lake Nipissing are sufficient for any scale of navigation for all time to come."

3. The Ottawa River has at any stage a sufficient body of water for the scale of navigation now proposed. The total fall between the mouth of the Mattawa River and Lake Deschênes is fully 300 feet, not uniform, but with stretches of still water, light currents and long rapids.

The banks of the river are generally high and mostly rocky. Taking advantage of this, Mr. T. C. Clarke has arranged the works in a series of high dams and locks to overcome the rapids, so that there are only two places (in the Culbute channel) where rock-cutting and dredging is necessary, except in short approaches to the locks. For the larger scale of navigation now required there will be more of that class of work, but the quantity will be moderate.

From the city of Ottawa to Grenville the latest information we have of the depth of water is from the report of Mr. (now Sir) Sandford Fleming, from soundings made under his directions in 1888. On the longitudinal section of the channel the least and greatest depth of water is given for each mile, reduced to a uniform datum, which conforms to the lowest level of the river, taken daily by the lock-master of the Rideau Canal during a period of seventeen years.

Mr. Fleming states: "There are only five points on the whole distance of 60 miles on which the depth of the channel on extreme low water is under 10 feet, * * * and these shallow parts are limited in length to a few hundred yards each, the whole making an aggregate length of a mile. * * * The material to be dredged is coarse red sand, and finer sand or silt in about equal proportions."

For the depth of water now required there will be, at extreme low water, according to Mr. Fleming's table of soundings, twelve points at which dredging will be required, varying from 1 to 9 feet in depth in short lengths. These may probably be reduced by the necessary enlargement of the locks and canal between Grenville and Carillon for the larger scale of navigation, if the dams are raised a few feet.

From Carillon to Lachine no dredging is shown for a 12 feet depth of channel, but for a 16 feet channel there may be some dredging. This can be ascertained from the charts and soundings of the Ottawa River in the Department of Public Works.

Now, as will be seen by the report which I have just read, which was made as recently as December, 1898, Mr. Marcus Smith, upon his own information, upon the evidence of Mr. Clarke and upon information supplied to him by Sir Sandford Fleming, whom he quotes, says clearly that, not only is the scheme feasible, not only can a uniform depth of fourteen feet be obtained, but that the work is comparatively easy and will not cost a very large sum of money. When the matter was up before the other branch of this Parliament certain gentlemen were examined on this and other points, and considerable information was then obtained. I would invite the attention and the serious attention of the House to the evidence which was laid before the committee of the Senate in 1898. Mr. Marcus Smith, whose report I have just quoted, who was examined at that time, made this further statement:

Mr. BELCOURT.

I am acquainted with this from the very commencement of the surveys in 1858 and 1860. Mr. Walter Shanly, the engineer, commenced the surveys of this work in 1858, and they were completed by Mr. T. C. Clarke in 1860. I know both these gentlemen very well, and I know many of the assistants, as they have been working with me on other work; and I have seen most of the plans, soundings, profiles and so on deposited in the Government office, and they are very complete. They are quite enough to make an estimate both as to the practicability of the work and the cost of construction.

Mr. Smith says the work is feasible, that the plans, sounding and profiles are quite sufficient to warrant him in coming to a definite conclusion as to the practicability of the work and in forming an estimate as to the cost of construction. Mr. T. C. Clarke, M. Inst. C.E., in his report to the Government of Canada, in 1860, says:

In the first place I have to report that the distance between Montreal and the mouth of the French River on Lake Huron (according to the plans furnished me by the department), is, following the line of navigation adopted, 430·76 miles.

That of this distance 351·81 miles are already a perfectly natural navigation, and require no improvement, and that it is perfectly practicable so to improve the remaining 78·95 miles as to convert the whole chain of waters into a first-class navigation for steam vessels, and to reduce the length of canalling to 29·32 miles, or, exclusive of the Lachine Canal, to 20·82 miles.

In a later report, he says:

To improve the navigation of such a river system is comparatively easy, for the greater part is already accomplished.

Then Mr. Welington, the American engineer, whose opinion I have already quoted, in another part of my remarks, at one time expressed himself as follows:—

The finest place on the globe for a deep-water canal is the Ottawa River route.

Mr. Wicksteed, who was examined also before the committee of the Senate, said:

As to the feasibility of the undertaking, I think there is no question whatever. I was over the greater part of it last winter with Mr. Stewart.

I also desire to call your attention to the evidence given by Mr. Wicksteed before the Senate committee on the same point. I submit with confidence that the evidence I have cited to the House must be looked upon as conclusive, and, it seems to me, that, on that evidence, the Government is absolutely warranted in granting the guarantee which is now asked by the promoters. We have full and complete returns from actual surveys by Canada's best qualified engineers. There are plans, profiles and maps of the whole undertaking, from the Georgian Bay to the city of Montreal, and the opinions of the Canadian engineers are corroborated by the opinions of eminent American and British engineers. We have full details as to the quality, quantity and nature of the work to

be performed, and we have full statements as to the nature of the locks, the nature of the dams and their extent and size. We know exactly from the reports of the engineers, the amount and the character of the dredging and its cost. I submit, Sir, that the proper depth of this canal should be fourteen feet. I have cited to you the opinion given by one eminent engineer as to that, and I would also invite your attention to the opinion expressed in the "North American Review" of June last, by another American engineer:

The project for a canal by which lake steamers should be enabled to reach the Atlantic is no new thing, and for more than ten years it has been strongly advocated by those interested in the commerce of the lakes. A number of routes for such a waterway have been proposed, but as yet no survey of any one of them has been completed. Owing in great part to the efforts of the Deep Waterway Association, a body composed of men actively concerned in lake shipping, Congress in 1895 created a Deep Waterways Commission for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of building such a canal "as shall enable vessels engaged in ocean commerce to pass to and fro between the great lakes and the Atlantic Ocean." Early in the year following, the commission reported that such a canal should ultimately have a depth of 28 feet, and that the Government would be justified in undertaking the work. It further recommended that surveys be made for such a canal. Later in the same year Congress appropriated funds for the purpose, and the surveys are now being made. While the Deep Waterways Commission were engaged upon their labour, Congress authorized the Secretary of War to have made an examination and estimates of cost of a canal "of sufficient capacity to transport the tonnage of the lakes to the sea." Whatever the purpose of Congress may have been, the act was less particular in its terms than the one previously passed, and it allowed an investigation into the question of what depth of canal would be best in the light of all the interests involved. By direction of the Secretary of War a preliminary examination was made by Major Thomas W. Symons, of the Engineer Corps. After careful consideration of the subject, Major Symons reported that a ship canal capable of floating a large ocean steamer would not be of sufficient benefit to justify its construction; but that a canal of about 12 feet depth, designed to carry barges of about 1,500 tons burden, such as could safely be towed to any part of the great lake system, would meet the demands of commerce and should be built. Two propositions are thus before Congress: first, to construct a 28-foot waterway from the lakes to tide-water, at a total cost of more than $300,000,000, for the surveys of which the sum of $150,000 already has been appropriated; and second, to build a similar canal of a depth of 12 feet at a cost of about $50,000,000.

There is another question which I presume the Government is desirous of having light thrown upon, and that is as to the cost of the work. Estimates were made by Mr. Clarke and Mr. Shanly, in 1860, when they made their report to the Government. Of course these figures have had to be changed very considerably since, principally on account of the increased depth of water now necessary. At that time it was contemplated to make a 9-foot canal only, but now, in order to be in line with the St. Lawrence Canal system, we must have a depth of 14 feet. Mr. Clarke has carefully and in detail, last year, revised his estimates of 1860, and his revised estimate amounts to $17,000,000. It is true that estimate does not agree with that of Mr. Walter Shanly, but Mr. Shanly's figures are explained in a satisfactory manner, an explanation which I could give the House if time permitted. The figures I propose to adhere to, however, are the figures given by Mr. Marcus Smith. He, last year, estimated the cost of this work, basing his estimate on the details, plans and profiles to which I have referred, at $25,000,000, and the promoters of the undertaking have adopted these figures and are prepared to expend $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 in the construction of this canal. On this question of the cost, I would also refer hon. gentlemen to the evidence given before the Senate Committee, which evidence has been printed and which they can read for themselves. With reference to the other question, as to the commercial value of the enterprise to those who will invest their money in it, I confess it is a matter of great difficulty to me, because I have not the knowledge or the data at my hand upon which to form a conclusion, and even if I had, I would probably be much embarrassed. Further, I wish to remind the House, that the estimate of the revenue which may be and will be likely to be derived from the operation of this waterway, has been made by Mr. Clarke and other gentlemen who are in a position to judge. In their opinion there is no question whatever, that commercially speaking, the venture will be a paying one to those who will invest their capital in it. It seems to me that the opinion of such men as Sir William Van Horne and others, who might, perhaps, be prejudiced against a waterway of this kind, and whose opinion in its favour should, therefore, have the more weight; it seems to me that the opinion of these men should be of sufficient importance to justify the Government in accepting them as conclusive, without going further into the question. To my mind, the Government is not called upon in this case, to guarantee the commercial value of the enterprise to those who are going to invest their capital in it. It would occur to me that all the Government should ask is a reasonable assurance from people who are in a position to know, that this waterway would be sufficiently paying to warrant the people who are investing their money in it to go to that expense. In England, whence most of the capital for this canal is to come, the opinion is very general that this will be a paying enterprise. I would like to remind hon. members that the old maxim "Fortuna juvat audaces" applies as much if not more to commercial matters than to any other human concern, and I might add that perhaps no race on earth has proven more clearly the truth of that maxim than has the English race. Here we have British capitalists

who are bold enough to come into Canada and expend $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 in constructing this canal, and, Sir, the men who are willing to go into that undertaking will at once prove the truth of the maxim I have quoted, if any people in the world can.

What is it these capitalists ask? They come here and say: "We are going to build this canal with our own money; we are prepared to spend $25,000,000 in doing so; we do not ask the Government to give us any guarantee at all for the present; the guarantee we ask shall not be operative until and unless this canal is wholly built and put into active operation." The guarantee they ask is 2½ per cent on $20,000,000, only a portion of the interest on the bonds; and I repeat—because it seems to me a very important consideration—that they are prepared to go on at once and in three years construct, equip and put into operation this canal without one cent of public money from the treasury of Canada. It is only when the canal is built, and if built that they ask the Government to act upon the guarantee which they now seek.

I know, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of objection has been raised, and not improperly—on the contrary, with a great deal of justification—against the Government pledging the credit of the nation on behalf of enterprises of this sort, until they have some reasonable assurance of its feasibility and its paying nature. The case of the Chignecto Ship Railway was mentioned the other day by my hon. friend from Pontiac, who pointed out very properly that that case was entirely different from this. In that case the Government bound itself to pay the promoters of the railway a subsidy of $170,000 a year for 20 years. The Government were bound to pay the subsidy provided the people went on with the work. It seems to me that this case is entirely different from that, not only in regard to its commercial aspect and the guarantee asked, but in regard to its prospects of success. Those who sat in the House at the time, remember how assiduously and how strongly certain members fought against the granting of the subsidy to the Chignecto Railway. It was asserted boldly in the House that it was a wild-cat scheme, a scheme condemned to be a failure; and yet the subsidy was granted. But this case is entirely different. We find gentlemen on both sides of the House supporting it; we find the press of Canada, the press of the United States and the press of Great Britain almost a unit in advocating this scheme as offering the greatest commercial advantages to Canada and as being a most potent factor in the development and enrichment of our country. In this case we have the strongest possible evidence, as to the feasibility of the scheme and as to its ultimate success, that could possibly be given. In the case of the Chignecto Railway that was all wanting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, for the reasons I have mentioned, that the feasibility and commercial value of this scheme are established, and any one who will with an unprejudiced mind seriously look into it will come to the conclusion that the time has come when the Georgian Bay Canal must be constructed.

Another objection—and I desire to elude none of them—which has been raised against the construction of this canal is that the Government itself should undertake this work—that it should be a Government work constructed and paid for by the Government with public funds. Well, that is a matter of opinion. I do not agree with those who think that the canal should be constructed by the Government; but in this case the question is not a material one, because hon. gentlemen will remember that the Act of incorporation of the Georgian Bay Canal Company provides in section 42 that Her Majesty may at any time take possession of and operate this waterway for the public benefit. I will cite the section:

> Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, may at any time assume the possession and property of the said canals and works, and of all the rights and privileges and advantages of the company, all of which shall, after such assumption, be vested in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, on giving to the company one week's notice thereof and paying to the company the value of the same, to be fixed by three arbitrators or the majority of them, one to be chosen by the Government, another by the company, and a third arbitrator by the two arbitrators; and the arbitrators may in such valuation take into account the expenditure of the company, its property, the business of the canals, and other works hereby authorized, and its past, present and prospective business, with interest from the time of the investment thereof.

So you will see that although this canal may be constructed with private funds, the Crown may at any time step in and resume possession of it.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the character of the men who have taken this matter up in England. I want to cite to you the names of the gentlemen who form part of the syndicate and who have deposited in the Bank of Commerce at Ottawa the sum required, being 10 per cent of the capital authorized of the Georgian Bay Canal Company. A syndicate has been formed with a capital of £50,000, and £41,200 have been deposited by the Lloyd's Bank in London to the credit of this company in the Canadian Bank of Commerce at Ottawa. What better evidence of good faith, and of the determination of these men to go on and construct this work could be given? And when I mention the names of these men, I am sure that the House will be impressed with their solvency, their seriousness, and their ability to bring to successful completion a work of this kind. These are some of the gentlemen who form the syndicate: Right Hon.

Sir Edward Thornton, late British Ambassador at Washington ; Right Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, late Secretary of State for India ; A. L. Jones, of the Elder-Dempster Co. ; R. N. Perks, M.P. for Lincolnshire ; Mr. MacIvor, M.P. for Liverpool, and one of the most influential members of the Cunard Steamship Co. ; Mr. G. G. Blackwell, of Blackwell. Day & Co., of Liverpool ; the Marquis of Tweedale ; Sir Dixon Mackenzie ; Lord Kelvin, of Glasgow ; C. J. Sassoon, of the East India Co. ; Sir Luther Vaughan, Mr. Francis Durant, Mr. Anderson, Lord Provost of Glasgow ; J. T. Reid, Director of the Bank of Scotland ; and others. The House, I am sure, will see at once that these men, having shown their faith in the undertaking by subscribing largely to the stock of this syndicate, are fully competent to procure the funds necessary to carry it to successful completion.

I have, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my ability, and as fully as my limited knowledge would permit, endeavoured to answer the objections which have been urged against this vast project, and to deal with the difficulties which it no doubt offers. The undertaking is too vast, too far-reaching, too important not to have aroused a great many objections, and much enmity and opposition. Not only have objections been raised against it, but that usually effective weapon, ridicule, has been brought into play in order to destroy it. But, Sir, the project, since its inception, has risen above party politics : it has survived opposition and enmity ; it has stood the test of severe and close criticism, and today it stands forth as the great, national and truly imperial project that it is. I may not have answered successfully all the objections which may be entertained by the Government with reference to the guarantee that is asked ; but I assure you that I have not tried to elude any of them ; and if I have not succeeded in convincing you and my colleagues of the great commercial advantages which will flow to our country from the completion of this great waterway ; if I have not succeeded in getting you, Sir, and my colleagues to share my firm belief in the necessity and ultimate success of the Georgian Bay water route, I trust that I may venture the hope and belief that I have, along with my friend Mr. Poupore, made out such a case that every member of this House will consider it his bounden duty at least to look into the question, and give it his serious and unprejudiced attention. I think I have made out such a case that the Government of the day cannot afford not to give it their prompt and serious consideration, and I have every reason to hope and believe that they will do so. My hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) and myself do not expect anything else from the Government or from any member of this House. All we desire is that the matter should be looked into and investigated : and I make bold to say that every one who does so will be as thoroughly satisfied as we are that the time has come when the Georgian Bay Canal shall be constructed. I trust, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will delay no longer in granting to the gentlemen prepared to spend their own money in this undertaking, the guarantee which they ask, and in enabling us to take full advantage of the magnificent natural waterway which Providence has given us—a waterway which in a very short time will divert and put in our control the enormous traffic of the great lakes and of the interior of this continent ; which will at the same time colonize, develop and enrich a large portion of Ontario and Quebec—a waterway which I am sure will make of the cities of Montreal and Quebec the true rivals of New York and Boston, and of the city of Ottawa, the worthy capital of this Dominion. The construction and thorough equipment of this waterway ought not, it seems to me, to be any longer a matter of doubt. Every one who has taken the trouble to look into it is and must be convinced that it must be constructed before long. I believe myself that the time has come for doing it. If we wish to divert the traffic which properly belongs to us, and which nature designed us to have, we must at once be up and doing. Our neighbours to the south, who realize the great benefits of this canal, with their well known prodigious energy and spirit of enterprise, will not neglect to take any and all steps, and will not shrink from the greatest of sacrifices, in order to retain within their own control the great traffic which I believe, if the Georgian Bay Canal is completed, will be surely wrested from them. Let the Georgian Bay Canal be speedily constructed, and the Ottawa and French rivers, which three centuries ago formed the route by which Christianity and civilization were carried into the interior of the country, will become the greatest channel of commerce and of national prosperity on the continent we inhabit.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House for having listened to me so patiently and for so long a time, particularly on an evening so trying as this. Before I sit down, I again bespeak for this project the serious and earnest attention of the Government and of the members of this House.

Mr. J. B. KLOCK (Nipissing). Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable diffidence that I rise to address this House, and I, therefore, crave your indulgence. Apart from any opinion of mine, I may say that my constituents are very much interested in this great national scheme, and consider it the best means of developing that great northern country, which is a land of unlimited resources. I am a strong and enthusiastic supporter of the scheme, and I regret very much that I do not possess the persuasive powers and eloquence of the gentlemen who have preceded me, especially the hon. member for Pontiac

(Mr. Poupore). These hon. gentlemen have put this matter before the House so carefully, clearly and concisely that very little is left for me to say. I feel, however, that I must say a few words. I do not intend to detain the House very long, and I trust that I shall be able to speak to the point and make myself plain. I shall not refer to statistics or comparisons, for if the Government want any information on this score, I am sure they will get all the information that can be had from the promoter of this scheme, Mr. McLeod Stewart. This is not by any means a new idea. It had occupied the minds of some of the greatest men of the Ottawa valley for almost a century, in proof of which assertion I shall refer to some of the debates of this House. On page 1211 of "Hansard," 20th April, 1885, the Hon. Peter White, member for North Renfrew, moved a resolution in favour of this scheme, and my reasons for referring particularly to these debates are because the men who took part in the discussions of that day were very earnest and knew whereof they were talking. In opening up his remarks, Mr. White said :

In what I am saying I am not offering any new theory or project. This scheme has been spoken of and been before the country for many years, but for several years nothing has been said about it. I believe that at the instance of Mr. John Egan, a former member of the old legislature of the province of Canada, for the county of Pontiac, this question of improving the navigation of the Ottawa was first brought to the attention of the Government, and as early as 1854 work was commenced on the impediment known as the Chats Rapids for the purpose of connecting the Chats and Deschênes lakes. Considerable money was spent in the execution of that work, and it was continued until 1857, when for some cause the work was abandoned.

I am sure it was an oversight of the Hon. Mr. White that he did not explain the cause. In the first place, a very unfortunate thing occurred. Mr. John Egan died, who, I have always heard, was one of the brightest and most far-seeing men that ever lived in the Ottawa valley, and I am of the opinion that that was the reason why the work was delayed. Had he lived for twenty years longer, I feel assured that that great scheme would have been an accomplished fact, and the grain now going by Buffalo would at this very moment be passing down in vessels behind this building for the port of Montreal.

Later on the all absorbing question of confederation was taken up, and with it the building of the great transcontinental railway for the purpose of binding all the provinces together. Under those circumstances, it is not a matter of surprise that the Georgian Bay Canal scheme became a dead issue until Mr. White took it up again in the House.

As I have already said, all those public men, namely, the Hon. Mr. Tassé, then member for Ottawa, Mr. Bryson, Mr. Dawson, of Algoma, and several others spoke strongly in its favour ; and, although they did not carry their views to a successful issue, it was through no fault of theirs, but because the Canadian Pacific Railway and other great public works were in hand, and the country was not ripe for this question. One remarkable thing at that time is, that there was practically no opposition to the scheme, so far as its feasibility was concerned. There seemed to be a little jealousy—perhaps I should not use that word—on the part of those interested in the Trent Valley Canal ; but this does not exist now, and, so far as I am concerned, I shall be pleased, and so would all other supporters of the Georgian Bay Canal, to see that Trent Valley scheme carried out as well. Without detracting from that scheme, or from the Toronto and Georgian Bay Canal scheme, I may say, that these have just one purpose to fulfil, that is, the carrying of the grain ; but the Georgian Bay Canal has several purposes. The Trent Valley Canal passes through a rich and fertile country, where they have railways, while this scheme would not only be of advantage to the grain-carrying trade, but would develop a large and rich mineral and agricultural territory within a very few years. If the country was not ripe for this scheme, when Mr. White introduced it in 1885, I am sure it is ripe for it now ; and I do not think any one would form any other opinion, if he consulted the people of the Ottawa valley. While the Ottawa valley may not be the whole country, it is a very important part of this country. In it I include a part of the district of Montreal. What would benefit the Ottawa valley would benefit all Canada. I was very much pleased, when the Prime Minister stated, at the beginning of this Parliament, that his policy was to lessen the cost of transportation. If he was—as no doubt he was—in earnest, here is his opportunity. Now, let me refer again to Mr. Tassé's remarks. This is what he says :

Trade follows the safest, the shortest and the cheapest routes. This is one of the first laws it obeys. It knows no frontier, no country, no nationality. It may have preference, but not to its detriment. If this contention be undisputed, then those who advocate the construction of the Ottawa Ship Canal have established their case on the soundest possible basis.

I do not think there will be any to dispute that this is the shortest possible route. While I am speaking about Mr. Tassé, I would like to draw attention to what he said about the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie's remarks on the subject. In 1865, Mr. Mackenzie made a very eloquent speech on confederation. In the course of that speech, he paid the following tribute to the scheme that is now before the House :—

I think it is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of this colony that our canal connections with the upper lakes should be perfected as early

as possible. Our canal system must be improved, so as to accommodate the large trade that is coming from the North-west. On the northern shores of Lake Superior we have sources of wealth that are perfectly inexhaustible. We read only the other day that a mountain of iron had been discovered close to the coast, quite sufficient to supply the demands of the world for 500 years. We have in that locality an abundant supply of minerals of all kinds, and unless our canals are made capable of carrying that traffic, it will necessarily find channels in another direction. There is an agitation among a portion of the community for making a new canal from Toronto to the Georgian Bay, and I admit it is very desirable it should be constructed, though I do not think it ever can be; and even if it could be, it is entirely beyond our resources at the present time. I am convinced that the true route for a canal (if a new one should be undertaken) to the Georgian Bay, is up the Ottawa, because that would be giving a great back-bone to the country. If we had a fine canal, capable of carrying vessels of war in that direction, it would be a splendid means of defence, as well as a great highway for the commercial products of the west.

Then he goes on again to quote Mr. Mackenzie. That gentleman and the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) met at Pembroke. Mr. Tassé says:

There the Liberal leader met a foeman worthy of his steel, that eloquent, that courageous tribune of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper. The two champions of our two great parties vied in their eulogy of the Ottawa valley, and the hon. member for East York used the following language:—

"I am tolerably well acquainted with the geographical features of the Ottawa valley, having for the last fifteen years been actively interested in all the questions which most closely affect its people. The very first year I was in Parliament, I was one of a committee appointed to investigate the question of canal navigation on the upper Ottawa, and from that time I have been perfectly satisfied that the valley presents the greatest facilities of any route upon the continent for the transportation of the products of the North-west to the Atlantic Ocean, or rather, I should say, to the head of the Atlantic navigation."

Now, we have a remark made by Mr. Chas. Magee, the president of the Bank of Ottawa, which, I think, all will concede to be one of the most flourishing institutions we have at the present day. He says, that Montreal should not, in making harbour improvements, lose sight of the fact that the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canal and the construction of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal is looked upon as one of the great public works necessary for the development of the country. The previous speakers have cited the remarks of others, and I could go on doing the same, but at this late hour I do not wish to take up too much time. In view of the facts that we have been able to bring to his attention, I am sure the leader of the Government must concede that this is a scheme which will lessen the cost of transportation. Previous speakers have shown what effect it would have upon colonization. The Government are paying out considerable amounts to assist immigration; if this work goes on, it will do more to increase immigration than all the immigration agents in Great Britain, and it will cost nothing, in that respect, to bring in a hardy class of men, such as we have on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Rideau Canal, and other canals, who are now among the best of our citizens. Some take the ground that this canal, when built, will injure comparatively young railroads, like the Parry Sound and Pontiac and Pacific Junction. If I thought such to be the case, I should be very sorry to support it; but I hold a different opinion. I believe it will help these railways. It will cause the country to grow and fill up, and the railway will have the light freight and passengers, and in the winter months it will be able to more than make up for competition that may meet it in the summer time. Before taking my seat, I must say this country owes a great debt of gratitude to Mr. McLeod Stewart, the promoter and agitator of this scheme. I trust the Government will assist him in carrying it out. And, when they do commence, I hope they will commence at both ends and in the district of Nipissing. It has been said, that this scheme may cost more than has been estimated. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have Mr. Shanly's report and Mr. Clarke's report. Mr. Clarke's estimate, if I am rightly informed, is about $12,000,000. But you have to take into consideration the advantages now existing for construction. For instance, supplies can be laid down along this proposed canal just as cheaply as they can be laid down at the city of Ottawa or the city of Montreal. At the date of that estimate supplies cost from $25 to $30 per ton to deliver at Mattawa or between that town and Nipissing. Furthermore, explosives are cheaper and more effective now, and electrical power along the line can be used. I am sure that the parties interested in this scheme are business men, and have a full knowledge of what they are about; and knowing the probable cost, and having an experience of the Manchester Ship Canal, I do not think they would wildly rush into this scheme, so that we need not trouble ourselves on that score. Let us give them an opportunity to make their estimate, while at all times we guard the public interests. Now, in conclusion, I may say that I am disposed to support the Government on this measure. It would be an interesting coincidence, Champlain, the first white man who passed over this route, being a Frenchman, if a French Canadian Premier were instrumental in converting that canoe route into the greatest waterway on the continent. I am supporting it from a national point of view. But while I am ready to support the Government on this measure, I want it well understood where I stand. While I wish to be on the very best terms, privately and publicly, with my Liberal friends, I want them

to know that I am a Conservative, and I shall stick to the Conservative party so long as they stick to their principles, that is to say, loyalty to the mother country, protection to our industries, and the development of our resources.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I regret to be obliged, from honest conviction, to oppose the scheme submitted to this House by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), and so ably supported by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Klock). I have no doubt whatever that these gentlemen are acting from a proper motive, and that they see in this scheme something of national importance that would be most useful to Canada. But those who dissent from their views may properly be asked to submit their objections. If I could be persuaded that at any time this enterprise will prove advantageous to Canada, I would gladly support it, but it is because I do not see either the value of the canal as a transportation route, or as a shorter route, or as a route for national purposes, that I do not entertain the same views as those hon. gentlemen I have mentioned. In the first place, the adoption of this scheme means a very heavy outlay to the Dominion of Canada. The proposal of a guarantee of 2½ per cent on $20,000,000, means that these parties believe it will cost at least $20,000,000. Now, I think that is a very moderate estimate, and that it will be found, in the event of this canal being constructed, that it will cost a very much larger sum. The question for us to consider is, Would the result of that expenditure bring back to the country a return for the money expended? It is true that we are only asked for a guarantee, but that guarantee means an outlay of $500,000 a year for twenty years. But we know by past experience that all these great undertakings, before they are finished, very much exceed the first estimate of their cost. The next consideration submitted to us was the question of the shortness of the route, and one of the great virtues of this route was said to be that it was much shorter than any of the other routes for transporting grain to the seaboard. Now, is it a fact that it is shorter? The hon. member for Pontiac read figures—I did not understand that they were figures compiled by himself, but at any rate he gave them to this House as reliable figures, regarding the length of this route compared with others. He said that this route from the Georgian Bay to Montreal was 430 miles long, fifty-eight miles of which would be canal. But he did not give us a comparison between that route and any others. Let me make a comparison, the correctness of which any one can ascertain by looking up the mileage on the canals and railways we have already. Take the Collingwood route and compare it with the Georgian Bay route. Any point on the south shore of the Georgian Bay would be a common point of distance as between Chicago and Montreal, because it matters very little if you are going from Chicago to Montreal whether you leave the Georgian Bay at Parry Sound, at Midland, at Collingwood, or at Owen Sound. From any of these points the difference in distance is not very much. But we are told that the Georgian Bay route would be much shorter than any of the others, and therefore much more valuable. The hon. gentleman starts out with the statement that it is 430 miles from Georgian Bay to Montreal. Now, I find that by Collingwood, if you examine the route that has been submitted for the consideration of the Government, it is only 409 miles from the Georgian Bay to Montreal, or twenty-one miles shorter than by the Ottawa route.

Mr. POUPORE. If you look at the "Hansard," page 4297 of my remarks, you will see that I quoted the paper read by Mr. Wicksteed to the Society of Engineers at Montreal, in which he gives the distance. I quoted his figures, and they are in the "Hansard." The hon. gentleman says I did not make any comparisons; but if he looks up my remarks he will find that I showed a total saving of 368 miles by the Ottawa route over the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SPROULE. Away around by the Welland Canal. There is no difference of opinion between us there. I said the hon. gentleman gave figures, which I understood were not his own, and I understood he presented them as authentic and correct. I said that he did not give any comparison as to the length of these various routes from the Georgian Bay to Montreal. It is true that if you are compelled to go around by the Welland Canal and down the St. Lawrence, the distance is very much longer. But it is not necessary to do that for the purpose of reaching Montreal from Chicago; we have several routes by way of the Georgian Bay that would be competitive routes with this one, and routes which are shorter to-day; therefore, the comparison made by the hon. gentleman did not prove very much in favour of the Ottawa route. Then, I take the next route, the Midland route. I find that route is only 333 miles long, as against 430. We have large quantities of grain going over that route to-day.

Mr. POUPORE. Do you mean the Trent Valley?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I mean by way of Midland, on the Georgian Bay, and thence by the Grand Trunk Railway to Port Hope and on down to Montreal. It is only 333 miles, or 97 miles shorter than this boasted route. No one can dispute these figures.

Mr. POUPORE. Would you have an all-water route?

Mr. SPROULE. No, you would not have an all-water route that way, but you would have a very much shorter route if you had a canal built by way of Collingwood, where there is at the outside only forty miles of canal instead of fifty-eight.

Mr. POUPORE. There is no 58 miles of canal to be built via the Ottawa and Georgian Bay route.

Mr. SPROULE. I give the figures contained in the hon. gentleman's own statement in this House.

Mr. POUPORE. If that is in my speech it is a typographical error; and it is not a fact.

Mr. SPROULE. I took it down at the time it was given, and, therefore, I thought it was correct, and I think still, though I have not had time to look it up, that "Hansard" gives it as I have stated, that there are 58 miles to be constructed. According to the papers the hon. gentleman read, there were 58 miles of canal to be built. If you want to have an all-waterway you have only to make a canal from Bradford, at the lower end of Lake Simcoe, to Toronto, a distance of 40 miles.

Mr. POUPORE. My hon. friend; I know, does not want to misrepresent me.

Mr. SPROULE. Let my hon. friend restrain himself, and I will give the figures as they are contained in "Hansard":

> It appears from the report of the surveyors made half a century ago, that of the 430 miles between Georgian Bay and Montreal only about 58 would need to be canalized.

How am I misrepresenting the hon. gentleman? I understood he gave the figures in the report which he presented to this House as reliable, and I think I should be allowed to criticise his statement as he gave it to the House.

Mr. POUPORE. The hon. gentleman is exceedingly unfair.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not unfair when I criticise the hon. gentleman's own figures, as given by himself.

Mr. POUPORE. If the hon. gentleman will look at "Hansard," page 4297, he will see where I make the following statement:—

> The figures given by Mr. Wicksteed show that by the St. Lawrence route you have 1,145 miles of lake navigation, 132 of river and 71 miles of canal, making a total of 1,348. By the Ottawa we have 575 miles of lake navigation, 372 of river navigation and 33 miles of canal.

There is your answer.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to the hon. gentleman making any statement that he desires. I have not looked into it very closely, and what he says may be correct. I have always understood that there were more than 33 miles of canal to be built in order to open up the Ottawa River. If you make this comparison, if you want an all-water and a deep water route, you can get it from the Georgian Bay for a much less cost and it will be a much better route. Therefore, I say, if the shortening of the route is going to reduce the cost of transportation at all, the arguments of the hon. gentleman is in favour of the Georgian Bay route by way of Collingwood and Toronto. The route from Parry Sound is 380 miles and millions of bushels of grain have been carried over that line by the Canada Atlantic Railway. That route is very much shorter than the one the hon. gentleman is going to have, though it is not an all-water route.

Mr. POUPORE. How many millions of bushels of grain went over that route?

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from memory, I would say 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 last year. The hon. gentleman who spoke to-night (Mr. Belcourt) said that the Ottawa and Georgian Bay route would reduce the cost of transportation by 50 per cent. If you have a shorter route than this could you carry grain for less money? If you have a route owned partly by a private corporation, which must collect canal dues in order to recoup itself for the expenditure which it has made, how is it possible to carry cheaper than by way of Government canals where there are no canal dues at all?

Mr. POUPORE. By shortening the distance.

Mr. SPROULE. But I have shown that the distance is longer, and if the Government undertook to construct the canal by way of Toronto and the Georgian Bay, as a Government work, there would be no canal dues, it would be doubly an argument in favour of the Toronto-Georgian Bay route as against the Ottawa and Georgian Bay route. I have here the report of the International Deep Waterways Commission, which was appointed by the Governments of Canada and the United States a few years ago, to look into this question and report to their respective Governments how rapidly to increase the trade between the east and west. The commission's report, so far as I have been able to look over it hurriedly, has not a single word to say in regard to this highway. This commission, which was instructed to go into this subject exhaustively, did not consider it worth while to say anything in regard to this route. They did not seem to consider it of sufficient importance to present a report calling the attention of their respective Governments to it. That does not speak volumes for the value of that route. If you compare that route with the route from Owen Sound you will find that the route from Owen Sound is shorter. The routes by way of Parry Sound and by way of Collingwood are much shorter; the route by way of Midland is 97 miles shorter. How can you reduce the

cost of transportation 50 per cent, which was said by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) would be the result of the construction of this canal? We want some better figures and some better evidence than have been presented to convince us that that would be accomplished. The hon. gentleman has given us no information as to what it would cost to carry a bushel of wheat from Chicago to Montreal by way of this route, comparing it with all other routes. He gave us nothing but a bare, bald statement which is not supported by any evidence.

Mr. POUPORE. Will my hon. friend allow me one word? I know he does not mean to be unfair, I am sure. He will find the facts and figures in the report of Mr. Thomas C. Clarke. In a supplementary report in 1898, all these facts are there. It requires, of course, looking into them, to understand them. I can understand why the hon. gentleman makes these statements; it is because he has not looked into these figures.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that I have not. But I know that the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) professed to lay all these facts and figures, in reference to this question, which set forth the evidence in support of this proposition before this House, and if he did not think it worth while to submit these figures that justifies me in not referring to them. I took it for granted that the hon. gentleman had submitted all the facts.

Mr. BELCOURT. I gave the reference at the time that I mentioned the facts. I mentioned the figures and I said that I did not want to weary the House with all the details.

Mr. SPROULE. If these hon. gentlemen did not put these facts before the House they are not in a position to find fault. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) comes out in a very fulsome eulogy of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), which to me was a most amusing thing. It was either a threat or an invitation to be bought—I do not know which. He said "I am not so hide-bound in my politics—this is not a party question—but what I would support any Government, Conservative or Reform, which will take up this work and carry it through.

Mr. POUPORE. That is right.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that he was strongly in favour of any Government and that he was prepared to support any Government that is prepared to take this work up and carry it through. Was it a threat, if they would not take it up, made so as to force it upon them, or was it an invitation that "I am willing to be bought if they will take it up"? I will leave it to the hon. gentleman to settle with the Government. I do not think the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) entertains so high an opinion of this scheme as the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) says he does, because I have here a letter which he submitted to the Liverpool, Eng., Board of Trade, and I have read it over carefully and I do not see in it that the Minister (Mr. Tarte) eulogizes this scheme. He says:

Ottawa, May 8, 1899.

Thomas H. Barker, Esq.,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce,
Liverpool.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of the resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool in reference to the project of the Georgian Bay Canal.

That question has been receiving a good deal of attention at the hands of the Canadian public men during the last years. But the enterprise is of such magnitude as to make it necessary to look carefully into it.

The Dominion has built, at large expense, a complete system of canals from the great lakes to the St. Lawrence. That system is now being completed and perfected. The Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Public Works are actively working in that direction. The River St. Lawrence from Quebec to Montreal is being improved with every possible speed.

Now, the Georgian Bay, on Lake Huron, is very rapidly becoming an accumulating point for western trade. The Dominion Government is completing what is known here as the Trent Valley system, which consists of works of lockage destined to bind between themselves several spendid water stretches. That new waterway will be 200 miles long, and will give communication during seven months of the year between Midland, on the Georgian Bay, and the Bay of Quinté, on Lake Ontario. The Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway has its terminal point at Parry Sound, another port on the Georgian Bay. The distance from Parry Sound to Montreal is about 380 miles. Last year that railway had handled about 15,000,000 bushels of grain, besides a large quantity of other merchandise. Collingwood is also a port on the Georgian Bay. Between Collingwood and Toronto, on Lake Ontario, the distance is 70 miles. The Toronto Board of Trade and a great many far-seeing public men believe that the construction by the Government of a railway connecting Collingwood with Toronto would shorten the distance between the great lakes and the St. Lawrence route, and thereby develop a very large traffic.

I take the liberty of giving you these details, in order to call the attention of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce to the large undertakings that are now under way in the Dominion, in view of diverting to British and Canadian channels as much as posible of the western trade. I may be permitted to add that the port of Montreal, which is the receiving point of that trade, and also the head of ocean navigation, is being improved as speedily as possible.

While I have the privilege of addressing the Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool, I must say that we, on this side of the ocean, cannot understand the reasons why the English underwriters have increased their rates in a way so detrimental to the interests of the Dominion. During the last three years the St. Lawrence River has been made safer than it has ever been before. A careful testing and sweeping of its channel has been carried out under the control of my department. The curves and bends of the river has been widened. Several parts of the

river have been deepened. The buoy system has been attended to with every possible attention. I hope, sir, that the chamber of commerce will pardon me for entering into these considerations. But I have thought that perhaps they would be of some interest, as there is such a large trade between Liverpool and the Dominion.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours very truly,
J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Mr. BERGERON. Who signed that letter?

Mr. SPROULE. J. Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works of the Dominion of Canada, and it is dated Ottawa, 8th of May, about a month before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Poupore) made his speech in this House. I wonder the hon. gentleman (Mr. Poupore) did not read that letter to the House when he was eulogizing the Minister of Public Works, and saying that he felt satisfied from what had been said by the Minister (Mr. Tarte) and by the First Minister that they were prepared to carry out this scheme. Shortly after confederation, this was a subject submitted to the Canal Commissioners who were appointed to report to the Government on the best waterways in the country, and these commissioners put this very route on the deferred list as a route that might be available some time in the future history of Canada, but not a route which was worthy of consideration then. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Klock) spoke very strongly in favour of this project, and he did his duty and nothing but his duty, and he has quite as intelligent a knowledge in regard to it as the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but he said nothing which might not be said by any member of the House. He read extracts from "Hansard" of years ago, as to what was said by Mr. Alex. Mackenzie and Sir Charles Tupper, at the time an election was going on in an Ottawa River district. They said they thought it would be a great waterway for the country, but in connection with that, it is sufficient to say that there was an election going on at the time. It sounded very much like what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) would say, if he were speaking today in a county where there was an election going on, and in the hope of inducing the people to vote for his Government. I repeat that the solution of the transportation problem, if it is to be found in any deep waterway scheme, will ultimately be found in the canal from Georgian Bay between Collingwood and Toronto. The highest estimate that was ever made of the cost of this project was $23,000,000. That undertaking, if carried out at all, should be carried out by the Government of Canada, and then there would be no canal tolls to increase the cost of transportation. In my judgment it is a shorter route, a better route and a more direct one from the west to Montreal. But, Sir, with the competition we have at the present day on these various routes, Owen Sound, Collingwood, Midland, Parry Sound, and all these others, and considering the other routes that are looming up in the future, when you make a comparison of all these there is nothing that can be said in favour of the route now before the House. I am free to admit that the hon. member (Mr. Poupore) presented one argument that perhaps might have something in it. If the depth of water by this route was what it should be, then in the event of international troubles, our navy could be moved through the interior of the country without any danger of interference from opposing forces. We hope at least that through the wisdom and intelligence of the two nations, there is not likely to arise any international complications that would necessitate our requiring any such military route for a very long time to come. It is a very heavy undertaking either for the Government or for any private company. If the scheme were undertaken at all with a view of lessening the cost of transportation, it would have to be undertaken by the Government and the country bear the expense, so that there would not be canal tolls to increase the cost of transportation as would be the case if it were controlled by a private corporation. On the other hand, it does not in my judgment, give the depth of water we ought to have to make transportation as free and as valuable as would be necessary in the interests of this country. The undertaking would involve as large an outlay as the Collingwood and Toronto route; in fact, in my judgment, it would involve a larger outlay, and would not be as valuable a route. In view of these considerations, I think the Government would be unwise to give to this scheme the support which its promoters ask. It is said, that there would not be a dollar required until the scheme was undertaken. We had the same argument presented to us in the case of the Chignecto Ship Railway; and, when people had invested a large amount of money in that undertaking, they came to this Parliament, and said: "It is unfair for us to lose all that money, and we shall be unable to complete the scheme unless you come to our assistance." So it would be in this case. They would find it much more expensive than they expect, and, after they had spent a large amount of money and found themselves unable to finish the work according to the terms of the agreement they had entered into, there would be reflections on the Government and on Canada because they had been allowed to undertake a very difficult, if not an impracticable scheme, and to invest in it a large amount of money, with no hope that they would ever get any return, and they would ask the Government to recoup them for their outlay. We do not want a repetition of the history of the Chignecto Ship Canal in this country. That has been a very costly, but a very important, experience to

us, and we ought to profit by it. Therefore, I cannot support this scheme, and I think the Government would be wise to refuse to give it the sanction and support which its promoters ask them to give.

Mr. CASEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 13th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—PRESENTATION OF PAPERS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I desire to lay on the Table a statement of the combined engine and car mileage covering all the sections; report of Engineer McLeod on the Drummond County Railway; further report of Mr. McLeod on the same road, accompanied by a report from the Deputy Minister; copy of an Order in Council connected therewith; statement of the maintenance and repair charges upon the Grand Trunk lines from St. Lambert to Point St. Charles; statement of maintenance and repair charges upon the Chaudière joint section.

Mr. FOSTER. On that point I may say that I am extremely grateful that these returns have come; but they are not of the slightest use to me, thrown into my face two or three minutes before I have to rise and speak on the question.

The PRIME MINISTER. You know them by heart.

Mr. FOSTER. I never saw them, nor did any one else.

DEPARTMENT OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of making the law what it was supposed to be by the director and officers of the department. The Auditor General raised an objection to the appointment of an officer, who had been appointed about a year ago, on the ground that the appointment was not in accordance with the Act. Upon reference to the Department of Justice it was ascertained that the proper construction of the Act was that a person could not be employed for temporary work in connection with the Geological Survey unless he possessed the full qualifications required for a permanent officer under section 4 of the Act. So that to all intents and purposes the law prevented the director from procuring the appointment temporarily of officers possessed of technical qualifications. This Bill is for the purpose of removing that difficulty, and permitting the Minister, on the requisition of the head of the department, as provided by the Act, to employ persons temporarily who do not possess the qualifications required for permanent officers of the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Minister state what specific cases this Bill is intended to cover? What are the names of the officers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The name of the officer was Mr. McLeish.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Interior. He said: The reason for the introduction of this Bill is almost precisely similar to the reason which caused the introduction of the Bill which I have just explained with regard to the Geological Survey. The Civil Service Act passed in 1895 recognized the appointment to positions in the service of certain gentlemen who were then in the service; but upon the death of one of them, Mr. Dufresne, who was a computer under the chief astronomer of my department, an attempt was made to fill his place, whereupon the Auditor General took the ground that we had no power to appoint a technical officer except by complying with the regular requirements of the Civil Service Act. We had either to appoint a temporary officer at $400, or appoint him a second-class clerk. We could not secure the services of a gentleman qualified to fill the position at $400 a year, we had no second-class clerkship vacant, and we had no desire to create a second-class clerkship for that purpose. I can perhaps explain the matter better by reading a memorandum from the chief astronomer of the department, explaining the position of affairs with regard to these officers. He says:

There are at present employed in this kind of work (that is, technical work in the office of the

Surveyor General) 25 or 30 men at salaries ranging from $600 to $1,500, who were appointed previous to 1895. In 1895 the Civil Service Act, section 47, was amended so as to abolish the class of temporary technical officers. By this amendment and a recent ruling all employees at Ottawa come under the provision of the Civil Service Act as either permanent officials or as temporary or extra clerks. The latter may be continued in employment at the same, but not at an increased, salary, but no others can be appointed to fill vacancies or to provide for necessary expansion, except at the salary of $400. There is no provision for any appointment between $400 and $1,100, the salary of a second-class clerk. The practical difficulties of this are as follows:—In case of vacancy, the salary of $400 is quite insufficient to secure men of the education and training required; otherwise, the only alternative appointment in the classified service, at $1,100 or upwards, would be usually inexpedient in the case of a new man untrained in the office routine, apart altogether from the restrictions upon a permanent appointment which would in the general case make that impossible. In case additional assistance is required for the time being in any branch, no salary can be paid higher than $400, which, as above stated, is insufficient. The business plan of training young men to their work would exactly meet the requirements of the department as to this class of service, but it cannot be followed under the present law; for no young man of education such as would fit him for taking hold of this kind of work would be likely to accept $400 a year, with the chance of rising to $600 after seven years, and no prospect of receiving more, however long he remained in the service, unless fortunate enough to secure entrance into the necessarily limited permanent service. The present law works badly as regards those now in the service as temporaries, for, without chance of increase of salary, a strong incentive to energetic work is wanting.

The cases that arose were first that of Mr. Dufresne, who was employed in the office as computer. He died in February, 1898. Mr. Louis Gauthier, one of the temporary technical clerks, was shortly afterwards transferred from the Surveyor General's office to fill his place, and Mr. Langlois, a surveyor, was at the same time appointed in the Surveyor General's office in Mr. Gauthier's place at a salary of $900 per annum; but under the construction of the law, the Auditor General, backed up by the Department of Justice, held that we could only pay $400 in these cases. We have also a number of these technical officers who have been in the department for several years, and it is impossible to give them an increase of pay under the present rule. At the present time an additional computer is required in the astronomer's office, and we cannot get a man to take that position at $400. The Bill is intended to enable the Minister to employ temporarily in professional or technical work, a person who is reported by the Deputy Minister and the head of the branch in whose branch he is to work, to be qualified for the work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand the hon. gentleman's explanation, under the general Act, technical officers can only be appointed at the minimum salary of $400, and he wishes to have the power to appoint them at a larger salary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, between $400 and $1,100, and without making a permanent clerkship.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE DOMINION LANDS ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: This Bill is for the purpose, in the first place, of altering the terms upon which the Government can sell school lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. At present we can only sell on the terms of one-fifth cash and four equal annual instalments thereafter. It is the general opinion, in which I quite agree, that a better price can be secured in case a sale takes place, if the terms of the sale could be made more favourable, and the proposition is to amend the law, so that in case a sale takes place, it may be on the terms of ten equal annual instalments instead of five. The next amendment relates to the law authorizing the Government to deal with the half-breeds of the North-west with regard to the issue of scrip. We are sending to the Athabasca district a commission for the purpose of making a treaty with the Indians there, so that they may cede to the Crown territory not hitherto conceded, and which is now being more or less traversed by white settlers. There is a large number of half-breeds in that territory, and it is beyond question that they will require to be settled with at or about the same time that the Indians are dealt with and that no treaty can be successfully negotiated with the Indians unless that is done. The law at present only enables the Government to give scrip on the basis of the half-breeds who were entitled to it on the 15th of July, 1870, and was passed for the purpose of applying to the half-breeds in the immediate neighbourhood of Red River. Of course, that date has no application whatever to the Athabasca district, and we purpose taking power to deal with this question on the basis of giving all the half-breeds who are entitled to it scrip up to the time they are dealt with. The same amendment would enable us to deal with the disputed cases in the North-west Territories, and to give scrip to half-breeds there who have been, since the settlement of 1885, urging that they should be dealt with upon the same principle as that on which we now propose to deal with the half-breeds of Athabasca district.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this Bill would enable him to deal with the claims of the half-breeds,

not only in Athabasca but all over the territory. Does he intend to deal with the claims of the half-breeds at Willow Bunch, south of Moose Jaw ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What I mean is this. The hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that since scrip was issued to the half-breeds, immediately after the rebellion in 1885, there has been a large number of half-breeds there who claim that, as the children born between 1870 and 1885, of the half-breeds who were dealt with in 1885, they should receive scrip as well as their parents, and that is what the Government propose to recognize by taking the authority referred to in the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the clause dealing with the sale of school lands simply mean that for the future there shall be ten instalments instead of five, or is it retroactive ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not retroactive.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAND TITLES ACT OF 1894.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149) further to amend the Land Titles Act of 1894. He said : This is a matter of detail which has arisen under the Real Property Act of the North-west Territories. Under section 121 of that Act, as amended by section 17, chapter 32 of the Statutes of 1898, there is a provision for the cancellation, alteration or abandonment of plans. Along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a number of town plots were surveyed on a much more extensive scale than subsequent settlement and growth have shown to be necessary, and the result is that in the immediate neighbourhood of some of these places, there are large blocks surveyed into town plots, which are of no use as town lots, and it becomes a matter of public policy to provide for the cancellation of the plans so that the lands may be used for farming purposes. A difficulty has arisen by reason of the fact that the court has held that these plans cannot be cancelled under our legislation unless each separate lot is brought under the provisions of the Act and a certificate of title issued for it. The cost of bringing these lands under the Act, in many cases, would exceed the actual value of the land : and this amendment is for the purpose of enabling the plans to be cancelled without going through the formality of taking out a separate certificate for each lot.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SCARLET FEVER AMONG THE GALICIANS.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a statement that appears in the newspapers of June 8th, to the effect that scarlet fever has broken out among the Galicians at Saltcoats and near Yorktown. Has the hon. gentleman any more definite information than has appeared in the newspapers on this subject ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). There have been two or three cases of disease dealt with amongst the immigrants, but just at this moment I cannot say whether the particular one mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has been dealt with ; but I can ascertain in half an hour, and let him know.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a return that has been brought down. It will be within the recollection of the House that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stated to me, on June 9th, that a supplementary return or explanation of a matter of some importance had been laid on the Table of the House by him, and, to use his own language, " It was handed to the Clerk, and I saw the Clerk hand it over to the hon. gentleman," meaning myself. I want to say, that that observation had reference to an incomplete return of the correspondence between members of the Government and Mr. Frederick Peters. I had pointed out that a very important date had been admitted in connection with the return. A cipher telegram from Mr. Peters to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was mentioned as having been received, and what purported to be the reply to that telegram was given, but without date. The date, under the circumstances, was the most important part of the return. I called attention to that on several occasions, and on June 9th the Minister of the Interior made the statement to which I have referred. That statement is incorrect. I was not handed such document by the Clerk, but since then, I was handed a document, which I have here, by one of the officers of the House, as being possibly the document the Minister of the Interior referred to, and it is as follows :—

Ottawa, 3rd May, 1899.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper having called attention to the fact some days ago in the House of Commons, that a return which was made to an Order of 24th April, 1899, respecting correspondence between Mr. Frederick Peters and the members of the Government was incomplete in that it did not give the date of the cipher telegram received or the date of the reply, the date of the cipher telegram is the 5th of May, 1898 ; the date of the reply cannot be ascertained, but it is stated by Sir Louis Davies to be the 5th or 6th of May, 1898. This letter may be shown to

any member of the House desirous of procuring the information it contains.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

This document was not handed to me by the Clerk. Moreover, it is in no sense a compliance with the very reasonable request I make under the Order of the House. This document, of course, cannot go on the Orders of the Day, and the document I ask for ought to go on the Orders of the Day. I am not myself concerned in it, and I am, for that reason, all the more anxious in the matter. The Order of the House was, that the correspondence should be laid on the Table of the House, and, when the return was made to this Order, these dates were omitted. It was an incomplete return on the face of it, and I called the Minister's attention to the fact and to the necessity, not for the writing of such a letter as this, addressed, as this is, to Sir John Bourinot, the Clerk of the House, but that, in the ordinary course, the Government should cause a supplementary return to be brought down. This is all the more important, because, in some extraordinary way, the Committee on Printing hurried through the report for the printing of the incomplete return. That, of course, has not been approved by the House, nor would it be. It would be obviously unfair to all concerned, because the return is incomplete. If the wish of the Printing Committee were complied with, when the return is printed, the facts given in this letter cannot appear, because this letter is not a return, in any sense. I call the attention of the Treasury benches to this omission and this irregularity, so that the information given in this informal letter may be included in a supplementary return. There cannot possibly be any objection to that. I wish to say distinctly, that I never saw this letter, and, if I had seen it, I would at once have said it was not the document I was asking for. I am not asking for the information for myself, for I know the facts, but for the record, and so that the record may be complete.

While I am on my feet, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to a conversation we had in Supply before his estimates were carried, respecting a return in connection with Inspector Russell. The hon. gentleman made me a promise—and I want to remind him of it—to have the return completed at an early day. I am particularly anxious to have it as soon as possible, and would be much obliged, if the hon. gentleman would give it more than the ordinary attention.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I wrote to my deputy the day the hon. gentleman called the matter to my attention.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) would kindly jog the memory of his officers, I should be obliged. I desire also to refer to the case of the Bauer application. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stated on the 8th of June, the day I handed him the letter of Mr. Bauer across the floor of the House, that he had immediately given instructions to his deputy to see the chairman of the Board of Examiners, and endeavour to meet my wishes, if possible, and he had had no reply. I would be glad, if the hon. gentleman would say, when he expects to deal with that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The matter has escaped my memory, and I cannot give the hon. gentleman a reply at once. As I said, I gave instructions that it should be done, and I will ascertain, and let the hon. gentleman know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose that the reason why the telegram to Mr. Peters came down undated was as follows:—The telegram received by me from him was in cipher, and I translated it, and gave it to the Minister of the Interior. He gave me his answer, and I telegraphed to Mr. Peters the answer he gave me. I wrote the answer at the foot of his telegram, and did not date it. When I was applied to as to the date, I told Mr. Sifton it must have been either the same day or the day following the receipt of Mr. Peters' telegram. The copy I had did not give the date, but I knew it must have been the same day or the day following, because of some correspondence I subsequently had with Mr. Peters.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) will see that the point is important. I knew no more what was in the cipher telegram than any other member of this House did. Mr. Peters, who was then intending to form a partnership with me and who at that time had no more partnership with me than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, happened to have a cipher code with me. In that cipher, as he has explained, he asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to use my cipher with him; but on no occasion did he tell me what was in the cipher, nor was it a matter of my business. I told the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what the cipher code was, and that was used. But the date is important, both as regards Mr. Peters' statements and my own statements in this House, and to show that we were not partners in any sense. We were merely friends at that time, intending to form a partnership, but which was not formed for some months afterwards, and I have not been able to understand why, when that matter was fully before the Government, these dates were omitted and were not supplied.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The reason they are omitted is because my copy does not contain them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The return does not show it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The way it can be supplemented is by letter from myself as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I regret that my copy does not contain the dates.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not quarrel with the contents of this letter. If they come down as a supplementary return, that is all I ask.

POSTMASTER AT NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) whether a report is true which came to me a day or two ago to the effect that the postmaster of the town of North Sydney, county of Cape Breton, had been dismissed, or was about being dismissed. I am informed that he had been dismissed, and that a successor had been called upon to furnish bonds. If the report is true, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is the cause of his dismissal ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to renew that question to-morrow, I will make inquiry in the meantime. I am not able from memory to say anything on the subject.

REPORT OF THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

Mr. CLANCY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) when the report of the Minister of Justice will be down. I desire to call his attention to the fact that it is some two months late in coming down.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I will inquire and answer the question to-morrow.

I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—PURCHASE OF THE DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that Bill (No. 133) to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway, be read the third time.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I propose to make some remarks on both the Grand Trunk Railway and Drummond County arrangements, and it may as well be done on this Bill as on the second. I had already, at an earlier stage in the day's proceedings, entered my protest against a method which has become all too common in this House, of a Minister absolutely refusing to supplement his promise to bring down returns of information, and then, at the last moment, just before a gentleman has to rise and discuss the question, to fling some papers upon the Table of this House. It is a way which is not courteous, which has not before been practised in this House, and which, although I am not going further to protest against it at this moment by delaying the Bill. I still treasure in my memory, and I propose to make it one of account if the same thing is done hereafter. No Government that ever I have been acquainted with has, at any stage in parliamentary history, so absolutely and persistently refused to bring down the most necessary information, as has been done in this Government by the present Minister of Railways and Canals ; and although a somewhat salutary lesson has been taught him, it would appear as if that lesson was not quite sufficient, and would have to be supplemented at a later date. Having made my protest against this uncourteous and unbusinesslike, and unparliamentary method of procedure, I will come to the question in hand.

After the discussions of 1897, 1898 and 1899, I am not going to weary the House by a historical review of the whole question of the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway arrangements. That has been debated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with great ability, at great length, and with great force, and it is not necessary for me to traverse the arguments those gentlemen have made any more than I can help, in pointing the remarks I wish to make. Those arguments, I may say en passant, have not been met, either by the gentlemen upon the Ministerial benches, or by those who support the Government, in any adequate and fair way. Now, as we are coming to the crucial point of the third reading of these Bills, let me ask the House briefly to go with me over certain points ; and, first, with reference to the circumstances under which these two matters came before the House. In the first place it will be proper to remember that in regard to these two matters, the purchase of the Drummond County road and the lease arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, involving, as it has been stated here, and as the House knows well, a capital sum amounting to in the neighbourhood of $7,000,000, I say that at no period in the history of this Parliament was, by discussion or by resolution, the least hint given by this House, which has control of the expenditures of the country, that such an arrangement would be desirable, or that steps should be taken to carry it out.

The Liberal Government and the Liberal party which, while it was in Opposition, at least, always professed a very great regard for the liberties of the people, the rights

of Parliament and the initiative of Parliament, in reference to these great expenditures, went to work on the eve of a session of Parliament and behind the back of Parliament, made this contract, bound the Government and the party which supports the Government, as that party must always be bound by the Government to support a contract entered into without their knowledge or consent, and the reversal of which policy would mean, of course, a change of Government, or at least, a new electoral contest before the people. I say that the first fact that we ought to keep in our minds in approaching this subject is that they entered into this contract without authorization or previous discussion of any kind in this House, that they have practically tied the hands of this House by entering into a contract without having been authorized in the least to do so. This although unparliamentary and unconstitutional in itself, except in matters of urgency, ought to be especially so considered by Liberals who have professed Liberal doctrines, and who have heretofore, at least, been very strong in their criticisms of any lapses from any proper recognition of the rights of Parliament. Again, Sir, I make bold to say to this House that if it will refer to its own experience, to the records in "Hansard," or to the contemporary history of debate in this House and in this country, it will find this second fact staring it in the face, namely, that in the face of these two large operations, involving such a large amount of money as I have stated, there has been an almost utter lack of anything like a technical and proper examination, investigation or reports upon which generally all measures of this kind, ministerial and governmental, are based. I think hon. gentlemen would search the records of this House in vain for the report of any of the technical traffic officers of the Intercolonial Railway going into the question minutely to show this Parliament what would be the probable effect of the traffic arrangements, of the bargain and the contract as far as Government is concerned, and yet, Sir, the arrangement, so far as the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned, ties us hand and foot for ninety-nine years, and practically for all time. One would have thought that an inexperienced Minister would have been anxious to have fortified his position by getting the most exhaustive reports from the technical officers connected with the railway management, getting all the data and facts which they could gather in order to base the conclusion for such an arrangement as he has made upon that data. Nowhere can we find it. We find, in the first place, that the contract was entered in and that up to the day that the contract was entered into there was not even a proper engineering report made to the Minister in reference to the Drummond County Railway, which he proposed to buy out and out from the company. Not even a single engineer's report, while standing in the face of the Government and of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was the cautious sentence in the official report of Mr. Schreiber, his Deputy Minister, who said in so many English words: I think such and such in reference to the Drummond County Railway, but I have never been over it, and I cannot speak from experience. If the Government propose to enter into an arrangement to lease or buy the road I would suggest that the right thing to do would be to have an exhaustive examination made of it first. With that standing in the face of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and with that before the Government, neither he nor the Government had the proper officer to make a proper investigation and report upon the road until the day that he had practically signed the contract and made it binding on the Government and on the party in this House. These are two very important points. First, in the face of the status and condition of that road it is proposed to buy it and pay for it and to make a 99 year arrangement with the Grand Trunk without having obtained the opinions of men who are versed in railway matters, of men whose lives have been spent in that work, of technical officers who understand traffic arrangements, the movements of freight, and are able to give distinct and well-reasoned opinions upon the effect that would result from that arrangement, such as was being entered into by the Intercolonial Railway upon the terms upon which it was based. If these reports have been asked for, or if they have been got by the hon. Minister of Railways, he has kept them in his pocket with that due diligence and care which he seems to keep everything in reference to matters coming before this House, either concealed about his person or in the pigeon-holes of his department. In the next place, we may mention another circumstance in reference to this transaction. This matter seems to have been sprung very early after the elections of 1896, in which the party opposite made an herculean effort to dispossess the then Government and get the reins of power. In addition to the public professions their supporters made in Parliament and in the country, it was necessary to gain the support of influential men and classes to enable them to gain power. Very shortly after the elections of 1896 the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals embarks upon a negotiation in reference to the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, and this is negotiated with a gentleman named Greenshields, from the city of Montreal. What are the circumstances of the case? Before 1894 Mr. Greenshields, a lawyer and business man in the city of Montreal, against whom professionally I have nothing to say and do not wish to be

understood as having the least thing to say —had, in reference to this particular road, the Drummond County, been presented with a gift of $50,000 worth of stock, or 500 of its 4,000 shares, without any financial consideration being given at all. A little later on he becomes the possessor of 800 shares of the 4,000 shares of the stock sold to him by the promoters and directors of the road for $24,000, making him the owner, at that time, of 1,300 shares out of 4,000 shares, or about one-third of the whole stock of the company. Then, Sir, about that time, Mr. Greenshields gets an option for a large block of stock, which option is carried on, and the major part of it is availed of—when ? When the contract had been made and signed by the hon. Minister of Railways for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, when in the end, Mr. Greenshields became the possessor of 1,376 more shares out of the 4,000 at par, according to the evidence, and so became the possessor altogether of 2,676 shares out of the 4,000 shares of stock. Thus that gentleman, interested in this way, interested in so strong a sense financially, seemed to have a complete knowledge of the result and progress of this negotiation, for he was the man with whom the negotiation was carried on. He knew just how long to make his option carry and just when to take the option up, and it was with this gentleman, with this adherent of the party, that the hon. Minister of Railways sat down to make a bargain for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. Now, Sir, what other circumstances are there in connection with that ?

We will go next to the property itself, as to which the remarks I shall make on that point will be better brought out. With reference to the Drummond County Railway property ; what was it at the time the Minister of Railways approached Mr. Greenshields in order to effect the purchase. It was a small railroad, which was at that time, and by the very force of circumstances, perfectly isolated. It commenced at Ste. Rosalie, having no connections towards the west ; it ended at Moose Park, having no line built from that towards the east. It had some kind of a traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, not for practical purposes, but for prospective purposes, by which it had for a certain rental the right of user on the Chaudière section, so known now, for a period of ninety-nine years. Of itself it was a road which in its isolation was of small value by the very fact of its being isolated. A small road, 90 miles in length with its branch, put in there, between the Grand Trunk Railway line and a blank where no road was built, and with reference to which the Drummond County Company did not seem to be able to get the capital to build the extension. The portion of line that lay there isolated as it was, was by that very fact limited in its value to a very considerable extent. The road was not only an isolated road, but it was an unproductive road ; it could not help but be unproductive. Its passenger list amounted to almost nothing. Its freight was confined to two or three of the cheapest kind of freight that could be handled by a road. Not having connections either east or west, it was impossible for its traffic to be anything else but a mere local traffic, and limited at that. Its position was such that the company, not being able to build a connecting line through to the Chaudière section, it was even in a worse plight, so far as the productiveness of its trade was concerned. It is true, that returns are given for the three last years, ending 1897, which shows a net average earning of about $30,000 ; but no one who has read the evidence and has gone over the history of the road, will, I think, deny the fact that, if the proper equipment had been kept up, and the road had been properly maintained from its revenues, in so far as a road is maintained from its revenues, there not only would not have been $33,000 of a net revenue for the last three years, but there would have been practically no net revenue at all—and I believe that if the matter were thoroughly gone into, it would be found that there would have been a deficit, instead of a net earning, during those three years.

What else with reference to this road ? This road at that time was bankrupt, and it is not saying too much to say that. The road at that time owed a large floating debt, and on the 30th June, 1897, I find, by page 98 of the evidence, that the floating debt owed by that road was $298,396. Bonds had been issued to the extent of $1,000,000, and all of these bonds were, I believe, in the hands of the Eastern Townships Bank, which held them as collateral for large advances that were made ; practically no more money could be raised on these as a collateral security. So that, with the floating debt it owed, with its stock taken up, as it was, and with its bonds hypothecated for large advances which had been made by the Eastern Townships Bank, mainly, I do not think it is too much to say, that the road in that condition was a bankrupt road. What more do we find ? As corroborative of this we find that in 1894 the owners of the road were willing to sell the portion that was built then, for $500,000, and actually gave an option upon it for that. We find that at another period they were willing to sell the completed road at that time, with all its appurtenances and its rolling stock, whatever that might amount to, for $400,000, and had given an option for that amount. These are undisputed points ; they are well known ; they were brought out in the evidence, and they were sworn to by those who were interested in the Drummond County road itself. The road had practically been built from subsidies got from the Dominion Government, from the Quebec Government, and

some slight subsidies from the municipalities. It is a moot point, whether even the $40,000 that was claimed was paid in on the stock, was ever actually paid in at all, or whether it was not one of these transactions, which are so easily made in the changes and interchanges of construction and the like, to make appear as being paid, but which were really not paid in cash. But, granted that one point, I think it may be stated that $40,000 is the outside of the money which these gentlemen themselves put into the road, and that it was built, as to the rest, by the subsidies, which in all amount to something over $650,000, and by the advances which they had got, and for which the bank held the collateral security on their hypothecated funds. I do not think, then, it is too much to say, that the road at that period was bankrupt, and that the then valuation by the gentlemen who owned the road, was a very moderate and very low valuation.

At that point and at that peculiar junction, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) stepped into the ring, and, without a proper engineer's report, without having discussed the matter in Parliament, or got any authorization from Parliament, without having had any indication of what the trend of the view of this Parliament was with reference to that, the Minister of Railways stepped in and proposed to buy that road on a valuation of $1,600,000, and to pay it in annual instalments of $64,000 per year. Now, let there be no doubt about this one point; it was brought out in the evidence: you can bring any actuary you like, and that actuary will confirm this statement. It was provided by the Minister (Mr. Blair) that $64,000 should be paid each year for ninety-nine years, and, under the conditions that the Minister proposed to pay it, that amounted to a then present worth value for the road of $2,049,192. What is that statement, summed up? It is, that for that road, built almost entirely by Government subsidies, the whole cost of which could not be proved to have been more than $1,115,000, which the owners themselves, as to its completed portion, were willing to sell for $400,000, and the completion of which cost a little over $680,000, all told—for that road the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) offered to his friend Mr. Greenshields $1,600,000 as the basis of valuation, and proposed a scheme of paying for it which lands into the pockets of Mr. Greenshields and his co-directors $2,049,192.

That is the bargain that the Minister of Railways made under these conditions with his friend Mr. Greenshields for the Drummond County road; that is the bargain that this hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) brought down to Parliament; that is the bargain that, althought it went against their grain in many cases, his followers undoubtedly voted for; that is the bargain that the Liberal party praised, and that is the bargain that the followers behind the Government vaunted as the very best that could be made, and which this country should ratify without a word of protest. That, Sir, was the bargain, and these are the actual terms of that bargain.

Well, Sir, something happened, and what was it? After the matter had been pushed through this House the Senate reviewed it, and came to the conclusion that the bargain was such an extravagant one that they would not implement it. The Senate threw out the Bill. Hon. gentlemen then simulated a great deal of virtuous indignation, but they did not go to the point of putting their virtuous indignation to the test, which could easily have been done by their dissolving the House and appealing to the country on the measure, to see whether or not the business men of Canada were against the Senate or for the Senate in their view of this transaction. That passed, but what happened? In the breathing time that was left, the Minister of Railways, prodded on, I have no doubt, by his more discreet colleagues—and, possibly, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), to whom the bargain must from the first have been very distasteful—the Minister reviewed that first bargain; and he now comes down to this House with an altogether different proposition. What is that proposition? It is, that, instead of paying $64,000 a year for ninety-nine years, which was equal to the sum of $2,049,192, the Minister (Mr. Blair) now comes down with a proposition to pay $1,600,000 in cash, and so there has been saved over $449,000 in cash alone on the transaction of the purchase of the Drummond County road. He saves more than that. Whereas the subsidy standards would make it necessary that for the payment of the subsidy of the new portion, the Drummond County Company should build it up to a certain standard, and whereas that standard is below the Intercolonial standard, which is necessary for the proper working of that line of railway in connection with the Intercolonial, in this second arrangement the Minister of Railways stipulates that the company shall spend, or the Government shall spend for them, $100,000 on the improvements, which is $65,795 more than they would have had to expend to straighten the curves and make the improvements which they promised under the first arrangement up to Moose Park. So that on that transaction alone, the Minister, when driven to it, took out of the pocket of Mr. Greenshields and the company over $500,000 in cool cash in comparison to what the Minister proposed to give under the first transaction; and the same Government, the same party, the same party press which lauded the first arrangement as the height of wisdom and embodiment of genius in the Minister of Railways and Canals, applauds in

an equal manner this backdown to the tune of $500,000. The Senate is vindicated. Business opinion all over this country is vindicated, to that extent at least, that the first bargain made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, a bargain made on insufficient data and insufficient information, and forced through this House at the point of the bayonet, was a bargain with regard to which all he had to do was to sit down with the gentleman with whom he made the first bargain, and say to him: "Come now, the country has been roused on this, and I cannot give you as much as that; you will have to knock off $500,000—will you do it"? And he came to terms and knocked it off in a moment. Mr. Greenshields held more than one-eighth the stock, which he got for nothing; an additional one-fifth which he got for 30 cents on the dollar; and knowing that after the debts of the company were paid, he would get his proportion of the purchase money, he procured an option on a very large block of stock for a period which carried him to the point of certainty, after the Minister of Railways should put down in black and white his signature to the contract, which made it firm and made the stock valuable which it was not before. To give the figures: The saving that has been made by this second bargain, with reference to the Drummond County Railway over and above the first, is, on principal, $494,192; and on the betterments of the road, $65,799; being a total of $559,987.

There is another thing that needs to be noted in reference to this road. The Senate declared that that bargain was not a provident bargain, and refused to pass it. The Government and the Minister of Railways considered, and they determined to hold on to the arrangement; but, as the Bill was not allowed to become law, they had to introduced another feature. They came down to this House and asked for a vote of money in the Estimates; and now I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite as to the truth of this statement which I am making. When they came down in 1897 and asked this House to vote $160,000 or thereabouts to enable them to pay the rental for a limited term, the whole arrangement was absolutely based on the statement which was made that it was meant to be an experiment, to prove to the House whether or not it would be wise to implement the whole arrangement, and for the lengthened term. I am not going to trouble the House to read the extracts. They are in "Hansard" of 1897; you will find them in the discussion of June of that year. You will find that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in answer to my own question, made the statement that it was proposed to test the matter and to experiment for a few months, to satisfy the House whether or not it was financially and economically and in a business point of view a good thing to go into this arrangement permanently. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) also spoke on the question in that same debate; and his speech all through is based upon the statement which he makes over and over again that this will test the matter, and that we shall know by the trade and the outcome whether or not it will be wise for Parliament to enter into this arrangement permanently. The Minister of Railways and Canals—no doubt we all remember his prophecy—prophesied untold gain from the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal; and all through he was careful to base his demand for $160,000 on the statement that it was to be for an experiment, and that the renting of the line for a few months would give the House an idea as to trade and income, whether it should be gone into permanently. Not only the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Railways, but when the Supply Bill had went to the other House, the Attorney General of the Dominion, Sir Oliver Mowat, in that House explicitly stated in so many words that what the House was asked for was an experiment. You will find it on page 809 of the Senate Debates. He says:

> I believe the object is this, that hon. gentlemen having doubts, or more than doubts, whether the business to be done would warrant the expenditure, it is felt desirable that there should be an opportunity to us all to know by actual experience how that would be.

There could not be any straighter statement than that, that is, that the Attorney General and leader of the Government in the other House put his plea for the Supply Bill going through, so far as that vote was concerned, upon the ground that it was meant to make a business experiment, and that a few months running would contribute to the knowledge of Parliament as to the results from a business point of view. Now, Sir, that having been carried, the Government and the country having had the benefit of nine, or ten, or eleven, or twelve months—yes, at the present time fourteen months—of running, what do we find when this measure comes up for its final arbitrament in this House? We find the Minister of Railways and Canals rising in his seat, and in the first place denying that any business information of any value at all can be given with reference to the Montreal extension, including the Drummond County road; and, next, giving an absolute refusal to bring down any information in reference to it, on the ground, as he says, that it cannot be got. Why, Mr. Speaker, how is it possible that a Government or a member of a Government can escape from themselves, and from the record of consistency and good faith which a Government ought to keep, so far as to ask Parliament, on the initiative of the Minister of Railways, for a vote for running these roads for nine months on the ground

that he proposes to make it a test period, and that the business result of those nine months could be stated in the House, and would be a guide to the House in reference to a firm and fast arrangement. And then afterwards, when that money was voted for that experiment, the same Minister of Railways and the same Government come down to the House, which they had led, by that pledge, to vote the money and try the experiment, and tell it flatly and absolutely that it is impossible to give one scintilla of information with reference to the business results throughout the thirteen or fourteen months experiment.

The hon. Minister's own officers very flatly contradicted him in 1898, when in answer to inquiries—and their telegrams in reply will be found in the "Hansard," page 3750 of this session—Mr. Pottinger, over his own signature, and Mr. Schreiber, who was being examined by the committee which sat upon the Drummond County arrangement, both inferentially and almost positively declared that it is possible to give the business results of the Montreal extension, and they were so careful to make it known that that could be done, that Mr. Pottinger sent a telegram over his own signature, on the 13th May, 1898, to Mr. Schreiber, in which he said:

> No freight charged on material for Drummond County reconstruction or equipment entering into the earnings of the Montreal extension for March, as per statement sent you.

That was for the month of March. Mr. Pottinger, general superintendent of the whole system, sent in a statement of the earnings of the Montreal extension, and to show that it cannot be misread, he said: I was careful to keep out any charge for freight on materials for the Drummond County Railway construction entering into that account. Why? Because evidently they were proceeding on Sir Oliver Mowat's statement and the statement of Sir Richard Cartwright and the statement of the Minister of Public Works, that that was a trial and experimental period, and that they must be very careful to make the statement correct and keep out the material that should not be counted in in order that Parliament might have the proper information. Yet to-day, when we ask for information before we implement the contract, thirteen months after the road has begun running under this arrangement and auspices, the Minister of Railways absolutely states that it is impossible to tell what are the earnings and expenditures of the extension, and consequently what comparative position the Montreal extension is in.

Now, I come to the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement. You may say of that exactly what we have said of the Drummond Railway. In so far as it was unauthorised by any previous action of Parliament, in so far as it was entered into by the Minister, in so far as the contract was made by the Government and the hands of the Government party, and consequently of this House, tied with reference to the matter, notwithstanding the expense and the long years of the existence of this contract, with all the consequence that this entails, that contract stands on all fours with the other, and I shall not repeat my remarks on that score with reference to it.

Let us come to the arrangements which were made, in the first place, with the Grand Trunk Railway. All the king's horses and all the king's men have not sufficed to draw from the Minister of Railways the frank avowal that consideration has ameliorated the first bargain which he made with the Grand Trunk Railway as it did the bargain which he made with the Drummond County road. One concession, and only one, have we been able to wring from him, and that is that he does not in the second bargain, pay the $6,000 a year rental for the ninety-nine years for the Chaudière section, and that the rental he was to pay on the other section has not been augmented so as to make up the difference.

I propose to briefly contrast the first bargain with the second. Here we find the same lack of any consecutive and well-reasoned method of getting at a basis of information upon which to negotiate. Not yet has the Minister of Railways put before this House the reports of any of his officials charged with going down to the Grand Trunk Railway to examine its terminals, its roads, its bridges, and make some estimate as to the cost and value of those terminals and those portions of the road to be used. It is true that when the investigation was going on before the committee, which Mr. Schreiber and the Minister of Railways attended, the hon. Minister produced a memorandum which, in his office in Ottawa, Mr. Schreiber had made up, giving a set of figures upon no plan at all, including half the value of some of the property, the whole value of some of the rest of the property, and in which Mr. Schreiber made up in this haphazard way a statement of valuations of terminals and divided that into two, and recommended that half the cost be paid at the rate of 5 per cent per annum interest. One would have thought that the hon. Minister, when entering into negotiations for a franchise so costly, so connected with the great franchises of this country, the Intercolonial Railway, that when once the two were joined it was practically impossible they should ever be disjoined—one would have thought that the Minister would have entered into that on some basis of information, that he would have first made an estimate of the cost and values of the Grand Trunk Railway pro-

perty in the terminals, in the bridge and in the road, in order to have some basis for his negotiations with the Grand Trunk Company. But nothing of that kind appeared. It is sought for in vain in the records of this Parliament. You cannot find the report of an engineer dealing with that subject brought down to this Parliament. All that we have is the fragmentary memorandum which was brought out in evidence before the Drummond County Committee. What is the basis upon which the terminals have been taken? Let us set down, as a basis of this whole arrangement, that whatever we get, no matter whether we pay rent for it beforehand or do not, we pay for the maintenance of it on the basis of car and engine mileage. The rent of the terminals and the rent of the Ste. Rosalie branch and the bridge, and the like, are in the nature of a retainer which you give to a lawyer to ally him to your case, so that he will not take your opponent's, and then, after having paid him the retainer, you will have to pay him the actual expenses and the work he puts upon the case. These are in the way of a retainer to the Grand Trunk Railway, which was to predispose them to give us certain privileges, on a basis of payment for maintenance, calculated on the proportion of car and engine mileage. What is the basis with reference to the terminals? First, the terminals were to be valued; they were valued in the way I have spoken of by Mr. Schreiber. Then half of the cost of the terminals was to be taken, and the Minister of Railways and Canals binds the country to pay in perpetuity 5 per cent per annum upon half of the cost. This is irrespective of the fact that although he paid for half the user in the rental alone, it was not possible that he should use these terminals to anything like the extent that he paid for them; and the fact has been brought out by returns tardily brought down that for the months that have passed the proportion of our user, has been between 6 and 7 per cent. That is, we pay for one-half the cost of the terminals on the basis of 5 per cent, which is an exorbitant rate, and we use them to the extent of 6 to 7 per cent. Now, with reference to the bridge—it was stated in indefinite terms that the bridge cost ten millions of dollars. It was stated somewhere in the evidence that as good a bridge could be put up for six millions of dollars. What my hon. friend appears to have done is to pay a rental of $40,000 for the bridge and to give it in perpetuity. Now, whether the bridge cost the Grand Trunk ten millions when it was built and as it was built, does not enter into this question. The question was: What should the Intercolonial Railway contribute over and above its maintenance for the privilege of getting the user of that bridge? I think a fair estimate would have been on the basis of computing the cost of a modern bridge over the St. Lawrence, and then agree to assume one-half of that cost and agree to pay a reasonable interest on it, say, 2½ per cent. Now, if the Canadian Pacific Railway could build at Lachine a bridge sufficient for the traffic of that great road at a cost of $934,000, it is fair to assume that we could have built a bridge for not more than $2,000,000. Assuming half the cost, or $1,000,000, then the $40,000 per year represents what? It represents $1,400,000, or about one-quarter of the $6,000,000 which the indefinite estimate gave as the price of a bridge, or within $600,000 of the $2,000,000 which would certainly build an adequate bridge across the St. Lawrence at the present time. So far as the bridge is concerned, the charge is not so inordinate as the other branches of the arrangement; still, $40,000 yearly in perpetuity for the bridge, while we use a little less than ten per cent, according to the figures, is an excessive amount to pay, and we should get it for much less.

But when we come to the Ste. Rosalie branch, from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, we find the Minister of Railways and Canals accepts a basis of $50,000 a mile for the cost of building a road between those points, through a country which railway experts know to be an easy country for railway construction; and upon the half of this he agrees to pay 5 per cent. I do not think that any railway engineer would be found to say that a road could not be built from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert at $20,000 a mile at an outside figure. Why, then, this estimate of $50,000, as agreed to by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and why, in the name of all that is sensible and businesslike, should he agree that this country should pay 5 per cent when we know that it can borrow the money it wants at 2½ per cent? Now, with reference to the Chaudière Junction; that is a rental of $6,000 a year in perpetuity, but, of course, under the first agreement, for 99 years. Now, what have we besides that? We have beside that an extraordinary clause in the first agreement, and if hon. gentlemen take the trouble to read that clause in the first agreement, and read it in the second agreement they will see a marked difference betwen the two. I am not going to read it in extenso, but I will state the difference. The Minister bound himself, under section 55, to pay half the cost of the double tracking of the Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert road and on all yard improvements and additional tracking in St. Charles and from St. Charles to the station, and to pay for all improvements that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council might judge to be necessary improvements for the Grand Trunk itself, this payment to be on the basis of 5 per cent, and to pay this in perpetuity. But there was another paragraph in that first agreement which is not in the second, and that paragraph bound the Minister to pay at the same rate, 5 per

cent, on half the cost of any further expenditure for the efficient carrying on of the business of the road. That was an altogether indefinite clause. That would take in elevators and other improvements which would have to be made to keep up with the progress of the times during the hundred of years for which this agreement would endure. That is left out of the present clause—is one betterment, at least. But, Sir, this is what the Minister bound himself to in the first bargain, to pay $62,500 as a retainer for terminal facilities, to pay $40,000 a year as a retainer for the privilege of using the bridge, to pay $37,500 a year for the Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert branch—half the cost, at 5 per cent—and to pay $6,000 a year for the Chaudière Junction section. That made in all $146,000, and, at 2¾ per cent, that would represent a capitalization, in round figures, of five millions of dollars. Now, the hon. gentleman will say that we get half ownership or interest in the Ste. Rosalie branch; and yet he acknowledged here the other day that all that is only in name and not in fact. If, 50 years from now, or 99 years from now, this arrangement were broken, we would own not a single spike in that property in which he says we have bought a half interest. The thing amounts to nothing more or less than a lease which grants certain privieges so long as the terms of the lease are carried out; and when they fall in no title to the property remains in the Government or the Minister of Railways. So that you may take that whole $146,000 as representing a simple payment to the Grand Trunk Railway for the privilege of getting the user, for maintaining which you have to pay according to the wheelage basis, that is, a capitalization of $5,000,000 represents what we pay to the Grand Trunk Railway for privilege of user, that we may have a right to a user, for maintaining every mile of which we have to pay according to our proportion the mileage as between us and the Grand Trunk Railway.

But there was another point—and here I am not upon certain ground, but I must go upon the ground of conjecture to a certain extent. What would these betterments amount to? We do not know. Whatever they were, we know that the Minister bound himself in perpetuity to pay 5 per cent interest upon half their cost. We know for a certainty that one thing that was contemplated was the double tracking of the St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie branch of the road, which would cost somewhere about $200,000. Anyway, we know that was contemplated, that it was a necessity, and is acknowledged to be a necessity. Now, I will tell you the ground I propose to go upon: With the increasing business of the Grand Trunk Railway system, with its branch lines extending all over this country and into other countries to the west, and continually broadering, and widening, and drawing freight and traffic for themselves, all centering down in the city of Montreal, it is not, I think, unbusinesslike or extravagant to make this estimate, that in the space of 20 years $2,000,000 at least would be expended for betterments and improvements of all kinds. An expenditure of $2,000,000 in 20 years would be about $100,000 a year. Now I leave it to business men in this House if that is an extravagant estimate to make. Let us argue upon that basis, that in 20 years time $2,000,000 of improvements would have been made on all that stretch, and those terminals, and the approach to the yards, and everything connected with it. We should have had to pay 5 per cent upon one-half, or 5 per cent upon $1,000,000, which would then be a payment in perpetuity of $50,000 a year, even if no further improvements were made after that 20 years. If further improvements were made, our proportion of the cost would have to be paid on the further improvements. Now, Sir, if you capitalize that $50,000 at 2¾ per cent, it gives you a capital sum of $1,750,000 which you have to set apart. So that there is $5,000,000 first, for what I call the user retainer, and there is $1,750,000 on this conjectural basis of an expenditure of $2,000,000 in 20 years for betterments, on which we have to pay 5 per cent on one-half the cost, which makes up $6,750,000 of a capitalization, independent entirely of the maintenance which we have to pay each month according to the wheelage basis.

But with all that, in the first arrangement the Grand Trunk Railway was still your constant competitor for the whole distance of this extension, because there was no traffic arrangement and no clause in the contract which prevented the Grand Trunk Railway from competing over their own road from Montreal to Lévis. So that you paid this extravagant retainer, you paid this maintenance on the basis on which it was paid, and at the same time you did not provide that the Grand Trunk Railway should not be your active and powerful competitor from Montreal the whole length of that extension down to Lévis where the Intercolonial Railway joins on to both. This then in brief was the bargain that was made, and which was heralded all through this country by the party press as being a mark of great wisdom and as one of the most businesslike arrangements that had ever been made by any Government.

Well, Sir, there was a period given for consideration, thanks to the Senate, and how does the present bargain stand in reference to the other? In the first place, $146,000 is not now being given as a retainer, $6,000 has been dropped off by Mr. Wainwright, by the Grand Trunk Railway. What does that amount to? $6,000 a year less paid under the second than under the first, $6,000 paid each year for a period of

99 years, compounded at 2½ per cent interest, amounts to $3,286,888. My hon. friend laughs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was paid on the Harris land job?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend shall draw even a large herring across the track. If he wishes to investigate the Harris land job, he has the capabilities, he has the papers, he evidently has the time to do it, let him do it. But at the present time it is quite a different thing we are investigating, we are investigating the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement, and although the Minister laughs, I say that by an absolute mathematical calculation it is as certain as that he now lives and will sometime die, as certain as that if the sun rises it will also set, to any one who will make the calculation or have it made for him, that if the $6,000 is not paid, and if it is put on investment at compound interest at the extremely low rate of 2½ per cent, in 99 years it will amount to $3.285,000. Now, the Prime Minister thinks that is laughable.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I do.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us why he thinks that is ridiculous?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I will not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend exercises his perfect right to laugh without giving to the rest of us his reasons for so doing. Now, then, the hon. gentleman has in the short time of cogitation which was happily given to him by the action of the Senate, revised the Grand Trunk Railway part of the bargain with a betterment to that extent. But let us take it upon another basis. That $6,000 per year capitalized at 2½ per cent amounts to a capital sum of $210,000, which would have to be set aside in order to produce $6,000 a year. I simply mention the other calculation to show that these sums paid out would, if you go on the line of investment for the time that this bargain extended, amount to an immense sum of money. Now we will take the other calculation. $6,000 capitalized, amounts to $210,000, so there is the present value of $210,000 that is saved by the $6,000 a year less being paid in the second bargain, as it was proposed to pay it in the other. Now, let me take the betterments, and I go again on the conjectural basis, that in 20 years $2,000,000 for improvements would be expended, and $1,000,000 would be our share. The Minister in the former bargain bound the country to pay 5 per cent upon that; in the present bargain he has taken the option of paying 2½ per cent instead of 5 per cent, therefore he has saved the difference, that is 2½ per cent. Now, then, what would be 2½ per cent upon that supposed and conjectural expenditure, take it at whatever you like? If you think it is too much, take less; if it is not enough, take more. But this proportion will always hold, that under the present arrangement the Minister may pay 2½ per cent, whereas under the former he agreed to pay for all time 5 per cent interest on the basis that I took, this would be $21,250 a year saving, and capitalized it would be $740,000. Add to that $210,000 the saving of $6,000 per year, and you have a saving of $950,000, or pretty nearly $1,000,000. I do not believe there is very much to find fault with in that calculation. I cannot believe that business men will tell you, after looking into the great capacities for the growth of commerce in our country, the tremendously wide expansion of the Grand Trunk Railway and its affiliated branches and affluents, and these all centering in the city of Montreal, and almost all passing out over the Ste. Rosalie branch—looking to all these considerations—I do not believe that business men will consider that $2,000,000 of an expenditure in the next twenty years would be an inordinate calculation, that this saving of 2½ per cent interest, in the second agreement over the first, would be $21,250 a year, which capitalized, would be $740,000. I come to another point, which is largely conjectural, but still it has a certain basis to go upon. In the first arrangement the Grand Trunk Railway Company was a full competitor from Montreal to Lévis, inasmuch as it did not bind itself to give over one single ton of traffic to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal. All that it did bind itself to do was, that if a shipper in the west wanted his freight shipped over the Intercolonial Railway and the transfer to be made at Montreal, the Grand Trunk Railway was to give effect to the shipper's wishes. That was a very small thing, and practically amounted to nothing. It made no difference to him whether it went to Lévis and was transferred, or whether it was transferred at Montreal, provided the Grand Trunk would give as good a rate to Lévis over its line as the Intercolonial Railway would give. The supplemental traffic arrangement which has been made, may amount to a great deal more than this arrangement. Under it the Grand Trunk Railway Company binds itself, in reference to all traffic from the west that originates on the company's lines, to make the transfer point Montreal, instead of Lévis, and that, consequently, the Intercolonial Railway extension shall have the benefit of the traffic from Montreal to Lévis. Does this amount to much or not? I will take the calculation made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), which, I believe, will hold good, as it was very carefully made. It is based on the 1897 returns. The 1897 returns show that the receipts from traffic west-bound, passing Lévis, amounted to $201,591, and from the traffic east-bound, passing Lévis, to $420,713. The two, added together, make $622,304. The hon. member for Westmoreland makes that calculation

as to what proportion of profit will accrue to the Intercolonial Railway on this extension in respect to the traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which was formerly transferred at Lévis, and will now be transferred at Montreal. It will be something very considerable. The hon. member for Westmoreland figures that the profit will be $35,000 per year, as the result of the new traffic arrangement, compared with the preceding traffic arrangement under the first bargain. If you capitalize that on the basis of the figures of 1897, at 2¾ per cent—and that is assuming that the traffic will not grow—it will amount to $1,219,000. If you take this as a fair basis of calculation, as far as the Grand Trunk arrangement goes, the second bargain, as compared with the first, shows a betterment, capitalized on the basis of 2¾ per cent, of $2,169,000. Some of this lies on uncontested present facts, while other parts of the argument lie on what business men and railway men would consider a fair proportion and a fair estimate; but I believe that these estimates that I have taken, that the hon. member for Westmoreland has worked out, will not be found to be inordinate. I believe that it is just as plain as can be that the betterment of the second, as compared with the first bargain, will come to the amount that I have stated. In the face of that, the hon. members supporting the Government and the press of the Government lauded the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in every possible way, for the contract which he brought down in 1897, and they called the Senate names because they did not implement the bargain. They also reflected on our wisdom and patriotism because we opposed that bargain in this House. Their argument was, that this is the best bargain that can be obtained, that it is an excellent thing for the country, that Parliament ought to ratify it, and that the Government ought to be sustained in its contract. Now, Sir, a few months of consideration, of calm consideration, under the restraining hand of the Senate, has brought the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the Government to acknowledge the fact, which they must acknowledge, that, as between the first bargain that they wished to rush through this House and bind upon the country for all time to come, and this second bargain which they are endeavouring now to have ratified by this Parliament, there is this immense difference, in the first, or Drummond, portion of it, of $559,000, in round figures, actual cash, which cannot be disputed. In reference to the Grand Trunk portion, some of which depends on uncontested fact—first, the $6,000 a year saving—some on partly uncontested fact—the difference that there is between 2¾ and 5 per cent on what you pay on half the cost—and some of which is conjectural to a certain extent, as to what will be the amount of difference under the arrangement to transfer traffic at Montreal instead of Lévis—a betterment of $559,000 is shown on the Drummond County portion of it, and a total betterment, under this calculation which I have made, capitalized, of $2,169,000. So much, then, in reference to the two bargains. Where would this country have been, if it had had confidence in the Government, if it had taken the word of the Government and the hon. Minister of Railways as the final word, and if the House had passed that agreement which was brought down in 1897, and put it upon this country for ninety-nine years—yes, and for all time to come? Where would this country have been, if Her Majesty's loyal Opposition had not stood up in this House and opposed it, and if the Senate had not exercised its fair right to revise all the measures that come before this House, on a business basis, and of rejecting that bargain? Where would this country have been? This country would have been saddled with an expenditure for all time to come in excess, by millions, of the expenditure which the wise action of the Senate has reduced to the amount involved in the bargain which we have before us at the present time. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will smile, and say, that I have made his position all the more tenable, when I say, that he has got more betterments under this bargain. That does not make his position more tenable; it shows his innate foolishness in making his bargain. It shows the haphazard and unbusinesslike way in which the Minister who for the time being has the money of the people of Canada, put up as taxation, plays ducks and drakes with the finances of this country, and rushes his unwilling followers into arrangements which plunge this country into expenditures of millions of dollars in the aggregate, over and above what he afterwards finds he could obtain the same privilege for, in the interest of the country and its business. It does not let the Minister out, but it is a tremendously strong comment upon the unbusinesslike and injudicious methods pursued by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and into which course, unfortunately, he dragged after him men of cooler heads and of different impulses, but whom he dragooned one way or the other into following his lead, and committing this patent and absolute absurdity.

But, Sir, it remains now to ask whether the present bargain is a bargain as good as the Minister of Railways could have made. I have no hesitation in saying it is not as good a bargain as he could have made. Even with this lightened burden, he has committed this country—if this is finally ratified—for ninety-nine years and for all time to come, to pay far more than it ought to pay; far more than it ought to pay. Why, on what ground of business can it be justified that when you get the user of little less than 7 per cent of the

terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway, you have to pay the full measure of that user as estimated by the car mileage proportions, and then over and above that, pay on the valuation of half the cost, 5 per cent interest for all time to come. In the first place, why should we pay for half the user by way of retainer, when we only use a little less than 7 per cent of it. But the answer is made: "Oh, but our traffic will increase," and the answer follows immediately to that, "so will the traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway increase." Do you mean to tell me that 4,000 miles of Grand Trunk Railway, draining this country to the west, stretching out into the American states, and drawing on these continually increasing productive areas, will not grow at Montreal, and increase with equal rapidity at least to the Grand Trunk traffic taken out of the city of Montreal or brought into it over that extension. And so, if you put the argument to me: True, it is only 7 per cent now, but it will be more later; I say that argument loses its force, because the increase will take place on the whole Grand Trunk Railway system as well as on the Ste. Rosalie branch, and certainly in equal if not in greater proportion. On what rule of finance or business can the Minister of Railways ask that out of the country's exchequer, for all time to come, an obsolete rate of interest shall be paid upon an extravagant valuation—an obsolete rate of interest, which has not obtained in this country for the last twenty years; which, since Sir Richard Cartwright's time, has not obtained in this country, for our credit has grown better and better, until the last loan was placed at 2½ per cent, or all costs and charges taken in, at 2⅞ per cent. Yet, the Minister (Mr. Blair) thinks it is a wise business operation, and the Government back him up in saying it is a wise business operation that Canada, which can get money at 2½ per cent or 2⅞ per cent, must pay for all time to come on an extravagant valuation, 5 per cent, or nearly twice as much as the normal and present rate of interest.

Again, Sir, what business man will pretend to say that it is a wise transaction when you are going to pay a sort of retainer for the user over the Ste. Rosalie branch, that you shall estimate the cost of that road at $50,000 per mile, making $1,500,000, cut that in two and pay half, though your user is not one-third—not one-fourth at the present time—and that you will then, upon that extravagant valuation, pay 5 per cent interest upon the money for all time to come. It is neither businesslike, nor is it in any way an arrangement which the Minister and the Government of this country should bind Canada to. Let the Minister place what is his fair valuation; let him place what is our fair proportion to pay for our user and be generous in it; let him pay a retainer if he will, but what business method is there in making an extravagant valuation of that kind, and then paying twice the normal rate of interest upon that extravagant valuation for the Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert branch? Again, Sir, what man of business habits, looking to the future of the Intercolonial Railway and the future of this country, will bind himself for all time to come to pay 5 per cent upon half the cost of any improvements that can be made? True, in the second bargain these improvements are more defined; some of the more objectionable and indefinite ones are thrown out entirely, but after all the Minister has bound himself to pay 4 per cent. Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) one question. I have not bothered him with questions during this address, and having had so long a rest. I am sure he will respond very willingly. I think that, in the Grand Trunk Railway Bill, an option is taken to pay 4 per cent interest, or to pay cash for these improvements. I do not think such an option ought to be in that Bill. I think that the cost should be ascertained, and that we should pay our share of the cost in money. I want to ask the Minister of Railways what the Government proposes to do, whether they propose to pay 4 per cent interest when they can get money at 2⅞ per cent, or whether they propose, as a business man ought to, who has the money and has the credit, to pay the cash when the cash comes due?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation in saying, that so far as my view is concerned, and the recommendation which I would make to Council would go, I would unhesitatingly advise the payment of interest rather than the payment of the principal for any improvements which we may sanction and desire. I should think it would be very unwise; I would think it would be indefensible, for us to pay cash in respect of any additions or improvements or alterations that may be made on the road, representing half the cost, when we have the option of paying interest upon it. The option was included in the contract for the reason that the time may possibly come when the conditions existing in respect to the Grand Trunk Railway encumbrances may be different from what they are to-day, and when we are paying this interest, will not be affected by any proceedings that would be taken for the foreclosure of the mortage upon the property, thus losing every dollar we had paid.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing that should go on record. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pretty well gone through what remarks I intended to make with reference to the financial arrangements of these two deals, and I have but few remarks to make in conclusion. I was going on to state that although the betterment as between

the two bargains enures to the benefit of the country, so far from it being a justification of the wisdom of the Minister (Mr. Blair), or of the Government, it is the strongest possible proof that could be had of the unbusinesslike methods which were adopted by the Minister (Mr. Blair) and by the Government in making these first arrangements in 1897. I was then going on to state that because the Minister has succeeded in making these betterments, it does not at all constitute a proof that the present bargain is a good one for this country, and one that Parliament ought to ratify. As regards the terminals, I went on to state that there seemed to be no reason in the world why we should pay a retainer for half the value of those terminals, and that, as a basis of valuation, we should pay in perpetuity 5 per cent interest, when the rate of interest at which we can borrow money is about half of that. With reference to the Ste. Rosalie branch, I said it did not seem to be businesslike or necessary that we should take a railway extending thirty miles through that country, which could be built for $15,000 or $20,000 a mile, and, as a basis of valuation, say it shall be valued at $50,000 a mile, and pay interest at 5 per cent for all time to come on half of that sum. These two things the hon. gentleman is doing. Then, on the betterments, he proposes to pay 4 per cent instead of 2¾ per cent. I do not think it is reasonable that that amount of interest should be paid when the country's credit is on the basis on which it at present rests.

These are the considerations which lead me to think that with reference to the Grand Trunk the bargain is still an indefensible and extravagant bargain, as I am sure it is with reference to the Drummond County road. The fact is, the Drummond County road was built very largely by the subsidies which were paid for it by the Government. That question of subsidy has been already argued from this side of the House, and I do not propose to go into the argument. The object of a subsidy is to enable a road to be built, and to enable it to be operated after it is built, by putting the company in the possession of capital on which they pay no interest, and, therefore, do not have to call on the road for interest to pay on that capital. But when the Government starts and buys out a road, which it has itself subsidized, it is to my mind very questionable indeed whether the Government has a right to pay again to these men the value which was put into that road by the very fact that the Government's money was paid to it.

With reference to this road, another question is raised, and it is a question which will meet this House. Let this bargain be carried out; let the Intercolonial extension be running as a part of the Government road from Lévis up to the city of Montreal, with the Government getting its income, the Government managing the road, the Government being the sole proprietor. How long does my hon. friend think it will be before the province of Quebec comes with a demand upon this Government to pay back to it the amount of money which it gave as subsidies to this local road, which has now become a Government road and is owned as part of the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you think that would be a legitimate claim?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a lawyer and would like to cross-examine me. He will not find me in the witness box just at this time. But I will give my hon. friend the benefit of my view upon it; and I will tell him this, that as sure as he is a Minister of Railways, and remains for any considerable length of time in this Government, and this scheme is carried through, and that road becomes part and parcel of a Government road, the province of Quebec will be here with a demand to have that subsidy paid back to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you think it ought to be paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I will argue that question when the demand comes. But I want to point out to my hon. friend what danger he is courting. He is paying to his political friends at present for the subsidy which the Quebec Government has put into that road, and he will be called upon, I think, before many years are over, to put his hand into the public exchequer, and pay back to the province of Quebec the amount that province contributed to the local road, which road has now been taken over by the Dominion Government. That is a question which hon. gentlemen opposite have to face, and it is a question which they ought to have taken into consideration when buying this road. To say that even $1,600,000 ought to be given for a road which was hawked about under an option of $400,000 for the 90 miles of it then built, when for the building of the succeeding portion about $680,000 have been expended, making some $1,100,000 as the actual cost of the road, I think my hon. friend will agree with me, is making a bargain which the internal value of the road itself did not warrant, and with regard to which my hon. friend could have made a very much better bargain.

But with all these exorbitant payments, where is my hon. friend with his system of roads? He has loaded the Intercolonial Railway with fixed charges which, on the basis of 2¾ per cent, amount under the amended bargain to about $212,750 a year for rental alone. Outside of that, he has to pay the user expenses, maintenance, repairs, and the like of that, according to the basis of the car mileage. But that is a fixed sum which he has adopted, and he meets that

with a still stronger competition at Montreal than he met with at Lévis. Montreal is the point of competition. There the Grand Trunk Railway, with all its great system west, is interested in its own line down to Portland for all oceanic freight. By his former agreement the Grand Trunk was interested in its own line from Montreal to Lévis; and it would have diverted, for the sake of its own line, as much freight as it could over that portion of its line, to have been delivered to the Intercolonial at Lévis for Intercolonial points or for through carriage. But, Sir, that point of competition is now intensified by the fact that under the traffic arrangement the Grand Trunk has ceased to become a competitor as to its line between Montreal and Lévis, and consequently its strong inclination and trend will be to send all this freight which is meant for export, over its line to Portland.

I want to say just one word with reference to the traffic arrangement. The new traffic arrangement which has been made, which I have outlined in part, has another portion to it, and that is the arbitraries that have been given. On another question the hon. Minister of Railways the other day explained that, and his explanation was simply this: for all freight which originates in the west for ocean carriage the Grand Trunk Railway receives its pro rata proportion for what it carries over the Grand Trunk system till it reaches Montreal. But the Intercolonial, when that freight reaches Montreal, and is then conveyed to Halifax, 837 miles, receives its pro rata proportion for only 425 miles. That is, it agrees to carry it two miles for the price which the Grand Trunk Railway gets for carrying it one mile. To St. John it agrees to carry it 740 miles, and to count the distance as only 375 miles so far as the division of profits is concerned, that is, it agrees to carry about two miles for one mile. That is on all the traffic which is east bound, something is given to the Grand Trunk, because it originated the freight; but, on the other hand, when the freight is originated east and is going west, the Intercolonial Railway carries it over 837 miles from Halifax and then gives it to the Grand Trunk Railway, which carries it, say, 1,000 miles on its own track, the Grand Trunk Railway gets payment for every mile it carries. In the division of the earnings, however, the Intercolonial Railway gets only one mile's pay for two miles carriage, putting it in round numbers. Now, if you take into account the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway, for that through ocean freight, is a road which is in keen and constant competition with continental roads, at Portland, at Boston, at New York, and other points, and that in order to get freight from the west for the ocean passage, it has to put the rates down, as competing with these great and strong lines of railway and steamship transport, and, consequently, that its freight rates must be brought down to the very minimum of what will be the very smallest profit over the cost of carriage, you will see that when you put upon the Intercolonial Railway, on rates as finely drawn as those, the burden of carrying two miles for one mile of freight, you put it into a position in which it is absolutely impossible for it to carry that freight unless it carries it at or below cost. What benefit will that be? My hon. friend, if he chooses to make capital do the work of revenue and income, if he chooses to cover up the loss in that way, may float along for a very little time, but it is impossible for the Intercolonial Railway system to be run for any length of time on freight rates given on such a basis. Every year the competition is keener, every year the Grand Trunk Railway will have to shave its rates closer and closer, to meet its great competitors, every year the rates will be made nearer and nearer the cost, and consequently, you will have the Intercolonial Railway under the detriment of carrying freight at those cost prices, two miles for one mile of pay. That will be not to the good, but to the continual detriment of the Intercolonial Railway.

There is one point in the matter of the traffic arrangement to which I wish to refer; you put the traffic arrangement alongside this Bill. You say that this contract shall continue for ninety-nine years and longer, if not then broken. One of the essential points in the argument is that in the supplementary agreement you have got the Grand Trunk Railway to agree to transfer freight at Montreal instead of at Lévis, which is a great advantage. That is not the ordinary traffic arrangement in which rates play a part and all the like of that, but is a generic feature in this whole thing, and we pay what we pay, if we agree to pay it in the ultimate, because we suppose we have got that concession to run as long as we pay these rentals and these other sums of money. But whilst the contract itself goes on, and our $140,000 must be paid each year for ever, and our maintenance on the mileage basis and our improvements on the basis of half the cost at 4 per cent—whilst these are to run on for ever, within ten days, after this Bill is passed, the Minister of Railways may sit down with the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway and make a further agreement by which the point of transfer will be Lévis instead of Montreal. There is no doubt about that, and that is not as it ought to be. I say that this is a generic part of the scheme, which gives to it very large value, and for which we pay, should be made a substantial and permanent part of it just as well as our payments are. As you cannot change the payments without an Act of Parliament, you ought not to be able to change this feature of the traffic arrangement without the consent of Parliament. I do not see why the hon. Minister did not put that in. It ought to be there.

If it is not to be there, let us know it, and we will find out that we have no compensation such as we thought we had, through that transfer point being at Montreal rather than at Lévis. I think that that is of great moment, and ought to be a part of the contract. That came down to us with the schedule, we passed it with the schedule, but when we come to the Bill we do not find it; but we find instead a provision authorizing the railway company and the Government to change that any moment they like, after the Bill is passed, and after we are committed to these immense payments for 99 years, or in perpetuity. Before the discussion is over, my hon. friends on the Treasury benches ought to consider that point and agree to insert it in the measure itself. If it is intended that we should have this advantage, if it is not a mere makeshift, let is be put in the Bill as a permanency. It is of great moment. We are paying great sums for these privileges, let us have the compensation as permanent as the payments. At least, let us have it permanent this far, that if a different arrangement be made it shall be made with and by the consent of Parliament, and not simply with and by the Minister of Railways and the Government. It may be fair to say that circumstances might arise which would make it necessary to have a change. Then, leave it in the power of Parliament, which will be a good and conscientious judge, just as competent as the Minister and the Government, to make the change. That far, at least, I would like the Government to go on that point. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for having listened to me so patiently.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think, Mr. Speaker, that one would be apt to infer, who had listened to the hon. gentleman's address from the beginning to the end, that the point which he desired to establish was not so much that the arrangement now before Parliament was a bad, an unbusinesslike arrangement, but that it was one which makes against the credit of the Minister of Railways. I rather inferred that the hon. gentleman's greater object was to say something which would reflect unfavourably upon myself personally rather than impress Parliament against the contract now before us. So far as the hon. gentleman may succeed in creating such impression, founded upon facts, without drawing upon his imagination or without, in a reckless or unwarranted way, putting before the House as fact what are not facts, I am perfectly content that the hon. gentleman should succeed. There is, as I understand it, one trouble which greatly embarrasses the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). He is deeply concerned to think that the Minister of Railways and this Government should have plunged headlong into this transaction without having availed themselves of the ordinary means of information, without having referred to the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals for their judgment and opinion, and solely for the purpose of carrying out some ill-considered scheme or policy which the Minister of Railways and his colleagues had jointly determined upon.

Now, Sir, I do not imagine that there is any gentleman in this House, I certainly do not imagine that there is any one who, even for the shortest period, has been a member of any Cabinet in Canada, who has not, to a greater or less degress, been convinced of the necessity of making some change with respect to the Intercolonial Railway—extending it beyond the point which was, up to about a year ago, the terminus of that line. I do not think that any one can say, having a belief that that policy ought to have been adopted, that, looking at the question in its several bearings, there was any alternative open to the Government, if it were to act in a judicious manner, than to acquire the Drummond County Railway and make it part of the Intercolonial Railway system. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) imagine that, being convinced, as I maintain this House to-day is convinced, that either the Grand Trunk, that part of the Grand Trunk Railway via Richmond, the South Shore Railway, or, as has been lately suggested, the Canadian Pacific, on the other side of the river, is a reasonable alternative. Nobody has, in this debate, I think, succeeded in establishing that proposition. The proposition we have submitted is the only proposition, so far as the connection between Lévis and Montreal is concerned, which can be supported by facts or argument, or on any business basis. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, what was there in the question requiring more consideration. What was there remaining to require closer critical examination by the Government? We had no alternative but to take the Drummond County line, if we could get it on reasonable terms. Then, the only matter we had to satisfy ourselves upon was: What would be the best terms on which we could acquire the road—buy it or lease it; if buy it, what price; if lease it, what rental? When we came first to Parliament, we told Parliament—and fortified our statement with the evidence of our engineers and officers—that, in our opinion and in their opinion, $1,600,000 would be a reasonable and proper value to put on the Drummond County Railway from Ste. Rosalie east to the Chaudière. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to make a point against myself, said, that we had never had before Parliament—and suggests that the Minister had never before him—the opinion of any of his officers. Well, that statement, I must say, is without warrant. I think I can call to the recollection of members of this House the fact that there was put before Parliament—speaking now from memory; I would say, upon the first occasion when this proposition was submitted, in 1897—a report of the chief engineer and

Deputy Minister upon this railway. That report was dated the 2nd of February, 1897, some days, some weeks, I think, before the contract was entered into between the Government and the Drummond County Railway. That communication, which I have in my hand, I venture to think is not now produced and will not now be read for the first time; for I think I have heard gentlemen criticising my course and the course of the Government on the strength of some statements contained in this report. What does it say? It is addressed to myself, and is as follows:—

In compliance with your request for information as to the general character of the road constructed by the Drummond County Railway Company from Ste. Rosalie Junction, on the Grand Trunk Railway, via Drummondville and St. Léonard to Moose Park, a distance of 73 miles, together with a branch, of 17 miles in length, from St. Léonard to Nicolet, and also my views as to the standard on which the balance of the road from Moose Park to its junction with the Grand Trunk Railway, near Chaudière bridge, should be built, assuming that the line was to form a section of the Intercolonial Railway, I have to report:

That 73 miles of the road is built and in operation, that the gradients and alignments are favourable, there being only one grade exceeding 53 feet per mile, and that one is 64 feet to the mile. That, with one exception, there is no curve of a less radius than 1,433 feet, and that the one exception is a curve of 955 feet radius.

That the road is well and substantially built, the cutting being 20 feet, and the embankments 15 feet wide at sub-grade. Ample drainage is provided by substantial steel structures resting on massive masonry spanning the larger rivers, and steel-plate girders resting on strong, well-built masonry spanning the streams of lesser magnitude, whereas the general drainage through the smaller rivulets has been passed through culverts constructed of sound cedar timber 10 in. by 10 in. square. The larger portion of the line through the cleared land is inclosed by a substantial post and board fence, whereas on a small portion of the line a wire fence has been erected. The permanent way is laid with 2,600 ties to the mile, with steel rails weighing 56 lbs. to the yard, connected with steel fish-plates.

The road is well ballasted with a very fine quality of gravel, the station buildings are neat buildings of what I consider sufficient capacity for the requirements of the road, and the water service is good.

I think you will agree with me from the description I have given of the works, that a really good road has been secured, fully up to the general standard of railways in Canada. At the same time, I think, you should insist on the 64 feet per mile grade being reduced to 53 feet, in making an arrangement for the acquisition of the road, if such be your intention, which I assume to be the case.

As you desire me to state the standard on which I would recommend the completion of the road to Chaudière bridge, supposing it to be a section of the Intercolonial Railway, upon that part of the subject I would say that the standard should be equal to that of the Intercolonial Railway as it now exists, and that the steel rails should not be less than 70 lbs. to the yard, with passenger, freight and other buildings of approved number, dimensions and design.

If these suggestions be carried out, the company will have a good substantial road throughout, the main line being 115 miles in length from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière bridge, with a branch to Nicolet of 17 miles in length.

Now comes the clause which was criticised two years ago by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they had this report before them:

Should you finally decide to acquire the road, before the matter is absolutely closed, I suggest it would be prudent to have an examination made into its condition. Of course, this season of the year is not favourable for making such an inspection, nor do I think it desirable that it should be made during the spring freshets or when the frost is coming out of the ground, but later in the season, when the road-bed is settled down into its place, and any damage which may have arisen from the spring freshets may be seen, is, to my view, the proper time to have the road looked over.

Before taking action in that direction, I shall await your instructions, as, of course, if an arrangement for the acquisition of the road is not reached, it would be a useless expenditure to send out the inspecting engineer to examine the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the date of that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The 2nd February, 1897.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is after——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) suggest?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When did the House meet?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In March, if I remember well. This report is signed by Collingwood Schreiber, chief engineer. Now, it is true, that the engineer does advise that, before a lease is closed, a more careful examination of the road should be made; but it was not possible at that time to have a better inspection of the road than had been made. We desired to facilitate the matter as much as possible; we thought it well there should be no unnecessary delay; and, moreover, we were not making a transaction with those gentlemen at all upon a basis which required us to make another inspection of this road. We had valued the road, and we were receiving it upon a valuation which was below its cost, much below what would be its cost under any circumstances. We were buying it at a valuation of $1,600,000. We stated to the House that it was upon that valuation we were proposing to pay rental to the Drummond County Railway Company, and upon no other; and we assumed as a matter of necessary inference that a road which had cost this company—I do not care whether part of the cost did consist in subsidies from different Governments—but a road which had cost this company, and would cost, when the extra 43 miles were completed to Chaudière, over $2,000,000, was a road that we were

getting at a reasonable price, and so low that we might very well submit it to Parliament at the time we did, without making any other critical inspection of the undertaking. I present this report at the present moment again for the purpose of showing that the Government did not proceed, as the hon. gentleman has stated, without having had any data or any information from our officers as to what their opinion was with respect to the character of this railway.

The hon. gentleman has put forward another proposition which I will take a moment to examine, because it is a proposition which I think, under our parliamentary system, is not a workable proposition. He dwells upon it and relies upon it, apparently, with the idea that it is a strong point, and ought to make an impression either upon Parliament or upon the country. He says that it is a violation, in the first place, of Liberal principles, and in the next place, of constitutional principles, for us to venture to make a contract with the Drummond County Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and submit it to Parliament for their approval; and he says: You are tying the hands of Parliament, you are practically depriving the members of this House who may have confidence in the Government and who support it generally, of the opportunity of exercising their free judgment upon the question, and the result is that if Parliament does not adopt the measure as proposed and confirm the contract, it involves a question of want of confidence in the Government and the Government must go by the board. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing unprecedented and nothing alarming in that proposition. It appears to me that there is no other way in which it would be possible for a Government to come before Parliament than in the way in which we did come before it. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that we ought not to ascertain, before we come to Parliament, the terms and conditions upon which the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the one hand and the Drummond County Railway Company on the other, would agree to convey to us, or sell the property to us? I trow not. Does the hon. gentleman insist that we should come to Parliament without having had an understanding with these companies as to the terms upon which they would agree to convey the property to us? I think not, that surely is not his belief. Otherwise, we should be coming before Parliament to do, what? To give us a free hand to authorize the Government to make any contract they pleased with these companies for the carrying out of this extension. Surely that is not the hon. gentleman's contention. We would have to indicate to Parliament even the identical terms, down to every dollar and cent of outlay that would be involved—that would be imposed upon the country—before the hon. gentleman opposite who has criticised our contract in this regard would be willing to give any support, or would consent to the approval of the proposed policy. Well, Sir, if we have to come before Parliament knowing exactly what the bargain is that we are going to carry out, and if we have to declare to Parliament exactly what the bargain is that we are going to enter into, what different position would we be in than we are in today? We would come to Parliament, and we would say: We have come to an understanding with the Grand Trunk Railway, they are willing to convey to us their road upon certain terms; and we desire you to give us authority to carry those terms out. Would not our friends be as much hampered as they are now? Would they be any freer to vote? Would any hon. gentleman in Parliament be any freer to vote for the proposition on the ground that it was not put down in writing, that it was not actually signed, sealed and delivered? Would the position of the friends of the Government or of the Government itself be any different, if they came before Parliament stating that such was their policy, and they expected their friends to support it if the policy commended itself to their judgment? And if they failed to carry it, I suppose no more serious consequences would follow from the defeat of the measure under those circumstances, than such as would follow in the case of a Bill which contained a contract which had been executed by all the parties to it. Further, it appears to me that the Government would be placing itself in an exceedingly weak and awkward position if we were to come to Parliament and say: We have agreed with these railway companies upon certain terms to take these railways over from them, the Grand Trunk Railway upon these terms and the Drummond County road on the other terms; and if we did not have anything whereby the companies would be bound, where would the Government be? What position would we be in? We might get the authority from Parliament, and if we did we could go back to the companies and say: Parliament has now authorized us to make an agreement on these terms, and we would like to execute it. Supposing these companies had changed their minds, having learned of the discussion that had taken place in Parliament, having learned of the suggestions made by hon. gentlemen on the other side, or by our friends on this side as to what ought or ought not to be contained in the contracts, what assurance would any Government then have, that the companies would stand by their understanding with us? We would simply be making ourselves ridiculous before this House and the country; and instead of being condemned for having taken action as we have done in this matter, our course should be approved. We would then indeed be placing

our friends in an awkward position, we would then be tying the hands of Parliament, we would be ridiculed and condemned for not understanding how parliamentary business ought to be done, for not taking proper precautions before we had gone through all the trouble and assumed all the responsibility connected with it. I leave, therefore, this proposition so far as the hon. gentleman has laboured it; I leave him all the benefit he may possibly take out of it. I dissent entirely from his proposition. I say, it is not defensible from a constitutional point of view, and it is not a reasonable proposition from any point of view; and I think any Government that would act in accordance with it, would lay itself open to very serious criticism. All Governments do it, all Governments will do it. The hon. gentleman will find, I think, exceedingly difficult to discover any precedent where contracts of this specific character involving terms and conditions so complicated in their nature, have not been brought to Parliament precisely in the way in which this was done.

Now, the hon. gentleman in a general way has taken up the question of the Drummond County and the Grand Trunk Railway propositions, and I think I am not doing the hon. gentleman any injustice when I say that he has not contributed anything new to this discussion. Following him closely, as I did, I was unable to discover that he has brought any fresh argument, or presented any fresh considerations which this House is called upon to consider. Perhaps, I ought to make one or two exceptions in making that statement. The hon. gentleman has presented one or two new propositions. but so far as they are new to us here, I think I shall be able to show that they are inaccurate. I think the hon. gentleman has been making arguments from one or two points of view which are not sustained, either by the contract or by any recessary or reasonable inference that can be drawn from that contract. The hon. gentleman has referred to the terms of the Drummond County arrangement. He has built his argument entirely upon the assumption that the road was not worth $1,600,000. He has built his argument on the assumption that it was a poor, worthless property when we had these negotiations with the Drummond County Railway. In arriving at this conclusion, he has absolutely ignored all the sworn testimony that was given at this investigation, although he has had that sworn testimony in his hands. He has absolutely ignored the evidence of the men who built that road, all the evidence of the employees, of the people who had the handling of the money which was used in its construction from the beginning to the end of the undertaking. He simply passed over the statements made by these people. He simply passed over the statement that Mr. Newton has made, and the statements of others, as if they were absolutely non-existent, and yet he asks this House to accept his argument and to come to a conclusion—I confess I do not know what conclusion he asks us to arrive at, but I presume that his argument was presented with the object of asking this House to arrive at some conclusion, but he absolutely ignored the sworn testimony given by the people who had a knowledge of the whole transaction, and which is entitled to be accepted, as showing what the actual cost of the undertaking was. What was the cost of the road? The cost of the road, as proved in the manner I have stated, was not less than $2,000,000, taking the outlay from beginning to end. I am free to confess that I am not concerned as to where the money came from, nor do I think the Government are concerned as to where the money came from which built this road. I think the reasonable view is this, that the Government, in negotiating with parties for the purchase of a property which it requires and which it believes to be necessary in the public interest, are not required to force these people down to the lowest possible figure, because we feel that we have them in a position in which we can force them to part with their property at less than it cost them. We are not called upon to pursue that course. It may be that Mr. Greenshields is a friend of the Liberal party; it may be that Mr. Greenshields was friendly to the Government. I do not know that it has been in times past regarded as a disqualification for a Government to negotiate with a man if he was a friend, I do not know that it has been considered necessary, in the past, that when they had any property to buy, they should say to their friends: Hands off, keep clear; our sense of purity and uprightness is so great that we will not sit down and negotiate a transaction with you because you are our friend. We will look to our enemies and to our opponents and see whether they have any property to sell to the Government, as we cannot buy from our own friends. I was not concerned as to whether Mr. Greenshields was a friend or an opponent of the Government, nor was I concerned whether Mr. Farwell, who had a considerable interest in that property, was a friend or an opponent. The purchase of this property was a policy which had been determined upon, if we could carry it out within a reasonable cost, and we sat down in our negotiations with the parties interested in the road, and endeavoured to reach a reasonable and fair price at which the Government could acquire this property. I think, notwithstanding all that has been said, that, when we acquired a property at a valuation of $1,600,000 which had cost over $2,000,000, we made a pretty fair business transaction, and one that it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentlemen who have attacked this bargain to complain of and criticise. In connection with this transaction, I think that

some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), in regard to the conditions of this contract, are calculated to mislead. He left the impression that we were indifferent as to the character of the road that we were buying. Let me read a clause of the contract of 1897 which will show that we stipulated that this road, when it came into our hands should be in good condition. The second clause of the original contract with the Drummond County Railway, dated in May, 1897, provided:

That the company for the consideration aforesaid, will build and finish according to the Intercolonial Railway standard, the uncompleted portion of its main line at or near Forestdale to the western side of the Chaudière River, subject to the satisfaction and approval of the Government Railway Engineer, on or before the first day of November, 1897, and will lay the road-bed of the said uncompleted portion of its line hereby agreed to be constructed with new steel rails of not less than 70 pounds weight per yard for the said distance, and as part of such construction will make all proper and necessary connections with the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway at or near the west end of the Chaudière bridge to the like satisfaction of the Engineer of Government Railways, and will, in connection with the said construction, construct and finish all proper and necessary station buildings, stations, sidings, switches, tanks, buildings, coal-sheds, cattle-guards, crossings and other necessary appurtenances, as required by the Minister and to the satisfaction of the Engineer of Government Railways, and according to such plans as shall be furnished on the request of the company by the Department of Railways and Canals, so that the said line of railway hereby demised, or intended so to be, shall be fully completed and ready for use and occupation by Her Majesty on or before the date aforesaid.

And then it says, and this is all I shall quote upon this point:

That the company will, in the construction of the uncompleted portion of its line, construct the same to the satisfaction of the Government engineer, and with a uniform grade of 52·80 per mile,——

That is the general grade of the Intercolonial Railway——

——and, in addition, on the line already constructed, will reduce the grades at Carmel Hill and the St. Francis River to a maximum grade of 52·80 per mile.

So that we not only went into this thing closely and stipulated carefully as to the character of that portion that was to be a new line, but we went back over the old portion of the line and stipulated that there were two grades which had to be reduced and curves which had to be straightened, and we required these grades to be up to the general standard of the Intercolonial Railway. This shows, therefore, that we were not taking this road in the condition that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke of as if we were glad to take it from the owners, and as if we were indifferent to the condition of the road as implied by the statement of the hon. gentleman, our only design being that we should succeed in taking the property off the hands of the owners and getting the price into their pockets.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, in the hasty review I was endeavouring to make of the speech of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), I was dealing with that portion of it which had reference to the Drummond County part of the agreement. I pointed out that the references made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to that subject, had been repeated over and over again, and were to the effect that there had been no report obtained from the engineering staff of the department before this scheme had been embarked upon by the Government, that there had been a much larger sum of money paid for the road than it cost the proprietors; and I was proceeding to deal with the third point in his speech, in which he alleged that a large sum of money had been saved by this later agreement. It was, I believe, quite within the knowledge of every member of the House that there was not an idea suggested, a statement made, nor a fact presented, by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that had not been repeated over and over again, and answered over and over again. There was certainly nothing new in his assertion that half a million dollars had been saved under the contract as it now exists, as compared with the contract originally made. It had been already pointed out to the House more than once that the Government did not start out with any intention of paying the Drummond County Company more than $1,600,000 for that road. That was the value placed upon it, and it was simply a question of judgment, as to whether or not the money was to be paid in cash, or whether or not the property would be leased and a reasonable rate of interest paid as rental. As I have already stated to the House, there might very well be a reasonable difference of opinion on that question. But I shall not repeat myself in that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) contributed nothing whatever to the information of the House; he stated nothing that was not already talked threadbare, and, if that portion of his speech had been altogether omitted, no information or no argument would be lost that would contribute the slightest value to the discussion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) then proceeded to take up the Grand Trunk Railway part of the agreement, and I wish to call the attention of the House to what appears to me a most striking and significant fact in this discussion. It is a most striking fact that we have spent all these days debating the agreement by which we acquire the pro-

perty of the Grand Trunk Railway to get the Intercolonial into Montreal; we have sat until early one morning, and all of another night and morning, and let me ask these gentlemen opposite, who declared that the policy of the Government was utterly indefensible in this regard, what did they devote their chief time and attention to discussing? One night they discussed whether or not I should produce a memorandum which I received from my Deputy Minister upon a subject quite irrelevant, quite unimportant at all events, to the main controversy. It made no difference whether it was determined that the Yamaska bridge was worth $300,000, or one-half, or one-quarter of that amount; it had not the slightest bearing on the real question we had before us. We might have dropped out the Yamaska bridge wholly from the calculation; we might have dropped out the cost of the Richelieu bridge wholly from the calculation, and it would cut no figure in determining as to the reasonableness of our bargain. I shall show, before I sit down, why I venture to make that statement; but I want to draw the attention of the House for a moment to the nature of the discussion which has taken place since we first broached the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement, and I desire to have it known broadcast, if I can, throughout this country, from one end of it to the other, that, when this scheme was under discussion in Parliament, these gentlemen opposite, who were denouncing it in all the moods and tenses as a bargain discreditable to the Government—these gentlemen spent the hours, the days, and nights in debating, first, whether a statement of my chief engineer with regard to the cost of the construction of the Yamaska bridge should or should not be produced, and second, whether or not statements were before the House, or ought to be before the House, as to what was the percentage which the Intercolonial Railway had to pay out of the total cost of the maintenance of the railway acquired from the Grand Trunk Railway, and its proportion of the expenses of maintaining and operating the line.

These are the two questions; and, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking within your knowledge when I say that these gentlemen, who ask to be seriously considered by this country as being opposed to this undertaking, and as having some basis on which to ground their opposition, have entirely occupied the time of the debate on this question by pounding away at these two questions. What is the inference which any one is entitled to draw, which any one is bound to draw, from this fact. It is that these gentlemen would very gladly have put real, substantial arguments before the House, and have urged good and substantial reasons, which would have made an impression in the country, if they had been able to find them. But, Sir, it was because they could find no argument, it was because it was utterly impossible for them to discover any way in which to answer the case put before the House in the Government's proposals, that they were driven to the only other alternative they had, and that they have exhausted the time of the House in these useless and childish discussions.

When they were speaking in regard to the cost of this Yamaska bridge, I said that they were discussing a matter that was entirely in the air. We were not considering the building of a bridge over the Yamaska River nor a bridge over the Richelieu River. These were merely items in the consideration of an alternative proposition that was suggested by somebody, I think by the Minister of Finance, as to whether, instead of acquiring from the Grand Trunk this railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, it might not be advisable for the Government to start in and build another railway. I gave to the House what information I had received from my officers as to what in their judgment it would cost to build another line of railway. What was it I said? I said that my engineers had made an estimate of the cost of building such a railway, and that in their judgment, outside of the land damages, it would cost $485,000. I said, add to that the cost of a bridge at Yamaska, which was estimated at $300,000, the cost of a bridge over the Richelieu, which was estimated at $400,000, $500,000, which was the sum estimated by myself as fair and reasonable for land damages. Land damages must necessarily be paid, and must necessarily be heavy when you consider the character of the country, the towns and villages which you would have to pass through from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert when constructing a new line of railway. What matter whether the Yamaska bridge was taken into the calculation at all or not? What matter whether or not the Richelieu bridge was taken into the calculation? I have shown the House why we agreed to assume that one-half of the railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert which we acquired from the Grand Trunk was worth $750,000. The Grand Trunk Railway Company put that value on it, and they had a right to say what they would sell that property for. We could not fix the value for them; we had no power to do so. There was no machiney which we could set to work, no tribunal to which we could appeal, in order to make the Grand Trunk take a less sum than they were willing to take for half their railway. They said: "We value that piece of road at $1,500,000, it cost us that, and we will give you half of it for half what it cost us; if it suits your convenience to pay us interest on the cost in the form of rental, that will suit us; but we want interest at the rate of $37,500 a year, if we are to fix a price on that portion of the line." We had to take it or leave it. I have endeavoured to point out to the House that we could not leave it without throwing

away a good bargain. I mean that we could not give up and abandon this policy entirely, when we were able to get all these different sections at the reasonable sum at which we did finally secure them, namely, at $140,000 a year. We could not throw them up without throwing up a good opportunity to secure entrance into the city of Montreal, which would not be open to us to secure in any other way for at least two or three times greater cost than we are actually paying. I pointed out that a fair estimate of the cost of a road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert would be $1,500,000. Suppose it was only half that amount. Suppose you struck off the cost of the Yamaska bridge and the Richelieu bridge, you would strike off $700,000, nearly half the amount; suppose you struck all that off, and you had only $750,000 remaining, and you built the new line for that sum, viz., $750,000, you would not save anything, but a pecuniary loss would actually fall on the Government by adopting that arrangement in preference to the Government plan. I put this proposition, which I say is not capable of being successfully gainsaid, that if we could build such a railway for $750,000, for half the amount which my engineer estimated it would cost, and had undertaken to operate it as an independent line, we would have made a great blunder and have entailed a pecuniary loss upon the country. I will show you why I say so. You now have the railway built for you from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, costing us, at 5 per cent interest, $37,500 a year in the whole. Included in that $37,500 is the right to the use of that railway for all purposes of the Intercolonial—not only for the purpose of carrying our trains of all kinds from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie and from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, but for the purpose of carrying over it whatever traffic we may pick up or lay down along the line, whether it be passengers or freight. Some hon. gentleman opposite, particularly the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who is very deft at making calculations seem to be very anxious to get down to figures. Let them ask whether they make any allowance for the fact that we are entitled to do business along that line between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, and that every dollar we earn—and we are earning a substantial amount, an amount not to be despised—goes towards the reduction of the rental we pay for this road. No such allowance is made in the calculation of hon. gentlemen opposite.

But, Sir, I have another statement to present which, I think, will be very conclusive proof of the proposition I have just started to establish. I want to show the House, as I can show it, that it is a most distinct advantage to us to own a railway in concert with the Grand Trunk Railway, rather than to own and to operate an independent line. We could not do any more business over the line, if we owned it entirely ourselves, than we can do owning one-half interest with the Grand Trunk Railway. Not one pound of freight more would we be able to haul on an independent or separate and parallel line, we would not be likely to carry as much, because we would be in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway, and would not be receiving freight at Montreal, as now. But we will be in as good a position, under our traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, to do business on that road, though they own one-half—in fact, in a better position—as if we were running and owning an independent line ourselves. While, on the one hand, we are in a position to do as much business and to enjoy to a greater advantage the benefits arising from the user of that line, we are in an improved position, by reason of the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway has to bear its proportion of the maintenance and repairs of that whole line. There is a way in which you can get at the figures with a good deal of accuracy. It is an item of considerable importance, one you cannot brush aside, and, if any one of you were going into the question to-day of building a railway or acquiring a part interest in an existing road from another company, you would, necessarily, take into account the fact that, owning the road yourselves, you would have to maintain and repair it.

If we had built the line, according to the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), for the money he says we could build it for, we would still have to maintain it; we would have to put in ties, as they decay—and they decay just as fast, whether you do much or little business—we would have to renew the ballasting, and it requires to be renewed just as fast, whether we do much or little business; we would require to renew the old rails, and though rails may wear out a little quicker by carrying additional tonnage, yet there is not so much difference between the wear of the rails under considerable use, and their life under little use. So that you have to take into account, as a matter of reasonable and proper business calculation, that if you owned the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, you would have to maintain and keep it in repair. There is a way by which we can arrive at what that would cost, and I think the calculation can be made by anybody who chooses to look at the departmental report. If you will look at the Intercolonial Railway Report of last year, Abstract No. 3, maintenance of way and works, you will find what it cost the Intercolonial Railway for the maintenance of its way and works over its 1,202 miles, and that cost amounted to $861,728. The 32 miles of new railway the member for York would build from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, would have to be maintained and kept in repair by the Intercolonial Railway, and it would cost as much to keep in repair those 32 miles at it would

any other 32 miles upon the Intercolonial Railway. If it would, you will find that it will cost $717 per mile for every mile of your railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert for maintenance and repairs. Is not that a very considerable item? We do not pay that now under the present agreement. We only pay a fractional portion, because the Grand Trunk Railway pays its share, and that is the larger share. That is not all. You have the station expenses and the station charges of all kinds, and if you turn to Abstract No. 4 of the Intercolonial Reports for the year ending 30th June, 1898, you will find that these expenses amounted on the Intercolonial Railway to $400,164 over its 1,202 miles, which is $333 per mile. You would have the same expenses, if you owned and operated the new railway yourself, because you would have to maintain your stations. I think the proportion of the cost of maintenance of the stations would be larger, but treat it exactly on the same basis as the rest of the Intercolonial Railway, and it would amount to $333 per mile on the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. Add to that rate the $717 per mile of which I have spoken, and you get $1,050, which you would have to pay every year for every mile on the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. One thousand and fifty dollars per mile for 32 miles would amount to $33,600; so, you see that you would have to add, as an annual burden upon your business and the country $33,600 for that one item, if you solely owned that railway. The hon. gentleman ignores these facts; they are of no account to him. Well, you may say, that we are paying a very considerable portion of that now, because we are paying our proportion. Let me tell you exactly what we are now paying, if $33,600 was the amount which we would have to pay, if we owned the line. The road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert being operated and owned jointly by us and the Grand Trunk Railway, instead of our paying $33,600 a year, we are simply paying, as our proportion of the $33,600, $8,400, because we are only chargeable with 25 per cent, according to the statement which has been laid on the Table. That makes a saving of $25,200 per year which we consider a substantial sum, instead of being foolish enough to embark in railway building and laying down another railway between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, we have been wise enough to make a bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway for a reasonable sum, in the working out of which bargain we save $25,000 per year on the maintenance of way and repair and operating charges, compared with what we would have to pay, if we owned and operated the road ourselves.

The hon. gentleman is very much disposed to capitalize amounts. I would suggest to him that he should capitalize $25,200 a year. You can capitalize $6,000, and the hon. gentleman is modest enough to only capitalize it for 100 years. He is modest enough to say that when this arrangement is reduced by $6,000, we save $3,000,000 of money. That is a striking way to put it, undoubtedly, and anybody who can realize what $3,000,000 is, would undoubtedly be overwhelmed by the weight of the hon. gentleman's argument. It really teaches us how important it is that we should save money on every vote we give. Supposing there was a vote for $10,000, and we could make it $4,000 and save $6,000, I have not the lea . doubt that in process of time this $6,000 would amount to $3,000,000. Keep that in mind; it is a striking fact but it is not less true with regard to every appropriation we make than it is when applied by the hon. gentleman to-day. Let us capitalize the $25,200 we save by working with the Grand Trunk on their road instead of building one of our own, and what does it amount to? I cannot tell you what it amounts to for a hundred years, for I have not figured that out; but for one year it represents a capital of $840,000. In other words, when you are paying $25,200 more than you need, you are paying 3 per cent on $840,000. Capitalize that for a long period of years, capitalize it for the hon. gentleman's 100 years at 3 per cent, compound it, and the amount that you get as having saved by this arrangement, would far exceed the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, when this fact is taken into account, whatever little point there might have been, whatever little strength there might have been in the argument of the hon. member for York is entirely destroyed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the House must have observed that the hon. gentleman took a great deal of pains not to discuss this matter very fully; he did not discuss it in the main; he did not discuss it in its broad aspects; he did not discuss it as one would think such a question ought to be discussed. I have stated to the House that we were proposing this arrangement as a whole; taking it roundly, we are paying $140,000, which at 3 per cent represents a capital of about $4,500,000. Has the hon. gentleman undertaken to suggest to this House any possible way in which we could get into the city of Montreal and enjoy one tithe of the advantages we enjoy under this contract for any less sum than $4,500,000. Before he could consistently or logically or with reason, take a stand in antagonism to our proposal, he ought to have attempted to establish one or the other of two things; either that we had no business to attempt to get into the city of Montreal at all or that, taken as a whole, less than $140,000 a year, or $4,500,000 in capital, could have been laid out in some other way which would have brought us to the point that we desired to reach, and would have given us at least some portion of the advantages which have been secured under

this agreement. But he never undertook to touch either of these propositions. He has not ventured to say that it was not the best policy for the Intercolonial Railway to be carried to Montreal. He knew that he would have been behind the age if he had undertaken to make such a proposition; he knew that it would not have gained him sympathy in the country or support in this House. He knows that everybody who takes an interest in the Government railway at all believes in the policy of getting into Montreal. So, he ought to have devoted his ability, of which he possesses a very large share, to pointing out to this House in what way it was possible for this Government to reach the city of Montreal, and secure terminal facilities there that would put the Intercolonial Railway in a position to do business, at a less cost than under the present proposal. He has not done that. And why? He has not done it because he could not do it. No gentleman on the other side has undertaken to do it. Somebody on the other side laughs. Perhaps he thinks I am not doing justice to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). It is true that hon. gentleman struggled valiantly with one or two calculations. He was going to take us to Caughnawaga, and he did get us there. He was to put us across the river, and he put us across at very small cost, at smaller cost, I think, than anybody would undertake to do the job for. He got us to the cattle-yards in Montreal—and left us there. But we are not content to be left in the cattle-yards. Nor are we content to travel seventeen miles further than we are obliged to travel under this arrangement, paying for all the maintenance charged on fifty-five miles of railway with all the cost of operating expenses, which would amount—I have figured it out here—to about $57,750 a year on the present basis of the Intercolonial Railway. Not only are you carrying that added length of seventeen miles upon your back, but you are paying charges and maintenance of operation to the extent of $57,750 a year, when only a small proportion of that sum would fall on you with the arrangement we have made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. So, these gentlemen have not grappled with this subject. They are absolutely and completely floundered. They have been unable to grapple with the question, and I think I can say in all fairness and moderation that they are absolutely floundered, that they have not a leg to stand upon in their criticism of this policy. Of course, if you say: We do not want to go to Montreal, the whole thing goes by the board. But if they say: It is a wise policy for us to take the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, then it does not lie within the power of any of them, cute as many of them are, capable as many of them are, to construct an argument of very little material and to make the worse appear the better cause, to take up this case and show even to the moderate satisfaction of an opponent of the policy that we have taken an erroneous course, or that in adopting the policy we have adopted, we have taken a more expensive method of carrying it out than some other that can be suggested.

Now, I will not sit down without making a reference to what was said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place, because I wish to do him justice, and I find it very difficult to do him justice without reflecting somewhat seriously upon him. The hon. gentleman was asked by me, and asked, I think, in a courteous way, to tell me how he established the proposition, which he had laid down, that for every dollar that we were earning on the Intercolonial Railway for the year 1898 in excess of what had been earned in 1897, we were paying out $1.32—in other words, for every dollar we had earned it cost us $1.32. Here is what the hon. gentleman said in reply:

> I find that the total earnings of the Intercolonial Railway in 1897 were $2,866,028.02, and in 1898, $3,117,669.85, a net increase of $251,641.83. Now, compare the expenses. The total expenses in 1897 were $2,925,968.68, while in 1898 they were $3,257,648.51, an increase of $331,679.84. Now, what does that mean? That the Minister of Railways and Canals earned $251,641 additional, and that to earn that additional sum he expended $331,679. What does that mean? That every dollar of additional earnings cost this country $1.32.

And after making this explanation he winds up with this remark:

> Now, I leave to this House, I leave to the hon. gentleman's associates in the Government, I leave to his followers behind him, this statement as a fair sample of the statistics he has given us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I am justified in characterizing the hon. gentleman's statement as being extremely unfair and extremely misleading. It does not bear out the statement which he made to this House that for every dollar of extra earnings we paid out $1.32; it does not bear it out because the hon. gentleman is attributing this to the extension to Montreal, and the hon. gentleman knows, he heard me when I made my statement in Parliament, he heard me give the references, he heard me go into the subject in detail. I supplied him with the material by which he could destroy my calculation if it was inaccurate. He knew, therefore, what that calculation was, having that knowledge, I say his statement was unfair, I say it was misleading, and I think I might use a much stronger term in characterizing it. The hon. gentleman knew that he was dealing with the year in which the Montreal extension had only operated four months; from the 1st of March to the 1st of July were the only months in that year in which

the Montreal extension was running. He knew, as everybody ought to know, that in referring to the effect of the operation of the Montreal line it was unfair to take the first four months. In the first four months we had scarcely got to work. Everybody knows that business does not spring up in an instant on a new line, under a new system; everybody knows that we require to advertise for a time, and months, perhaps, require to elapse before business men would know that the line was in operation and was extended to Montreal. So it was unfair for the hon. gentleman to make that statement, from that point of view, and it was misleading, when he knew that the Montreal extension had nothing at all to do with the greater portion of the deficit of $209,000 that year. He knew from the statement that I made to Parliament, and the figures which I furnished him in detail, that a sum greater than the difference between the deficit which I showed last year and the deficit which was shown by the Minister who preceded me, was made up by reason of additional expenditures in repairs and maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway. I showed that we spent over $150,000 last year in order to bring the road up to its proper condition in the spring of the year, and thereby doubled the expenditure of that character within the period of 12 months, or within the fiscal year. The hon. gentleman having that knowledge, was grossly and manifestly unfair when he attributed the deficit to the extension to Montreal, and charged against its operation that we were spending $1.32 for every dollar additional that we earned. Now, I leave the hon. gentleman there, I leave him with the inferences which hon. members of this House are fairly entitled to draw from his statements. I do not think the hon. gentleman has done himself a great deal of credit in that connection.

I will now for a few minutes refer to one or two criticisms made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) upon the Grand Trunk Railway bargain, not at all with respect to the contract as it is now before the House, but with respect to the contract which was before the House a year ago. In this connection I may say that the hon. gentleman appears to take a great deal of comfort out of the fact that the present arrangement is better, in a sense, than that which we originally proposed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not been able myself to see that in respect of the terms of the contract between us and the Drummond County Railway, there is much to be said in favour of the present over the former arrangement, nor is there room for a strong opinion one way or the other. That is my judgment, and that is the judgment, I know, of a good many others; that was the judgment of the Government when we had the question before us. It was a question of whether we would rent the railway at 4 per cent upon $1,600,000 or whether we would try to effect a sale upon that basis of value, and under all the circumstances we concluded, possibly not wisely, that it was better to make this arrangement than to effect a purchase. But the hon. gentleman, and the leader of the Opposition as well, were very much concerned because I had been unable, or was unwilling, to acknowledge that the present arrangement was much preferable to the old one. Well, I presume the hon. gentlemen would not expect me to say that unless I was of the opinion that the present arrangement was a better one. If, in my opinion, it was a much better arrangement, I would not hesitate to avow it. The ex-Minister of Finance said this afternoon, that we are coming down now with a better scheme than we had in the first instance, and we are open to the charge of having tried to force through an inferior contract, and if it had not been for the Senate blocking our plans we would have forced it through; but as a result of their action, we are here to-day with a better arrangement. I would not be afraid nor unwilling to acknowledge that the bargain is better if it were better. But, as a matter of fact, as to the Drummond County bargain, I do not see that there is very much difference between the two. I am free, however, to acknowledge that the present Grand Trunk Railway arrangement is in some respects better than the previous arrangement. I would not have tried to improve upon the old arrangement if I was going to be afraid to acknowledge it. I think, perhaps, some of those hon. gentlemen opposite, if they had been in my position, would have insisted in having the old arrangement carried out in all its details, rather than have to acknowledge that they could make a better one. Wherever this contract is better than the other one, I am willing to acknowledge it. I am free to confess that in respect of the reduction of $6,000, which under the old arrangement we were paying to the Grand Trunk Railway, the present one is an improvement upon the first. I am free to confess that when the time came to make a new contract, and when we decided to ask the Drummond County Railway to give us an option to buy at a cash basis of $1,600,000, and when we got the terms of the new contract settled, then I felt we were in a position to say to the Grand Trunk Railway: We think that you have no reasonable ground to add this $6,000 to the $140,000 we have agreed to give you. We think that the Intercolonial Railway have no reasonable right to pay $6,000 in addition to the $140,000 we have agreed to give you. We will not go to Parliament and ask them to give you $146,000 for this rental. As a result, it was agreed that they should accept $140,000. Whether it was in consequence of the action of the Senate or not, it is quite immaterial to me. The hon. member

for York (Mr. Foster) asks: Where would the country have been, if the Senate had not defeated this project? I do not think we would have been in any different position from that in which we are to-day. I might ask: Where would we have been, if the Senate had defeated the scheme under which hon. gentlemen opposite purchased the line of the Grand Trunk at $12,000 per mile, and in addition had to spend a large amount of money after that to put it in proper condition? If the Senate had defeated that, which it did not do, how much better off would our position have been to-day? But the argument did not strike the Senate at that time, and the arrangement, as it was presented by Parliament, was accepted. I think the arrangement we presented to Parliament two years ago ought to have been accepted, because it was a good business arrangement. I do not think $6,000 a year counts in the calculation at all. When you have regard to the enormous advantages from the stand-point of the Intercolonial Railway, when you have regard to all that we have secured from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, $6,000 does not cut any material figure in the transaction. I was told the other day, by one of the officers of the Grand Trunk, that they had made a valuation of the terminals in Montreal. They have 43 miles of tracks laid down, and 150 acres of land, with all the buildings and equipment which have been gathered there during all these years, and they say, that the value that has been placed upon that property by expert and competent valuators, is $30,000,000. When you consider that we have access to property of $30,000,000 in value, when we have access to all the tracks, which allow us to go everywhere and anywhere in the city and in the precincts of Montreal, that the business needs of the situation require, what money value can you put upon it, even as respects the business of the Intercolonial Railway? The Intercolonial Railway has, as I think I have taken occasion to repeat before, is not restricted in its use of these terminals by the fact that its business is not on so large a scale as that of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We have to use portions of the terminals, perhaps frequently, but not all of them as fully, as the Grand Trunk. We have to turn to one department and another to get to slips to reach the ships and to reach the different wharfs and warehouses, the different junctions and connections where we have to receive and deliver our freights. We require to reach these places as much as the Grand Trunk has to do, though they may send twenty trains to one point to our one. But it is just as necessary for us to get to these points to take one car-load as it would be, if we had to take a thousand car-loads, and, if we were not enabled to reach these points, we would have to pay the cost of carriage in some other way, if we are to do the business, which we can now reach at practically no cost to ourselves whatever. So it is not at all, it appears to me, an extreme view to say, that we are participating to a considerable extent in the value of these terminal facilities which have been placed at our disposal, and which we have the fullest right to use under the terms and conditions of the contract. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has put forward one or two propositions in connection with the question of rental, the percentage of user, and so forth, which rather indicate to me that he is labouring under an entire and complete misconception of the nature of this contract. I venture to say, he has not used understandingly or to advantage the papers which have been in his hands for all these weeks and months, though he is calling out for more. He has wanted these terminal papers, and, when these terminal papers are before him, they apparently convey no intelligent idea to his mind. He might as well not have seen them at all. In the proposition which he puts forward, he says, that the rental of the Grand Trunk property is of the nature of a retainer; that, after paying rentals, that is, after you have handed over your retainer, you have bound yourself to pay for the user of these lines and terminals at the rate of 5 per cent for all time to come. I think I have correctly stated the hon. gentleman's position.

Mr. FOSTER. I made no such statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I so understood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I say I did not. The hon. gentleman could not have understood me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman not only said it once, but repeated it three or four times.

Mr. FOSTER. I said, that the 4 per cent was entirely in reference to betterments.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did not the hon. gentleman say, that we would have to pay for the user?

Mr. FOSTER. Why should I say that, when I knew that it was not so?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did not the hon. gentleman say, that these rentals we were paying in respect of this railway were only in the nature of a retainer?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What did that mean? And did not the hon. gentleman say, that we would have to pay for the user afterwards?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I venture to say, that, when

we consider it, he meant that we would have to pay for the user of the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "Hear, hear," the hon. gentleman says. I wish to say that there is nothing in any term of the contract which says, that we have to pay for the user of these terminals or this railway after we have paid our rentals, and the hon. gentleman is showing us that he has not turned to account the opportunity he has had of reading the papers which have been in his possession all these months. A retainer is an honorary fee, and after you pay a retainer, you have to pay for the work that the recipient does. After we pay these rentals, the hon. gentleman says, that we have to pay for the use of the road, the use of the bridge and the use of the terminals. Do we? I say, we do nothing of the sort. What the hon. gentleman has done has been to confuse and mix up the contribution which we make towards the wear and tear, with the rental which we pay. He does not discriminate between the two. We pay rental upon the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert upon the basis of one-half of the value of the line. We get half of the road, which is ours as well as theirs; but it has to be maintained, and the moment our rental is paid, not one shilling goes to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in consideration of having any use or ownership of that road. The agreement says, that a division shall be made between the Grand Trunk and us of what it costs, after we have the property, to keep the property in proper shape. It is one thing to build a railway, and another thing to maintain it. The hon. gentleman has not discriminated between the two. You have to keep it re-sleepered, re-tied and re-ballasted, and, if need be, re-railed, and it is in respect to the wear and tear that any question arises between us as to the combined car mileage, and it is not in respect to the rentals. When the charges are made up for the month for repairing the waste on the road, making good what requires renewal, the cost is divided between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Railway on the basis of the user of the road, and the only contribution we make towards the user is our proportion of the cost monthly of the repairs, as they are incurred.

And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) undertakes to advise this country and this Parliament that they must not assent to this arrangement because, he says, the $140,000 a year is simply a retainer or a gift, and that you have to still pay the proportionate value for the use of that property which your money has gone to acquire. It must be a very dull man indeed who does not understand this arrangement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not only been confusing the particulars I have stated, but he has been confusing the terminals with the line from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie. They are altogether upon a different basis, although used in the same way, and I will show you why. We agreed with the Grand Trunk Railway on the sum of $140,000 as a fixed amount, but we said: A portion of that is for your terminals, including your station at Bonaventure and your 150 acres of buildings, work shops, sheds, tracks and connections. A portion of that is to be considered by way of a fixed rental, not at all based upon the amount we use of it. Any man can tell the proportion we use, in a general sense, as it will depend upon the amount of business we do. This year we may not do much, next year we will do more, in ten or twenty years we hope to be doing an immensely increased traffic, and although our business may double or quadruple, our rent is the same, and the only particular in which our payments to the Grand Trunk Railway will differ from the first year's occupation is that if the Grand Trunk Railway business does not increase as ours does, we would have to pay a larger amount for the repairs upon the portion of the terminals as they are described in the contract, than we did at the outset. Just examine the question of the bridge with me for a moment, and you will see how completely the arrangement has been made is in the interests of the country. We pay the Grand Trunk Railway a sum which we say may fairly be fixed at $40,000 for the use of that bridge, and that represents all the use we can make of that bridge, for there is no limit to our occupation of it. In addition to the $40,000, we pay a small proportionate amount according to the number of cars and engines we send over that bridge, to assist in keeping the rails and tracks in order. Well, hon. gentlemen will see that the rails and tracks are a very small part indeed of that bridge. The Grand Trunk Railway have to keep men on the bridge all the time repairing the iron-work, repairing the stonework, painting it, keeping it in up-to-date shape, and we do not pay one farthing for all that. They have to do it at their own cost. Under this contract, all that we pay in addition to the $40,000 is to contribute a portion towards the proper repairing of the track according to the amount of business we do relatively to the business done by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Now, supposing we ourselves were to build a bridge across the St. Lawrence—anywhere you like—do you not imagine that the cost of maintaining that bridge, looking after the ironwork and the stonework, painting and repairing it, would be a very considerable item. I know that it would. I know that the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway are a constant charge to us. I know that the steel and iron bridges have to be painted frequently. All these charges with respect to the

Victoria bridge are, under this arrangement, borne by the Grand Trunk Railway, and we only pay (according to the returns which have been brought down) 5 per cent of the cost of keeping the track, and the track alone, in repair.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had a good deal to say on the betterment clause in this Grand Trunk Railway contract, and he tells us how much better it is than it was before. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been unable to see wherein the very great improvement lies between these two contracts, even in respect to betterment. The basis of the original agreement was that we should pay 5 per cent upon half the cost of any improvements we might make within the area specified in the 35th clause of that contract. I will tell the House why we agreed upon the 5 per cent. It was because the Grand Trunk Railway Company would not agree upon any less rate than 5 per cent, because at that time they were paying 5 per cent themselves for every dollar of money that they borrowed. Would you expect that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would borrow money at 5 per cent to make betterments on the road which we would enjoy the advantage of, and accept a less rate of interest from us than they themselves had to pay. It is a small matter after all, but you see that the position the Grand Trunk Railway was in was such that they could not be expected in reason to agree upon any less rate of interest than was named. If you wish to be fair, you must keep in your mind that at the time the arrangement was made, the position of the Grand Trunk Railway was very different indeed from what it is today. Under the present management there has been a marked improvement; they are differently situated in the money markets of the world than they were then, they can borrow money now at a less rate, and under that circumstance, when we came to revise the contract after it had been defeated in the Senate, applying the same argument they presented to us in the first instance, we were able to show them that there was good reason why they should consent to a reduction in the rate of 5 per cent. Look at this clause in a business way; and what do you find? Was it not necessary that some provision should be made in the contract for conditions which would be certain to arise, rendering it necessary that there should be improvement and betterment made upon the line. We had to anticipate the almost certainty of that; we had to anticipate the certainty that the time would come in the course of the ninety-nine years when, in our own interest, it would be necessary that more tracks should be laid down, and that there should be some facilities added which were not in existence when the contract was made. Now, I would like to ask any one, how any safer or fairer provisions could be made than were made in that contract of 1897. In my opinion, except that there is a difference of 1 per cent in the interest, this contract of 1897 is just as good as the contract of 1898. We were making provision there for a condition of things which are certain to arise, and we were making provision that whatever the cost might be, seeing that it was upon the property encumbered by the Grand Trunk Railway that the capital expenditure should be made by the Grand Trunk Railway, and that we would allow them a fair and reasonable rate of interest upon that proportion of outlay. It is apparently overlooked, whether accidentally or otherwise, that we surrounded ourselves in this contract with the most perfect safeguards as fully as it was possible for any person to do in a written arrangement. We provided that it was only when in the opinion of the parties—not of one party, but of all—it was necessary to lay down double tracks at any point on that line, including the line between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, and moreover only when Her Majesty determined to use such works and improvements, and in case the Minister declared that such works and improvements were necessary, and declared that in writing, then we should pay for the use of such works the interest on half their actual cost. So that we simply desire to provide and did provide, to meet the condition of things which it was necessary we should provide for, and which, if we failed to provide for, would have led to interminable trouble in the event of this contract being confirmed. Now, Sir, I think it is only fair to say that was a reasonable and proper provision to insert, when you were entering into an agreement for a long term of years, and when you could already anticipate that the time could not be far distant when just such works as these would become necessary. But, Sir, the present arrangement is based upon a different principle to that of 1897. I do not say it is any better; I do not know that it is a particle of improvement; I doubt if it is any better. We started by paying interest on half the cost of these improvements, if any are made, between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. We have agreed to pay interest at 4 per cent upon the proportion of this capital expenditure, ascertained upon the basis of wheelage. In other words, after it has been decided—and it must be decided with the consent of the Government and the Minister, and he must declare it necessary, and so declare in writing.—the Grand Trunk may proceed to lay down a double track between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie, or any part of that line which may be covered by the understanding. After that has been determined upon, then the proportion of the burden to be borne by us as compared with the Grand Trunk is ascertained on the basis of wheelage, and we pay interest on that proportion for all time. That is the nature

of the present arrangement, and it is a fair matter for difference of opinion as to whether it is to be preferred to the other, or whether the other is to be preferred to this.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have in these references touched every proposition which the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House has referred to in this connection, and I think I have shown that the criticisms which he has to-day passed upon the present arrangement, so far as they have been new and have not been repeated over and over again in this House, are easily susceptible of explanation; that the terms of this arrangement are reasonable and proper terms to be incorporated in this agreement; and that, taking the contract as a whole, so far as I can gauge and measure and judge of the character of the discussion on the other side, there has been no effort made, much less successfully made, to show that the proposal which we have submitted to Parliament is not the best that could have been made, and one which is in the true interest of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say a very few words with regard to the contract which is now being discussed. So far as that portion of the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways which deals with the Drummond County Railway is concerned, I do not propose to say anything, because I have already placed my views very fully before the House; but I wish to say one or two words with reference to that portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks which relates to the Grand Trunk Railway. If the House is not enlightened in regard to this matter, it is certainly not by reason of any hesitation on the hon. gentleman's part to occupy the time of the House. We might venture to think that if he had spent as much time before this agreement was prepared, in considering it as he has spent in discussing it in the House, we would not have had the agreement of 1897 in the form in which it was presented. Nor would we have the hon. gentleman coming to the House two years afterwards and vainly attempting to assure the House that there is no very important difference between the terms of that agreement and the terms of the present agreement. I will not go over all the points which the hon. gentleman has dealt with so very fully; but when he stands up in the House and says that he for one is not able to determine whether the wheelage basis for the cost of improvements is better than the half-cost basis, and almost in the same breath shows us that in the one case the cost would be almost double what it would be in the other, I do not think the hon. gentleman's remarks need very much refutation. He tells us that the proportion of the user of the Intercolonial Railway in respect of the line from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert is 27 per cent. According to the figures he has brought down I do not make it so much; I make it 20 per cent. Under the agreement of 1898 we pay one-fifth of the cost of the improvements, and under the agreement of 1897 we pay interest at 5 per cent on one-half the cost of the improvements. That is one very important matter with respect to which the agreement of 1898 is distinctly better than the agreement of 1897.

Now, the hon. gentleman made a very curious argument with regard to the maintenance of the road. It was rather an ingenious argument, though I am not quite sure I do not unduly compliment him, when I say it was ingenious. He told us that if we built the road, we would have to pay practically the same cost of maintenance, whether we used it much or little, because the cost of maintenance is not very much greater if you have an enormous tonnage going over the road, than if you have a small tonnage. Does he not see that, if his own statement be correct, the Grand Trunk Railway are making a very good thing out of it, because they would have to keep up this road just the same as now from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. They have exactly the same use of it now as before, and they are saving 25 per cent of the cost of maintenance, which they put into their pockets.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never said the Grand Trunk Railway had not made a very good arrangement; but I said, that we have also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think the hon. gentleman would have to admit that the Grand Trunk Railway made a very good arrangement. Any one who saw the obvious anxiety of the Grand Trunk Railway to have this agreement carried out, would have no doubt that they considered it a very good arrangement for them. The hon. gentleman coolly tells us, that, if we had to build the road, we would have to maintain the whole thing, whereas now, he says, we pay only 27 per cent of the cost of maintenance. Does not the hon. gentleman see that that very argument shows what a remarkably good bargain the Grand Trunk Railway are making, independent of the enormous rental of $37,500 per year which they are getting for the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Seventy-five per cent is the benefit to us, and 25 per cent to them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand the hon. gentleman, and am very much afraid he does not quite understand himself. Let us look into the position of affairs a little more closely. The Grand Trunk Railway receives from us a rental of $37,500 for that portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert. Well, according to the figures he has brought down, I make the user of the Intercolonial Railway about 20 per cent of

the total amount of the user of the two roads of that portion. The hon. gentleman may make it, I think, 27 per cent; but I do not see that the figures bear that out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The figures show over 25.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will look at the figures he has brought down, and see whether or not that is correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We pay $18,000 on $73,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let us have the whole thing. So far as the terminals are concerned, in respect of the Montreal terminals our user was as follows:—

November	6·31
December	5·87
January	5·28
February	5·92
March	6·59
April	9·90

Now, from St. Lambert to Point St. Charles is a distance, I understand, of about 4 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About 2 miles bridge, and 2¼ miles is road.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The total is about 4 miles, and the percentage of user for the Intercolonial Railway was as follows:—

November	12·32
December	10·46
January	9·42
February	10·65
March	11·62
April	16·81

From St. Hyacinthe to St. Lambert is about 29 miles, and the percentage of user of the Intercolonial Railway was as follows:—

November	20·90
December	16·20
January	14·88
February	17·02
March	18·45
April	29·73

The hon. gentleman tells us that that means 25 per cent. I have worked it out, and from St. Hyacinthe to St. Lambert, on the figures he has brought down, it is 19·56, and not 25 per cent. If he is correct in saying it is 25 per cent, he has brought down wrong figures. I will now give the rest of it. From Ste. Rosalie to St. Hyacinthe the percentage of the Intercolonial Railway was as follows:—

November	22·13
December	17·13
January	15·69
February	18·39
March	19·49
April	30·70

And the average is not 25 per cent, but 20·59. How the hon. gentleman gets 25 per cent out of those figures, I cannot understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you will look at the returns brought down, you will observe that the total charges for the period is $73,000, paid by the Grand Trunk Railway on maintenance and other expenses in connection with these sections. Our proportion is $18,000, and that, I take it, is pretty close to 25 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. That takes the station operating expenses, besides the maintenance, and that is on a different basis.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, that takes it in, but it is exactly the same principle. I say, that the maintenance of the road and the station and operating expenses amount to about 25 per cent of the total cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is confusing two things. There is one basis for one portion of the cost of maintenance, and another basis for another portion of the cost of maintenance. The one I was dealing with, and on which the hon. gentleman undertook to contradict me, was the proportion of train and engine mileage, and the figures I have given show that it is not over 20 per cent. Now, there is another basis on which some portion of the cost of maintenance is to be calculated, and that is the number of trains passing or leaving stations. I am not taking a proportion of the station expenses, but of train mileage, and the proportion of train mileage is in the vicinity of 20 per cent, very little more or less. I have given the hon. gentleman exactly the proportion for the 4 miles of terminals, and the proportion, as I have computed it, taking the average of the figures he has brought down, is this:

From—	
St. Lambert to Point St. Charles	11·96
St. Hyacinthe to St. Lambert	19·56
St. Rosalie to St. Hyacinthe	20·69

And for the short distance from the Chaudière bridge to the siding there, a very short distance—I do not suppose more than half a mile—which we use almost solely, our proportion is 69·50. But, taking the whole line, you will not get 20 per cent.

The hon. gentleman takes great credit because, as he says, we are really saving 75 per cent of the cost of maintenance. What the saving amounts to when analysed, is simply this. We are paying a rental on the basis of half the user—the basis on which his engineer made it up under his directions, and on which he acted—and we are paying for the cost of maintenance on the basis of our proportion of the user. Then, the hon. gentleman who is paying rental on an extravagant basis, so far as user is concerned—that is to say, paying on the basis of equal user, when our user is only one-fifth—tells us, in justification: Oh, you will lose on the rental, but you are making on the cost of maintenance. Now, when you come to analyse that argument, it does not seem to me it affords a

very striking illustration of the strength of the hon. gentleman's position ; but, such as it is, to use his own language, he is entitled to the benefit of it.

Now, I do not propose to deal with any portion of this Grand Trunk agreement, except in so far as I can endeavour to assist this House by referring to the information which the hon. gentleman has, at last, seen fit to bring down. And I do think that when the hon. gentleman stood up in his place in this House and talked about waste of time, he certainly had an amount of nerve and courage that I have never seen equalled on the floor of this House. He detained this House from eight o'clock in the evening until half-past one on the next afternoon because he would not bring down information which he had promised——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) permit me. I gave the hon. gentleman credit—I did it sincerely—for desiring to be fair. But I am sure he is not trying to be fair now. He knows very well that when it appeared the other night that the hon. gentleman desired a statement of the combined car and engine mileage of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, I told him at once that I had not it and could not get it until the next day, that is, until it could be obtained from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I said that the Intercolonial Railway had not the figures, and the hon. gentleman knows it was utterly impossible for me to give the information before the time I did. I offered immediately—it was about eleven in the evening, before we had got into the debate and this question came up —I offered and the Premier followed up my offer by making repeated offers of the same kind, but hon. gentlemen opposite would not be content to go on with the business and let their request stand until it could be acceded to next day. I am surprised that he would say that I refused to bring down the information. I could not bring it down, but I offered to do so as soon as it could possibly be obtained.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will not find that I am disposed to be unfair, but I am disposed to call the attention of the House to what the actual facts were. I asked on the 26th of May for certain information and took up about a column of "Hansard" to make it perfectly clear to him what I desired. I waited until about last Tuesday night, and then I asked the hon. gentleman if the information was brought down, and he said that it had been. I give him credit for speaking in all sincerity at that time. But when, next night, I found out that the information had not been brought down, I brought the fact to the hon. gentleman's atttention. And what took place ? The hon. gentleman raised point after point with regard to the matter——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He raised point after point with regard to it, and he stated that the proportion of user by the Intercolonial Railway was about 25 per cent. I told him that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) had stated to me that different information had been given to him in the House by my hon. friend (Mr. Blair). Now, I did not see at that time, and I do not see yet, if the information was not in possession of the hon. gentleman to give to the House, how he would have any idea one way or the other, except the proportion of expenses——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the only way I could tell, and I gave it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why did not the hon. gentleman give it to us at once ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman was offered it and would not take it. He and his friends would not have anything but the combined car and engine mileage, and "Hansard" will show that they were offered and refused.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I understood the hon. gentleman to offer to the House that night was not a proportion at all, but simply a statement of what the Intercolonial Railway had paid for operating expenses. If I misunderstood him, I regret it. I did not understand him to offer me or any one else a statement showing a proportion. If the hon. gentleman did offer that or anything else, "Hansard" will show it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "Hansard" will show that I offered to bring in a statement to show how much the Grand Trunk had charged us and how much we had paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will recall what took place he will remember that gentlemen on this side offered over and over again to take up other business, go into Supply, to leave aside the Grand Trunk Bill, which was then being discussed ; but the only answer we could get from the hon. gentleman was that he would continue to sit and discuss that Bill. I do not want to go over again the events that took place during that long sitting of the House, but I venture to think the hon. gentleman is not in a position to taunt any one on this side with wasting the time of the House or the country.

The matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House, and almost the only mat-

ter, was simply this—the hon. gentleman, in making his bargain with the Grand Trunk, appropriated a sum of about $65,000 as the annual amount to be paid to the Grand Trunk for terminals at Montreal; in addition to which we are to pay our proportion of the cost of maintenance. Now, the proportion of user which we make of such proportion of the terminals as we do use is a little less than 7 per cent, about one-fifteenth of the total user. Now, the hon. gentleman, in his speech to-night, said that we used all the terminals more or less. I did not so understand the view of the hon. gentleman when this matter was being discussed before the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have always said that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman produced a statement from Mr. Schreiber, as will be found at page 11 of the Committee's report, in which Mr. Schreiber makes use of this language:

The Grand Trunk Railway property at Point St. Charles, Montreal, must be worth several millions of dollars, but we shall use only a small proportion.

And the hon. gentleman, in his answer to Mr. Powell, at the bottom of the same page, said:

Q. This is for half, or simply the share that the Intercolonial would require of these terminal facilities?—A. That would be on the basis of one-half the value at 5 per cent of such portions of these terminals as he thought he would require to use.

Now, it does not appear that at that time they thought they would use all the terminals, but it does appear that they thought they would use a portion only, which Mr. Schreiber values at $1,239,200. And, again, the hon. gentleman, giving evidence at page 12, says:

Mr. Schreiber states in his memorandum that the line from Point St. Charles to Montreal is worth several millions of dollars, but as we would use only a small proportion he makes the value on that proportion.

Again, at page 13, he says:

Mr. Schreiber has estimated on a basis of part of the cost of such portions of the terminal facilities as we may reasonably be expected to use.

Again, at page 13, he says that they estimated on a basis

Of equal user of such portions of the terminals as we would require to use.

It is abundantly evident, from all these statements, that the hon. gentleman did not then understand, nor did his deputy understand, that they would use all the terminals, but only a portion. What was that portion? It was the portion made up in the statement by Mr. Schreiber, to be found at page 11 of this report, in which Mr. Schreiber estimates that the cost of the terminals which the Intercolonial Railway would require, amounted to $1,239,200. I assume that the hon. gentleman is not paying the Grand Trunk Railway for terminals which he does not use. I have the right to assume that some reliance can be placed upon this statement which the hon. gentleman's deputy prepared, and which the hon. gentleman himself put forward in his evidence before the committee as a statement on which reliance might be placed. What result do you have from that? This result—that the total cost of the portion of the terminals we may expect to use is $1,239,200. Now, the rental which is paid by the Intercolonial Railway, being $65,000 and the user of the Intercolonial Railway being one-fifteenth of the total, the rental for these terminals on the basis of the user—which must be admitted to be a fair basis—would give you a rental of $975,000 as the total rental for the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railway in respect of this property. That is to say, if the Grand Trunk were to pay rental on the same basis as we are paying, the total rental for this property, which is worth less than $1,250,000, would be nearly $1,000,000. I think if anything could demonstrate to this House and to the public that the rental which we are paying for these terminals is an enormous rental, that fact alone is sufficient to demonstrate it. Now, Sir, if anything further were required to indicate to the House that we use only a very small proportion of these terminals, the evidence of Mr. Wainwright, which has already been brought to the attention of the House, would show it conclusively. I refer to what he says on page 56:

I have shown in this plan that it involves the use of 40 miles of sidings, freight-sheds, round-houses and all appurtenances. It is very much like going to a man who owns a palace, with my wife, having married, and asking him to give me his whole house. Of course, I can only use one room, but in a few years there may be a large family. I do not know what proportion will be our use and what will be theirs.

Then, further down, he answers the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals:

I would not like to undertake to say that the user of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as the whole terminals are concerned, would be 100th part the user of the Grand Trunk Railway.

So that you have two things to consider here. In the first place, you have to consider that, of the terminals, which the hon. gentleman says are worth about $20,000,000, our portion would be worth, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman's engineer, $1,250,000 at the outside. Then, you have next to consider that, in respect to that very small portion of the terminals which we do use, our proportion of user, as compared with the user of the Grand Trunk Railway, is as 1 to 15. Then, take into consideration that we are paying a rental of $65,-

000 for user, and I venture to submit again, that the contract the hon. gentleman has made is not a good contract for this country, but, as the hon. gentleman very truly states, it is a most excellent contract from the stand-point of the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. gentleman seems to lay a great deal of stress on the fact that our user may increase as time goes on. And so the user of the Grand Trunk will increase as time goes on, and, as pointed out by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, it is probable that the user of the Grand Trunk Railway will increase in greater proportion than the user of the Intercolonial Railway. What will be the result? If both these roads continue to increase in their business, the terminals will have to be increased, and money will have to be expended, and we will have to bear our proportion of that, and the result will be, that we will pay an increased rental for the increased value of the terminals, under the provision of this contract for that purpose. So, this $65,000 does not measure the real rental which we may have to pay in the future, if our business does increase, as the hon. gentleman anticipates. As I ventured to point out on a previous occasion, the amount which we are paying as rental for this road is out of all proportion to what the Intercolonial Railway receives from the Dominion and Atlantic Railway. That railway has 34 miles of the Intercolonial Railway road, a very good portion of the Intercolonial Railway, a good-paying portion of the road, of which it has exclusive user, and it has 14 miles more of which it has user in common with the Intercolonial Railway, just as efficient a user as that to which we are entitled under this agreement. It has the use of our terminal facilities at Halifax, in addition to this 48 miles of road, and the net amount which we received annually for the last three years from that railway was the sum of $16,682.50, or about one-ninth of what we are paying for the use of 38 miles of the Grand Trunk Railway and the terminals at Montreal. So, it seems to me that the agreement which the hon. gentleman has made, however excellent it may be from his stand-point, is certainly a very different kind of agreement from that to which we had to submit, when we made a bargain with another company.

I merely desired to bring to the attention of the House the result of the returns which it took so long for the hon. gentleman to bring down for our information; and I say, that, having regard to these figures, and having regard to the figures relating to the user of the terminals, I am confirmed in the opinion which I have entertained ever since I first made any investigation into this matter, that the amount of rental which we are proposing by this agreement to pay to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, is a very excessive rental. I think that the matter which the ex-Minister of Finance brought to the attention of the House, with respect to traffic arrangements, is also one which the Government might well take into consideration. The ex-Minister of Finance did not put that matter any too strongly. We are giving the Government, by the confirmation of this agreement, power to make any traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway which this Parliament could authorize the Government to make; we are placing power in the hands of the Government beforehand to make exactly any kind of agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway concerning traffic that they may see fit to do. Now, if it is proper to bring traffic arrangements of that far-reaching character down to Parliament, I venture to think that it is only right and proper that the Government should insert a clause in this Bill providing that any alteration or modification of that traffic arrangement should be submitted to Parliament, and, unless that is done, I, for one, am not prepared to approve or to vote for this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would you vote for it, if we did?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have already endeavoured to explain to the hon. gentleman as fully as I could, and I think no one in this House misunderstands my position, that, for the reasons which I have already pointed out, I think the agreement which he has made with the Grand Trunk Railway is based on a very excessive rental. Therefore, I would not deem myself justified in voting for it. But apart from that, I say, the hon. gentleman is taking to himself power to make any agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company which Parliament could give him power to make; he s taking that power in advance; he is taking it without any control from Parliament. In other words, the Government, by means of he ratification of this agreement, are placing themselves in the position of Parliament, so far as future dealings with the Grand Trunk Railway in respect of traffic arrangements are concerned. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will agree with that view, but it seems to me perfectly clear. By this Bill we confirm this agreement, and we give it the force of an Act of Parliament. The 40th section recites that Her Majesty has made a traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and it also provides that the Government and the company may modify that traffic arrangement in any way they see fit by mutual consent. Then, this House, when it ratifies the 40th section, gives to the Government exactly the same power which Parliament has, to deal with traffic arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and it does not seem to be a proper thing to confide to the Government of this country power of that kind with respect to arrangements which, in the ordinary course, are submitted to Parliament. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I do

not see my way clear to vote for the Bill of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is now moving the third reading.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I just desire to say a few words upon this question. I can hardly believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in their criticisms up to the present point, because, all the time, I see that they are getting worse. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), in his opening remarks, said that there was no instance in the history of this country where a bargain had been entered into by a Minister of Railways and carried through Parliament in the manner in which the present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), is seeking to carry this bargain through the House and to secure its sanction. I looked up the record to find out how the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who was Minister of Railways in 1879, introduced to Parliament and carried through a scheme for the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I find that the course adopted by him on that occasion is on all fours and exactly the same as the course adopted by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals on the present occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain wherein he is making a serious mistake. My predecessor, Mr. Mackenzie, had obtained the common consent of Parliament to making an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway for the purchase of that branch of the Grand Trunk before I took it up at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will not challenge what the hon. gentleman says. I am sure he is honest in stating what he has done, but he introduced a resolution himself for the purpose of bringing about the purchase of this road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so, but after a year's discussion on the subject by the country and by Parliament.

Mr. McMULLEN. No. The hon. gentleman said :

> Among the papers submitted will be found a letter from Mr. Shanly, in which he estimated the 119 miles of property the Government had purchased.

My hon. friend stated at the time—

> The property the Government had purchased.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. McMULLEN. Upon the introduction of a motion for the purpose of providing the money, my hon. friend arose and spoke of "the property that the Government had purchased."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Very well. He was introducing a resolution upon which he intended to base a Bill for that purpose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that not the same as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has done ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The difference is this. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) entered into this arrangement with the Drummond County Railway and with the Grand Trunk Railway Company without having the subject brought up in this House at all, whereas I entered into an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company that my predecessor, with the fullest approval of the House of Commons, had been negotiating for, and with the perfect understanding that that negotiation would be carried out.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is quite mistaken. That the negotiations had been under way before he came into power is quite true, but the question never was before the House. There was never any resolution moved in the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. No. In regard to the purchase of the road there may have been some talk between the parties, but there never had been any negotiations between the Grand Trunk and the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will challenge the hon. gentleman to look up "Hansard" and prove that I am wrong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not convenient at this moment to do so, but I may do so later. I may say that the House had been informed by my predecessor, the Minister of Public Works, that they proposed to open this negotiation, and it was thoroughly understood before by Parliament that we were going on with this negotiation.

Mr. McMULLEN. It may be true that they proposed to open negotiations. Nobody denies that. The question that the hon. ex-Minister of Finance raised was that not a single case of the kind had taken place before, and that there was no precedent for the manner in which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had conducted this business. That hon. gentleman said that he should have come to Parliament and get authority to enter into negotiations to make this purchase. I say that there is a case exactly on all fours. The purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch was conducted exactly in the same manner as this has been.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With that difference ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I just want to compare that purchase with the purchase which has been completed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). The Rivière du Loup branch is 119 miles in length, while the Drummond County Railway, that is now purchased, from Chaudière Junction to Ste. Rosalie, together with the branches of this road, has a mileage of 133 miles. The Rivière du Loup branch cost $13,000 a mile, with old iron rails, which the Government of the day agreed to take off and give to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The hon. leader of the Opposition made an arrangement by which the Government agreed that these old rails were to be lifted up and given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and that steel rails should be laid down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say a word. I think it is rather trifling with the House; this matter was fully stated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. It was answered by me, and the hon. Minister has dealt for hours with this subject since, and has never referred to my reply. The whole case has been covered. I say that we had the report of Mr. Schreiber, and that we paid $200,000 less than Mr. Schreiber said a similar road could be constructed for. We had that report referred to Mr. Shanly, who was regarded as one of the greatest engineers in the country, and Mr. Shanly stated that the price we paid for the road was $600,000 less than the real value of the road. Everything has been said in reference to this subject. I have not said a word since I spoke in regard to it early on the discussion, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has spoken at great length on a number of occasinos since. It is rather trifling with the business of the House to take up the time of the House with the discussion of a matter which has been completely refuted over and over again.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am only making a comparison. Hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with the purchase made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. They declare that the road could have been built cheaper and they say that $1,600,000 is placing a valuation on the road which is not warranted. I am comparing the purchase that the hon. leader of the Opposition, when Minister of Railways and Canals, made, with the purchase which has been made by the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I want to show that when the hon. leader of the Opposition bought that Rivière du Loup branch he paid $12,600 a mile for it. He will not deny that he paid $1,500,000 for the road. There were no steel rails on it. It was covered with iron rails, and he entered into a covenant with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to take them off and give them back to the company, so that he only got a road bed with some ties on it, and paid $12,600 a mile for it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has got 133 miles of road for $1,600,000, or $12,030 per mile. He has purchased the road for $570 a mile less than the hon. leader of the Opposition paid for the Rivière du Loup branch of the Grand Trunk, without a nail of any kind, yet hon. gentlemen opposite are declaring that there is something wrong about this and that there is some extravagance connected with it. In the face of the bargain entered into by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and in the face of the fact that the cost of the St. Charles branch was $121,000 a mile, I do not think that hon. gentlemen have any warrant for saying that there is any evidence of extravagance in connection with this purchase. I cannot come to any other conclusion than that by keeping up the discussion they are seeking to prove to this House and to the country that the bargain is not a desirable one.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has got it now.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance said that the province of Quebec might demand to be recouped for the money they have put into this road before the Government purchased it. We had a little experience in that matter some years ago. We had a little experience some years ago of a similar matter, when the Toronto, Grey and Bruce became part of the Canadian Pacific Railway there was a very strong appeal made by the people of Ontario that the money expended on that road should be refunded because it became part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A large deputation pressed upon Sir John Macdonald that that money should be refunded, but his reply was, that the Canadian Pacific Railway were not depriving the people of the advantage of that road, that the people would get as good an accommodation as they ever anticipated, and the people could not deny that. Sir John Macdonald told them that if the people were deprived of their accommodation they would have some claim, but since they were not he did not see they had any claim. The same argument would apply to the people of Quebec if they asked the Government for a refund of the money on the road just bought. I cannot see any justifiable ground upon which hon. gentlemen opposite are lengthening out this discussion. I think, comparing it with the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch, the building of the St. Charles branch, and comparing it with the cost of the construction of any other line, it is a first-class bargain in the interests of the people of Canada, and I believe they will realize in a few years that it was a most desirable bargain for the Minister of Railways to make. The same applies to the arangement with the Grand Trunk Railway. If we were to cut up the city of Montreal to lay out new lines of railway and to build terminals there, it would cost

more millions than any man in this House can form any idea of. The estimate given by the Minister of Railways to-day with regard to the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway for their terminal accommodation in Montreal, is, I have no doubt, pretty nearly correct. If the Intercolonial Railway were to make a separate entrance into Montreal it would cost a fabulous sum to give it the facilities it now enjoys on the Grand Trunk Railway system of getting into every warehouse where trade can be secured. From this day forward, and during the rest of its history, I look upon the Intercolonial Railway as being placed in such a financial condition that the country will not be called upon to make up its annual deficit. I believe in a very few years it will pay to the treasury of the Dominion, something in return for the many millions that have been sunk in it.

House divided on the motion (Mr. Blair) for the third reading of Bill (No. 133) to authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Bain,	Landerkin,
Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beausoleil,	Legris,
Beith,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Macdonell,
Bernier,	Mackie,
Bertram,	McCarthy,
Bethune,	McGregor,
Blair,	McGugan,
Bostock,	McHugh,
Bourassa,	McLellan,
Britton,	McLennan (Inverness),
Brodeur,	McMillan,
Brown,	McMullen,
Bruneau,	Malouin,
Burnett,	Marcil,
Campbell,	Meigs,
Casey,	Mignault,
Champagne,	Monet,
Comstock,	Moore,
Copp,	Morrison,
Costigan,	Parmalee,
Cowan,	Paterson,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Penny,
Davis,	Pettet,
Decheno,	Préfontaine,
Demers,	Proulx,
Dobell,	Ratz,
Douglas,	Richardson,
Dupré,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rogers,
Erb,	Ross,
Fielding,	Russell,
Fisher,	Rutherford,
Fitzpatrick,	Savard,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Scriver,
Gauthier,	Semple,
Gauvreau,	Sifton,
Graham,	Snetsinger,
Haley,	Sutherland,
Harwood,	Tarte,
Heyd,	Tucker,
Holmes,	Turcot, and
Hurley,	Wood.—91.
Johnston,	

156½

NAYS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	Kaulbach,
Bell (Addington),	Kloepfer,
Bell (Pictou),	LaRivière,
Bennett,	McCleary,
Borden (Halifax),	McDougall,
Broder,	McInerney,
Cargill,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Casgrain,	McNeill,
Clancy,	Marcotte,
Clarke,	Martin,
Cochrane,	Morin,
Craig,	Prior,
Davin,	Roche,
Dugas,	Seagram,
Foster,	Sproule,
Ganong,	Taylor,
Gillies,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Gilmour,	Tyrwhitt, and
Haggart,	Wilson.—40.
Henderson,	
Ingram,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Christie,	Roddick,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd).	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Cowan,	Montague,
Gibson,	Corby,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Logan,	MacLaren,
Calvert,	Hughes,
Talbot,	Bergeron,
McInnes,	Earle,
Lavergne,	McAlister,
Mulock,	Osler,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Ethier,	Blanchard,
Somerville,	Kendry,
Frost,	Reid,
Fraser (Lambton),	Guillet,
Livingston,	Hodgins,
Flint,	Mills,
Ellis,	Powell,
Desmarais,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Geoffrion,	Quinn,
Martineau,	Ferguson,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Tolmie,	Macdonald (King's),
Bell (Prince, East),	Maclean,
Robertson,	Wallace,
Carroll,	Monk.

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

I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—AGREEMENT WITH THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved :

Third reading of Bill (No. 138) to confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House. I wish simply to put in the shape of an amend-

ment what I spoke of this afternoon with reference to the traffic arrangement. I move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instruction to add at the end of the first clause of the Bill the following proviso :—

"Provided, however, that any alteration of the mutual traffic arrangement between Her Majesty and the company referred to in the fortieth paragraph of the said agreement shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, or in the said agreement contained, be subject to the confirmation of such alteration by the Parliament of Canada, and no such alteration or amended or supplemental contract or arrangement shall take effect unless and until the same shall be so confirmed by Parliament."

Amendment negatived on division.

Motion agreed to, on the same division as that on the third reading of Bill (No. 133).

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig-iron made in Canada, authorized by chap. 6 of the Acts of 1897, shall on the termination of the period therein mentioned, be gradually reduced during a limited term until they are extinguished, and that the bounties to be paid for the additional term shall be as follows :—

(a) From the 23rd of April, 1902, to the 30th of June, 1903, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 90 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(b) From the 1st of July, 1903, to the 30th of June, 1904, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 75 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(c) From the 1st of June, 1904, to the 30th of June, 1905, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 55 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(d) From the 1st of July, 1905, to the 30th of June, 1906, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 35 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

(e) From the 1st of July, 1906, to the 30th of June, 1907, both inclusive, the bounties shall be 20 per centum of the amount fixed by the said Act.

Provided, however, that if any steel ingots be made from puddled iron bars manufactured in Canada, no bounty shall be paid on such steel ingots.

The said bounties shall cease and determine on the 30th June, 1907.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House deals with the question of bounties on iron and steel. The object of the Government in submitting this measure is two-fold. In the first place, we desire to give a reasonable measure of encouragement to these industries. We have a strong hope, I think I shall be justified in saying a strong belief, that under the policy we have propounded in this resolution there will be a very considerable development of these important industries in the Dominion. In the second place, while adopting this policy and endeavouring to give some encouragement to the industries, we desire to keep in view the fact that the policy of bounties is one which may be well open to criticism, and that it is only to be regarded as a temporary movement, and, therefore, we should look forward to an early day when the industries established under the influence of the bounties may be able to stand unaided ; and so we provide for a gradual reduction of the bounties until they are extinguished. I suppose that on a question like this there may be found extremes of opinion. There may be those—I think there are some, perhaps many in Canada—whose views of political economy are so strong in one direction that they would not look with favour upon a bounty system to any industry at all ; and no doubt at the other extreme we shall find those who, believing strongly in the policy of protection, would be willing to have a system of bounties as a part of our permanent fiscal policy. Between these two extremes there is the happy medium which we think we have found in the policy which the Government have pursued. That is to say, finding, when we came into power, a system of bounties in operation, we were prepared to continue that system for a limited time, with the desire that the industries which had grown up under that system should have a further opportunity of firmly establishing themselves ; and we think that when we extend the system by the present resolution, and fix a time at a comparatively early date when the bounties shall cease to exist, even those who may not generally approve of the system of bounties may recognize in that course a policy to which they could give their support. I think many will acknowledge that it would be justifiable to encourage industries by the granting of bounties, if we could look forward with a reasonable hope that at an early date they might be able to stand alone. It is in the belief that these industries may at the time referred to in this resolution reach that position, that we propose the policy now before the House. We think the policy of a gradual reduction of the bounties is a wise policy, even in relation to the industries which now exist. We have a number of iron establishments in Canada, and if we should abruptly terminate the bounties which, perhaps at the present time, form a large element in their receipts, the results to these various industries might be serious. We think it is in their own interest that we should adopt a system of gradual reduction until the bounties are extinguished ; and I trust that those now engaged in the iron industry will see that this is a wise policy. Perhaps it may not be out of place if I call attention to the history of these iron and steel bounties. It was in the year 1883 that the first bounty Act was carried through Parliament. It was then in contemplation that the bounty system should last

for six years. The bounty was fixed for two periods—the first three years at $1.50 a ton, and for the second three years at $1 a ton. At that time there were three iron furnaces in operation in Canada—one at Londonderry, N.S., one at Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, and one at Woodstock, N.B. The Londonderry and Woodstock furnaces unhappily have not proved very prosperous. The Woodstock industry soon ceased operations, and the Londonderry works also have suspended. The Three Rivers furnace has been continued, and has had a fair degree of success; so that of the three that were in existence at that time, two have ceased to exist and only one remains. It was contemplated at that time that the bounty system would lead to the establishment of furnaces at Belleville and at Ottawa; but these projects never seem to have come to any substantial form.

In 1883 the Bounty Act was first passed. In 1886 another Act was passed, whereby the bounty system was extended until 1892, which made a period of nine years from the passing of the original Act. In 1890 another Act was passed, by which the bounty was increased. Instead of being $1.50 for one term and $1 for another, it was provided that for five years after 1892, which would bring the term down to 1897, the bounty should be increased to $2 per ton. Up to this time, the bounty had only extended to pig-iron, but in 1894 the resolutions were so worded as to include not only pig-iron, but puddled iron bars and steel billets. In 1894 an Act providing a bounty of $2 on pig-iron, puddled iron bars, and steel billets was granted to all existing furnaces for a period of five years from 1894, and, in the case of any new furnaces that might be started prior to March, 1897, the bounty was to be for a period of five years from the date at which such new furnaces were started. That brings us down to 1897. In 1897, in connection with the general revision of the tariff, it was deemed expedient to reduce the duties on iron considerably, and compensation was made to this industry, to some extent, by increasing the bounties on iron and steel, with the provision that the bounties should extend until 1902. The bounty provided by that Act was $3 per ton on pig-iron made from native ore, $2 per ton on pig-iron made from foreign ore, and $3 per ton on puddled iron bars made from the Canadian product and on steel ingots.

It is now sixteen years since the first Bounty Act was passed in 1883. If we carry ourselves forward to the date referred to in these resolutions proposed, we find that we shall have had a bounty system in Canada for not less than twenty-four years. After that measure of encouragement, we think it not too much that our iron and steel industries might be established on such a firm footing that they would then need no further Government aid. Not only may we look forward to this reduction of bounties, but I venture to add that, in the interval, we shall be able to still further reduce the customs duties on iron. We all agree that a supply of cheap iron and steel in the country is a very important element in the development of our various industries and the general progress of the country. Whatever method we may adopt to obtain that end, whether by bounties or reducing the duties, it is of the utmost importance that cheap iron and steel should be furnished. I hope that before the time referred to in these resolutions has expired, we shall find the industry so firmly established that, not only will it not require a bounty, but we will be able to make further reductions on the duties on iron.

I have here a statement of the bounties paid from the beginning of the system until the present time. The first statement shows the bounty paid on pig-iron and the number of tons manufactured each year:

Statement showing Bounty on Pig-iron and number of tons manufactured for each fiscal year since the inception of the Bounty.

Fiscal Year.	No. of Tons.	Bounty.
1883-84	29,388 16	$44,089 91
1884-85	25,769·13	38,654 91
1885-86	26,179·19	39,269 56
1886-87	39,717·00	59,576 16
1887-88	22,209·61	33,314 41
1888-89	24,822·42	37,233 62
1889-90	24,373·10	25,697 27
1890-91	20,153·01	20,153 05
1891-92	30,294·08	30,294 37
1892-93	48,420·18	93,896 48
1893-94	62,522·05	125,044 49
1894-95	31,691·19	63,383 96
1895-96	52,052·43	104,104 84
1896-97	33,254·36	66,508 69
1897-98	75,895·38	165,654 25
	546,741·29	$946,875 97

These figures relate entirely to pig-iron. Then, I have a short statement of the bounty on steel billets and steel ingots:

Bounty on Steel Billets and Steel Ingots—

1895-96	29,749·26	$59,498 52
1896-97	8,683·09	17,366 16
1897-98	23,049·43	67,454 03
	61,481·78	$144,318 71

I have, further, a statement showing the bounty on puddled iron bars:

Bounty on Puddled Iron Bars—

1895-96	2,805·58	$5,611 17
1896-97	1,509·42	3,018 82
1897-98	2,615·18	7,705 78
	6,950·18	$16,335 77

Summarizing all these, the bounties on pig-iron, steel billets and steel ingots, and puddled iron bars, the result is as follows:—

SUMMARY.

	No. of Tons.	Bounty Paid.
Pig-iron	546,741·29	$946,875 97
Steel billets and ingots..	61,481·78	144,318 71
Puddled iron bars	6,930·18	16,335 77
Total	615,153·25	$1,107,530 45

This represents the extent of the advantage granted under the various Bounty Acts from the inception of the system down to the present. Pig-iron is manufactured now in Canada by the Canada Iron Furnace Company, of Three Rivers; John McDougall & Co., of Drummondville; the Hamilton Blast Furnace Co., and the Nova Scotia Steel Co., of Ferona, N.S. Steel ingots and steel billets are manufactured only by the Nova Scotia Steel Co., and puddled iron bars by the Ontario Rolling Mills Co., of Hamilton.

Under the new scale of bounties, which is a system of gradual reduction, beginning with the first year after the expiry of the existing Act, we make the period from the 23rd July, 1902, down to the 30th June, 1903—a little more than a year—the object being to bring it down to the 1st July, which is a very convenient starting point. For that period we propose for the first year a bounty of 90 per cent of the present bounty; for the next year, 75 per cent; for the third year, 55 per cent; for the fourth year, 35 per cent, and for the fifth year, 20 per cent. Converting these percentages into actual figures, we find that the bounty on steel billets and steel ingots, on puddled iron bars and on pig-iron made from Canadian ore—these three have a bounty now of $3 per ton. But, under the new system, the bounty will be as follows:—

The First year of the new period.....	$2.70
Second year	2.25
Third year	1.65
Fourth year	1.05
Fifth year	0.60

After which the bounty shall cease and determine. In the case of pig-iron made from foreign ore, the bounty on which is now $2 per ton, the bounty will be as follows:—

The First year of the new period.....	$1.80
Second year	1.50
Third year	1.10
Fourth year	0.70
Fifth year	0.40

After which the bounty will cease altogether. I observed in the public press a criticism of this policy, to the effect that we are striking a very serious blow at the iron industry, and particularly at that industry in Nova Scotia, in which province I am particularly interested. I am quite satisfied that experience will show that that criticism was mistaken. I firmly believe that instead of striking a blow at this industry, we shall, as a result of this policy, have a very considerable development. I believe that it is a fact that the Hamilton Blast Furnace Company contemplate considerable extensions. At Deseronto, the Messrs, Rathbun, I believe, are turning out iron of a very good quality. At Midland a company are establishing new works. There is some talk—I confess I have no very tangible evidence—of proposed new works at Toronto and Owen Sound. But whether these new works are established or not, those at Hamilton may be relied upon to continue and prosper, those that are already at work at Deseronto will go on and the works at Midland may, I believe, be regarded as a certainty. So that in the province of Ontario, there is a very fair prospect of a very considerable increase in the iron trade.

And, far from striking a fatal blow at the industry in Nova Scotia, I think we may fairly expect a large development in that quarter. The Nova Scotia Steel Company, carrying on its operations at Ferrona, in the county of Pictou, have had a fair measure of success of late, and I think I am correct in stating that they are contemplating the establishment of new works in the island of Cape Breton. But, whether they establish these new works or not, it is reasonably certain that other works will be established there by a gentleman who is already largely interested in the development of the mineral wealth of Nova Scotia. I refer to Mr. Henry M. Whitney, of Boston, who is the head of a great coal company that operates a large proportion of the coal mines of Cape Breton. Mr. Whitney's company was established under an arrangement made when I was Premier of Nova Scotia. The wisdom of the arrangement made at that time was, like all important questions, open to doubt in the minds of some gentlemen. It was strongly criticised in Nova Scotia, and even on the floor of this House the matter was deemed one worthy of very grave consideration. But, whatever doubts there may have been in the past, I think I am right in saying that time has vindicated that policy. The company then established is carrying on mining business in Cape Breton with great satisfaction to all concerned. It has cheapened the production of coal by means of improved methods both of mining and of transportation and by applying large capital which has put the business on a footing previously unknown. And now, as I have said, the gentleman who is at the head of this enterprise, has turned his attention to the iron industry. He has said that if certain bounties were granted for a certain period, he would be prepared to go into the industry on a considerable scale. The bounties we are granting are not those he asked, because he as well as others desired that the whole bounty should be continued for five years. But, while the bounties are not all that this gentleman desired, I believe they will be deemed by him sufficient for the purpose, and I anticipate

that, at a very early day, we shall see a very important development of the iron industry there. Cape Breton possesses advantages of a very marked character for the iron and steel business. The great things required in this business are large bodies of ore, large bodies of coal, large bodies of limestone and large capital. It is only by having these in combination that you can make a successful iron industry. There is a very large deposit of iron in Cape Breton, but, apart from that, this gentleman has obtained an option upon and is now virtually in control of a very valuable iron property in the sister colony of Newfoundland, the ore from which is found to blend very well with the native ore, while the Nova Scotia coal is admirably adapted for the work of smelting. Consequently, with the iron ore of Cape Breton available and the ore of Newfoundland so near that it can be brought to the coal at a very small cost, with large capital, and with limestone in profusion, all the elements required for the successful carrying on of an iron industry are combined in that locality, and I have no doubt that if that gentleman and his associates take hold of the matter, they will carry on the business on a large scale. Nor does it end there; for we all know that the establishment of a successful iron business, means the establishment of other businesses that grow out of it.

It may be only a vision, but I am willing to entertain the hope, even though it be a vision, that, as a result of the development of this iron and steel industry, we shall see a revival of ship-building in the maritime provinces, that we may see iron and steel ships built there. Nothing that has occurred in the maritime provinces for the last half century has done more to create difficulty, has been a more serious blow to the development of the resources of that section of the Dominion, than the decay of the industry of shipbuilding. It was a great industry throughout those provinces—not only the industry of building the ships, but the business of owning and manning the ships. Not only did our people build these ships, but as a result of the building of them, our young men all over our provinces grew up to be mariners and sailed over every sea; and, no doubt, to that very fact is due in considerable degree the large measure of intelligence that is usually credited to the people of Nova Scotia. They were people who went down to the sea in ships and did business on the great waters. But, unfortunately, it is part of the history of progress that there is no step taken onward but somebody is injured, however many may be benefited. And, in the great march of the development of modern civilization, the industry of building wooden ships has suffered. As we had the change from wooden ships to iron and then to steel, we have now the change from steel sailing ships to steel steamers. You can now buy a steel sailing ship for what you could have bought a wooden sailing ship twenty-five or thirty years ago. Not having an iron industry, the business of ship-building has passed away from us with the passing of the wooden ship. I think it was Mr. Henry Fry, of Quebec, who was very enthusiastic in his advocacy of building iron ships. He has now passed away, but in his lifetime he expressed a strong opinion that the time was not far distant when Quebec would engage in the building of iron ships. With the development of the iron industry not only on the sea-coast, but in the west, I think we may reasonably hope to see the production of iron and steel plates for shipbuilding in Canada. With the improvements that are going on, the deepening of our canals, the opening of the Rainy River Railway, and other things that are being done to improve the transportation of the products of Canada, there will be a large development of the iron industry on the great lakes and also upon the coast; and, out of this, I strongly hope we shall see a revival of that ship-building industry which was so important in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in by-gone years, the revival of which would have such great effect in promoting the prosperity of our country.

This has been happily described as Canada's growing time. Such, I believe, it will prove to be with regard to this industry. The success that has attended the efforts to develop the iron and steel industry in the past has not been inconsiderable. We have several industries established in the country which are now in a very good position. Nevertheless, hon. gentlemen opposite, who were chiefly instrumental in the inauguration of that policy, will, I think, admit that the results have fallen short of what they expected when they enunciated that policy. I believe that the time is more auspicious for the development of an iron and steel industry than for years past, and I hope that with the announcement of this policy—a policy of certainty, because we give certain encouragements for a few years to come—we shall see a large expansion of this important iron and steel industry and that through it much will be done for the advancement of the welfare of the people of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I have great pleasure in tendering my hearty congratulations to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Government for the step which has just been taken. The whole subject, however, has been so fully covered by the speech with which these resolutions have been introduced, as to make it unnecessary for me to occupy the time of the House at any length. I may say, how-

ever, that having given this subject a great deal of attention, I some time since arrived at the conclusion that there is no field for the production of a great industry which offers at the present moment greater prospects of success than the proposal of the Minister of Finance to extend the bounty system to the iron industry for a period beyond the termination of the existing Act. I hope with him that the amount of assistance offered will be found sufficient, and I am inclined to believe it will be found quite sufficient to induce the investment of such capital as may be required to establish a great and flourishing iron industry in Canada. I may say that I was a good deal disappointed at the result of the measures that were taken by Parliament in 1887 in regard to the iron industry. But that was easily accounted for by the fact that shortly after that policy was entered upon, as every gentleman who has given this subject any attention knows, the price of pig-iron in Great Britain fell to such a great extent as to render unprofitable what otherwise would have been a very profitable industry. But the circumstances are now entirely changed. It is perfectly apparent that Canada must take the step that is now proposed by my hon. friend in these resolutions of extending such a degree of Government support as will attract the necessary capital, otherwise we must at an early day become dependent, not upon the mother country, but upon a foreign country for the iron that will be consumed in Canada. The consumption of iron in Canada is very great in proportion to the population, it will rapidly increase, and I do not believe that in the very sanguine picture that my hon. friend has drawn, he has in the slightest degree overstated the prospect that exists of not only attracting such capital as will rapidly build up a great iron industry in Canada for the manufacture of iron, rendering us completely independent of any other country, but will place us in a position to take up the question of the construction of iron and steel ships, and probably to attain the same pre-eminence in that field that Canada held, especially in the maritime provinces and Quebec, when wooden ships were the order of the day. I believe that the prospects are entirely favourable for the realization of all that my hon. friend has suggested in this connection. But I may say that I would not be disposed to confine the effect of these operations to the maritime provinces or to the province of Ontario. I believe, having given that subject a good deal of attention, that with the excellent coking coal that is found in British Columbia, and with the undoubted iron deposits at Texada Island and other portions of the province of British Columbia, we will see a great iron industry established on the Pacific coast as well as on the Atlantic coast.

There is another point to which I might draw my hon. friend's attention. The Act of 1897, which is being extended, draws a distinction between iron manufacturd from Canadian ore and that manufactured from foreign ore. I quite agree that the distinction should exist between British-American ore and foreign ore, but I hope my hon. friend will agree with me that the term foreign ore ought not to be applied to that of a sister colony, and I would suggest that the term British-American or British North American be substituted for the word Canadian. If that be done it would enable these valuable iron deposits of Newfoundland to contribute much more effectively than would otherwise be possible, to building up a great Canadian industry. I am certain there was no intention on the part of the Government in drawing that distinction between Canadian and foreign ore to apply it to one of the sister colonies, and especially a colony that is of such great importance to Canada as Newfoundland, which I hope will at no distant day become incorporated as a portion of this Dominion. Having made this observation, I beg again to say how gratified I am to find that the Government have taken this step, which I think is going to be so conducive to the prosperity of Canada.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I am pleased with the decision arrived at by the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to extend this bounty. I would point out, however, to the Minister that while I agree with him as to the benefits that will be derived from a further extension of this bounty system to the works which are now in operation, I am afraid that the benefit that will accrue to the new works will not be as great as possibly the hon. Minister and other hon. gentlemen might expect. Works that are only just begun, or which will not be begun until this Act passes the House, as the hon. gentleman will see, cannot be established so as to be in full working order at least inside of a year, and perhaps not even then. Any company undertaking a work of this kind have to select their location, complete their surveys, secure their money, and do a lot of work in connection with organization before building. We have only got before us three or four months before winter is on, so that any company will practically have not more than about six months to carry on other operations. In my judgment I do not look for a new work being established even within a year, under these conditions, and that is why I regret that the Minister has seen fit to make the time for payment of the full bounty so short as 1902. If a company begins to organize now they cannot get into working order inside of a year or a year and a half, so that the full benefit will only accrue for a year or a year and a half to any organization that are now just begnining to lay their plans. However, I hope that when it is seen that companies have spent a great deal of money without getting much advantage from the bounty, that something further may be done for them before the time for full bounty ex-

pires. Works have been referred to by the Minister which are about to be established in Cape Breton; I understand they are being arranged for to some extent, and I look forward to the predictions of the Minister being, in a large measure, realized.

As to shipbuilding there is no doubt that there is no point in the Dominion of Canada that affords greater advantages to that great industry than Cape Breton, as well as some other points in Nova Scotia, and I venture to predict that as a result of the building up of this chief industry, a great many other iron industries will spring up as a consequence. The hon. Minister of Finance referred to the disappointment at the results of the bounty previously paid by authority of this Parliament. I agree with the hon. Minister in regard to the disappointment we all feel in that regard, and I am quite sure that the benefits that will accrue from this step will be greater. At least, I hope so, and I think there is considerable reason to expect better results. There is this very strong reason, however, that at the time that the Conservative party proposed this bounty system, they did not have the support of the hon. gentleman who have now united with them in this policy. But now the conditions are so changed that people who want to invest their money in this industry will feel that they can do so with greater security, in view of the fact that both parties in Canada are united on this policy. For this reason, I certainly expect better results than those that we had before. I will not, therefore, delay the House at any further length, but I wish to point out to the hon. Minister of Finance that it seems to me that the wording of this resolution does not carry out the object in view:

That it is expedient to provide that the bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig-iron made in Canada, authorized by chap. 6 of the Acts of 1897, shall, on the termination of the period therein mentioned, be gradually reduced during a limited term until they are extinguished, and that the bounties to be paid for the additional term shall be as follows.

My understanding of these words is that the former Act terminates the policy of the bounty in April, 1902. I do not consider that this resolution would give, in these words, the power to pay beyond that time, although the lines which follow would give that impression. I would beg to suggest to the hon. Minister that before it is put into the Act that all the words after "mentioned" in that paragraph be struck out and the following words added:—

Be further continued to the 30th June, 1907, subject, however, to the reductions hereinafter provided.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is all right as it is, but I will undertake to see that in the bill founded upon this resolution, there shall be no room for doubt.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the resolution which has just been introduced any more than in 1887, I could congratulate the present hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), when he introduced this iron resolution. Free trader as I am, I cannot allow this resolution to pass without at least offering my humble protest. My opinion is that if Canada is to make its best development, the producers of the resources of Canada, who contribute, in the first instance, to the promotion of the development of the country and furnish our large exports, which go to pay our foreign indebtedness, must be placed in the same position, in so far as buying is concerned, as they occupy in regard to that which they have to sell. It would be far more reasonable to give to the farmers of Canada bounties upon their products than to give bounties upon the production of iron. It is not my intention to delay the House for any time upon this subject, but it is perfectly impossible for me to support any legislation of this kind without entering my protest, and I do not intend to do so on the present occasion.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not rise to oppose the proposition for the payment of bounty because I think this is a step in the right direction. It is carrying out the principle which the Conservative party have long regarded as one of the sound principles of the National Policy. When we look over the figures given us by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), we find that an average bounty of $73,814 a year has brought about the inauguration of this industry, and its development to an extent which, I think, must be regarded as satisfactory to this House and to the country. It is pleasing to know that the bounty in future will be reduced. I have some doubts as to the success of the new enterprises which are to be started up in the near future, and which can only have the benefit of a few years of this bounty, whereas some of the older ones have had the benefit of it for a very much longer period. But I rose more particularly to say that, since the hon. Minister of Finance has been so liberal, and in my judgment, is doing what I regard as right in offering encouragement to the production of iron, I think he ought to go much further and, upon the same principle, give a bounty upon the production of beet-root sugar, because, for every one that the hon. Minister can benefit in connection with the iron industry by this bounty, he would benefit ten of the farmers or agriculturists of the country if he gave them a bounty, and it would not require quite as much money. I am quite sure that, if he did, in a very few years he would find that quite as important industries had sprung up in the country as had sprung up because of the bounty given on the production of iron. I was pleased to hear the hon. Minister of

Finance acknowledge, in view of what I have often heard in this House, as an older parliamentarian, perhaps, than he is, that the cause of the destruction of ship building in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces was that there had been a change from wooden ships to iron ships, and from iron ships to steel ships. We were told over and over again, in this House, in 1879 and afterwards, that the destruction of ship-building in the maritime provinces was entirely due to the National Policy and to no other cause. We were told that by friends of the hon. gentleman, some of whom are here to-night and many of whom are not here, but it is refreshing to hear from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite the admission that the cause which we assigned was the proper one, and that it was not the cause which they assigned.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in saying that I am highly gratified indeed to learn that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has determined to continue these bounties on the production of iron and steel. I presume that he has not only weighed this matter carefully, but that he has been in consultation with gentlemen interested, in a business way, in the production of iron, and I hope that the measure of assistance in these bounties will be sufficient to do what is the purpose in view, and that is to stimulate and promote the production of iron in Canada. There is a great deal of force in the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), that the one great advantage which will come to those who are thinking of entering upon this industry, lies in the fact that, so far as the utterances of public men in the Canadian Parliament is concerned—with the exception of our hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards)—there is no difference of opinion as to the advisability and propriety of supporting certain industries in the manner contemplated by this resolution. Consequently, the business men who are contemplating such investments, will have greatly increased confidence, knowing that this matter is no longer a subject of controversy between political parties, but is one to which men of all parties have given their consent, and, therefore, cannot be affected by political changes. The county I have the honour to represent is, I need scarcely say, deeply interested in this matter. In the lower provinces we have now to depend very largely upon manufactures, and we look forward very hopefully to the day when steel ships will represent upon every ocean the enterprise of the sons of Nova Scotia, as wooden ships did in the years past. Our great industry in days gone by was wooden ship-building, and as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said, our business was not only building ships, but sailing ships; and these ships brought large sums of money into the maritime provinces. I hope sincerely that the good wishes of the Finance Minister will be realized, and that at a very early date we may see Nova Scotia again occupying a prominent place as a ship-building province. I believe, too, that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is not too sanguine, when he says, that he expects to see a great industry of that kind grow up in British Columbia. Our country throughout is rich in minerals, and there is no reason why we should not at an early date assume a leading position as an iron-producing country. We know, from the experience of the past, that every country which has become prominent in the world, produced iron in large quantities, and laid the foundation of her fame in industrial development and commercial prosperity by its production. Canada may hope to attain a high position by that means. I am, therefore, glad the Minister of Finance introduced this resolution, which, for my part, I heartily approve.

Mr. GEO. H. BERTRAM (Centre Toronto). The resolution brought in by the Minister of Finance is of great importance to the country, and it might be debated to considerable extent with profit to the community at large, but at this late hour of the night I shall not detain the House for any length of time. The development of the iron-mining industries of this country is of great importance, and, as has been stated by the Finance Minister, at the date of the expiration of the present bounties proposed in the resolution, iron bounties in Canada will have been in existence for twenty-four years. There is no denying the fact that a great deal of theoretical objection can be made to giving bounties of any kind, but we have to deal with conditions as we find them, and, if we cannot develop our resources in one way, we have to do it in another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERTRAM. I believe that, if there is one industry more than another that requires such assistance in the beginning, it is the mining industry of Canada. I am well aware of the fact that bounties should not be looked upon as being a permanent charge upon the country, and I quite agree with these resolutions, inasmuch as they appoint a time when the development of our iron industries will have to try and get along in the near future without the present system of bounties. At the same time, I believe it will require a certain term of years to bring about that condition. Therefore, I heartily agree with the resolutions proposing to extend these bounties, and I heartily agree in their looking forward to the time when the bounties shall be done away with, because it stands to reason that, if we cannot develop our iron industries within a certain time, with this assistance, we must come to the conclusion that we have not the natural facilities and that we are engaged in a losing game. A few observations on the statement

made by the Minister of Finance with reference to ship-building in the lower provinces, may not be out of place from me. This country is placed on an entirely different basis from what it occupied in the past, in connection with this matter. It is a well-known fact that Great Britain was the home of ship-building, simply because she had the capital and the material combined.

Mr. EDWARDS. And free trade.

Mr. BERTRAM. Oh, we will not mind free trade just now. The capital, and the material, and the natural facilities which she possessed, made Great Britain the home of ship-building; but, Sir, I believe the conditions are so changed that, in the course of a very few years, this continent of America is going to become the home of ship-building. I believe that, because the production of raw material required for ship-building, while yet in its infancy, is an increasing factor on this continent, whereas in Great Britain it is rapidly decreasing, and they now require to look to other countries for their raw material for the ship-building industry. I, therefore, believe that the time is very opportune for us to seriously consider the whole question. Now, I shall give the House a little piece of information in relation to the cost of material, which I am sure will surprise those who are not engaged in the ship-building business. I had occasion to buy on this continent some 3,000 tons of material in the month of January last—I know the conditions are not exactly the same to-day, but I believe these conditions will return within a short time. In the month of January last, I purchased 3,000 tons of material for ship-building purposes, and I had quotations from producers of that material in the United States, and also from producers in Great Britain. I found that, in the production of a great deal of the structural material for ships, there was a difference in one class of material of 43 per cent in favour of the American manufacturer, of 32½ per cent in another class; and in plates alone there was a difference of 23 per cent in favour of this continent. This shows that this continent is now becoming the home of the production of ship-building material, and, that being the case, we should try to get ourselves into such a position that we can compete with other countries in that particular.

Mr. ELLIS. Your illustration is a good argument against your theory.

Mr. BERTRAM. I am showing that the conditions have changed in regard to the production of ship-building material. Here is the point I wish to make. If you go into the United States, you see that there is an enormous production of that kind of material, whereas there has been little or no production of that material in Canada. Therefore, if you give some encouragement to the production of that material in Canada, you will bring about in Canada the same conditions that exist in the United States.

With regard to shipbuilding, I have always held the opinion, and I hold it still—I expressed that opinion at the meeting of the British Empire League the other day—that the best way in which we could bring about the establishment of a steel shipbuilding industry in the lower provinces, which we are all so anxious to have, is, if we are going to have a fast Atlantic service at all, to have the ships for that service built in this country. There is no reason why that cannot be done, and I believe the policy we are now laying down, of giving encouragement to the iron and steel industry, is a step towards that end. All that is necessary for the building of those ships is the material, the organization, and the capital. Therefore, I hope that when the Government again takes up the project of a fast Atlantic service—which seems to be asleep at the present moment, so far as I can judge—they will see that one of the conditions provided will be that the ships for that service shall be built in the Dominion of Canada; for, after all, you cannot have such a large investment of capital as would be required for the creation of a great ship-building plant in the maritime provinces, unless those who established it could see where they could get trade for some years to come. The construction of the fast Atlantic steamers would amount to millions of dollars, and in their construction an opportunity would be given for starting an industry of that kind. As I said before, the question is a large one, and one might speak in detail upon it for a considerable length of time. I rose only to say that I am very glad indeed that the Minister of Finance has brought in this resolution for the purpose of continuing these bounties for a short time, looking to the near future when they will cease. I think it is a policy in the interest of the country at large.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John). I would not have risen at all to speak on this question, but that I do not desire my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) to think that he stands alone. I entirely agree with him, and I dissent from the propositions of the Minister of Finance. The whole theory of bounties is a wrong theory, according to the views of free traders. If the principle is sound as regards iron ships, my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is quite correct in his argument that bounties should also be given for the production of beet-root sugar. In fact, bounties to any industry might be supported on the same lines. If the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) is correct with regard to the price of ship-building material, all the Government has to do to secure the establishment of the iron ship-building industry in this country, is to remove the duty from everything that enters into the building of ships; then we can get the material so cheaply that we can restore the ship-

building industry. I beg to point out that the industry of ship-building did not depend on bounties when wooden ships were in existence. The men who built them, the men who manned them, and the men who sailed them on every sea were, as the Finance Minister said, men who depended not on bounties at all, but on their skill, their capacity and the freedom of trade that existed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I be permitted to remind my hon. friend that the Government did give a most substantial bounty for the building of wooden ships. It was given in the province of Nova Scotia before we came into confederation, and it was continued by the Dominion Parliament afterwards.

Mr. ELLIS. It certainly was not in the direction of a tonnage bounty.

An hon. MEMBER. Drawbacks.

Mr. ELLIS. Yes, drawbacks on some of the material. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure, as I always do, to the Minister of Finance in the glowing picture he drew with regard to this industry; but he failed entirely in his speech, in comparison with the speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition in 1887 or 1888. That speech remains in my mind like some beautiful romance which one reads and carries the recollection of for ever. When the hon. gentleman described the capacity of this country to produce iron—the proximity of the fluxes. the coal and the raw iron—we were charmed by his admirable description, and we could all see wealth rising up before our eyes; but when he passed to another part of his programme and talked of the charcoal iron furnaces, the lights of which would light every traveller to his home, I was almost led to believe, contrary to the views I had always held, that his predictions would turn out to be correct. I hope, although I am afraid I hope without hope, that the propositions of the Minister of Finance will not prove as fallacious as the propositions of the hon. leader of the Opposition at that time. when he was Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman has given us a reason for the failure of his policy. There must always be a reason for the failure of a policy when it fails. When a policy is not founded on a sound principle it is very likely to fail. I do not intend to lead any particular opposition to these propositions, but I think we are departing from the principles which the Liberal party enunciated when it laid down its platform, and we are conceding too much to the views of men like my hon. friend from Centre Toronto.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the fact that a smelter is now being established in the town in which I live, the town of Midland, and in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, must be my excuse for saying anything in connection with this matter. It is simply to draw attention to one fact that has not been referred to. While we have been successful in the past year in exporting 2,500 tons of pig-iron, it must be borne in mind that that has been in the main iron produced from charcoal, which I understand is very much more in demand than pig-iron produced from coke. In this connection, I wish to say, from information which I have received from the gentlemen interested in the smelter now being constructed at Midland, that the only hope Canadians can have in competing with the United States of America, lies in the production of charcoal iron rather than coke iron; and perhaps the Minister of Finance will be able to state how much of these 2,500 tons was charcoal iron and how much was coke iron. In reference to the matter referred to by the hon. junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), I think it would perhaps be fairer to these new concerns if the term were advanced one or two years further, because, owing to the extent of the concern at Midland. I have reason to believe that it will not be able to avail itself of the bounty for some little time. There is one question to which I wish to draw the attention of the Finance Minister and the Government; that is, that in the allotment of the bounties, I believe. if it is possible, before the Bill is brought down, some distinction should be made in favour of pig-iron produced from charcoal. In this there is the production of many other things known as by-products, which affords employment to a large number of men, and must be the means of bringing a large amount of capital into the country. I think I am right in my surmise that in the Hamilton Iron Furnace Company, the coke would be brought from the United States, while, on the other hand, if the pig-iron is made from cordwood, or rather, hard wood, there will be an immense amount of labour required in the making of charcoal, because the contemplated furnace of Midland will have a capacity of some 110 tons a day or thereabouts, and while, practically, employment will only be afforded for 75 or 100 men in the actual work in and about the smelter, still a large number of men will be employed in taking out the quantity of wood they will consume annually, which, it is anticipated, will run to over 50,000 cords per year. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance to consider whether or not, when pig-iron is produced from charcoal, having consideration to the immense amount of labour taking the wood from the forest, it should not have a higher bounty as against the pig-iron produced from coke. Referring to the question of vessel building, it may be a matter of interest to the hon. gentleman to know that last year there passed through the town of Midland a large number of iron plates, which were going to Belfast for the construction of ships, and which were made in South Chicago, and I believe that the gentlemen con-

nected with the concern at Midland expect the day will come when they will produce on the shores of the Georgian Bay large quantities of plates for that purpose.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) It was most gratifying to me, Mr. Speaker, to hear the announcement made by the hon. Minister of Finance with regard to these bounties, and also to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition express himself as thoroughly in accord with these resolutions. That shows that whenever any matter is brought up in this House, that is palpably for the good of the country, it will get the heartiest support of this side. I was very glad, indeed, also to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that he should not leave out of consideration the needs of British Columbia with regard to this bounty. Every one knows that British Columbia is a large mineral producing country. I might state that the iron ore there is of magnificent quality, and in tremendous quantities. We have not only iron ore of very good quality on Texada Isle, as stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, but large deposits close to the city of Victoria, and in hundreds of other places all over the province. Most magnificent coke and coal are obtained on Vancouver Island and also in the Crow's Nest Pass. The Crow's Nest Pass Company, as proved beyond doubt, is making as magnificent coke as can be found on the whole continent of America, and we believe in British Columbia that it will be a very short time, especially if we have the assistance of Government bounties, before we shall have large iron works started there. In the last year or two, we have had gentlemen from Wheeling and other large manufacturing centres in the United States, spying out the land, to see what chances there are of their starting works in British Columbia; and several of them have reported that they consider there is everything in that province they can possibly want—the iron ore, coal, coke and fluxes, all of the very best quality. Before long a tremendous trade is expected to spring up with China and Japan, so that it will pay to invest an enormous amount of capital in opening up the deposits in British Columbia to supply that trade with steel rails and other things. I listened with great amusement to my hon. friends from St. John (Mr. Ellis), and from Russell (Mr. Edwards), airing their free trade ideas, and I do not wonder at their doing so, because, to my mind, the policy they advocate is the avowed policy of the Government. But I am very glad to see that the hon. Minister of Finance has changed his mind with regard to the protection needed for these industries. Even if you have the very best materials on hand in British Columbia, you could not possibly compete with the United States. The Americans own their own mines, have large capital invested in these mines, and employ black labour, so that they not only can beat us in our own country, but are sending at present, as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) knows, large amounts of steel rails and castings to the old country. I trust that, if possible, the term of these bounties will be extended, as my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) asks, so that new concerns will have a little more time to come in and operate under the benefit of the bounties. I shall not take up the time of the House any longer, but I felt it would not be right for me, coming from British Columbia, to let these resolutions pass without expressing my approval of them.

Mr. H. CARGILL (East Bruce). I do not rise for the purpose of detaining the House at any great length at this hour, but it is not very frequently that we have an opportunity on this side of congratulating the Government on any of its actions, and, therefore, I avail myself of the present opportunity for expressing my gratification at the resolutions proposed by the hon. Minister.

I have come to the conclusion that these gentlemen, for the last eighteen or twenty years, have been sleeping, and that they have just now got their eyes opened to a realization of the fact that the only way in which the affairs of this country can be successfully carried on, in the interests of the people, is by pursuing the policy originally introduced by their predecessors. I am very much pleased, indeed, to see that there are only two remaining now to be converted to the ideas carried into effect for the last eighteen or twenty years by hon. members on this side. I believe that these gentlemen opposite very shortly will also be converted, and the sooner the better.

Now, I only hope that the Government will continue on the same lines on which they have started. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), last evening, made a motion asking for a bounty to be given to the beet-root sugar industry. I was very much surprised at the conduct of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on that occasion. Last evening when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) represented, in a very logical and strong manner, the claims which the agricultural community have upon the Government, and asked for a bounty to be given in order to stimulate the beet-root sugar industry, the hon. member for North Wellington got up in his place and tried to define the difference between——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a past debate.

Mr. CARGILL. I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, but I know that the hon. member for North Wellington will pardon my reference to him because he and I are on very intimate terms. I have known him

for many years, and respect him as a business man; but lately I have come to the conclusion that politically he does not pursue just as straight a course in matters that come up here for discussion as he does in connection with his own business affairs. Now, Mr. Speaker, I promised to be very brief, but I felt that I could not let this resolution pass without commending the action of the Government in this matter. That is my excuse for rising. I believe that the present Government, so far as they are pursuing the course laid down by their predecessors are doing right, but just so soon as they begin to digress from that, I contend they are working against the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I also desire to express my gratification with that resolution that has been introduced by the Finance Minister. I am sure that we on this side of the House can pursue no other course and we desire to pursue no other course, than to express approval of the policy to which in the past we were so strongly wedded. While hon. gentlemen were speaking, a little incident came to my mind which I thought had been very aptly illustrated indeed. I had the pleasure, a short time ago of an introduction to a gentleman from the province of the Minister of Finance, a gentleman who succeeded him as Prime Minister of that province. In passing through the corridor behind the Speaker's chair, the hon. gentleman asked me if I ever went into No. 16. I said that I did not know the password "Oh," he said, "the password—adopt the policy of your predecessors." That is just what hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are doing. So, I presume, in a short time we shall all have access to No. 16. At any rate, it seems we are so happy in the resolution that there is no question as to whether it is No. 6 or No. 16; in fact, were it not for the smallness of our room, I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite: Let all come down to No. 6. I trust that this resolution, notwithstanding the position taken by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), will receive the approbation of the House. I am quite sure it will receive the approbation of the country.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Fielding) state how much of the iron is produced with coke and how much with wood?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have sent my figures to the "Hansard" room, and cannot give the hon. gentleman the information at the moment. But if he will deduct from the total quantities made by the Canadian Iron Furnace Company and John McDougall & Co., who are producers of charcoal iron, he can set the rest down as coke iron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend will agree with me in the suggestion that we should not treat the province of Newfoundland as a foreign country, and that when the Bill is introduced it will be in a form to prevent this being done.

Mr. ALEX. McNEILL (North Bruce). I wish to join my friends in congratulating the Government in their course in reference to this question. I am satisfied that the only way in which we can develop our iron industry is by pursuing the course pursued by every other country that has developed its iron industry—and that is to protect the manufacture of iron. I am very glad indeed to find that the Government have adopted that policy. There is one thing I would like to know from the Minister of Finance. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has come in, and I observed that these two Ministers were in consultation a few minutes ago after a question by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule). I would like to know from the Minister of Finance whether he has succeeded in converting the Minister of Agriculture to his protection views, and whether he could induce that hon. gentleman to give the bounty on beet sugar which we are so anxious to have. I hope it may be so. I trust the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will use his influence in the same direction; I believe that his constituents are a good deal interested in beet sugar production. But I am afraid the Minister of Agriculture is a very strong free trader, and that he would be hard to move in that regard. But we hope for the best. As to what has fallen from the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), who always speaks so practically in this House, I do not know that I can accept what he says in connection with the fast line. I should like very much to see an iron ship building industry established here in Canada, and I do not know any reason why we should not have it established. I believe that we can have it if the Government, no matter which party happens to be in power, only pursues the policy of protection to the iron industry. But I hope we have not to wait for the establishment of that iron industry before we get the fast line, because, however sanguine my views may be as to the prospects of Canada as a ship-building country, I do not see how we can build such vessels as will be required for the fast Atlantic service for many a year to come. I notice by yesterday's paper that it is alleged that the vessel to replace the "City of Paris" that was,—the "Paris" as she is called now,—is to be built, not in the United States, but abroad, because they say that vessels can be built more cheaply abroad than in the United States. If they

are not able to build vessels of that kind in the United States as cheaply as they can be procured elsewhere, I think it will be some time before we can provide vessels of that kind for ourselves. I should be sorry if the fast Atlantic service were to wait until that day.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). I would not have risen to say a word but for the remarks made by the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) that there were only two lone members that have offered any objection to this proposal. I have found it not much use talking in this House unless you can have some backing. But if gentlemen would formulate their ideas in the shape of a resolution and divide the House, they would find, I think, a good many more than these two lone members of that way of thinking, and place the agricultural representatives in a tight place. I do not believe in Government pap for any industry in this country. I voted against the Government bonusing the export of butter, declaring that I was against the principle of bonusing. I hold the same opinion now, and believe that all the industries should stand upon the same footing. We have to get along without bonuses in our great industry of agriculture, which is the foundation of all and is most important than all. We do not ask for any Government pap. It is evident to me that these industries could stand upon their own feet a good deal better were it not for the extortionate salaries and the big dividend they clamour for. If people were not anxious to put money into such investments as cotton mills, mortgage and loan companies and banks, if they were satisfied with the reasonable rate of interest that we in the agricultural industry are compelled to be satisfied with, they would not be seeking Government pap, nor should we have two hundred millions in our banks and fifty millions in our savings banks awaiting investment, but this money would be invested in the industries of the country and would be of use in developing the resources of the country.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the observation of the leader of the Opposition about the use of the word "foreign" in this resolution, I hope he will not press his suggestion. Of course, the word "foreign" is not generally used to apply to the colonies. But the bounty is very considerable, having been increased at the time of the reduction of the tariff, and it will probably be found that, owing to the extensive operations that I anticipate will follow the adoption of this policy, we shall be called upon to pay a pretty round sum as it is, and I am afraid that, if we are to adopt the policy of paying $3 a ton upon all the iron made of Newfoundland ore at the beginning, and reducing it gradually under this scale, the demand on the treasury will be much larger than the House will be willing to grant. That question has been thoroughly considered, and I think, on the lines of the present resolution, the object will be accomplished.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the difficulty could be got over in the same way that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the British Government, got over the difficulty, when it was proposed to increase the tax upon colonial securities. The term "foreign securities," used in Great Britain, applied to the colonies, and there was no means by which any tax was imposed on colonial securities except under the clause which said, that foreign securities should pay so and so. But we induced the Chancellor of the Exchequer to change the Bill, so as to exempt colonial government securities, by an amendment to the Act, declaring that the word "foreign" did not apply to the colonies. In the same way, we might amend this Act by simply providing that the word "foreign" should not apply to a British colony. That would meet the case, I think, without causing any material alteration in the policy. I think the Bill would be, from every point of view, much more satisfactory, if it was amended so as not to exclude anything from the Island of Newfoundland.

Mr. PRIOR. Am I to understand that this applies to the whole Dominion?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Resolution reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 14th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MR. MARK WORKMAN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I find that I have unwittingly offended, Mr. Speaker, the feelings of a gentleman of whom I knew nothing, Mr. Mark Workman, concerning whom I asked a ques-

tion yesterday. I wish to say that I endeavoured to frame that question so as not to suggest that he was not a British subject, or that he operated his factories for seven days. I put the question at the request of a gentleman in Montreal, and in looking over it, I saw, at the time, as I supposed, nothing objectionable. I have a letter from a gentleman, whose credibility I do not doubt for a moment, saying that Mr. Workman has been a British subject of twenty-five years and never operated his factory seven days in the week, and I hasten to make the explanation in order to show that I had no information that he was not a British subject or did work his factory seven days in the week. I was merely asked to put the question.

GAME PRESERVATION ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 153) to amend the unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894. He said: The purpose of the Bill is to extend the protection now given to the buffalo in the unorganized territories for a further period of two years as to the males and to perpetuate the protection as to the females. The protection given has been found effective, and the buffalo are increasing, and it is desirable the protection should be extended.

Bill read the first time.

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

Bill (No. 154) further to amend the Customs Act (Mr. Paterson), read the first time.

BONDS OR SECURITIES REGISTERED.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

What officers employed in the public service in the Yukon district since February, 1897, have given bonds under the provisions of section 5, chap. 19, R.S.C., or other statute?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It will be impossible to answer this, and my hon. friend will have to move for a return.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This relates to information which the statute requires should be given to the House without motion at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the answer placed in my hands to a question put the other day. My hon. friend challenged the accuracy of the answer, and I brought the matter to the attention of the hon. Secretary of State, and he reaffirmed the position he took. The question put the other day was as follows:—

1. Has the Secretary of State, since 1896, caused to be prepared for the information of the Parliament of Canada, within fifteen days after the opening of every session thereof, detailed statement of all bonds or securities registered under the provisions of chap. 19, R.S.C., and as required by the said provisions?

2. If not, why not?

3. If not, will he cause such statement to be laid before Parliament forthwith, covering the cases within the said statute of officers employed in the public service in the Yukon?

To which the following answer was given:—

In conformity with the provisions of section 23 of chap. 19, R.S.C., the Secretary of State caused to be prepared for the information of Parliament of Canada within fifteen days after the opening of every session since 1896, a detailed statement of all bonds or securities registered under the provisions of the aforesaid statutes. This statement was laid upon the Table of the House on the following dates:—20th April, 1897; 16th February, 1898; 30th March, 1899.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES ON THE GRENVILLE CANAL.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has the Government settled, or do they intend to settle, with Mr. Robertson and other farmers who, it is alleged, have suffered very great damages in consequence of the improvements now being made on the Grenville Canal by contractors Piggott and Inglis; said farmers, it is alleged, having been deprived of their roadway to their farms on the south bank of canal for seven months of the year 1898, as well as from December 1st, or close of navigation, to the 15th of May of the present year, 1899, these farmers, it is alleged, having lost the use of their lands and firewood and suffering great annoyances and damages on account of these obstructions varying in amount from $100 to $150?

2. Have any damages been paid to these several farmers? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). In reply I beg to say: 1. The Government has not settled with Mr. Robertson and other farmers for damage, if any, done by Messrs. Piggott and Inglis, contractors, in carrying on the work of enlargement of the Grenville Canal.

The contractors under the terms of their contract are liable for any damage they may do in the prosecution of their work.

2. Claims for damages such as referred have not been paid to the farmers by the Government, because, if any such damages have been suffered, the contractors are liable; in the second place, although claims have been made it has not yet been learned that the farmers have suffered damage.

I. C. R. PRIVILEGES AT LEVIS STATION—MR. FELIX PICHETTE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. How much did Félix Pichette pay for the privilege of keeping a counter and selling, within the station of the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis?

2. How much does he now pay for the said privilege?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. F. Pichette paid $520 a year for the privilege of keeping a counter and selling, within the station of the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis.

2. Mr. Pichette now pays $520 a year for the same privilege.

BUOYS IN ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN.

Mr. MILLS asked :

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries a report or information to the effect that the different buoys in the Annapolis and Digby Basin are not in their proper places?

2. Has said department any official report that said buoys are in their proper places ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The department has not received a report to the effect that the different buoys in Digby and Annapolis Basin are not in their proper places. 2. The department has received a report from the harbour master stating that all the buoys are placed in their proper places. A temporary buoy has also been placed at Black Point until an iron can buoy arrives at Digby for Black Point.

AMERICAN FISH TRUSTS AND THE FISHERMEN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What licenses to fish have, if any, the following parties : William Robinson, Selkirk Storage and Transportation Company, Ainsworth & Ganly, J. Clark, Charles Noble ?

2. Is the Government aware whether or no that these licensees are the paid agents of United States fishing firms which control the fisheries of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron ?

3. Are the Government aware that Canadian fishermen complain that the agents of American fish trusts pay through the above means three cents each for Lake Winnipeg whitefish averaging four pounds each, while these fish are sold by the trust for twelve cents per pound ?

4. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries any reports showing that in this way United States firms control the catch of fish in Canadian waters and sell Canadian fish at high prices, the catching of which brings but little to the fishermen ; and if not, will the Minister obtain reports on the above at an early day ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1 and 2. None to any of these parties. 3. The Department of Marine and Fisheries is aware that Canadian fishermen complain that the agents of the United States Fish Trusts pay very low prices for the fish purchased from Canadian fishermen and sell the same at a high price in American cities. 4. There are reports on file to the effect that United States firms largely control the catch of fish in Canadian inland waters, and the department has done whatever could be done to counteract this state of things. The department does not grant licenses to fish now in any of the great lakes in Ontario and only to British subjects in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

MAIL ARRANGEMENTS, GRAND VIEW, P. E. I.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Has the Government received a petition from the people of Grand View, in Prince Edward Island, asking for a change in their mail arrangements ? If so, what are the changes proposed and asked for ? Does the Government intend to accede to the prayer of petitioners ? If not, why not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). A petition was received in the department in December, 1892, from the postmaster at Grand View, and a number of others, asking that the mails for Grand View, which are now exchanged with the mail courier on the route between Caledonia and Orwell, be exchanged with Charlottetown in closed bags, and that Grand View be the distributing office for the offices at Murray Harbour Road, Montague Cross, Caledonia, Rona and Iris. The inspector reported against both of these proposals, and the late Government took no action on the petition. On the 25th March, 1895, these matters were again brought to the attention of the department by the postmaster at Grand View, and on the advice of Mr. A. Martin, who, I understand, is the present member for Queen's East, who was consulted by the late Government, it was decided to make no change in the arrangements. In July, 1897, the same matters were again brought forward, and as the officers of the department reported against the changes asked for, the arrangements have remained unchanged.

FERRY BETWEEN BUFFALO, N.Y., AND CRYSTAL BEACH, ONT.

Mr. McCLEARY asked :

1. Has a license been granted to any persons to ply boats or vessels between Buffalo, N.Y., and Crystal Beach, Canada ?

2. If so, to whom and when ?

3. Does such license grant the privilege of running boats on the Sabbath ?

4. If such license has been given, is it an ordinary ferry one ?

5. Are the licensees supposed to carry vehicles drawn with horses ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. No. 2. A license has been promised to Mr. Fred. W. Hill, and the department is only awaiting certain information to enable it to recommend the granting of the license. 3. Yes, between the 15th of June and the 30th of September, the regulations require that at least three round trips shall be made daily, between the hours of ten o'clock in the forenoon and ten o'clock at night, unless such trips are rendered impracticable by stress of

weather. 4. When the license is issued it will be an ordinary license granted under the provisions of the "Ferries Act." The regulations of all ferries are not exactly similar, but vary according to the requirements of the locality where the ferry is run. 5. The lease heretofore granted did not require the lessee to accommodate vehicles drawn by horses.

LONDON LETTER-CARRIERS.

Mr. BEATTIE (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Are the letter-carriers at London required to walk and not allowed free transportation on the street railway?
2. Are the letter-carriers of Kingston, which has about half the population of London, provided with free transportation?
3. Does the Government intend increasing the salaries of the letter-carriers to where they would have been had not their increases been stopped?
4. Will they receive their increases that have been stopped, in a lump sum, or how?
5. How many men are temporarily appointed in the post office at London?
6. Is the Government aware those temporarily appointed men are allowed no holidays?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1 and 2. Transportation by street railway to the full extent required by the public interest is provided at the expense of the department for the letter-carriers at London and Kingston when on duty. 3 and 4. The Estimates show the increases proposed by the Government. 5. Nine. 6. The Government is not aware that temporary appointees are not allowed holidays.

STEEL BOXES FOR INDIAN DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HODGINS (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

Were a number of steel boxes purchased for use of the Interior or Indian Departments during the past year? If so, how many? By whom were they supplied? Were tenders called for by public advertisement, or by letter? If by letter, how many parties were notified? To whom was the order given? Why were not tenders publicly invited?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Yes, 3,744—2,960 by the Eclipse Office Furniture Company of Ottawa, and 784 by the Office Specialty Company of Toronto. These are the only two Canadian companies known to the department as manufacturing this special article, and were asked to supply the same in consequence.

REPORT.

Report of the North-west Mounted Police for 1898.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

DEALINGS IN LAND BY GOVERNMENT AGENTS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to advert for a moment to a matter that was referred to by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) on Friday last. On motion to adjourn the House, he referred to a report in the Winnipeg "Telegram," which stated that an officer of the Department of the Interior named John Harrower had aided in some fraudulent transactions in the purchase of land. The gist of the hon. gentleman's complaint, as I understood it, was that this man being an officer of the Department of the Interior had trafficked in public lands and had done so for the purpose of defrauding the settler. I was quite satisfied when the hon. gentleman made the statement that we never had had an officer of that name and that the man referred to was not and had not been an officer, but I did not care to make a statement of that kind without referring to the public records. I desire now to say that the man referred to is not an officer of a department of the Government and never has been, and, so far as any connection of his with the department is concerned, the story is made out of whole cloth.

THE CASE OF MR. BAUER.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). My hon. friend the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has asked me once or twice about a man named Bauer who desired certain consideration in connection with the Dominion Lands Survey. I desire to say that at his urgent request I have ordered a meeting of the board to be called for the purpose of passing on his papers.

SCARLET FEVER AMONG THE GALICIANS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) called attention to the report that there had been an outbreak of scarlet fever at or near Saltcoats, amongst the Galician immigrants. I wish to inform the House, that there has been no outbreak of scarlet fever at the place mentioned, but there has been an outbreak of scarlet fever at a place called Strathclair. But it was not brought into the country by the Galician immigrants; they got the fever in the city of Winnipeg, where they were temporarily stationed.

DISMISSAL OF THE POSTMASTER AT NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to repeat my question to the Postmaster General with respect to the report that the postmaster at North Sydney has been dismissed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman's question, I desire to say that some months ago, complaints reached the department regard-

ing the management of the post office at North Sydney. The matter was referred to the inspector, Mr. Macdonald, who made an investigation and reported that the general management of the office was unsatisfactory, and occasioned a great deal of dissatisfaction. For these reasons a change of postmasters was decided on, and, I think, has gone into effect.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Who was appointed to the office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the name at hand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Robert Musgrave.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask my right hon. friend the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will lay before the House the correspondence of the Montreal Board of Trade and other boards of trade in the Dominion, asking for insolvency legislation.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will move for the correspondence, I shall be happy to bring it down.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend knows how long it will take to move for a return. I simply ask him if he will be kind enough to bring down the correspondence.

The PRIME MINISTER. Next Monday my hon. friend can move his motion.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would again call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to an Order passed by the House for papers in respect to the transfer or lease of a property connected with the railway at Grand Narrows. The Order was passed, I think, about six weeks ago, and I would like to know when the papers will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I remember the hon. gentleman asking me a question, and I gave him a reply. I will make a note of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) goes away—I am glad to see him able to be in the House again—I would like to remind him that an Order was passed on the 17th of May regarding the production of Mr. Coste's report, and his special trip to the Yukon district.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I remember very well that all the documents were ready, and I do not understand why they are not already before the House. There is no objection whatever to having all these papers brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My impression is that that report was brought down some days ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know the papers were all ready before I left.

DAMAGES TO FARM LANDS IN LINDSAY.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to read for the information of the House a letter from Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, of Lindsay. The House will remember that some days ago the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) made some observations concerning that gentleman, and Mr. McLaughlin desires to have his connection with the matter of these damages of record.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will move to lay that on the Table.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. This letter was sent to the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and forwarded by the Solicitor General to me to read, as he cannot be present :

Lindsay, June 8th, 1899.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 20th of June, referring to certain questions placed upon the Order papers by Mr. Hughes. The following is the statement of the facts in connection with the matter, which I will thank you very much to make public in the House. As charges and insinuations such as Mr. Hughes is continually making in the House are calculated to do our firm considerable injury in a professional way, and we have no redress for, or protection from, malice that exhibits itself in the House of Commons.

About the year 1890 or 1891, the dam at Fenelon Falls was raised 20 inches, and it was alleged by the farmers surrounding Cameron Lake that their low lands had been flooded in consequence. Mr. Hughes had these claims in hand as representative of the constituency from 1892 till 1896, and as a result of his efforts a couple of affidavits have been filed in the department, made by lumbermen interested in the dam, to the effect that the water on the lake had not been raised by reason of the increased height of the dam, but that compensation had been made by deepening the old slide and the construction of a new one. No evidence had ever been taken from the farmers, and the matter had been practically decided against them without their being heard at all. In the fall of 1895 a number of the farmers consulted our firm, and instructed us to take up their case against the Government as solicitors, and to proceed by petition of right in the Exchequer Court. In the spring of 1896 the farmers held a meeting, and all agreed to join together and contribute to the expense of obtaining a settlement, and to retain our firm. This was irrespective of politics. Every one around the lake agreed to come in. We took the matter up, and we insisted on the Government

taking the level of the water, and after a great deal of correspondence and a couple of trips personally to Ottawa, Mr. Blair agreed to leave the matter to George H. Pope, the Government valuator, to examine the grounds around the lake, and take the statement of the farmers and make a report. The writer attended with Mr. Pope over every farm in dispute, and took the statement and evidence of the farmers, which clearly established the facts that the average height of the water had been considerably raised and a considerable amount of damage done.

Upon Mr. Pope's report the matter was settled, and somewhere about $1,600 was eventually paid to the farmers in compensation. We acted for the farmers as solicitors, and although we had a great deal of work in the first place in obtaining a settlement, and a great deal of work in having it carried through, as we had to answer the requisition of the Department of Justice as to title in every case, and prepare and procure execution of a great many conveyances, releases, discharges of mortgages, &c., in order to obtain this settlement. Our disbursements in the matter were about $150, and the total amount paid us by our clients was $308, disbursements and all. Our account was considerably more, but it was settled with our clients to their entire satisfaction for an amount which would be an equivalent to 20 per cent on the amount realized. In these matters we acted solely as solicitors for the farmers.

Judge Barron was at that time agent for the Minister of Justice, and acted for the Government in the matter, and whatever fees the Government paid were paid to him with the exception of one case (Suggitt), the final settlement of which was delayed for about a year later than the others, and before which the Hon. Mr. Mills, owing to the elevation of Mr. Barron to the bench, had asked me to act as agent for the Minister of Justice, and in that case the Department of Justice allowed us the ordinary fees for preparing release and passing title. Up to that time we had had no professional relationship whatever with the Government, and never received a cent for professional fees on these or any other matters from the Government.

The Cameron Lake claims that were allowed were: Sackett, J. L. Brown, J. Palmer, T. Moffatt, W. H. Graham, R. R. Graham, M. Graham, William Isaac, R. N. Moffat, Joseph Pearn, W. T. Eade, Adam Potts, N. McIntyre, R. Byrnell, J. Suggitt, and several others that were not allowed.

This was a matter entirely between our firm and our clients, in which the Government had no interest or information as far as we know. We were employed and paid for professional services in the ordinary way, and the amount that we received from our clients was not over the ordinary professional fees. It was the ordinary payment of fees, except that the bill was very much reduced. Our clients were perfectly satisfied, and none of them ever thought or intended that we should do this work for them and pay out a large amount for disbursements in the matters out of our own pockets.

Since the writer was appointed agent for the Minister of Justice here, a year ago, we have had a number of titles to investigate and settlements to obtain in connection with expropriated lands, for which we have received the ordinary Government fees, amounting in all to about $75, over and above disbursements, and in any of these matters in which we have been employed by the Government, our fees have been wholly paid by the Government, and we have received nothing whatever from anybody else; and, in like manner, before we acted as agent for the Minister of Justice, anything we received was paid by our clients and the Government paid us nothing, and we had nothing whatever to do with them.

Yours truly,
R. J. McLAUGHLIN.

I beg to move for leave to lay this letter upon the Table.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Before this motion is passed, I wish to say a word. The letter, communication, or whatever it may be termed, which has just been presented by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), bears out on the face of it every charge, every word, that I uttered the other day in the House. I would like to ask the Postmaster General—I have not seen the paper yet, and could not catch what was said—but did he say that Mr. McLaughlin stated that he had entered suit in the Exchequer Court for this money? If so, then I stand here to say that that statement is false.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say so.

Mr. HUGHES. There was something in it about having entered a suit in the Exchequer Court. The facts are just as I told you. Mr. McLaughlin was the Liberal candidate in the fall of 1895, and he went to these farmers around the lake. These farmers never went to him, not one of them. He went to the farmers and said: Why don't you get the Tory Government to settle these claims around here. That is just what was done. He tried to make political capital out of it, and sought to get votes in the ensuing election by telling these men that they should have their claims. Now, about the settlement of this matter. Not one farmer ever had any claim prior to 1895. The dam was only raised—I will not say the exact year, but the dam was only raised a short time previous to that year, and the interests of the farmers in that community were being well looked after, not the slightest fear of that. Thousands of dollars were paid in settlement of the claims, and not one farthing had ever found its way into the pocket of any friend of the Liberal-Conservative party in that county. I say this is the first instance that has ever come to my knowledge where any money was taken by any person as a political reward in the county in relation to Dominion claims. Mr. McLaughlin states in his communication that these farmers came to him in the fall of 1895. That is untrue; Mr. McLaughlin went to these farmers and canvassed them on political lines. He states that in the spring of 1896 a meeting of these farmers was called. That is not true; the meeting was called after the return of the present Government to power. It was in the fall of 1896 that he met these farmers and made an arrangement by which he undertook to get their claims paid by the Government, he, having the patronage of the riding, and arranging for a commission of 20

per cent in some instances, and more than 20 per cent in others, of the claims. More than that, the Government would not deal with these farmers themselves. That was the point I was getting at the other day. When these farmers would undertake to deal with the Government directly, instructions were given, not only to them, but to any one else who had anything to do with this matter, to the valuators, that they must look to Mr. McLaughlin, and I know that, when these valuators came there, they could not proceed without consulting the defeated Liberal candidate for North Victoria upon this question. I asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, to whom the cheques were made payable, but I have not found out yet. In the letter Mr. McLaughlin has written to the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), he seeks to make some capital by saying, that from 1892 to 1896 these claims had remained unsettled. I want to tell this House and that gentleman that these claims were not in existence in 1892. It was not until 1894, or 1895 possibly, that these people found out that their lands had been flooded owing to the raising of this dam. I know that these claims were being looked into and settled, and that hundreds of other claims were settled all along the line of that canal, and that not a farthing was extracted—I use the term "extracted" advisedly—by any person. We find this gentleman posing in his relationship to the Government as the representative of that riding, and as the gentleman who holds the political patronage there. That is his political relationship to the Government, and he turns around and levies a charge of 20 per cent upon the people. When he attended the meetings of these farmers with the valuators, what was his conduct? His conduct was to try and persuade the valuators to force up the prices as high as possible, so that, after he got his 20 per cent, the farmer would still have a fair value for his land. One of the valuators, I think, was Mr. Pope. If the valuators were doing their duty, what business had Mr. McLaughlin there at all? Has the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals not sufficient confidence in Mr. Pope, a gentleman who, I believe, has valued thousands and tens of thousands of claims for this Government, to go there without having this man hanging around him? If Mr. Pope would give a correct valuation, what, in the name of common sense, was this gentleman doing there? He had no earthly right there. He was there to screw up the price as high as possible, in order that he might get his 20 per cent. If the reports along these waters are true, these farmers are not at all satisfied. They find that this man could not bulldoze and browbeat the valuator, that the valuation he made was an honest valuation. This gentleman either took 20 per cent from the people over and above what he was entitled to, or he took 20 per cent from the farmers off a fair valuation. He stands convicted of having extracted from the farmers this 20 per cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Hughes), if I understood him correctly in stating that the Government would not deal with the claims of these farmers, but insisted upon the intervention of some third party, intending to suggest that Mr. McLaughlin was the third party intervening in the matter.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, if he did not instruct these valuators to go direct to Mr. McLaughlin and consult with him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am asking the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. HUGHES. I am answering the hon. gentleman by asking him another question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman answers my question, I will answer his.

Mr. HUGHES. Did the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, or his department, instruct the valuators to consult with Mr. McLaughlin? I know that, when the valuators reached Lindsay, they could not proceed without consulting with Mr. McLaughlin. It seems strange that these valuators should begin by negotiating with Mr. McLaughlin.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It appears to be impossible to elicit a direct answer to the question I put to the hon. gentleman. It only harmonizes with the general course that the hon. gentleman has pursued in this connection, and I may say, that he does not appear to advantage in this transaction. The fact that Mr. McLaughlin was his opponent in the election contest appears to be the reason why the hon. gentleman is taking the present course. I think it does not add to his dignity.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. Minister is imputing motives to me, although I may say, that anything that gentleman may say has no terrors for me.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is really no point of order in that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to say, that if the hon. gentleman means to say what he has said, what he does not seem to be willing to follow up, that the Government declined, or were unwilling to deal with these claims directly, he is stating that which he is not authorized to say, and which is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. Minister a question ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Did the hon. Minister instruct the valuators to call on Mr. McLaughlin and negotiate through him for the settlement of these claims ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I certainly did not give such instructions.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down ; order.

Mr. HUGHES. This matter will be before the Public Accounts Committee, and we will find out then who is telling the straight story.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In connection with these claims, the same thing occurred as occurs in connection with all claims for damages against the department. The claims came into the department ; we inquired into them, and we sent out Mr. Pope, who has been the valuator in the department for many years. He is not one of my appointees, for whom I am responsible, except to the extent of having retained him in the department, having found him there. I found him a very satisfactory officer, in the main, and I thought he was doing his duty, and, when these claims came in, Mr. Pope was instructed to go down there to see these farmers and judge as to whether or not damages had occurred by reason of the action of the Government in consequence of the raising of this dam, or upon any ground on account of which responsibility could attach to the Government. He went there, in accordance with his instructions. I do not recollect, but it may be, that Mr. Pope, in view of the fact that Mr. McLaughlin was pressing these claims and was acting on behalf of these people, and was able to tell where these people would be found, had an interview with Mr. McLaughlin ; but Mr. Pope was not instructed either to confer as to the valuation of this property, or be guided in the slightest degree by Mr. McLaughlin's views or wishes in the matter. I am sorry that I was not aware that my hon. colleague (Mr. Mulock) was going to bring this matter up to-day. If I had been I would have brought to this House a letter which I received a few days ago, immediately after the hon. gentleman had called attention to this matter in the House, and which, I think, would have thrown a great deal of light on this transaction. I wish to say, here, that I do not think the reflections which the hon. gentleman has cast upon Mr. Pope, are warranted by anything that has occurred in reference to this transaction.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) did not reflect upon Mr. Pope.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman did reflect upon Mr. Pope, if it is possible to use any language which would reflect upon any one. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) implied that Mr. Pope was induced and was prevailed upon by Mr. McLaughlin to raise the value of the property beyond that which he otherwise would have fixed on——

Mr. HUGHES. I said the very opposite.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS—so that Mr. McLaughlin might get an increased percentage as a result. That is a reflection.

Mr. HUGHES. What I said was that Mr. McLaughlin endeavoured to induce Mr. Pope to bring the price up, and Mr. Pope would not do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Pope has written to me to say—and I shall bring the letter to the House since the hon. gentleman makes the statement—Mr. Pope has written to me to say that Mr. McLaughlin was not concerned at all with him, and that Mr. McLaughlin did not try to influence him, if I remember the letter, in placing a valuation on this property. Mr. Pope did his duty fearlessly and faithfully to the best of his ability and made a report to the department.

Mr. HUGHES. Did the Minister say that Mr. McLaughlin did not try to influence Mr. Pope to raise the price. If he said so, it is not true.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I received this letter from Mr. Pope, and although I did not closely examine it, if I remember it aright, Mr. Pope in that letter entirely exonerates Mr. McLaughlin from having attempted to do anything of the kind.

Mr. TAYLOR. Produce the letter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will produce the letter, and it will speak for itself.

Mr. GEO. McHUGH (South Victoria). When this matter was being discussed the other day, I stated that I was quite satisfied that if Mr. McLaughlin had the opportunity to explain matters he would come out of this charge with credit to himself. The more the whole thing is sifted the better Mr. McLaughlin appears, and the more inquiry we have into it the better Mr. McLaughlin will appear in the transaction. That gentleman was charged to-day with going to these farmers in order to make political capital out of the matter. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) if he would not be one of the first to charge Mr. McLaughlin with political

corruption, if Mr. McLaughlin had done this legal work for the farmers and charged them no fee for it. But because Mr. McLaughlin charged his clients a legitimate legal fee for doing the work they employed him to do, the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) charges him with political corruption, although he no doubt would also have charged Mr. McLaughlin with political corruption if he charged no fee at all. I am quite satisfied that if the Minister brings down the answer to the question as to whether these cheques were made payable to the farmers or to Mr. McLaughlin, he will find they were made payable to the farmers and not to Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. McLaughlin was dealing with the Government for the farmers as their solicitor. That is the only connection Mr. McLaughlin had with the matter. He received no fees from the Government. He was employed by the farmers to look after their interests and they paid his fees. It is a very natural thing, if people have a claim against the Government or against anybody else, that they should employ a solicitor to take up their case, and it is also very natural they should pay him for his work. All Mr. McLaughlin had to do with this transaction was in acting as solicitor for these men who were seeking redress from the Government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). When I asked the permission of the House to submit this letter, I had no idea that the statement of facts contained in it would have been the subject of any controversy or discussion. I am personally acquainted with Mr. McLaughlin (as are other hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House), and I think you will search in vain in Ontario to find any one who will charge him with not being strictly professional in the discharge of his duties. May I say that the floor of the House is not the proper place to deal with the professional ethics of gentlemen who are not members of this Parliament. There is a tribunal in our province, before which professional gentlemen of the law may be cited if they are guilty of any offence against the rules that apply to them as officers of the courts. And if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) desired to make a point against the Administration, there is a better way than a discussion here where nothing can be determined. There are the ordinary committees of the House, and if these committees are not sufficient to elicit the truth special committees could be supplied. I think the hon. gentleman will find the Government most willing to place the whole machinery of Parliament at his disposal to get at the facts, so far as they are a proper subject of inquiry at the hands of this Parliament. Speaking as one well acquainted with Mr. McLaughlin, both professionally and politically, I say that I doubt if there is any person at the bar of Ontario to-day who more deservedly enjoys the respect and confidence of his clients and of the public, than does Mr. McLaughlin.

Mr. BERGERON. We have witnessed a very extraordinary proceeding in the House to-day. A few days ago, a member of Parliament, acting on his right, asked a question from his seat, and the Minister of the Crown refused to answer it because he said the question was not put in proper form. To-day a Minister of the Crown answers that very question which should have been answered a few days ago, and he tries to make political capital out of it. If that is allowed to go on, the rules of the House will certainly suffer.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask for my own information: How far it is allowable for a member of Parliament to bring a letter written to him, for whatever purpose, from any person outside of Parliament, make a motion that that letter should be submitted on the Table of the House, and found a discussion on it? It does seem to me if this is allowable, that we can undertake methods of political warfare in this House which I have not seen initiated up to the present time. A Minister has a perfect right to answer a question which has been put to him, and to answer it at the proper time, but it does not seem to me it is regular that any one member of this House—and surely members of the House have the same privileges as the Ministers in that respect—can bring in a letter written by a gentleman outside the House and can read it, and then make a motion to have that letter laid on the Table of the House and found a discussion on it. If that is allowable, it is a matter which can be followed up to the complete disturbance of the whole business of the House. I look upon the proceeding as being absolutely irregular.

Mr. SPEAKER. It strikes me in this way. In the first place this is not an answer to a question, and as I understand it, the adjournment of the House was moved the other day and a charge was made by the hon. member (Mr. Hughes). It ended there for the time being. A letter has been addressed to a Minister of the Crown since then, relating to departmental as well as to personal matters. It would be manifestly unfair and irregular for a Minister to read any such letter, unless there was a motion made at the time which enabled a discussion to take place upon that letter. Therefore, when a Minister of the Crown receives a document relating to a departmental or public matter and desires to submit it to the House, I think it is proper and right for a motion to that effect to be made. For that reason I think that this is in order. I do not think any Minister of the Crown should do that about a private matter. I think if this letter is a public matter it is within the rules, and is, I believe, according to the practice of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. For information and further guidance, do I understand that the idea of the Chair is, that a letter can be written by a gentleman outside of this House in reply to whatever a representative of the people inside this House may say from his place? Do I understand that a letter may be written by a person outside who feels that he is aggrieved; written to a member of Parliament and then that it is perfectly proper for the member of Parliament to get up in the House on an occasion like this, and read that letter, and make a motion to lay it on the Table? If that is the ruling, it seems to me we will find that numbers of citizens in this country, feeling that they have been aggrieved, or misrepresented, or that their views have not been properly expressed by some gentleman who has a seat in the House, will undertake to send to private members long explanations and have them read in the House, and have discussions founded upon them. So much with reference to the general question. Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that you rule that a Minister of the Crown, on an occasion like this, and in reference to a subject like this, has any other privileges in this House than a private member? Surely that cannot be what the Chair has intended this House to conclude! But his words carry that conviction, at least to me. I beg leave to dispute the assumption that a Minister of the Crown has any rights or privileges in this House that a private member does not have. It does seem to me that this whole business has been irregular.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, if there is a point of order, it seems to me it ought to have been taken when my hon. friend made his motion.

Mr. FOSTER. It was raised before the discussion took place.

The PRIME MINISTER. Coming to the merits of the case, apart from the question of order, the question stands thus. The character of a gentleman was assailed on the floor of this House some time ago, and this gentleman wants to put his character right before the country.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did the Minister not answer in time?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Minister did not answer in time because the question was not properly put.

Mr. BERGERON. That does not put this in order.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman forgets some things which it seems to me he ought not to forget. The Minister at the time refused to answer the question which was put by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). Thereupon the hon. member for North Victoria moved the adjournment of the House, and upon that motion assailed the character of Mr. McLaughlin. He has repeated the charges to-day. Mr. McLaughlin puts into the hands of a friend—it does not matter whether he is a member of the Government or another member of Parliament—a letter which will give him an opportunity of vindicating his character; and if the hon. member for York will go back a few years, I am sure he will remember several cases in which this has been done before.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember one.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no occasion in my mind, but I will undertake before the debate is over——

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend say that there is a single precedent for any private member of the House or Minister of the Crown, on going into the Orders of the Day, reading a letter from a private citizen reflecting upon statements that have been made in the House, and then moving to lay that private letter on the Table of the House? If that is true, I could bring to this House an editorial from a newspaper or a letter to a newspaper or any document whatever making animadversions on members of this House for views expressed which this editorial writer or letter writer might consider reflected upon himself. I would have a perfect right to bring that matter here, and read it and make a motion that it be laid on the Table of the House. Surely nothing but public documents, relating to the public business, may be laid on the Table of the House. I doubt if my hon. friend can find a precedent for this.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not recall at this moment a case in which that was done in the way in which it has been done to-day; but private letters have again and again been read by members of the House to vindicate the characters of gentlemen referred to in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a way in which the hon. Postmaster General could have put himself in order to read a private letter; but the hon. gentleman, instead of taking the constitutional method of putting himself in order, tried to put himself in order by a practice that has never been adopted in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. The danger is this, that if a gentleman of the name of McLaughlin can defend his honour by writing a letter to a Minister of the Crown to be read here, every member will say, why did not Major Walsh write a letter to some member of the Government?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because there was no occasion.

Mr. BERGERON. This shows that unless the rules of the House are carried out, there is great danger.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to support the point of order raised, by a casual reference to Sir John Bourinot's work. For instance, it is said at page 408 :

> Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member, or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

I have always supposed that that was an elementary rule, and that these letters could only be read or considered, or a motion founded upon them, by the indulgence of the House. For instance, the Prime Minister has referred to that spirit of fairness which sometimes leads the House of Commons to make an exception in the case of a man outside who has been attacked, and who has made some explanation. But, bearing in mind this practice, I was always under the impression, and am yet, that this is a matter of indulgence, dependent upon the universal consent of the House. The mischief which the hon. member for York has pointed out is the real and serious mischief that would result from such a rule being laid down as you, Sir, have suggested, that it is the right of a member either to fortify himself or his arguments or to simply be the mouthpiece of some one outside of the House, by reading a letter, because, if a letter, what is to be the length of it ? And if the door is once opened, the speech will not be the speech or the views of the member, necessarily, but the criticisms and arguments of people outside of the House. That is the danger of such a rule, and I notice that in England, even in the case of an attack upon character, the exception, where the House is disposed to listen indulgently, is applied to the case of high public functionaries and officers in the army and navy. At page 420, it is said :

> The House will also always be disposed to listen indulgently to explanations in refutation of statements injuriously affecting the conduct of important public functionaries or officers of the army or navy.

I do not remember a case where the House of Commons of England has extended that indulgence beyond public servants ; and in the case of public servants, the Minister would exercise a certain discretion in regard to the character of the explanation which he would lay before the House. In regard to other parties, there is no opportunity for the exercise of that discretion ; the rule seems to be rigid, and can only be waived by unanimous consent ; and the case in which that consent is refused would seem to me to be an extreme case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is a great deal of force in the point taken by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) ; and, for my part, although the mover of the motion, I may say that it was moved more in deference to the suggestion that fell from the Chair than from my thinking the motion was in order. When reading the letter or comments made, I was availing myself of the privilege allowed at this stage of the proceedings, not supposing that there was any controversy ; and when the Speaker suggested that I should lay the letter on the Table, I fell in with that suggestion ; but I concede that to establish a precedent of that kind would be objectionable from many stand-points, and I myself am inclined to take the view that to move such a motion, unless by the common consent of the House, is not in harmony with the rules of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad that my hon. friend comes to that conclusion, but we cannot rest content with anything less than the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. J. COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) I just want to say, that, to my mind, it appears that if we had had more regard for the proper observation of the rules of the House, when this incident occurred, there would be no such discussion as has arisen here to-day. A question was put by, I think, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and the Minister who was expected to reply, took objection to the wording and form of that question, and suggested that, if amended, the answer would be given. The hon. member refused to modify the question, and the Minister felt justified in refusing to answer.

It has always been a rule of the House that the Government of the day, being obliged to answer all questions properly put, have an equal right to refuse to answer questions improperly put. If the question had been modified that day, the answer would have been given ; but what makes it a special case, deserving of special consideration, is the fact that the answer not having been given—for good reason, I think—immediately on the refusal to reply, several prominent gentlemen on this side came to the conclusion that that was an evidence of guilt on the part of the person named in the question. It was, therefore, put before the public, and in "Hansard" the opinion was expressed, that the refusal of the Minister to reply was apparently because he had no answer that would not incriminate the party named Mr. McLaughlin, and the matter went to the country that way, which is very unfair.

The hon. gentleman need not smile, because he was the one who put the contention, that, no matter how improperly a question is put, reflecting upon the character of some person, unless the Government immediately answer it, there is a presumption of guilt against that person. Therefore, you might put a hundred questions upon the paper, implying guilt, and though the questions were evidently improper, if the Government took the ground that they were im-

proper and refused to reply, their refusal would be taken as a presumption of guilt in each case.

It was a bad precedent to establish. As to the point of order raised in connection with the letter just read, I do not wish to anticipate the decision of the Chair, but merely to call attention to what gave rise to what is called the irregular proceeding of to-day. If the rule had been observed in the first instance, there would have been no cause for that discussion to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Undoubtedly, this motion could not possibly be in order without the unanimous consent of the House, perhaps for more reasons than one. At any rate, it is not in order, because no notice was given, and, therefore, an objection being taken, I have to rule it out of order. With reference to the suggestion made by me, when the hon. Minister was reading the letter, that he should make a motion, he was just beginning to read it, and I could not tell what was going to follow. I could not see any justification for his reading a letter, unless he made a motion; and, when he made the motion, if the House did not object, he was in order. However, I think it is quite clear that this motion is out of order in its present shape; and, with reference to the way in which a document of this nature might be brought forward or might not be brought forward, I would rather reserve my decision until a case arises when it is absolutely necessary to decide, and such a case has not come up to-day.

Mr. BERGERON. Under the circumstances, in accordance with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the whole thing will be struck off "Hansard."

Mr. SPEAKER. I have nothing to do with "Hansard." That is a matter for the Committee on Debates. It is not for me to say what should or should not go into "Hansard."

Mr. BERGERON. But the whole thing will appear in "Hansard," although you have ruled it out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman perhaps should have taken the objection, or perhaps the Speaker should have taken it, at an earlier stage. However, that is my ruling at present.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, according to your ruling, it remains in "Hansard." I leave it to the Chair, whether that is right.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope that the members of the Government will not so mislead the House again.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. COSTIGAN.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). As we are very near the end of the current fiscal year for which these supplementaries are brought down, I propose that the House should take up the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Further amount required for printing Dominion notes..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. I think that my hon. friend has not passed, in the main Estimates, his vote for the printing of Dominion notes for the coming year, and there are some returns I have asked for in connection with this, which I would like to have down. I do not propose to make any stand on this estimate, as far as that is concerned, but I would like to ask, how much he took in the main Estimates last year for the printing of Dominion notes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Forty thousand dollars. This adds $10,000. The circulation has been exceptionally large, so much so that at times we had difficulty in keeping up the supply, and that is the explanation of the increase.

Salaries of agents for country savings banks $650

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We made considerable reductions, and it turns out that we reduced the amount somewhat too much. We reduced the number of our agents, but find it was a mistake. The amounts given show a considerable reduction over the preceding year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any increase in the salaries?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Further amount required for contingencies $1,000

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This amount is in connection with the swearing in of Lord Minto at Quebec. This is usually rather a costly business, and I shall read the items.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman need not read the items, as I see them.

Department of Militia and Defence—
Additional amount required for clerical and other work, $525; printing and stationery, $2,600; sundries, $275..... $3,300

Mr. FOSTER. We would like some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden, King's). On the item of contingencies in the main estimate, I explained that our vote for many years had been too small, and in the main Estimates for this year I increased the vote, and stated that a sum would be required for the current year as usual. This is slightly larger than the vote of last year, but, I think, only $300. Last year the total

vote under this head was $10,000; this year it will be $10,400. The reason for that is the increase in the account for printing and stationery owing to the large number of orders issued in the military branch by the new General. We have had to increase the cost of printing between $500 and $600. We had also to get additional clerical assistance, because, while the defence committee was sitting last autumn, we had to spare one of our best clerks for them and had to engage the services of another clerk in the meantime.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, King's) must be mistaken in the summing up in some way, I think. I find that in 1898-99, the total estimate for the Department of Militia and Defence on this account was $7,100. If you add this $3,300, you get a total of $10,400 for the current year. For the next year, commencing 1st July next, the hon. gentleman, with the experience of the past and current years before him, is only asking $9,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The amount expended last year, 1897-98, was $10,000, and the amount for the current year will be slightly more than that. The amount for the coming year, as the hon. gentleman said, is $9,000, and we hope to be able to get along with that amount.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are you going to make the saving?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can hardly explain that in detail to the hon. gentleman. This vote is absolutely required; it is practically expended now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How does this compare with 1896?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is about the same, but I cannot give the exact figures at the moment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman stated in 1896 that the amount was extravagant.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The annual vote in the main Estimates for a number of years has been $7,100, and that has always been supplemented by a vote in the estimates for the current year, for about $2,000 or $3.000—I cannot give the exact figure. In fact, the expenditure has been between $9,000 and $10,000 a year for the last three or four years.

Department of Inland Revenue—
Further amount required for printing and stationery, $400; clerical assistance, $125 ..... $525

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I may explain that this was owing to the department taking from this year's vote $530 incurred during the previous fiscal year. We had to take so much of this year's vote——

Mr. MONTAGUE. On what authority did the hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) pay last year's accounts out of this year's vote?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. On the authority of necessity.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a new authority which hon. gentlemen in office seem to appear to appeal to quite constantly. I do not think this House will accept that statement as being a reason.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If my hon. friend thinks I am guilty, all I can do is to admit my guilt and say that I will try and do better another time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is not a question of guilty or not guilty, but a question of whether the law shall be observed or not. If the hon. gentleman finds he has an account over from last year, there is a legal way of getting the money to pay it, but that way is not to take money voted by this House for a certain purpose after explanation and apply it to another purpose which the House has never heard of.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. But my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) will see that I am doing better this year. Last year I did not take the precaution of getting a vote in the supplementary Estimates; this year I am trying to do better.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this item passes, I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister a matter which I mentioned to his deputy, in order that it may not be overlooked. Mr. Ryan, of the Weights and Measures office, Halifax, was dismissed in 1896 on the ground of alleged political partisanship. Subsequently, an Act was passed enabling the contributions to the superannuation fund to be paid back with interest at 5 per cent in such cases. I understand from Mr. Ryan that he has received from the department the contributions he paid into the fund, but he has never received any interest. I would be very glad, indeed, if the hon. Minister would make a note of it and see what is the reason.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I was very sorry he did not write to me. I am going to take a note of it. Is it Mr. Ryan?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes. I mentioned it this morning to the Deputy, and I merely wished to keep it in the mind of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). These things have to pass the Treasury Board. So far as my memory goes, this discrepancy was never brought before the Board. I know the case of Mr.

Ryan. If he has not received the same as the others, it should be made right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am only stating what he has told me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the Minister tell me how he got this account passed out of the present year's appropriation? By what power did he get this account paid out of this year's appropriation, and how did the Auditor General come to pass it?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is frequently done. I am going to inquire into this matter to see how far we have been breaking the law. But it is not the first time that it has been done.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Finance will probably know how it came to be passed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would come under the notice of the Auditor General, who is generally very strict in examining these things. I could not answer the hon. gentleman's question off-hand. The Auditor General has passed it, and he, as a general rule, is not too ready to pass any items about which there is a shadow of doubt. However, we will promise to look into it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think we ought to allow it to stand. There is certainly no authority for the Government to pay an account of 1897 out of the appropriation for 1898; the Minister of Finance knows that well. It is only a small amount, but it is clearly irregular, to say the least, and we ought to have some information as to why it was paid, and on whose authority. The Minister has no right to pay it, the Council has no right to pay it, and the Auditor General has no right to pay it. This Parliament votes money for certain purposes, and the Government have no right to use it for any other purpose.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The hon. gentleman surely knows that it has been the practice constantly to do what has been done by the Minister of Inland Revenue; it has been done as a matter of course. I cannot speak of the practice of the House of Commons in former years before I entered it, but I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman will find by the records that it has been done as a matter of course. I can refer my hon. friend to a case in former years in which a sum certainly exceeding $50,000, I think it was about $70,000, was paid for immigration services out of the vote of one year, although the expenditure had been incurred for the former year. The case was referred to in the Auditor General's Report, as, I think, my hon. friend will find. It was called to my attention last year in a discussion on a similar case in connection with the Postmaster General's department. It has been a matter of discussion in the House before, that accounts have been carried on year after year until there was an enormous accumulated deficit. My hon. friend knows enough about departmental work to know that it is almost impossible to avoid things of that kind, but every Minister should avoid it as much as possible. I find the secretary of my department has furnished me with an explanation like this: That we were $530 short on an appropriation of $8,000 last year, and we had to pay it out of this year's appropriation. Sometimes that cannot be avoided.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman is multiplying cases in which this has occurred. For my part, I know that during the short time I was in the Council, it was an exceedingly difficult matter, quite a process had to be gone through, with a special minute of Council showing the importance of the case, and all that kind of thing, before any such payment could be made. I was inquiring as to the process by which the matter went through, and how the Minister had authority to pay it. He says he paid it because it was a necessity. Other things are matters of necessity, but the Government do not undertake to meet the necessity without a vote of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would suggest, as it is rather desirable that the succeeding estimates should be passed, that we reserve this question, and when we come to the corresponding department in the main estimates, I will see that the information is furnished to the hon. gentleman.

The Department of Finance, including $2,000 to J. Fraser, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	$150 00
Contingencies—Further amount required..	$300 00

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This increase is caused by the promotion of the gentleman named there, Mr. Fraser. His promotion took effect on the 1st day of October. The other item for contingencies is the general expenditure of that class. This year a little more was expended on telegrams. The sum of $2,848 was expended last year. The appropriation for this year including the present item, will be a little over $3,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. If this gentleman's promotion took place last year, why was not the salary provided for last year? Why should he ask for it now? When I was in Opposition I found fault with this everlasting overriding of the Civil Service Act, and I cannot sanction it now. If the Civil Service Act cannot be lived up to, it ought to be amended so that it can be. I would like to know how it is that provision was not made for that item when the man was placed in that position?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As I explained on the corresponding item in the

main Estimates, this is a case of a particularly capable officer whom I desired to promote, in excess of what the Civil Service Act provides. This gentleman has been for a long time in the service, and has to perform very responsible duties, and I am sure that my hon. friend opposite, who is acquainted with the case, will not raise a question as to his capacity and merits. I cannot, however, subscribe to the views of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that in no case shall there be a departure from the Civil Service Act. I think this is an exceptional case; if there is one in the whole Estimates which can be justified, this is such a case.

Mr. McMULLEN. If this was the only item, possibly I might allow it to pass, but I find on every page "notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act." Now, I have urged for years, and I urge now, that the Government should go to work and recast the Civil Service Act and make it so that we can live up to it, or else abolish it altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. The only way in which you can make a Civil Service Act that this Government will live up to is by abolishing it entirely, and let them have their own sweet wills. The principle my hon. friend argues for is perfectly right, and a Minister cannot raise the salary of a civil servant before he has the authority of Parliament to do it, and the Minister ought not, until he has a parliamentary appropriation, to incur a liability for himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no liability in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a liability incurred, because my hon. friend has, without any appropriation, increased the salary of Mr. Fraser, such increase to date from October, 1898.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only when we get a parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. But still you have pledged the department to do it, and of course you have forestalled the action of Parliament in that respect. It would be ungracious for my hon. friend's own party not to carry it out after he had really pledged his word, and the word of his department, that this should be done. But if you admit the principle at all, you can go to work and carry it out all over the whole line of appropriations, which will lead to interminable difficulties, and would be directly against the rule, which is, that Parliament must give the Minister money to spend before he undertakes to spend it. I entirely agree with my hon. friend, but when he says that you must amend the Civil Service Act I think he goes too far. He had better, with myself, try and bring pressure upon this Government to live up to the Act which is sufficient for all practical purposes if it were lived up to.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there are instances in which evil results might follow when civil servants understand that that practice can be adopted in order to secure an increase of their salaries. Every clerk who thinks that he is a man possessing peculiar capabilities which should be recognized, will press upon his deputy head his claim for an increase, and will dance attendance upon him. The result will be possibly that the deputy head will recommend to the Minister that some more recognition be given of the services of Mr. Brown, and, if the application is successful, the deputy head will recommend that, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, an additional sum be given to this officer. I contend that the system is wrong and rotten, and that it should not be tolerated. If the Act is not felt to be equitable and fair, improve the Act, but let us live up to it.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very amusing that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. McMullen) always fails to criticise the Government. He falls back upon the Civil Service Act that his friends have paid so little attention to. If the hon. gentleman would turn his guns on his friends, who sit in front of him, and ask them to live up to the Act in force or repeal it, and substitute something else, he would be doing better service to the people. The hon. gentleman says that it cannot be worked. The hon. Minister of Finance, not long ago, declared to this House that there was a recommendation in regard to his department of those who should have an increase. We heard nothing about Mr. Fraser.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, yes, we discussed it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said nothing about a pledge given to Mr. Fraser long ago that he would receive $150, and it seems to me a most vicious principle that a gentleman can extract a pledge from a Minister that he is to receive an advance, while all the others in the department are left in a state of uncertainty. It seems to me a most vicious principle to introduce into the service, and that is the principle of which the hon. gentleman stands guilty to-day. There would be no end to the evil that will arise out of the course the hon. gentleman is now pursuing. Mr. Fraser, no doubt, has had the pledge of the Minister. If he made a pledge he should carry it out, but I want to point out to him the difficulty that may arise from the example which he has set in the department. Any clerk in the office may have a pledge in his pocket that the Minister will advance his salary, while the principle is entirely ignored that every civil servant should be practically independent and that he should receive his increase if he deserves it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) dis-

cusses a vicious principle he generally has to go to his imagination for it, and that is what he has done in this instance. The hon. gentleman says that I had pledged Mr. Fraser that he was to get this amount. I have made no pledge to Mr. Fraser. The Government and Parliament are perfectly free to give this amount to Mr. Fraser or to withhold it. I recommended it to my colleagues because I believe Mr. Fraser is a capable officer, and because the increase was accompanied by economy. We are dispensing with an officer; an old public official died, and I concluded not to fill his place, but to promote another gentleman, and to give him an increased salary corresponding with the more important duties that he is called upon to perform. I gave him no pledge and I am perfectly free to strike this out, but when I say that the whole effect of this is to give a worthy officer a reasonable income and to promote economy by not increasing the number of officials, I think I make a case that the committee will accept without discussing it further.

Mr. CLANCY. That can always be urged in favour of an official. There is not an official who needs an increase who is not represented as being a very efficient servant, who should receive some advance. The hon. gentleman knows that there are others who have been recommended, but who have not been advanced. The Government have not considered favourably all the recommendations for increases made to them. The hon. gentleman advances a reason for this increase now by saying that Mr. Fraser was an efficient servant. No one says that he is not. No one says that he is not worthy to receive this increase, but Mr. Fraser might receive this on the common ground that the Act provides, instead of the hon. gentleman violating that Act.

To pay P. Mungovan as temporary clerk, from 20th March to 30th June, 1899, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary..... $153

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have that explained.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The explanation which I have had furnished me is that Mr. Mungovan is employed in assisting the mailing clerks during the session of Parliament, during which time there is a very large number of documents required to be sent out, but at the end of the session his services will not be further required.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if this gentleman was employed at the request of the Queen's Printer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. The answer that the Queen's Printer has furnished me does not give that explanation. I should reasonably assume so, but I cannot give the hon. gentleman a definite answer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the assumption is rather unwarranted. I do not think the Queen's Printer has asked for any assistance. If I remember correctly the staff at the Bureau is about as it was in 1896, at which time the Queen's Printer had plenty of assistance. He not only had plenty of assistance, in my judgment, but plenty in his own judgment. I do not think that the Queen's Printer asked for this assistance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course my hon. friend may have more knowledge of the Queen's Printer's judgment than I have. I telephoned and asked the Queen's Printer for an explanation of this item. Dr. Dawson wrote me this letter, which I have read just as Dr. Dawson has supplied it. Of course, I have no personal knowledge of Mr. Mungovan, and I cannot give my hon. friend any more information.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not the question; the question is whether more clerical assistance is required at the Printing Bureau. The Printing Bureau is perhaps the one spot in the Government where, if you once allow political patronage in, you will have the very greatest possible difficulties. I know that when I was in charge of the State Department, my instructions to the Queen's Printer were to run it simply as a pure business enterprise. I think we ought to have evidence as to whether there is any necessity for additional assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the hon. Minister's explanation as to why he has put in the words, "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume that he has no certificate.

Mr. FOSTER. I presume so too. If the course which was pursued in reference to Mr. Fraser, which has been catechised somewhat, was in the opinion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) wrong and rotten, this case is not only wronger, but rottener. In this case you take a man who has no qualification, while in the other case you take a man who is well qualified. There are lots of young men in Ottawa who have qualified themselves for positions as writers and as clerks from amongst whom you could pick if need be. But you take an old gentleman who has no qualification and who cannot qualify himself, and you not only employ him without knowing as to whether he is necessary or not, but you employ him against the law which you yourself have put on the statute-book. I doubt that the hon. Minister of Finance can plead that he is "par excellence" a man fitted for this kind of work on account of its high techni-

cal character, on account of his deftness of management or anything of that kind. You have gone over the heads of hundreds of young men and young women who have gone to the expense of qualifying themselves under your law, and who could have done the work as efficiently, and I believe many times more efficiently than this gentleman. We should have a reason as to why these young men and young women who have passed their civil service examination have been refused the work and Mr. Mungovan put in their places.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has apparently an intimate knowledge of Mr. Mungovan, and that is more than I can claim, for I know nothing about the gentleman. If he wishes this item to stand, I have no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a question of principle, and not a personal question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). He used to be employed by the ex-Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. This vote is to pay the salary from the 20th of March to the 30th June, and I presume Mr. Mungovan has been at work in the department between these dates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope so. We should not vote his salary, if he were not; but I have no information as to that. If my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) puts the question seriously, I shall get the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I can tell the Minister that, during the election campaign at Brockville, this gentleman was doing duty for the Liberals. He was there with Captain Sullivan and the gang, and now we have the Government asking money to pay for one of the gang. This is the first vote of $153 to be asked from Parliament to carry the Brockville election. Mr. Mungovan was there, with his big club, during the entire election, and the Minister should strike out the item altogether.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The item can be reserved. Mr. Mungovan is so well known by hon. gentlemen opposite that I am at a disadvantage in not having the honour of his acquaintance.

The CHAIRMAN. The item stands.

Department of the Interior..... $1,415

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I asked, some time ago, what officers were employed in the public service in the Yukon district in February, 1897, who gave no bonds, under the provision of section 5, chapter 19, Revised Statutes of Canada, and I was told to put a motion on the paper. At this stage of the session that means that the information will not be given.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). That request was made to the hon. gentleman because his question referred to all the different departments; but, so far as my department is concerned, I can tell him now that there have not been any officers who have not complied with the statute referred to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is sufficient for me.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this vote?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As to the $1,000, I may say, that the clerical work of my department has almost doubled in the last two years, and the House will observe that the expense has not increased very materially. My officers inform me that it will take a thousand dollars to close up the accounts for the present year, and pay everything, so that we will not require to draw on the appropriation for next year. Four hundred dollars is required to pay the salary of a young man named Morrisette, who was appointed temporary clerk to take the place of Mr. Grant, a third-class clerk, who retired. We could not appoint a third-class clerk, as the office was abolished, and we could not use the appropriation for a third-class clerk to pay Mr. Morrisette. The remaining $15 is to cover a mistake made in estimating the salary of Miss Mercer, one of the temporary clerks.

Mr. BENNETT. Some time ago, the Minister was asked a question in reference to a Mr. Willison, appointed in the Yukon, as to whether or not this Mr. Willison was a brother or a cousin of Mr. Willison, the editor of the "Globe." Is the Minister yet aware whether this Mr. Willison is a relative of Mr. Willison of the "Globe"?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know whether he is a relative or not. The information I have is, that he was an employee of the "Globe" office for a short time prior to his appointment; but he had spent his life principally as a timber agent, and was specially qualified for that work which he is now doing. I would infer he was a relative of Mr. Willison, but nobody ever told me he was.

Mr. BENNETT. Was this Mr. Willison recommended by Mr. Willison, the editor of the "Globe"?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no recollection of having received any recommendation from Mr. Willison, of the "Globe."

Mr. BENNETT. I know a person who accompanied Mr. Willison up there, and my information is, that he is a close relative of Mr. Willison of the "Globe."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know he is a cousin.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not in a position to deny that. From the fact that he was in the "Globe" office, and the name being a rather unusual one, I would infer that he is a relative of Mr. Willison of the "Globe." If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will write to Mr. Willison of the "Globe," and try and find out.

Mr. FOSTER. In view of the advance notice of the Yukon scheme which was published in the "Globe," I have no doubt it entitled Mr. Willison to have some patronage for his relative.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the communications from Miss Faith Fenton?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister seemed to know something about this Mr. Willison, because, when I put the question, he said he was not a brother of Mr. Willison of the "Globe."

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think I said that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and, when I pressed the question further and asked if he was a cousin, the Minister stated that he was not interested in tracing up the genealogical connections of these gentlemen.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friends here are somewhat unreasonable. The fact that this gentleman came from the "Globe" office ought to recommend him to hon. gentlemen opposite, because the "Globe" is such a splendid judge of Cabinet timber, that one of its employees might be supposed to be a judge of Yukon timber.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was going to ask the hon. Minister if the qualifications Mr. Willison obtained in the "Globe" office have fitted him for the position of timber inspector in the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Willison has shown himself to be thoroughly qualified as a timber agent. I do not think he learned his business in the "Globe" office. He has spent his life almost entirely as a timber agent, and he is specially recommended for that work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, may I ask if the son of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is employed on the same business in the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The son of the hon. member for South Grey is a clerk in the Gold Commissioner's office. I understand that he is a very good clerk, a credit to the family.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—
Further amount required for contingencies $350

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to inquire of the Minister whether or not the report of the commission appointed to inquire into the lobster fisheries has been printed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It has been in the hands of the printer for some time, and I have hardly allowed a day to pass without sending a messenger to inquire for it. I was told by the Queen's Printer the other day that it would be ready in a short time. He could not inform me as to the exact day. I will take care to have it distributed the moment I receive it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. Minister has signified that it is not intended to act on the recommendations of the commission this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not where the recommendations are for extensions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some practical men in my own province have addressed to me letters on the subject, in which they have expressed the opinion that it is very desirable that the recommendations should be carried out in their entirety during the present year. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has stated to the House the reasons which induced him to forego the adoption of the recommendations this year. If he has not done so, I would be very glad to know, for the benefit of these correspondents of mine, what the reasons are that induced him to take that course.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have explained the position several times in the House. It would be quite impossible to bring the regulations into effect this year, because many of the fishermen had gone to fish before the time when the regulations proposed they should begin, and I did not want to take from the fishermen any privileges they had. Before a final decision is made, I would like the report to be in the hands of hon. members. We cannot discuss the matter intelligently without that report, and it is a matter of great importance to the maritime provinces. Therefore, we had better leave the discussion for a few days till the report comes down. I do not propose to take from the fishermen any privileges they have at present.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me that the delay is a great disadvantage to the fishermen, because the season is far advanced, and in a few weeks it must come to a close.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say frankly that so far as the fisheries on the east coast of Cape Breton are concerned, where an extension is recommended, and in some other special localities, I have quite made up my mind that an extension should be allowed till the 1st of August, but not beyond that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do I understand that the hon. Minister has decided to extend the fishing season ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not all round, but for 15 days in one or two special localities, where the lobster commission recommended a long extension--up to the 15th of August, if my memory serves me. I do not give, this year, the full extension they recommend.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I would strongly recommend the Minister to act very cautiously in regard to giving any extension of the season. The localities that have been most fished are the localities that are now in favour for a shorter season, seeing the necessity of it to prevent the total extermination of the lobster. I think it is the duty of the Minister and the department to take every precaution to prevent the fishing out of the lobster. In the localities where it was first being fished, the lobsters have deteriorated in size to about one-third of what they were when the packing commenced. This shows the necessity of prudence in extending the season. In the eastern section of the province of Prince Edward Island, the packers do not favour any extension of the season, knowing the effect of it on the fishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think any extension is contemplated there at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I was just going to refer to the western section of the island. They had an extension there, I think, last year, of a few days beyond what they had in the eastern section ; and, if my information is correct, the department rather winked at it. There were people from my section fishing there, and they continued to fish after the close of the season, saying that it was well-known they were fishing, and that they were allowed to do so. That is not right nor consistent with the regulations or laws of the department, and I trust the Minister will not allow that to be repeated. If allowed, it will only result in people in other localities disregarding the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is any provision made in this vote for paying $100 to Mr. McCammon, of Gananoque, who has a claim against the Government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, this is for the telegraphic service.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the Minister to say that he would have it in the supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say that. I said I would look into it. I called the attention of the accountant of the department to the claim, and I find that it is 18 years old. I put it to one side ; I did not decide on it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is old enough to be respectable.

Mr. TAYLOR. A year or two before the late Government went out, the matter was adjusted, and the then Minister, the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) wrote a letter, settling the amount at $100. Mr. McCammon has that letter, and there is a copy of it on file in the department ; I have seen it.

Mr. BENNETT. If the claim is right, the Minister certainly cannot allege that it is overlooked on account of its age ; because, if he looks at page 16 of these Estimates, he will find that it is proposed to pay Mr. Burke, the postmaster at Burke's Falls, for a period dating from the 1st of July, 1878 ; that is, 21 years back.

Mr. CLANCY. Since the hon. Minister got his main Estimates through, my attention has been called to the dismissal of a lighthouse-keeper at Pelee Island, one Jas. E. Quick. I understand that this man has been 12 or 15 years in the service, and has been a very efficient officer. It is alleged that he was dismissed with practically no notice, and I understand that he is a poor man, and, having been in the service so many years, he has got into a groove, and is unable to make a living otherwise. I would ask the Minister what is the cause of his dismissal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no recollection at all, and do not want to controvert what the hon. gentleman said, nor has my deputy any recollection. I will, however, look into the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. Then the understanding is that the hon. gentleman will give me an opportunity of discussing it later ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, when the supplementaries for next year come down.

Mr. INGRAM. I observe in the "Globe" certain regulations with respect to the fisheries of Ontario, issued by the Attorney General of Ontario. Has the hon. gentleman had anything to do with these regulations ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not seen any regulations issued by the Attorney General of Ontario, and he has no right to issue any, as the absolute and exclusive power to make any regulations rests with this Government. He may have published our regulations or some regulations with reference to the Ontario fisheries officers.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to the necessity that exists on the Island of Vancouver for inspectors to look after the trout fishing there. We used to have some inspectors, but I am informed they were taken off.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, there are men appointed there. I appointed one man within the last few months.

Mr. PRIOR. There are several gentlemen there of good standing, living on their means, who have very little to do, and who told me they were willing to act as inspectors without any salary, and as they are keen sportsmen I thought that would be a very good way to have inspectors. Of course, if the hon. gentleman has paid inspectors, and capable men, I am glad to know it, but I was informed that the Government saw fit to stop the salaries of these men.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think not.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman will look into the matter I would be much obliged. I would like also to call his attention to the fact that some lobsters were put out there some time ago, and we have heard very little about them since. I know that one or two were seen somewhere, which shows that some of them are alive, and I would suggest that Prof. Prince should send some more out or see that a good chance is given to those that are there to increase, by seeing that they are in proper places. Another thing we have been promised is some bass for the lakes. We have plenty of lakes with trout and plenty without trout. I know that bass cannot live in the same lakes as the trout, but it would be a great thing for British Columbia if we could get the black bass of Ontario put in some of the lakes as they are splendid sporting fish. We would also like to have some eastern salmon out there, Restigouche salmon, because although we have magnificent salmon, they will not take the fly, and, therefore, there is no place where sportsmen can get good salmon fly fishing. We have splendid trout fishing but no salmon fly fishing. I do not know whether the eastern salmon would take the fly on our rivers, but would like to see the experiment tried, and so would a great number of gentlemen in British Columbia. I did speak to the hon. gentleman on the subject, and he gave me a little hope that he would do something in the way of having the experiment made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman did mention the matter to me privately the other day, and I made a note of it and laid it before Prof. Prince. Prof. Prince told me that, as regards the lobster sent out years ago, the department has no information except that some had been seen lately, so that the fact that they are alive is well proven, but whether they have been increasing in number I am not able to say. Prof. Prince said that he would be able to send some salmon out there next year, as requested, and possibly some bass, but the latter experiment would have to be made with great prudence because the bass would destroy any trout in the lakes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am informed that Dr. Temple, of Sydney, is in the employ of the Government in connection with some fishery business, and I would like to ask whether any portion of this vote is intended to pay him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has nothing to do with it whatever. Prof. Robertson and myself had some lengthy consultations as to the temperature at which fish can be properly kept and exported commercially, and Dr. Temple was requested to make some experiments.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How long has he been employed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. About ten days.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand that the same gentleman was in the employ of the department last year, and made a trip to England.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at the department's expense.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. Minister got Parliament to pass a vote of $500 for a service of that kind last year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We only paid him $180 towards his expenses out of the $500. I might add that we are not now on the general fishery vote.

Mr. GANONG. I am advised that in 1889 one James Glass was appointed fishery warden of the county of Charlotte. I wish to call attention to the fact that this gentleman has been a United States citizen, at least six years, so that before the next supplementaries come down the Minister can advise us whether this gentleman's name will be in the Auditor General's Report as drawing $286 of public money, although he is registered as a United States citizen. I might add that we have a sufficient number of resident Canadian citizens quite capable to attend to that business in the county of Charlotte without paying American citizens.

Department of Agriculture—	
Salaries—Statutory increase for Mr. D. Routhier, omitted in 1898-99 Estimates	$50 00
Contingencies—	
To pay the following differences in salaries between $400 and $600 per annum, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act :—W. H. T. Megill, from 11th March, 1899, to 30th June, 1899, $61.11 ; Alexander Campbell, from 21st March, 1899, to 30th June, 1899, $55.55.....	116 66
Printing and stationery.....	776 46
	$943 12

Mr. FOSTER. We would like an explanation of these breakages of the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The words "notwithstanding the Civil Service Act," come in here, as I have explained before. Mr. Megill takes the place of Mr. Farmer, who was employed as assistant patent examiner, a university graduate, who left the service in consequence of getting a better offer. We got the vote to pay Mr. Farmer, but, as he has left and another gentleman has come in, we have to get the vote to pay the other by name. Mr. Campbell came into the service to do the work of Mr. Bailey, a permanent clerk in the department, who is on sick-leave, and was obliged to leave for six months. We are obliged to get Mr. Campbell on the same terms as the other assistant patent examiner to do this work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before this item passes, I would like to suggest to the Minister that, in advance of our going into the main Estimates, we should look into a matter that has been pressed on the department a number of times; that is, the care of lepers outside of the Tracadie Lazaretto. The hon. Minister knows that in the province of British Columbia there are a number of lepers on Darcey Island. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has noticed quite recently a number of organizations have taken the matter up, and, on humanitarian grounds as well as on sanitary grounds, asked that these lepers be removed to the lazaretto at Tracadie. The hon. Minister, I suppose, has not gone into that matter, but he might look into it before we come to the main Estimates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This matter has been lately brought to my attention in the way the hon. gentleman refers to. It was brought to my attention a good while ago by one of the representatives of British Columbia—I think the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) corresponded with me on the subject. I have always felt, and I think my predecessors have felt, that these lepers were properly in charge of the provincial authorities, the control of other matters relating to public health being a provincial matter. It is true that the Tracadie Lazaretto is in charge of the Department of Agriculture; but that is in consequence of an arrangement made with the province of New Brunswick at the time of confederation, and it is a special instance, entirely apart from the ordinary rule of this country, that matters of public health should be in charge of the provincial authorities. I have continued to take the same view of these questions that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) and others of my predecessors did. While I appreciate the fact that there might be reasons of a humanitarian character to take particular care of lepers, still, I doubt whether it would be expedient to make a new departure in that way on account of the Dominion Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite understand the ground the hon. Minister takes, and it is one which has great weight with one presiding over the department. It is true that matters of public health are left almost wholly to the provincial authorities, but I think, and have always thought, that this is a case in which the Government of the Dominion must eventually act. This is not a thing that occurs every day. It is not like cases of tuberculosis or epidemics. We are not likely to have other cases of leprosy for many years, and I hope we shall never have them. I think that if the hon. gentleman will go into the subject, he will agree with me that, eventually, these people will have to be taken care of in a different way from that now adopted. I do not wish to reflect upon the provincial authorities, but I am told that these lepers are not taken care of, either on sanitary or humanitarian grounds, in a way that they might be. I think that, eventually, they will have to be dealt with by this Government; in fact, I think it is a disgrace to the Government that they are not dealt with. The sooner something is done, the better, and the best thing to be done is to remove them to the lazaretto.

Mr. PRIOR. This is a serious matter, and one that has been brought up, as the hon. Minister says, year after year. With regard to the care of the lepers, although the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has heard that they are not well looked after, that is a mistake. It is true that there is nobody staying with them to look after them, and they have to raise their own vegetables, and so on; but they are housed, and a steamer goes now and again to see that they are not in want. But there is another point to which I would like to call attention. I saw in the British Columbia papers the other day that it was said, that some outside Chinamen had been going across in boats to this island and obtaining vegetables from the lepers. Not being a medical man, I do not know whether there is any danger to the people of British Columbia in that, but, if there is danger, something should be done about it. I agree with my hon. friend from Haldimand that the Government ought to make a special case of these people. There are only five or six lepers on the island, and it would cost the Government little to take them across and put them in the lazaretto at Tracadie. I admit that it would make a precedent, and, if more lepers were discovered, the Government would be asked to take charge of them; but it is a long time since a case was found, and I hope it will be a long time before there are others. This case is causing friction between the Dominion and Provincial Governments. It may be that the provincial government should look after these lepers, as a matter of public

health ; but I think, and my colleague (Mr. Earle) thinks the same, that the Government might make an exceptional case of this, and take these people to Tracadie. Should new ones be discovered, they could be removed to the lazaretto also. But this would be much better than to leave these five or six miserable wretches on an island by themselves.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not wish to continue the discussion, but I may note one or two points. In the first place, some cases were discovered and sent to Darcey Island within the last couple of years. This is not a case of merely a few people, who are dying off, but it is a case where new cases are sometimes found, and——

Mr. PRIOR. Brought over from China.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are found in British Columbia. Of course, I do not know whether they are brought from China as lepers, or whether they develop the disease in British Columbia ; but they have been found in British Columbia occasionally, and they are sent to this island, when found. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) speaks of vegetables raised there being distributed. It is clearly the duty of the local health authorities to see to that ; it is not in any way the duty of the Dominion Government. In fact, I do not know whether, constitutionally, we would have power to deal with the matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) was merely illustrating the necessity of action.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite so. I received a complaint that these people were badly treated, that complaint coming from a source that seemed to me to make it worthy of attention. I wrote to the quarantine officer at Victoria, Dr. Fraser, and asked him to send me a confidential report. I did not feel myself authorized to make an official inquiry into the matter, but, having an officer of my department there who would be quite competent to give an opinion in the matter, I asked for his report. Mr. Fraser wrote me a letter which indicates that these people are not by any means so badly off as has been represented. They are few in number. They are supplied with food regularly and systematically, with clothing, with some slight luxuries in the way of tobacco and one thing and another. They are visited at stated intervals by the local physician who has charge of them. Lands were given them and houses, they have garden tools and utensils, so that they are quite able to take care of themselves. Several of them who are not in an advanced stage of disease are able to take charge of the others who are in a more advanced stage. They are able to raise vegetables, and look out for themselves. The reports that have gone abroad with regard to maltreatment are not founded on fact ; I say this in justice to the local guardians, so that there may be no misapprehension as to the position of affairs.

Mr. PRIOR. I may say it would be impossible for the provincial government to keep people from going there if they insisted on going, without keeping a guard there. There is a large island on which they may circulate. A good many vessels pass there all the time within a mile or two of them.

Post Office Department—
Salaries—
Amount required to pay the officers of the Dead Letter Branch a provisional allowance to meet the exceptional cost of living in Manitoba and British Columbia, from 1st of July, 1898, to 30th June, 1899, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, viz. :—
G. A. D. Mailleue, superintendent of the dead letter office at Victoria, B.C..... $120
E. M. Walker, superintendent of the dead letter office at Winnipeg.... 90
Increase of salary of one third-class clerk 50

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the Postmaster General in a position to give us any information now about the mail service to the Yukon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is an item later on in these estimates which will bring that up.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Could not we get the information on this item ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman prefers it now. Will he let me know what he desires ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Postmaster General knows that I brought up the question the other day on finding some mail matter returned to me from Victoria. He told us there was no mail service for parcels until the ice broke up, and further arrangements were made for bringing such matter into that country. A great many people besides myself are interested in the same way. We hear of complaints from day to day that anything larger than an ordinary letter is being returned from the dead letter office. Nobody in Canada seems to know whether anything beyond the weight of an ordinary letter can be sent to Dawson City ; that is the information we want.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a contract for carrying the mails between Vancouver and Skagway that covers all mail matter without exception. There is another contract for carrying mails during the period of navigation between Lake Bennett and Dawson City, and that covers all mail matter as well. We have a special officer at Skagway who, by arrangement with the United States Government, is given posses-

sion of the mail matter for Dawson City, and he sees that it is conveyed across the White Pass to Bennett, and despatched through to Dawson. I presume the service is in full swing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why are they returning parcels ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Those were sent during the winter when there were no facilities.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mine was sent on the 12th of May.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Navigation was not open, I suppose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have heard that some were returned since.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At all events, the postmasters have no instructions to return matter that can be sent forward.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why did they not keep the mail matter until the service was made available to the public ? And why did not the Postmaster General inform the public of some date when they could avail themselves of this service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were not instructed to return it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman says there is a contract for the service, but he is not in a position to assure us that the service will be performed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmasters have not been instructed, so far as I know, to return this matter. I suppose they take note of the conditions of the country and of the service, and they think it better, I suppose, when it is not possible for the matter to go forward, to return it. They acted upon their ideas of what is best. They are not acting in that respect under any instructions from me.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But they have no right to violate a law of the post office, and no law of the post office gives authority to a postmaster to return mail matter in transit for a point beyond his post office. The postmaster who takes upon himself to do that without the authority of his Minister, should be subject to dismissal. If the matter is in transit for a point beyond the post office where it happens to stop, it is the duty of the postmaster having charge of that mail matter, to hold it until the first opportunity to forward it, unless he has directions to the contrary from the Postmaster General's department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will say to the hon. gentleman that the very moment he brought the matter to my attention, I had a telegraphic message sent to this postmaster not to do what he has complained of.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If I am not incorrectly informed, the postmasters stated they had returned these parcels by instructions, as there was no service of that kind established.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No such instructions were given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is positive as regards that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am satisfied they would act upon what they considered the needs of the situation. They had no facilities for sending other than letters to the Yukon district until the opening of navigation, and it would be a reasonable thing for them to do, in the ordinary course, to communicate with the senders of parcels and return the parcels to them during that period. Whether instructions were sent to them on the opening of the Dawson route how to act, I could not say. I will get the hon. gentleman that information, if he desires it. But I do say that since we have facilities for sending parcels other than letters, and since the matter was brought to my attention, I had the necessary instructions sent to the postmasters.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Instructions for the future are that all sorts of mail matter go forward ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. During the period of navigation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there not some arrangement between the contractor carrying the Canadian mail and the man who had the contract for carrying the United States mail, by which the former swapped off the privilege to the United States contractor to carry the mails through Canadian territory ? Was not that the cause of the delay ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that was not done. It happened that the United States Government were desirous of establishing a mail service through Canadian territory to connect with Alaska. It was not considered by the Government proper to allow a foreign country to take a mail service through Canada, to establish stations and huts and to maintain a service as if they were exercising sovereign power in our country. But in order to show proper courtesy to the nation that desired to have that service, we agreed to make a nominal contract with their contractor in order that he would be acting as the contractor of the Canadian Government. He was not supposed to be performing any service for us more than he chose voluntarily to perform. He was nominally our contractor in order to enable him, in the name of the Canadian Government, to establish huts in Canada, and to carry on the service as in the name of the Dominion. His service substantially was for the United States Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you pay him anything ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We did not pay him anything. We depended on the Mounted Police for our service and not upon him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Were there not other tenders from Canadians for the service for which this man was paid nothing ? Were there no other bona fide tenders recommended by Mr. Fletcher, the post office inspector ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was a return laid on the Table of the House showing everything that occurred in regard to the service in the Yukon. We did advertise for tenders and we received numbers of tenders, but the department came to the conclusion that it would be better not to put the service in private hands, although we tried to obtain a service in that country, for fear that the contractors might not be able to maintain the service. It was thought better to rely on the police.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did not the service under the United States Government break down and prove unsatisfactory ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman refers to Richardson, I may say that I do not think that Richardson ever gave a proper service to the United States. I think he was an unsatisfactory contractor to them. I do not think he had the facilities, or the staff, or the equipment necessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It broke down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He never had any practical accountability to us. We extended to the United States the courtesy of the Canadian service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the only arrangement the hon. Postmaster General had was with this American contractor ; that this American contractor failed in his contract with the United States, and that, therefore, the service he was expected to do for Canada, for nothing, was not done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. His contract with the United States called for some $46,000 or $50,000. In reference to our interest in the service we agreed in a neighbourly way that we would establish an exchange office at Dawson City. We would carry all the mails we could through to Dawson City, and we told them that we would allow them to receive them at Dawson City, although at a Canadian point. They agreed to reciprocate that courtesy at Dyea and subsequently at Skagway. They thought it would be their duty and their interest to maintain a service with Alaska through Canadian territory and in view of the fact that a large part of their mails, that we would be carrying, for Dawson City might be American mails I presume the American Government authorized their contractor to reciprocate on their behalf by carrying mails to Dawson, and in this way Canadian mails would go too.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not exactly what I gathered from the hon. Minister's first statement. As I understand it, in so far as the Canadian Government depended at all on the performance by that American contractor of that contract, there was a failure. That is to say, that the United States arrangement fell through, that Richardson was not able to carry out his contract, and that in so far as the Canadian Government had expected work to be done in connection with their mails, in getting their mails forward, and for which they would not have to pay anything, there was failure and disappointment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The word failure is a vague term. I believe the contractor was employed to perform a fortnightly service and to maintain it with regularity through the winter. I do not think he did so or that he had the proper equipment to carry his mails with despatch, and if there were any Canadian mails entrusted to him they suffered the same as the other mails. He did not perform his service as regularly as the police did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The statement that has come to me is pretty nearly the statement, as I understand it, from the Postmaster General. The information I have is that the Canadian Government made a contract with Richardson, who had the United States mail contract. That is correct, I presume ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is the other way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Richardson had a contract with the United States ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not understand the order of time in that way. There may have been a contract. The gentleman came here and stated that he was tendering for the United States mail service or had some service with the United States, but that he could not carry out his contract without the permission of the Canadian Government. It seemed proper to give that permission, but it seemed proper to give it, not in the way that he would be the United States contractor, but that he would be the Canadian contractor. In order to enable him to carry out his contract with the United States and at the same time oblige the United States, we made a nominal contract and the Canadian Government gave him permission to carry United States mails.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The order of the contracts does not matter, but it comes to this, as my information seems to agree with that of the hon. Postmaster General. Under the contract that was made he was to carry the mails in and out of the Yukon, free of charge to this Government, the only consideration being the privilege granted by the Canadian Government of passing through Canadian territory. The contract provided for two trips per month each way. That was the only service that it called for. The statement that I have is that there was no other arrangement, outside of the police, for carrying these mails, and that the Canadian Government depended on the contract where the contractor was not being paid for the service, that this was the only contract which existed until December, 1898, when tenders were invited for a semi-weekly service to alternate with the service under the Richardson contract. A large number of tenders for this service were received and the post office inspector recommended the acceptance of one of them, stating to the department that he was thoroughly satisfied of the ability of this tenderer to perform the service, in addition to which the tenders were each accompanied by a marked cheque for $4,000. The report in regard to which I have information has not been brought down. I have had no communication with Mr. Fletcher. This is the statement of the parties who were tendering. Shortly after the tenders were received the department decided that the Mounted Police should carry the mail and inaugurated the present service. The point I was endeavouring to make on this information is, that until this present arrangement for carrying the mails by the police, the only contract the Government entered into was that contract by which they expected to get the service done without paying any cash. The result of that, as the world knows, was a complete failure.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hardly think that is a fair description of the situation. The hon. gentleman's instructions are inaccurate as regards the dates The arrangement with the police was not made in December, but everything was ready for the mail to go forward as soon as the ice would admit. I remember giving my instructions very early in the fall of the year. It may be that these tenderers put in marked cheques, but I did not think it would have been safe to have depended upon contractors, and I do not think so yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. After the experience——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, after the experience. I am quite willing to admit that Mr. Richardson was not a satisfactory contractor, but I would ask the hon. gentleman, in fairness, to take the whole of my statement when I say that he was only a nominal contractor with us. It is hardly a fair description of the situation to say that we were making a bargain to get the service performed for nothing. The nominal character of the service was to oblige the United States Government——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What other service was there outside of that Richardson contract before the present arrangement with the Mounted Police ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Mounted Police service continued from the previous year, and throughout the whole of 1898-99.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If you mailed a letter at any point on the Sound for the Yukon in September, 1898, how would your officers send that to Dawson ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would have gone by the police.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And not by Richardson ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the Richardson contract began then.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Was it stipulated that a certain fixed amount of mail should be carried by Richardson ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so ; the contract was laid on the Table.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If Yukon mail matter is addressed via Seattle, would it not be sure to go to the Yukon district by that route ? I understand from the Postmaster General that although the postmaster at Victoria had authority to refuse to send mail matter to the Yukon district, yet the officers here had no authority to refuse to forward that mail. When I complained at the post office here, the officers told me that they had no information as to the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where did the hon. gentleman post his mail matter ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. In the House of Commons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster of the House of Commons is not an officer of the Post Office Department.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is he not an officer acting between this House and the post office of the city of Ottawa ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what his status is.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Well, I know that when you mail matter here you are supposed to be mailing it at the post office in the city, where the regulations ought to be perfect if they are perfect anywhere. I complain that I was not informed here that this matter would not be forwarded.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will go now if you send it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is the duty of the Postmaster General to give information, and he should give it to the House and to the public.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I want to do my duty to the hon. gentleman, and if he wishes my advice, it would be that if he puts that in the post office properly addressed it will go forward without any delay. I told the hon. gentleman that some days ago.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The last thing the hon. gentleman told us about the mail service there was that it had gone to the dogs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will give me that parcel I will be responsible for its going forward without any delay.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before this item passes, I wish to ask the Minister if he has a gentleman by the name of Landerkin employed in the Toronto post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have a most efficient officer by the name of Landerkin in the inspector's office at Toronto, drawing a salary of, I think, $400 a year, and his services are so valuable that I propose to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) to join with me to enable us to have the opportunity of increasing his salary with that of others.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did he pass the civil service examination?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is he a son of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) that he is said to be a son of my esteemed friend (Mr. Landerkin), and I will have to ask the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to supply the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) with any further information he may require on that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that in the county of Halifax it has been the practice, at some post offices at least, to make up what are called private mail bags for the convenience of persons who live a long distance from the office, and to give them in charge of the mail courier to be delivered at the addresses. This is a practice which, rightly or wrongly, has prevailed in certain districts, and Mr. W. C. Henley, of Spry Bay, so received his mail. I should have said that in 1896 the post office was moved from the immediate vicinity of where he resided, and he now lives two or three miles away from the office. He had been in the habit of receiving what is called a private mail bag made up at the post office at Spry Bay; and on the 12th April, 1899, the following letter was addressed by the inspector of Nova Scotia, Chas. J. Macdonald, to the postmistress at Tangier, county of Halifax:

> Is it a fact that you are making up a private mail-bag containing the correspondence of W. C. Henley, Spry Bay, notwithstanding my express instructions to the contrary? If so, please discontinue it at once.

What Mr. Henley complains of is, that, while this privilege is denied to him, it is extended to certain other persons in the city of Halifax. Mr. Henley is a strong Conservative and a very active worker, and he has a suspicion, rightly or wrongly, that this privilege has been taken away from him because he is a strong worker in the ranks of the Conservatives. I can give the hon. Postmaster General the names of four persons who are strong Liberal workers in the city of Halifax——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman need not tell me about the other cases, because there is only one rule in the department in these matters. I can recall only one instance of being asked to have orders sent to a contractor to carry a private bag. It may be the case in point, or it may not be. But I can state, generally, that there is nothing obliging any contractor not to carry a private bag, it being left entirely optional to the contractor to do so or not, as he thinks proper. It is the custom for couriers to be neighbourly, and sometimes for a small douceur to drop mail matter in boxes, and so on, along their route, and I have never authorized any instructions such as are indicated in that letter. Mr. Macdonald has no authority to interrupt any arrangement of that kind, and the couriers are at perfect liberty to carry private bags for persons by the way, if it does not interfere with the proper despatch of their work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The explanation of the hon. gentleman is very frank and satisfactory, and I trust he will see that these instructions are countermanded. I agree entirely with him that, so long as no responsibility is placed on the Crown, the practice is a matter of convenience to the people, and might very well be done. I see no objection to the course pursued. The difficulty I see about it is what I mentioned to the hon. gentleman, that, while it is done in other cases, instructions have been given in this case by Mr. Macdonald, apparently without authority. I will rely on the hon. gentleman to see that those instructions are countermanded, and that Mr. Henley is placed in the same position as other persons in the county.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the carrying of that private bag interfere

with the proper discharge of the courier's duty ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not at all. As I understand the facts, the contractor is perfectly willing to carry the bag, and the postmistress is perfectly willing to place Mr. Henley's mail in the bag, and Mr. Henley does not ask the Government to assume any responsibility at all. He is willing to trust the postmistress to put his mail in the bag and the contractor to bring the bag, and he simply asks, as a matter of convenience, that that should be done.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). In this particular case it is clear that it is not the contractor who has been interfered with, but the instructions have been issued to the postmistress. Has the inspector any authority as to that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I tried to cover the whole situation by my answer. I spoke about Mr. Macdonald. I say, no instructions have been given to any officer, so far as I know, to interfere with the arrangements that may be made with couriers in these cases for the carrying of private bags.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. Minister says there is no desire to interfere with couriers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Or any officer. I am not playing on words at all.

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

After Recess.

QUEBEC RAILWAY, LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 84) an Act respecting the Quebec Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, and to change its name to "The Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company."—(Mr. Carroll.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 13,

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It has been pointed out to me, with reference to the schedule, that schedule A is all right, but the law clerk of this House has pointed out that some twenty or thirty pages of schedule B might be struck out without destroying the effect of the Bill at all. I am sorry that the hon. member in charge of the Bill is not present, but in view of the report of the law clerk, I would move that in the 13th clause, after the words "set out" in the fifth line the words "in part" be inserted. The object of that is to save a very large expense in connection with the printing, besides avoiding incumbering the statutes with it. And on page 9 of section 1, down to page 37, I move that all be struck out.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the promoter notice of this ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then the Bill had better stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You can allow it to stand till the third reading.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We shall allow it to stand in committee if it stands at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If there were really an opposition, or criticism in any way, it would be all right not to pass it through committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know anything about it except that the promoters are not here.

Mr. HENDERSON. We do not know whether there is any opposition, because no notice has been given.

Motion agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 3) respecting the Canada Accident Assurance Company.—(Mr. Monk.)

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 4) to incorporate the Canada Plate Glass Assurance Company.—(Mr. Monk.)

NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CALVERT moved that the House resolve itself in committee on Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move in amendment,

That the Order of the Day for the House in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 69), being an Act to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, be discharged, and the Bill referred back to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

When this Bill was considered before the Railway Committee there were several other committees of the House meeting, and many members of the Railway Committee were unable to be present. Under these circumstances, I think it would be well to have it referred back for further consideration.

Mr. CALVERT. When this Bill was before the committee we had a thorough discussion upon it, we had a good-sized committee, and we spent a good deal of time in discussing it. This Bill has been before the House a considerable time, and I think every member who is interested in it at all thoroughly understood that the Bill was coming up before the committee that day. I do not think it would be fair, after we

have considered the Bill so thoroughly, to have it referred back now. I think the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution was there and voted on the Bill, and I do not see any reason why it should be referred back to the committee at all.

Mr. WOOD. I can corroborate the statement made by the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, that in consequence of several members of the Committee of Railways and Canals being absent at other committees, it had not a fair consideration, and had these other members been present, this Bill would not have been reported to the House by the Chairman, it would have been simply voted out of the committee altogether. I think it is only fair that it should go back where it may have a full and free discussion on its merits. I suppose it is scarcely worth while to take up the time of the House in discussing the question now if it goes back to the committee; but if it goes back to the committee, I am quite certain this House will never see it again. If it should unfortunately come here again, I have a resolution prepared which I shall move; but at present I shall content myself with saying that I believe the Bill should be referred back in the interest of all concerned, in the interest of the public, and in the interest of the city I have the honour to represent.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the reasons given for referring this Bill back are sufficient. If there were not enough members of the committee present to form a quorum, that would be a good reason for sending the Bill back.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the reason advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite for referring this Bill back, are altogether insufficient. Many Bills are passed with a very small attendance before the Railway Committee. For myself I was not present when the Bill was considered before the committee, but it is a Bill that I understand thoroughly well, and I know that if it is referred back I shall make it a point to be there and I shall support the Bill, as I am doing now. I do not see what is to be gained by referring the Bill back.

Mr. J. McMULLEN (North Wellington). I can fully corroborate the statement that when this Bill was before the Railway Committee there was not a very large attendance. But it seems to me that is not a sufficient reason for referring the Bill back. It was carried before the committee on the very narrow majority of 3. There are some provisions in the Bill that, in my opinion, are exceedingly objectionable. This road has had a very checkered history. It has been before the Ontario legislature and before Parliament no less than 14 times, when this company was asking either for amendments, or renewals, or extensions, or alterations in its charter. From the time they first got their charter, which I think was in 1881, down to the present time, they have built about 12 miles of road, and have got 14 different amendments to their charter. They had a charter covering almost the entire Niagara peninsula. They first got a charter from Niagara Falls. The city of St. Catharines has unquestionably suffered considerably, having granted a considerable amount of money towards the construction of this road. But after they had built 12 miles of road it was eventually sold, and all it brought was $36,000. Now what have we done? In the haste with which that Bill was rushed through that committee, when it was nearly one o'clock, we granted the present company, which is a new company altogether, power to bond that 12 miles of road now built, at the rate of $25,000 a mile, which would come to $300,000. I must confess as a member of that committee that I feel ashamed that we should have given them power to bond 12 miles of road for $300,000, when they admitted before the committee themselves that all it cost them was $36,000. I contend that of itself is sufficient evidence to convince this House that there must have been a good deal of rush to get the Bill through, with that peculiar provision, or else the committee was unquestionably lax in the discharge of its duty. I have never known in the history of this Parliament a Bill to come before the Railway Committee where the incorporators securing such privileges as these, that is to say, power to bond 12 miles of road that cost $36,000 with a mortgage of $300,000, and to place these bonds upon the market. That of itself shows there was a great deal of laxity on the part of the committee. This fact, if there were no other reasons, would justify us in referring that Bill back to the committee in order that that peculiar provision of it might be recast. I say we should not allow that company these enormous bonding privileges upon the 12 miles of road that they got for $36,000. Suppose the present company should try and realize upon these bonds, suppose they sold them for 50 cents on the dollar, that would be $150,000. They take out the $36,000 that they paid, and they would have left $114,000 of a clean balance to put into their own pockets, and leave it just where it is, and allow the next bondholders to come in and go through the same operation.

Now, I do not think we should sanction a private Bill of that kind and allow it to become law. We cannot deal with that clause before the House as well as we can deal with it before a full committee. This company got their first charter in 1881. The original charter was granted by 44 Vic., chap. 73. It was a charter to build from St. Catharines under the name of the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company. In 1882 they were before the Ontario legislature again. In that year they got an amendment allowing them to

build a line from St. Catharines to the village of Bismarck, thence to Smithville, and to Caledonia or Canfield, on the Grand Trunk Railway, with branches also to or near Hamilton, on the Hamilton and Northwest Central to Queenston. Then, again, by 45 Vic., chap. 62, they got power to build from Hamilton to Toronto. That was away back in 1882. In 1884, by 47 Vic., chap. 72, they got further corporate powers. In 1885 they again appeared before the Ontario legislature for the purpose of securing the ratification of the by-law of St. Catharines granting them certain amounts of money for the construction of this line, and granting them the right to construct a line to Hamilton and Toronto from any point on their line. All these improvements and changes in their charter are supposed to have been made in order to place this company in a position in which they could construct their lines, for which they had received charters. In 1886, by 48 Vic., chap. 79, they got a further extension, and a still further extension in 1887, by 49 Vic., chap. 78. They had then been seven times before the Ontario legislature. I presume that for very shame's sake they could not go back any more to the legislature after they had done little or nothing in the way of construction, and it was then that they came to the Dominion House. What did they do here? In 1887, by the statutes of Canada, chap. 60, they got it declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, and got authority for a branch from Oakville to Cooksville. In 1888 they got, by the statutes of Canada, chap. 78, re-enacted all the previous Acts, consolidating them, and the time extended to the 22nd of May, 1890, for beginning the work, and to 1893 for completing it. In 1890, chap. 54, sec. 36, they got power to extend from Hamilton to Burlington, and the time for completion was extended two years. In 1891 they got power to increase the bonds and power to extend to the Niagara River. In 1892 the time was extended again. In 1894 they again got the time extended, and in 1895 they got the line extended through Hamilton to Brantford and Woodstock, with power to build to Port Dover, and a loop line to Thorold, to lease to the Hamilton Radial Railway Company, and to change the name to Niagara, Hamilton and Pacific Railway. In 1896 and in 1897 they got power to build from St. Catharines to connect with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway at Smithville in Lincoln County, and they also had the time extended for two years. This is the history of legislation in connection with this road.

Mr. TAYLOR. It cost them a lot of money.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, they have had a lot of legislation that has taken up a considerable amount of the time of this House. They have been seven times before the Ontario legislature and seven times before this House. All they have done is to build 12½ miles of railway that cost, I have no doubt, a considerable amount of money. But, after all, it was sold out under the bonded debt, and they admitted themselves that all that the little line brought was $36,000, although I believe St. Catharines had given bonuses on two occasions of $60,000 each, or $120,000 altogether, for the construction of this road. After all that money was sunk in it there is only this 12½ miles left, which was sold under the bonded debt, amounting to some $370,000, for $36,000. Now, the company comes back for the fifteenth time and asks that the time be extended so that they can build to Hamilton and Toronto, and it is also asked that we shall grant them power to bond, not only the new line, not only the portion that they have already built, but——

Mr. CALVERT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) if the old charter does not give them power to build to Hamilton and Toronto, which charter has not expired?

Mr. McMULLEN. The old charter does, but it is about to expire.

Mr. CALVERT. It has not expired yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. And they want, before it expires, to get another extension. They want to come to this Parliament and get five years to enable them to carry it over another five years. I contend that we should at least call a halt in connection with this charter. In the first place, I contend that granting permission to bond the road to the extent that they are asking is exceedingly objectionable. I have never known, in the history of this House, that Parliament has granted to a company power to bond a railway for ten times the amount that it cost. We are really giving them power to bond and to place on the market bonds to the extent of ten times the amount that they acknowledge that the road cost. I do not think we should do that. If a man bought a bond for $300,000 and Parliament gives him power to realize $300,000 by putting the samp of legality on it, it is committing an imprudent act. That bond provision deserves to be reconsidered and recast by the Railway Committee before we should allow it to pass. I think we should ask the promoters of this road to go back before the Railway Committee and show their bona fides, beyond all doubt, before we renew this charter. I hold myself responsible for it, as well as other members of this House; but I think that, perhaps, in the past, we have been too lax in granting charters without looking fully into the financial ability of those seeking the charter to carry out the work that they ask Parliament to give legal existence to. In my opinion, it is unwise to

legislate in the direction of chartering every company that comes before us seeking to get these powers, and when a company have had the history that this company have had, when they have been so frequently before Parliament as this company have been, where its history is so exceedingly objectionable, I think we should hesitate before granting their request. I know of no other railway that has a history so objectionable as this one, unless it is the Great Northwest Central. That road has had a checkered existence also, but when they last came before the Railway Committee, we tied them down to a very short time for the purpose of getting those into whose hands the road has now come, to make some progress with its construction. To give these people the time that they are asking and to allow them to issue bonds to the extent to which this charter would enable them to issue and to place them on the market, would be most unwise. These people are Americans. They came before the committee and they offered some explanations. We were told that they were members of a very important financial firm some place in the United States. Let us ask them to deposit to the credit of the Receiver General, or to make an arrangement in some way to deposit money in Canada as a guarantee that they would carry out this undertaking. It is time that we should do that, knowing the history of the road as we do. They have seen how often it has been before Parliament; they know of the amendments which have been made to this charter.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) a question? Has the hon. gentleman overlooked the fact that the names of very responsible Canadians have been added to the list of those who are seeking this legislation?

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit there are some very respectable names, one or two, but I do not know whether they are directors or not. They may be provisional directors put on to lend a kind of grace and dignity in the meantime, and after this Bill is passed, they may get out and allow some others to take their places. They will have accomplished their purpose if they secure a renewal of their charter and the extension of the time, and then their services will not be required any more. They lend their names to it now, when it needs some kind of decent representation, and afterwards they can retire. When you look over the whole situation and consider the enormous cost of that line as proposed to be built, and then try to find the men who have the money to carry out an undertaking of this kind, I cannot say that Parliament would be justified in coming to the conclusion that these men mean business. Possibly they expect they may be able to sell this charter. They talk about running an electric line in place of a steam line, and they may be able to sell out for some consideration. We know well that charters have been sold out in the past. I can look back to the date, many years ago—my esteemed friend from Hamilton will correct me if I am wrong—when the Canada Southern charter was sold for $60,000. There have been any number of charters granted to the peninsula of Niagara, but there are only two or three that could be successfully carried through, and this line is not one of them. Let us get these men to come before the Railway Committee, and show their bona fides as to the carrying out of this undertaking. That is a reasonable request. The question came up at the closing hours of the committee meeting, when the committee was pretty well exhausted, and when they were ready to allow almost anything to slip through without criticism. The passage of the clause I have drawn the attention of the House to, and the bonding powers granted to this company, is sufficient evidence that the committee did not give that Bill the consideration they should have given it, out of respect to themselves as well as for the protection of the public interest. If this Bill is referred back to the committee it will receive that consideration which it deserves, and the committee can criticise the ability of these men to carry out what they have undertaken. I question very much that after it gets through the committee, it will come back to this House in the same shape it is in now.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). As chairman of the Railway Committee, I feel called upon to make a few remarks with regard to this Bill. I am in the judgment of the members of the House who were present, when I say, that the number of members attending this committee when the Bill was passed, was above the average. Further, this Bill was allowed to stand on several occasions at the request of those who said they were opposed to it, and in accordance with their request it was made a special order at a previous meeting, and then, again at their request, postponed to the day on which it was finally considered. In my humble opinion, the history of the legislation with regard to the past state of affairs has nothing whatever to do with the question, the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to the contrary notwithstanding. If any censure is to be attached to anybody, it is on this Parliament for granting the legislation that is referred to with regard to a company that is now out of existence. Let me call your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any argument with regard to the legislation of the past, it is an argument favourable to the present owners of this property, and for the reason that they have dropped, in the legislation which is now before the House, between one and two hundred miles of road that was previously chartered by Parliament. However, as I have said, that has nothing to do

with the present case. Parliament did grant a great many privileges to this old company, and they built 12 miles of the road. They became insolvent, and what we have to consider is the state of affairs arising after the bankruptcy of this former company. The people who owned the bonds took occasion to proceed in the courts in the ordinary way, and this was advertised for sale by the Superior Court of the province of Ontario. As to that, all I have to say is, that every Canadian, and every Canadian company who now oppose this charter, had the privilege of bidding at that sale. Now, Sir, I have said what I had to say as chairman of the committee. Let me now say that the reason I support this Bill is because it is in the public interest of the locality that this railway should be put in good running shape. Canadians would not risk their capital in the enterprise when the Americans bought this property, and out of common courtesy to these foreigners who have invested in a proper and legal enterprise, I believe this Parliament should pass this legislation. A respectable counsel of the city of Toronto; one of the most respectable and reliable counsel in that city, appeared before the committee and gave the names and the business of these four American gentlemen who had bought this property from the courts, and he pledged his word that they were men of high financial standing. He gave also the names of the Canadians associated with them as provisional directors, and they are men of very high standing in our own community. I have heard no good reason why this Bill should be referred back to the committee. There was a large attendance at the committee when it passed; both sides were represented by counsel and there was a long discussion. I am surprised at my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) making a long speech with regard to the history of a company which is now out of existence, and saying nothing with regard to the case as it stands at the present time; not even referring to the resolution which he himself moved and which was rejected in the committee by a majority of three. If I had a vote I might have voted with my hon. friend in regard to curtailing the number of miles they might get leave to build; but, after a long discussion, and after hearing counsel on both sides, it was decided by a majority of the committee that the Bill should pass as it now stands. I say, Sir, that in the interest of the locality in which this road is situated, it would be doing a great injury to this community, if the people who purchased this road in good faith and who show their ability to do the work, are not encouraged to do so.

I want to point out that this company became bankrupt, and the people who bought the property paid the highest price that could be got for it, as it was sold by tender by the court. The road had been condemned by the Department of Railways and Canals, and the trains had stopped running, and manufacturers and others interested in that line were suffering for want of communication with the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway. To satisfy the Minister of Railways and his department, these men had to put their hands in their pockets and spend $50,000 or $60,000 of their own money before they asked for any legislation from this House; and there is no unbiassed member of this House who would say, that, after these men have bought this property, paid their money for it and met the demands of the Minister of Railways, expending altogether over $100,000 of their own money to put it into good shape, they should not receive an Act of incorporation. There has not been one reason given in the committee, or out of it, why this company should not be incorporated, as our law requires that it must be, in order to work the property. While there may be a difference of opinion as to what extensions should be granted, these men cannot fairly be refused incorporation as a new company. They have dropped between one and two hundred miles from the charter, for which they previously paid.

Mr. WOOD. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I can prove it. I will risk my reputation in this House that the words I state are true, and, if my hon. friend will back them up, that in previous legislation they had power to build to Port Dover.

Mr. McMULLEN. They had power several times to build, but from time to time they stopped.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend will please answer my question. Had they not power to build to Port Dover?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, I know. That power can be found in the statutes of the Parliament of Canada. They ask in this Bill for power to extend to Port Dalhousie, to Fort Erie and to the city of Toronto, via Hamilton. I have no objection to a difference of opinion with regard to the extension; but there is no reason why any reflection should be cast on the character of the men who have purchased this road. It is in the interest of the community in which this road exists, that they should receive an Act of incorporation, and, if the question were referred to the Railway Committee, I do not believe that there would be five men to stand up and refuse to give it to them.

Mr. W. McCLEARY (Welland). Mr. Speaker, to me it is a very sad commentary upon the representation of the people in this House, that there are men in it who will stand up against the people's interest in favour of any monopoly. There can be no reason given for the action of those hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken against

the incorporation of this company, other than that they must be influenced to withhold legislation from a company that may compete with other railway corporations. As the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said, this company has had a somewhat checkered career; but, as the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has so plainly put before the House, it has been no fault of the company which is at present seeking incorporation. It is an unfair and unjust thing on the part of this free Parliament to say, that this charter, which is in existence to-day, shall not be continued to these people, who have had the courage to put their money into a concern which no Canadian would buy. The property was twice put up by the Superior Court of Ontario for sale. The judges thought the first offer was too small, and they would not accept it. They called for new tenders, and the highest tender they could get was from the men who are now seeking incorporation. When the hon. member for North Wellington says we are giving the company power to bond the road for ten times the amount they have paid for it, that is unfair, because every one knows that for the 12 miles they have built, the Government granted a subsidy of $3,200 a mile, the city of St. Catharines granted a bonus of $80,000, and guaranteed bonds for $88,000, and my own town guaranteed the interest on $20,000, at 6 per cent, for twenty years. To say, that the city of St. Catharines, the town of Thorold, in which I live, and the whole community about there should be deprived of railway competition, is most absurd on the face of it, particularly as this Parliament has already incorporated a company and given it the necessary powers to build this line. As the chairman of the Railway Committee, the hon. member for North Oxford, has very truthfully said, it is very seldom that there is such a large gathering in that committee as there was when this Bill was discussed. It received at the hands of that committee very careful consideration. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) took up a great deal of the time of that committee. For nearly two hours this whole matter was discussed, pro and con, and the result was, that the committee reported the Bill, with some slight amendments, to this House. Why should this House go back on its record simply because three or four men may have some interest—I am not going to say what it may be—in asking for a reconsideration of this measure, in order that they may be able to pack the committee and carry their object against the wishes of the people? The truth is, that the Niagara Peninsula has only one railway; that is, the Grand Trunk. It may be said that we have the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo, but that only runs from Hamilton to Stony Creek, a distance of 10 or 12 miles, and then goes up the mountain. The fruit-growers of the Niagara Peninsula have complained, time and again, of the rates they have to pay for the transportation of their fruit. Why should that district be kept under the thumb of one railway? As I stated the other morning in committee, before these 12 miles were built, the people of the town of Thorold paid 60 cents a ton to the Grand Trunk on coal coming from Niagara Falls, a distance of 8 or 9 miles; but, since that short line was built, we have only had to pay 25 cents a ton. So that, if we had this extension to Hamilton and Toronto, giving us the competition we ought to have, by connecting us with the Canadian Pacific Railway, as well as with the Grand Trunk, it would no doubt be for the benefit of the whole community. I sincerely hope the House will not accept the motion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). The Bill stands on its merits, and it should be passed.

The time for the consideration of private Bills having expired, the House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

(In the Committee.)

Post Office Department—

Salaries—Amount required to pay the officers of the Dead Letter Branch a provisional allowance to meet the exceptional cost of living in Manitoba and British Columbia, from 1st July, 1898, to 30th June, 1899, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, viz.:—

G. A. D. Mailleue, superintendent of the dead letter office at Victoria, B.C.	$120
E. M. Walker, superintendent of the dead letter office at Winnipeg.....	90
	$210
Increase of salary of one third-class clerk	50

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have now before me the return, and while the subject is fresh in the minds of the committee, I would call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to one or two points which seem to corroborate the impression I had of the arrangement. There was an arrangement datd 17th May, 1898,—a good deal earlier than the hon. Minister thought it was—the chief consideration of which was its cheapness, for which reason probably it failed. Under that arrangement, on condition of being allowed to carry the United States mails between Juneau and Alaska, a contract was entered into, without payment of any kind, for the carriage of the Canadian mails, and no security of any kind was taken for the effective discharge of that service. Afterwards, late in the fall, tenders were asked for for a regular service, the tenders to be received at Ottawa until noon on the 1st February, 1899, for the conveyance of Her Majesty's

mails. Up to the 21st November, 1898, it is clear there was nothing but this abortive arrangement I have referred to. The return contains a report from the post office inspector, Mr. Fletcher, which is apparently the report to which I referred this afternoon. It is dated February 8th, 1899, and mentions the various tenders received. Mr. Fletcher says that there were only two bona fide offers at Victoria, and neither of the tenderers was in a position to furnish the service Then there is a draft contract, so that from the official information brought down, whatever else there is behind, in connection with the order of the House, there is simply that document, under which the hon. Postmaster General was unable, before recess, to state who would take officially a letter posted at the time that agreement was in force, at Victoria, or Seattle, or Fort Townsend, or Vancouver, or what arrangement the Government had for carrying a letter, posted according to the rules and regulations governing mailing matter, to the city of Dawson. I know of no arrangement of any kind, and certainly there is none under the cover of this order except this arrangement which fell through. The arrangement with the police, of course, is not a contract and not covered by the terms of this order, but is simply an arrangement between the Post Office Department and the Mounted Police Department arrived at by correspondence. It is notorious that from May down to November, 1898, the condition of affairs was simply scandalous, and the reason seems to have been the want of proper arrangement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In 1897 arrangements were made for the carriage of the mails to Dawson and return by the Mounted Police. Originally that service was called for as a monthly service, as the country was just being developed. That service was subsequently made a fortnightly service, about September or October, 1898, and has so continued down to the present. The return laid on the Table covers all the hon. gentleman asked for. There was no contract made with the Mounted Police, but simply an arrangement between the two departments, I think, in 1897. There was first of all a monthly service as the facilities for travel were much less than during the past year. In the summer of 1898, the police were able to establish huts which they could stock with provisions and so be able to carry the service by means of relays. Prior to that the mails had to be carried on dog trains, which carried the food required along with the mail matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I received a letter from a friend of mine in Calgary who states that a letter mailed at Brockville takes two or three days longer to reach Calgary than a passenger does, owing to the fact that the mail comes into Ottawa, remains here over a night or two, and then starts on its way west, instead of being, as it should be, transferred, as passengers are, at Carleton Place. I would like to know from the Postmaster General whether steps will be taken to remedy this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), but I am inclined to doubt the accuracy of the statement; because we have at the head of the railway branch an officer who has not his superior in the service, and that officer has the fullest support of the department in making all the improvements that the interests of the public require. If such a thing happens as the hon. gentleman referred to, I am sure it is not with the knowledge of the head of that branch; but I greatly doubt that such a state of things does exist.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) look into the matter?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will look into it carefully.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement made to me by my friend in Calgary is that letters bear the Ottawa post mark, showing they come to Ottawa before they are sent to Calgary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say as to that, but what I wish to have understood is that I believe the letters go by the quickest possible route.

Mr. TAYLOR. If they come to Ottawa there must be delay.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will look into the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I bring to the attention of the Postmaster General, on this vote, as I may not have another opportunity, the fact that the post office accommodation in the city of Halifax is very defective. I think this matter has already been brought to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Mulock) attention. I suppose that it is a matter that the deparment of Public Works would eventually have to deal with. I brought it to the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and submited to him a resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Halifax with regard to it. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has ever been in the city of Halifax, he knows that the post office accommodation would be a disgrace to a country town of 5,000 people. We have 40,000 people in Halifax, besides seven or eight thousand in Dartmouth who are largely accommodated by the post office in the city. There is not sufficient accommodation for the officials, or for the public, and the building, which is made to contain the post office, the Customs Department, the Inland Revenue Department, the Marine and Fisheries Department, and various other offices, is absolutely insufficient for the purpose. While the Public Works Department may be directly concerned, still the hon. Postmaster

General has a certain responsibility in connection with it; and I hope and trust that, if he has not investigated the mater, he will do so and will endeavour to get the people of my city some accommodation in this respect before long. This is the growing time, as the hon. gentleman knows, and the Government accommodation, in Halifax should grow with other things. I am sure there is no place in Canada, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will admit, in which some additional accommodation is more required than in the city of Halifax; and I know if my hon. colleague (Mr. Russell) happened to be in the House this evening he would be the first to support me in the suggestion I am making.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may say that the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Borden's) colleague (Mr. Russell) has on more than one occasion brought the matter to my attention. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that this is a matter belonging to the Minister of Public Works; and I can only hope that that department will, in good time, be able to provide the accommodation required. From what I have been told of the accommodation there, the hon. gentleman has not overstated the condition of affairs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am asking, of course, for the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Mulock's) moral support in connection with my application.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think you will have it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am aware that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has given considerable attention to the matter just brought before the committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden, King's) is going off to camp, so it is suggested that we proceed with the estimates relating to his department.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the hon. Minister of Militia propose to go to camp?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To-night if he can get away.

Mr. FOSTER. And he wants to get his estimates passed before he goes?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might just as well go right now.

Militia and Defence—

Further amounts required for—	
Annual drill	$125,000
Salaries and wages of civil employees	9,000
Military properties	35,000
Stores	39,700
Clothing	20,000
Transport	15,000
Miscellaneous and unforeseen	10,000
Royal Military College, including an increase of pay to Prof. Worrell, $200, and to Prof. Chartrand, $200.	10,400
Purchase of Hamilton rifle range	3,000
To complete payment for London property	1,090
For Defence Scheme Committee	6,100
	$274,290

Mr. McDOUGALL. Last year I called the attention of the Minister of Militia to the case of a young man in my constituency who made application for admission to the Military School at Fredericton, N.B. He received, as I understand, a certificate for admission, and after a few days there he was ordered to leave for his home without giving him, so far as I could learn, any particulars as to the reasons that led the officer in charge of the institution to refuse to give him instructions after that time. I have here the report of the discussion which took place between the Minister of Militia and myself last year. It is as follows:—

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Minister state the rules on which young men are admitted to the military school at Fredericton, and on what grounds they are discharged after being there a short period? I am acquainted with the case of a young man who went to the military school at Fredericton a great expense, and after he had been there a few weeks or a month was ordered home. The reason given to me for this action was that the young man was a Conservative.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nothing could be more untrue and unjust than to make a statement of that kind. I do not charge it against the hon. gentleman; but it would have been only fair if the hon. gentleman had sent me notice that he would make a charge of this kind. I can assure him that if he will send me the name and the particulars, I will investigate the matter. But there is not the slightest particle of political partisanship in connection with the administration of the military schools. We never inquire as to a man's politics at all. I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to the men who are sent from the different militia battalions throughout the country to these schools of instruction.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This man was never under instruction in any way until he went to Fredericton. The man's name was McKenzie. I forget his Christian name now.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. But he was not a member of the active militia.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then he had no business to go there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There were a number of young men from the neighbourhood who went there, but it happened that their politics were different, and the others got not only one term but two terms.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) understands what he is saying, but I am sure I do not understand what he means. No man can enter these schools, unless he has joined one of the militia corps of the country. We provide schools at the different depots to teach non-commissioned officers and officers of

the active militia. The colonel in command of a battalion makes a request through the proper channel to have some of his officers or men received at a given school, and in the maritime provinces that is at Fredericton. If there is room there these men are received, and in all cases they are received in the order in which the names are sent in. No question is made as to politics. We know nothing whatever of their politics. As a matter of fact, four-fifths of the commanding officers of the militia are Conservatives, but the department does not know any difference between a Conservative and a Liberal. We receive in these schools every man who is properly recommended and is a member of the active militia, in the order in which application is made, and if there is room for them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know personally these young men about whom I speak, as they are from my neighbourhood. Two brothers, one Archibald McDougall and the other, Daniel McDougall, attended the military school at Fredericton, and before they went there they were never under one single hour's instruction in their life. They were never members of any corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They could not go there without belonging to a corps.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They never had any connection with any corps belonging to the militia, and the other young man was precisely in the same position in that regard.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) give me their names ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Daniel McDougall and Archibald McDougall ; they served their time one or two terms.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Were they Conservatives ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. These two were Liberals. The man who was sent home after a short time was John McKenzie, I think ?

Mr. MILLS. Was he a member of any corps ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No.

Mr. MILLS. Was he a Tory ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes. The three men lived within a mile of my place, and I might say my authority is the father of this young man, McKenzie, who complained to me about how his son was treated, and he could not understand it except that the young man gave away that he was a Conservative.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Could the hon. gentleman give me about the date McKenzie went there ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. As near as I can remember it was September or October last.

That ended the discussion on that point last session. On the 10th of May last, I put the following question to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) :—

Why was Francis McKenzie, of Christmas Island, refused instructions in the military school at Fredericton, in 1897 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Want of intelligence and educational attainments, showing that he was not likely to become efficient.

Then, on the 29th of May, I put the following question :—

What commanding officer recommended the admission for instruction at the military school at Fredericton, N.B., of the following persons from the county of Cape Breton :—Archibald J. McDougall, Dan J. McDougall, Hugh P. McKinnon and Francis H. McKenzie ? To what volunteer companies did they belong and how long have they been members of such company ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Commanding officer of the 94th Battalion. 2. To No. 3 and 4 companies, 94th Battalion (as stated at the time by the officers commanding those companies). 3. It is not known how long they have belonged.

Now, in the discussion last year the Minister of Militia and Defence gave me to understand that none of these young men could get admission for instructions at the military school without first belonging to some active militia in the Dominion, and that they should have a certificate from some officer of that militia to entitle them to admission to the school. I know these young men, and I know they did not belong to any active militia in the capacity of officers, privates, or anything else, they were simply civilians who had never spent a day in drill.

Mr. PRIOR. Were they accepted ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. They were accepted at the military school, with the exception of this McKenzie, who was only kept there for a short time, and the Minister of Militia and Defence informs me that it was because he was lacking in intelligence and educational attainments. Well, I know the young man, and I know him to be intelligent, and I know him to have the necessary education to qualify him for any ordinary position that he applied for in any company. He compares very favourably with the other young men, and I cannot understand the Minister giving that answer. Now, finding that the answers made to my questions were unsatisfactory, and that a great injustice was done to this young man, and that instead of giving what to my mind was a proper explanation in accordance with the facts, a further wrong was done to the young man by insulting him on the floors of this Parliament. I addressed a letter to the Minister of Militia and Defence the other day which I will read. The hon. Minister has to-day thousands in the active militia not nearly as intelligent as the young man of whom I speak ; he has, to my own knowledge, hundreds in the active militia not as intelligent. I addressed this letter to the Minister of Militia and Defence to acquaint him with the fact that I was about to bring this matter to the notice of the House. I am not taking him unawares in the matter, and I hope he will be prepared to give me information more in accordance with the facts than he has done. My letter is dated June 7th :

Hon. F. W. Borden,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir,—The answers given to my question in respect to the refusal of military instructions to

Mr. Francis McKenzie at the Fredericton Military School, and in respect to his admission and the admission of others, not being satisfactory, I shall be obliged at the earliest convenient opportunity, to bring the matter again to the notice of the House, and now beg to advise you of the fact, and also that I shall be obliged to challenge the accuracy of the answers to my questions, in which I believe the commanding officer of the 94th Battalion, who, I understand, occupies a seat in the House, is concerned.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) H. F. McDOUGALL.

Now, I addressed a letter also to the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune), who I understand to be the commanding officer of the 94th Battalion, and who issued certificates to these young men who were admitted to the military school:

Ottawa, June 7th, 1899.

J. L. Bethune, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons.

Sir,—The answers made to my question by the hon. Minister of Militia in respect to the admission of young men to the military school at Fredericton being unsatisfactory, and in which I understand, as commanding officer of the 94th Battalion, you are concerned, I beg to advise you that I shall be obliged to bring the matter to the notice of the House again at the earliest convenient opportunity.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) H. F. McDOUGALL.

A great injustice was done to these young men, and I cannot understand what the motive would be upon which this young man would be discharged without, as far as I can ascertain, a single word of explanation before he left that institution. If this practice has been going on, the people of this country have been defrauded. If the rules and regulations of the militia service say that a young man cannot be admitted to the military schools without first belonging to the active militia in the capacity of private or officer, or in any other capacity, I cannot see how this young man or any of these young men have been admitted. The commanding officer, I am in a position to say, knows these young men also nearly as well as I do, and he knows that they did not belong to the active militia.

Mr. BETHUNE. They signed the service roll before they were recommended to go to the school, and they belonged to the corps when they were recommended. They have to sign the service-roll before they can go to the military school.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Am I to understand that all that is required is to sign the service-roll before a man can go to the military school?

Mr. BETHUNE. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Well, then, either the hon. member (Mr. Bethune) or the Minister is not correct, and I will leave the Minister and the commanding officer of the 94th Battalion to settle this matter between themselves. I understood from the statement of the hon. Minister that they would have to belong to the active militia.

Mr. BETHUNE. That is what I mean; it is the same thing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the difference between signing the roll there and right after going into the institution? I cannot see it.

Mr. BETHUNE. I cannot recommend anybody to go to the school until he has a certificate that he belongs to the company or to the corps.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain where he can find some of these young men to-day that he has been recommending and giving certificates to that they belong to certain companies. One of these young men, Hugh P. Mackinnon, left my employment to go to the military school. He never remained a day in any company, and the country paid his expenses at Fredericton. He never returned to our part of the country, but he went to the United States and settled there. There are several others besides him who went under the same circumstances to the military school at Fredericton. I cannot understand this. Public money is expended in this way, and certain young men are getting favours that others do not get.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden, King's). Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has read the bulk of what took place across the floor of the House a year ago in regard to the subject which he now brings up. The gist of it seems to be that I stated that no man would be allowed to attend military schools in this country unless he was a member of the active militia. I stated that, and it is a fact. If the men to whom the hon. gentleman refers were not members of the active militia, all I can say is that a fraud has been perpetrated on the country. I have no personal knowledge of the facts. I am told by the officers of the department that every one of these men came to the school with the statement of the captain of the company to which they belonged to the effect that each one of them was a duly enrolled militiaman, and the captain's certificate was filed at the school when the men applied for admission. I have that statement here under the hand of Mr. Hemming, major in charge of military depot No. 4 at Fredericton. I can possibly have no other knowledge of the subject than that which I can get from my officers. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) is able to show that a fraud has been perpetrated on the Militia Department, I promise that a searching in-

vestigation into the matter will be made. That is all that I can promise him. In reference to these men, I will read to the hon. gentleman the full report:

Fredericton, N.B., May 19, 1899.

From O. C. No. 4 R.D., R.C. Regiment, to D.O.C. M.D. No. 9.

In reply to your letter of the 18th instant, I submit to you the following information regarding the non-commissioned officers referred to therein:—

Corporal P. Mackinnon, 94th Battalion, joined No. 4 Regimental Depot, R. C. Regt., on the 1st of October, 1895,——

A year before the present Government came in.

——and he was struck off on the 31st of December, 1895.

Six months before we assumed office.

Obtained a first-class certificate.

Corporal A. B. McDougall, 94th Battalion, joined No. 4 Regimental Depot on the 1st of October, 1895, and was struck off 31st December, 1895.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) ought to have begun his investigation a little earlier.

Obtained a second-class certificate.

Private D. McDougall, 94th Batallion, joined No. 4 Regimental Depot on the 7th January, 1896, and was struck off on the 21st March, 1896.

Some months before the present Government came in.

He obtained a first-class certificate.

Private F. H. McKenzie, 94th Battalion, joined No. 4 Regimental Depot on the 6th October, 1897, and was struck off on the 30th October, 1897, in accordance with General Order 94, paragraph 4, 1897.

(Sgd.) T. D. R. HEMMING,
Major,
Commanding No. 4 Reg. Depot, R.R.C.I.

In regard to the case of Private McKenzie, my hon. friend claimed that the answer I gave was one calculated to do an injury to this man. I would regret exceedingly if such should happen to be the case; nothing was further from my intention than to do this man, or any one else, an injury or an injustice. The hon. gentleman has asked why this man was not allowed to attend the school. Let me point out to him that the answer which I gave him was in the exact wording of General Order 94, referred to by Major Hemming, under which supervision and control is exercised over the men who are sent to the schools of this country. I will read to the hon. gentleman the provision:

General Order 94.—Commandants of schools will not only see that these instructions are complied with, but they will so arrange that by the constant supervision of an officer detailed for that purpose, attached non-commissioned officers and men who give evidence by want of intelligence or educational attainments that they are not likely to become efficient non-commissioned officers, are to be immediately returned to their corps and the cases promptly reported to headquarters.

These are the exact words of my answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall). The answer was given to me by the General Officer Commanding, and was taken from that provision of the General Order, and the report on this was:

Peter McKenzie, 94th Battalion, was struck off on the 30th October, 1897, in accordance with General Order 94, paragraph 4, 1897.

I have given to my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) all the information I had. I have no personal knowledge of the case, and nothing would be further from my wish or desire than to inflict an injury upon any man, and if the young man has received any injury from what has taken place, he must thank my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall), and not me.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg to differ from the hon. Minister, and I tell him that I still hold to my ground.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Of course you do.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, and that is, that the young man is perfectly intelligent and perfectly fit to acquire the knowledge he went to that school for. Notwithstanding what the officers say, there must be something besides that reason which led to the dismissal of that young man from the school. With regard to W. B. McDougall to whom the Minister referred; he went to that school under the same circumstances as McKinnon. He was on his way to Boston, took in the school at Fredericton on the way, and never returned to the country until he came home to see his people last summer. He is a citizen of the United States. He went there not with the intention to belong to the active militia, but for the purpose of passing a few months on his way to Boston when the times were dull. That is practised with the knowledge of the officer of the militia who is giving these people certificates. Several of the young men besides these named have gone to the United States and are there now, and they never stood a day in any company. They may have put their names down on the roll just as they were getting their certificates from the officer, but nothing more. If only that is required I have nothing to complain of, but I understood from the Minister (Mr. Borden) last year that they should belong to an active militia corps, and have served in it. I did not understand that all that was necessary for them was to simply sign the roll.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) that signing the roll is of the essence of the whole matter. That

means taking the oath and becoming enrolled in the active militia of the country. On being enrolled the man binds himself to serve three years. It often happens that the captain of a company gets hold of a good man, between camps, and enrolls him and he is sent to the school in order to be more efficient when the camp comes around another year. By the act of enrolment these men become members of the active militia, and when their captains send a certificate that they were enrolled in their companies, the commandant of the school has no alternative but to receive them if he has room, provided, of course, that they were recommended by the commanding officer of the battalion and the D. O. C.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What has the Minister to say with regard to the abuse of this system ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman establishes a case of abuse I will see that it is investigated in full. If the department is being imposed upon, we want to know it, and we will take every precaution in our power but I can scarcely see how we can take more precautions than we do now. In the first place, the captain of the company must certify ; in the second place the commanding officer must approve, and in the third place the D. O. C. must recommend before the man can get a place in the school

Mr. McDOUGALL. The abuse is in permitting these young men to go to the school without serving a single day of training in the active militia, and never returning or remaining in any part of Canada when they got their training at the school. I am establishing a case now, and the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune), who knows these people and who is commanding officer, knows these men did not remain in Canada after getting instructions. I ask him to say whether or not Hugh McKinnon, W. B. McDougall and McNeill (I forget his first name), ever stood one single day in the active militia since they received their instruction at Fredericton. I am quite sure they did not, because they were not in the country.

Mr. BETHUNE. That is no fault of mine.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understood the hon. member (Mr. McDougall) to say that these were all Conservatives and constituents of his.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not say that. If the hon. gentleman referred to the discussion which took place last year, he will see that of the four young men I named, I stated only one of them is a Conservative. The other three received their instruction. One of them went to the States, and the other two returned home. The only Conservative out of the four did not receive instruction. He was refused and insulted.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. BETHUNE. The first thing to be done is that the man must sign the service roll, one of which is kept by the captain of each company, and a copy is forwarded to the D.O.C. of the district. I received the captain's certificate, which reads :

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the aforesaid.....has taken the oath of allegiance to his Sovereign on.....date ; also, that he has a permanent residence in the military district within the prescribed limits, bears a good character, and is able to read and write fairly.

Then the medical certificate follows that the man is physically fit, and so on. I apply then for permission to admit the candidate to the school, and I address that to the D. O. C. If the D.O.C. wishes he approves and forwards application to the commandant of the school, and if there is room the candidate is admitted. There are about ten officers and twenty non-commissioned officers admitted from the district annually, and we take our proportion of that number, which would be an average of four each quarter. I advise our captains to send as many as possible to the school with a view of promoting the efficiency of the corps, and I have perhaps a dozen applications for each quarter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) must remember that McKinnon and McDougall attended the school in 1895, long before this order was issued which caused the sending back of McKenzie. It was under a different order altogether that McKenzie was sent back.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that McKinnon attended the school at Fredericton ?

Mr. BETHUNE. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But he never attended drill before or since ?

Mr. BETHUNE. I have nothing to do with that. I examine the roll at various times, particularly at the annual training. I know McKinnon belonged to the militia at the time he applied for his admission, and that is all. I have the captain's certificate to that effect. That was in 1895, when anybody could be admitted, non-commissioned officer or private, who was able to read and write, and whether he passed his examination or not at the end of the course, was not material. But this order to which the Minister referred changed the whole of that. McKinnon applied at the term beginning the 1st of October, 1897, and in the meantime, on the 9th of that month, this order was issued which the Minister read :

Not only must officers commanding corps exercise great care in selecting or recommending men for course of instruction, but they must also ascertain that besides physical fitness these men possess more than an average degree of intelligence.

They have to see that he is not only able to read and write, but possesses more than an

average degree of intelligence. That was not inquired into, when McKinnon went to school. I did not know anything about this order; it was not issued then, and McKenzie was accepted in the meantime. I want to read this further order:

Commandants of schools will not only see that these instructions are complied with, but they will so arrange that by the constant supervision of an officer detailed for the purpose, attached non-commissioned officers and men who give evidence, by want of intelligence or educational attainment, that they are not likely to become efficient non-commissioned officers, are to be immediately returned to their corps and the cases promply reported to headquarters.

It was the act of the commandant of the school; nobody else knew anything about it. It was Colonel Maunsell or Major Hemming, I think, who was commandant at that time. These orders appeared in the meantime, after the man's application had been accepted. He went there on the 1st of October, and in the meantime these orders appeared. The commandant of the school thought McKenzie was not making sufficient progress, and ordered him home. No one other than he knew anything about the matter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me the hon. Minister might have given that explanation, instead of the answer he gave, that in the meantime, while this young man was undergoing instruction, the changes in the regulations took place which made it necessary for the commandant to discharge him. That would have been a fairer and much more appropriate answer for the Minister to make than the answer he did make.

Mr. BETHUNE. No one is to blame, if blame there be, but the commandant of the school. So far as I was concerned, I acted in accordance with instructions as they existed at the time.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I am not surprised that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) brought this matter before the House, because to a gentleman who is not au fait with military matters, it certainly looks suspicious. With regard to the intelligence of the man, my hon. friend says he is above the average of intelligence, and I, for one, cannot understand how a man who is known by the hon. member as a man of intelligence, could not pass the examination required in that case. If a man can read and write, and shows himself at all amenable to discipline and teaching, he can pass. I would like to know how long he was tried. Was it the first day he was there that he was sent away? Because I will defy any man to prove a man's want of intelligence in an hour or two of drilling.

Mr. BETHUNE. He went there on the 1st of October, and his name was struck off on the 30th of October.

Mr. PRIOR. That being the case, I have nothing more to say as to the evidence of his want of intelligence. You have to leave it to the commanding officer of the school to say, whether a man is getting on with his drill. If a man is there for a number of days, you can find out whether he is likely to make a good soldier or not. But there is another thing on which I would like to say a few words; that is, in regard to men signing the roll for the purpose of getting into the school. There is no doubt there is a tremendous lot of fraud perpetrated by officers in the militia in this matter. A man who, perhaps, has some "pull," goes to the captain of a company and says: "I am not doing anything now, and I would like to get into that school." The captain would like to give him a helping hand, and he says: "Go and sign the roll." The captain, who is responsible, sends his certificate to the commanding officer, who must accept it; it is forwarded to the doctor, who certifies that the man is physically capable, and then the certificate is sent on to the commanding officer of the school. And the man goes and puts in his time at the school at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. He has no idea of joining a regiment or fighting for his country. He is simply putting in what he calls a good time there, and, when he comes out, that is the last the commanding officer, or any one else connected with the school, sees of him. I have seen this in my own regiment. Men have gone into the schools, and, as soon as they get a fair smattering of military matters—which, I am glad to say, they do—they go across the line, and are only too gladly taken by regiments in the United States. That is not what we want, and I would like to call the attention of the Minister to this, so that, if possible, some means may be adopted for making officers more careful of the men they take into these schools. I think it would be a good deal better, if it were made imperative that men, before being taken into a school, had to serve a certain time in a regiment, instead of being allowed to join one day and sign the next. It is not fair to those who have served months, or perhaps years, in the regiment without being able to get into the school, to see these men getting ahead of them. I am not astonished at the hon. member for Cape Breton bringing this matter up. He simply did so because he thought this man had not been fairly treated. After the explanation he has heard, I think he will see that the state of things is different from what he thought existed.

Mr. BETHUNE. The state of things that existed then does not exist to day. Order 94 covers the whole of the hon. gentleman's objection:

As a general rule non-commissioned officers only will be recommended. Only where these qualifications are possessed in a marked degree will a private soldier be recommended.

With regard to the other point raised by my hon. friend, the regulations say:

Non-commissioned officers or men recommended must have completed at least twelve months' service in the corps to which they belong, and must have attended the last annual training of their corps.

These are the regulations now.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I may say, that this young man is possessed of more than the average intelligence and learning possessed by the men in the several companies of the 94th Battalion, and the hon. member for Victoria knows that very well. He knows that the majority of the men in those companies to-day are men who are not educated—that many of them cannot write their names. I am quite sure of that, as they are people with whom I have been doing business for the last twenty or thirty years.

Mr. BETHUNE. They belong to your county.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, the hon. gentleman's county; but they happen to have been customers of mine for twenty or thirty years and I know their education and character possibly better than the hon. gentleman does. I know that the young man in question is possessed of a great deal more than the average intelligence of the whole of these companies.

Mr. FOSTER. It is dry work criticising $295,000 of public expenditure in the absence of the responsible Minister. Of course, it is very imperative that the hon. Minister should go to-night, but he ought to have had his estimates down before, and it would be better to take up some other item and wait until the Minister is back, as no doubt he will be in a few days.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. colleague had so much faith in the accuracy of his estimates as to leave them in my hands, confident that with the assistance of his officials, I could give the hon. gentleman all the information they desire.

Mr. EARLE. There are some items in these estimates which it would be impossible to discuss satisfactorily in the absence of the Minister responsible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under those circumstances, I will withdraw the item.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. gentleman give any information respecting the arrival of any consignment of these medals?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I received a letter from the Minister of Militia yesterday, in which he said that none had yet been received from the mint in England, and he was not sure when they would come. They have been ordered, and his department had been pressing for them, but it might be a couple of months before they would arrive.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that the first consignment was to have left England the first of the month, and the expectation is that it might be on its way out, and from now on small consignments will arrive from time to time.

Mr. PRIOR. That is another reason why we should have a mint in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Could we not pass the item of annual drill with the understanding that the whole thing may be reviewed on the main Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see that this is only part of the item and cannot be reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why not let the whole item go through, and let the whole discussion take place on the other items?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends have been here three months and have not seen fit to bring down the supplementaries until a day or two ago, and the Minister of Militia did not see fit to bring down his items until an hour or two before he went away. It is all a little bit of pressure that will not work.

Item withdrawn.

Contingencies—To pay Mr. S. J. Carter, temporary clerk in the dead letter office at Winnipeg, as a provisional allowance to meet the exceptional cost of living in Manitoba from 1st July, 1898, to 30th June, 1899, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $43

Mr. FOSTER. How long is it going to cost so much more to live in Winnipeg than at Ottawa? I notice that the hon. Postmaster General is extending his allowance. Heretofore, in the estimates, at least, for the last few years, it was confined to railway mail clerks and officers in the inspectors' divisions, particularly the travelling officers, but he is now extending it to the dead letter department, that now being a distributing department under his legislation. I would ask him to look into this matter thoroughly so as to see whether or not there is really a difference which would make it necessary longer to keep up that distinction as between the cost of living in Winnipeg and other cities.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The information we have is that there is considerable difference. The other day in the Public Accounts Committee, there was evidence of persons of standing from Winnipeg that the cost of living there was greater.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that subject was gone into, but only incidentally mentioned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This young man is one of the temporary writers,

with a salary of only $430, and I think the increase allowed in Winnipeg is only 10 per cent. I will have inquiries made in time to give the information on another year's items.

Mr. FOSTER. For the essentials of life, the prices should be cheaper in Winnipeg than here. Beef and grain products come from that country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The freights on imports are pretty high.

Mr. FOSTER. When you come to put the increase on bulk freights into the cost of living and consider the very small amount of that which a man uses, I do not think that can affect the question. The sentimental part will, no doubt, be kept up as long as possible, even though there be not good ground for the increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What about house rents ?

Mr. FOSTER. If the rents and taxes are any higher in Winnipeg than in Ottawa, and you get any less there for your money, I give up the item.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the percentage of the increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The practice has been to allow ten per cent.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does that apply to the Yukon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish it did.

Mr. FOSTER. To what department now, outside or inside, do these dead letter clerks belong ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The inside.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that there is just as strong and well-defined a difference between a vote for your inside department of the post office and your outside department, as between your post office and your militia vote. I do not suppose that my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) would borrow from the Militia Department to make up a shortage in his own department and think he was right in doing so ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, on what principle can he take a vote which is canvassed here and passed in this House for the special work of the outside division, and apply it to the inside work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What item does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) refer to ?

Mr. FOSTER. To the last : $968 to recoup the amount paid out of the miscellaneous appropriation of the outside service of the Post Office Department for removal expenses of the officers of the inside service who were transferred from Ottawa to cities where dead-letter branches had been establishd. When I was in the Finance Department, we attempted to draw the line very closely with reference to the demarcation of appropriations ; because, if you allow the clerks in a department to violate that rule in small matters, they are taught to violate the rule and to regard the rule, therefore, as not being one that ought to be thoroughly kept. The Auditor General, with whom I had numerous conversations, drew the line, and we passed in the Treasury Board resolutions holding the accountant of each department strictly for account for misappropriating from the credits they got, or over-expending, or diverting to different votes the credit cheques which the Auditor General gives them from time to time, and out of which they pay. Now, my hon. friend will see that this is a principle which is vital in parliamentary appropriations and expenditures ; and it is only because I see that it is persistently violated, and, in some cases which will come before our judgment very soon, most grossly violated, it seems to me, that I refer to the matter. This violation of rule actually takes away from the significance of a vote of Parliament. For instance, we are coming to a vote by and by which involves this case : The House canvassed a certain proposed expenditure for the Interior Department, and, without the least authority of Parliament, so far as I can see, a very large amount of that vote is taken and distributed in a department of work which was never contemplated by Parliament, the money never having been voted for that purpose. Then the Ministers come and ask Parliament to recoup them. Now, there is one mode by which the Government can get money which Parliament has not voted, if its case is strong enough and if urgency exist through a new demand having suddenly sprung up. The Governor General's warrant is there for that purpose, and the Governor General's warrant will bring money for the purpose of such an expenditure. But where would be the sanctity of appropriations by Parliament, if, for instance, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is going to give half his vote to his needy neighbour, if the Minister of Customs is going to give half his revenue for expenditure, not a cent of which should be given to expenditure ? The principle is, that a parliamentary vote should cover the purpose for which it is intended, and, if urgency exists, the Governor General's warrant, in large matters, is a means by which expenses can be met. In small matters, the Government can draw from the vote for unforeseen expenses. Of course, if you have an era of general extravagance, such as there are many signs of at the present time, the miscellaneous vote will be spent in the first few months of the Min-

isters' mad career, and so they estop themselves from getting anything from that source. I wish to call attention to this, as a matter of principle.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not take exception to what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has stated——

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, this case, in itself, is a small matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but still, the principle is sound, and I quite approve of what the hon. gentleman has said. The only thing I can say, in justification of this case, is this. The Bill for decentralization of the dead-letter branch passed Parliament at a very late date in the session, and the cost of moving expenses of the staff did not occur to those who prepared the estimates, and so there was no item in the estimates, as there ought to have been, for that service. The Act was put in force, and the members of the staff went on their way, paying their own expenses, as, I believe, is the custom, and rendering an account. When the accounts came in, it was found that there was no appropriation for this service. Unfortunately, the occurrence had taken place; there was nothing in the unforeseen item for it, and I had to assume the responsibility. I felt that the Act of Parliament having been passed directing that decentralization should take place, was to some extent, if not a complete vindication, at least an authorization from Parliament to decentralize that might, at all events, be cited, ad misericordiam, in mitigation of the offence.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not taking exception to the expenditure.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite understand that, Mr. Chairman; but I desire to explain how the case occurred. I can offer no defence for it, except that it grew out of the circumstances in developing a new system.

Mr. PRIOR. I see there is an amount here of $416.33 for the removal of G. A. D. Mailleue to Victoria, B.C., in connection with this decentralization of the dead-letter branch. There is no doubt that Mr. Mailleue is a very good public servant, and a very good man for the position he occupies, but I do not see how it can have cost $416.33 for his removal expenses to Victoria, when I see that Mr T. I. D. Moffat is allowed for expenses to Halifax $12.15.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know to what extent the practice has been followed, but I suppose that, if Mr. Mailleue is a married man, we should have to pay to move him, and his family, and furniture. These accounts have all been properly audited.

Mr. PRIOR. What we want in British Columbia is population; so I suppose this is all right.

Department of Public Works—
Further amount required for printing, stationery, sundries, &c..... $3,000

Mr. FOSTER. I notice the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has departed from the general rule. The general rule to which we have carefully stood, and for very good reasons, was to divide these amounts so that what was needed for stationery should go to stationery, what was needed for printing should go to printing, and the same for sundries. That division was made in my own department for the good reason that where you have a lump sum you can run too much of it into sundries, and find out afterwards, when the bills come in for printing and stationery that you would not have enough to pay them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Printing and stationery generally together.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is realy only a question as to the form of an account. According to the explanation furnished me by the officers of the department, it appears there was a practice in the department to charge telegrams against each distinct work to which they related. That was carried on until recently, when the Auditor General called attention to it, and thought that the whole telegraphic account should be put together. The consequence is that this item is necessary in order to provide for the telegraphic bills which remain unpaid, the Auditor General not being willing to have the item charged to the various works as in the past. It does not increase the appropriation, but merely enables the Minister of Public Works to comply with the requirements of the Auditor General.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Auditor General made the same stipulation with reference to the travelling expenses, or is it the practice now to charge the travelling expenses against each one of the works, and to take the general travelling expenses of officers who are here at Ottawa and distribute them all round amongst the different works?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have sent for the information, and will reserve that item for a little while.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It has been the practice in the past, when a public work was being constructed in any part of the Dominion, to charge to that public work the travelling expenses, and a certain amount of the telegraphic expense, the engineering expense, draughtsmen's work, and all that sort of thing, to the special account. When these accounts are not given in detail, it is impossible for the House to know just how much money is being spent in each

one of these services. I think the Auditor General did well to call attention to that method and suggest the other one.

Penitentiaries—
Kingston Penitentiary—To pay the expenses of the Devlin investigation $2,632 73

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think this item ought to stand. It is arranged with the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that there shall be a discussion, but if it is the understanding that this question can be taken up on the main Estimates we can go on with the penitentiaries, with the exception of the Devlin investigation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the absence of the Solicitor General, any of these items relating to the Justice Department may be held for consideration or the subjects may be discussed on the main Estimates, if any hon. gentleman desires it.

Experimental Farms—
Balance of $300 due on purchase for Experimental Farm, of portion of Lot 1, Con. B, Rideau Front, Nepean Township, and interest thereon at Government Savings Bank rates, from 15th March, 1887, to 1st July, 1899 (amount $159.22)..... $459 22

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the history of this case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was in consequence of the fact that the owner of the farm had a minor child who had a claim in consequence of his mother's right to the property which could not be paid until he came of age. He came of age this last year, and the amount has been paid out. This is on the original purchase money of the Experimental Farm.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the original amount $159.22 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A claim was made for interest on the money.

Mr. MONTAGUE. $300 is the original amount.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $159 is the interest.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the ground taken and entered upon and occupied from that time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. This was not the price for this piece of property, but only the portion retained because of a minor child's interest in it.

North-west Territorial Exhibition—
Revote of amount lapsed out of $4,000 voted in 1897-98..... $887 86

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why was this not put in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The accounts did not come in.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this settle everything, probably ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you advertising for claims ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Omaha Exhibition—
Re-vote of amount lapsed out of $5,000 voted in 1897-98..... $727 20

Mr. FOSTER. What was the whole cost of the Omaha Exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $8,000 was the amount voted. I cannot remember the exact cost, but it was $100 or $150 less than that amount.

Printing, binding, &c., Canadian and other Patent Records, further amount required. $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that work done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know exactly. But it is done partly in Montreal and partly in Toronto, but it is under the management of the Printing Bureau entirely. This is really the lapse of votes for several years which have been paid out of succeeding years. I wish to close up the matter so that we can start fair. This is really in consequence of the fact that bills were not rendered in time for several years, and they were paid out of the succeeding votes. This is an accumulation of lapsed votes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the branch still self-sustaining ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it costs $9,000 a year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But outside of that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, outside of that.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole patent department is a source of income ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, a large source of income.

Purchase of books and publications for Patent Office library..... $2,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are these books ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There have been no works upon patent law, patents and inventions in the department, and I think I explained already to the committee that I have been obliged to secure the services of some younger men. The older patent examiners had books of their own, especially Mr. McCabe, whom the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) knows very well. Mr. McCabe had a library which has been used by the other examiners. It is now in the Patent Depart-

ment and I propose to take it over for the use of the other examiners.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are taking over the old books.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. We propose to take over Mr. McCabe's library and purchase some new books.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know whether these books are Mr. McCabe's private property, or whether they were originally purchased by the Government?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, he had paid for them and the other patent examiners have been using them, and he thought that it was only right that he should be reimbursed.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not paid for originally by the Government?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. Mr. Decelles valued these books at $1,700, and I am asking $250 more with which to buy such new books as are necessary.

Quarantine—
Amount transferred to Department of Public Works $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last winter there was necessitated a very large quarantine in Halifax in consequence of the arrival of the Doukhobors there in the middle of winter and of their detention. There was no money available in the Public Works Department for this purpose, and I made an arrangement with the Auditor General to allow us to take a portion of the quarantine vote on the understanding that it should be returned. He afterwards advised that I should ask for a supplementary vote. The money has been expended on the arrangements at Halifax for the accommodation of the Doukhobors when they were detained there in consequence of small-pox.

Cattle Quarantine—
Tuberculosis—Further amount required for salaries and expenses..... $5,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where is that money being spent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All over the country. I announced to the country at large I would test cattle for the people wherever it was asked for, and the increase in that work has been very great. Consequently there is an increased expenditure. The number of cattle subjected to the test was a great deal larger than the year before.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who are the parties who make the test?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Various veterinaries all over the country who are qualified to do it.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are they paid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are paid fees, and they receive their expenses.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the mileage fee?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are paid at the rate of $5 a day for their work. They are paid no mileage expenses, but they are paid the actual disbursements in going to and from their work, whatever accounts they certify.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How do you make up the time? A man goes out two or three miles, say three miles, makes a test and comes back. What do you allow him?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It takes him two days to make a test. As a matter of fact it takes two days from early in the morning until late at night. Some of them have asked to have an extra day, counting two days as three, but we refused.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You do not allow mileage, but only actual expenses?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Actual disbursements.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What do the disbursements come to?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have a statement of the actual disbursements, but there are only the lump sums paid to each officer. I cannot say how much it cost per mile. I have a list of the payments made to the different officers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are the names of those who have been paid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are 30 names here altogether of persons to whom payment has been made.

Mr. MONTAGUE. These are, I understand, your veterinaries employed all over the country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are veterinaries employed all over the country, and in addition we have two or three officers who are under salary and whom we send out where necessary, where there is no veterinary competent to do the work. The others are paid so much a day, whenever they are called upon to work and they are paid their actual disbursements. If my hon. friend will mention any place in which he is interested, I will give the names.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will read the list, as it will be useful to have it on "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say in connection with Mr. A. H. Hall, whose name appears on the list for

$1,175 services and $960 expenses, that Mr. Hall has been working in the eastern part of Quebec where there have been a very large number of demands upon his time, where there are no railways and where he has been driving about with teams. Following is the list :—

Name.	Place.	Services.	Expenses.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
A. H. Hall	Quebec	1,175 00	960 95
W. W. Hall	Campbellton, N.B.	1,090 00	353 75
A. E. Moore	Montreal	833 30	499 70
J. G. Adami	"	833 30	24 30
H. S. Hurlburt	"	250 00	34 75
A. David	"	125 00	
V. Daubigny	"	416 60	49 10
C. F. Martin	"	416 60	25 90
G. W. Higginson	Rockland	416 64	
W. H. Pethick	Prince Edward Island	270 79	90 14
D. McCuaig	Moncton	60 00	3 92
J. C. McMurtry	Arnprior	645 00	148 50
A. C. Wannan	Oshawa	340 00	6 50
J. A. Mowbray	"	335 00	80 00
Wm. Jakeman	Halifax	20 00	24 87
F. Fisher	Carleton Place	225 00	22 50
O. H. Duncombe	Waterford	87 50	21 50
Thos. Chalmers	Truro	88 75	11 38
F. W. Bryant	Sunderland, Ont.	73 75	51 05
J. A. Bean	Gananoque	112 50	
A. E. James	Ottawa	73 75	23 50
W. A. Shoults	Gladstone, Man.	55 00	16 75
A. A. Leckie	Prince Edward Island	56 00	18 50
J. H. Frink	New Brunswick	102 50	75 16
F. G. Hall	Amherst, N.S.	35 00	30 00
C. L. Smith	Brantford	60 00	5 00
H. S. Manhard	Smith's Falls	140 00	52 00
Chas. Little	Winnipeg	259 00	202 50
T. R. Duchesne	Chicoutimi	135 00	200 95
A. B. Campbell	Berlin	80 00	14 50
J. G. Stewart	Brantford	175 00	
J. D. Whyte	Leeds, P.Q.	72 50	
Thomas Thacker	Renfrew	230 00	
D. McCrae	Guelph	65 00	52 40
H. S. Perley	Ottawa	38 50	12 00
W. A. McNeely	Brooklyn, Ont.	105 00	63 00
Sundry veterinary surgeons under $30.		280 75	240 20

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is all right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There seems to be some items there outside of the salaried men which would indicate that some of these veterinary surgeons are almost constantly employed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are one or two.

Mr. MONTAGUE. One man seemed to have been employed for 200 days.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A couple of months ago I stopped that man.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was about to say that he had better be employed permanently by the department. There is another man getting $800.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is Mr. Moore, who is employed permanently in Montreal and has a salary. Professor Adami, of McGill, also gets $1,000 a year salary. I thought it was necessary to have a man of standing to do the bacteriological work in connection with the milk tests, and I employed Prof. Adami.

Mr. PRIOR. What becomes of the cattle suffering from tuberculosis ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are quarantined and isolated, but we have not ordered their slaughter. We quarantine them strictly and as a general rule they are slaughtered by the owners. There has been a good deal of difficulty in consequence of demands for compensation, which I have not felt justified in acceding to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have you the question of compensation under consideration ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not had it under consideration, because when I got a vote to deal with this matter I pledged the House I would not

pay compensation, and I have not felt free to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. None has been paid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None.

Mr. PRIOR. When in quarantine are they under the control of a veterinary surgeon until they are discharged or slaughtered ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not directly under the control, but the owner would be liable to a severe penalty if he broke the quarantine.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What are the regulations under which the service of these veterinary surgeons can be obtained by any one who would like to have his stock examined ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Any one who makes application to the department is sent a form of application, which he is expected to sign. That form of application gives the conditions under which the Government will make this test free of charge, and one condition is that the owners shall not ask for compensation. I confess that I have shrunk from allowing the thin end edge of the wedge of compensation to be entered. I felt it was such a large question and would require such a very large vote, that I did not think the House would grant it, but when I obtained a vote of $15,000 to deal with the question I distinctly pledged myself to the House that none of it would be used for compensation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Suppose a farmer living 2,000 miles from Ottawa finds that sickness has appeared amongst one or more of his stock, has he got to make written application to the Minister at Ottawa to get the services of a veterinary surgeon ? If so, I cannot see the use of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have applications from the North-west and from the furthest points east, from people who write that they fear there is tuberculosis in their herds. We immediately send to them a form of application and inform them who is the nearest veterinary authorized to make a test. As a general rule that veterinary is quite close to them. Of course, where there is a great deal of work to do, we appoint another veterinarian.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Suppose the complaint is made by the owner of a neighbouring herd ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have taken the ground that this is not a compulsory test, and that we cannot force any man to accept the test. There has been a great deal of discussion in the agricultural press and at agricultural meetings about it, and a good deal of experience in the United States and in England about it ; and I did not think it wise or feasible in the present state of public opinion or knowledge of the question, to make the test compulsory. Therefore, I have only acted when the owner of the cattle wanted to have the test applied.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When that question of compensation comes up, I hope the Minister of Agriculture will remember my case, for I, unfortunately, lost nine or eleven head of Jerseys under the practice the Minister refers to. While there was no compensation, I had the services of one of the veterinary surgeons, who ordered the slaughter of the whole herd.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very careful not to order the slaughter of any animal, because if we do that we may be liable for compensation. It is left entirely to the discretion of the owner of the animal to say whether he will have it slaughtered or not. It is quarantined, so that he cannot sell it or its products, which might be dangerous to the public health.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may add that there was, unfortunately, a penalty imposed upon me in addition to the loss of the herd. The animals, unfortunately, got affected just before June, 1896, and I think I lost a good many votes among the farmers, who thought I had infected their herds.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the number of the whole staff in connection with the quarantine work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say off-hand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has it increased or decreased ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Including the tuberculosis work, it has increased ; but apart from that I think it is about the same.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has removed the quarantine as against the United States. What is he doing with those officers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have dispensed with the services of a number of officers along the American frontier who were there on salary ; but I have had to retain certain officers there to make tuberculosis tests of animals which might come in from the United States without certificates, and they are paid by fees and are not on regular salary. Consequently, the expenditure is considerably less on that account than before.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you maintaining the sheep quarantine in the North-west against the scab ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No special quarantine, except that animals

coming from the United States require to have a certificate that there are no contagious diseases in the district from which they come.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the hon. gentleman has given up all hope of getting the removal of the embargo in Great Britain ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For the present I practically have.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has found that it was not a case of thinking that our animals were infected, so much as wanting to protect their own interests.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I found that the schedule being established, it was very much harder to get rid of it.

Mr. BRITTON. Perhaps this would be a good time to ask the Minister if his attention has been called to a rather interesting and very important report made by a person named Julian Ralph, who is now in India as a special representative of "Harper's Weekly," with regard to the plague in that country called the black death, and with regard to the precautions necessary to be taken to prevent it spreading to Europe and America. He gives, first, the circumstantial causes which tend to the spread of this trouble, and, secondly, the precautions to be taken. If the hon. Minister has not seen the report, I shall be glad to hand him an extract from it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say that I have seen the report in question. I may say that my chief quarantine officer, Dr. Montizambert, has been watching carefully the plague in India, and the precautions taken in Europe against the introduction of the bubonic plague, and we are watching all vessels that might carry that disease.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to ask the Minister if he has a statement of the number of animals found to be infected by the veterinary surgeons who inspected the herds, the percentage of animals, and the number of examinations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have a statement here in two parts. It is as follows :—

CATTLE TESTED FOR TUBERCULOSIS.

Province.	No. tested, July, 1896, to July 1, 1898.	No. Diseased.	No. tested, July 1, 1898, to April 20, 1899.	No. Diseased.
Ontario	3,000	188	6,184	119
Quebec	1,267	200	3,120	62
Prince Edward Island	159	11	276	5
Nova Scotia	117	23	124	12
New Brunswick	241	14	414	23
Manitoba	231	127	780	233
Totals	5,015	563	10,898	454

I ought to say, in explanation of the state of affairs in Manitoba, that the tests were largely made in connection with certain dairy herds at the request of the local health authorities, and I have no doubt they show a much larger percentage of disease than would be found were the tests distributed over the whole province ; and I do not think it can be fairly considered an average test for the province of Manitoba. In the other provinces the tests have been spread all over the province, and, therefore, the proportion indicated by the figures is about the proportion of the disease. I have not made out the percentages for this year, but the percentages of last year in the various provinces ranged from 5 to 6 and 8 per cent of diseased animals ; and I may safely say, I think, that that is as high as the average of the disease in the country at large.

Mr. ROGERS. How long is the quarantine maintained on a herd, or by what means is it removed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The quarantine against tuberculosis affects only the animals found to be diseased. If they are isolated from the rest of the herd, the rest of the herd is released from the quarantine immediately on the premises being properly disinfected. The diseased animals are kept in quarantine, and the stables where they are, are quarantined as long as they stay there.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the department does not now order the slaughtering of diseased animals of any kind ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am talking only of tuberculosis.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman expect to check the disease if it is left entirely optional with the owner to slaughter the animal or not, the department standing back on the sole ground that compensation might be claimed if the animal were de-

stroyed ? On one side that is, no doubt, in the interest of economy, but I doubt whether it is in the interest of the purity of our herds.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The diseased animals are quarantined, which means that they cannot be disposed of or removed, and cannot be put in contact with other animals.

Mr. CLANCY. Yet they are still the property of the owner, and kept there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. There is a limit, I presume, to the time they will be kept there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the quarantine is not removed.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, the animals may be left there until they die.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not that an unusual course ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is the law.

Mr. CLANCY. I fancy it is a very bad law. If diseased animals are to be kept in quarantine with some that may not be diseased —and I am told that sometimes, even on close examination the veterinary surgeon is not quite sure—it seems to me that is not a step in the right direction. The better way would be to say to the owner, that the animal should be slaughtered, if a cure is not possible, and give him no compensation, rather than let it stay there until it dies, without giving compensation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The condition of affairs is very different under different circumstances. The test shows that the animal is affected by the disease tuberculosis. The results of examinations have been so uniform that I may say this test is almost infallible. The test does not, however, show the extent of the disease in the animal. A good many appear to be perfectly healthy and sound, and are, perhaps, quite fat. If they are slaughtered, in some cases the flesh is perfectly good for meat, and in others it is not ; and the question, whether that flesh may be sold for food or not, is left entirely in the hands of the local health authorities.

There is, however, another point. Occasionally, the animals recover. If, at any time later on, the animal which is being quarantined, is offered for test again, and is found not to react, it will be released from the quarantine. There are cases where animals have reacted, and then later on have not reacted ; and, when later on they have been slaughtered, it has been found that the disease existed in them, but the tubercules became inactive, and the animal was really healthy, although the presence of the disease was proved to have been there before.

There is another reason why it might not be profitable for the owner to slaughter his animals. While the cow is diseased, it is also clearly proven that, in the large majority of cases, the calf born of that cow is not affected ; and, if special care be taken to take the calf away from the mother, there is no reason why it cannot be raised, free from the disease. In the case of valuable breeding animals, it may be worth while to keep them and breed from them for the sake of the offspring.

Under those circumstances, it seems to me wise to leave the determination of what shall be done with the diseased animal in the hands of the owner, so that he may act according to what he believes most suitable to his own circumstances. That is the reason why no order is given for slaughter, but the law is carried out, so as to see that the animal is not allowed to go about and spread the disease, or that its products are not sold so that they might spread the disease.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will know, from the reports of his officers, that the manner in which this quarantine is kept is very loose indeed. It is quite clear that, unless there is a constant watch, it is impossible to have the law enforced. Suppose a farmer has a portion of his herd diseased, all that can be done is to keep them apart from the others, because you could not keep an officer to watch over cases of that kind, and the result is a great deal of looseness. I think that, on the whole, it would be better to slaughter the animals, and the farmers should have some compensation for the loss. Any one having any knowledge of the subject knows well that the disease may be spread from the looseness that obtains all over this country, owing to the fact that the control is in the hands of the owner, who is anxious to make the most he can from his animals, and the strong incentive not to incur loss is sufficient to bring about a state of things that may be the means of spreading the disease to the balance of the herd or to the neighbouring herds. I think money could not be better spent than to eradicate the disease, wherever the department can find it, and every farmer should have reasonable compensation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why should he have compensation, if he has diseased animals which ought to be killed, in his own as well as the public's interest ?

Mr. CLANCY. The disease may have come to his stock from imported animals, and not depend upon any act of his in any sense whatever. At the town of Guelph, they imported, some seven or eight years ago, a considerable number of very fine thoroughbred stock. The animals were kept in quar-

antine a long time, and it was afterwards discovered that they were diseased, and had come to Guelph, and affected the whole herd. as well, possibly, as the other herds in that neighbourhood. There are the best of reasons why the department should make some compensation under such circumstances.

Hog Cholera and Sheep Scab—
Further amount required for compensation for slaughtered hogs and sheep, and for salaries and expenses..... $13,000

Mr. CLANCY. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) that when his main Estimates come up, I shall ask for some information with regard to the officers appointed in the quarantine department, and their salaries. I shall not discuss the matter now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall give the hon. gentleman all the information he asks for.

Department of Public Works—
Further amount required for printing, stationery, sundries, &c..... $3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An hon. gentleman opposite asked a question respecting the item to which the travelling expenses were charged. I find that the practice is, in the case of the Minister and chief officers at headquarters, travelling expenses are charged to contingencies, while the expenses of engineers are charged either to the surveys in the preliminary work or to the general votes for the respective provinces; and they will be found in the Auditor General's Report accordingly. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) called attention to the fact that this item of $3,000 for contingencies does not conform to the practice that divides sundries from printing and stationery; and so I would divide this item in this way:

Printing and stationery.....	$ 760
Sundries	2,240

The item of $2,240 relates to telegrams, under the circumstances which I have explained. The additional item of $760 means that there is a considerable amount of work being done, and necessarily, therefore, some additional expense for printing and stationery.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the Minister of Finance say whether this item of $3,000 has anything to do with the expenses of the chief engineer to the Yukon and to London on the last trips he made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose none of this was appropriated to buy those French flags?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Public Works did not leave me any information upon that point.

Mr. FOSTER. He will get a new one in Paris.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At present we go in for the old flag. I may remark also that in this case we ask for the appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. We have done a hard day's work, and I think we had better close up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So early? I thought hon. gentlemen opposite would prefer to take up some further items in the public works. I think we might as well sit until twelve o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the Government intend to take up Supply to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think so, but I would like to reserve that point until the Premier returns.

Public Works—Chargeable to Capital—
Quebec—
River St. Lawrence ship channel—Additional amount required..... $60,000

Mr. FOSTER. How much does that make the total appropriation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appropriation for the year was $256,000, to which this will have to be added. There has been a considerable amount of work going on, and the Minister reports that it is absolutely necessary to have this additional sum if the work, which is so urgent, is to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a tremendous expenditure; we used to spend $75,000, $100,000 and $150,000 a year. The Minister will have to give us an idea of the work that was done and what still remains of obligatory work that this $60,000 is to cover. I do not ask for it in detail, of course.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister's memorandum showing expenditure up to the 27th April shows amounts of 1897-98 paid in 1898-99, $16,690.93; for new buildings and machinery at Sorel, $41,344.71; dredging plant, $111,269.19; deepening the channel, $52,385.37; testing of channel, $5,095.58; hydrographic survey, $23,431.22; total, $250,217. This left some $5,000 available at the date when the memorandum was prepared and large amounts of work still required.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed it was about like that. When you come to get the facts, you find that the active work of bettering navigation receives only about one-fifth of the whole vote that has been expended. The rest has gone into these sink-holes at Sorel and into the dredging plant. It is really too bad that when the whole shipping interest and business interest of the coun-

try are anxious to get a channel there which is of a certain depth and width, and when we pour out our money to the extent of two or three hundred thousand dollars a year, we find in the end that a very small proportion of it really goes to the work of deepening the channel. These shops at Sorel and all the paraphernalia about them, I believe, are a perfect sinkhole of expense. Were the old buildings burnt down—was that the reason for the new buildings, or are these extensions?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I had the opportunity of going through these buildings with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and I venture to say that nobody who inspected the buildings could doubt the necessity for rebuilding. They were actually falling to pieces, rotting down. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) made one remark which, I think, he would not make on reflection, certainly would not make if he saw the work done. The foreman seems to be an exceptionally smart man, one of the smartest in his line that I have ever met. He took us through the new dredges and explained the mechanism. He will be able to do ten times as much work as with the old dredges. He showed us the working of the old as compared with the new dredges, and it is not too much to say that, by comparing the work of the old dredges was mere pottering—we were positively wasting money in using the old dredges, considering what can be done with the new ones. Of course, I know nothing about the cost, whether these have been cheaply built or not; but certainly the new mechanism will do splendid work, and, I think, will repay the public three times over for the outlay.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt about its being good policy to have dredges which are strong enough and of approved pattern to do the work and do it thoroughly. But what I have found in connection with the whole business is that there is a lot of money expended that does not reach the ultimate point. I have long been of the opinion—I do not give it as an expert, of course; it is an opinion formed from my having to do with these accounts—that we would be further ahead if we wiped out the whole caboodle, and simply had our dredging done by contract, after public call for tender, and have it thoroughly supervised by competent officers. It might be said that there is not plant enough, but plant can always be found where there is call for it. If it is once the settled policy of the Government that all that paraphernalia, the basis of which is largely patronage, which will get in in spite of fate, is discarded and you simply appropriate clean money and have the dredging done by actual contract, by men who make that their business, and who will carry it on as economically as possible, I believe we would get much further ahead than we are. I do not think it is possible to carry on an establishment at Sorel such as that without a very large amount of expense that might be avoided on the other plan. I agree with my hon. friend that there is no use fiddling away with a spoon dredge when you want the strongest and best kind of dredging done. But I think we go at it in the most expensive way, and it entails a tremendous amount of trouble on the department which would be entirely avoided if you laid down the hard and fast principle of getting this done by contract. Dredging will never cease in this Dominion, it will increase rather than decrease, because as commerce and its needs expand, you will have these smaller harbours that have to be helped, and the larger harbours that have got to be kept up, and the river courses that have to be kept clear. So you will have an incentive for competent business men to put money into adequate plants, and these would be at the disposal of the Government on the contract system.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Minister of Finance able to say what will be the total expenditure for 1898-99?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $316,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Chiefly and largely in plant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Minister able to say how much the hydrographic work proper costs out of that $300,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Out of the $256,000 appropriated, there was expended, up to the 27th of April, $250,000 odd, and of that $23,333 is chargeable to the survey.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to call attention to a great economy that might be effected when this expenditure is swelling. That work, I am satisfied on a comparison of results, is far more economically discharged by the hydrographic officers of the Marine Department. I think it is a mistake to have that work divided, or to have two departments doing the same class of work. It stands to reason that the one department or the other ought to have that work under its exclusive supervision. I know the work that has been done on the Georgian Bay and Lake Erie, it is managed on a scientific basis. You have in the Marine Department the nucleus of a splendid hydrographic service, you have there excellent men who have had special training and every advantage. The other system, no matter how good it may be, is costing the country a great deal more from the very beginning. If the whole thing was thrown into one department it would be far more economically and efficiently managed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friend that where the same works occur in different departments, it is desirable they should be consolidated. I am advised that these surveys are really necessary in the Public Works Department to enable it to carry on the dredging. That is a preliminary survey to doing the dredging work, and, therefore, it seems properly to attach to the Public Works, just as the survey of an engineer who goes out to locate a wharf or a breakwater.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is all right enough, because it is preliminary work, such as taking the soundings. That is not what I refer to. I refer to the technical and nicer part of that work that comes at the end rather than the beginning. The Public Works Department are now engaged in making charts, and so is the Marine Department. It is such fine work that I think ought to be under one management.

Public buildings, Ottawa—
Towards reconstruction of portion of Western Deparmental Block destroyed by fire, revote of lapsed amount..... $9,860

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything in the main Estimates for that Western Departmental Block ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. If this does go through, it must be understood that on the main Estimates we may have a discussion upon the cost of that Western Departmental Block.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can give my hon. friend the cost now from the information furnished to me. The vote in 1896-97 was $36,989.34 ; in 1897-98, $90,139,-82 ; 1898-99, $59,860, making altogether, $186,989.16 voted for the repairs of the block. With regard to the particular item under notice, it is for work which was expected to have been done at the close of one year, but was delayed or passed over into the service of the next year, and they neglected taking an appropriation, and the money lapsed.

Halifax quarantine station, Lawlor's Island $17,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a vote rendered necessary by special expenditure in connection with the arrival of the Doukhobors. A small item in the same connection has been referred to by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think there is enough charged to enable them to stay for three or four years in quarantine. There is item 32 of $2,000, which was in the Department of Agriculture, and in the Department of Public Works we have $17,000 more. Can the hon. gentleman tell us whether or not these are permanent works ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They will be suitable for other parties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will be used for other immigrants.

Montreal Public Buildings—
Improvements, alterations, repairs, &c., work done..... $2,054 10

Mr. FOSTER. What was the nature of these alterations ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure is as follows :—

To pay for repairs to heating apparatus, gas-pipes, wash-basins, new partitions, doors, locks and knobs, hinges, glazing, painting, repairing and pointing with cement stone-work, steps and platforms, &c., and materials received for the above work from 1st August to 1st October, 1898.....		$1,333 74
Post Office—		
To pay for new oak doors, trimmings, &c., for the lobby of the post office, 270 superficial feet, including glazing, varnishing and polishing same	$630 36	
For new street-receiver of the post office on St. James Street	100 00	
		720 36
Total grant required.....		$2,054 10

Quebec—Citadel—Governor General's quarters, to pay for work done.. $2,236 51

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was for repairs. in consequence of the Governor General having taken up his residence there. At the beginning of the season it was not known that His Excellency intended to occupy the Citadel.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for this summer's occupation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Ottawa Public Buildings—
Photographic establishment for Patent offices, Department of Agriculture.... $7,000

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture about this expenditure of $7,000 for a photographic equipment. I recognize the fact that a photographic establishment is one of the most useful annexes that the public departments could have, especially in connection with the department that my hon. friend controls, but in connection with the archives department as well. In the British Museum where valuable documents are stored there is a photographic establishment for the purpose of assisting in the examination and reproduction of records But it strikes me that $7,000 is a large sum for an equipment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That includes a very large amount for other works in addition to the photographic appar-

atus. I have not the exact figures in my mind and I have no memorandum. It includes a large amount for steel shelving put into the building, and which was substituted for the old wooden shelving which was considered dangerous in the Langevin Block, a building intended to be practically fire-proof. This work has been going on during this year, and, while the item appears, on the face of it, to be for photographic apparatus, that really has cost less than half of the amount indicated. I am speaking from memory when I say less than half, but I think that the photographic room, the dark room and the staircase to reach it, because it is away in the top of the block, and they had to construct a spiral iron staircase, cost nearly $3,000. The remainder of the money is for other work, such as this steel shelving which is being put in to a considerable extent in place of the old wooden shelving, which is looked upon as being dangerous in that block.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Does that refer to the steel shelving on the second floor of the Langevin Block where Mr. Brymner's department is ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and some above that.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Are these shelves now filled with the books taken out of the Western Block ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. As I pointed out on former occasions in regard to the archives, there has been difficulty with people, not only those who have come from the United States, but from Great Britain, in obtaining a look at valuable public documents owing to the disarrangement of the archives department after the fire in the Western Block.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is all settled now, so that the documents are easily obtained and available.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the items in reference to this $7,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are as follows :—

For heating, plumbing, electric motor, shafting, new pump, &c.	$ 900
"Eclipse" office furniture, 54 sections of steel shelving	2,101
One circular iron stair	274
J. Bailey, for iron-work, &c.	327
W. J. Charleson, for hardware supply	421
C. Ross Co., for desks, chairs, blinds, duck	215
Material of all kinds	1,006
Labour	1,600
Painting material	55
Labour, painting	100
Total	$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where was that done ? Is that work done in the room or rooms to be used for photographic purposes ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, this steel shelving is in a number of rooms on the second floor of the Langevin Block. The room which is allotted to us as a photographic room is right in the centre of the block and back from the street up on the roof. There was no access to it except by this spiral staircase which has been put in from the third floor. This will run up to what is equal to $2,500, and perhaps more.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is something for plumbing and all that sort of thing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We had to put in a water tank and get a water supply for photographic purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. And that cost $900 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember the items.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Yes, that was what the hon. Minister of Finance read.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that photographic establishment for the Government or is each Minister going to have a little photographic establishment of his own ? The Public Works Department, with their view of being a microcosm in themselves, have, I believe, a full-fledged photographer there, with lots of lantern slides, chemicals, dark cloths, and all the like of that. I am not sure but that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has tucked away in some of his rooms an elaborate system of photography as well, and now the young Minister of Agriculture comes along with his spiral staircase and $900 worth of plumbing and photographic establishment. I think the Government need one photographic establishment, but, in the name of all that is economical, why do you not make one do for all the work of the Government. By and by it will be that every good Grit will be running in to have his picture taken for nothing. Seriously, I want to ask the hon. gentleman what would be the character of this photographic business ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This photographic work is carried on in connection with the classification of patents for the exchanges and rearranging them in the patent office. It will be quite impossible to do that work away from the department, because the patents have to be taken off to the room and spread out and photographed and brought back immediately and placed where they belong. It would be impossible to allow these patents, which are the only records we have, to go out of the charge of the department. It is a work that will take several years. After that, if the patents increase as they are, the room will be kept busy all the time with this work. It would be quite impossible

to do it in any other department or at another place. The work in connection with this is provided for under the vote for classification of patents in the main Estimates, and that is the reason this photographing arrangement was needed.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not possible that the photographing work which is done for the Public Works should not be brought under the same system. Who is the photographer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Desjardins, an officer of the department. He could not undertake this work without special arrangements for it. The room is now wholly occupied by him and his assistant, and at the rate they are able to do the work it will take nearly three years to get through the arrears.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I have no desire to find fault with this expenditure for a photographic room, but I would like to ask the Minister whether a person who desires the photographic reproduction of documents in the Archives Department, will have the opportunity of using this photographic room on payment of a fee, or on payment for the negatives or for the prints. In the British Museum no documents are allowed outside the museum, but they may be placed in charge of an official and taken to a photographic room where they are reproduced; prints made and the public accommodated. The reason I mention this is, that I had occasion to have about 100 photographs made of historical works in the Library, and the light in the Library is so wretched that it was impossible for the photographer to work. On a special occasion the Librarian has kindly allowed, under the charge of an officer, a document to be taken out and photographed, and brought back immediately. If this room could be made available for the public I think it would be a step in the right direction, and it would be of immense assistance to a large number of people who are searching the Archives Department in connection with the writing of Canadian history.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of any such request having been made, but I quite agree that such work could be done there perfectly. As a matter of fact we have applications for copies of patents which we have not yet reached in our ordinary work, but which we have photographed for the applicants. In making this classification of patents we have made arrangements to keep the negatives, so that at any time application is made for a copy of a patent, we can print it at once and have it available. I see no reason why, if it is desired to photograph documents in the archives, it could not be done in that way. I shall take steps to see that that privilege is given to the public.

Mr. BENNETT. With respect to the expenditure of this $7,000, were tenders asked for the work performed or the materials purchased?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would be in connection with the Public Works Department, but I can safely say it is work that could not be done by contract. It would be impossible to explain at the commencement of the work what was required, and it must necessarily be done by day's work.

Mr. BENNETT. What about the construction of the spiral stairway?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were no tenders for that.

Mr. BENNETT. For what part of the expenditure were tenders asked?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the electric motor only. The largest item is $2,100 for sections of steel shelving. There are only two firms in Canada which make that class of work, and both have been employed by the Government at prices which are deemed to be fair.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection at all to those two enterprising establishments getting the work of the Government, but because there are only two, is no reason why there should not be tenders asked as between those two. Even if there were but one such establishment in Canada, there ought to be some method of getting at the price of the work as compared with similar establishments in the United States so as to see, that while Canadians do get the work, which I am glad of, the Government still protects the public treasury by the competition principle. Is the work simply done by private agreement between the Minister and the gentlemen who own these factories?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When we have only two establishments of the kind in the country we are not always sure we would have competition even if we called for tenders, because there is a strong temptation, if they are human, to put their heads together. The matter was the subject of negotiation with the parties, and ultimately a price which was considered a very reasonable one was agreed upon.

Mr. BENNETT. For what other item, except the electric motor were tenders called for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were no tenders for anything else except the motor item of $900.

Mr. BENNETT. Then there has been an expenditure of $6,000 in respect to which tenders have not been invited. My humble protest goes out against such a system, particularly in view of the fact that if a mail contract is to be let for $60, or $70 a year, or

a buoy service is to be provided at $60 a year, competition is invited. But when it comes to an expenditure of $6,000, the Minister can go to his party friends and distribute the patronage without tender. It is a striking fact that the firm of Charleson & Company appear for a considerable amount here, as well as in a number of other places, especially in the Public Works Department. I again protest against the large expenditure of $6,000 being made without competition being invited.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About $1,700 of this is for labour performed by the men regularly employed in the service of the department; so that that would hardly be a matter for tender.

Mr. BENNETT. If that much is expended on labour, it shows that the work is a fair matter for competition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is one of the great questions, whether contract or day labour is preferable. Some think day labour is preferable.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Referring to the vote for the archives, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, whether it is the intention of his department, at any future time, to issue a catalogue of the works in the archives branch, other than the list that is published in the very excellent report which Mr. Brymner, the archivist, issues each year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not discussed that question with Mr. Brymner at all. It is a matter that has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The Minister is aware that there is no catalogue at present except the card catalogue, so that, when a non-resident of Ottawa wants certain information for historical purposes, it is very difficult to lay hands upon the proper books or documents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cataloguing of these books and documents would take some little time, and it could only be properly done by a man with special qualifications for the work.

Committee rose, and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 15th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 150)—from the Senate—to incorporate the Imperial Loan and Investment Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 151)—from the Senate—respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ellis.)

Bill (No. 152)—from the Senate—respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155) to further amend the Post Office Act. He said: Under the Post Office Act, publishers may inclose in newspapers sent to subscribers certain matter, such as accounts, circular invitations for subscriptions, &c.; but are not allowed to do this in the case of sample copies, that is papers sent to other than subscribers. The first section of this Bill proposes to extend the same privilege to sample copies as is now given in the case of copies sent to regular subscribers. The second section proposes to make eligible for the position of superintendents of railway mail service, clerks who have been in the railway mail service, even though they may not have been continuously railway mail clerks. At present superintendents must be chosen from those who have been for ten years railway mail clerks, and that rather limits the choice. The third section provides for the fixing of a rate for mailable matter mailed after the regular hour for closing the mails. The object is to enable the post office to forward to the trains matter that would ordinarily have to wait the next outgoing train, and for this service to charge a late-fee. This system is in use in Great Britain, and, possibly, elsewhere.

Mr. CLARKE. Will there be an extra collection from boxes in connection with that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot go into the details. We will endeavour to make it as effective as possible. That may be a point to be considered in connection with it. The last provision is to enable the department to provide indemnity for the loss of registered mailable matter to the amount of $25, or whatever less sum is sufficient to make up the actual loss, and to charge fees as an insurance fund to make

good the loss to the department under such circumstances.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Mulock) please say what the object of the second clause is—that with regard to railway mail superintendents ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At present, a railway mail superintendent must have been ten years a railway mail clerk. Some railway mail clerks are transferred from the railway mail service on the trains to the railway mail service in the cities—perhaps to be assistant superintendents—and the clause provides that the superintendent may be chosen from those who have been in the railway mail service, whether they have served ten years on the trains or ten years partly on the trains and partly inside.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF TUBERCULOSIS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Have the Government caused an inspection to be made for tuberculosis, in the county of Chicoutimi, since 1896, and notably at Hebertville ?
2. If so, what sums have been paid for such inspection ?
3. To whom have the amounts been paid, and how much has been expended for salary, travelling expenses and board ?
4. Has one David Ouellet received any money in connection with the said inspection ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This is practically the same question as the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) asked some time ago. He has a motion on the paper now for all the papers connected with it, which I shall be glad to bring down when the motion is passed.

HON. JUDGE CHOQUETTE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. To what judicial district was the Hon. P. A. Choquette assigned as a puisne judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec ?
2. Does the said Hon. P. A. Choquette reside at the chief town (chef-lieu) of the judicial district to which he was so assigned ?
3. If not, where does he reside, and in virtue of what authority ?
4. How much has been paid to the said Hon. P. A. Choquette for travelling expenses from the date of his appointment to the present date ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. Arthabaska. 2 and 3. The department has no definite information as to whether the judge has yet removed to Arthabaskaville, but some recent correspondence with him would seem to indicate that he still resides in Montmagny. In October last the judge asked to be allowed travelling expenses in connection with courts held at Arthabaskaville for six months from the date of his appointment, but he was informed in reply that such claim could not be allowed. 4. $450.

I. C. R.—ASSISTANT MANAGER.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. While Mr. A. R. Macdonald, late assistant manager of the Intercolonial Railway, was suspended, who acted in his stead ?
2. Did the person so acting in Mr. Macdonald's stead receive the salary of the assistant manager ?
3. Is it not a fact that at one time three persons were receiving the salary of assistant manager, viz., A. R. Macdonald, one Belleau and one Ouellet ?
4. Was the said Ouellet dismissed, and if so, for what reason ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. While A. R. Macdonald was suspended, Chas. Belleau, chief train despatcher at Rivière du Loup, acted as superintendent in his stead. 2. Macdonald's rate of pay was $141.66 a month. Belleau's rate of pay as chief despatcher was $83.33 a month, to which, while he was acting superintendent, we added $41.67 per month, making his pay during such period $125 per month. 3. No, that is not the fact. 4. Yes, Ouellet was dismissed for neglect of duty.

GRANT TO THE CITY OF OTTAWA.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that this House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that in consideration of the municipal corporation of the city of Ottawa providing adequate water supply and fire protection for the property of the Dominion Government in the said city and in the vicinity thereof, and exempting the Dominion Government from any charge therefor, the Minister of Finance and Receiver General be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada the sum of $60,000 per annum for a period not exceeding twenty years, for the purpose of improving and beautifying the city of Ottawa by the acquisition and maintenance and improvement of public squares, and the improvement of the streets and thoroughfares in the said city : such a sum to be paid to a board of commissioners to be appointed under the authority of an Act of the Parliament of Canada to be passed for such purpose.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF WHEAT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved : That Order No. 17, for the second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the General Inspection Act, be discharged, and that he have leave to withdraw the said Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason of this extraordinary proceeding?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE This Bill is for the inspection of wheat, and my hon. friend understands what an important question that is. The Bill was prepared with considerable care with the view of rendering justice, as we thought, to all parties concerned. But since the Bill has been in print, and even before the Bill was printed, I received protests from a number of millers, dealers and others, especially in Ontario and Quebec, against some portions of the Bill, and asking to be heard before the Bill was pressed in this House. I thought it was only fair and just to delay the Bill in order to grant their request. A couple of days ago there was a meeting of the representatives of the Ontario millers, and of the different boards of trade of Toronto, Montreal and other cities, as well as of the western members and representatives of western interest; and the result was that we adopted a number of modifications to the Bill which, I think, are of a nature to render justice to all parties. The Bill was at first prepared more with a view to meet the requirements of the North-west exclusively rather than of the whole Dominion. Now that we see what the views of the east are, as well as those of the west, we shall try to embody them in a new Bill. The Bill as introduced and printed has been so much changed and amended by various new provisions, that we think it would be very difficult for the House to discuss it and understand it until it is reprinted. Therefore, I ask leave to withdraw this Bill that I may introduce another one.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 156) to amend the General Inspection Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Please explain the purport of the new Bill.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have done so to some extent in explaining the purport of the first Bill. The real purpose of the Bill has not been discarded. The purpose was to recover for our Manitoba wheat the good name to which it is entitled, and which it was in danger of losing if the measures necessary to secure a good inspection continued any longer to be neglected. The intention of the first Bill was to protect the good name of our Manitoba wheat, and that is the intention of this Bill. Everybody understands how important that is. Indeed, I look upon the wheat of the North-west as ten times more valuable than all the gold of the Klondike; and I do not think we can take too much care to teach the people of England, who are the principal consumers of that wheat, to appreciate its superiority.

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE. The first Bill was prepared at the instigation and on the advice of the farmers of the North-west, the dealers and exporters; it was really for the purpose of protecting the grain of the North-west. But it was a little too exclusive in that it had in view the consumers of North-west wheat, who live principally in England, to the neglect of the consumers in Ontario and Quebec. Naturally, these latter thought they had a perfect right to ask that their claims should be heard and taken into consideration, and that they should receive protection and fair-play. The Bill had not been prepared from that point of view, but rather from the point of view of exportation to England. In the preparation of the new Bill we have endeavoured to give fair-play to all parties, to the millers and exporters of Ontario and Quebec, as well as to the wheat-growers of the North-west.

Mr. DAVIN. Does my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) provide for an enlarged percentage of Red Fife in No. 1 hard in the Bill?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We increase the percentage from two-thirds to seventy-five per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman allow any inspection east of Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is exactly where the difficulty lies. We had so much confidence in our inspection that I must say the claims of the east were to a certain degree overlooked, and it was on account of the millers of Ontario bringing forward that claim to consideration that we have amended the Bill so as to give them the right, in case there is reason for them to be dissatisfied with the inspection in the North-west, to have another inspection made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

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

(In the Committee.)

Ocean and River Service—	
To pay Dominion Coal Company for coal supplied steamers "Newfield" and "Aberdeen," years 1895, 1896 and 1897	$ 3,258 00
Amount required to pay for repairs to steamers "Stanley" and "Lansdowne"	10,000 00
Further amount required for the maintenance of Dominion steamers	20,000 00
Compassionate allowance to the widow and nine children of Francis Menard, who was accidentally killed on board steamer "Aberdeen," O.C. 9th November, 1898	300 00

To provide for compiling list of registered shipping and forms for registration of shipping.....	$ 500 00
Amount required to meet the increased services in the tidal service for current year, including amount to pay Robert Angus and S. C. Hayden each the difference between $400 and $600 per annum, for technical work in connection with tidal service, from 1st May to 30th June, 1899, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	2,066 66
Further amount required for unforeseen expenses generally.....	2,000 00
Additional amount required for winter mail service	1,500 00

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see in the account here $10,000 for the "Stanley," and $20,000 for the maintenance of Dominion steamers. That makes practically $30,000 in addition to the general vote for maintenance. How much does that make altogether for the year ending June, 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Repairs and maintenance are always kept separate. This is a special vote for repairs, $3,000 for the "Lansdowne," and $7,000 for the "Stanley." After the heavy winter's work the "Stanley" has been at Pictou undergoing certain repairs to her bottom, sides, boilers and machinery. The repairs have been made under Mr. Stephen's survey. This is separate altogether from the "Lansdowne" account. As to the $20,000 for the maintenance of the Dominion steamers, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will recollect that I have already explained that in 1897 "La Canadienne" had been injured and the local engineer reported that it would cost close upon $40,000 to repair her. I determined not to repair her, so that in that year she was not in the service. The "Aberdeen" was transferred from the marine service for a year to the fishery service, and paid out of the fisheries vote. I had "La Canadienne" examined by Mr. Stephens, and I found that the local engineer had hugely exaggerated the case when he said that it would take $40,000 to repair her. I found that it would take nothing like that sum, and when I had "La Canadienne" repaired she took her place again in the fishery service, and the "Aberdeen," which had been paid out of the fishery vote, went back to the marine vote. The marine vote had been cut down by this $20,000, and now that the "Aberdeen" has gone back to the marine service, this amount has to be voted for maintaining her.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. Minister quite understands what I mean. I am not referring to the bulk vote. I see in the present Estimates for the year ending June, 1900, $145,000 for maintenance and repairs to Government steamers. What would the vote be for the year expiring the 1st of July, 1899, as compared with the vote for 1899-1900, which is $145,000, adding this amount of $30,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I gave the items, but I have the statement here showing what the vote has been since 1897-98. In 1897-98, it was $117,644.39. A vote was taken last year of $112,000. The expenditure makes this $20,000 more, or $132,000, and the addition of $10,000 for repairs to the "Stanley" and the "Aberdeen" would make the expenditure $142,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he is able to give any information to the committee in regard to the extraordinary price paid for coal. This item covers an item for coal bought from the Dominion Coal Co. I have no complaint as regards the amount charged by the Dominion Coal Co, being $1.95 per ton, but I do complain about $6 and $6.25 per ton being paid for coal. Six dollars and $6.25, it appears, were paid to a gentleman in my county and also at Gaspé.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These accounts only came in for the first time lately from the Dominion Coal Company for 1895-96-97, and, of course, I could not pay them without a vote.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. If he looks at K—99, Auditor General's Report, he will see the name of C. & W. Hackett, North Sydney, coal, 29½ tons at $6 ; trimming coal and sundry labour, $5.65. He will also find, on the same page, A. T. Carter, Gaspé, coal, 290 tons at $6.25 per ton.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) has called my attention to these charges, because, in view of what has been stated in the House, it is absolutely essential that I should explain how hon. gentlemen came to be misled. Until the year 1896 the Auditor General was accustomed to publish these small amounts in lump sums, called "supplies" for the different agencies. For reasons of his own, the justice of which I do not call in question, the Auditor General has seen fit since that time to publish every small detail, down to the price of every little item of baking powder.

Mr. FOSTER. That was done before 1896.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, because, as I showed the other day, from the Auditor General's Reports, these items were formerly grouped together. I am not complaining about that. I am perfectly willing, if the House is satisfied, no matter what size the Auditor General's Report may grow to be by this new process ; I am perfectly willing that it should be so, and I make no complaint whatever.

But I want to state here that the manner in which the Auditor General's clerks have copied the accounts have led hon. gentlemen opposite—I attach no blame to them for it—into very serious error. Charges have been scattered broadcast throughout the country that we have paid prices for goods which are absolutely misleading. The clerks in the Auditor General's office have misled the members of this House, and misled the country, by not copying the accounts just as they found them in the vouchers. Now, take that item on page K—99—Coal, 290 tons at $6.25. That appears to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) to be a gross piece of mismanagement.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) would be led to believe that we paid $6.25 for soft coal, and, if that were so, no doubt something would be wrong in my department. Now, the Auditor General's clerk had before him the fact that that bill was rendered for 201½ tons, another bill for 43½ tons, and another for 45 tons, making the total quantity 290 tons; and on the face of each of these bills it was expressly stated that that coal was "anthracite coal." The clerk copied that bill into this book simply as "coal," leading the people to believe it was soft coal, and from one end of the country to the other the people are reading the "Hansard" reports, and believing the officers of my department have been paying $6.25 for "soft coal," when the very voucher under the hands of the Auditor General's clerk shows that it was not "soft coal," but "anthracite coal." The department has been entirely misrepresented by that kind of thing. I may explain here, as much as I can, but I cannot overtake the misrepresentations which have been sent out with regard to the matter. The "Hansard" has gone all over the country, and, make as many explanations as I can, I never will be able to get these explanations in the hands of those who made the misrepresentations.

Mr. FOSTER. Send them out a copy of the vouchers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would have to send them all over the Dominion. Some of the Conservative papers have copied the item and called the attention of their ten thousand and one readers to the alleged fact that the Department of Marine paid $6.25 for soft coal, which every one knew could be purchased for $3.25. I cannot see what excuse the clerk in the Auditor General's office had for doing a thing like this. I know very well that the Auditor General, neither directly nor indirectly, would be a party to such wrong-doing. But, nevertheless, the injury has been done. I hold in my hand the original vouchers which went through the Auditor General's office, and on the face of each of these vouchers it is plainly stated that Carter's account was for anthracite coal. I cannot understand how such a mistake came to be made in the Auditor General's office. But this is not the only complaint I have to make. My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) cited a series of apparent overcharges, and, when I asked my accountant for an explanation, he stated that if the clerks in the Auditor General's office had copied these accounts as they should have been copied, misrepresentations would not have been made, not only with regard to coal, but with regard to other articles.

Mr. TAYLOR. Name them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall. For instance, in Mr. Parent's account there was a good deal of half fun and half earnest about a pair of scissors costing $3.60. Now, they are not "scissors" at all, but "shears" for cutting sheet-iron, and yet they were copied in the Auditor General's Report as "scissors." The clerk would have no object in misleading the House and the country, but nevertheless hon. gentlemen have been misled. Then, there was a great deal said about the price paid for bricks. The hon. gentleman from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) talked for hours about it, and I do not blame him, because the Auditor General's Report shows simply that bricks were bought at 4 cents each. They were not ordinary bricks.

Mr. TAYLOR. They were white bricks.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, they were fire-bricks, bought for the furnaces, and they were not paid for at the rate of 4 cents each, but the account shows that they are "white-bricks," purchased at 3½ cents each, as low a price as ever was paid for them. Why did not the Auditor General's clerk copy that in; why mislead the House and the country; why allow the department to lie under this heavy cloud of extravagance which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has raised against it. I hold in my hand each of these accounts, and they are open to the inspection of hon. gentlemen opposite. But that is not all. Then, I was seriously charged with being an extravagant man, because I had bought a bucket for $4.80. The account is Mr. Chouinard's of Quebec. I turned up the account, and I find that it does not say a bucket alone but a "bucket of pickles," which we bought for $4.80. By the omission of the word "pickles" I am represented as paying $4.80 for bucket.

Mr. FOSTER. That left you in a bad pickle.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then my hon. friend spoke of biscuits. He seemed to know a great deal about the price of biscuits, and waxed

very warm about that. What biscuits? There is no designation of the kind at all. Well, I turned up the account, and they are marked ginger biscuits, which I am told is a special kind, and the price charged is said by my accountant, who has been accountant for many years, to be reasonable and proper.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $3.20 for 28 pounds. Sometimes His Excellency and suite take a little trip down on the "Druid," and the officers at Quebec provide the best fare for them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not fair to charge His Excellency with eating a bucket of pickles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will leave that question to the critics on the other side of the House. Now, I want to call my hon. friend's attention to some others of the little items he speaks of. Mr. Gregory, the agent at Quebec, after seeing the report of the debate in "Hansard," wrote the following letter to the accountant:—

Baking powder in this city is sold by grocers at from 15 cents to 60 cents per pound. Go to any grocer in Ottawa, and ask him the price of the "Royal" baking powder, and I do not think you can get it under 50 cents a pound; that would make it $6 per dozen. There are several other brands, varying in price to 15 cents a pound. We never buy the latter; but, occasionally, we buy as near the "Royal" as possible: hence the charge by Chouinard of $4.80 per dozen. We usually pay $3 per dozen, as you will see by M. Thibaudeau's and Ls. Mercier's bills. Baking powder is in one-pound, half-a-pound and quarter-pound packages; that would make a difference in price. The higher price is for special purposes, and many people think it is cheaper on account of its superior quality, and taking so much less to cause the rising of flour, especially pastry.

As to the price of biscuits, on some special occasions, when the Governor-General has been on board, or some other distinguished persons, for a fine quality of table biscuits as high as 20 cents per pound has been paid; but this very rarely happens.

Now comes the question of brick at 4 cents apiece. I paid $35 a thousand for the white fire-brick I built my house with, and bought several thousands; that is pretty nearly 4 cents apiece. The bricks we paid 4 cents for, by the hundred, are worth it, and that is the price. Every one of them was selected by hand, a large portion of them being arch-bricks, and all imported into this country from Scotland, and used for our furnace buildings.

Mr. TAYLOR. The finest buildings. The hon. gentleman will find that my statement that they were white bricks is right. I have read those letters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is the official's report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where do you find fire-bricks mentioned?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are called fire-bricks by Mr. Gregory, and they are put in the account as white bricks, and I am told by my accountant and deputy that they are fire-bricks.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is stated in the account sent to the Auditor General?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. "White bricks" in each case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How long has that clerk been in the office? We must have suffered badly from him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In your days the Auditor General did not set down the details.

Mr. FOSTER. I will correct my hon. friend. If he takes up the Auditor General's Report for 1895, he will find that the details are just as minute there as they are in the last report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I cited the other night from the Auditor General's Report a great many instances in which he grouped a number of these small charges together as sundries. I went to the Auditor and asked him why he had adopted the new system. He said he had adopted it in the year 1896, before this Government had come into power.

Mr. FOSTER. I will read to my hon. friend these items from the Auditor's Report of 1895:

Washers, 5 lbs. at 8c.; screws, 79½ gross, $10.51; sash fasteners, 2 doz. at 20c.; pulls, 6 at 5c., 75 at 2c.; buttons, 54 at 3c., 60 at 2½c.; door-springs, 2 at 50c.; tarred felt, 6 rolls at 65c., 6 rolls at 60c.

And so on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not doubt that there are a large number of details, but what I say is that he was accustomed to group these small items in one lump sum of $2,000 or $3,000. I do not complain of his doing this, but I want it done squarely. On the question of these bricks for which we charge 3½ cents and 3 cents——

Mr. TAYLOR. Four cents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One place at 4 cents; but here is the bill and the hon. gentleman will not find a charge of 4 cents in it. The Auditor General's Report for 1891-92, page C—265, showed that 511 fire-bricks cost $52.79, or over 10 cents each.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman must know that there is quite a difference between fire-bricks and bricks used for building purposes. No one ever knew of fire-

bricks being used for the erection of a residence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are not fire-bricks for a residence; they are used for the furnaces.

Mr. TAYLOR. For arches over windows.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the arches of furnaces in lighthouse stations and fog signals. I was pointing out that according to the Auditor General's Report of 1891-92, white bricks were then bought at over 10 cents each. And in the Auditor General's Report of 1893-94, at page J—22, 400 fire-bricks cost $16, or 4 cents each; and in the Auditor General's Report of 1895-96, 579 fire-bricks cost 4½ cents each. In the bill which the hon. gentleman criticises these bricks are charged for at only 3½ cents.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the account say they are white brick or fire-brick?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. White brick, and the agent tells me that they are fire-brick for furnaces.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read his letter; he says they are for the arches of the house.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The arches of the furnaces.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (reading)—

Every one of them was selected by hand, a large portion being arch-bricks, all imported into this country from Scotland, and used for our furnace buildings. * * * As to the iron at 3½ cents, that was a special order of a special size—6 in. by 3 in. by ⅛—specially made for tanks, and sold at the time all the way from $2 to $3.50, according to gauge. The whole bill for this special iron only amounted to $25 or $26. We could have bought ordinary tank plates at $2.25 to $2.50; but these special sizes always cost more, and had to be specially ordered. The price may appear high, but has always been so for such brands of iron.

Now, when it comes to bar-iron, there are several prices. There is common bar-iron and bolts, used for building wharfs. That iron can be bought at $1.90 per 100 lbs.; but refined iron, in bars, differs in price according to size, and is always considerably higher than common iron. We use the very best refined iron in our forges in making chains, swivels, shackles, &c., &c.

As to nails, common nails can be purchased at from $2.10 to $4; finishing nails, $3.15 to $4.50; and wire nails, $3 to $5, according to size. In our business, we sometimes require 200 or 300, or so, of specially hand-made nails, and the quantity of such nails obtained by us is very small.

Then he goes on to say about the confusion in the accounts:

These things are jumbled up in the blue-book, in the shape of baking powder, biscuits, nails, iron, &c. For instance, one pair of scissors is marked down at $3. Why, it might be a pair of shears for tinsmith work, worth from $2 to $5. Putty is quoted at $1.85 per pound, when it is meant for 100 lbs., and it is cheap at that. The question of shovels also came up. Shovels vary in price from 50 cents to $1.50. The shovels that we use and buy at 90 cents are very large and strongly made, specially for coaling vessels, and carry nearly half a bushel.

If the large quantity of 3½-cent iron is referred to in the attack, they are steel plates of a special size used in the construction of the deck-house of the "Constance." I can only say that it was most difficult to get it at any price at all, because the stocks here were all out, and Mr. Parent had to import it specially in the winter, paying high rates of freight and cartage. Even now steel plates are exceedingly scarce, demands being months ahead of the supply.

Now, the accountant gives a memorandum on the same lines, explaining that the biscuits were ginger and table biscuits, and the beans complained of were charged $2 a bushel, or 175 pounds at 4 cents. I do not know whether that is reasonable or not, but can only compare it with prices paid heretofore. In the Auditor General's Report of 1895, K—101, 5 cents per pound are charged for beans. On page K—13 of the same year, $2.10 per bushel is charged. The best quality of beans is sold at 3 cents per pound in cities, and in outside parts at 4 cents per pound. As regards coal, I have given the hon. gentleman pretty full explanation of that. I find in the Auditor General's Report of 1893-94, pages J—48 and 49, 161 tons of coal charged at $6.90.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does that say hard coal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am pointing out that prices charged in previous years are higher than the ones criticised now. This is anthracite coal and not soft.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There are two other bills.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to read all through these explanations. He goes through it pretty much as did the agent at Quebec.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the same explanation apply to the bill of Mr. Hackett of North Sydney, for coal—29½ tons of coal at $6, page K—99?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not all the accounts for that. The accounts were sent to the Committee on Public Accounts, on the motion of my hon. friend. Will I have to look them up and see if the same explanation applies?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why does the hon. gentleman pay in Pictou 65 cents per ton more for coal than in Cape Breton?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is better coal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It must be better coal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Not at all. Cape Breton coal is being brought into Pictou to take the place of Pictou coal. What is the system under which coal is supplied ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The bulk of the coal is supplied by tender, but should a vessel come into port out of coal either the agent or the master of the vessel buys a supply at the current market prices, and has to certify that it is the current market price.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me that the hon. Minister, knowing that during the season a large quantity would be required for the use of his steamers, ought to ask the coal people for tenders, and then instruct those in charge of the steamers to apply to the parties whose tenders are accepted for the coal they need.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have explained that the coal is purchased by tender, but often a vessel goes to an outport short of coal, and is allowed to purchase the necessary supply for the time being at the current market price.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister has attempted to clear up the charges that I made and produces a file of accounts which do not at all refer to the item I was discussing, page K—46, $4,475, the bill for which are in the Public Accounts Committee. The parcel my hon. friend has sent across to me refers to a bill for $1,423.84.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have sent the hon. gentleman part of the bills. Here are some more.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has said that in the accounts there are no bricks at $4, but the first item in the Auditor General's Report is 100 bricks at $4.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. While the Auditor General's clerk has entered so many bricks at $4 per 100, I cannot find any voucher to correspond with that. They are all $3.50 per 100.

Mr. TAYLOR. I saw that in the Public Accounts Committee, and they are marked white brick, and the letter which my hon. friend read corroborated that fact, because he said the best buildings in Scotland are built from them and they are used here for arches.

Mr. GIBSON. They do not build houses in Scotland with white bricks.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not build houses in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I told the hon. gentleman, on the authority of the agent in Quebec, that these were purchased for furnaces.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister tells us that what was put down here as a pair of scissors by the clerk is in reality a pair of tinsmith shears. But if he had referred to Mr. Parent's account for things we could all understand, he will find at page K—46 that Mr. Parent supplied sixty-seven kegs of nails at an average price of $4.12 per keg. They run from $3.25 to $5. At the same time Chown & Co., of Kingston, as seen at page I—19, supplied twenty-eight kegs of nails at an average of $2.27½. There is double the price paid in one case that is paid at another for an article that everybody knows about. And the Minister comes down and in the supplementary Estimates asks for $30,000 additional to carry on this service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I explained that.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the main Estimates last year the hon. gentleman asked for $95,000, and now he comes down for an additional $10,000, and an additional $20,000, making a total of $125,000, a sum larger than ever was asked by the late Government for this service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not true. I gave the hon. gentleman the amounts and he ought not to make that statement. I showed that the expenditures had been as follows, in round numbers :—

1884-85	$148,000
1885-86	130,000
1886-87	141,000
1887-88	150,000
1888-89	126,000
1889-90	114,000
1890-91	111,000
1891-92	127,000
1892-93	146,000
1893-94	142,000
1894-95	129,000
1895-96	150,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman know in what years these larger sums covered part of the purchase of the "Stanley," the "Aberdeen," and other vessels ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The money to purchase the vessels is voted apart from this.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is as my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says—the years when there is a large amount it is accounted for by the purchase of some Government steamer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The purchase price of these steamers was voted apart from this. We would not take a vote for maintenance and buy a steamer with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The charge that the hon. gentleman makes is that the Auditor Gene-

ral's Report did not give details until 1896. Why, my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) could not have remained in the House had that been the case. He came here day after day with details of prices, and declaimed against extravagance, and said that when his friends got into power all this would be done away with, and all goods be bought by public tender. But is that the case? The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) is asking now, as I predicted he would, for a supplementary estimate to make up the deficiency caused by these extravagant prices. His purchasing agent paid $4.12 for nails, when we know that the price last year for the average sizes was $2 at wholesale—the Government ought to get them at wholesale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) listen to the explanation Mr. Gregory gives as to the nails:

As to the nails, common nails could be purchased at from $2.10 to $4; finishing nails, $3.15 to $4.50, and wire nails $3 to $5, according to sizes. In our business, we require 200 or 300 or so of specially hand-made nails, and the quantity of such nails obtained by us is very small.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister had better discharge the man who makes the statement that wire nails are worth from $4 to $5 a keg.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He says from $3 to $5.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) what wire nails are worth? They are manufactured in Hamilton.

Mr. WOOD. It would depend upon the size.

Mr. TAYLOR. But from 3-inch up the prices are the same. When you come down to half and quarter inch, you pay a little more. I know about nails; I have sold them, and know the prices. The price was $2.25 at retail in the country stores last year. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Kloepfer) told me this morning that he had purchased a car-load last year at $1.80. And the Government that ought to buy them at bottom prices, pays $4.12 for sixty-seven kegs purchased from Mr. Parent.

Mr. WOOD. Are they finishing nails?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I think they will prove to be finishing nails.

Mr. TAYLOR. Another item that the hon. gentleman did not mention when he was picking out a pair of scissors and some white brick and blaming the Auditor General for inaccuracy, was condensed milk. This article is made at Truro and sold at the factory at $3.50 a case. I see by the accounts that the Yukon contingent were supplied at Vancouver for less than $5.50 a case, freight paid. And the Government purchased from fifty to one hundred cases and paid from $8 to $9.60 a case.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it sold by Charleson?

Mr. TAYLOR. It was sold by friends of the Government. I find in the accounts of Kennedy, of St. John, four cases at $9, or more than double the price for which it can be purchased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it fair that the agent's statement should be given. He says that the account of J. Kennedy for condensed milk at $8 and $9 a case was challenged before the amount was paid, and the agent reported that the wholesale price in St. John for "Reindeer brand" was $2 a dozen, and "Swiss brand," $2.75. The amount was paid on receiving this explanation. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will turn to the Auditor General's Report for 1895-96, he will see that condensed milk was paid for at $2.40, $2.25 and $3 a dozen. The hon. gentleman was perfectly satisfied with these prices then, but he finds fault with the same or a little lower prices now.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) said that the details were not given in the Auditor General's Report previous to the advent to power of the present Government. Now he is able to quote details——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) must not misrepresent me. I did not say that there were no details published; what I said was that very little of these details was given. The Auditor General was accustomed to enter "sundry supplies" in lump sums of $2,000 or $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. We find the same thing here. At the bottom of Mr. Parent's account you find "sundries, $100.38." And in other accounts you will find charges for "sundries." My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) is now proving that the Auditor General did put in details under the late Government. He is trying to meet the overwhelming proof that under his administration supplies are bought without tender, and altogether from political favourites, at two or three prices.

As to the condensed milk, that is an article that is sold everywhere, and the best known brands are the "Reindeer" and one or two others. But the best brand that was sold to the Yukon contingent, the "Reindeer" brand, was sold at Victoria at $5.60. Then, take up other items, the price of which everybody knows. Look into Kennedy's account, and you will find a large quantity of currants charged at 10 cents a pound. You can go to any store and get 3 pounds of them by retail for 25 cents; the wholesale price is about 5½ cents. That is the price charged

at Victoria and Vancouver to the Yukon contingent. I see that my hon. friend pays Bate & Son, in Ottawa, 9 cents for currants, and he pays his friend in the county of St. John 10 cents a pound, paying double prices for the article. These things account for the extravagant waste of money, and explain how it is that the Minister is obliged to ask, in the supplementary Estimates, for an extra $20,000 to pay the supplies of these steamers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in error in saying, that the accounts that he referred to do not include the cost of these Dominion steamers. The only case in which there was a separate account shown by his own report, Appendix No. 8, for the construction of steamers out of the ordinary amount which we take in that form, was the case of the vessel to replace the "Glendon" and "Lady Head." After that, as is shown by the Minister's own report, these vessels, both the "Stanley" and the "Aberdeen," which were built in my time, appear under a lump sum for Dominion steamers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not the "Stanley." I remember the vote passing; the ex-Minister of Finance brought it down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am quoting from his own official report, page 52, Appendix No. 8, where he will find the only two items separated for purchases for steamers, away back in the case of the "Lady Head" and the "Glendon."

But I wish to bring out a point in connection with the tidal survey. The hon. gentleman is asking $2,066.66 to supplement the sum of $4,000, which he took last year, and in connection with the general vote of $4,000 which he has in his estimates for the following year. It is in regard to a service upon which the hon. gentleman held such peculiar views that it is difficult to understand why he is spending money at all. On the 12th of May, the hon. gentleman told me across the floor of the House:

> The scientists pretend that we should make a survey of the currents around the coast, and try and describe them more accurately on the chart than they are described at present, but I have not been able to find a practical seaman who shares that opinion, or an expert who recommends me to incur that expense.

Again, in that debate, he says:

> The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I told the hon. gentleman that I was keeping an open mind on the subject.
>
> Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But the Minister makes the extraordinary statement that no practical navigators had declared in favour of the necessity of this service.
>
> The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How can I help that? I have done all I could to inform myself, and I have yet to find a practical navigator who says it is necessary.

Now, in order to bring that question up sharply, I endeavoured to question the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; he thought that I was cross-examining him. On May 17th, he declined to answer a question which I put on that subject, when he said:

> I am quite unaware whether there are petitions sent in by practical seamen or not. I will bring down any petitions there are.

Since then, the hon. gentleman has handed me across the floor of the House a petition, to which I call attention, because here is a service for which we are voting money from year to year, in regard to which I have complained from year to year that we were not voting enough, and that he was only half doing the work. Yet, while the Minister is asking for main and supplementary Estimates here, in the year 1899, his position was, that this was a scientific matter, and that practical navigators were not favourable. What does this petition say that has been unearthed. It was received in the department in October, November and December, showing that many names on the petition came forward in October, and the balance of the names were forwarded later. The petition shows exactly how wrong the Minister's position is, and how necessary this service is in the minds of practical men:

> We, the undersigned masters and officers of vessels engaged in the navigation of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and of the waters on the Atlantic coast of the Dominion of Canada and of Newfoundland, desire earnestly and respectfully to petition the Government and Parliament of Canada, that they would promptly take such steps as they may deem advisable to obtain as thorough a knowledge as possible of the currents in these waters, whether due to the tides or to any other cause, and to distribute amongst mariners the information obtained.
>
> We believe that the serious loss of life and of property due to shipwrecks attributable to "unknown currents" during fogs or hazy weather may thus be greatly diminished. In such weather these currents are a cause of great anxiety and danger.

Then follow several hundred names in one column, and in other columns are shown their rank, name of vessel, and tonnage of vessel. In that list will be found officers of nearly every line of steamers approaching our coasts on the Atlantic, or up the River St. Lawrence. You find there the names of well-known mariners, who have been navigating those waters for a lifetime. Take, for instance, Captain Richardson, of the "Sardinian," now retired from the service on account of age, a mariner of great experience and splendid standing. Then, there was the late Captain Hugh Wylie, of the "Polynesian," the commanders of the "Carthaginia," the "Lake Ontario," and the "Vancouver." I mention these as ships well known, but there are several hundred

others. Then, there is Captain Trott, of the cable steamer "Minia," a very experienced navigator, well known to all connected with shipping. This shows that the position the Minister took, in saying that the question was not being pressed upon him by practical men, is erroneous. This petition itself should not have been lost sight of, particularly when the Minister was not entirely inactive, but was obtaining grants of money from year to year for this service. I want to ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to this item respecting Robert Angus and S. C. Hayden: when were there gentlemen appointed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the 1st of May.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Whose places do they take?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not take anybody's places. Mr. Dawson reported to me that the tidal service reports from each station were rendered useless because they were not worked out, and he said that he must have some technical clerks to work them out. I told him I could not appoint any until I got authority from Parliament. When I asked the Auditor General about it he said that I must take a special vote for it, naming the clerks. I went to Council and got authority to employ these two men, one of whom is a graduate of Prince of Wales College, and the other who has been employed by Mr. Dawson, off and on. He was a telephone or telegraph man.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that Mr. Hayden?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Hayden is the graduate of Prince of Wales College. Mr. Angus was a telephone and telegraph man, and he had been temporarily employed with Mr. Dawson. Mr. Dawson said that temporary employment was not what he wanted. He wanted two clerks to devote themselves to working out these figures. I got an Order in Council appointing them at $600, and I have to ask a special vote to pay the differenec between $400 and $600 for the current year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman increase the vote after July to make this amount?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister to explain an item I find in the Auditor General's Report paid to Mr. Parsons, one of the agents of the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is the agent of the Marine Department in Nova Scotia.

Mr. TAYLOR. In a bill, which he is paid for his disbursements, I find seven cases of condensed milk at $4.50 per case that he has been allowed to purchase. He has purchased it at $4.50 per case, whereas merchants who have supplied this article at Charlottetown and elsewhere have charged from $8 to $9.60.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The purchase of the article at St. John was made through our agent, Mr. Harding, in the same way that Mr. Parsons purchased it at Halifax. It was certified to, but as the amount seemed large the accountant sent it back to Mr. Harding for an explanation, and that explanation I have referred to. It was purchased in the same way by Mr. Harding as by Mr. Parsons.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Parsons purchased this himself and presented the account. He purchased it for $4.50, while you are paying $9.60 in some cases for the same article to other parties. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what political friend received $25 for exterminating noxious insects? You will find that in the Auditor General's Report, K—16. You need not mind looking it up. His name is E. A. Evans.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose he is a political supporter of the Government who had to get something, and so he is put down for $25 for exterminating noxious insects.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—
Towards the construction of Upper Traverse permanent lighthouse, to replace lightship $20,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In connection with this lightship, is this the first item that appears to authorize that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has this work all been done?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it is now under way, and it is to pay for the work which is being done from day to day. We are building the wooden part of this structure, and taking it down to be sunk. I will require $20,000 more in the Supplementary Estimates next year as the entire work is estimated to cost $40,000. It has been a subject of a great deal of consideration, not only on my part, but on the part of my colleagues, and a special investigation has been made into it by the chief engineer personally who visited

the ground. The shipping interest reported to the department that, if possible, the erection of a permanent structure in place of the floating lightships would probably result in an enormous advantage in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and it was thought that the building of a permanent structure would keep navigation open for two or three weeks later in the fall. The lightships had to be taken away before the ice formed, whereas if there were a permanent structure and permanent lights located at that point it would render navigation safe until that time. My hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), the shipping interests of Quebec and Montreal, the insurance companies, and everybody interested in obtaining longer, better and safer navigation in the St. Lawrence, took the greatest interest in this work. At first the chief engineer felt inclined, from his general knowledge of the subject, to the opinion that it would cost in the neighbourhood of from $70,000 to $100.-000, perhaps, to complete this work, and I hesitated, but at the request of the hon. member for Quebec West, I sent the chief engineer down to make a thorough inspection of the ground, to find the depth and strength of the water and to obtain all the data necessary to form as accurate an opinion as it is possible for an engineer to form.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman say when the engineer went down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last autumn; I think sometime about September, although I cannot give the hon. gentleman a more accurate idea than that. Afterwards he made his estimate and report. After consultations with practical men he came to the conclusion that the structure could be built for about $40,000. The vote for the maintenance of lights will not enable me to pay for it out of that. As I intimated last year that I would do so, I am asking for a special vote of $20,000, which will be paid before the end of the year, and I will ask for $20,000 more.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This opens up a very important question, which may be attended with considerable danger and certainly a great deal of inconvenience to the department. I do not recall a case, no matter how pressing the necessity of lights and aids to navigation, of a departure being made from the rule which has governed the department in the making of its estimates. For instance, there is only $30,000 taken, as a rule, to cover the cost of new lights. It once was $40,000, I think, for a year or two, but the amount was reduced to $30,000. The practice was that the items of the estimate should be under a sort of division among the provinces. We had, in order to secure an approximately fair division as between the different coasts, the Pacific, the Atlantic, and the St. Lawrence, and so on, to make that arrangement. The department is inundated from January to December with calls for lights. I am not saying a word against the Upper Traverse. That subject was often discussed and considered in my own time, but I am adverting to the departure that is being made in connection with this matter. Hitherto it has been possible under the implied instructions from this committee and the House for the Minister to simply give an answer that he has estimated for the construction of lights, and he cannot exceed that, that the amount has been divided and to go beyond that is not in his power. You have here an urgent case I admit, but it must have been before the Minister for a long time, and so that excuse is taken away. This Traverse lighthouse is one of the largest works ever undertaken by the department, and yet the Minister goes ahead, and without consulting Parliament, commits the country to an expense of $60,000 or $70,000 for one light, which is more than double the cost that Parliament has hitherto allowed for any light in all Canada. This is an extraordinary thing, and it brings up many considerations in connection with the system under which the country is now governed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I will be able to explain it to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in a manner satisfactory to him. I do not call in question the principles which he said should control us in obtaining or expending this vote. The hon. gentleman will remember that this is not the first time I have taken Parliament into my confidence on this matter. I discussed it last year, and, although I said we had not reached a conclusion, yet I was in hope that when the engineer had made the survey, we would reach a conclusion and be able to build the light. I found that the present lightship had to be condemned, this was her last year anyway, and if I were to put in a new and improved lightship it would cost $50,000 or $60,000. The question arose as to whether I should wait until the first of July to begin this work, or whether I should prepare the woodwork before the ice went away, when I could do it at one-half the cost. I submitted all the facts to my colleagues in Council, and they thought, under the circumstances, I would be well warranted in taking an amount from the general appropriation, because I could do the work for one-half the price, and then when Parliament met, I could ask for a special vote, because the general vote would not cover that, and the other expenditure. I did not venture to start out on a large expenditure on this occasion without having taken Parliament into my confidence, because I informed Parliament that if the engineer reported the work could be built for any reasonable sum, I would undertake the work rather than sup-

ply a new lightship. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, see that from a business standpoint as well as from a constitutional standpoint, I was more than justified in going on. I cannot conceive it possible for any one to question the propriety of building this permanent structure, once the chief engineer reported it was feasible and could be built for $40,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister has nothing before him beyond the estimate of a very competent engineer, I admit, in regard to work, a large portion of which is certain of being under water. The Minister has not even asked for tenders, I understand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The chief engineer satisfied himself thoroughly after making three or four visits to the place and examining it, that he could build it much cheaper than if it were let by contract. He told me more than that, that it was a kind of work which he would not care to trust to contract, as it was work which was required to be carefully done, under daily supervision.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is superintending it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know ; he is a first-class man, though.

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Lemieux.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He is the best man in the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He bears a very high character, and the chief engineer reported him to me as being an extremely capable man for this kind of work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The answer of the Minister is an answer that could be given in any case where you preferred to be governed by the Governor in Council rather than by the Parliament of Canada. Hitherto, in all these matters in connection with the construction of lights, the rule has been——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And a good rule.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The rule has been that Parliament would first determine what work of that character would be undertaken, but now the same spirit that has taken possession of the Government in other matters has shown itself in this. They get the Governor in Council to approve and they go on with the work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Had to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, I was compelled to build a new lightship, or I had to start and build this permanent light.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the present ship will not last more than this year, and I had to have a ship, or a permanent light ready for next year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is no excuse. In 1896 or 1897, the Minister knew his lightship would not last, and he could then have come to Parliament. The excuse given by the hon. gentleman is an accusation against himself. In 1892, when I was in the department, the question was before the department, although at that time there was no urgency as to the lightship not lasting for some years. The Minister in this case has departed from the sound constitutional practice of not asking Parliament for an appropriation in time. He has opened the door to extraordinary pressure, and left himself open to a great deal of difficulties in the future. I do not object to the substitution of a permanent light for a lightship ; but I enter my protest against any department incurring this responsibility first, and then coming to Parliament simply to register a mechanical approval of it. How many men has Mr. Lemieux under him, and how much is he paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has fifteen men, my deputy tells me, and we pay the men through our agent. We calculated the other day that by the end of this month we will require the whole $20,000. but, of course, the accounts are not paid until I get this vote.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When were these men employed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Sometime before the ice went out of the Louise Basin. We had to do this particular cribwork on the ice, or we would have had to postpone it for another year.

Mr. BENNETT. This is on a par with the construction of a lighthouse on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, which was brought before the House by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The work was done there by day's work and not by tender.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nearly every year the chief engineer reports to me that owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case such and such a lighthouse has to be built. He advises it should be built under the supervision of Mr. Noble there, and built by our own men by day's work rather than by contract. That frequently happens ; and, as far as I am concerned, I am governed almost altogether by Col. Anderson's advice in that matter.

Mr. BENNETT. I remember that, during the term of the last Parliament, there were three lights built on the shores of the Georgian Bay. One was a very difficult structure, built on a rock of about an acre in extent and 20 miles from the shore. The Minister has undertaken an expenditure of about $40,000, of which about $20,000 has already been spent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will have been by the end of this month.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no use quibbling about a day or two. The Minister has based his whole argument on the report of his engineer, who, he says, recommended that the work should be done by day's work, and personally supervised. Mr. Lemieux, a first-class man, is now looking after the work. Surely, if tenders had been called for and the work let by contract, the department could have availed itself of the services of Mr. Lemieux to watch the contractor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can only say, that Col. Anderson reported to me that this work was of a very special character, that the cribwork had to be built on ice, and then sunk, and that, unless it were built with great care, he could not guarantee that it would stand the run of the tide there; and he strongly recommended that it should not be done by contract, but done under our own supervision. What would the hon. gentleman have me do in such a case? Would it be for me to call for tenders in the face of that recommendation?

Mr. BENNETT. The engineer is not on the ground, and will not be on the ground, supervising the work personally.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But he has been on the ground continually.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Lemieux is entrusted with the duty of looking after the work. If he can look over a corps of men in the employ of the Government, surely he could look after a contractor's men, and see that as good and efficient work was performed by men employed by the contractor as by men employed directly by the department. This department appears to be conducting its work in a similar manner to the Public Works Department. Last night we had a sample afforded of the way in which the Public Works Department does its work, when we were informed that $6,000 worth of work is done on the Langevin Block without a tender being called for. I also find, in the Report of the Auditor General, that certain work was done by the Public Works Department in connection with the taking out of some scows to work with the dredge "Challenge"; and that work, amounting to nearly $2,000, instead of being done under contract, is entrusted to a party friend, who does just what he likes. True, the hon. Minister is fortified by the opinion of his engineer; but, when he brought his judgment to bear upon the question, surely he must have seen that if this foreman could overlook the men in the direct employment of the department, he could overlook work done by men under a contractor. But the Minister stands responsible for undertaking a work involving an expenditure of $40,000, without calling for tenders. It is the duty of the Opposition to point out these facts, and, as long as I am here, I intend to do it, more particularly as hon. gentlemen opposite seem disposed to acquiesce in everything of this kind done by the Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think my hon. friend is quite fair to me. The general statement is correct, that I am taking the responsibility, as Minister, for having this work constructed by day's labour, and, if I do not succeed in having it done as cheaply as it could be done by contract, I shall be held responsible. What is the fact? Here is a man at the head of the lighthouse department, Col. Anderson, a man of very great experience, who has been in that position for the past twenty years. He was a long time making up his mind whether it could be built there at all, and stand the pressure of the ice and tides. After making a number of surveys, he came to the conclusion that it could be done, provided it was done in a proper way and done very carefully, and he came to me and said; "I could not advise this being let by contract, for I cannot take the responsibility of the work being properly done, unless it is done under my own supervision; and, if we can get a trustworthy man to superintend the work, I would advise that it be done by day's labour." I think I am justified in taking his advice. If I did not, and the work should be carried away, I would be held responsible for not following the advice of my expert officer.

Mr. BENNETT. Under the late Government, when a lighthouse was to be constructed, tenders were called for, and the work was given to the lowest tenderer, and the person who got the contract was bound to give ample security to the department for finishing the work. The position of the Minister is this. If the structure is carried away, he can blame Mr. Lemieux, but he cannot fall back on him for damages; but, if the Minister had followed the ordinary course, and asked for tenders, and required security to be given for the performance of the work, he would have had the security put up by the contractor to fall back upon. So that the Minister is much worse off than he would be, if he had let the work by contract.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think my hon. friend would have taken any other course, if he were in my position.

Mr. BENNETT. How does the Minister know that the work could be done cheaper by day's labour without calling for tenders ?

Mr. CLANCY. Has the engineer given in a written report to the effect that this could not be well and safely done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had a great many conversations with him, and am almost sure that his report is in writing.

Mr. CLANCY. It is important to know, because it is very difficult for the committee to make a distinction between Mr. Lemieux following out plans and specifications made, for which tenders were had, or plans and specifications for construction by day's work. There is a distinction without a particle of difference. I must confess that I cannot see any difference, whether Mr. Lemieux has supervision of this work done by the day or let by tender.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not very well see how the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was at liberty to depart from the recognized principle, unless the Government have the courage of their convictions and set that principle aside in all the departments. The practice followed in the Marine Department was that in nearly all cases, in which the cost was under $10,000, the work was put in charge directly of one of the officers of the department who employed day labour. That practice proved very successful and economical. But here is an extraordinary departure. This is the heaviest piece of work undertaken by the department in a great many years. We have never had any such work undertaken since 1888, and in this instance the rule that is binding by statute on all the departments is set aside altogether. The hon. Minister did not even know the name of the man who had charge of the work, and had to get his name from his colleague, the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell). Not an engineer in his department, either the chief or any of his subordinates, has been given the supervision of the work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The engineer is there constantly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief engineer has been in the city of Ottawa nearly the whole time, for I have seen him here daily. The hon. Minister ought to give us the report on which he is acting, and also the reports which Mr. Anderson made some years ago. All the risk is being run by the country. There is no protection whatever to the Government, and should this foundation be carried away, the expenditure would not be $40,000 but double that. The risk of its being carried away is enormous, and that was one of the reasons why no lighthouse was attempted there in former days. The trouble about erecting any lighthouse there is to get a foundation that will stand, and we have in this case, not only the absence of the risk which would devolve on the contractor had this work been let in the usual way, but we have also the absence of the technical supervision of a known and responsible officer of the department. Mr. Lemieux may be all right in his own way, but is simply a temporary employee, only employed by the Government for superintending this particular work. What is he paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Four dollars a day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Here is a $4 a day man willing to go down to the Traverse and spend his time there. He may be a very good man in a way, but the hon. Minister will not pretend, and I am sure his hon. colleague from Quebec will not say, that Mr. Lemieux is an expert or an engineer.

Mr. DOBELL. I consider Mr. Lemieux is a specialist in wharf building and block building. I have known him for many years, and have given him orders for heavy work, and left the carrying out of the work entirely in his hands. He is really a genius in wharf building. I do not wish to appear as if I had not some degree of responsibility in urging upon my colleague the construction of this work. From the first time I entered Parliament, I saw the necessity of having a permanent lighthouse in the Traverse, which is a narrow waterway, 500 feet wide in a river about six miles wide, with nothing to indicate where that channel-way is except two lightships known as the North Traverse lightship and the South Traverse lightship. These are taken down, as soon as the weather permits in the spring and remain there until the weather in the fall becomes too boisterous or ice forms in the river and is carried up and down the river, and liable to cut the lightships through, as they are built of wood. Those lightships then are removed, and it is only two years ago that a large steamer came up the river St. Lawrence late in the year laden with goods, but when she came to the Traverse these lightships had been removed. She waited there three days to get a pilot steamer to show her the way through, but that pilot could not be got, so she went back down the river and discharged somewhere in Nova Scotia. My contention is this—and I am perfectly satisfied that the House will agree with me—that our object should be to make our navigation as long as possible in the year. If we can possibly make it nine months instead of six, we shall be doing a great benefit to the whole coun-

try. To accomplish this, the first thing necessary was to make one or two permanent lighthouses in the Traverse to take the place of those two lightships. It happened that one of these lightships was reported unsafe and not fit for the service this year. An estimate was obtained as to the cost of another one, and it amounted to something like $70,000. I then urged on my hon. colleague that a permanent lighthouse could be erected there at a much less cost and with much greater benefit to the country, and I urged him to have it done before the ice had gone out of our Louise dock basin, so that we could make the bottom of the pier exactly to correspond with the place where it had to be put at the Traverse. I believe that an engineer went down and made plans of what was required, and the work was then begun and carried out. I believe that the work will be done for one-half what it would have cost if we had waited until now.

Mr. CLANCY. Was Mr. Lemieux ever a contractor?

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think he ever took a contract. He works by the day.

Mr. CLANCY. How did the hon. gentleman come to discover his genius?

Mr. DOBELL. Because I have employed him, and the works he constructed for me some years ago gave me entire satisfaction. This is no ordinary work. It has to be sunk in an exact position and at the edge of this deep channel. It has to be sunk in twenty-five feet at low water, and at high water it will be sunk something like 42 feet. So that it is not ordinary work. Besides, it has to resist the ice and is of very peculiar construction.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) say whether Mr. Lemieux ever before constructed a work of that kind?

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think there is a similar work in the country. When you require a special work, you must have a man with special qualifications to carry it out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He runs no risk, and gets $4 a day. No one is disputing that this work should be undertaken. I began the discussion myself and took great care to avoid that, because I knew that if it was possible to build a permanent work there it was desirable to do so. But I did challenge—and I do it again, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) does not seem to have followed me at all—the handing over of these things either to the Government or to any one member of the Government, no matter what his ability may be. To plunge into a work of this kind that could have been and should have been brought before Parliament to get authority for it, is something not only novel, but dangerous, and it puts this House at once in the position of being nothing more than a body to register the decisions of the Government. That is what I protest against. We have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries telling us that a work is going on that, according to the estimates of his own engineer, will involve us in an expense of $40,000, a work that, in my day, was estimated by the same engineer and the same officers at a far greater sum. And more than that, it is a work that involves, as the hon. member for Quebec knows well—and he will not deny it, certainly no engineer of intelligence would deny it—danger of the whole work being carried away.

Mr. DOBELL. The Government could have that insured if they wish.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Government does not insure; the Minister does not propose to begin any practice of that kind, and the suggestion I do not take to be a serious one. Speaking from memory, in my time the estimate of the cost of this work was $60,000 or $70,000; and you have the risk of losing the whole of it. You could get a lightship, not for $75,000, but for $40,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES Not the new and improved light-ship.

Mr. DOBELL. The wood of which a lightship would have to be built has advanced considerably in the last ten years, I speak of oak and elm. Any one acquainted with the trade knows this to be a fact

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The light-ships are not always built of wood. The light-ships on the coast of England are not of wood, I believe.

Mr. GIBSON. They have no ice there.

Mr. DOBELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman this—does he mean to say it is worth while to take up the time of the House discussing whether it would be best to build a light-ship of iron or wood? Surely, if you can get a permanent lighthouse on the Traverse, it would be a much greater benefit than keeping up the lightships.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I object to the interruption, and I shall not address myself to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) further, if he persists in discussing the wisdom and propriety of engaging in a work about which Parliament never was consulted. My protest is that this action has been taken without consulting Parliament, when we should have been consulted in the first place. No one is discussing the propriety of the work itself. The Minister says—and I do not quarrel with him for that: "I take my stand on the opinion I get from my engineer; I do not understand these things in their technical aspect, and I act upon the reports of my engineer." We

must have the same means of knowledge that he has. We are entitled to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is an important thing for consideration whether the hon. gentleman has plunged into this, as I fear he has, prematurely. Or not exactly prematurely, because he says that his light-ship was used up, and he had to come to a decision before he had an opportunity to consult Parliament. My answer is that he was neglectful in not consulting Parliament a year ago, when his light-ship was showing signs of being used up. We have Mr. Lemieux there at $4 a day. What is he paying the men and where do they come from? Does he ship them from Quebec, and if so, is the cost of transport and maintenance borne by the Government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The cribwork was being carried on in the Quebec basin, while the ice was there, and it will be taken down through to Traverse. Mr. Lemieux is there. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was astray in saying that no officer of the department has control over him. Mr. Noble, who is a good man——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A very good man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—has been there three or four times watching the work. Col. Anderson has been there also, I think more than once.

Mr. DOBELL. Three times.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Since the work began?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and watched the work very carefully. As the hon. gentleman knows, we have taken into our own hands the work formerly done by contract, of buoying the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec. Therefore, we shall have an officer in that part of the world, and the work at Traverse below will have the benefit of his constant and continuous supervision. We take a general vote every year for the construction of lighthouses of about $45,000. And when the vote was going through last year, I stated that this matter was under consideration. I was quite aware, of course, that what I could spare of this $45,000 would not enable me to do this work, or to do that part of it which is to be done in the ensuing year. So, we were placed in this position, we had either to let a year go by, as my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) has said, or we had to build that cribwork before the ice went out. My hon. friend told me, and he was backed up by the engineer, that if I did not get the work done before the ice went out, it would cost me three or four times as much as to get the cribwork done afterwards. The question was whether I should go on and construct it, knowing that I could not finish the whole work out of the vote I had and then come to Parliament and ask for a special vote in the supplementaries—which, when I began, I thought it would be long before June—or abandon it to another year. But I could not abandon it for another year, for the present light-ship has about run its course. So, I had either to build the permanent work or else get a new light-ship. I do not see what more I could have done. Of course, technically, speaking, it may be said that we strained a point. If the engineer had had his mind made up when my supplementary Estimates went through last year, I would have asked a vote; but, as I explained to the hon. gentleman, the engineer wanted further surveys and examinations before he made up his mind. He satisfied himself that it could be built, and the exact spot on which it could be built, and the amount for which it could be built. But this was after the supplementaries of last year were voted. Then I had to decide whether to abandon the work for another year or take the responsibility of going on with the expenditure, and, at the earliest moment, take Parliament into my confidence and ask for a vote for the work to be done this year. I had no doubt as to the wisdom of the scheme. I felt there would be no objection raised to that. All, I believe, are satisfied that this aid to navigation is one of the most pressing and important in the Dominion; and I am sure I shall have the support of my hon. friends opposite, as of those around me, in carrying it out. The whole shipping interest of Montreal and Quebec are looking forward with anxious interest to the completion of this work. The insurance companies are more than delighted at the fact that the work is going on. The very fact that we are taking in hand these great and expensive works for improving the navigation of the river St. Lawrence, will have a material effect in reducing the enormous rates of insurance which are now being charged on the shipping which comes to that river. The only point that can be taken advantage of is when they say: You should have taken a vote last year. I have told the hon. gentlemen why I did not take a special vote. Col. Anderson had not sufficient knowledge to enable him to say that the work could be built for less than $75,000. I could not bring myself to the conclusion that I would be justified in asking the House for $75,000. But after he had made his further survey and talked for a long time with Mr. Noble and Mr. Lemieux, he came to the conclusion, after going over his estimates carefully and seeing what the woodwork and stone could

be purchased for, that it might be built for $40,000. When I was informed by these gentlemen: Unless you begin the work before the ice goes, you must leave it for another twelve months, I took the responsibility of saying: We will go on, and ask Parliament at the first moment for authority to defray these bills. I want this money to do that, and I am sure the House will not think that I have taken an extreme departure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What are the men getting who are working under Mr. Lemieux?

Mr. DOBELL. In the early part of the season, before the ships came in, they were getting $1.25; since then, I think, the wages have risen to about $1.50.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am asking in regard to these men on the work the Minister speaks of.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not the knowledge. Mr. Lemieux employs them, and he is under the control of Col. Anderson. Mr. Noble has been there three times, and Col. Anderson has been there since the work began. two or three times. Mr. Lemieux knows the names of the men. They are paid by the agent in Quebec, Mr. Gregory. They are doing the cribwork.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman give them instructions to go on with the sinking of the cribwork and fill it up?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be done under Col. Anderson's special supervision.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it to be done by day's work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The whole work will be done under Col. Anderson's special supervision, under his responsibility and care. He reported that that was the only safe way he thought it could be done, so that the department would have control of it all the time, and see that the work was actually done in such a way that it would resist the pressure of the ice. I believe that report is in writing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the special difficulty in the construction of this cribwork?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The depth is 25 feet at the lowest possible tide, and when the tide is high, it is 42 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. What proportion of the money goes for labour, and what for material?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not tell. Tenders have not been called for the material. The material has been bought by Col. Anderson, and Mr. Noble, and the agent at Quebec.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman's officers any idea of what the material costs?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My deputy tells me that the accounts are kept in Quebec, and I cannot answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister has utterly failed to justify the course he has taken in this matter from the start up to the present day. He says it became a case of urgency. There was no urgency about it. If the Minister had been looking to the affairs of his department as closely as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) would have done in the same position, he would have provided for this, there would have been no need for this undue haste. Then he tells us that he is entirely guided by his engineer. Well, why not let the engineer run the whole department? What is the need for a Minister if he exercises no judgment of his own in this matter? He says the engineer did these things. He says no tenders were asked, and so the law is violated. No information is given to the public, as should have been done. He says the engineer recommended this. Why not have given us the report of the engineer. If the hon. gentleman has a report from his engineer that has convinced the Minister, why not let us see that report so that we may decide if the Minister has a right to be convinced. He says the job can be done for $40,000; we do not know but that it may cost $60,000. He says: Look at the enormous difficulty in sinking a crib in 25 feet of water. Well, there are men who are able to sink a crib in 100 feet of water. He says the work is under the constant supervision of Col. Anderson. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says that he sees Col. Anderson nearly every day in Ottawa, so it is not under his constant supervision, because, I presume, Col. Anderson has many other works to look after which occupy his time largely in other places. But the Minister has not justified the violation of the law in going into this work without asking for tenders, and without a proper understanding of the work.

Mr. W. GIBSON (Lincoln). Since the hon. gentleman has been kind enough to mention my name, I may say for the benefit of the committee, that I have just about finished a piece of work in water, not, perhaps, quite as deep as the Government requires this to be done. There is a serious difficulty in sinking cribs where there are 17 feet of tide to contend against. As I gather from what has been stated before the committee, at low water the crib is 25 feet deep, and at high water it is 42 feet, there being a rise

of 17 feet at the tide. With respect to the wages that the Government are paying their men, I say frankly, that the Government are very lucky in getting their men at $1.25 and $1.50 a day, for I have to pay to the same kind of labour $1.75 per day; and at the same time I have to pay my foremen $5 a day instead of $4. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked the Minister if he could give him an idea as to the cost of wages and the cost of material. I may say that after an experience of 30 years in constructing public works, I have found, invariably, that the cost of wages and the cost of material are almost identical. In ordinary circumstances the one costs just about as much as the other. This may be a special case. I have no doubt there is a good deal of difficulty in contending with the tide, because with the tide there is a current and sinking a crib under such circumstances entails a good deal of trouble. I think it will be found that, when this work is completed, the cost of wages and material will run along on parallel lines. I may say, that I approve, and have always approved of work of this kind being let, wherever it is possible to secure tenders, to the lowest tenderer, if the gentleman who is the lowest tenderer is a reputable man and able to put up the necessary security, and I venture to say, that the Government would be justified in giving a contract of this kind, though not in this case, to the lowest tenderer, if his price were below the estimate of the engineer. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) wished to make the point, but I think he could hardly have been serious, that the risk was entirely put upon the contractor, because, if a work were let under contract by that hon. gentleman, I am in the judgment of the House in saying, that he would have made some provision for the payment to the contractor, as the work progressed, from month to month, of perhaps 80 per cent or 90 per cent. If that work were carried away, would not the Government be out 80 per cent or 90 per cent, if the Government had paid to the contractor that amount?

Mr. BENNETT. There would be the sureties to fall back on.

Mr. GIBSON. That just shows that my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) does not know that the Government does not accept sureties in connection with work. It accepts the contractor's deposit of 5 per cent or 10 per cent, when the work is tendered for.

Mr. HAGGART. And it also accepts securities.

Mr. GIBSON. Not at all. Apart from securities, I would like to know, from the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), if he ever followed up these securities under any contract he let in which the contractor failed. Did he follow up the securities in the case in which Goodwin ran away after he had done the mucking, leaving the heavy work for the Government to do? In the case of this peculiar kind of work, such as has been described by the hon. Minister, the Government were perfectly justified in doing this work by day labour. I can recall an instance of another company which had a similar piece of work to do, at a place called Norman, in the Lake of the Woods region, where the risk was so great that the company would not give it to a contractor, because they felt that, in the event of a washout or the dam being carried away, they would be at a loss to the extent of the work that had been done. In my opinion, from what I have gathered from the information given to the committee by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, this was a piece of work that could not be let to a contractor, except at an exorbitant figure, and I consider the Government were perfectly justified in doing the work themselves.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman know anything about this work in question?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, then, the hon. gentleman's information is not worth a great deal, is it?

Mr. GIBSON. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman; but, considering the works I have carried out, and the experience I have had, I hope I am not as stupid as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) would lead this House to believe. I can gather the nature of that work from the experience I have had of that kind of work, because I can tell my hon. friend, in a word, that a contractor very seldom has the same kind of work to do twice, and he has to gather his experience from the different kinds of work he has to do, so that he must have a general knowledge. Surely, the building of a crib, framing it, dove-tailing and filling it with stones, is only a question of labour and a question of quantity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIBSON. Exactly. The question of putting it down to a greater depth means a great deal more in this case, because you have the tide to contend against, which has a rise of 17 feet, in addition to which, there is a flowing river and consequently a strong current.

Mr. MILLS. It is an advantage, rather than anything else, because you can do the work at a time when the water is out.

Mr. GIBSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) would confine himself to law, he would be all right, instead of talking about the building of cribs. In the building of a crib, you build it out of the water, and gradually sink it. You anchor it as near the place as you can, and it settles by reason of the filling, so that it is not built from the bottom,

but is built from the top and sunk down as the work progresses. So much for my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. With the danger of the tide and with the danger that the work might be carried away, I say, that the Government were perfectly justified, in my opinion, in having this work performed by day labour, so that it might be completed by the close of navigation.

Mr. CARGILL. I understand, from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) has stated, that he has found, in taking contracts, that the cost of material being always equal to the cost of wages, that would be a fair price or value for any contractor to estimate work upon. Is that right?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. CARGILL. In this particular case it would depend altogether as to what these two cost, what the contract would be worth. As to the amount of wages paid for the work, I understand that the wages paid were from $1.25 to $1.50 a day for ordinary labour, and $4 a day for supervision. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has been in the habit of paying $1.75 a day for ordinary labour, and $5 for supervision; so that it just depends on the amount of wages paid. I inferred, from what he said, that the price of doing a piece of work of this kind wholly depends on the wages you have to pay to do the work, therefore, if he had got the contract it would have cost the country 25 per cent more than the fixed price.

Mr. GIBSON. I think I would be justified, and I think the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) would bear me out, in saying, that better results will be obtained from men at $1.75 a day, working for a contractor, than from men working for the Government at a lower rate of pay. Mr. Brassey's experience—and perhaps there was no greater authority, at all events up to the time he was engaged in public works—was, that he got the same comparative results in all parts of the world, no matter what the wages were. If he got coolie labour in India at 25 cents a day, he got 25 cents worth of work, and, if he paid the English navvy $1.25, or 5 shillings, a day, he got $1.25 worth of work, plus the profit. While I, perhaps, pay in this case 25 cents a day more than the Government. I would expect to receive that additional return from my men on account of the wages being higher.

Mr. HAGGART. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) has appealed to me—perhaps I am not a good authority on the subject—I may say a word or two. The reasons for not doing this work by tender are, to me, the most extraordinary I have ever heard. Here is a crib that is being built, as the hon. member for Lincoln knows, in the Louise Basin, at Quebec. This is all the expenditure there is up to the present time. It is being built there, and it is to be towed down to the work. Up to that period, what reason is there why the work should not be let by contract? This cribwork was built on the ice in the Louise Basin, in the city of Quebec, where, above all places in the world, it could be let by tender and carried out under the supervision of the officers of the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You and the engineer differ on that. The engineer thought it should be done by day's work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to the question raised by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), although I am not an authority on this matter, I would cite the practice of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) as against his contention. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) let out a contract for cribwork a short time ago in the city of St. John, N.B., where there is greater depth of water and a greater tide.

Mr. DOBELL. They are not parallel cases.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It may be a defect on my part, but I did not appeal to the hon. member from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) as an expert in this matter.

Mr. DOBELL. No, but I feel perfectly satisfied from my experience of the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that he only wants to get at what is right, and that he does not want to deal in any vain imaginings. I merely wished to assure the hon. gentleman that the two works are not parallel, and I shall not interrupt him again.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was for the reason that I did not wish to indulge in any vain imaginings that I did not address my remarks to the hon. member from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). I know that he has some responsibility in this, for he apparently employed the men and fixed the wages.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, he was the gentleman who furnished the name of Lemieux when the hon. Minister did not remember it. Lemieux was one of his own employees, and having got Lemieux employed it is only fair the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) should see the Minister through it. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) were a better authority on the subject his view would be valuable, but I think the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is a more serious man to tackle on cribwork, and that without any disparagement to the hon. member (Mr. Dobell). Now, I am an absolute tyro in these matters, and I know no more about them than does the Minister

of Marine, but I point out that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), who has expert advisers also, gave a contract for cribwork at St. John where the water is deeper and the tide stronger than at the Traverse. Does the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) now say, that we are running a risk at St. John and that it would be better to do the work there by day's work ?

Mr. GIBSON. They not only have the tide at the Traverse, but they have a current also, which is not the case at St. John. I suppose the cribwork the hon. member refers to at St. John is the wharf.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Then the circumstances are entirely different. I was not aware until the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) told us, that this cribwork was built and towed down the river and put in its place, and my judgment is that the Government did perfectly right in building it at a point where the timber could be got easier and cheaper, and the question of towing was a matter of very small importance. What I tried to point out was, that the Government ran the same risk, comparatively speaking, whether they let this by contract or did it by day's work. If let by contract the Government would have to pay the contractors every month 80 or 90 per cent of the total cost ; and if perchance a storm arose and the cribwork was wrecked while being towed, the contractor would have to repair it, it is true, but suppose he was not able to do so, the Government would have to replace it in the end at the country's expense. In my humble judgment the Government have taken a wise course, although it may not be according to parliamentary practice in doing this work without tender. I have not seen the place and do not know the circumstances, but generally speaking when a reputable engineer makes a recommendation of this kind ; when a trustworthy engineer of the Government tenders this advice to the Minister, I consider that the Minister either has to take the recommendation of his engineer, or discharge him as being unfit to give the advice. If any criticism is offered on the fact that the Government are paying extravagant wages, I wish to state here that the Government are not even paying the current wages that are paid to like workmen in other parts of Canada.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not raise any point about the wages paid. I rather inferred that Lemieux was got cheap, and that the men were got cheap for good work.

Mr. GIBSON. So they were.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Too cheap, I thought.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister gives the excuse of urgency for dispensing with Parliament altogether in this matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not dispensing with Parliament ; I am appealing to it now.

Mr. FOSTER. After you undertook the whole expenditure.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No ; we are only beginning the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister (Sir Louis Davies) said that his engineer recommended that if the work was not done before the ice went out, it could not be done at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What I said was, that it might cost three times as much.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I have experience in that kind of work, and I know that cribwork can be done as well on the water as on the ice. You start the bottom in the water, and all you have to do is to build up. I have sunk a great many piers, and I prefer doing it in the summer season than doing it on the ice, because you will do more work in a day in summer than you will in winter. There is no question of urgency about the matter at all. When the Liberal party was in Opposition, their charges rang through the country against the Conservative Government because they built the Curran bridge by day's work, but in that case there was urgency, for the work could only be done in the winter when navigation was closed. This is a case which has been standing for years and years, and it is only now they find it urgent to spend $70,000 or $80,000 on a lighthouse. If the Government is going to act in that way there is no necessity for a Parliament at all, and we might as well pack up our trunks and go home. I state here that the engineer of the Marine Department will not make a statement in writing that it was absolutely necessary to start this cribwork on the ice, for I say as a practical man, that you can do it as cheap in summer on the water as you can in winter on the ice. The engineer will not contradict my statement in that. There is no question of urgency at all in this case ; it is simply a job, and a job worse than the Curran bridge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the case of the Curran bridge the money was voted by Parliament, but in this case the money is spent and given to political friends of the Government before being voted by Parliament. My friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)

has a man in his employ, and he says to him: We will get you a job from the Government at $4 a day constructing cribwork, and you will have the pleasure of hiring the men, and you will keep the time and everything else. That is the way the money of the country is spent. There has been a light-ship there for years. Why not keep her on until you can consult Parliament to see whether Parliament is willing to change that and build a crib-pier at an expenditure of $75,000 or $80,000. But these hon. gentlemen undertake to expend this large amount of money without tender, among the friends of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) justifies that, although when he sat on this side of the House he condemned the late Government if it let a $100 job without tender. When the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was in charge of the Marine Department, the Gananoque Narrows light, late in the fall of the year, was moved by a big storm. The engineer came down to look at it, and he decided that the only way to protect it was by placing one or two hundred cords of hard stone, hardheads, around it. These could be purchased from the farmers at from 50 cents to 60 cents a load; yet he would not allow that to be done under the inspection of a man he could name, during the winter, when the farmers could haul the stones on their sleighs and dump them on the ice. He called for tenders and the contract was let at, I think, 60 cents a load. But the ice was so bad that the work could not be done till the spring, when the stones were carried to the light in boats, and dumped in the river. This was a $200 job which the Minister would not let except by tender; but here is a job of $80,000——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the hon. gentleman talking about? No one has mentioned $80,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the bills come in, I think the hon. gentleman will find that the total will not be much less than $80,000. I would like to see the report of the engineer who said that this work had to be constructed in the winter time on the ice, because I do not think any engineer of standing will say that it was absolutely necessary to start the work on the ice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody said it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman made that statement a short time ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say anything of the kind. I made the statement that it would cost very much less if started on the ice.

Mr. TAYLOR. That that is the recommendation of the engineer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that was the cause of the urgency. Why not wait for Parliament, which was in session in March, and then make the statement that this work was required? But the hon. gentleman has admitted that he wanted to give his friends in Quebec West an opportunity of employing Mr. Lemieux. My hon. friend near me will inquire who Mr. Lemieux is. He gets the job, and then the Minister comes here and lays the blame on the engineer of the department, charging him with being responsible for starting this cribwork in the winter. I would rather do the job in the summer, when you can work for ten hours, than in winter, when you can only get seven or eight hours' work. You can do the work cheaper in summer than in winter. That is my experience of crib building. I prefer doing it in water to doing it on ice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) if any one recommended Mr. Lemieux before he was put in charge of that work. Then, I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the House if Mr. Lemieux is a brother or relative of the hon. member for Gaspé?

Mr. DOBELL. If the hon. member had heard what I said, he would know that I volunteered everything I knew about Mr. Lemieux. I believe he is no relation whatever of the hon. member for Gaspé. I never asked, but I feel perfectly satisfied that he is not. I never even asked him whether he was a Conservative or a Liberal. I never do ask that question. I have not quite got over my prejudice for liking many good Conservative workmen, if they are better than Liberal workmen, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman who spoke before (Mr. Taylor) could make up such a tissue of misrepresentations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DOBELL. I take it back, and I say a tissue of misstatements. I have been so dazzled by the eloquent but imaginative words that have proceeded from the opposite side, that I have almost been afraid to speak. But the hon. gentleman's inaccuracies, I will call them, were perfectly marvellous in their development. They began at $20,000, they crept up to $30,000, they went on to $40,000, and they finally finished at $80,000. That shows what is gained by eighteen years' experience. I have only had one or two years, and I have no doubt that if I could acquire the same power of exaggeration, this pier instead of costing the $40,000 would easily be increased to what the late

Minister of Marine and Fisheries estimated, viz., $70,000 or $80,000. But it is only going to cost $40,000, because it is being handled in a proper businesslike way, and the work is put in the hands of the right man. I will again bear testimony to the ability of Mr. Lemieux. I never knew a more experienced expert in wharf building. The building of this pier, which has to be taken down the river and placed just where it is wanted, is the work only of an expert. I do not think I need take up the time of the House. My position is that the pier will be built and sunk for $40,000. As there will probably have to be another of these piers built later, I venture to say that if you call for tenders for that, it will be found to cost twice as much as this one.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman say whether these are bottle-necked cribs?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), and I have come to this conclusion, that both he and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are trying to humbug the House. That is a serious charge, but I make it deliberately—that they are trying to humbug the House in connection with this proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Just before six o'clock, I wish to ask the Minister if he will fortify himself with the report of his engineer for the discussion after dinner?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are surely not going to carry this on after dinner?

Mr. FOSTER. I certainly am. This is the most extraordinary development of the whole thing, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sits there and thinks this is a trifle—a laughing matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not say anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman has not been in the House during the last two hours while this subject was being discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman thinks he is going to arrogate to himself the appropriation of public moneys without even bringing down to Parliament the report of his engineer on which he makes that appropriation, he is reckoning without his host.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never made any such assumption, and gave all the information necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any appropriation in the main Estimates for this work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not brought it before the House, although the main Estimates have been before the House for nearly two months.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman did not let me, but delayed business by his tactics.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows that if he wanted to bring that item before the House, he could have done so any time within the last two months.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. Minister a report from his engineer stating what the cost would be?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, $40,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This will be probably like the lighthouse on Manitoulin Island, for the construction of which tenders were called for, but after the tenders were received they were put aside as being too high, and the work was done by day labour, under the supervision of somebody recommended by the hon. member for Algoma, and my information is it cost half as much more again as it would have cost had the tender been accepted for its erection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman is right in that.

Mr. SPROULE. And the material was bought from the bookkeeper of the hon. member for Algoma, because it would not do to appear in his name, and among them they furnished the labour and succeeded in getting the lighthouse built at a cost a little more than half as much again as it would have cost had the lowest tender been accepted. I hope in this case it will not turn out that the bookkeeper of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is supplying the timber and some other of his employees the men. It will probably cost half as much more again as the estimate.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. member for Lincoln if, when referring to Mr. Brassey, who every one knows was one of the biggest contractors in the world, he stated that when Mr. Brassey employed Asiatic labour at a low price, he only got value for that price, but that when he employed English navvies, white labour, at double the price, he got double the work?

Mr. GIBSON. What I did say was that the experience of 40 years by Mr. Brassey, who is perhaps one of the greatest contractors England ever produced, and who was the father of the present Lord Brassey, he said that although he could get in India coolie labour at 25 cents per day, he only got from that labour 25 cents worth of work, and that when he paid the English navvies $1.25 per day, he got from them the full value in work.

Mr. PRIOR. That went to prove that it was cheaper to employ white labour at high prices than Asiatic at low prices.

Mr. GIBSON. The net result was the same.

Mr. PRIOR. Is that the hon. gentleman's experience ?

Mr. GIBSON. I have never employed Asiatic labour, but Mr. Brassey said he found the same conditions in every part of the world.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope the contractors on the Pacific coast will get to know this and act accordingly.

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

After Recess.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I had not the advantage of being present when the vote was first brought up, and I may have to ask one or two questions for information that have been already asked and answered. At what time did this work commence ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) explained that this matter was before the department some three years ago. About 18 months ago it came prominently before my notice, and I asked the chief engineer, Col. Anderson, for a report on the probable cost. His estimate then was $60,000 to $70,000. Not feeling at liberty to recommend so large an amount to my colleagues, the matter was left over, until my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) commenced to press it upon me very strongly, stating that unless something was done, the insurance rates on the St. Lawrence would be largely increased. I told him I would bring the matter before the House last session, and did so in a general way, stating the amount of Col. Anderson's estimate and saying that during recess he would make a more careful examination personally and that I would not ask for a vote at that time. In the summer I instructed Col. Anderson to make a personal examination. He did so, and consulted with a number of men in Quebec who had knowledge of the cost of building such works and those who understood the cost of material. He was then prepared to revise his report. At that time the catastrophe we had feared occurred, and we were informed by the insurance companies in Montreal that the English companies were considering seriously the advisability of increasing the rates on the St. Lawrence. Col. Anderson reported that the work could be built for $40,000, and said if a part of it could be undertaken before the ice moved out, a great saving could be made. He reported also that owing to the character of the work, it could be best done by day's labour. I brought the matter before my colleagues and explained that my general vote, $45,000, for lighthouses, would not be sufficient to do the ordinary work and at the same time pay the amount for this work that would be called for before the end of the year ; but I thought there would be plenty of time to obtain a vote from Parliament, as I had explained the matter to them last session, before very much expense had been incurred in the work. They agreed to that, and Col. Anderson was authorized to proceed with the work.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the date of the authorization ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was after I got back from Washington, and before the ice left—I suppose in the month of March. Col. Anderson went to Quebec and made arrangements with Mr. Lemieux to do that portion of the work which had to be done on the ice. That work has proceeded, and it is to pay for that, and to pay for the cost of conveying the woodwork down to the spot, that I ask for this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. When did Mr. Lemieux commence his operations ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As soon as authority was given. I may say that I lost no time after the House met in putting the House in possession of the facts. Early in the session, in answer to some questions across the floor of the House, I stated these facts and said on the supplementary Estimates I would ask for this vote. I might have asked for an increase to the general vote, but thought that this was special work which should be specially voted. In the meantime, deputations had waited on me in the insurance interest in Montreal, pressing the national importance of the work in view of the extraordinary increase which had been made by the insurance companies. I received a communication—a private one, it is true—from Lord Strathcona, pointing out the tremendous importance of assuring Lloyds in England that we were doing everything that was possible. I answered him that I would press the matter upon my colleagues and would also recommend it to Parliament at the earliest possible moment. This is not a party matter ; it is looked upon by all sides of politics as a vital work in the interest of the shipping interest, and in the interest of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I thought I would be justified in going on with the work by day's labour in accordance with the advice of the chief engineer, coming to Parliament at the earliest possible moment for the necessary funds. Of course, I cannot pay the bills if the money

is not voted. There are some things, such as wages, that can be paid out of the general vote that will have to be recouped when this is voted. There is more interest in this work, not only here but in England, than I could possibly express to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). Even within the last fortnight I have received numbers of letters from gentlemen interested in insurance rates on the St. Lawrence, pressing upon me the importance of this and kindred works. I am sure that if my hon. friend reflects he will not take any stand against this Government providing all necessary aids to navigation to the great city of Montreal. The hon. gentleman knows that in some cases, after votes have been submitted to Parliament and before they have been actually carried, the Auditor General has taken that as sufficient justification to allow the expenditure to go on. That is stretching the technical constitutional rule; but I am quite sure that in proceeding with the construction of a public work which will meet with the approval of both sides, particularly when I proceeded in accordance with the advice of the chief engineer, I acted in the public interest, in view of all the circumstances. It is not a great deal, in comparison with the total cost of the work. I have now, not in the main Estimates, as I was inadvertently misled by a statement of my deputy to say, but I have put in the supplementaries for the coming year a provision for the additional $20,000 really given to us. The work, which a few years ago was estimated to cost $75,000, will now be finished for at least $40,000; and, when it is done, the general opinion is, that we will have prolonged the safe navigation of the St. Lawrence for a period varying from a fortnight to over three weeks in the autumn. I need not say to my hon. friend what an immense advantage this will be, not only to the commercial interests of Montreal and Quebec, but of the Dominion generally. I would appeal to my hon. friend on higher grounds. I acknowledge there is a good deal of force in the criticisms which have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the impropriety of any work being undertaken by any Government until full authority has been given by Parliament. But last year we discussed this matter pretty fully in the House. I told them what it was my intention to do, if the engineer made a report and brought the sum down to a reasonable figure; and, if I was able to pay the sum which up to the 30th of June would be required to pay for this work, out of the general vote of $45,000, I would be strictly and technically within my rights. It will exceed that amount; therefore, I come to Parliament. But I did not wait until the Estimates came down. I told the House, in the early part of the session, that I was going on with this work, exactly what was being done, and that I would bring down, at the earliest possible moment, in the first supplementary Estimates, a vote to defray the necessary expenses up to the 30th of June. If I had not done that, I would have had to provide for a lightship for this year; the present one could not go on beyond the year, and I would have had to put a vote in the supplementary Estimates for this year. So that I had to choose between building a lightship, or constructing a permanent light; and I had to make up my mind upon constructing it, even although I had to incur liabilities for an amount beyond what was within my vote, within my control by the vote of Parliament, and I would come to Parliament at the earliest moment and ask them to give me a vote for the necessary expenditure up to the 30th of June. Really, there is no difference of opinion on either side of the House as to the absolute and pressing necessity for the work; and I cannot see, under the circumstances, how I would be justified in letting it stand over until after a vote in the Estimates for next year was obtained. I, therefore, would urge upon my hon. friend to look at the matter from a reasonable standpoint.

Mr. FOSTER. Could my hon. friend refer me to the "Hansard," where he took the House into his confidence?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot at this moment. I thought my hon. friend would recollect it. I mentioned, last year, that the sum estimated by the engineer was so large that I had not made up my mind to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman said he had discussed the matter in the House before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I brought it to the notice of the House, and stated that I was going on with the work now, and that, when I brought down the supplementary Estimates for the year, they would contain a vote to cover this very amount. I did not lose an hour on the very first feasible opportunity of bringing it before the notice of the House. I think, therefore, not only with reference to last year's debates, but with reference to the statement I made this year, that I have taken the House into my entire confidence. I am sure my hon. friend who has been my predecessor in this office, will recognize how essential it is that, in a technical matter of this kind, the Minister for the time being should be governed largely by the advice of his engineer. I have no hesitation in saying, that I am fortunate enough in possessing in Col. Anderson a man of great experience, of great common sense, a man who has a thorough understanding of the necessities of navigation and a desire to keep well within constitutional rules also. There may be some question in the mind of some hon. gentleman, whether every kind of work, good, bad, or indifferent, should not be let by contract; but I will say this, that not only myself, but each

of my predecessors, as far as I can make out, has, time and again, on the advice of Col. Anderson, the chief engineer, when he thought a lighthouse could be built better and cheaper, and that it was in the public interest it should be built by day's labour, under the supervision of the officers of the department, instead of by contract, he has let the work in that way, and it has been in the public interest to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman the report in his department, stating that the lightship was no longer fit for use after this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I have not got that here, but I tell my hon. friend that such is the case. It was a question last year, whether we should continue that ship this year. It is very old, and could not go on with safety. Last year we had to remove that vessel very early in the year because of the ice, and the danger of leaving her there after the ice comes on.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost of the cribwork?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not the exact amount of the cribwork estimated here. But it is now finished, and we can do nothing more until we get a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be somewhere near $20,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would judge, from what my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has said, that it must be one-half of the total cost, or about that sum.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister a report of the engineer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My deputy told me he would have it here, and I will give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will credit me, when I say, that not a single word I am going to speak, with reference to this matter, is in a party sense at all. But I must say, that, when I came in this afternoon, and heard the discussion going on, I was very much disappointed, because I thought that, on the face of it, one of the first rules of parliamentary appropriation was violated by my hon. friend, and I have looked to him, of all the members of the Cabinet, not to do that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The first question I asked Col. Anderson was this: Will our general vote of $45,000 enable us to do the work, if it is necessary to be done up to the 30th of June? I cannot spend beyond $45,000. Well, he said, I do not think it will. And so I decided to go on, and come to my colleagues to see if they would authorize me to go on with this work until Parliament met. I did this in consideration of the enormous saving it would be to the public, and in consideration of the fact that the present lightship could not go on another year, and that I must either provide a permanent lightship or a new one. I was told by him that to provide a proper lightship of the modern style would cost in the neighbourhood of $60,000 or $70,000. There was not a shadow of doubt that the public interest demanded that a permanent lightship should be built, if it could be done.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not discussing the relative merits of the lightships. I was going on to say something else. I know that we are partisans, all of us, and the best of us are probably too much partisans; but, when you come to the administration of matters financial, I think it ought to be a pride and the honour of leading public men on both sides to see that the well-understood principles of appropriation and expenditure of money are carried out fully, and according to the precedents, and according to the rules.

Now, I was myself in the Marine Department for several years before I undertook the Finance Department, and I became acquainted with this question of the Traverse lightship and the investigations which had, to a certain extent, been carried on as early as that relative to the merits of the two. In the first place, when I came into the department, I found a well established tradition. There was annually an amount of from $30,000, or $40,000, or $60,000 put aside for the building of additional lighthouses and lightships, and it was the tradition of the department before, and I immediately followed it up, that the moment an estimate was brought before the House to be voted on by the House the Minister was to lay on the Table a list of the lighthouses that he proposed to build with that $30,000, or $40,000, or $60,000. I never considered, as they had never considered before, that it was doing what was proper to be done to go outside of the statement which was made on the taking of that vote. Neither did I ever get a vote without giving that information to the House. That is to say, in the matter of new buildings the House asks to be seized of what it is proposed to do so that it may hold the Minister to account for doing what he proposed to do under the vote which he had obtained. There were two very dangerous points; the Murr Ledges on the south coast of New Brunswick and Traverse in the St. Lawrence. These two were very difficult places. In reference to these two the best attention of the department was given to them for several years, and the question was considered as to whether a permanent construction or a lightship

would be the better. In reference to the Murr Ledge we need not speak now, because that is not under discussion, but in reference to Traverse, there were two opinions as to whether a lightship would be better, or whether a permanent construction would be better. Everybody agreed that a permanent construction would be better, but there was a very great question and doubt as to whether a permanent construction could be made which would be secured within what might reasonably be appropriated for that purpose. Although it was understood in the department that it would be wise to spend even a large sum of money if you could assure a permanent and stable construction, there was always doubt, as to whether it could be made, with any fair contribution from the treasury, permanent or not. But it would have been the last thing that I should have thought of doing, in any way at all, not only to build a permanent construction on the Murr Ledge or at Traverse, but even to undertake a new lighthouse, unless something had been destroyed, and I thought it was absolutely necessary to replace it, without having been authorized, without having made a full statement, and having it discussed before the House. What has the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries done? He comes down here, fifteen days before the financial year closes, and asks for a vote of $20,000, all of which is to be expended by the 1st of July, the inference being that the work that has been done is pretty closely up to the $20,000 mark or will be within a few days. It does not make any difference, in principle, as to whether it is $500 or $20,000, although the House generally will give more attention to a large amount than it will to a small amount. The question then is really this: Without having advised Parliament, or getting the sanction of Parliament upon it, the hon. gentleman undertakes by Order in Council, to make an appropriation of what may come to $40,000, or what may exceed $40,000, by a large amount. I remember that in my time what was supposed would construct that lighthouse was between $60,000 and $75,000, and we never got lower figures from Col. Anderson than that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not either until lately.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember that explanation so that the matter has two aspects. In the first place I think it is utterly beyond doubt that there is considerable risk in putting this large amount of money into the form of a permanent construction in the Traverse. There may be a difference of opinion upon it; the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), may think that it can be placed there and will be permanent without serious risk or danger, but I think he will agree with me that we would be better convinced of that after a thorough trial of it. The Traverse is a very difficult and nasty piece of navigation; the current is swift and other difficulties, which my hon. friend well knows, import an amount of doubt into this question which makes it a public risk. When you add that to the other it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would not do his duty unless he came specially to this House and discussed the matter. Now, he knew he was going to do this. He brought down the main Estimates and he knew that he must make an appropriation for the work which would carry him after the 1st of July, which would appear in the Estimates of next year. He did not put any amount in the main Estimates for the Traverse lightship; he only put in what was the regulation amount. If there had been an idea in the hon. Minister's mind that within that $45,000 he was going to take some portion of it for the Traverse construction he should have informed the House of that, because it is a matter of great interest, and would have provoked a good deal of discussion. Anyway he would have had the benefit of the discussion of this matter at an early day. In the matter of so much importance the hon. Minister should not have left it in that condition. I should like to see the discussion upon this question which took place when it was discussed and find out for myself how far it went, but I know it did not go so far that it aroused the interest of the House, or led to any general discussion, and it certainly did not give the sense of the House in favour of constructing a permanent lighthouse, or doing that which was going to amount to $40,000 or $60,000. That is where, I think, the hon. Minister did not sufficiently weigh and give sufficient force to the salutary principle that is absolutely necessary for the good administration of any Government in a constitutionally governed country, that you must have the assent of Parliament and the vote of Parliament before you undertake to expend the people's money. You must have an authorization before you undertake to do it. The Minister sees the necessity for the thing; he is honest in building it; it ought to be done; he thinks great good will come out of it, but the case is an extraordinary one in which an individual Minister or a Government ought to go away from that rule. If they have been neglectful in not bringing it up in the proper time, then that is one of the inadequacies of administration, and they must suffer the penalty of that neglect and wait until they have time to bring it before the House in order to put it under way. It is so easy to start the ball rolling in this way of irresponsible appropriations that the very first one ought to be very carefully guarded against, and, as I said, I was disappointed when, this afternoon, I came here and found that this moot matter, involving so large a sum of money, was actually under way and practically

completed without having any adequate preliminary discussion or the assent of the House and before we were pledged to the carrying of it out. I am not disposed to carry this matter a bit farther than I think it ought to go, but I do want to say to my hon. friend, and as especially to him as to any one on the front benches, that it is in accordance with his standing, his reputation and his legal knowledge that he should be a veritable watchdog in this respect over some of his colleagues who are probably not as conscientious as he himself is in this matter of spending money; the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) for instance. I do not know how I formed that impression that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be very careful and strong upon a point of this kind.

Well, it is not the first case, and I suppose you can go back to other Governments and find where there are exceptions. I am ready to grant that ever and anon there will something occur which will make it absolutely necessary for the Government to father the responsibility of the expenditure of even a large sum of public money, but in this case it could have been avoided by a little more prevision on the part of my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies). If, when he found in March, about the opening of Parliament, that it was better to spend as a limit, $50.000 or $60,000, he had taken the first opportunity of discussing that matter in the House, he would have got the support of the House if his grounds were good—and I think his grounds were good if Mr. Anderson has been explicit in his recommendation in that respect; I think that because I have a great regard for Mr. Anderson's standing, and for his discretion, and for his knowledge as well. I do hope that on both sides of the House, we will strive to keep that fundamental principle as intact as it possibly can be kept. Now, as to the method in which this work has been done—and we will talk as man and man—could any case be more clear than the building of a cribwork above ground on certain specifications—Mr. Lemieux is not building it without specifications and plans definitely laid down by Mr. Anderson—could a case be more clear that any competent contractor could tender on that. The Minister lays a great deal of stress on supervision, but you would not give that work to a contractor without supervising him from day to day. You always have your paid inspectors to look after work, and you would undoubtedly have him for a construction on the Traverse on which so much depends both for the Minister and the department. They know it would be a serious blow to their reputation if they undertook to build a permanent structure there and afterwards found they commenced on a slippery foundation and came to grief. In this case you have all the specifications and plans as given by Mr. Anderson, and it is the plainest kind of thing to give a tender on. When you come to putting your cribwork down on the Traverse, there might be a question as to whether the Government had not better undertake that work with the aid of its own vessel; but so far as the $20,000 of cribwork is concerned, there never was a plainer piece of work for open tender than that. However, my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) says: We can do it just as cheap by day's labour, and if Mr. Anderson says it could be done by day's labour as cheap, I think we are justified in doing it. Well, you can stretch that too far. The officers of a department are simply men who recommend what kind of work should be done, and the details of its execution, but they are not the men to fix the public policy of the Government or of the department. Since confederation the rule has been laid down which all Governments were to abide by, that to all these large works the contract system should be applied.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a general rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is laid down by Order in Council, binding upon every department, and only in some departments is the method specified by which they can get out of it. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) will agree with me that since 1896 there has been, by open and implied statements of one Minister and another, and by practice, a slipping away from the principle of contract and tender. You might appeal to the labouring interests in that respect, you might say that you can do it in some cases just as cheaply by day's labour, but take it on the whole, any Government which embarks upon that system by way of experiment will find that the door is opened by the jobbing system to jobbery, and that although, under the contract system, through lack of supervision, you may find work scamped, yet you will also find that the contract system will give the best general results. Have good supervision, then let the work by open tender, and take the lowest responsible contractor. Every once in a while we hear a Minister say: I think it can be done cheaper by day's work, and I shall do it on my own responsibility. Well, Mr. Speaker, we must have some principle to go upon, and you may depend upon it the safe principle is that of tender and contract. You will find objection to be urged against any system, but much less objection can be urged against the system of tender and contract than against any other. Granted, times of stress, granted political aspirations and political wishes—and they are always around us—the Minister who is open to giving a job to whomsoever he likes by day's work, is not only going an uneconomical way about it,

but he is leaving himself open to certain pressure, which may be exercised upon him, to the detriment of the interests of the country. I hope I have not said anything unnecessarily strong; indeed, I have not discussed this matter from a party point of view, but I do wish to impress upon the leaders of the Government—I suppose it is a work of supererogation for me to do so—that they ought to be careful of the general traditions and underlying principles of good financial administration in the matter of the expenditure of this country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), absolutely and unreservedly, that the past traditions of the Marine Department in that regard have been scrupulously carried out by myself. I cannot hope to have, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would not expect me to have, the knowledge and experience which Col. Anderson has in these matters, to enable me to judge whether in an exceptional case the general rule, which is a good one, should be departed from. Last year I was called upon to build three or four lighthouses on the Alaskan and British Columbian coasts, leading up to the Lynn Canal, and Col. Anderson, who had made a special visit on my instructions, reported to me that in his opinion, and beyond any peradventure, it would be madness to let that work by contract. They were too far away from the centres where material could be provided, and he recommended that we could do a great deal better by our own ship and our own men than we could by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite different. This is close by.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said to Col. Anderson: "We will build them just as you say." We did build them, and I think they have given satisfaction, and have been built a great deal cheaper than they would have been if we had built them by contract. The first thing we talked about was the necessity of calling for tenders. Col. Anderson was very strong the other way. He said it was a special case in which he would unreservedly advocate building the pier by the department under our own officers. He said: "If you called for tenders, the margin of risk is so great that an enormous sum would have to be added to the cost by the contractor."

Mr. FOSTER. There is no margin of risk in building the crib.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The building of the crib is a small part of the work by the time you get it down and loaded with stone. We hope to have it down by the 1st of July. I can assure my hon. friend that I had Col. Anderson, not only in consultation, but a formal written report from him, advising me strongly to do this work under the supervision of the department. We have had Mr. Noble down there, one of the best men, to superintend the work, and Col. Anderson has made visit after visit there; and we shall have the advantage of having Col. Anderson's assistant engineer, who is at work in connection with the placing of buoys in the St. Lawrence, within reach of this work, so that he can examine it from week to week. It is a great and important work, one of the biggest the department has ever undertaken. Col. Anderson thought—and I yielded to his judgment unreservedly—that in the public interest we should take the responsibility of doing the work ourselves. I know that not only on this side of the Atlantic, but on the other side, at Lloyd's and other places, they are waiting anxiously to know what we will do in regard to this and other kindred works. The hon. gentleman knows that we have entirely reconstructed our work on the south-east coast of Belle Isle; we are building another work at Flower Ledge in the Straits of Belle Isle; and we are building this third work in the Straits of the St. Lawrence. I am in hopes that these works will be proceeded with, with promptness, energy and despatch, so that those parties may know that everything possible has been done by us to give such aids to navigation as will do away with the prejudice, the unreasonable prejudice, which exists against the safe navigation of these waters, and to put the shipping of the country in such a shape that it can insure its vessels at reasonable rates. I cannot impress too much on hon. gentlemen the importance which is attached by the shipping interests to this business. I am pressed, not only weekly but daily, to get the work pushed forward; and my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell), who, perhaps, is more responsible and more looked to than any one else in matters of this kind, has never let a day go by since I returned from Washington last March, without bringing me letters from men at Lloyds, and from commercial men of Quebec and Montreal and other places, urging the great importance of pressing forward this work at once. For a long time Col. Anderson did not yield to the belief that this work could be done for less than $70,000; and while he held to that estimate, I hesitated. I could not bring myself to recommend to my colleagues to appropriate so large a sum. But while I was at Quebec last year on the Joint High Commission, my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) pressed the matter upon me again and again, and asked that Col. Anderson should be brought down to examine the ground again completely, and make a new and thorough report; because he was satisfied that the work could be done for a very much less sum. Col. Anderson came down, examined it, and made his report; and when he satisfied himself that the work could be done for $40,000, my mind was made up at once, that instead of building a new lightship we should build a

permanent lighthouse; and I am satisfied that the whole commercial interests of Quebec and Montreal, and the insurance interests on the other side of the Atlantic, will be a unit in saying that we have done the right thing and done it at the right time; and if in doing it we have somewhat stretched the constitutional rule, I would ask my hon. friend, in view of the importance of the work, not to oppose it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to put a few questions to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who is the practical man of the Government. In the first place, I would like to ask him the size of the crib.

Mr. DOBELL. I would answer my hon. friend, though really the remarks he made this afternoon about the course I adopted——

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend will answer the question—I have two or three more to put to him—he can discuss the matter afterwards.

Mr. DOBELL. I am going to answer as I like. The hon. gentleman this afternoon went out of his way to reflect on me without the slightest reason. No antecedents in my course should warrant him in saying that I put this man Lemieux on the work because I wanted to find him employment. I recommended him to my colleague because I knew he would do the work well, and that he could be trusted to carry it out successfully. The crib is 100 feet long and 50 feet broad. It is 10 feet longer and 10 feet wider than I recommended, but Col. Anderson thought he had better be on the safe side.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I understand that the deep water is 25 feet, and the tide rises 17 feet, which makes 42 feet until you get above water?

Mr. DOBELL. That is right.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I presume it will sink 8 feet in the ground, and stand 10 feet above water; so that we would have to have a crib 60 feet high by 100 feet by 50 feet.

Mr. DOBELL. There is no chance of its sinking, because we found the bed rock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, 50 feet will cover its height?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the crib built of square timber? If so, of what quality?

Mr. DOBELL. The crib is built all of merchantable square timber, and is so built that the ice will not hold on to it. It recedes, so that the ice will pile up and fall over. That is, it is wider at the bottom and tapers towards the top, its average width being 50 feet.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has it centre courses, and if so, how many?

Mr. DOBELL. It is built so solidly and so strong of timber that the only difficulty they feared at the time was that they could not sink it. But they have provided for this and I feel sure it will be a success.

Mr. TAYLOR. What size are the pockets for stones? Are the timbers 10 feet square, 6 feet apart or 12 feet apart?

Mr. DOBELL. Really, I have not the plan in detail, but I know that it is specially strong.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume my hon. friend has seen it since it has been under construction, and he can tell me the size of the pockets for the stonework. He can give me a general idea.

Mr. DOBELL. I would say that they are from 10 to 12 feet square.

Mr. TAYLOR. In that case there would be five courses of timber one way and 12 the other way. Then, the Minister says there is $20,000 expended on that work already.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said, that by the 1st July there would be $20,000 required.

Mr. TAYLOR. What kind of timber will be used—pine, spruce or oak?

Mr. DOBELL. All below low-water is either hemlock or spruce. There is nothing better than hemlock under water. Above water, yellow pine and other timbers adapted for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope that neither yellow pine nor any other soft wood would be put above water. In erecting a lighthouse, surely the Government will use the best quality of oak. I understand that on the pier a house is to be erected.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood that about $20,000 would be spent this month to pay for the cribwork, and towing it down, and sinking it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any contractor will furnish the woodwork of this size and description, if the contract is let by tender, for $10,000, and make a good profit—100 x 50 and 50 feet high, with timbers crossing every 10 or 12 feet. Calculate the quantity of timber and figure it up per thousand, and where will the hon. gentleman put one-half of $20,000.

Mr. DOBELL. Is the hon. gentleman going to scold us because it is not costing enough?

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend says that $20,000 is already spent on the crib.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said that I am instructed that $20,000 will be required by the 1st July.

Mr. FOSTER. That can only be for the crib and towing it down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And putting it in its place.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much has been expended to date ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell, because the liabilities are there yet to be paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. gentleman brought down the plans and estimates made by Col. Anderson ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have brought down the report, and will read it, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much has been paid already ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot pay until I get the money. There may be a small sum paid for wages, out of the general maintenance vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What amounts are due at present ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell, but I am instructed that it will require $20,000 by the 1st July. The report is dated 4th November, 1898, and is as follows :—

I have made a thorough inquiry into the question of replacing the two lightships in the Traverse of St. Roch, River St. Lawrence, below Quebec, by permanent lighthouses on piers, and, in accordance with instructions, I submit the results.

General Description.—The Site of Lighthouse.

The Traverse is a critical point in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the deep-water channel being only about a quarter of a mile wide for a distance of three miles, with a 7½-knot current running through it, partly in a diagonal direction. Being in a wide part of the river, with submerged flats, four miles wide each side, it has always been necessary to mark it well, and from its position range lights on shore have not been practicable. It has, since 1836, been marked by lightships, one at the upper and the other at the lower end, on the south or port side of the channel. The lower lightship is a staunch iron vessel, and carries a powerful steam-whistle. The other is a wooden vessel, and is practically worn out, and must be soon replaced.

Mr. FOSTER. This dispenses with only one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

The development of the trade in the St. Lawrence has of late years induced shipowners to run more risk in attempting to navigate the river earlier in the spring and more particularly later on in the autumn than used to be thought prudent. This condition has given rise to complaints against the lightships, on the ground that they cannot be put out sufficiently early nor left out sufficiently late to accommodate the shipping. The department has consequently been urged to replace one, if not both, of the lightships by more reliable and permanent structures.

On three occasions, the last time in August last, I have taken soundings and have examined the bottom in the neighbourhood of the two lightships to test its suitability to receive the foundations of piers. In both localities it is of mud, apparently overlying shale, and with good level terraces in about four fathoms at low water. Near both lightships spots with only two fathoms can be found, but I fear these would not be sufficiently near the channel nor sufficiently in line to be satisfactory, and the bottom there appears to be more uneven in surface and in texture.

To build piers in 24 feet water at low-water springs, which would give about 41 feet at high-water, piers with large bases would be necessary, and to resist the very strong current and the probability of field-ice, weight and stability are essential. The conditions at each end of the Traverse are practically identical, except that a powerful fog-alarm would be required at any establishment at the lower end, while none would be necessary at the upper end.

The cheapest piers, and the most easily built, would, of course, be of wooden cribwork, filled with loose stone ballast, and for work below low water mark I would recommend this construction. No matter what description of top-work was adopted, above water the question is somewhat difficult to decide. For permanency and efficiency, a steel casing lined with a thick wall of concrete, and a concrete deck, would be best ; but this plan would materially increase the cost of erection beyond that involved in using timber-work throughout. From what I have seen of old wharfs in Quebec, I think the timber-work is fairly durable nearly up to high-water mark ; above high-water mark, or wherever it is subject to alternate wetting and drying, it decays very rapidly, say in ten to fifteen years, or at most twenty years, if extra good timber is secured.

From the fact that the Upper Traverse lightship is in such bad repair, it is urgent that we should build a pier at the Upper Traverse at once, and I think it advisable that a pier should also be built at the Lower Traverse if the necessary funds are provided, because it would be so much more reliable than any lightship, and would be at the station when the need for the aid is most urgent, and when a lightship cannot be kept there, at the very end of the season. With the tendency every year to extend the season, and to bring larger ships to the St. Lawrence, the necessity has become pressing. The cost of maintenance of a lightship, once established, is less than that of a lightship, while the cost of erection will probably not greatly exceed the first cost of a lightship.

I want to impress that on my hon. friend. I had to decide whether to build a new lightship or a permanent lighthouse.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why not repair the one there ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot ; it is worn out.

The necessity for a permanent lighthouse at the Lower Traverse is not so urgent as at the

upper end, because the lightship is a first-rate one, because the greatest risk is incurred in autumn, when steamships are leaving the river, and have to make the upper entrance first; and because a permanent lighthouse at the upper end, in range with Pillar's lighthouse, leads into the lower end of the channel, which can be navigated by working the two lights together. A second permanent lighthouse would, however, increase security and admit of improvement in the service.

That is a matter we will have to consider later on, in the years to come.

Finished plans for a pier or lighthouse have been designed, but from a rough estimate based on the cubic contents of a structure of suitable size, it is estimated that it would cost $40,000 for a wooden pier with a lighthouse, complete; or, if the portion above water were finished in steel and concrete, the cost would be increased about $20,000, but this change would probably prolong the life of the structure, without extensive repairs, three-fold. I recommend a wooden pier, with the top-work finished in concrete, surmounted by a wooden lighthouse and keeper's dwelling, as the best permanent investment, at either station. The increase in the size of the pier to receive a first-class fog-alarm, and the installation of the fog-alarm would probably add $10,000 to $12,000 to the cost of the Lower Traverse establishment.

I further recommend that the work be done by the department under its own direct supervision. If such work were done by contract the contingent risks would be so great that it would be necessary to put on a large margin to meet them, and the opportunities for slighting work of this kind would offer a great temptation to a contractor. If done by the department, good work and materials would be assured, and the cost would probably be less than by the contract system.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not see a word there about urgency.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The very word "urgency" is used. If I cannot convince my hon. friend, I will only have to give it up.

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says is that he hears nothing in that report about the necessity of building on the ice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This report was given me last November. I consulted the hon. member for Quebec West and said we would have to wait until Parliament met, when we would take a vote. He pointed out that we would lose a season, that the lightship would not last for another season, and that if something was not done the rates on the St. Lawrence would be increased. Then he told me that the work could be done so much cheaper by constructing the cribwork on the ice.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the date of that report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is dated 4th November last. I told Col. Anderson to consult with the hon. member for Quebec West and with those he recommended as having experience in this matter. They must have had half a dozen interviews. It was then suggested that Mr. Lemieux, an expert in these matters, should be brought up to the department, and I told them to bring him up. So my hon. friend Mr. Dobell, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Lemieux consulted. I was there and did what I could, though I do not profess to be skilled in these matters. After long consultation, Mr. Anderson told me he was satisfied it would be in the public interest and would save money to commence the cribwork on the ice.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand my hon. friend from Quebec West, the 42 feet of this pier is of hemlock and spruce.

Mr. DOBELL. Not the whole 42 feet. What is between low water mark and high water mark and is subject to changes, may require other wood.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no hemlock, then, above low water mark, 25 feet?

Mr. DOBELL. There may be for a tier or two above, but there is no timber above the 25 feet that the superintendent did not think perfectly safe. Above that is pine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Because, I can inform the hon. gentleman, if he puts in hemlock which is not covered by water all the time, that is wet sometimes and dry sometimes, it will not last more than five or six years. I have had experience in building wharfs. Now, I have figured out the cost and I will give the figures later on. But I would like him to explain, as a practical man, how this work can be done better on the ice than in open water?

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think it wants any explanation. I will appeal to the intelligence of any man in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Besides the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) himself, there are, perhaps, not more than half a dozen men in this House who ever built a crib.

Mr. DOBELL. I see the hon. gentleman has a perfect knowledge of this business. I begin to find I have a master of the art before me. Therefore, I must be careful. But I appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor); if there is an uneven bottom——

Mr. TAYLOR. But you explained that this was a level rock bottom.

Mr. DOBELL. No, not level. We had to frame the bottom of the crib so as to fit the place where it is intended to rest.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know how that is.

Mr. DOBELL. I did not know until I saw this work going on, and found they were fitting the bottom of this crib, much as a bootmaker would fit a boot for one's

foot, so as to fit exactly where it is intended to rest. Mr. Lemieux has engaged an expert diver who took his soundings and measured every foot, taking great care. I do not see how my hon. friend could make such a structure in the water.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I must say I am very sorry for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as well as very glad. I am sorry for the unbusiness-like way in which he seems to have conducted everything in his department that has come before the House to-day. He had a good reputation as a business man with us, but it has not grown since he came to Ottawa. He has had the engineer of his department make plans and specifications of a public work, and, no doubt, an estimate of the cost. The engineer has gone further and advised that it would be in the interest of economy to carry on this work by day labour. If I were in the Minister's place and my engineer advised me against my own judgment, I would rely on my own judgment and call for tenders, just as a man would do in his own business. The hon. Minister spends $40,000 of the public money without the sanction of Parliament. Why, the Queen of England cannot spend a pound of public money without the sanction of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman is putting himself above the Queen by spending $40,000 without the sanction of Parliament and without tenders. Urgency, he says! Why, where is the urgency? It is in building a crib 100 feet by 50 feet and 42 feet high. Any one who knows anything about timber knows that a crowd of men could build that whole structure in a fortnight. Is it being built in the open sea, where it is likely to be torn to pieces by the storm? Not at all; it is in a dock where there is not a ripple to disturb it. The urgency is that it should be built on the ice. Why, any man knows that it could be built more readily in the water than on the ice. In the water you can float your timber about as you require, slide it up on skids and bolt it down. The structure sinks as you build up. It is ridiculous to say that there was urgency to construct this on the ice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is evident that we have the wrong engineer in the department.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am not an engineer, but I have common sense enough to know that that is right. We are told that this is a matter of a technical nature and that nobody but an engineer can construct it. Why, there are a hundred and one people in the hon. gentleman's own constituency who, with the plans and specifications could build that structure. Technical work is all my eye. While I am sorry to see the Minister badgered, I think it is in a good cause, and that he will be more careful in future to let out work of this kind by contract. The same thing may apply to the matter under consideration in the early part of the day, when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House found fault with the prices that were paid for articles consumed on the schooners engaged in the fishery protection service and steamers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do not let us go back to that.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I wish to show that one thing is on a par with the other. Now, what do we find? I am not blaming the Minister of Marine and Fisheries more than his predecessors, but I say there is something particularly rotten about that whole business, from first to last. I have experience enough to know that there is great room for saving public money in regard to the supplies to these fishing schooners and steamers used by the department in protecting the fisheries. We find very ordinary seamen put on those vessels, and they are fed like fighting cocks, with jams, tomato sauce, sausages, macaroni, plums, lemons, syrups, oranges, vermicelli, catsup, marmalade, prunes, lamb, calves' foot jellies, bananas, evaporated cream, curry powder, figs, fancy biscuits and capers. Now, I say, that the larger portion of these things are wholly unnecessary for a service of that kind, and they are used in enormous quantities. In one instance there were 40 pounds of curry powder used, at 40 cents a pound. There is curry enough to make us all feel pretty warm, anyhow. There is something particularly loose about the manner in which public money is expended in this branch of the service. I want to say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that there is lots of room for him to show his business capacity in controlling the expenditure of public money in his department. Now, with respect to this cribwork. There have been no tenders asked for its construction. It will be constructed at the end of this month, and I think the next best thing the Minister can do is to ask for tenders for the placing of that crib in position, and the ballasting of it. They talk about $20,000 or $30,000 for the construction of that cribwork. I do not think it will cost any such sum. I should say, from my little experience, that $10,000, or $15,000 at the outside, ought to construct that cribwork. However, I do not want to confine the hon. gentleman to a few hundred dollars; but I think public money should not be squandered in this free fashion, without public tenders.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). It appears to me that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is talking to us, on this side of the House, as if we were not interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I want to tell him that we are as much interested in

the safe navigation of the St. Lawrence as he is, or as the Government of the day. But there is a principle involved in this question for which the hon. gentleman and his friends were great sticklers, when they were on this side of the House. I was sorry to see the levity the hon. gentleman manifested, when my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald) was talking about the supplies that were purchased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend must not object to my recognizing the humour of my colleague from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. COCHRANE. Humour! Well, Mr. Chairman, if he thinks it is humorous to pay double prices for luxuries for the men employed in the fisheries service that the farmers of this country have to pay for, he is greatly mistaken—these farmers that were bled white, as they said, when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House. You think it is very nice to tax the farmers more than double for luxuries for men that are not above them in position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that "Oh." But I understand that the farmers of this country do not feel disposed to pay for biscuits at 20 cents a pound, and then have the Minister come back and lay it on the Governor General, when there is a hundred pounds of biscuits. The Governor General never ate that amount of biscuits. I hope you will recognize that fact. Whenever you are brought to book for any extravagance, you get behind a Tory official. But now the hon. gentleman has—I was going to use the word "meanness," but I will refrain—he has the audacity, when he is brought to book, to say, that the Governor General used the biscuits. Just think of the state the farmers of this country were in, when the Tory party left office—bled white by an extravagant Tory Government, as asserted by the Liberals; and the Liberals would hardly allow us to breathe, unless we did it under contract. They come in, and propose to expend $40,000 without contract. They led me to believe, in my innocency—and I was as much led astray as was the contractor (Mr. Gibson), who spoke so feelingly this afternoon, and who found out that he was mistaken, as I was—they led me to believe that they were building this pier in the winter time at a place where they were going to put it this summer. But we find now that they were building it in a harbour where there was not a wave to disturb the peaceful breast of my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). I would not insinuate that that hon. gentleman would do anything wrong. I would not even suppose that he urged on the Minister to accept his advice. I would not consider that he had any influence with the Minister, when he sent his friend up to Ottawa to consult with the engineer of the Minister. I think it was an insult to his engineer to bring in outsiders that he did not know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is a colleague of mine.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why, the member for Quebec West is a colleague of yours; but this gentleman that he brought up to consult with your engineer, surely is not a colleague of yours.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must address the Chair.

Mr. COCHRANE. I beg your pardon. I addressed you when I began, and I did not expect that I would have to address you, every sentence that I uttered. But, if you want me to say, "Mr. Chairman," every time I begin a sentence, I will address the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that it is out of order to address himself to an hon. member.

Mr. CASEY. Do not say, "you."

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, where have you been all summer? I was just saying that this engineer, Mr. Lemieux, came up from Quebec to consult with the engineer of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Why did he allow Mr. Lemieux to come up? Was the Minister acquainted with him before he left? He shakes his head. Well, Sir, this genius from Quebec is equal to the occasion of building a cribwork in a bay where there is not a breath of air to ruffle the water. He came up and consulted with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) came up—I do not say that he had any motive at all; I would not suspect any such thing—but the fact is that he came up and got his friend to come up with him. He impressed the Minister to such an extent that he had a recommendation made by his engineer that it was necessary to construct this pier, he said, on the ice, although I do not find that in the report. I do not think it cuts any ice in the hon. gentleman's report. I would say it looks very much like a job, if it were not going to offend you, Mr. Chairman. If that expression is too strong I would be disposed to take it back, but I cannot help feeling that there is a job in it, not only a violation of principle, but there is a job put up for the hon. member for Quebec West to have his friend at $4 a day employed, and all the friends he sends down there. He said that he would have no objection to a Tory working there, but I venture the assertion that if there are Tories there it is on the understanding that they support the hon. member for Quebec West in the next election. If an

election were to come on in the near future, I suppose we would have the same job perpetrated that we had when the Western Block was being reconstructed. They had an election going on over in Wright, and they had hundreds of men from that constituency employed. I saw five men holding a ladder for one man to work on. If there is an election brought on before that pier is completed, I will venture the assertion that all the idle men in Quebec will be found working on that pier. I say to the hon. Minister that he should have regard to the burning words that he uttered in the past, and I admired him when he was on this side of the House, although I sometimes thought he was talking to the gallery with that innocent look that he assumes. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he does not feel it down in his heart that he has gone back on his public record in this House in consenting to such an iniquitous job as to carry on a work without contract. His conscience will trouble him, and to-night when he retires to his bed, and lays his head on his pillow he will realize how far a departure he has made from the principles he laid down when he was on this side of the House. I speak in all seriousness; I say it is unfortunate, and I am sorry to think that public men can be found in this country laying down sound principles while in Opposition, and then going back upon them when they get into power. What did the hon. gentleman do to-day? He presented a humiliating spectacle. He went back to the public records, and he appeared to me to be perfectly delighted when he found that a Tory Government had perpetrated an iniquity such as that which is charged against him. This is a case of the hon. Minister undertaking to build a pier which is going to cost the people $40,000 without consulting Parliament. What position is he in to-day? He tells us that he had to do it, that the old light-ship was worn out, but when we come to find out, the light-ship is doing duty to-day, and will be doing duty all this season. I am satisfied if the Minister had consulted Parliament and got an appropriation, and if he had let that work by tender, he could have had the work done as expeditiously as he will have it done without tender, and with less money.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Chairman, I would not have taken any part in this discussion had not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) seen fit to contrast the farmers of this country with the fishermen. I want the hon. gentleman to understand, at least, in so far as the courts of this country have decided the matter, that the farmers are much more purchasable than the fishermen, and that if he sees fit to make a distinction and set the farmer above the fishermen, he makes the biggest mistake he ever did. I can refer the hon. gentleman to the hon. gentleman on his right who understands what the fishermen are, and he will find that so far as intelligence is concerned, the fishermen of the lower provinces are not only the peers, but if there is any difference, the superiors of the farmers for whom he sees fit to speak.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say they were not.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I will refer the hon. gentleman to his colleagues from the lower provinces, who, unfortunately for the fishermen, happen to represent them on that side of the House on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman says that Conservative parties are purchasable when they get work. He understands that better than I, better than any other hon. member, and he knows whether or not they should be considered in this case as a purchasable party when they get work. He ought to know, and I have no doubt that he does. He understands exactly how it was done in other days.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are you referring to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If the argument meant anything, it meant that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), in getting men to work who were Conservatives was therefore able to purchase them.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I did not argue that.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; that is his argument.

An hon. MEMBER. Question, question.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If the hon. gentleman who calls question will just wait a moment I will reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane), because I understand that this is debate. It may be rather hard on the hon. gentleman who represents farmers to have this matter brought up, but I maintain that if the hon. member (Mr. Cochrane) proved anything it is that the Conservative party, if they get work, are purchasable. He cannot deny that. The hon. gentleman said that the farmers are more intelligent, and that the fishermen are inferior to the farmers. The hon. gentleman is on record, and I venture to say that he will find that the words that he uttered were just of that character.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The matter has gone beyond him now, and he knows it as well as I do. I want him to understand that these fishermen are the peers of the farmers of this country. In this country, composed of farmers and fishermen as it is, there is as much, if not more

intelligence represented in the same degree of life by the fishermen than the farmers for the reason that the fishermen and sailors go abroad and see the world more than other men in their position in life, and if the hon. gentleman thinks that the farmers are more intelligent he makes a mistake. I do not say this because I happen to represent a county largely composed of fishermen, although I am glad to make that statement just to show the men that sent me here, but I do say that so far as the fishermen are concerned they are as intelligent men as any in Canada.

As to the building of this work the hon. Minister has given an explanation. That explanation may not be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, but there is the explanation. I want to draw attention to the fact that, when any question is raised on the other side of the House as to an expenditure made in the regular way by the officials, it is a legitimate argument to say that hon. gentlemen opposite stood by an expenditure made in the same direction, and even to a greater extent, and never raised their voices against it. Is it not the fairest and best argument to point out, in making purchases now, according to the regular method pursued by the late Government, that hon. gentlemen did not find fault when their own friends were in power. It is not an argument to say that, if wrong was committed, wrong should be perpetuated, but it is a strong argument to say that the Government are doing in the regular way the legitimate work of the the Government, and in a way that hon. gentlemen opposite approved of when these expenditures were made by them. If that be the case, they are not in a position to find fault with us. So far as the fishermen are concerned, they can hold their own with the best in the country.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I am somewhat astonished at my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser), not only at the style of his address, but at the warmth with which he rose to defend the reputation and intelligence of the fishermen down upon the sea coast, whom nobody else in this House has mentioned in this debate with the exception of the hon. gentleman himself. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) tell me where the hon. member (Mr. Cochrane) slandered the fishermen ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysorough). I did not say he slandered them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, what has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) been complaining about ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I simply rose to say that he represented them as inferior to the farmers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) did not refer to the fishermen at all, and the effort on the part of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to get an occasion whereupon he might proclaim himself as a hero in defence of the fishermen, is altogether uncalled for. The fishermen were never mentioned in this debate, until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) mentioned them. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) stated that luxuries had been supplied to the crews upon the boats, which luxuries had to be paid for by the farmers of Ontario, and which luxuries the farmers of Ontario were not able to buy for themselves. That was the statement pure and simple, and if the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) can see in that statement of fact, slanders on the fishermen, which would give occasion for all his stormy and blasty indignation which he has fired off in defence of his friends and supporters the fishermen of Nova Scotia, I confess that gentleman has better ears than any other member in this House. The farmers of Ontario do not claim, nor do the people of Ontario claim, any superiority over any one, but the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) may remember the day and if he does not his colleagues will, when these Liberals used to attend meetings in the electoral campaigns in Ontario, and with tears the size of cricket balls rolling down their faces——

Mr. COCHRANE. Crocodile tears.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, crocodile tears ; they told the farmers of Ontario that they were being taxed and bled white on their binder twine, in order to give free binder twine to the ignorant and servile fishermen of Nova Scotia. Where was then the thunderous voice of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) in defence of the fishermen ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I was not there then. Who made the statement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) was not there, but he heard it stated many and many a time in this House.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I never did, and I want you to mention the name of any one who used these words.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not quoting now directly from "Hansard," but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) knows that time and again the Conservative Government were attacked for placing a tax on binder twine, while they gave free twine to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) need not resent the small statement of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) when he (Mr. Fraser) remembers that a certain gentleman whom he now follows in this House referred, not only to the province of Nova Scotia, but to the other maritime provinces, as "the shreds and patches of the Dominion," and not only that, but referred to the province of Nova

Scotia as "the dry nurse or the wet nurse of boodlers." I do not remember the thunderous tones of the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) being then raised in defending the fair honour of his province in this Parliament. Now, with regard to the matter which has been under debate; it appears to me that the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell) has been the adviser of the Minister of Marine all the way through. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) nods his head in assent. He has been the adviser as to the extreme importance of this work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) nods his head again. He has been the adviser as to the man who was to be selected to supervise the work. Let me ask him, did he advise that the work should be done by day's work or by tender?

Mr. DOBELL. I have no hesitation whatever in saying, that I believe the work is being done certainly from 30 to 40 per cent less than it could have been done by any other means.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) advised that it should be done by day's work?

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And very properly so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Solicitor General, of course, comes from the city of Quebec, and he, no doubt, quite agrees with his Quebec colleague. Now, after the hon. gentleman representing Quebec West, and the Solicitor General had both offered their advice, and the Minister of Marine had yielded to their importunities, may I ask the Minister if he himself has gone carefully into the figures with regard to the expense. We are told on this side of the House, that this crib work could be built for about $8,000 or $9,000, and the Minister tells us that up to the 1st of July he will require $20,000, and that sum, apparently, would cover nothing but the cribwork. It is a plain arithmetical calculation as to the number of feet, as to the value per foot, as to the number of days of labour required, and has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gone into that calculation with his engineer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I accepted the statement of the engineer that this is about the sum that will be required on the first of July. I could not do anything more than that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is very indefinite, but let me ask how far has the work progressed at the present moment?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) will know, and the officer of the department is here.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do as every other Minister does, I accept the statement of my engineer, that up to a certain date there will be a certain expenditure required, and upon his report I ask Parliament for that sum.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We want to know how far the work has progressed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The engineer is not here, but my deputy tells me that between the 20th and the 23rd of this month, the cribwork will be towed down to its place and the work of submerging commenced.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an important point for the future. We are to understand that the towing of the crib and the submerging of it is to be finished by the 1st of July?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the belief. It is upon that belief that this estimate is made.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is to cost $20,000?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So I am advised.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much will the towing down cost?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Quebec West will know.

Mr. DOBELL. About $250.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much will the sinking cost?

Mr. DOBELL. A great deal. It is to be filled with stone.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I venture to believe that it will not be filled with stone by the 1st of July.

Mr. DOBELL. Why not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. How is it to be done?

Mr. DOBELL. By stone thrown into the crib.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought at one time, by the figures given by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald), that it was going to be filled with currie powder, because $400 worth of currie powder seems to be more than sufficient to make all the currie required for the Governor General when he goes down there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman give me the authority on which he makes that statement, because he is putting it on "Hansard," and it will go everywhere.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was 400 pounds, and it is worth about a dollar a pound.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is making a statemnt for which he has no authority.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have made the statement which was made by the hon. member for King's only a few moments ago, and which the Minister of Marine did not challenge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman verified it ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I have not.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I say that there is a statement in the Auditor General's Report that 400 pounds of currie powder was bought at 40 or 50 cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On what page ?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I have not the page.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know nothing about the matter. I am only repeating a statement which was unchallenged when it was made by the hon. member for King's. Does the hon. member for Quebec West say that the sinking will be done by the 1st of July?

Mr. DOBELL. I did not say that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many cords of stone will it take ?

Mr. DOBELL. I really cannot tell you.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that the money will not be paid until the work is done.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that, but I want to know what the money is to be paid for. The hon. gentleman surely knows how many cords of stone it will take.

Mr. DOBELL. I feel perfectly satisfied with what was said by the late Minister of Marine, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), when he enjoyed that office, that he would have done this work if he had not found that it was so expensive. The lowest estimate he got for the work was $75,000. The Minister to-day tells you that it will be completed and put in its place for $40,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are you going to construct this work for $40,000, if you spend $20,000 on what is less than half the work?

Mr. DOBELL. Can you not leave it until you find what it is going to cost, and, if we fail, then bring up your charges. Let us go on with the work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The suavity, the generous confidence, and the supreme indifference which the hon. gentleman affects towards details becomes him very well; but the House looks at these matters, even though we are not just as practical men as the hon. member for Quebec West. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues have made statements before that have not been verified. We remember two or three years ago when, by the great offices of the hon. member for Quebec West, we were going to have a fast steamship line across the Atlantic. We almost heard the sound of the fog whistles of those bottle-necked steamships; and yet here we are, three years after the patient, earnest, constant, determined, forward-and-backward efforts of the hon. member for Quebec West, and we are no nearer the bottle-necked steamships than we were when the hon. gentleman began. He took the same position then that he does now. He showed the same supreme contempt for details and the same suave indifference to the questioning of the members on this side of the House when any one attempted to get some information from his superior knowledge of steamship matters; and now, after having been the close adviser, genius and guide of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to this whole question, the hon. member for Quebec West says: "Oh, why can't you leave this until a later stage, and see whether we are right or not." We have the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this work is only going to cost $40,000; but the Minister is unable to tell us what the opinion of his chief engineer is as to how that money is to be divided—how much is to go for cribwork, how much for stone, and how much for sinking. Has the hon. gentleman those figures now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has not those figures, and I submit, with all due respect to the officer he mentions—an officer for whom this side of the House has equal respect to his own—that it is an extraordinary proposition that a Minister of the Crown will spend money not yet voted by Parliament on a work as to the cost of which he has not a detail from the engineer on whose opinion he is basing his whole calculations. He ought surely to be able to tell the House how much is to be spent on cribwork and how much for superstructure. From whom was this timber bought, may I ask the Minister ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not give you the names.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. member for Quebec West can tell us ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, no. The accounts will be brought down. The hon. gentleman has been a Minister, and he knows that he never

saw such questions asked in Parliament before.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has a memory as short as a match. He sat on this side of the House for years, and I venture to say that there is not a question of detail which we have put to him that does not find a 200 per cent precedent in questions put by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House criticising the late Administration. Surely we have a right to ask where the supplies for this work were bought? Can the hon. member for Quebec West tell us who supplied the timber?

Mr. DOBELL. No, I cannot tell.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He cannot tell. I venture to say that he knows what the day labourers are paid.

Mr. DOBELL. No, I do not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did not the hon. gentleman recommend them?

Mr. DOBELL. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, that is a different policy from what is followed in most cases. But surely he ought to be able to tell us where the timber was purchased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was purchased through Col. Anderson and the agent at Quebec.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not by tender?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a case where tenders might have been called for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It had to be bought at the lowest market price for timber of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quebec is a business place where timber could be got at a short order, and there is no excuse for tenders not being called for that. I think it is material to know from whom the timber was bought, and the price at which it was bought. The market price in the mind of the Minister or the mind of the hon. member for Quebec West may be a shade different from the market price at Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The instructions were to purchase everything at the current market prices. I am quite sure my hon. friend will be satisfied that I am giving, frankly and freely, all the information I have, and I would frankly appeal to them that we might go on, as the matter has now been pretty thoroughly discussed.

Mr. SNETSINGER. I fail to see how hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side can complain with any seriousness of the course of the Government in this matter, when they contrast it with their own record. They spent a half a million dollars on Sheik's Island dams, and never called for tenders. They gave a contract without tender for a lock on the Cornwall Canal which cost a lot of money, and which has never had a crank turned on it yet; and those who built that dam made a large profit out of it. All this was done without tender, yet we have these hon. gentlemen protesting that this Government should not do $4 worth of work without calling for tenders.

Mr. MACDONALD. Did the Tories do right?

Mr. SNETSINGER. They did wrong; but it illbecomes these same hon. gentlemen to make such an outcry about these small matters.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I rise to say a few words on a subject that has been very fully discussed. I do not propose to deal with the extraneous subject that was debated by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). Fishermen are, I apprehend, as useful citizens as any other class of men. If the farmer ploughs the land, the fisherman ploughs the sea. If the farmer cultivates the land, the fisherman cultivates the seas. But I was rather struck by the reason given by my hon. friend from Guysborough why the House should accept his statement, that the fishermen are intelligent men. He asked the House to believe in their intelligence because they sent him here. Far be it from me to say, that the slander of the fishermen was on the Government side of the House, rather than on this, but I think that retort might fairly have been made by my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane).

I am not going to say anything with regard to the point that was so strongly put by my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), namely, that the Government had done wrong in departing from the rule that they should not spend public money without first coming to Parliament. That has been fully discussed. But, after hearing all that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has said on this subject, and after all that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) has said, I am still unable to understand why tenders were not called for. Colonel Anderson had clearly made specifications. That fact is admitted by the hon. member for Quebec himself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps my hon. friend was not here when I read Colonel Anderson's report. I acted on his special report that, under the circumstances and having regard to the peculiar character of the work, it would, in his opinion, be very much better done under the supervision of the department than by calling for tenders.

Mr. DAVIN. I was here when that report was read, but the one sentence to which my hon. friend refers, is at the close of that report, and it seemed to me to be a non sequitur. I did not see how it hung together with the previous part of his excellent report. It is perfectly clear that the department was in a position to ask for tenders. I am quite ready to admit the urgency, but again I ask, why were not tenders called for, because it cannot be seriously maintained that the delay which would result from the calling for tenders would be such as to materially interfere with the urgency. I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, after recess, make a long and eloquent plea to justify what he had done; but, if you look at the character of that statement, you will find that it bears a strange and striking similarity to those made by the Ministers of Trade and Commerce, and Agriculture, and Interior, and Militia, and by other Ministers, when apologizing for precisely the same official misdemeanour that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has apologized for to-night. When we protest against the Government letting out a large contract like this without calling for tenders, we cannot forget that there is not a department in that Government that, contrary to—I was going to say, law—contrary to the well-understood rule of procedure in these matters, contrary to what is due to Parliament, has not been guilty of the same offence; and in each case each Minister has had to make the same excuse, in each case we have had the same special pleading as we have had to-night.

For my part, I may tell you that in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, one of the strongest features in impression made against this Government —and there is a strong impression against it prevailing there to-day—is due to the fact that every department has been guilty of just such an offence as we are dealing with at this momment. How can the people feel secure that honesty will prevail in the administration of public affairs, when large contracts, amounting to $40,000 and $50,000, are given and no tenders called for? And in a case like this, as has already been hinted at by one of the previous speakers, we ought to be specially on our guard, more particularly at a time like this, because there cannot be the least doubt, notwithstanding the innocence of demeanour assumed by my hon. friend from Quebec West, that if we were on the eve of an election to-morrow, the fact that this work is being done by day labour by the Department of Marine, would be a temptation that certainly it would be difficult for that department not to yield to, to so manipulate that contract as to influence public opinion in the province of Quebec.

I need not point out the utter absurdity of the reasoning put forward by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). He said, that, because my hon. friend from East Northumberland referred to a well-known fact, a fact to be deplored, that there is not a constituency throughout the length and breadth of Canada—and I suppose, not in any other constitutionally governed country—in which there is not a certain set of men, belonging to both parties, who are liable to influences that, to say the least, are undesirable—that, therefore, my hon. friend from East Northumberland admitted that the Conservative party was purchasable.

Why, Sir, it is mere rhodomontade; it is pure nonsense. There are men professing Conservatism, just as every sensible man on the other side will admit that there are men professing Liberalism, men who are a disgrace to whichever party they profess to belong, who, instead of thinking of their duty as citizens, think how far they can utilize their privilege of citizenship to benefit themselves momentarily, to swell the number of dollars in their own pockets. I wish we could hold them up to well-merited reproach; I wish we could drag them from the obscurity in which they hide their infamy. But, to pretend our saying there are such men, is to prove that the Conservative party is purchasable, is as I say, the merest rhodomontade. Why, we know very well that here in Ottawa and in every place where public works are constructed, if those public works are administered by day labour instead of by contract, they can be manipulated so as to influence opinion, so as to affect the results of elections. And how can you prevent the public looking with suspicion on a transaction of this kind, and especially at such a time? For, however closely you examine what has been said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and by the hon. member for Quebec West, you can find no reason why tenders should not have been called for. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) has stated the rate of pay at $1.25 and $1.50 per day. Does he know what is being paid for the timber?

Mr. DOBELL. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) just now informs me that the price is 12 cents per foot.

Mr. DAVIN. Can the hon. gentleman say where it is being bought?

Mr. DOBELL. No.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman represents one of the constituencies of Quebec. We are told that this work will cost $40,000, constructed of timber and stone. No doubt it was such a structure as this, with a difference that was before the eye of the previous Ministers of Marine and Fisheries, and we know that if you add steel and other materials, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us will cost from $20,000 to $25,000 more, you bring up the cost to the $70,000 which was before

the mind of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We have no guarantee of what it will cost, except the probabilities held out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries speaking—I say it without offence—in a rather second-hand way, because he does not profess to know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I speak from the report.

Mr. DAVIN. We have only the probabilities thus held out as ground for believing that the work will be confined, even in its simplest form, to $40,000. We have the admirable speech of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who, speaking as a master in questions of this kind, threw light upon it for those of us who are laymen in matters of construction. He tells us he was accustomed to pay $1.75 a day, and quotes the well-known dictum of Lord Brassey that you get what you pay for. Now, is it not an inference that cannot be said to be presumptuous, but one that may be honestly made, and with the utmost respect for members of the Government, that paying $1.25 and $1.50 a day instead of having a contractor do the work with labour at $1.75 a day; and remembering, as we must, how we have seen, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says, men in strenuous idleness trying to put in time around some of these very buildings and grounds—is it not a fair inference, I say, that the men on this work will try to make the work go as far as they can, and that instead of getting value for what we pay, we shall find that we pay far more than we should have paid if we had handed the work over to a contractor, even if that contractor paid higher wages?

Now, I confine myself to that one point. There are grave objections besides that, but I confine myself to this one because it is one that has impressed me most. As I tell you, Mr. Chairman, after listening last session to the excuses of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), to the excuses of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), to the excuses from the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), to the excuses of other Ministers, for doing precisely the same thing, we are forced to the conclusion that it has become a system with our ministerial friends to transgress the cardinal rule that tenders shall be called for in all cases where possible. Therefore, Sir, it is our duty on all such occasions as this to call public attention to this attack which, being systematic, gathers a criminal complexion, to protest in the strongest possible language in this House, so as to emphasize the rule that is well established and well understood—although lately so much broken here—and, emphasizing that rule, to try to guard as much as possible in the future against similar misconduct and similar misdemeanours.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. member for Quebec West told us of the quality of timber being put into this crib. I would like to know whether the hemlock timber to which he refers is sawn, hewn or round, or in what condition?

Mr. DOBELL. It is square timber, but whether sawn or hewn, I do not know.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In stating the price at 12 cents, does he mean to say that squared hemlock timber costs 12 cents a foot?

Mr. DOBELL. I should say that for squared, sound hemlock timber, 12 cents is an exceptionally low price.

An hon. MEMBER. A cubic foot.

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the price of the pine timber?

Mr. DOBELL. I should say it would range from 25 to 27 cents.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Am I to understand that this cribbing is laid close joint or open joint?

Mr. DOBELL. I wish I could induce the hon. member to go down and look at the work. I am perfectly satisfied that he would be also satisfied with this work. I forgot to say that Col. Anderson said that he did not like to leave the building of such a crib to contractors, because any failure to have the timbers properly welded and bolted together in that pier might cause it to break up at an early date.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has Mr. Lemieux instructions to ask for tenders for the supply of stone?

Mr. DOBELL. I could not say. I believe he is taking measures to get stone from the farmers on each side of the river.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman knows that if this man goes round and buys stone from every friend of the Government in the neighbourhood, he will have to pay the price that is asked for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The price is fixed by the engineer here.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, the engineer here has no means to fix the price. The way to govern the price is to ask for tenders and see who can furnish the stone the cheapest. The hon. gentleman may be correct in doing the work by day's work, but the timber and the stone should have been obtained by tender and contract. Any one who knows anything about building work of that kind, knows that he can get material of that kind much cheaper under tender and contract. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to say what is the price fixed by the engineer, as he says the price is fixed by the engineer here?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a clause in this item 62 referring to an allowance to Judge Wilkinson in an investigation into charges against light keepers. There is a case reported in to-day's "Mail" newspaper to which I wish to call the Minister's attention, the case of a man named James Quicke.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that stand, because I have no information about it whatever. I will examine the records and will be glad to bring my hon. friend the information when I find it.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to ask him another question referring to the lighthouse on the Georgian Bay, known as Hope Island lighthouse. Two years ago the keeper was dismissed and a temporary appointee is entering on the third year of service. Does the hon. gentleman intend to make that a permanent appointment?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not given the matter any consideration. The present keeper was installed by the inspector, and I have let it rest. I will look into the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems extraordinary that the Minister should come, with the limited information he has given this House, and expect us to vote money in this way. He cannot tell how much stone is in the cribs, how much timber will be required, or what kind of timber.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said a careful estimate had been made some years ago by Col. Anderson, and he estimated the cost of this work in the neighbourhood of $70,000 or $75,000, on the assumption that the superstructure above low water was to be built of iron and cement. After consultation with Mr. Lemieux, the foreman, and after going personally to Quebec to inspect the wood work which had been under water for 80 or 90 years, he came to the conclusion that his first estimate was larger than it ought to be, and after revising his estimates carefully and going through them in detail, making another examination of the ground, and taking soundings to ascertain the exact description of the bottom, he made up his estimate and submitted it to me that it could be done for $40,000. Into the details of that estimate I did not go. I am not an engineer and I could not tell whether his estimates were right or wrong. But I know that Col. Anderson has been there for 30 years, and there is not an officer in the civil service that more deservedly enjoys the confidence of his chief than Col. Anderson. I have not found him astray in his estimates so far, and I appeal to the House if I was not bound to accept estimates so carefully framed, and which had been under Col. Anderson's consideration for nearly three years. I ask the hon. gentleman could I have done more or could I have given the House more information?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has gone to a good deal of trouble to defend Col. Anderson, against whom I have not said a word.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is his estimate that we have here.

Mr. SPROULE. What I was about to say, if the hon. Minister had listened to me, was that while the estimate may be all right, the time has nearly expired when this money may be spent. I understand that this money is required before June 30th.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twenty thousand dollars of it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the money must be nearly spent, or the hon. gentleman requires more to be spent in the next fifteen days. What I do complain of is the fact of the money being spent without any estimate being furnished to us as to what the work will cost, that the money has been practically spent up to the present, that more money is required, and that in the face of that fact that the hon. Minister requires more money immediately, he is unable to give the committee any information of what has been done with that which has been already spent. He says there has been so much money spent, but he cannot tell us how many cubic yards of stone or how much wood has been used, or what this stone or wood has cost. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) says that this is a most wonderful work, that it is like some of those clocks that you never have to wind, that he never saw anything like it. If we accept his own statement, he never saw anything like it before.

Mr. DOBELL. Go down with our hon. friend who has promised to visit the place.

Mr. SPROULE. I am referring to the hon. member for Quebec West, who professed to give information and to know so much about this work, yet when he was asked for details he had no details to give. He did not know from whom the timber was purchased. Some one was uncharitable enough to say that it might have been purchased from himself because he was in the timber business. I do not think the hon. gentleman would go into a transaction of that kind, but it might be done in the same way in which it was done on Manitoulin Island, where a large quantity of timber was purchased from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment), and put

in the name of his book-keeper, so that it would not appear as a transaction with that hon. member. There may be a suspicion of something of that kind going on down here, but I do not think that such a course was pursued in this case. I think the hon. Minister should have given the House more information, especially in view of the fact that this is not a work let by contract, although it could easily have been let by contract. In regard to Col. Anderson, the engineer of the department, I believe him to be an exceptionally good man. He has endeavoured to do his duty faithfully; I have not one word to say against him, and it is not with a view of discrediting the ability, the honesty or the integrity of Col. Anderson that I speak, but it is in regard to the limited information that the hon. Minister is able to give the committee when he asks them to vote such a large sum of money on the spur of the moment, most of it money which has been already spent.

Mr. TAYLOR. And not voted.

Mr. SPROULE. A very large part of the money that is available has been spent and the expenditure is going on.

Gratuity to the widow of the late Robert Muirhead, engineer of fog whistle at St. Paul's Island, equal to six months' salary. $250
Gratuity to John Chisholm, light-keeper at Michaels Point, Manitoulin Island, equal to one year's salary..... 250

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asks me to give an explanation of these two gratuities. Robert Muirhead was the engineer of one of our fog-whistles. Many of these men, who are at isolated places, get into a rather despondent condition. He shot himself, and representations were made to the department that his widow and children were in a very poor condition. On these representations the Government granted a gratuity of $250. John Chisholm was the lightkeeper at Michael's Point That light has been abolished and the keeper is to be allowed a gratuity equal to one year's salary.

Mr. POWELL. Have you thought any more of Thomas Allan's gratuity?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Scientific Institutions—
To provide for cost of rebuilding dwelling in the observatory grounds, Toronto $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. What building is that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This $2,000 is for the cost of rebuilding the dwelling in the observatory grounds, Toronto. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that, last year, I explained that the British Association had recommended the transference of the magnetic observatory from Toronto to a place nine miles out, because the electric railways prevented the observations having any value. The old magnetic observatory was left empty when a new building was provided. We are repairing that old building to be used as a dwelling-house for Mr. Stupart, the observer, so that he will be continuously on the spot.

Fisheries—
To provide for repairs to steamer "Acadia," of the fishery protection service $9,500

Mr. BENNETT. Is that work to be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This item of $9,500 is for repairs to the steamer "Acadia." The "Acadia" is nineteen years old. Her upper and lower decks were found, on examination, to be decayed, and new decks are being put on. The engine and boilers are being thoroughly overhauled. The amount as stated is thought to be rather underestimated for all the repairs necessary, but Commander Spain reports that he will endeavour to do the best he can with the sum.

Mr. POWELL. Is she an iron vessel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but with a wooden deck.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the repairs being made?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At Halifax.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this work being done by contract?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, you could not do this work by contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are Longard Brothers doing the work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know.

Mr. POWELL. What do they estimate for the decks?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no itemized account here. I have only got the full amount. She was thoroughly overhauled and examined by our Government inspector.

To pay Her Majesty's Government balance of divisible expenses in connection with the Behring Sea Arbitration at Paris, which were to be shared jointly between Great Britain and Canada, O.C., 20th February, 1899. $1,802 62

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This matter has been in process of adjustment for years back.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that close it out?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This closes it out.

To pay F. Peters and E. V. Bodwell each $1,000 for legal services in the adjustment and distributing of the Behring Sea award of $473,151.26..... $2,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When the award was made by Judge King and the American commissioner, they awarded to each vessel a lump sum. For instance, we will say they awarded to the ship "Vigilant," her officers and crew, $37,000. The question arose as to how much of that would go to the owner, how much to the captain, how much to the mate, and how much to the men. I wrote to the commissioners, stating that it was impossible for me to divide the money, and they referred me to the evidence. It was utterly impossible that I should go through thousands of pages of evidence, and so I referred the matter to the counsel who had been engaged throughout the investigation, and they reported to me on an equitable division of the sum.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is Mr. Peters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The partner of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Mr. PRIOR. Can my hon. friend tell me how much Mr. Peters has been paid, and how much Mr. Bodwell has been paid?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Bodwell will not accept the sum I tendered to him, and which I reasonably though should be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought $30 a day, while he was at his home in British Columbia, acting as junior counsel, was reasonable and fair, and then, when he came to Halifax, I allowed him $40 a day. Mr. Bodwell says he will not accept that sum, and he is filing a petition of right. I did not feel disposed to pay any more, and the matter stands in that way. I am glad to say, that the distribution of the award made by these gentlemen has been very satisfactory.

Mr. PRIOR. I want to bring to the attention of the Minister a case of hardship in connection with this matter. I have had two or three letters from Mr. W. J. Ward, and in one of them he writes——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) would do me the kindness to come over to my department, I will go through the papers with him. There is an immense mass of papers in connection with the case, and I would have to go through the evidence and give him the report of the adjusters.

Mr. PRIOR. I went to the department, and I saw Mr. Venning, and he looked through the whole of the papers, but he could find nothing in regard to this claim of Mr. Wm. J. Ward. Evidently, the claim was lost in some way, and it seems unfair that any man who was on the vessel when she was seized, should lose his claim simply because some one has blundered. Mr. Ward writes to me:

I went before Mr. Bodwell at the time of the sitting of commissioners, and he made out my claim in the presence of Captain Warren, and he said he would send it in, so of course I believed it was sent to headquarters the same as the others. When the claims were advertised for, I sent my claim in to the Hon. Mr. Peters. He said he received it. I gave evidence before the commissioners in Captain Warren's case. I was engaged as steward on the "Dolphin," Captain Warren, in the year 1897, and was on board at the time of the seizure by Americans. My wages were $40 a month and 25 cents a skin for two boats, termed lay-money. My claim put in by Mr. Bodwell was $500 and interest. When the award money came here, I applied to Hon. Mr. Peters for my amount. He told me to apply to Collector Milne, who told me to get Captain Warren to identify me, which I did right there, and Captain Warren verified what I said as to wages, &c., and Collector Milne made a note of it, and said he would forward it to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that one of the Warren claims?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that is in chancery.

Mr. PRIOR. I understand it is in chancery, and there was something like $130,000 sent to the receiver, but only the Indian claims and one man is included, and that man is not Mr. Ward. He was on board one of the steamers when it was seized, and, through some mistake, apparently, on the part of Mr. Bodwell, Mr. Peters, Mr. Milne or the department here, his letters were lost, and he loses his claim of $500, which is a large amount for a man in his position. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to try and rectify the matter in some way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman gives me a memorandum, I will be glad to look into it.

Mr. PRIOR. I am glad to hear the Minister say so. I have been to the department, and received no satisfaction, although I must say, that the officers treated me with every courtesy and gave me all the information they could. This man is a constituent of mine, and the only way I can get at the matter is to bring it up before the House.

Gratuity to R. N. Venning, for special services in connection with the Behring Sea Claims Commission, years 1895, 1896 and 1897 ..... $750

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the total of all that is given to Mr. Venning for his extra services?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is all.

To pay John S. Hall, Q.C., taxed account for professional services re Bruce eel fisheries, in the years 1891 and 1892..... $1,100

Mr. FOSTER. What is this about?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This arises out of an old case extending back in 1891. The fees were taxed by the Department of Justice, and sent to me, and to my untutored mind, coming from the maritime provinces, I thought the fees were too large, and I refused to pay the bill. I sent it back to the Department of Justice, and we had a good deal of correspondence about it, but eventually the department refused to tax it lower, and Mr. Hall now wants his money.

Gratuity to Commander Wm. Wakeham, for services in connection with the Hudson's Bay expedition, 1897..... $500

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Wakeham was in entire command of the expedition, and he was ordered away from his home and vessel, and sent up there, and I must say, that he conducted this expedition in a remarkably excellent way.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he get nothing more than his pay, when he was up there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—including ventilation and lighting—Repairs, materials, furniture, &c..... $11,000

Mr. TAYLOR. Might I ask the Minister in charge the price the Government are paying for the electric lighting of the public buildings in Ottawa, and what arrangements have been made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $2.25 per lamp per year up to 3,000, and for any number in excess of that $2 per lamp per year, for each 16 candle power lamp.

Mr. TAYLOR. I live in a small town of 4,000 population, where we have an electric light company. I have in my house 22 lights of 16 candle power, and for them I pay $30 a year, which is an average of less than $1.50 per light; and here in the city of Ottawa the Government are paying $2.25 per light and using several thousand lights. Why did not the Government put in a plant of their own, instead of doing the lighting by contract—I presume without any tender? It appears to me to be an outrageous charge.

Mr. PRIOR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the time this contract was made I think there was only one company in Ottawa supplying electric light.

Mr. TAYLOR. If tenders had been called for, other companies would have been formed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would hardly pay a company to be formed for that special purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why not? Go to Montreal, Toronto or anywhere else where the electric light is used, and you will not find people paying as much as the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister say whether there is any contract with the electric light company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a written contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to have that contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have that contract brought down before concurrence, if my hon. friend will accept that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister say how many lights are availed of under this contract, and whether it covers all the lights of the Government?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the total number approaches 6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the method of calculating? Suppose the lights are not all used, do we pay for every fixture, whether the lights are burning or not?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. I am advised that the fact that some of the lights are not always used all the year round was an element in the transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. So that if you have 6,000 installed, you pay absolutely for 6,000 lights?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. How was the price fixed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was fixed as the result of negotiations between the Minister and the company. It was a subject of discussion as to what would be a fair sum, and the rates were determined on, having reference to what was paid by private parties in Ottawa; and by comparison with what is paid in Ottawa, I am informed that the prices are considered reasonable.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the price lower, and if so, how much lower than is paid by householders in Ottawa who have from 30 to 50 lights. For instance, there are said to be 600 lights above this Chamber. They are at work while we are here, for about four months in the year, and for the rest of the year they are not lighted. Is it possible

that we are paying $2.25 or $2 for these as well as for all the other lights ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I so understand, but I understand at the same time that when the rate was fixed, the fact that a considerable portion of the lights would not be used all the year round was considered, and affected the price fixed for all.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose these 600 lights are used for four months in the year and unused the rest of the year. Then, go through the corridors, and you will find that a large number of lights are not lighted at all except for the four months that the House is in session. Then go into the departments, and during the summer and holiday season you will find that many lights are not used there. So that you may fairly come to the conclusion that of these 6,000 lights which we pay for, we do not continuously use during the lighting time more than 3,000 at the outside ; and yet you are paying $2.25 per light, when I can inform you that a householder in this town who uses 20 or 30 lights is not paying as much. When you come to make a contract for an immense number of lights, a company can afford to give them at a great deal lower price than they would charge for a smaller number of lights. I would like to know whether or not, in the fixing of this price, the responsible officers of the department made thorough inquiries, and whether there was any report to show the cost of lighting in this and other towns. If these are facts, it makes no matter who supplies these lights, it is a very big "cinch" at $2.25 and $2.

Mr. HOLMES. I had occasion a short time ago to make some inquiries concerning the cost of electric lighting in various parts of the province of Ontario. I sent inquiries to a number of towns, and the average price I found that was charged per year for the incandescent light was about $4 a light. They make different arrangements according to the circumstances. I have the electric light in my house, and pay $6 per light per year for 6 lights. I have 12 lights in my house, and in consideration of the fact that they are not used all the time, the company deduct a certain percentage. From the inquiries I have made—and I have inquired pretty thoroughly into the matter—the average charge throughout the towns of western Ontario is about $4 per light per year.

Mr. SPROULE. The company that is charging that in this country must have a very big profit. In the town of Durham, where there are two companies, they are selling their lights at $1 per light per year, running to 12 o'clock at night and put on again at half-past five in the morning. In the place where I live, and where there are only about 2,000 lights in the whole place, the charge is a little over $2 per light for 16-candle power lamps. Go to Collingwood and Meaford or other towns in that northern country, and there is not one where more than $3 per light is charged per single light. But if you take a number of lights, the price is reduced very much. Any company that has the lighting of this building at $2.25 per light of 16-candle power, considering the time these lights are used, has quite a big cinch on the Government. Does that include the putting in of the plant, or if not, how much does it cost to put in the wires ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The wiring is a part of the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What do they charge for that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About $3.50 per lamp.

Mr. SPROULE. How long does the contract run ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One year.

Mr. SPROULE. At the end of the year, what would be the result in the event of not renewing the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that we are quite free to make any better arrangement, if we can.

Mr. SPROULE. If the company put in the lamps, these lamps would be kept for a length of time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract does not oblige us to keep them longer than a year.

Mr. SPROULE. How many lamps are there now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nearly 6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is $18,000 for putting in the lamps.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that there is a large number of reflectors in connection with these lights. There are 931 lights, which means the wiring of the reflectors attached to these lights.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand there are actually 900 lights, but they are 10 candle-power, and equivalent to 600 lights of 16 candle-power, so that we pay for 600 only, owing to the difference in candle-power.

Mr. SPROULE. And you pay $3 each for putting them in ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that all this talk has amply demonstrated that we had better have the contract before us.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will bring the contract down, but will be glad to know what other points you desire information about.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the plant belong to the Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The fittings belong to the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Those have been paid for extra.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and they are the Government's property, and the wiring too.

Mr. SPROULE. If you do not continue the contract, they have the privilege of taking them out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at all; that is not the ordinary way of business.

Mr. PRIOR. I have been looking into this matter a little myself lately, because I have noticed a great many lamps all over the departmental buildings, which are never in use, and I have a question on the Orders of the Day which refers to this matter:

1. By what individual, firm or company, is the electricity for lighting purposes in the Houses of Parliament and the several departmental buildings supplied?
2. Is it supplied under contract?
3. If so, what is the date of the contract and for what term?
4. Is the electricity supplied paid for by the Government at a specific sum per annum, or by the amount of energy shown as passing through meters, or at so much per lamp in position in the buildings?
5. If by meter at what rate per 1,000 Watt-hours? If by lamp, at how much per hour, month or year per lamp?

I notice that in any number of the offices there are far more lamps than are required the contract which obliges us to renew it. seems to me, if we are paying per lamp. that we must be paying a great deal more than if we were paying by the meter. It would have been a great deal cheaper to pay by the meter than by the lamp.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is made for one year, and we are now in the second year, but there is nothing in the contract which obliges us to renew it We did renew it, by an Order in Council. The contract is with the Electric Light Company of Ottawa, and the rate is per lamp of sixteen candle-power at the figures I have described.

Mr. PRIOR. Is not that an extraordinary way to let a contract, namely, so much per lamp?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course there are two methods—the one per lamp and the other by meter. I am advised that at the time the contract was made, it was considered a very fair contract. I am afraid that the charge for electric lighting somewhat varies—one man paying one price and another another. Many private houses pay much in excess of the rate fixed by the Government.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is for the year round?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the estimate for the purposes of the Government contract, account was taken of the fact that a great many of these lights would not be used the year round. I am also informed that, finding that some of the lamps were not used, a circular was issued recently to the several departments to ascertain how many lamps they could dispense with, and if any can be dispensed with, they will be cut off.

Mr. SPROULE. $4 a lamp for putting these in is about three times what they are worth. $1 a lamp is what they are put in for at our place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Including the wiring?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, everything. If you get chandeliers, they are charged extra.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is my hon. friend's house a stone one?

Mr. SPROULE. It is brick.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The boring through the stone walls is quite an expensive item.

Mr. SPROULE. They will make everything an expensive item, if you let them have their own way. You have all those lights, and they are supplied by the one wire, and it is little less than highway robbery to charge any such figure. The company must either consider that the Government will come to any terms at all, or are disposed to believe that they enjoy a monoply, and that no other company will do the work under the figures they ask. I made a good deal of inquiry before we installed the plant in the town where I live. I found that in some places lights are supplied for $1 per light per year, and $1 a light for wiring where wires are exposed. In Durham, there are two companies, and that is their own figure. In several towns they put them in, if you will make a three-year contract, but in other places they will charge you $1 per lamp for putting them in. At the end of three years, if you do not elect to keep them, they have the right to take out the wire by paying a moderate amount. If you want a single light, they will charge you $2 or $3, but if you take half a dozen, it is much lower. In many towns, where you take a single light, all they charge is $1 to $1.50, that is, where they are not used all night, but are available at any time up to twelve o'clock midnight and again in the morning. You take a building where there are so many lights, and so few of them used as there are here, it seems to me a very dear contract, and the party who made it knew very little about the business, or else was indifferent about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we shall have to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to arrange these matters, because it is evident he can do these things cheaper than some of us can. He says he can get lamps put in at $1 each. I am not speaking of the supply of light, but of the first cost of wiring, &c. That would be $6,000 for 6,000 lights.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be a good price.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may inform the hon. gentleman that the transformers alone cost $7,000. I am informed that that is the actual cost.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what apparatus you have, but I speak of the facts I know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Do you require transformers in your town ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what you call transformers ; but there is an instrument put in to prevent them burning out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a box placed on the outside of the building.

Mr. SPROULE. There are several in the town in different places, but not in the houses. They put a transformer on each branch, one branch supplying one street, and another another street.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where you use the alternating current, you must use a transformer to reduce the current for house light. The transformer is indispensable.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, they must be there, as they are here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It may be, that you do not use the same system.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the incandescent light. What other system is there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It depends on whether you use the alternating system or direct. You probably use the direct.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between one and the other ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman were to touch an alternating wire, he would find out.

Mr. SPROULE. That is no answer. The Minister professes to know something about it, but evidently knows nothing. If he did, he would explain it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know very much about it, but I know that, where you use the alternating system, the current is tremendously powerful, and you must use transformers to diminish the current to use it for a house light.

Mr. POWELL. That is, reduce it from a high to a low voltage.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is quite evident there has been a transformer put in here. The Minister has done the transforming, and deceived the House and the country. When he came down with the vote, it was discussed and understood that the Government were going to put in their own electric plant. That is what the money was voted for. Now we find he has gone into a contract, paying two or three prices to get the work done. Why did he not use the money for the purpose for which it was voted, and provide the Government's own plant, as was promised ? But they put in a transformer, and there is a job here for the Minister or for somebody. The hon. gentleman is going to bring down the contract. That is what we want. I would like to have my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) bring down the papers to which he refers. He must refer to incandescent street lamps and store lights, not house lights, because he cannot find in Canada an electric company that charges $2.25 for house lighting. The Gananoque Light and Power Company will put in a light in any house for $1 a light, and do their own wiring, but charging extra for the lamps. If you want a chandelier, of course, you pay for it. A dollar a light per year is the average for a house light. The lights in this House run pretty steadily for four months. But how about the lights in the offices here ? The office hours are from nine to four, and yet we have to pay $2.25 for the lights in the departments. Practically, there is no night work done in the departments. Now, in the main Estimates the Government are asking for $100,000 for lighting and ventilation. Have there been any improvements in appliances for ventilation in this Chamber for the last eighteen years ? Sitting here, as we are going to do, all this season, there should be some electric fans put in. But we have the same old system of opening the windows and blowing down cold air upon the members, and giving them colds. There has not been $5 spent in any change in the windows. But we are asked to vote $100,000, and to pay $2.25 for the first 2,000, and $2 for the balance of 10,000, or 12,000, or 15,000 lights we use—using $100,000 to light these buildings. Why did not the Minister provide his own plant, as he promised ? We had a plant here that worked well and lighted the buildings. What became of that ? This item must certainly stand until the contract is brought down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it stands, it will have to be for a better reason than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has

given. He says, that 6,000 lights at $2.25 will cost $100,000.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is what the hon. gentleman said—that we were going to ask for a vote of $100,000, and——

Mr. TAYLOR. I say, you are asking, in the main Estimates, for a vote of $100,000 for lighting and ventilation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are talking about lighting now.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that is my statement—that you are asking $100,000 for lighting and ventilation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is mixing up two things.

Mr. HOLMES. It would appear from what the hon. member from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says that he prefers darkness rather than light. If I understood him aright, his investigation was in reference to street lights. My investigations were not in reference to street lights alone, but also in reference to lighting houses with incandescent lamps. I have not the papers before me, but the information I got from the different towns to which I sent, shows that the average price paid was about $4 per year per light, house lights as well as others, but not including arc lights.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask the hon. gentleman to bring down the papers, or name the towns that pay $4 for house light. It cannot be done.

Mr. HOLMES. I say that in my town we are paying more than $4 per light.

Mr. McCLEARY. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken when he says he is paying $6 for incandescent lights.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member must remember that every town in Canada has not water power the same as Welland has.

Mr. McCLEARY. I can refer you to towns that run electric plant by steam power as well. When the hon. member decided to pay $6 for 16-candle-power lights he must have had a notion of running for Parliament, and did not care much what price he paid. Somebody must have imposed upon him. We have an electric plant in our town, and I had something to do with putting it in. The town owns the plant, and has wired the private houses for $2 a year per light of 16-candle-power.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you test the lights here with regard to strength? Do the Government have their inspector for electric lights?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an electrician attached to the Public Works Department, who makes an examination to satisfy himself that the lights are of the proper candle-power.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the sooner the Government gets a plant of their own and supply their own electric light, the better and cheaper it will be for the country.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of the installation of these electric lights? I find in the Auditor General's Report for the year 1897-98, which, I think, probably might include payments on that account, that $49,980 have been paid in one payment on account of electric apparatus. Electric triplex fire-pumps complete, with dynamos, four at $8,900. Then, switch boards, cabling, &c., $3,325. Does that take in the transformer business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then comes the electric light wiring in the East and West Blocks, 678 lights in the East, 712 in the West, at $3.50 for the wiring. That would be about 1,400 lights in the two blocks. The wiring does not seem to have been charged on the cost of labour, but at so much for each light. You put in wiring for one light for $3.50, and in a space of a few yards you may have one or two dozen other lights, yet the wiring costs $3.50 for each light. There does not seem to be any basis upon which to charge the cost of labour, but the lights are all lumped together and charged as a lump sum. There does not seem to be any rule of business at all in simply saying to a man: Wire my house, and I will give you so much per light.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is very often done that way, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that the wiring of a house would be according to the cost of wire that you need, and the amount of labour necessary to put it in. You can take the wire into a large room, and you have all the expenses of wiring into that room; but when you get into it, it is a small matter to connect two or three dozen lights in that room. It is not a business basis to charge so much per light for the wiring. The same basis seems to have been adopted there as was adopted for payment of the lights; whether they burn three months or one month, whether they are used or not, you pay so much a light.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But they calculate before they start in. They go over the building and find out about how many lights there will be to put in; they make their calculation as to the quantity of wire, the number of lamps and the amount of work which will be necessary to get into the building, and as to the transformers, and they total it up and find out how much it will be per lamp.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a nice explanation, but it does not fill the bill. I do not think that any officer or Minister has done his duty in reference to the public funds, that he is dispensing, unless he makes a close calculation as to the cost of wire and the cost of labour for wiring the building, and unless he sits down with the man and on that basis comes to a conclusion as to how much he will give him. If that is not done it is simply working by a rule of thumb. You may put a dozen lamps in a room when you do not require to use them. Unless the department can show that there was a calculation as to the cost of labour and as to the cost of wiring so that they would be able to show what the total cost would be, giving a fair profit, I do not think that they have done their duty. Take this building, and it is the simple, common-sense view; take a little room up stairs, part of which I have the privilege of occupying. There are twice as many lights as are ever necessary to be used. They are not used more than three months or three months and a half during the year, and during that time they are not constantly used, notwithstanding which we are paying $2.25 or $2 for each one of these lights. Then there is a generator, which is charged for, and various other things. I find that at one point in this Auditor General's Report, but it is fragmentary, and I would like to know the total cost, first of the plant that is necessary and next of the wiring.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would like to have a statement of the cost of wiring. It is $3.50 per light.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but I wish to come to another point. Is there in connection with this what you might call a large plant—dynamos?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have nothing to do with the dynamos at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Yet we paid for them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the dynamo is, of course, connected with the manufacture of the light. We do not manufacture the light.

Mr. FOSTER. We paid for the dynamo?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is the bill. Yes, here are "electric triplex fire pumps complete with dynamos."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not for lighting.

Mr. FOSTER. These are for what purpose?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For fire protection.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, then, there is a switch-board, cabling and the like of that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is all in connection with the pumps.

Mr. FOSTER. $38,925 for that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are there of these pumps?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Four.

Mr. FOSTER. $9,000 each.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $8,500.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us how many transformers they have, and whose make they are.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are Westinghouse transformers. There are about 6,000 lamps. As there are about 500 lamps to each, that would mean nine or ten transformers. If we had 6,000 it would be 12, but we have under 6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many lights are there on each wire that you could cut off in this building?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a switch for each row.

Mr. SPROULE. How many are there in each row?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As there are 900 altogether, that would be 150 on each wire of the 10 candle power lights.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the 10-candle power lights increased by the Luxfer prisms to 16 candle power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they are we do not pay for 16-candle power.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are paying for the prisms; we are supposed to pay for the increased light. Are your lights all 16 candle power irrespective of the prisms?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that they are only 10-candle power, but our contract is so much per lamp for 16-candle power lights, and thus we are paying for 600 while we have 900 lights.

Mr. SPROULE. You have 150 on each wire, and yet you pay $3 apiece for putting in the lamp and for putting in the wire.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a separate transaction, and I am advised that the cost is $1.60 for each lamp above.

Mr. SPROULE. $1.60 for each lamp is very high. I think 50 cents per lamp would be very high when they could be put in with one wire. When we are putting so many lamps on each wire it should be very much less. How much do these transformers cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole thing represents about $7,000.

Mr. SPROULE. For ten transformers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is roughly correct.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract is all in the interest of the contractor and not in the interest of the country that is paying for it. There are ten of these transformers in, and the contract is for one year. Do I understand the hon. Minister correctly that these wires are now purchased out and out, that the company has not the right to take them if this contract should be cancelled at the end of the year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly not. They are Government property.

Mr. SPROULE. Although they are Government property and have been paid for, some companies make one contract and some another.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no such qualification.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume that if the company performed their contract satisfactorily that it will be continued from year to year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose anybody who undertakes work of that kind and gives satisfaction may reasonably expect a continuance of that work, but there is nothing in the contract to say that it shall be for more than one year and we are at liberty to abandon it and make any other arrangement which in the judgment of the Government is best.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Finance give us the cost of this arrangement here by itself?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. In the town of Barrie where the electric light is owned and conducted by the town and is a steam power, the rates there are $2 up to 20 lights, and $1.50 after that, 16-candle power.

Mr. INGRAM. Formerly the people of Ottawa had the choice of paying by meter or by the lamp, but they are now compelling the people of Ottawa to use according to meter. Why should they not give that privilege to the Government?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Evidently the Minister thought the present arrangement was better than he could accomplish by meter.

Mr. INGRAM. These lights are not very much used, and the meter system would be better for the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) want the House to believe, that it is cheaper to pay $2.25 for each lamp when they are not used one-third of the year—and in that paying more than do householders supplied by the same company who use their lights the whole year—than it would be to pay by meter for the power you use?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Everything turns on whether we are paying more than householders pay. Some gentlemen tell me that the Ottawa rates are higher than are quoted by gentlemen on the other side of the House, and my information is that private persons are paying more than the Government pay.

Mr. BENNETT. In Barrie where it is a steam power the rates are $1.50, and I believe in Bracebridge where there is water-power the rates are still cheaper.

Mr. CARGILL. What is the Minister paying for his own lights?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not rich enough to afford electric light; I belong to the working classes who have to use gas.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will bring the information down on concurrence we can discuss it in the main Estimates. The Minister of Public Works, when the first vote was given, went into the subject quite extensively as to the cost of wiring and all that sort of thing, and these details must be in the department, and should be brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Minister has any information as to what would be the cost if measured by electrometers, we should have it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not know what quantity we use now, and we would have no means of making a comparison.

Mr. SPROULE. You know how many volts would be used in your electrometer for a 16-candle power, if you use a standard light, and it is very easy to calculate from that.

Mr. POWELL. Not only has the promise been given to the House with respect to the ownership not been carried out, but there has been a direct breach of faith with the House so far as the making of the contract is concerned. There was a distinct pledge given by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that the lighting should be let by tender. He first announced his scheme, which was to add to the plant at the foot of the hill. I will read from "Hansard" what the Minister of Public Works said, when this vote was first going through the House:

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the item of $75,000, the idea is to change the system of lighting which we have to-day. Part of the buildings are lighted by electricity and the balance by gas. The bills so far have amounted to from $21,000 to $23,000 a year for gas alone. The idea in my mind is this. We would change the whole thing and build a new plant at the foot of the hill, where we now have a plant, increasing the strength and capacity

of that plant and using electricity for fire appliances. We are not now protected. After the fire in the West Block, we went all over the buildings, and found that we were in no way protected. My intention is to add to the plant we have now, to do away with lighting by gas, which costs us a great amount of money, and to utilize our electric power not only for lighting but for appliances against fire. We propose to put electric pumps in every building. I have no definite plan yet, although I have given a great deal of attention to the subject, and my intention is to have the best possible means to protect these buildings against fire. My proposal is to change the mixed system into one system, and I am sure that it will effect a great saving.

At a later period, he said :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry he has not the same confidence in me that I might have in him. We are now spending for gas a sum varying from $18,000 to $22,000 or $23,000 a year, and our electric system costs us about $10,000 a year. It is admitted that it is dangerous to use gas in these buildings, and a few days ago a committee of the House properly suggested that gas should no longer be used. Some means ought to be taken to guard against the great disaster we have experienced. I consulted with the engineers of my department, and with engineers and architects outside, and they suggested to me that it would be better, in the public interest, that a system of electric lighting and electric protection against fire should be adopted. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wants a detailed plan ; will he permit me to say that it would not be wise to give it, as I intend asking for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders for what ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders for putting in all this apparatus.

There was a distinct pledge given by the Minister (Mr. Tarte), and the vote was passed through the House, and the Opposition did not demand the details on the express promise of the Minister, that he would call for tenders, and that the giving of the details and estimates of his engineers would interfere with the tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He does not appear to have carried out his intention of a separate lighting plant.

Mr. POWELL. He did not carry out his intention although he pledged the House to this scheme. Not carrying out his intention has nothing to do with the fact, that he (Mr Tarte) has gone to an enormous expense and asks the House for a vote of $100,000. If he thought it advisable on a vote of $75,000 to call for tenders, a fortiori he should think it necessary to call for tenders on a vote of $100,000. The hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Holmes) says that $4 is the average cost. I happen to know a little about electric lighting. I had a good deal to do in a small way with the details. I happen to be president of a company in the town in which I live ; and I may say—and I will be fair to the Minister of Public Works—that there is a great deal of difference made in the schedule of charges adopted as respects dwelling houses, and banks, churches, stores and other buildings of that kind. There is a higher tariff for other buildings than for dwelling houses, and there is a great difference between the two rates.

Mr. CARGILL. That is owing to the length of time the lights are burning.

Mr. POWELL. I do not know the reason of it ; it is a practice that prevails almost everywhere. I think it is something like the railway tariff, based on all that the traffic will bear. Then, what the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) says may be true, taking all Canada together. I know that in the cities of Fredricton and St. John, as the Minister of Railways will bear me out in saying, the rate is higher than that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is double what it is here. I was surprised to find the rates here so low.

Mr. POWELL. That is owing to the water-power. In the maritime provinces the cost is greater because we use steam. But this much is certain, that taking the large group of lights together, the price does seem high. In the summer time, for instance, in these departmental buildings, the exception is the burning of a lamp at all ; and in the winter time the lamps are only burned for a short period, because the offices are closed at five o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A good many of the offices are dark, and the lights are kept going all day.

Mr. POWELL. There must be a small number of lights used. When you even take them into account, the charge strikes me as excessive from the knowledge I have of tariffs generally.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia.... $7,738.12

Mr. FOSTER. What is the first item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a re-vote of $3,481 to pay a balance due to the contractors for the construction of a wharf at Hantsport. The cost of the wharf was $5,947 : superintendence and contingencies, $204—making the total cost of the work $6,151.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the Minister give me any information about the building of a wharf at Iona in the county of Victoria ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an appropriation for such a work and arrangements are being made to build it, but I think the work of construction has not begun.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand that there was a quantity of timber landed there

lately, and I want to know what that is for. Has the work been let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was first proposed to repair the old wharf, and a quantity of creosoted timber was obtained for that purpose. The question is under consideration, however, whether it is not better to build the wharf entirely anew. There is the question of site also involved, and no further progress has been made.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the site been selected ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at this moment.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My information is that there is a man in charge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a man put in charge to receive the timber and take care of it ; but the site of the new wharf has not been fixed at the present time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister if he can give me information as to what the Government propose to do with regard to some balance due on the cost of repairing the old wharf in 1896 ? When the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) was looking after the Department of Public Works, he gave instructions for the repairs of that wharf in the beginning of the summer season of 1896. The instructions came through myself. I remember also that my hon. friend from Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune) was interested in the repairs of that wharf at the time ; but after the expense of repairing the wharf had been incurred, at the request of the department, the people who performed the work had not been paid. They have been paid in part. I understand that the Government, on coming into power, at the instance of somebody who made it his business to protest against the payment of the expenditure on that wharf, just because the parties who were engaged on the repairs of the wharf were not supporters of the incoming Government, sent a man to examine the work—whether an official of the department or a man in the service of the Government I am not sure ; but that person, I am informed, reported to the department that the charge made by the parties who did the work was, in his opinion, excessive. On that report, that man undertook to go to work, accompanied by somebody who knew nothing of how the work had been done, and did not consult with the parties engaged on the work or the foreman in charge or anybody else who could give him reliable information. But he took with him a supporter of the Government, who was evidently the man who protested against the payment of the money incurred in the cost. The explanation given by the parties engaged on the repairs of the wharf was to this effect, that the work cost more than it should have cost, in the judgment of a person unacquainted with the circumstances. The timber had to be got at short notice from a distance at a season of the year when it was difficult to get it—I think in the month of May ; and the appliances for performing the work had to be sent for at a considerable distance. A pile-driver, for instance, and the freighting of that pile-driver, were a portion of the charge. The appliances for putting the pile-driver into use had also to be got. They had to take the men who were available for doing the work. The work was difficult, the wharf had become a wreck, because the storm had carried a piece of it away. There was a lot of stone and sticks in the bottom, and the work could not be done with the same facility as it could have been, had this stuff not been there ; so that the men whom the department sent to examine the work, could not see anything like the work that had to be done. Up to this moment, I understand, these people are without their pay. The hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), who had charge of that department at the time, is now supporting the Government, the ex-Minister who ordered the work, and the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune), who was interested in getting that work done, and who, I think, will bear testimony to the statement I make. What I want is a promise that justice will be done those people by paying them their day's wages. I venture to say, that they did not charge for an hour more than they spent honestly in the performance of that work. If I remember right, there was a limit to the amount that the foreman would be allowed to spend, which limit, I believe, he exceeded. He could not help it ; the work had to be done, steamers were waiting, freight had to be transferred from the railway to the steamers, to be carried to Baddeck. The work was, therefore, of the greatest possible necessity, as the hon. member for Victoria will admit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter belongs to my department, and not Public Works. I can promise that justice will be done, but whether in the sense the hon. gentleman expects, I cannot say to-night, for this reason. The matter was brought to my attention by my hon. friend from Victoria, two or three days ago. I told him that at least two years ago claims had been made on my department which seemed excessively large. I referred the claims to the agent at Nova Scotia, who made an examination into the facts, and a report. I have not been able, since my hon. friend spoke to me, to look up the report again, but my impression is, that at the time I formed an adverse judgment on the claim, but promised to look into it very carefully again, and intend doing so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I venture to assure the hon. Minister, if he means to rely on that report, he will rely on what is not worth relying upon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman recollect who the officer was?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not, and I care not who he was; the report is not such as the Minister should pay any regard to, because the means that officer took to get information were not sufficient.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That may be. I promise to look into the matter very carefully, and to look up the papers again. I recollect, however, very well the impression I formed, after sending the agent there to examine and to report, and that impression was rather adverse to the claim. I shall, however, look into it more particularly.

General repairs on improvements to harbour and river works..... $5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to reduce that to $2,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to call attention to an answer given by the hon. Minister of Public Works to a question put by myself a month or two ago. I asked, whether he had visited a place called Gabarus, in the county of Cape Breton, and examined the location for a breakwater or pier there for the building of which applications had been before the Government for years. I asked the hon. Minister, whether he had visited that place, when on his tour around Cape Breton last autumn, and he said he had not. But I have information from the people of that locality that he did visit and examine the place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There must be a misunderstanding. The chief engineer, who accompanied the Minister on that occasion, says they desired to visit Gabarus, but could not get there on account of stormy weather.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That seems very strange, because I have information from the people, that the Minister did visit the place and spent a short time there. He told me another thing, which I did not ask, in reply to my question. He said, that a survey had been made years ago, and that the report was rather against the building of the breakwater or pier at that place. I wish to say, that a survey was made under the Administration of the late Mr. Mackenzie, and then an estimate of about $100,000 was made. Year after year, however, I tried to get a grant for a breakwater in that place, and finally, four or five years ago, I succeeded, after a good deal of trouble, in having another survey made, and accompanied the engineer myself. A site was selected, with the approval of the people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who was the engineer?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Mr. Milledge, I believe. A site was selected, acceptable to the people, and I understood, on making inquiry of the Department of Public Works subsequently, that a report was made by the engineer to the effect that a suitable breakwater or pier could be built there for between $25,000 and $30,000. That was about five years ago, or about two years before the last general election. The Minister then promised me that he would recommend to his colleagues the granting of a sufficient sum to provide for that breakwater, and I think that, before the Minister of Public Works undertook to volunteer that reply to my question, he should have gone further, and related the circumstances in connection with the subsequent survey, the result of which was so far different from that of the first survey. I would ask the Minister of Finance to make a note of this, and confer with his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, in order to see if he cannot make up his mind to recommend a grant for the building of a breakwater or pier at this particular place. It is a very important fishing station. There are some 80 or 100 large fishing boats there, without protection of a harbour, and the people have to haul their boats up on the beach every time there is any sign of a storm. Within the last fifteen or twenty years, some 12 or 15 vessels have been driven ashore there for want of protection. I have frequently brought this to the notice of the department, and I am sure that my friend the Deputy Minister will remember that I made many visits to the department, and perhaps bothered him a good deal more than he cared for in respect of this matter. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance to try and coax the Minister of Public Works to give some further attention to this question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend manifests so much more confidence in us than in his own friends as to quite flatter us. He says, that he tried year after year with them, and got nothing, and now he expects us to do the work. I know the importance of the work to which he refers, and have had frequent representations from gentlemen in the district on the subject. I will discuss the matter with the Minister of Public Works. Still, even at the reduced estimate of $30,000, the amount is a considerable one for a single work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman will see that it took a long time to knock out the report showing the cost to be $100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, he must give us some time also.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—
Ontario — Kincardine — Balance due contractors for reconstruction of north pier..... $3,384 08

Mr. INGRAM. What was the original contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was $11,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Would not what you are asking for now and what they have already received make up more than $11,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have been paid $7,920, and there is a balance of $3,334.39.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Messrs. Bowman, Bowman & Porter.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the contract let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Dredging—Including the salaries of engineers, superintendents and clerks connected with this service :—

New dredging plant.....	$15,000
Dredging (Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick).....	5,000
Dredging (British Columbia).....	5,000
	$25,000

Mr. BENNETT. What is this $15,000 for new plant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Tug for Lake St. John, $2,000 ; new scows, $3,000 ; new tug, " Sir John," $5,000—I think the item ought to be passed for the sake of the name —scows for River St. John, $3,000 ; pile driver scows, $2,000—total, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether this is the proper place, but I would like to get some information as to the rule of the department where dredges are hired by the day or hour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The rule of the department is to pay $80 per day for a minimum service of 600 yards.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the department pays an inspector whose duty it is to see that this minimum of work is done ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the inspector supposed to be there from the time the dredge commences work in the morning and continuously while the work is going on ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the inspectors allowed to do other work for the dredging companies and also to attend to their duties for the department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are expected during office hours to devote themselves wholly to the service of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I think the Minister had better investigate the case of his inspector at Owen Sound. My information is that the inspector visits the dredge about ten o'clock, remains a short time, and spends most of the day around town smoking and amusing himself, going down to the dredge two or three times to see how the work is going on. The rumour is also that he is employed by the dredging company to do a portion of their work. I do not say that this information is absolutely correct, but if it is correct, then, according to the hon. Minister of Finance, this man is not doing his duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no information in the department to the effect the hon. gentleman states, though I am not in a position to contradict it. The dredges are visited occasionally by an engineer of the department who should see to it that the officials do their duty.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. Minister be good enough to get the information ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the name of the inspector ?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot give it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will find it out.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask one or two more questions, but, perhaps, they will come up more appropriately on other items.

Mr. CLANCY. Are the dredges paid for any excess over 600 yards ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, any excess enters into the day's work.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose they cut off pretty sharply when they have done that quantity ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it not unlikely. If by mistake they do too much, the country benefits to that extent.

Roads and Bridges—

Spray River bridge at Banff—For work done	$1,050
Sappers' bridge, Ottawa—Completion of repairs	700
	$1,750

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this is to pay for an item on Sapper's bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Was that work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was done by the men of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Who has charge of the Banff work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The superintendent of the park has the care of the Banff bridge.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire to call attention to the condition of Dufferin bridge alongside the Sappers' bridge in Ottawa. It has been in a disgraceful state for years. I do not suppose there is such a miserable footway in the city of Ottawa or in any other city The bridge belongs to the Government, as I understand it. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) suggests that the city is responsible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not like to make any dangerous admissions, but I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is right. As the Government is paying such attention to the Washington of the North now, this matter will have to be considered.

Mr. WALLACE. Any one who walks over that Dufferin bridge, as I do many times a day, knows that it is disgraceful and dangerous for foot passengers. They attempt to put in a few old planks, and leave five times as many old planks remaining.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the Government build both those bridges?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand the Sappers' bridge was built by the Imperial Government, but the Dominion Government, by arrangement made some years ago, agreed to maintain them both, so that they are both a charge upon the Government for maintenance.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. What business do the Government intend to take up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Government hope to get through these Estimates, and also to take up the Redistribution Bill, if possible. With the concurrence of the Opposition, we will get through both.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 16th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

STRIKE OF THE G. T. R. TRACKMEN.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government whether there is any truth in the report in the morning papers that the Grand Trunk Railway trackmen's strike has been settled?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Not so far as my own information goes. Negotiations are proceeding, but I am sorry that I am not in a position to say that they are ended yet.

Mr. CLARKE. In this connection, might I ask the right hon. leader of the Government if there is any objection to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) bringing down to the House, on Monday, any instructions that have been given to the engineers of his department to make an examination of the road-bed of the Grand Trunk Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Several communications have been received by members on this side of the House asking whether such examination is being made.

COUNTERFEIT $1 BILLS.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to information which I have received to the effect that there are about 15,000 or 20,000 counterfeit $1 bills in circulation, chiefly in the city of Montreal, but of course they go everywhere. They all bear the date of 1878, as I would imagine by the description given. I am told that the bankers can detect them by a slight mistake made in the picture of Lady Dufferin, but the general public is misled. The suggestion which I am asked to make to the Minister is that the issue of 1878 be recalled and replaced, so as to protect the holders of those bills from the great loss which they will sustain in seeing these bills refused at the bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman's suggestion all due consideration. I was aware that similar counterfeits were afloat. I have heard very little complaint on that score, but I promise to give the matter attention.

ANTI-JAPANESE LEGISLATION.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman when he will bring down the correspondence and telegrams that passed between the British Columbia Government and the Dominion Government in regard to

the anti-Japanese and Chinese legislation of the former Government? I have a notice of motion on the paper, but the right hon. gentleman asked me to allow it to stand twice. It seems to me that he should be able to bring it down after having made a statement in the House in regard to the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I brought down all the correspondence in regard to the anti-Japanese legislation between the British Columbia Government and Canada several days ago.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I intended to-day to bring the Redistribution Bill to the consideration of the House. I am sorry to see that the House is somewhat thin, but as my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has to be absent next week on an important domestic event, he desires to make a statement to-day and move the second reading; and if hon. gentlemen on the other side are not ready to debate it to-day, we will adjourn the debate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the explanation which I am about to offer to the House might more properly have been given on the introduction of the Bill, but unfortunately I was unable to be present on that occasion, having to attend the last ceremonies in connection with the death of a gentleman who had been a very prominent citizen of Canada, and accordingly the explanations which I then would have made, I now briefly offer to the House. It has not been the custom in the Canadian Parliament to make changes in the constituencies except in the session immediately succeeding the decennial census, but it has happened that, ever since confederation, the census and the succeeding redistributions have taken place while our political adversaries were in power. The opinion of the Liberal party, and, I think, of all fair-minded men will be that the redistributions, especially that of 1882, and certain features of that of 1892, were not upon fair lines, that the effect of these redistributions has not been to secure in this House that fair representation of the public opinion of Ontario that our constitution contemplates, but that they have resulted, on the contrary, in an unfair representation of public opinion in this House, as I will endeavour to prove, and therefore the existence of this legislation calls for the removal of the causes, at the earliest moment, even if it takes place after the redistribution that has occurred since the decennial census of 1891. The chief abuse of the power vested in Parliament to redistribute, and to which this Bill directs itself, arose under the Act of 1882. As hon. gentlemen now in the House and who were then in the House, will remember, and as other hon. members, who came since, will have learned from reading, that measure was offered to Parliament and was forced through Parliament ostensibly to accomplish two purposes. One was to give to Ontario four new members to which the province had become entitled after the census of 1881, and also to arrange for two vacancies arising from the merged constituencies, Cornwall having been merged with Stormont, and Niagara having been united with Lincoln. The exigency, therefore, that occurred was to provide these six seats, and the justification for the wholesale changes in the ridings that took place on that occasion was said to be to produce a better equalization of the ridings. If one of the objects on that occasion, the wholesale alteration of the political map of Ontario, was to produce an equalization of the population of each riding, the slightest reference to the populations of the ridings after that redistribution will show how completely that attempt failed. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that at no period since confederation up to this time, will you find any due respect paid to the subject of the equalization of population in the various constituencies, here in Ontario, or in any other province of Canada. You find in our own province of Ontario, for example, the population of constituencies after and before every redistribution showing very wide differences. I have a table before me showing the populations at the various periods, but for one moment, to prove my first proposition, that the Redistribution Act of 1882 did not even accomplish the ostensible ground upon which that wholesale disturbance of the political map of Ontario took place, I may just give to the House, in a brief summary, the figures showing the populations of some of the ridings of Ontario after that attempt made to equalize the populations in the various ridings. The census of 1881 showed that if each riding was to have an equal population for each riding, the population would have been 20,904.

Mr. WALLACE. What year was that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am referring to the census of 1881. Taking 20,904 as the unit of representation for the province of Ontario, and allowing a reasonable margin under and over that sum, as being reasonably within the unit, because it is not possible to produce an absolute equality, I will suggest that we take the numbers as 19,000 and 22,000 as represent-

ing the outside limits of a unit of population of 20,904. It is to be borne in mind that when the redistribution of 1882 was taking place the then Government had thrown aside all the restraining influences, such as county boundaries and entire municipalities, so there was not the difficulty with them in producing an equalization of population that there is in the present case where the policy of the Administration is, that paramount the question of population is one involving respect for county boundaries. We have taken the ground in Parliament, and before the public that county boundaries shall govern, that no county should be divided into two or more divisions, and such divisions united with fragments of other counties. If it is that a county's population is not sufficient to entitle it to have two members, it shall have only one; if its population is not sufficient to entitle it to three but more than one, it shall be limited to two. In 1882, that principle was not in force, and not being in force it would have been possible for the then Administration to have equalized population as much as they desired. But, Sir, if they did desire it they most effectively failed in their desire, for out of the 92 seats that Ontario was entitled to as a result of the census of 1881—assuming any population between 19,000 and 22,000 as fairly representing the unit of population of 20,900—I say that of the 92 seats, the population of thirty of them, after the redistribution of 1882, was under the minimum of 19,000, and the population of thirty-four of them was over the maximum of 22,000. There were 64 of these 92 seats that did not conform to the principle on which that Bill was said to have been founded, namely, the equalization of population, and only 28 of the 92 had a population between 19,000 and 22,000. Taking the population of the various ridings of Ontario, as a result of the Redistribution Act of 1882, we find that the population of Leeds and Grenville—in order to save time I shall give the figures in round numbers and leave out the fractions of thousands—the population of Leeds and Grenville in 1882, being the smallest population of any riding in Ontario, was 12,000, and then we have a scale of population extending until at last we come to the constituency of West Toronto, which was given one member with a population of 38,000. We have proof in these figures, that whatever may have been the object of the Government of the day in regard to equalization, there was a practical failure to carry it out, inasmuch as West Toronto had a population more than three times that of Leeds and Grenville. We had after 1882, in Ontario, three constituencies with a population of 13,000; two constituencies with 14,000; four constituencies with 15,000; five constituencies with 16,000; eight constituencies with 17,000; five constituencies with 18,000, and so up to the maximum of West Toronto. And, if you take the census returns of 1891, you will find the same inequalities perpetuated. As a further illustration I may remark that the population of the east riding of the city of Montreal—and I suppose if there should be equalization in one province there should be equalization in another—the population of East Montreal at the census of 1881 was 67,000, and it was only given one member and continued to be represented by one member until this present Parliament, although the population of that constituency had increased from 67,000 in 1881, to over 90,000 at the decennial census of 1891. I have reviewed the figures of every province in Canada from confederation down to the last census and last distribution, and I challenge contradiction of my statement, that you will not find in any province, or in the Territories, that at any period of time from confederation to this moment, there was any due regard paid to the principle which it was pretended governed the Redistribution Bill of 1882; namely, that the ridings were to be equalized in population. I am aware, Sir, that since this present measure has been before Parliament, an attempt has been made to prove that equalization of population is a cardinal principle of the Liberal party and is in harmony with the old doctrine of representation by population.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." He evidently is quite unfamiliar with the meaning of the question of representation by population. That question arose during the union of the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and the Liberal party then argued on behalf of the people of Upper Canada that there should be a proper regard for population in the representation of the two provinces, in the common legislature of the two provinces; but I have never yet heard it said—and if it has been said by any one in authority I have failed to find it—I have never yet heard any authoritative utterance binding on the Liberal party, that in each of the provinces, the ridings should be equal in population. On the contrary, the proposition that was advocated by the Liberal party in Parliament in 1882—I was not then, however, a member of the House—the proposition that we have advocated on the platform and elsewhere since; the resolution of the Liberal party at the Ottawa convention of 1893, all prove conclusively that the Liberal party took the ground, that in order to provide safeguards against the party for the time being governing the country making an abuse of their power, there should be some guiding principle to restrain them, and, Sir, that restraining influence which we sought to establish, that proposition which we adhered to, that proposition on which we went to the country on and which helped us to carry the country was: That there should be no breaking up of county boundaries in arranging for the representation of the people in Parliament. If, as a result of any redistribution measure

—this or any other which the Liberal party advocate—there should be an inequality in the population of the various ridings; that is quite proper, if it is in deference to the paramount and dominating principle that there shall be no breaking up of county lines, and no creating seats out of fragments of different counties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to prove to Parliament, by figures which I will give the House, and the accuracy of which cannot be challenged; I will prove that the Redistribution Act of 1882, produced a representation of parties in Parliament that a fair redistribution Bill would not have produced. I will prove that the continuance of that Act during the elections of 1887 and 1891, and up to the last general election of 1896, produced the same unjust results. From 1882 down to the present time, I will prove that the Liberal party has been unjustly treated as a result of that Redistribution Act, and I will further prove that if the Redistribution Bill of 1882 had been upon fair lines many gentlemen who occupied seats since then, and many of those in the House to-day, would not have been elected. Were it not for the Gerrymander Act of 1882 and the subsequent one of 1891, there are several members of this House who never would have been returned. I shall speak now of the Bill before Parliament. It does not propose to do complete justice to the people but it proposes simply for the present, to do away with the more glaring injustices of previous redistribution Acts. The present measure does not propose to affect the ridings east of the county of Ontario, for it was westerly of and including the county of Ontario that the principal work of the gerrymander was done. There, under the guise of finding six new seats, and the pretense of equalizing populations, it was represented as necessary to distribute about fifty ridings; and taking those fifty ridings and taking the measure before the House to-day, which seeks to restore the municipalities to the counties to which they belong, and to give to the counties, when so restored, their fair representation, and looking at the votes cast since 1882 down to and including the year 1896, you will find that the voice of the people, as distinguished between Liberals and Conservatives, has been unjustly and unfairly represented in Parliament because of those unfair measures. The Government of the day took a number of municipalities of strong Liberal tendencies, and grouped them together, creating a number of hives. In their exultation at the time, they called them Grit hives, and they were not mistaken in that term. They succeeded in weakening a large number of surrounding ridings, detaching municipalities having Liberal majorities from this, that and the other riding; and, grouping those detached municipalities into one riding here and one there, they succeeded in weakening the fair strength of the Liberal party in a large number of ridings, and in that way carried constituencies for the Conservative party which otherwise they never could have carried. Now, Sir, if that is true——

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If that is true, and I say it is true, then Parliament since 1882 has never fairly represented public opinion of Ontario. I will give the hives which were created at that time, and the results. There were created in 1882 eight Liberal hives, with overwhelming Liberal majorities in them. They were North Brant, West Bruce, West Elgin, South Huron, South Middlesex, West Ontario, North Oxford and South Oxford. In the different general elections these ridings gave the following Liberal majorities:—

	Aggregate Liberal Majority.	Average Liberal Majority.
In 1882	6,071	771
1887	7,210	901
1891	7,473	934
1896	6,663	833

Now, Sir, what was the effect of giving these enormous Liberal majorities in these eight constituencies? The Bill before Parliament affects some 43 constituencies in Ontario——

Mr. WALLACE. More than that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It affects the following constituencies in certain respects:—In doing away with the hives, and in abolishing constituencies which do not correspond to counties, Bothwell and Cardwell, and bringing the constituencies of Haldimand, Welland, Lincoln and those others into their proper limits, the Bill affects the following constituencies, namely:—Bothwell, Brant North, Brant South, Bruce North, Bruce West, Bruce East, Elgin West, Grey South, Grey East, Grey North, Haldimand, Huron West, Huron East, Huron South, Kent, Lambton West, Lambton East, Lincoln, Middlesex East, Middlesex West, Middlesex North, Middlesex South—Monck is abolished, but my figures embrace the time when it was a constituency—Muskoka and Parry Sound, Norfolk South, Norfolk North, Ontario North, Ontario South, Ontario West, Oxford North, Oxford South, Peel, Perth North, Perth South, Simcoe North, Simcoe South, Simcoe East, Welland, Wellington North, Wellington Centre, Wellington South, Wentworth North, Wentworth South, York North, York East. West York was not affected by the gerrymander. It is the same constituency that it was prior to that legislation.

Mr. WALLACE. The legislation which the hon. gentleman proposes now tumbles West York upside down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It takes that portion that belongs to the city of Toronto, and puts it into the city.

Mr. WALLACE. It takes half the district away.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It leaves enough for the hon. gentleman to handle.

Mr. BENNETT. To be elected in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, he will have his opportunity. Now, Sir, I take these ridings and I present to the House——

Mr. McNEILL. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that part, might I ask him a question? He says the Bill affects North Bruce. How does he know that the judges will deal with North Bruce?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad the hon. gentleman calls my attention to North Bruce. The Bill will leave it to the judges to deal with that matter. The hon. gentleman is aware, as well as any one in this House, how North Bruce affects him, as a member of this House. He knows very well that, from the day that Gerrymander Act of 1882 was passed to this moment, that Gerrymander Act and the Gerrymander Act of 1892, were the reasons whereby he got a seat in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that full well, and, if he challenges the statement, I can give him the figures. He is very discreet, and he will not challenge it.

An hon. MEMBER. The Minister is perfectly satisfied to leave that to the judges.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perfectly satisfied.

Mr. McNEILL. But he wishes to prejudge the case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I will return to my hon. friend's constituency in a short time, and he will see whether or not it is wise and fair to submit to the judiciary whether the north riding of Bruce should remain as it is or not.

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite willing that it should be. I do not object to that, but I object to the hon. gentleman saying that the judges will alter it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not said that they will alter it. I do not know what the hon. gentleman bases that statement on. It is on nothing I have stated.

Mr. FOSTER. A little incautious that time, were you not?

Mr. CASEY. A moment of weakness.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have stated nothing that I did not desire to state.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us who the judges are, now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman need not be at all concerned on that account. The judges will be fit, proper and honourable men.

Mr. FOSTER. For your work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Premier authorizes me to say, that there will be no objection to naming the judges before this Bill becomes law.

Mr. FOSTER. I should say so. You know them all.

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite satisfied with any of them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, my hon. friend will have to make a virtue of necessity.

Mr. McNEILL. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted now to prove a proposition that I advanced a short time ago? Taking the votes cast in the constituencies, the names of which I have read—forty-six of them in the general election of 1882, forty-six in the general election of 1887, forty-six in the general election of 1891, and forty-three in the general election of 1896; and, adding together the majorities obtained by Liberals and Conservatives in all these elections, let us see if we can find out what ought to have been a fair representation of parties in this House.

At the general election of 1882, the 46 constituencies that I refer to gave a Liberal majority at the polls of 8,574. The election returns gave for those 46 seats, 15 Conservatives and 31 Liberal members. If there had been a fair representation of those various majorities——

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he selected those 46 constituencies all over the province or in one part of the province?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have taken the 46 constituencies, the names of which I read to the hon. gentleman, and all of which are affected by the Gerrymander Acts of 1882 and 1892, and by the Bill now before Parliament, which seeks to return to all these counties affected the municipalities which are not now, and have not been since confederation, part of the counties for electoral purposes.

Take those 46 seats, and if the representation had been in proportion to the majorities which they gave in the election of 1882 to the Conservatives and Liberals instead of the Conservative party having had 15 representatives in this House in that Parliament, they would only have had 10, and instead of the Liberals having only had 31 they would have had 36. In other words, while the Liberal party got only 15 seats in Par-

liament, a fair representation of that party, according to the vote cast, would have been 26, so that the Liberal party was deprived of ten votes on a division in this House.

Take the returns of those same 46 counties in the general election of 1887, and the following is the result:—There was a Conservative majority of 5,447 and a Liberal majority of 10,257. The election returns assigned to the Conservative party 22 seats in this House and to the Liberal party 24 seats, giving the Liberals a majority of two votes in this House, out of the total 46. But a rightful proportion would have given the Conservative party 16 seats in this House and the Liberal party 30. In other words, the Liberals would have had a majority of 14 instead of only 2, so that by that gerrymander the Liberal party was wronged out of 12 members on a division.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. Minister know that it would give that difference?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have added up the figures, and the hon. gentleman will get the same result, if he will add up the election returns.

Mr. CLANCY. That does not determine anything.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity of giving his views on my argument.

The general election of 1891 gave the Conservatives 3,661 of a majority and the Liberals 13,516, but the election returns give the Conservative party 15 seats and the Liberals 31, or a majority of 16 in Parliament. But a rightful proportion would have been 10 seats for the Conservatives and 36 for the Liberals, or a majority on a division of this House of 26 for the Liberals, instead of which they only had 16. In other words, the gerrymander wronged the Liberals out of 10 seats.

I now proceed to the election of 1896, the present Parliament. I omit three seats in my figures, namely, North Simcoe, which was represented by the late Mr. McCarthy, which I omit for obvious reasons. North Wentworth and North Brant, in the meantime, had been merged into one, and Monck had disappeared, so that the figures I am now giving have to do with only 43 seats instead of 46. In this connection, I group with the Liberal majorities the member for West Bruce, and the member for Prince Edward County, independent Patron Liberals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hon. gentlemen will not get much comfort out of whatever little argument they might make by my having grouped these with the Liberal party, if they think they are not correctly grouped.

The figures are as follows:—The 43 constituencies gave a Conservative majority of 3,814 and a Liberal majority of 12,442. The election returns gave 17 Conservatives and 26 Liberals, or a majority of 9 for the Liberals in this House. But a fair proportion, based on the majorities given at the polls, would have been 10 Conservative seats to 33 Liberals, or a rightful Liberal majority in Parliament of 23 instead of 9. In other words, the gerrymander caused a loss to the Liberal party of 14 votes on a division of this Parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. Why does the hon. gentleman make the division on majorities instead of the total vote polled? Does he not see the distinction?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I take the majorities as a fair test. Take the gross majorities and divide them by the gross number of seats, and you get a fair proportion of the majority of seats.

Mr. HAGGART. No, it is the total vote polled which the hon. gentleman ought to take.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is free to argue that point.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you given the figures, showing the average unit of representation of these 46 seats?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It must be 20,904.

Mr. CLARKE. Of those 46 seats?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could give the hon. gentleman the figures to add up if he desires them. The result of that redistribution has been that, as a result of the various general elections, in 1882 the Liberal party lost 10 votes on a division of Parliament; in 1887, they lost 12 votes on a division; in 1891, they lost 10 on a division; and in 1896, 14 on a division. That being so, I think I have made out a case showing the existence of a grievance, and a grievance which a popular assembly like this is bound, at the earliest moment, to redress. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is anxious to take part in this discussion, so I will illustrate the effect of this redistribution with the case of North Bruce. The hon. gentleman had not a seat in Parliament when the Redistribution Act of 1882 was passed, still he, doubtless, had some influence here. By the Confederation Act, North Bruce was divided into two ridings—North Bruce and South Bruce. The township of Saugeen was part of the riding of North Bruce. When the census of 1881 was taken, the county of Bruce had a population of 65,188, which, if equally divided into three, would give 21,729 for each constituency. The Redistribution Act of 1882 gave three seats to the county of Bruce. The population of North Bruce, as it existed under the census of 1881, was 20,735, being less than the unit of population for the county.

Mr. McNEILL. There was no North Bruce at that time. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) speaking of Bruce as it was when divided into two ridings?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The county of Bruce was divided at the time of confederation into two ridings, one of them being North Bruce; in that riding of North Bruce was the township of Saugeen, and in that township of Saugeen was a very substantial Liberal majority.

Mr. McNEILL. And in the township of Bruce also.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And in the township of Bruce also—let the hon gentleman take what comfort he can in that. Well, Sir, the two south townships of North Bruce were Saugeen and Eldersile——

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) might as well possess his soul in patience——

Mr. McNEILL. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) wanted to be right in his facts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am giving nothing but facts.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wanted to say that the county of Bruce was divided by the Redistribution Act of 1882 into three ridings, North, West and East Bruce; and as a result of that redivision, there was given to West Bruce a population of 24,218, and to North Bruce a population of 18,645.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) mean to say that is the population as he finds it to-day?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking now of the population when the Redistribution Bill was passed.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman had better deal with it as it is now, not as it was 100 years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will come to that presently—and I will take up Bothwell, too, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has already taken that up in his schemes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Put it down, rather.

Mr. FOSTER. You must take a thing up before you can put it down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was saying that, as a result of the division of Bruce in 1882, North Bruce was left with a population of 18,645, and West Bruce with a population of 24,218, a difference of 5,573. In order to accomplish that inequality it was necessary to detach from the original riding of North Bruce the township of Saugeen, with a population of 2,090, thus making North Bruce, which was below the unit of population, still further below that unit, and increasing the disparity between North Bruce and West Bruce.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the hon. gentleman say what was the population of these ridings at the next census?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will come to that.

Mr. McNEILL. The reason I ask the question is that North Bruce was at that time rapidly filling up with settlers, whereas the south was an old riding; and the hon. gentleman will find at the next census there was a great change, and North Bruce had greatly increased, while South Bruce had largely diminished.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will come to that. I am showing that the riding of North Bruce at the time of the Redistribution Act of 1882 had about 5,500 population less than West Bruce, and in order to bring about that inequality it was necessary to detach something from North Bruce, and the only thing that could be detached was the township of Saugeen, and that was detached and for good reason.

Mr. McNEILL. And the township of Bruce also.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; if we deal with the matter geographically Saugeen would come before Bruce.

Mr. McNEILL. But it was detached.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was not part of North Bruce at that time.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Now, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) will only be patient——

Mr. McNEILL. Of course, if the hon. gentleman wants to make misstatements of fact——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the last thing I desire to do.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, I tell the hon. gentleman he is mistaken.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) will have an opportunity of proving that. I would like to be allowed to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I might call attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that while inter-

ruptions are sometimes allowed, they are being carried further than is consistent with the courtesy of debate.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to say that nothing is further from my intention than that. I wish to keep the hon. gentleman right as to the facts, and if he does not wish me to do so, I will not say another word.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the slightest desire to prevent reasonable inquiry as I proceed, but there is a limit even to that. What I wish to illustrate and will illustrate, if I am allowed to proceed, is that the Gerrymander Act—and I make the proposition and we shall see whether I prove it—the Gerrymander Act of 1882 and the Gerrymander Act of 1891 resulted in enabling the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) to carry North Bruce from 1882 up to the present time; and if there had been no gerrymander, if the votes that were cast in the portions of North Bruce detached from it had been cast in North Bruce, he would not have been in Parliament from that time to this. That is my statement; now, I will proceed to prove it. North Bruce, before the Gerrymander Act of 1882, had a population less than that assigned to West Bruce, yet they detached from North Bruce a portion which had a Liberal majority and added it to West Bruce, increasing the Liberal majority in West Bruce. The result was that the riding of West Bruce was left with a population nearly 6,000 greater than that of North Bruce; and in the election which took place a few weeks afterwards, the hon. gentleman carried North Bruce by 88, and the Liberal party carried West Bruce by 892. Now, if the Liberal township of Saugeen, with a population of 2,000, had not been detached from North Bruce, making that population of that riding so much more below the unit of population, the hon. gentleman, instead of having a majority of 88, would have been defeated by nearly the same number. The township of Saugeen, that properly belongs to North Bruce, at that time gave a Liberal majority of 161, which would have wiped out his 88 majority and left him in a minority of nearly as much. So much for the beginning. I think I have made a start with the hon. gentleman. No doubt he had good reason to thank the gerrymander in that case.

Well, Sir, I proceed to the election of 1887. In that election the riding of North Bruce gave the hon. gentleman a majority of 113. The riding of West Bruce gave the Liberal candidate a majority of 1,085. The township of Saugeen, which he had fortunately got rid of, had given a Liberal majority on that occasion of 214. Where would his majority of 113 be, and where would those great orations which he has embalmed upon the "Hansard" have been but for the gerrymander of the riding in 1882? Great was the power of the gerrymander. Well, the 1891 election came on. How did the ridings behave then? It was getting a little uncomfortable for the hon. gentleman. He succeeded in carrying North Bruce on that occasion by the enormous majority of 30. The Liberals carried the hive of West Bruce by a majority of 930. The Liberal township of Saugeen which had been so successfully placed in the hive to make it sure of returning a Liberal, had on this occasion given a Liberal majority of 222. Why, Sir, he would have been nearly 200 in a minority if he had faced the music without the Gerrymander Act of 1882. I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman advocating and worshipping such legislation. He says that his riding was rapidly increasing in population, that his soul was so moved by a desire to equalize populations that in 1882 he felt it necessary to detach in anticipation 2,000 population from North Bruce and put it into West Bruce, because he thought that in ten years hence the population of North Bruce might become more nearly equal. Well, in 1891, when his majority had come to 30, what took place? He was afraid to face the music again with that majority of only 30, and something else had to be done. Saugeen could not be detached, but there was a municipality that had been showing up badly so far as the hon. gentleman was concerned. There was the little town of Port Elgin, which, in the year 1891, had given a Liberal majority of 88, it was in my hon. friend's constituency. Now, if Port Elgin could by hook or by crook be detached from North Bruce it might save the hon. gentleman once more; and then in 1892, for the first time, he argued about the importance of equalizing the population, and to that end he detaches the small village of Port Elgin from North Bruce and puts it into West Bruce, because at that time North Bruce had become slightly more populous than West Bruce. There was in 1891 a difference in favour of North Bruce of 1,812, and by putting Port Elgin into West Bruce he could make West Bruce more populous than North Bruce. But he only equalized them to the extent of 302. In 1892 the hon. gentleman took Port Elgin out of North Bruce and put it into West Bruce in order to bring about an equalization of 302; but in 1882 he weakened the population of North Bruce which was then below that of West Bruce, and brought it down to a minority of nearly 6,000.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. member allow me to interrupt him?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. I think my hon. friend's memory is a little defective. I want to remind him that I stated on the floor of the House that it was not only for the purpose of equalizing the population, but because Port Elgin had been put five miles off in another constituency, and I thought it was unreasonable that I should be obliged to go five miles into the territory of West Bruce

to find a majority against me. I frankly stated that on the floor of the House; and I ask the hon. members on the other side if they think in all fairness that that arrangement should be allowed to continue. I also stated at the time that the village of Port Elgin had been left in the riding of North Bruce at the suggestion of a friend of the hon. gentleman, namely, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). He and I had a little conversation across the floor of the House at the time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You have not stated it all.

Mr. McNEILL. Do you want me to state it all? I understand that my hon. friend's explanation of the matter was this: There was a suggestion made to put in the township of Saugeen, which Sir John A. Macdonald opposed. There was also a suggestion made to put in a strip of territory lying between the villages of Southampton and Port Elgin, together with those two villages, which Sir John A. Macdonald had also refused to do. My hon. friend proposed that the village of Port Elgin should be put in, and Sir John A. Macdonald, after some pressure, agreed to that. My hon. friend's explanation of his suggestion that Port Elgin should be put in, a village which gave a Reform majority, was that, having induced Sir John A. Macdonald to put in the village of Port Elgin, he would also be able to induce him to put in the township of Saugeen, which he had already refused to put in. Is that the correct explanation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will give my explanation.

Mr. McNEILL. Does that fairly represent what my hon. friend said?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman will give his impression, and I will give my remembrance.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend can look at the "Hansard" of that date and find out whether I am correct. I pointed out to him at that time that he must have thought Sir John A. Macdonald was a very silly bird to be caught with a small pinch of salt on his tail in that way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend at some length has endeavoured to explain why he was able to succeed in having transferred the village of Port Elgin to West Bruce, namely, because he did not think it fair that he should have to travel five miles out of his constituency, the proper constituency of North Bruce, to meet his constituents of Port Elgin. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was in Parliament in 1892 when that Bill was passed; and if he was so moved in his soul against any portion of his riding being in another riding, I presume his principles were not limited to the riding of North Bruce, but would apply generally. The hon. gentleman, in 1892, supported a proposition to detach from the north riding of the county of Wentworth the township of Beverley, and annex it to the neighbouring riding, and he split the north riding of the county of Wentworth into two parts, separating the south part from the north part by the townships of Ancaster and Beverley and the city of Hamilton. He supported that Act, so far as North Wentworth was concerned. Now, what was the effect of the detachment of Port Elgin from North Bruce on the election of 1896? Again, I remind the hon. gentleman, and I remind the House, that in 1882 it was not deemed by those who advised the Government from North Bruce—and in Parliament the hon. gentleman was credited with having given them advice—but it was not deemed necessary in 1882 to bring West Bruce and North Bruce nearer together, in point of population, than nearly 6,000. Yet in 1891 and 1892, ten years afterwards, the hon. gentleman insists on a change, though the effect promoted equality to the extent of 302 only, whilst an inequality of 6,000 did not move him in 1882. It was not because Port Elgin was a little outside of North Bruce that Port Elgin was detached from North Bruce; it was because Port Elgin in 1891 had sounded a warning note, and given a majority of 88 against the hon. gentleman's party. He knew that if he had to face the electors in another election, with Port Elgin in North Bruce, it would be against him, and accordingly, Port Elgin was transferred to West Bruce. In 1896, the hon. gentleman's majority was 31. Port Elgin on that occasion gave a Liberal majority of 78. If Port Elgin had not been, fortunately for him, detached by the Act of 1892, he would have been defeated in the general election of 1896. So I have proved, I think, to the satisfaction of every fair-minded man, that, in the four elections since 1882 to the present time, the Gerrymander Act, and the Gerrymander Act alone, has seated the hon. gentleman here. That is an illustration of how the Liberal party is to-day unrepresented to the extent of 14, as a result of the Gerrymander in Ontario to which I have alluded. I say, that the point can be established by the figures I have given, and that the North Bruce case is a fair sample. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) desired to have his case considered. I would speak of Bothwell, then, as follows:—

Mr. CLANCY. With respect.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And with much greater respect after the next elections. There is an argument to be made in favour of certain changes in 1891 in regard to Bothwell. The population of Bothwell, at the time to which I refer, was 27,102. It was by that Act reduced to 22,477.

Mr. CLANCY. In 1891?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In 1881. By the Act of 1882, as the result of the election then, Bothwell had a Liberal majority —a very considerable majority—some two or three hundred.

Mr. CLANCY. When ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In 1882. By the Act of 1882 the following municipalities were detached from Bothwell :—Euphemia, with a Conservative majority of 30, was taken away.

Mr. CLANCY. Where did Euphemia belong ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will just give my facts, and the hon. gentleman can give his.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman will pardon me, because he is going on to deal with municipal county boundaries.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Euphemia is a part of the county of Lambton. There were also detached from Bothwell the townships of Howard and Orford, and the town of Bridgetown. These municipalities gave a Liberal majority of 321. Taking from that amount the 30 Conservative majorities detached, there was a net loss to the Liberal party in Bothwell of 291. There was added to Bothwell, by that Act, Wallaceburg, with a Liberal majority of 10, and Chatham township, with a Conservative majority of 64. The net loss to our party by the additions was 54, and the net loss by the detachments was 291. In other words, the change made to Bothwell weakened the Liberal party by 345. In 1882, after the gerrymander, the Conservatives carried that riding—Mr. Hawkins, I think, was the member—by a majority of 16. If these changes had not been made, instead of his having carried that riding, the present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) would have been elected by 329. Take that same riding, and see how it would have turned out for my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy), if there had been no gerrymander of that riding in 1882.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend had better follow up the successes of the hon. Minister of Justice there, year after year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will take the vote cast by the municipalities that were detached from and added to the electoral district of Bothwell by the Gerrymande Act of 1882, and we will see how the vote turned out. The hon. member (Mr. Clancy) was declared elected by a majority of 87. The municipalities which were detached from Bothwell by the Gerrymander Act, gave a Liberal majority in 1896 of 379. The municipalities that were added to Bothwell by the Gerrymander Act, gave a Conservative majority of 66. By the addition of that Conservative majority to Bothwell, and by the detachment of that Liberal majority from Bothwell, the Liberal strength was weakened by 445. Where would the hon. gentleman's majority of 87 have been, but for the Gerrymander Act, which gave him 445 votes ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is wiping out Bothwell. He does not propose, in his Bill, to build up Bothwell as a constituency, but he proposes to do away with it entirely. So, the hon. gentleman will see that his argument falls to the ground. He is not restoring Bothwell ; he is wiping it out in toto. So, that this has nothing to do with it at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am simply illustrating the working in detail of the Gerrymander Act, so that, no matter whether Bothwell is a municipal county or an electoral riding, in either case, the Gerrymander Act of 1882 is what seats the hon. member at this present moment. I do not propose to trace in detail every riding, although I have no doubt some hon. gentlemen will take up other portions of the province in question, and deal with them more in detail. I have given these few illustrations, and I can give more, if necessary, to prove the general proposition that I laid down, that the Gerrymander Acts of 1882 and 1892 have operated to deprive the people of a fair expression of public opinion, according to their party views, on the floor of this House.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman know that the hon. Minister of Justice sat for the riding of Bothwell from 1867 until defeated in 1896, almost continuously, with the exception of one session after the election of 1882 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am well aware that, because of the principles that he advocated, because of the confidence of the people in him, and because of the good sense of the people, the Minister of Justice was able to a large extent to overcome the disadvantage he laboured under in consequence of that Redistribution Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. What became of his principles the last time ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will be better able to answer that than I am.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) passes from his consideration of the effects of the gerrymander of those constituencies, might I ask him how many candidates ran in North Bruce last election ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will have a full opportunity of going into that later.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Get the "Parliamentary Companion" and you will find it there.

Mr. GILLIES. Give it to the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is only necessary to look at the map of Ontario to see what little regard was paid to the convenience of the people in carving out constituencies. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) reminded me, for example, of what took place in the county of Brant. I think I am right in saying that the north riding of Wentworth and Brant, running from Oxford through Brant to Wentworth, part of several counties, comes in contact with six or seven other ridings so shapeless is it. I believe that the north riding of the county of Ontario, consisting principally of a tier of townships ranging in width perhaps from four miles to twelve, has a length of nearly 150 miles, almost as great as the distance between Ottawa and Montreal. I should like to know on what principle the riding of North Ontario was built up in that way. How were people, members of the same constituencies, supposed to meet and confer and deliberate on public affairs, how were they to meet and discuss when separated by the practically impossible distance of over 100 miles. No person can look at the map of Ontario in the gerrymandered district, and form any other conclusion than that it was a measure designed not to secure, but to defeat, the will of the people. And, Sir, if that be the case, the duty is upon us to redeem, as we have redeemed up to this, more and more the pledges given by us to the country prior to the general election; it is our duty, I say, to redeem here one of our pledges, and our chief pledge. and since hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to assist us in redeeming our pledges, I bespeak from them their co-operation in dealing with this measure.

The Bill itself is in principle a very simple one. It is in conformity with our principle not to disturb county boundaries, and that being the case, we have to take these counties whose population is not sufficient to entitle them to two members, and assign to them one member. This applies to the counties of Dufferin, Haldimand, Lincoln, Peel, Welland, Wentworth, Muskoka and Parry Sound. Some of these counties have a population somewhat in excess of the unit, but not sufficient to entitle them to two members, and accordingly nothing remains except to assign to them one each.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population of the county of Wentworth?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I shall give the population of these counties as the result of the census of 1891. Dufferin, 16,860; Haldimand, 23,440; Lincoln, 30,079; Peel, 24,871; Welland, 30,631: Wentworth, 29,869; Muskoka, 17,038; Parry Sound, 19,317.

Mr. DAVIN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if all his calculations are based upon the census of 1891?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a Redistribution Bill that ought to have taken place immediately following the census of 1891, and as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is aware, there was a bad Government in office at that time. Then, we come to another group of counties that are entitled to be represented by more than one member, but perhaps are not entitled to three. They are Brant, Elgin, Lambton, Norfolk, Ontario, Oxford and Perth.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population of Brant?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. 36,445.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that include the Indians?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is taken from the census.

Mr. CLANCY. We all know that, but what I ask is, does it include the Indians?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to say whether it includes the Indians or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, the hon. gentleman ought to be able to say that, when he presents a Bill to this House, and founds an argument in favour of it upon these very figures. He ought to know whether two or three thousand population of a county have been disfranchised by him or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows that the Indians of Brant, some of them, are entitled to vote, and perhaps all of them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are not; they were disfranchised by you last year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is not familiar with the Ontario Act.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to ask the Postmaster General——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) wishes to interrupt he must ask the permission of the hon. gentleman addressing the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, I will ask the permission of the Postmaster General, because this is an important point.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will explain to my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) the point which I think he desires to make. The Ontario Act gives the franchise to an Indian who chooses to take his location ticket and be separate from the band and not receive an annuity, and is not in other ways dependent upon the Government. There may

be some enfranchised and there may not, but the census will speak for itself and the voters' list of the province will speak for itself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. gentleman read the population of the counties that have two members each ?

The POSTMASTER GENENAL. Yes. Brant, 36,445 ; Elgin, 43,377 ; Lambton, 58,-810 ; Norfolk, 30,992. Do the hon. gentlemen desire me to read all these figures ?

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to have them on record.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are all in the census.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Better have them here too.

Mr. CLANCY. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) that the township of Tuscarora is entirely excluded from the local franchise which we have adopted. It was included in the Dominion franchise, but all the Indians of that township are excluded under our present franchise.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How many ?

Mr. CLANCY. Somewhere about 2,000, I believe.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of suggesting in committee whether he thinks Brant ought to have less than two members. Ontario, 43,355 ; Oxford, 49,-849 ; Perth, 51,716. I now come to another group of counties that the Bill proposes to assign three members to, namely, Kent, Huron, Bruce, Grey, Middlesex, Simcoe, Wellington and York. The population of these are : Kent, 58,019 ; Huron, 66,781 ; Bruce, 64,604 ; Grey, 71,214 ; Middlesex, 58,-540 ; Simcoe, 82,727 ; Wellington, 57,543 ; York, 61,391. Then, I come to the city of Toronto. The Bill proposes that there should be four members to the city of Toronto. Since the Bill has been before the public, other views have been suggested, and they have been fully considered by the Government. I may say that it has never been the practice in Canada to give as full representation to groups of population in cities as in the more sparsely settled districts.

I want to remind hon. gentlemen of the representation of the city of Montreal. According to the census of 1881 Montreal had a population of 140,000, and yet it was left at that time with three members only. It was not then considered to be inadequately represented, nor was it deemed necessary to have an equalization of population in the three ridings ; for whilst the centre riding had only 25,000, Montreal West had 48,000 and Montreal East 67,000. So that if inequalities are suggested by the present Bill, whilst I would not defend anything in the Bill which could not be defended on its own merits, simply on the ground that it existed before, still I would point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that their party did not deem it an unfair thing to leave Montreal Centre with 25,000 population and Montreal East with 67,000, the latter constituency growing and increasing in population until 1891, when its population exceeded 90,000 ; and yet it had merely one member until the general elections of 1896.

Mr. CLARKE. How did Montreal fare in the redistribution of 1892 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The population of Montreal in 1892 attained the figure of 182,000.

Mr. CLARKE. And the representation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It had five.

Mr. CLARKE. That inequality was done away with.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was, in 1896. The population of Toronto, according to the census of 1891, was 144,000, and if you add to it the portions of Toronto that are at present in the constituencies of East and West York, the population would be brought up to 191,000.

Mr. CLARKE. 177,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, whatever it brings it up to, it will not be much less than that of Montreal with its five members. The figures I have given are census figures. I will say, with reference to the representation of Toronto, that the Government are desirous of making this Bill in every respect fair, and removing from it every possible semblance of unfairness. It is in that spirit that the measure is conceived ; it is in that spirit that suggestions that have appeared in the press have been entertained, and it is in that spirit that I am authorized by the Government to announce that if it is the wish of this House, the Government will approve of increasing the representation of Toronto from four to five.

Mr. MACLEAN. What will the unit of representation be then ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would depend on what you make the total population of the city. The population of Montreal is 182,000, making the unit of population there about 36,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman now tell the House why the city should not have representation equal to that of the county portions of the country ? Why should the city be disfranchised, or have two votes that are only equal to one elsewhere ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you support that system before ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not for me to find explanations, but there are various arguments. For example, one argument is that a city is sure to have among its population men representing outside constituencies. There are many gentlemen living in the city of Toronto and representing outside constituencies both in the Senate and in the House of Commons.

Mr. WALLACE. How many ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not gone through the list, but I think I would be safe in saying that there are half a dozen residents of Toronto representing outside constituencies. We have, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East York——

Mr. MACLEAN. I represent the city as well as the county, and I live in the city.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And brought up in the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. it is doubly represented.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are probably to-day resident in the city of Toronto 20 members of the Senate and House of Commons.

Mr. WALLACE. Only two in the House of Commons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know three—the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and there may be more—I have not gone through the list.

Mr. CLARKE. You are wiping one of those seats out, occupied by a gentleman who resides in Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not anticipating that it will deprive the hon. gentleman of a seat.

Mr. CLARKE. You are wiping out the constituency he represents now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He represents a constituency, part of which is in the city, and part of which is outside the city. I now come to the next point in the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the hon. gentleman, before he goes on, if it is proposed to divide Toronto into five constituencies ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is proposed to assign five seats to the city of Toronto, and to leave the judiciary to divide the city.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell me where he takes the seat from that he gives to Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a very proper question, because it is quite impossible to give another seat to Toronto without taking it from some other place. The hon. gentleman is aware that Bothwell is disappearing, and that its fragments are going back to the counties from which they came. That will give back to Kent a considerable portion of the territory that belonged to Kent municipality, raising its population to 58,000 odd. It was proposed in the draft to give Kent three members, but in order to meet the views of those who think Toronto should have another member, it is proposed to give that city that other member, and to give two members to the county of Kent.

Mr. CLANCY. That fixes it all right now, does it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I trust that the hon. gentleman will find that any objection he had to over-representation in Kent will be overcome by that. The Bill also proposes to restore to certain counties in the province of Quebec a number of municipalities that were destroyed from time to time.

Mr. CLARKE. Is any change made in Algoma ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. In the province of Prince Edward Island——

Mr. McNEILL. Before the hon. gentleman comes to that, I would like to ask him whether the judges are to take into consideration the increase of population since the last census, or is the increase or change of population during the last eight years to be left out of consideration altogether ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill mentions the matters that are referred to the judges. The census deals with the subject of population. This is a measure that is proposed to be passed in this year, 1899, which should have been passed in the year 1892. And they will sit as if they were sitting in 1892, having before them the census of 1891, the maps of the provinces, the history of the country and such other circumstances as they may deem necessary to guide them in arriving at a fair judgment.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the judges sit as a court and hear both sides or in secret conclave and decide for themselves.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to say whether they will sit as a court.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the matter is referred direct to the judges, are they to meet themselves and settle it among themselves and not as a court ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not desirable they should sit as a court, I presume, but as commissioners.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not quite understand the hon. gentleman's answer with regard to the population. Am I to understand that the judges are not to take into consideration any change of population that may have occurred during the last eight years, or are they to be allowed to take into consideration any such change that may be brought to their notice ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a measure being past nunc pro tunc. They will sit and undo what my hon. friends succeeded in accomplishing in 1892. They will be asked to assume that they are sitting immediately after the census of 1891.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us some information respecting the constituencies of Ottawa and Hamilton, which are now represented by two members each ? Is it intended to have them divided into two constituencies, each returning one member ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not intended to do anything which is not indicated by the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. The intention, then, is that there shall be two members representing Ottawa and two Hamilton, and they are to be elected by the city at large ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill will not interfere with anything it does not purport to interfere with.

Mr. MACLEAN. How are the judges to deal with the city of Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The judges will assign five seats to the city of Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will they be free to give West Toronto two members and some other portion one member ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will be free, unless the Bill should otherwise circumscribe their powers.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I find nothing in it. If the hon. gentleman will read the Bill——

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. Minister is explaining the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite right, and I do not object to that question. If the hon. member does not understand, let me tell him that the Bill proposes to ask the judges to take the city of Toronto and divide it, as in their judgment seems right, into the number of constituencies the Bill assigns to that city.

Mr. MACLEAN. Can the judges give to West Toronto two members and East Toronto only one ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will be asked to give five separate seats.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the very point I wished to be informed upon.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the judges be asked to divide the constituencies of Ottawa and Hamilton and make two in each ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained that the Government, on this occasion, is not dealing with the whole province, but only seeking to deal with the more glaring abuses of the Gerrymander Acts ; but if the Bill does not go far enough to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps the Government will be prepared to advance it a stage.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the hon. gentleman say whether it is to be left to the judges to determine whether they will hear evidence or not, or whether they are to be precluded from hearing evidence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill contains all the necessary provisions to guide the judges. The subject, no doubt, will be discussed fully in Parliament, and if the arguments are sufficiently cogent to suggest any wiser course, no doubt a wiser course will be adopted.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the course intended by the Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I refer my hon. friend to the measure.

Mr. McNEILL. I am asking for an explanation, and I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to be discourteous. He says that if some wiser course is suggested, such course may be adopted. But I want to know what the course now provided is. Are the judges to determine, under the Bill as my hon. friend understands it, and which he is supposed to be explaining, whether they will admit evidence or not, or are they precluded from admitting the evidence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I refer the hon. gentleman to subsection 2 of section 2 of the Bill :

> The letters patent appointing the commissioners shall direct them, in making the divisions, to consider the distribution of population according to the latest census of Canada, the public convenience, and such divisions as appear to them best calculated to do substantial justice.

Mr. McNEILL. Are they to take evidence in reference to that or not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The clause of the Bill contains their instructions and they will interpret it.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the intention in the mind of my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My intention would not override any provision of the measure.

Mr. McNEILL. What I want to know is, what, according to the hon. gentleman who

is explaining the measure, is its intention with regard to this matter ?

Mr. FOSTER. Let some one else take hold of the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to continue my remarks.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend refuses to give the explanation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I refer the hon. gentleman to the Bill. I next come to Prince Edward Island. The Bill restores the county lines to the province of Prince Edward Island. That island is entitled to five members, and the counties have, until very lately, been represented each by two. A change was made. Portions of one county were detached and given to another, and the number of members reduced from six to five. It is now proposed to restore to each county those portions that municipally belong to it, and to give representation accordingly—one to King's, which has the smallest population, and two each to the other counties, whose population exceeds that of King's.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it intended to divide the counties of Prince and King's ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not intended to divide the counties of Prince and King's into two separate constituencies, but to adhere to the practice which had so long obtained since confederation of allowing each county to vote as one constituency, sending two members each.

Mr. MARTIN. Why is the principle of dividing the constituencies established for Ontario and not for Prince Edward Island ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The measure endeavours to disturb as little as possible the arrangements that have obtained in each province, from confederation down, and if the people of Prince Edward Island has had one system of voting and the people of another province another system of voting, we desire as little as possible to interfere with those customs which the people have become accustomed to.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill is founded on custom now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is adapted to consult the convenience of the people.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. Minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. Minister to have declared that he would decline to be interrupted.

Mr. WALLACE. On the contrary, he is just delighted, Mr. Speaker, to have questions put to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With these remarks I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). After listening attentively to the speech with which the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has favoured the House, I am at a loss to know why he prefaced his remarks with an apology and a tendering of his sympathy to the House for his absence when the Bill was introduced, so that the duty of introducing and explaining the Bill devolved upon the Premier. When the hon. gentleman prefaced his remarks with that statement, I supposed he was going to deliver an able, clear exposition of this measure, which he found the Premier had not understood. The Prime Minister, it would appear, had taken his place, unfortunately, in the hon. gentleman's absence, but had lamentably failed in doing justice to this measure. We all listened with great interest to hear the words of wisdom which should fall from his lips in explanation of this measure, which the Prime Minister was quite unable to explain. But I think that those who have heard the latter part of the hon. gentleman's speech, must have come to the conclusion that he himself knew little or nothing about the Bill. When asked the commonest, simplest and most pertinent questions, as to what was intended by the Bill, he answered : I must refer you to the Bill. With the hon. gentleman, it was the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. It was not the William that was equal to the occasion, but the Bill.

Now, I may say at the outset, that, in one respect, the House was indebted to the hon. gentleman. He has certainly exhibited a frankness which the Prime Minister failed to exhibit, when he introduced this measure. The First Minister, with the great plausibility which he possesses, undertook to explain that this was a very innocuous measure, intended to correct some little inadvertencies of no very great import. But the Postmaster General has thrown off the disguise, and tells the House and the country that this Bill means one thing, and one thing only—to strengthen the hands of the Liberal party before they venture to appeal to the people. That is the beginning and the end ; that is the whole story. The hon. gentleman clearly confesses that he is afraid, and the Government of which he is a member are afraid, to face the popular verdict. I am not at all surprised at that, having learned, as they have, the feeling of this country, from one end of it to the other, in regard to the measures they have put before this House. I am not surprised that they have to come to the conclusion that there was one thing, and one thing only, that was of great importance to Canada, and that was the salvation of this Government. Under the law and constitution of the country, they are compelled to go back to the electors, from whom they received power, and ask them for a renewal of their term of office. They find that it would be hopeless,

in view of the position they have taken, in view of the measures they have attempted and have succeeded in forcing through this House, for them to challenge the independent verdict of the country. They could not do so with any hope of success. Consequently the hon. gentleman has thrown off the mask to-day, and told us that this Bill means one thing, and one thing alone. There is no regard for distribution of population. The hon. gentleman tells us the question of representation by population was a big one, when it was one between Ontario and Quebec, when the Liberal party in the province of Ontario were demanding, in thunder tones, that their province should have greater weight and influence by being allowed representation according to its population. But, he said, it was a provincial question. Does not the hon. gentleman see that every argument, every word, that George Brown ever uttered in defence and support of the principle of representation by population, applies, and forcibly applies, to the mode in which that representation shall be distributed in the various provinces? Does not the hon. gentleman see that the whole story of representation by population is a farce, if the Government can so dispose of the population so as to prevent the fair and independent verdict of the country being given by the voice of the great body of the people? There is no doubt that, under the system of county boundaries and arrangements that have long existed, a certain difficulty arises in establishing a hard-and-fast line of rigid adherence to the unit of population. The right hon. First Minister, when he introduced the Bill, read a long portion of a speech of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald on the importance of county boundaries. But he forgot that Sir John had delivered himself afterwards, when he had had ten years' more experience of public life, in 1882, when he qualified largely the views originally presented by him in regard to the great importance of county boundaries, and showed that the question of population must be taken into consideration, in order to give the people a fair and equal voice in the representation of the country. Every person knows that, in certain sections of the country, there are cases that affect the views and sentiments of the people that do not prevail in other sections; and the only way by which you can get a fair and dispassionate verdict given by the people is, without disturbing the county boundaries unnecessarily, without doing any violence to these that can be avoided, to so arrange it that the unit of population shall be maintained as nearly as possible, avoiding the disturbance that would follow a too close adherence either to the county boundaries on one side, or to the unit of population on the other. But the hon. gentleman started out by saying, that this Bill is intended to correct the unfairness practised in 1882 by what he calls the Gerrymander Bill. He has denounced, in the strongest terms, the violence that was done by that Bill to the county boundaries. He has discoursed on that subject very forcibly and very fully. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he is a supporter of the Liberal Government of Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I thought that Liberals never did wrong at any time, under any circumstances—I thought that was the doctrine of Liberalism. I say, that every word that the hon. gentleman has said of the Gerrymander Bill—as he calls it—the Redistribution Bill of 1882, applies with tenfold force to the province of Ontario, as gerrymandered by Sir Oliver Mowat. And yet Sir Oliver Mowat has not only never failed to have the hon. gentleman's hearty support in all these measures that were taken for the purpose, avowedly, admittedly, of striking down his opponents and increasing the power of the Liberal party in Ontario—doing the grossest violence to county boundaries, and everything that the hon. gentleman has spoken of as so important—but he was brought down here by the Premier to become a member of the Liberal Government here. By supporting the Ontario Government, these hon. gentlemen have adopted the policy propounded by Sir Oliver Mowat, and have given their imprimatur to the most extravagant act of gerrymanderism that has ever been committed within the bounds of Canada. I would recommend the hon. gentleman, and I would recommend the Government, to abandon this pretext of following the county boundaries, and to acknowledge that the only principle underlying this measure, the only principle which they know anything about, is the great cardinal principle of obtaining, by means fair or unfair, such advantage as will enable them to strangle certain constituencies in Canada, when they have to appeal again to the electorate. That is the only principle in this matter.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says they are very anxious to have a fair measure. Is this a fair measure that has been laid upon the Table of this House? So gross was its unfairness that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have been compelled to change it already, because they could not face a second reading of this Bill until they had admitted its gross unfairness. Is that a fair Bill that allows a Conservative district, with 200,000, as this Bill did allow them when introduced, to elect only four members to this House, while it gives to districts containing a population of 200,000, supposed to contain a Grit majority, power to return ten members to this House? Within the four corners of this Bill you find 200,000 constituents, avowedly Conserva-

tives, held down to four members, and you find districts containing a population of 200,000 allowed to send ten members to this House. Is that fair? Is there an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who will say that that is a legitimate measure?

I shall only refer briefly to the observations made by an hon. gentleman who sat down after telling the House that he did not know anything about the Bill, and that we would have to read it for ourselves; he did not know what the judges would consider it their duty to do under this Bill, whether they would hold a court, whether they would take testimony pro and con, and whether they would sit in secret. But this is a vital question, and touches the foundation of this measure. Yet the hon. gentleman admitted that he did not know anything about it, and I suppose we shall have to retain a lawyer who will be able to construe the Bill for us in such a way that we may find out what it means.

Now, Sir, I may say that if this Gerrymander Bill of 1882 was as frightful a measure as the hon. gentleman has intimated, the people of Canada have great reason for thanking God that that Bill was put upon the statute-book. If the Conservative party owed to that Bill the power under which they have governed this country since 1882, down to three years ago, no persons ought to be so thankful as the hon. gentlemen opposite. Suppose this Bill of 1882 had not been passed in the form in which it was passed, and suppose these gentlemen opposite had come into power, where would Canada be to-day? Why, Sir, the first thing that would have happened the National Policy, the life-blood of this country, that which they now admit is the great source of life and vitality for this country, would have been swept away. Where would preferential trade have been, the pretense which has covered the breasts of hon. gentlemen opposite with decorations? There would have been no preferential trade. We would have been taking a tariff made at Washington against England, and the attitude of Canada would have been that which was described by the Hon. Edward Blake in the "Times" newspaper, at the heart of the Empire, who declared that the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite contained the germs of commercial subjugation to the United States, soon to be followed up by the political disintegration of our country and our absorption by the United States of America. If the Bill of 1882 had not been passed, where would the Canadian Pacific Railway have been, with its 7,000 miles of railway and branch lines owned or leased, covering this country? It would have been wiped out by hon. gentlemen opposite, who, under their resolution tabled only two years before 1882, declared that the work ought to stop at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and who had never dreamed in their wildest imaginations of connecting the city of Ottawa, the seat of Government, with Fort Garry, now the city of Winnipeg. I say that if the hon. gentleman has shown that Canada owes to that Bill what he says it does, in keeping the Liberal party out of power and maintaining in power the Conservative party, which has made Canada what it is to-day, and if, as he says, that was an unfair measure, then unfairness was never used more wisely and in the best interests of any country than was that measure.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has admitted that political gain is the object. If ever the Minister of Justice committed an act that to the end of time will stamp him as a narrow-minded man, blinded by personal passion and prejudice, he committed it when he drafted this Bill for the purpose of striking down a man whom the electors of Bothwell had declared that they considered a better man than himself. I say that all through this measure, whether we consider its treatment of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)——

Mr. GIBSON. You read him out of the party.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—who here and now I recognize and always recognized, as an ornament to this House. I read him out of the party—why did I read him out of the party? Why, Sir, if hon. gentlemen opposite knew what the word gratitude means, the last man they would touch is the hon. member for North Bruce. The last men they would touch are the hon. members for East York (Mr. Maclean) and West York (Mr. Wallace), for they owe their positions in this House to-day to the support that they received from these gentlemen on a very vital and important measure. I say, therefore, that if ever black ingratitude stamped a measure that emanated from any Government in the world, it stamps this measure by which the hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to strike down men to whose support they owe their position on the Treasury benches to-day. Although I think these hon. gentlemen who are aimed at were mistaken in the course they took, I recognize that they were actuated by the highest and most conscientious motives. And now the Government endeavour to strike down these men by abusing the power that they believe they possess, but which I do not believe they possess; and I will tell the House before I sit down why I do not believe they possess the power to put so infamous and so unconstitutional a measure as this upon the statute-book of Canada. The hon. gentleman gloats fiendishly over striking down the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), as he thinks he is doing; he gloats fiendishly over striking

down the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). But it is not done yet, and I do not believe it will be done. Before I sit down I shall show the unconstitutionality of this infamous Act, and that the right hon. Prime Minister has read himself out of court on the constitutional question. I shall expose the hollow and empty pretenses by which the right hon. gentleman has endeavoured to bolster up the constitutionality of this measure, and which the hon. Postmaster General wisely avoids, because, I suppose, he knew that a measure such as this never was contemplated by the Act of confederation, and that it was a violation of the spirit and sentiment that underlies the whole of that Act. They have brought in this Act, this unconstitutional, this unfair, this unjust measure for the avowed purpose of strengthening their hands against an outraged electorate in this country. But I believe that there is independent sentiment enough in the great independent electorate of the country to rise in its might and say that a Government who have no means, no measures. nothing that they can show that is calculated to promote the public interest. who are driven to the miserable expedient of cutting and carving the constituencies so as to enable 200,000 Liberal voters to send to Parliament ten members, while 200,000 Conservative voters are only able to send four members—that a Government that are reduced to such an extremity as that are unworthy of the support of independent free men. The independent men, and they are numbered by thousands and by tens of thousands to-day, who believed what these gentlemen declared, solemnly, in this House and on every hustings in this country, were their principles which, when they got into power they would maintain, face to face as these hon. gentlemen are, with every promise violated, with every principle that they had propounded trampled under foot—these independent men, by tens and hundreds of thousands will say: We are not to be dragged at the heels of a Government or of a party that, having violated every principle and being unable to show anything they can do for the country in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine. come down to Parliament and say. there is only one measure that we put in the mouth of the Governor General to submit to Parliament, and it is a measure to strengthen the hands of the Liberal party by cutting up constituencies in violation of the constitution of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are constitutional wreckers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says that they are constitutional wreckers. They are a destructive party. There are two parties. Men and parties are moulded upon two great principles. The party that accomplishes anything for the country are a constructive party. The Conservative party from the first hour of the birth of Canada, thirty-two years ago, down to this hour, have proved that they were the constructive party. Measure after measure, calculated to aid, to expand, to unite, to consolidate, to develop and to build up a great nation on this northern half of North America, has come from that party, and it is due to those measures that hon. gentlemen opposite are enabled to boast of the grandeur and greatness of Canada to-day. We can point to-day to the great constructive policy of the Conservative party which have brought forward every measure—I say it without hesitation—every measure that has made Canada great, progressive and prosperous, and we not only brought them forward, but we fought them through the Parliament of Canada and put them on the statute-book despite all the power, all the influence and all the opposition that hon. gentlemen could offer to them, and by which we have built up here in Canada an edifice and a monument that every Canadian may look upon with just pride and may congratulate himself that the Liberal-Conservative party had the desire and had the power not only to conceive these great measures, that have accomplished so much for Canada but to carry them out, to make them law and to put them into successful operation despite all the opposition that hon. gentlemen could offer. I pity them; I am sorry that the success of the Liberal-Conservative party has been so great that, when, with the assembled wisdom of the present Government, they sat down in Council to conceive what great measure should be inaugurated in this last year of the 19th century, when they asked themselves: What great measure is it that we should put before the Parliament of Canada, and, when, after they had scanned the country, after they had searched the country from end to end, after they had looked it over from the east to the west and from the north to the south, they were driven to the humiliating confession that everything had been done, that nothing had been left for them to do except to introduce a Gerrymander Bill. That Bill, and that Bill alone, will be handed down for all time to come as the great effort of the assembled wisdom of the great Liberal Government and party in this year of our Lord to signalize what the last year of the century could accomplish, a Gerrymander Bill, nothing more, nothing less. When it comes before this House the hon. Postmaster General who undertakes to explain it to the House, after having admitted that the object of the Bill is undisguisedly to strengthen the Liberals and to break down the strength of Conservative sentiment in this House and this country, closes by declaring that, practically, they will have to retain a lawyer to enable the House to know what the clauses mean as he himself is unable to explain them. But the hon. Postmaster

General tells us, and I think he has followed the right hon. Minister in that respect, that Quebec is untouched. Why is Quebec untouched? Was there no room after the Act of 1882? These hon. gentlemen have intimated that they would not attempt any alteration in that province except of a most insignificant character. In this they pay a tribute to the effect of the Act of 1882 so far as that province is concerned. When we come to Prince Edward Island the hon. gentleman says they wanted to go back to the former state of things where two counties would return two men each and the other one, because it would leave county boundaries untouched. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), asked a very pertinent question: Why should you leave Hamilton with two members and Ottawa with two members and take away two members from West Toronto and divide them into single constituencies? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) does not seem to know whether that would be the effect of the Bill or not; but, undoubtedly, although I am not a lawyer, I believe, that is the effect of the Bill. He is asked the question: Why do you do that? Oh, well, he says, because we do not want to disturb the state of things that existed a long time ago. What has he to say as to St. John, N.B.? Why is he disturbing the condition of things in St. John, N.B., which existed for a century, for the last hundred years? The city and county of St. John have always elected two members, one for the city, and those having votes in the city voted also for the member for the county. Has anybody ever complained of that? Why, Sir, the secret is simply this: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), or his mentor in this matter, who is an astute authority on everything like gerrymandering and arranging elections, says to him: The Liberal party will have a better chance if you separate the city from the county; and so, in order to give the Liberal party a better chance, a condition of things which has existed for a century is to be swept away and the Liberal party strengthened. I do not think it will be necessary for me to waste any more time with the remarks which fell from the Postmaster General in introducing this Bill. Notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has slightingly referred to the manner in which the Bill was introduced by the Prime Minister, I must be permitted to go back and to pay some attention to the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman on that occasion. I do not think the right hon. gentleman was at all happy. He introduced the Bill, as he always does, with such an extremely bland and pleasant manner that you would suppose it was one of the most innocuous things it was possible to conceive, and that all you had to do was to fall down and worship it as being of the most charming, fair and excellent character. But when I ventured to make a few observations in relation to the Bill, my right hon. friend, unfortunately for himself, lost his temper and did not do himself quite justice. In reference to myself he made some very extravagant statements, and he charged me with having been guilty of making a speech which contained nothing but "Billingsgate," or abuse. I do not think the right hon. gentleman knows what "Billingsgate" is, for if he did he would not apply the term to anything that I had said.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have sat long enough in this House to understand something about it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had said nothing except to give a little resume of the measures which the Government of the right hon. gentleman introduced into this House, and I drew the attention of the House perhaps in somewhat strong terms, to the opinion I entertained and which I believe the country entertained with reference to these measures. That is not Billingsgate. "Billingsgate" is using low, vulgar language. I ought to know something about it as I have the honour to be a fishmonger; being a member of the Fishmongers' Guild, which is the only one of those old English guilds which really performs important services for the Government of England to-day. The right hon. gentleman pays a very poor compliment to the measures he and his Government have forced through this House, if he says that a simple reference to them is "Billingsgate." I said nothing more than to characterise the measures of the Government as they should be characterized, and I leave it to the right hon. gentleman to reconcile it to himself whether the term "Billingsgate" is properly applicable to those measures with which he has been so closely connected.

But, Sir, I did challenge the constitutionality of this Bill, and I drew the attention of the Premier to the fact, that he closed his speech wihout having made any reference to the authority upon which he ventured, in the year 1899, to bring forward a redistribution measure. I told the right hon. gentleman what he well knew, that he would search the records of the Parliament of Canada in vain to find any such Act passed at such a time, and, for the sufficient reason that the constitution of the country indicates in plain and unmistakable terms, not only the time, but the only time that was proper for a redistribution Bill. Could anything be more illustrative of the force and wisdom of the constitution of the country, which provides that such a measure as this should only be enacted immediately after the close of each decennial census; could anything better illustrate that than the position in which the Postmaster General found himself to-day. In the year 1899 he is explaining a Bill that is to settle the redistribution of seats in the Parliament of Canada, and when he is quoting the population of constituencies and is asked what population he is referring to, his answer is: Oh, to the population in

the census of 1891. He is asked again : Are you not aware that in various sections of the country there has been an overwhelming change since then, that that which might be proper after the census of 1891, has ceased to be so in 1899, because there has been such unexampled progress made in many sections of the country as to render absolutely absurd any comparison founded upon the census of 1891 ; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) replied : The judges have got to go back to 1891 ; yes, Mr. Speaker, the judges have to become antiquaries. They cannot take cognizance of the condition of the country to-day, but they must act on the population of the country in 1891, and only on that. Such a proposition has only to be stated to show the utter absurdity of it, and to show the wisdom of the Imperial Act which gives us our constitution, under which a redistribution is to be made only after each decennial census. It has always been recognized that the only time such a measure should be dealt with by the Parliament of Canada was after the decennial census. Section 51 of the British North America Act says :

> On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority and in such a manner and at such a time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides.

There is an absolute direction that this measure shall take place after the decennial census, and then to show in the most emphatic manner that then and then only could such a measure be dealt with. It is said in section 92, in reference to the exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures :

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the class of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say : "The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of lieutenant governor."

The British North America Act is not contented with stating that the only time provided for a redistribution Act is afer the decennial census ; not satisfied with that, you have on the face of the same Act, a broad distinction drawn between the Dominion of Canada and the various provinces by saying that the provinces can pass a Bill of this kind at any time. It would be difficult to find anything more conclusive as to that.

Mr. BRITTON. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) think, then, that the Act that was passed in 1893 to amend the Act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons was unconstitutional ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have read to the hon. gentleman, and, if he is a lawyer, as I believe he is, and a very able one, he ought to be able to understand this :

> On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such a time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides.

I think that answers the question my hon. friend asks.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think that answers it at all, because that provides simply for readjusting the representation as between the different provinces. That is a very different thing from determining the limits of the electoral divisions in any one province ; and the Act I refer to seems to me no more constitutional than the Act now proposed, because that Act did change the boundaries of a great many constituencies. I will send the book over to the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will deal with that, as the hon. gentleman will see, before I sit down, because it will follow on the argument I am now addressing to the First Minister on this very important question. I addressed the right hon. gentleman on that point, and called his attention to the fact that he had addressed the House on the Redistribution Bill, and, although he knew very well that the right to pass any such measure was challenged by the press all over this country, except after a decennial census, he had sat down without any reference to the authority under which this Bill was proposed. The hon. gentleman undertook afterwards to deal with that question, and said—I read from "Hansard" :

> He asked me if we have power to bring in such a measure, since there has been no census. I answer in words which I hope he will adopt, that, according to the precedents laid down on the floor of this House more than once, we have that power. Redistributions of constituencies have taken place under similar circumstances not only after a census, but during a session when there had been no census. I would call to the hon. gentleman's attention the fact that in 1883 or in 1885, Parliament, at the suggestion of a Conservative Government, brought in a measure to redistribute the counties of Argenteuil and Terrebonne. One or two years later the Government introduced a Bill to reconstitute the constituencies of Terrebonne and Montcalm. If that can be done for one, it can be done for many. There is our power.

There is the hon. gentleman's argument. It is delightfully indefinite. He says, 1883 or 1885. The hon. gentleman, bringing in a Bill to redistribute the constituencies, contrary to what he knows to be the strong sentiment and opinion of a large section of the country—I am inclined to think that the whole of it, except where extreme partisan necessity indicates a divergence from it—the hon. gentleman, knowing that, had taken so little pains to ascertain whether he had any authority or power to do so, that he absolutely referred me to Acts of 1883 or 1885 in which, he said, it had been done. There are no

such Acts in 1883 or in 1885. The hon. gentleman will search, as I have done, in vain, to find any such Acts, giving any such authority or power.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? I stand corrected. I meant 1893. I had not supposed that the question of power would be challenged, in view of the precedents already introduced in this House. But my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) has just called the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition to the Act of 1893, which recast the Act of the year before in several particulars, four or five at least. In regard to the county of Terrebonne, I meant to refer to the Act of 1869, 32-33 Victoria, which took the township of Doncaster from the county of Montcalm and put it in the county of Terrebonne.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The right hon. leader of the Government and the hon. member for Kingston will find that that does not relieve them from the difficulty in the slightest degree; and I think I shall be able, I do not say to convert them, but to convince them that they are dancing on air, and have no foundation whatever under them, in reference to this matter. But the Prime Minister, when the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) referred to the matter, went on to say:

> I not only answered it, but I answered it most effectively by quoting your own precedents. I quoted the Bills of 27-28 Victoria, and 32-33 Victoria, where the limits of the counties of Terrebonne, Montcalm and Argenteuil were reorganized by this Parliament.

Why, Sir, was anything ever more absurd? The authorities which the hon. gentleman quoted were Acts passed before the Parliament of Canada was organized.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, no. The Act of 32-33 Victoria was passed in 1869.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said the Acts of 27-28 Victoria and 32-33 Victoria, both passed before the Parliament of Canada had any existence.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. The Act of 32-33 Victoria was passed in 1869, and here it is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman my authority for the statement I have made. The first Representation Bill passed was 35 Victoria, chapter 13, which was passed in 1872.

The PRIME MINISTER. Pardon me. My hon. friend is wrong. The first Bill is 32-33 Victoria, chapter 46, an Act to detach the township of Doncaster from the county of Montcalm, and to attach it to the county of Terrebonne for electoral purposes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Next week.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is very happy, and I am glad to see that he is enjoying himself; but, if he will possess his soul in patience, I will give him a little subject for contemplation before I take my seat, as I know that my hon. friend, with all his geniality, is open to conviction, and I will address my argument to him with confidence that, in the course of time, he will be over here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will listen patiently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The second Readjustment Bill was passed in 1882, 45 Victoria, chapter 3. In 1887 it was amended by 50-51 Victoria, chapter 4.

The PRIME MINISTER. Amended? Is it possible? I cannot believe it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell my hon. friend how it was amended. He made a contract, involving about $5,000,000, and, when the original contract was forced out of the hands of the Government and laid on the Table of the House, it was found to contain the word "east," where "west" should have been found, and, consequently, the whole thing was an utter absurdity. That contract was taken out of the House by the Minister of Railways, and amended, and "west" put where "east" was; otherwise, it would have been perfect nonsense. I want to ask my hon. friend, if a mistake is made in any Act, whether it has reference to a contract or a redistribution of seats, whether he thinks that a clerical error like that should not be corrected.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly. That is what we want to do: we want to correct mistakes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend is satisfied with his position on that question. The Act of 1887 was to correct clerical errors—first, to make the number of members mentioned in the second section of the Act of 1882, as revised, include the members from the North-west Territories, and second, to declare that every county, township, village, &c., shall be as it stood prior to the bringing into force of the revised statutes. I may say, that in 1887 the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, then Mr. Thompson, moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 42, to amend the Representation Act. He said ("Hansard," 1887, page 889):

> The Representation Act, as published in the Revised Statutes, continues the old enactment that the House shall consist of 211 members, and a subsequent chapter deals with the representation in the North-west Territories; but it is proper that the second section should be amended to make it conform with the present number of members of the House. There is also a difficulty arising from the fact that, since the representation in the House was last distributed, the boundaries of some municipalities have changed, and, therefore, if the Act reads as it now does, from the day the Revised Statutes were brought into force, the boundaries of some of the con-

stituencies would be different from those boundaries as established by the Act of 1882. The Bill contains a short clause declaring that the meaning of the Representation Act is that every county, town, township, village or other territorial division, shall be as it stood prior to the bringing into force of the Revised Statutes.

The amendment was caused by the Revised Statutes not having taken sufficient notice of the Redistribution Bill. On that occasion the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, for whom the right hon. Prime Minister has great respect, as every man in this country now has, whatever he may have professed to have had before, said ("Hansard" of 1887, page 840):

I think the principle was set early in our legislation that there should be no readjustment of the constituencies,——

Mark that. The hon. gentleman has quoted a column of Sir John Macdonald's speech, as being the highest authority he could offer to this House.

I think the principle was set early in our legislation that there should be no readjustment of the constituencies, either in regard to the boundaries or otherwise, except every ten years, after the taking of the census, and I think it would really be well if we should adhere to that rule. Occasionally, by the addition of a rural portion of a county to a town, there may be a little inconvenience, but it would be much better that that little inconvenience should be borne than that we should have little Bills brought in on every alteration of the bounds of the constituencies for electoral purposes. We would have continual taunts of gerrymandering thrown across the floor. We had better leave the matter as it is, so that the electoral districts shall remain both as to boundaries and otherwise as they are until the next readjustment. Depend upon it, we would bring upon ourselves a great deal of trouble and a great many objections from both sides of the House by making any other alterations in the boundaries of constituencies, because if the argument of convenience is adopted in one case, that argument will apply in another, and various reasons will be given why it is convenient to alter the boundaries of constituencies. The boundary of a constituency should not be altered except once in ten years.

That is the opinion of an hon. gentleman who commands to-day the undivided confidence of the people of this country. In the committee, the late Sir John Thompson said ("Hansard," 1887, page 1127):

The object is to correct a clerical error in the Revised Statutes. Notwithstanding the addition made of the four members for the North-west, under the Act of last session, the Representation Act was carried forward into the Revised Statutes with the word "211." The object of section 2 is to preserve the Representation Acts as they existed prior to the Revised Statutes. Of course the Revised Statutes repealed the previous legislation. It is not intended that the boundaries, as previously established, shall be changed.

While on that subject, I may say, as the late Sir John Thompson has been referred to also in this connection, that he moved for leave, in 1893, to introduce a Bill—and I now call the attention of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) to this, as I promised to answer before I sat down, the very pertinent question he put me. Here is the explanation given by Sir John Thompson, when he moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 42) to amend the Representation Act:

This is a short Bill which I introduce for the purpose of amending the Representation Act of last session in certain particulars which are of a clerical character, and which merely relate to the correction of the boundaries, without making any change in any of the principles on which the Act was founded.

Mr. BRITTON. The question I asked the hon. gentleman was with reference to 1893.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the Bill of 1893, and this is what Sir John Thompson said in introducing it.

Mr. BRITTON. If that is so, then it is a most unfortunate caption to the Bill, because the title is "An Act to readjust the Representation of the House of Commons."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now giving my hon. friend his answer. In the words of the man most able to answer him, and that is Sir John Thompson, who introduced the Bill, and who referred to the contents and not to the title. Sir John Thompson said:

The first section is more accurately to define the boundary lines of the electoral district of Nipissing. It enumerates the parishes and gives the boundaries with more technical accuracy. The second section is to correct an error in respect to the city of Ottawa. While the Bill was in committee the committee adopted a section stating that the electoral district of the city of Ottawa should consist of the city of Ottawa, &c., &c., the limits of which had been changed since the passage of the previous Redistribution Act; but the law clerk, in placing the section, placed it as a paragraph to a section which provided that the places thereinafter mentioned should return one representative.

A purely clerical error, under which the city of Ottawa could elect but one representative. And just as you would change west to east or east to west, if found to be a clerical error, you correct a clerical error of that kind.

This would have had the effect of depriving the city of Ottawa of one of its members. Therefore, we provided that the city of Ottawa shall consist of the city of Ottawa, except that part thereof known as New Edinburgh, and shall return two members. Then there is the amendment substituting the word "east" for the word "west," in order to correct an error in respect of the boundary of one of the new districts of the county of Ottawa. In the next section we correct a mistake in respect to the electoral district of Hochelaga, providing that it shall consist of the towns of Ste. Cunégonde, St. Henri and Côte St. Antoine and St. Gabriel ward of the city of Montreal. The Act of last

session describes Côte St. Antoine and St. Gabriel as being wards of the city of Montreal, whereas St. Gabriel only is such. There was a parish left out in the description of Rouville, and also in that of the electoral district of Bagot, and in Provencher some of the rural municipalities were left unenumerated.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain what is the technical error which he intends to correct by his amendment in the district of Nipissing ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can describe it in a general way by saying that the description in the Act of last session did not suit the amended boundaries of the province of Ontario.

That was the sole comment, I believe, made by the right hon. leader of the Government in reference to a Bill which was accepted, as my hon. friend from Kingston will see, not only by the Opposition, but by the whole House as a measure intended purely to correct clerical errors, and upon which no question should arise.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 4) to incorporate the Canada Plate Glass Assurance Company.—(Mr. Monk.)

QUEBEC RAILWAY, LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

House resolved itself in committee on Bill (No. 84) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, and to change its name to "The Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Carroll.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TISDALE. I understand that all this Bill, except part of section 13 was passed. In the absence of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll), who has charge of the Bill, I am instructed by the promoters to agree to the striking out from the schedule of all after the words after "say" on the 9th page to the words "9266" on the 37th page.

Mr. SPROULE. What does that mean ?

Mr. TISDALE. It is simply descriptions of property in the deed, and these were objected to by some hon. members as loading the statute unnecessarily.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I take it that the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Tisdale) is to the same effect as the amendment I moved on Wednesday night. I would like to read a letter addressed by the solicitor of the company to the Law Clerk of the House :

The amendments proposed by Mr. Sutherland on Wednesday night in Committee of the Whole to clause 13 and to the schedule "B," are satisfactory to the company and are consented to.

(Sgd.) A. FERGUSON,
For the Company.

As the member in charge of the Bill was not present I did not like to press it then, though I had been informed that it was satisfactory. I suppose there will be no further objection to the amendment I moved on Wednesday—to add the words "in part" in the 5th line of section 13 after the words "set out," instead of inserting the whole schedule, and strike out some 30 pages of the schedule.

Mr. TISDALE. I thought the words "in part" were inserted before.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, they are inserted.

Mr. BAIN. When that had been done objection was taken that the promoter was not present, and we did not strike out all these pages.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY.

House proceeded to consider the proposed motion of Mr. Calvert that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for House in committee on Bill (No. 69) an Act to incorporate the Niagara and St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, and the motion of Mr. Landerkin in amendment thereto, that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways and Canals for further consideration.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. W. GIBSON (Welland). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I think it is only right that I should offer some explanation to the committee why I supported the amendment of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I am quite sure it could not have been pointed out to the committee, when this Bill was under discussion, that the city of St. Catharines gave to this railway $80,000, and this House proposes to give effect to legislation that will place in the hands of the promoters of this railway the power to bond the road to the extent of $25,000 a mile. As was pointed out the other night by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), this railway was bought in for a sum equal to something between $35,000 and $37,000. While I have no objection to the legislation being given to incorporate the company, I think that some limitation should be placed upon the powers given them. In the first place, without going to the expense of building another inch of this railway, under section 9 of the Bill, the company :

May issue bonds, debentures or other securities to the extent of $25,000 per mile of its railway

and branches ; but such bonds, debentures and other securities may be issued only in proportion to the length of railway constructed or under contract to be constructed.

The railway as already constructed is about twelve miles in length, and, if this Bill is agreed upon by this Parliament, we will be placing in the hands of the gentlemen who are now seeking incorporation, $300,000, which will represent a property that cost them something like $35,000 or $40,000. I think I would be doing an injustice to the county that sends me here, and particularly to the city of St. Catharines, which promoted the incorporation of this railway at the inception of the undertaking, if I did not ask this House not to give unconditional powers to these incorporators to bond the twelve miles of railway already built, and place in the hands of these gentlemen $300,000 of the people's money. Even if these gentlemen were not successful in realizing on the bonds to the extent of the par value of $300,000—suppose we say that they can only get 50 cents on the dollar—we will be then placing in their hands $150,000, a sum which would represent a property that they acquired for $35,000. My reason, and I think a reason should be given to the House for asking that this Bill be referred back to the committee, is that some provision may be made by which protection can be given to the city of St. Catharines, and I would suggest that a condition be imposed upon the incorporators by which $80,000 of the bonds of this company should be made payable to the order of the city treasurer of St. Catharines. When we have placed that amount to the order of the treasurer of St. Catharines ; if the railway were extended further than twelve miles, the length already built, if these gentlemen show their bona fides by extending the line either to Port Dalhousie or Fort Erie or to Hamilton, it is quite competent for the citizens of St. Catharines to refund $80,000, the amount that they paid in good faith for the construction of this road. If the hon. members of this House declare in favour of this Bill they will be legislating in a most vicious way in view of the fact that they will be giving these incorporators the control of $300,000 to do with it as they like. Under this Bill, $300,000 can be placed at the disposal of these people the day after the legislation has been enacted and this Bill becomes law. I want to ask every hon. member in this House if this is the kind of legislation to give to these incorporators who come along and find a road embarrassed as this road is. The city of St. Catharines and the citizens of that place contributed a large sum of money towards the construction of this road. The town of Thorold, represented by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), I understand, gave $40,000. The city of St. Catharines gave $80,000, so that there is $120,000 taken out of the pockets of the people, and when this road became embarrassed, under its management, the people's money was handed over, holus bolus, to a corporation who bought the road for $35,000. I leave it to the judgment of this House if this is not vicious legislation. I claim that we ought to be very careful in seeing that every protection is given, not only to the people of St. Catharines, but to the people of Thorold, and to those who have put $120,000 into this railway. I have no objection to the railway being built in any way or shape. I believe it would be in the interest of the county I represent. A large portion of the people are in favour of the railway, but, so far as the interest of the city of St. Catharines is concerned, I think I would be forgetting my duty as the representative of the county were I not to point out to the House the grave situation and the grave aspect which this road presents in its present condition. All I ask is that the protection of this Parliament be given to the county I represent, and more particularly to the city of St. Catharines, which has given $80,000 towards the construction of this road. I would ask that in the issuing of these bonds special protection should be provided, and that they should be made payable to the treasurer of that city to the amount that St. Catharines has already paid out. If the railway is extended there will be no great hardship in the city repaying that money to the company. Should the railway be built, or a portion of it, I feel satisfied that the citizens of St. Catharines would be willing to repay that money, but until it is, they are entitled to that $80,000. If I remember rightly the intention, when the railway was first projected, was for St. Catharines to give $160,000 towards the construction of the road, $80,000 was to be paid by St. Catharines upon the completion of the railway to the city. Then, upon the completion of the line from St. Catharines to either Hamilton or Toronto, I am not quite clear as to which city—at all events, when the railway was extended from St. Catharines to Hamilton or Toronto, $80,000 more was to be paid for the construction of the road. The railway was not built to either of these cities. At the time that the railway was under construction I know that an offer was made on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the promoters of this road that if they would give up the charter they would pay to the promoters the whole of the expense of the construction of this twelve miles of railway plus 10 per cent for profits. When that offer was made to the railway company, the largest shareholder, the late Mr. Neelon, was inclined to accept it, but other advice prevailed upon the poor man, and he rejected it, or, in other words, he demanded not only 10 per cent profit on the construction of the line from Niagara Falls to St. Catharines, but an addition of 10 per cent

on the prospective profits that were to be made out of the construction of the railway from St. Catharines to Toronto or to Hamilton. The Canadian Pacific Railway very properly refused that offer, and the result was that the railway never went beyond St. Catharines. It fell into bad shape, although I must say for some of the gentlemen who are promoting this road that they have put the road, as I understand it, in a fairly good shape and in a good state of repair. What I am more particularly concerned about is, not to object to the construction of the road, or its extension in either direction, but I do object to power being given to these gentlemen to raise, on debentures, $300,000 upon a railway which cost them only $35,000 or $40,000. With these remarks, I leave it to the judgment of the House whether the city in the county which I represent is not entitled to the consideration that I ask for.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). As I understand, the hon. gentleman has two objections to this. The first is that the House would give authority to this railway company to bond this road for $25,000 a mile because the whole road was bought for $36,000. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not deny that there are 12 miles of the road built. They had power to bond the road for $30,000 per mile before a mile was built, and if there has been money enough put into that road to build 12 miles, it must be that much more valuable now than when they had power to bond it for a greater sum. Therefore, I think the House is not going astray when they are giving authority to bond it for $30,000 to-day. Originally the charter of this road gave authority to bond for $30,000 because it was passing through a section of country where the right of way was very expensive. The other feature of it is that if we pass this we allow them to raise $300,000, but it is only upon the portion of road already built or under contract to be built. He says they may raise that money and they may squander it. They cannot do that, because they can only raise it when the road is under contract to be built. He wishes part of this money should be given to St. Catharines so as to compensate that city for the heavy bonus she gave. But St. Catharines has the advantage of the portion of the road that is built at the present time, and if there is any money raised by way of selling bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile, it must be on the road either built or under contract to be built; and if there is any more built St. Catharines must get the advantage of the whole. So with Thorold. I do not see in the reasons the hon. gentleman has given any ground for refusing this company the right to bond the road for $25,000 a mile. Certainly both St. Catharines and Thorold will get the return that they expected to get when they gave bonuses for that road that the company might be able to bond the road for $25,000 a mile

Mr. W. S. CALVERT (West Middlesex). In reply to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), I may say that I was a little surprised at what he said with reference to St. Catharines. The other day when the committee met we had before us the mayor and solicitor of St. Catharines, and some others, and they were most anxious that this Bill should be passed. I think it is of great importance to St. Catharines that this charter should be granted for this company. The city of St. Catharines has contributed, as he says, the sum of $80,000; they have also secured bonds to the extent of $80,000, making $160,000 as the interest St. Catharines has in this road. They have up to the present time paid $120,000 with interest, and they still owe $40,000. Now, a city contributing so much is naturally anxious to receive value for their money, and they appeared here the other day and urged upon the committee and upon every person interested to grant this charter. I may say with reference to this matter, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) remarked the other day, that an Act of incorporation was granted to the old company by the Ontario legislature in 1881, chap. 73 of the statutes of that year. In the following year the charter was extended from the city of Hamilton to Toronto. Now the Government of Ontario, situated as they are at the seat of operations, know whether it is in the interest of that portion of the country to have this road extended to Hamilton and Toronto. The objection seemed to be that they did not wish the road to pass the city of Hamilton. After a full discussion before the committee, they decided by a fair majority that it should be extended to the city of Toronto. Now, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), in discussing this question the other evening said, that we were not asking now by this charter within 150 or 200 miles of what the old charter received from this House. I may give some of the places to show that the hon. gentleman is absolutely correct. For instance, in 1895, by Dominion statutes, chap. 61, this company was authorized to go from Hamilton to Brantford, from Brantford to Woodstock, from Woodstock to Port Dover, from Port Dover to Port Burwell, and also to build a loop line from Thorold up to a point between St. Catharines and Jordan. Now, figuring out the distance between these places, I find that the hon. member for North Oxford is absolutely correct, that the old charter granted was some 175 miles more than the charter we are asking for to-day. Now, this road, it is true, cost a great deal of money, and the people of St. Catharines have contributed largely to it. That 12 miles cost a lot of money. Now, my hon. friend says they are bonding it for $25,000. But $25,000 per mile would be covering the

whole road, and if this road is worth as much as the hon. member for Lincoln says, is it possible to suppose that the city of St. Catharines, or my hon. friend himself, or any other capitalist, would allow that road to be sold for $36,000 ? Now this road got into bad repair and the Railway Department said to the company that unless that road was put in proper condition they would have to stop it. The consequence was that those gentlemen who purchased this road spent $12,000 or $15,000 in strengthening the trestle work and bridges. Then the bondholders put on a receiver in order that they might receive back the money they had contributed. After a time the bondholders placed it in court, and the High Court of Justice sold out the road. The final judgment for sale was pronounced in the bondholders' action on June 9th, 1897. The master's report on sale was made on the 31st of January, 1899, and the vesting order, vesting the railway, undertaking, franchise, &c., in the purchasers, and ordering the receiver to give up possession, was made on the 14th of April, 1899. Now, this road was advertised, these gentlemen were the highest tenderers, and the consequence is that if you expect gentlemen to come in and purchase a road of that kind, sold by the courts of this land, and then say that they shall not be permitted to have a charter and run it under that sale, it is a strange condition of affairs. Now this section 276 of the Railway Act compels any company who purchase a road from the courts to come to this House at the session immediately following, and ask for a new act of incorporation. That is what we are doing here to-day. The old charter between the city of Hamilton and Toronto has not run out, they have to the 23rd of July to complete that road, and they have commenced operations upon it, I am told. These gentlemen did a certain amount of work in order to comply with the Act. The solicitor of the company makes this statement :

The branch to Hamilton and Toronto was commenced in 1895 ; right of way for a considerable distance was acquired, and grading done. The time for commencing the branches and completing the whole undertaking of the company had been extended, the last Act being chap. 92, Dominion Statutes, 1894, which authorized the commencement of the branches before the 23rd of July, 1896, and the completion of the undertaking before the 23rd of July, 1899. The Act of 1895, which authorized the line to Brantford, Woodstock, &c., required it to be commenced before 22nd July, 1897, and completed before 22nd July, 1900. This line to Brantford, Woodstock, &c., was not commenced within two years, but the main line was commenced within the proper time, and the branch to Hamilton and Toronto was commenced within the proper time. The result, therefore, is that the time for completing the main line and the time for completing the branch to Hamilton and Toronto will not be up till the 2rd of July, 1899.

It seems to me strange that our friends should object, because I am told these gentlemen are going on in good faith. I am informed by Mr. Lash, the solicitor for the company, that there is no doubt that these men are able and intend to have this road built. Now, I believe the other day before the Railway Committee, we limited the time to one year for the commencement, and to three years for the completion. That is limiting them very well, and certainly it is only fair, when these men have put their money in, bought it from the court in good faith, and now come back to this House as the law requires, to ask for reincorporation; it is only fair that they should be permitted to go on with the work. I trust this House will grant the request of the incorporators and do as the Railway Committee did the other day, pass this Bill.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman asked me why I, with others, did not undertake to go into a thing of this kind. I might tell the hon. gentleman and tell the House, that I had an opportunity of going into it, and I decided I would not go into it, because I saw very plainly the whole and sole object of these promoters was to acquire certain rights and privileges belonging to the Government of this country, in order that they might sell out these privileges to some one else.

Mr. WM. McCLEARY (Welland). I am certainly amazed at the attitude the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) takes in this matter. He is the representative of the county of Lincoln, and as well of the city of St. Catharines, which has a population of upwards of 10,000 people, and why he should take a position in this House which must be clear to every member is contrary to the interests of the people whom he represents, I cannot understand. He makes his excuse on the ground that if this Bill will state that the city of St. Catharines shall be recouped the $80,000 it paid as a bonus to the original company, his objections will be withdrawn. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) has stated, the mayor of the city of St. Catharines, one of the aldermen of that city and one of the leading merchants of that city, were before the committee when this Bill was discussed. I am quite certain, Sir, that they understand the needs and requirements of their city, and the views of their citizens, quite as well as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) does—and I say that with all due deference to his great discernment of the needs of his own people. And, if these representatives of the city of St. Catharines had an idea of asking that this money be recouped, I am sure they would have stated so ; but they are satisfied, as I know full well, that this company should receive the incorporation they are asking for, and be allowed to continue this line to the city of Hamilton, the city of Toronto, and to Port Dalhousie and Fort Erie. To support this statement of mine I will read a short article from the St. Catha-

rines "Journal," a Liberal paper which supports my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson):

THE N. C. R. TO TORONTO.

The present owners of the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway have secured the passage of a Bill in the Commons to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, and to acquire rights for the extension of their road to Hamilton and Toronto. Whether these people proceed with the construction of these extensions or not, they are at least arousing some action on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway and other local companies that have temporized with the city of St. Catharines for too many years in this matter of local accommodation. The "Journal" hopes the company will proceed with the extensions, including the one to Port Dalhousie, and that they will prove paying investments. The opposition to their Bill in the Railway Committee at Ottawa was mose active, and came principally from the Grand Trunk Railway, which opposed the extension to Toronto, and from the Hamilton members, who opposed the extension of the line from Port Dalhousie to Hamilton. The Bill was strongly supported by Mayor Keating, of this city, who happened to be present.

The opposing interests have had this city and district in their power for a considerable time, and as they have failed to supply demand for extended accommodation, the new proposal should be encouraged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of having cold water thrown upon this project by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) he should have taken another course, and in my opinion he has come far short of fulfilling the duty he owes to his political friends, as well as to the entire community he represents, in assuming the attitude he does here to-night. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) will reconsider it, and give his aid to the passage of this Bill. So far as the town of Thorold in my constituency is concerned, I want to say that we are most anxious we should have something for the money we have put into this road. The city of St. Catharines would not do without the Niagara Central Railway to-day for any sum of money. I even believe that city would be willing to take that road and run it in their own interests, for it has added to the prosperity of the whole community. As I have said, the town of Thorold wants to get something in return, and there is no reason why this Bill should be opposed, other than the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway, and of the electric road that is running from the city of Hamilton, part of the way through Lincoln and down to the village of Beamsville. Mr. Speaker, I do not think these private interests should be held by this Parliament as paramount to the interests of the people.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and I think it a wise suggestion. We all know well that we are giving this company power to go on with that twelve miles of road at the rate of $25,000 a mile or $300,000. We have had it on their own statement before the committee, that they bought the road for $36,000. I would like to know from my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) what guarantee this House has, and what guarantee the city of St. Catharines has, that this money will be honestly applied to the construction of the road. All that my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) asks is, that the city of St. Catharines should become possessed of the bonds that are to be issued on that twelve miles of road to the extent of the $80,000 they hold. I would go further than that and I would say, that out of the $300,000 bonds which they are authorized by this Act to issue, they should deposit with the treasurer of the city of St. Catharines $200,000, in order to secure to that city that the undertaking we are chartering by this Bill will be honestly carried out. That would prevent these men from selling these bonds and putting the money in their pockets, and leaving St. Catharines in the position it was left in before. My hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) knows perfectly well what the history of this road has been. When they got power to bond the road at $10,000 a mile they sold these bonds and spent the money. Then they got their power extended to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile, and they got the city of St. Catharines to take $80,000 of these bonds and sold the rest. When that amount was consumed they came back to Parliament, and got power to bond the road to the extent of $30,000 a mile. What did they do with the city of St. Catharines? They went to that city, and induced it—I cannot understand how the city permitted itself to be induced—to give up $80,000 of bonds on a road bonded at $20,000 a mile, and to accept in exchange $96,000 of bonds on a road bonded at $30,000 a mile. In other words, they gave up bonds on one-third of the road, or 4 miles, in exchange for bonds on one-fourth of the road, or 3 miles. The Act that enabled the company to bond the road for $30,000 a mile, declared in the plainest terms that the object of the bonded debt was, first to take up the amount of bonds that had been issued at $20,000 a mile, to settle with the city of St. Catharines, and apply the balance of the money to build the road to Hamilton and Toronto. That covered the entire issue of $30,000 a mile, or $360,000 of bonds. But they violated the Act, and have we not a right to conclude that they will violate the Act again? They actually sold the $360,000 of bonds, and did not build a mile of the road. They simply carried out the arrangement about the 12 miles, which, at the time they got the bonding power, were all built. They never applied a dollar of the money to the construction of the road. They simply issued the second bonds, and took up the first, and pocketed the balance of the money. I con-

tend that a road that has a history of this kind deserves to be closely watched by this House. An hon. gentleman opposite who addressed the House, said he was led to the conclusion that the opposition of my esteemed friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), myself and others to this Bill was based on a desire to favour the Grand Trunk. I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to point to any statute of this country that contains in it the peculiar and extended provisions contained in this charter. As I said before, it has been before Parliament fourteen times, and this is the fifteenth time, and every time it has come, it has brought new provisions. One of its provisions, after reciting how many places the railway may go to, winds up by saying: "with full power to pass over any portion of the country." Carte blanche, if you will; go as you like. If they went to one village, and did not get a bonus sufficient to induce them to build there, they could go to another. If they went to one township, and asked for a bonus, and did not get enough, they could go to another. In this way they could auction one against the other. They were not bound to any point. They could go over the whole Niagara Peninusla between Toronto and Fort Erie. They had the privilege, by their charter and amended Acts, to do as they liked.

Mr. CASEY. That is the old charter. That is not in this charter.

Mr. McMULLEN. That was the Act passed in 1882 in the Ontario legislature. After reciting a number of places—Bismarck, Smithville, Caledonia, Canville, and other places—it winds up by giving the company full power to pass over any other portion of the country. Though the charter had all these enormous and unlimited privileges, the company has never made any particular progress. The only thing the incorporators have ever done is this: By manipulating one Act after another, they have got $80,000 or $100,000 out of the city of St. Catharines; and my esteemed friend (Mr. Gibson) made a suggestion to-night that is creditable to him. He is trying to prevent the city of St. Catharines being again euchred out of what it is entitled to. That city has virtually produced the money that built the railway. My hon. friend says the mayor of St. Catharines was here. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon anybody, but I do not know who was the mayor of St. Catharines when that exchange of bonds was made. Unless there was some extenuating circumstance, I say, that was an exceedingly stupid act. If these people are to go on with this road, I want to know what objection they can have to depositing these bonds with the city treasurer of St. Catharines. If they are honest and sincere, they cannot object to that. If they went to a municipality, and asked for aid, and the aid were granted to them, and debentures were issued, those debentures would not go into the hands of the company at all, but would go into the hands of trustees. Our municipal law contains the strict provision that, in case of aid being granted to a railway, the money is held by trustees, and shall not be handed over to the company, except as the work goes on, and 25 per cent shall be retained until the work is finished. That provision is inserted for the protection of municipalities, and I ask, why it would not be fair for this House to impose a like provision upon these people, if we are going to grant them power to bond that railway. I am quite willing to be stigmatized with others as desiring to favour the Grand Trunk; but I wish to see the people who granted money to put this road where it is, properly protected, if we are going to revive this charter and give this company an opportunity to go on, without any more fooling and humbugging. There has been too much of that in the past, and we do not want any more in the future. Their charter has not yet elapsed, and they can do a good deal of work before it does; and, if the people of St. Catharines, the people of Hamilton and the people of Toronto are anxious to see this road built, the best thing we can do is to refuse the charter, because the company will then come to a crisis; and, if, as my hon. friend says, these men are Americans and have plenty of money, the only possible way in which they can keep the charter alive will be by putting on men and pushing the work to the utmost before the time for building the road expires.

Mr SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman not know that since it was sold by the courts, they must get new legislation?

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend is mistaken. It was sold out, but they have not only got the bonds, but the franchises. The law provides that the sale of the bonds carries with it the franchises, and they can exercise every power to-day which they could if they were the old incorporated company. They can go on and build a very considerable portion of that road.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Private individuals, buying a road from the courts, have to receive incorporation within one year, or they cannot continue.

Mr. McMULLEN. That may be the law. I do not claim to be a lawyer, but I was under the other impression. They can incorporate under the Joint Stock Companies Act if they like.

Mr. SPROULE. No, they cannot.

Mr. McMULLEN. But I say, if they go on they will then have the sympathy of this House. If they come back next year and show positive evidence of a considerable quantity of work having been

done, and that they are going to carry through the road, their charter will be record in Canada of a company which showed evidence of good faith, not being allowed the privilege of any legislation necessary to enable it to go on. We will do well to guard the interests of the people against any further impositions by any company. It has been said that these men are Americans of high standing. That may be, but I have heard of Americans, men of very high standing, who could do some very small things. These men, it is said, are associated with others of high standing in Canada. But I have heard of men of very high standing in Canada getting badly euchred by men of high standing on the other side of the line. The Americans, in many cases, are too sharp, shrewd and keen for us, and that may prove to be the case in this instance. If this Bill should go to committee, I would urge that we should make some provision to protect the city of St. Catharines against a second instalment of the evil or loss that she has already suffered. No one can deny that after putting her money into that road, the proposition made by my esteemed friend (Mr. Gibson) is a proper and prudent one. Have we done anything of this kind before? I claim that we have. When the Hamilton and Buffalo road was built, it was built also, I think, by some Americans. There was a very large amount of money owing to the labourers along that road, and the men who furnished materials, and there was a certain amount coming to the company from the Dominion treasury by way of subsidy. Representations were made to this House with regard to the danger of allowing these men the handling of the money, and the Railway Committee ordered that all accounts that could be proved due to the men who had furnished labour and materials should be paid before any money was handed over. We took it into our own hands to prevent these poor creditors being defrauded of their just rights. The city of St. Catharines does not quite stand in the same position, because she has not appealed to us, but she may do so when it is too late, and we ought to do what is possible to protect that city in the future. My hon. friend, I think, deserves credit from his constituency and from the city of St. Catharines for asking this House, if it is going to allow the company to bond that road some $25,000 or $30,000 a mile, to provide that at least $200,000 of those bonds shall be deposited with the city of St. Catharines until such time as the city is prepared to pay them out again; and if then that city should repeat the folly of the past, we, at least, will have done all we could to help her. I have no particular interest in the city of St. Catharines, but I do contend that, under the circumstances, that city should have our protection, and be put in a position to be recouped the money to which she is entitled. Hon. gentlemen opposite may make any insinuation or charge they please, my hon. friend may repeat his charges, but they all fall to the ground before the argument we have presented on behalf of the city of St. Catharines. As to the insinuation that we are actuated by other than public motives, I am glad to be able to say that I was never asked by the Grand Trunk Railway to take any action in this matter, but when the Bill was before the Railway Committee I noticed its peculiar provisions, and voted against it. I then pointed out how wrong and imprudent it was to grant these men the power of bonding that road for $30,000 a mile, and I must say that never in my eighteen years of parliamentary life have I known a charter to be granted by this House with so many objectionable features in it, and I know of no railway which has such an unsavory record, from then down to the present, as this Niagara Central Railway. I do not know what the present parties intend to do. Their intention may be better than those of the old company. These new men may possibly show some desire to go on, and if they do, we have no desire to cripple them. On the contrary, we want to give them every encouragement, but we desire to prevent these bonds being carried to the other side and the money being put into the pockets of those men, and the enterprise left in the same position as it has been in the last twenty years.

Mr. McCLEARY. Is the hon. gentleman in a better position to judge of the city of St. Catharines than the mayor and council?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have full confidence in the judgment of my hon. friend from Lincoln.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. The hour for private Bills has expired.

The committee rose.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House resumed the debate on Mr. Mulock's motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was dealing with the points that had been raised by the leader of the House and some other gentlemen in reference to precedents that it was contended would warrant the consideration of such a measure as this; and I think I may safely say that, so far as I had gone,

I had satisfied hon. gentlemen opposite that they were entirely mistaken in supposing any of these cases was really a precedent for such a Bill as that now before us. I may say that, in dealing with the amendments, 56 Vic., chap. 9, I have shown the Bill was, so far as I have gone, to correct clerical errors: 1st. to define more accurately the boundary line of Nipissing; 2nd. to correct errors of the law clerk in placing the city of Ottawa among those places that returned one member, thus depriving Ottawa of a second member; third, to correct the description of St. Hyacinthe so as to include about twenty voters who were of no county, which will also be recognized at once as a merely clerical error. I may say that the present Judge Ouimet, who was then in this House, moved the second reading. As to the description of the electoral district of St. Hyacinthe, he said, as will be found in "Hansard" of 1893, page 1617:

The description of the county of St. Hyacinthe remained as it was according to the original establishment of the county in 1864, but since then the parish of Ste. Marie de Madeleine has added a certain part of the parish of St. Jean Baptiste, and it is in order to include about twenty farmers there that the amendment is moved. As it is now, these farmers are in no county.

Mr. BERNIER. The reason given by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) are perfectly true. The changes made by the motion are only a matter of detail; they were rendered necessary in order to allow a certain number of electors of the parish of St. Jean Baptiste to exercise their right of vote, which they would be deprived of should the law remain as it is. The electors are included in the parish of Ste. Marie de Madeleine. It was formed with part of those of La Présentation, St. Charles and St. Damase, in the county of St. Hyacinthe, and with a slight portion of the parish of St. Jean Baptiste. Were not the change effected just introduced into the law, or were not a new enumeration of the parish included in the county of St. Hyacinthe inserted into the statute, 25 electors at least would be deprived of their right to vote. I had the honour to hand over to the hon. the Minister of Public Works a petition signed by the interested electors, and asking for this change in the law. I fully approve of the amendment just made. I would add, through this change the limits of the county of St. Hyacinthe will be, as regards the House of Commons, exactly the same as those for the local house.

These reasons, given by gentlemen on both sides of the House, show that this section was simply the correction of a clerical error. My hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says it was not a clerical error. I ask him: Does he say that an Act such as this, proposed by a gentleman belonging to one party, seconded by a gentleman belonging to the other, and accepted by the House without a word of criticism, justifies the introduction of the Redistribution Bill now before us? If not, it is a waste of time to dispute whether it is a clerical error or an amendment to correct what every one was disposed to regard as a clerical error. Now, the next amendment was in 1895. The object was to detach Courcelles and Joliette from Berthier and annex them to Joliette. The Bill was drawn up and agreed upon by the member for Berthier, Mr. Beausoleil, and Mr. Ouimet, and was accepted unanimously by the House as a correction of a clerical error, and as simply carrying out the wishes of the House, without affecting in any way any party question or arousing any opposition. Then, I drew the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that the quotation he gave of 27-8 Vic., as undoubtedly an error, as that chapter was passed before confederation. The chapter of 32-3 Vic., to which he referred, was also a proposal of the same character as that to which I have referred, as the House will at once see; and whether you call it a clerical error or an error of whatever kind, it threw upon the House the duty of amending the law so as to carry out what it is well understood to mean. The Confederation Act provided, as regards Quebec:

Quebec shall be divided into 65 electoral districts, composed of 65 electoral divisions, into which Lower Canada is at the passing of this Act divided under chap. 2 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, chap. 75 of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, and the Act of the province of Canada of the 23rd year of the Queen, chap. 1, or any other Act amending the same in force at the union, so that each electoral division shall be for the purposes of this Act an electoral district entitled to return one member.

The amendment in this case was to detach the township of Doncaster from Montcalm and attach it to Terrebonne for election purposes. The section reads as follows:

From and after the passing of this Act, the 16th subsection of section 1 of chap. 75 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, intituled "An Act respecting the divisions of Lower Canada into counties, and the boundaries of certain cities and towns, for the purpose of representation in the legislature," shall be read and construed, in so far as relates to the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada, as if the township of Doncaster therein mentioned had never formed part of the county of Montcalm, and the said township, so detached from the county of Montcalm, shall be attached to the county of Terrebonne, for the electoral purposes hereinbefore set forth.

I may say that the second and third readings were carried on the same day without any discussion, it being one of those obvious and necessary corrections in order to give a proper interpretation to the Act. It was introduced by the hon. member for Terrebonne, and met with the unanimous concurrence of the House. I think, therefore, I have disposed of every one of the suggestions that have been made by the hon. gentleman, for there is nothing in the shape of an argument that can be raised in my judgment upon the subject. I have shown that from the date of confederation down to the present hour, there has been no Redistribu-

tion Act whatever, except after the taking of the decennial census. That has been recognized from the first down to the present time as the only time when a Redistribution Act could with any propriety be referred to the consideration of this House. I do not believe that in the days of that eminent man who so long led this House of Commons, there was any person on either side of the House who ever ventured to suggest that a Redistribution Act could be brought forward at any other period than after the taking of a decennial census. I am not aware that such a suggestion has ever been made, it certainly never was entertained; and these slight verbal alterations, and corrections of clerical errors, to carry out the obvious wish of Parliament, certainly, instead of forming any basis for the introduction of such a measure as this, all go to prove that no such Act has ever been contemplated or undertaken before.

Just imagine the speech delivered in this House to-day by the Postmaster General when he says that these judges, when appointed, are going to become antiquaries, they have to go back into ancient history in order to find out their duties. Here we are within a little more than a year of the time when a new census has to be taken in Canada, after immense changes have taken place all over the face of this country in regard to the movement of population, and within a little more than a year of the time of taking a new census, you wish to go back and act upon a census taken nine years ago. Why, Sir, that appears to me a proposition so eminently absurd that I cannot understand how it came to enter the minds of the hon. gentlemen, except some dire necessity induced the Government to believe that their only hope for the future was to pass a Redistribution Act in order to relieve themselves from the verdict that they believe in their conscience will be rendered against them by the people of Canada unless the constitution of the country is violated. Sir, I want something better than that. We ask the Government, strong as they are in numbers—and they are only strong in numbers—to give to the people of this country some justification for a grave violation of the constitution, some reason that has more weight than a mere desire for party gain. I believe you will search in vain the history of any country for the introduction of a measure by a gentleman charged with such an important change in the law, in which he singles out individual members of Parliament who are to be struck down and decapitated under the Act that he holds in his hand. I say he has disclosed to the House the sole object of this monstrous violation—I will not say of the constitution, but of everything like common sense which you can apply to such a question as we are now considering. I believe that hon. gentlemen will find their labours in this House in vain. I do not hesitate to say so. They may force the measure through here by mere numbers, just as they forced through the Drummond County Railway Bill and the Yukon Railway Bill. Sir, what position do they occupy in reference to these measures? It is because they have dragged their supporters through the mire in reference to these measures that they are now compelled to adopt some means of enabling those supporters, who have sacrificed the esteem of their constituents by their course, to get back to this House when next they have to appear before the country. That is the object of the Bill. We all remember how they found men unwilling to take the responsibility of swallowing such a monstrous measure as the Minister of the Interior ventured to propound to this House, a measure, that the more it is considered, becomes more and more revolting. Am I using too strong language? Why, Sir, the only time that we have seen the blind supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite unwilling to come up to the mark, refuse to stand by the Government on any emergency, was when that measure was proposed, and after it was discussed and examined, five members who had always supported the Government, turned their backs upon them and refused to support them. That is not all. We have here a declaration of one of their present supporters, a gentleman who sits behind the Government. I draw attention to what he says on this matter, because I believe that the Yukon Bill has created in the minds of the Government the absolute necessity of this violation of the constitution by redistributing the constituencies within a year or two of a census. Now, Sir, this is what the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) tells us in the paper which he publishes in the city of Winnipeg, on the 19th day of May last:

> As pointed out in the "Tribune" some time ago, time has thrown much new light on Yukon transportation and routes which were at one time regarded by some as feasible, are, according to Government authorities, very problematical or worse. In any event, had the Yukon Mann & Mackenzie railway deal gone through, the line would have been of little service to the country. With only three months' navigation at one end of the railway, and a possibility of none at all at the other end, it is just as well for Canada that the enterprise was stopped. In this case, Sir Charles Tupper's change of mind seems to have been in the right direction. It was brought about by the independent members of the Conservative party.

Now, I give you something still more amusing. Sir Charles Tupper has given evidence on the floor of this House that would satisfy any man with a head on his shoulders, that the grounds for his action were such as warranted that action. But I will now give the hon. gentlemen something a little more amusing than a reference to myself:

It is now an open secret that the rank and file of the Liberals were not greviously disappointed at the action of the Senate in blocking the deal.

"The deal," mark you, Mr. Speaker, from one of the supporters of the hon. gentleman present in this House.

It saved the country a kingdom of what is spoken of as valuable mineral lands.

Is it any wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing that they have to face the electors, at no distant day, think it is a necessary preparation to redistribute the seats and change the judge, to pack the jury, before they go to trial. That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not intend to detain the House at any very great length, but there are two or three points that still require consideration. First, I will allude to the fact that I have shown that hon. gentlemen are unable to show any precedent whatever for such an Act; I have shown from the opinions of the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald that such a thing as a redistribution Act was never contemplated in his day except after a decennial census. I have said before that, although hon. gentlemen may force this measure, as they have forced other measures through this House, contrary to the convictions and opinions of hon. gentlemen who sit behind them, and some of whom went into open revolt, I hold the opinion that this cannot become law, and I will give my reason for it. We have a Senate Chamber in this country; we have a security against hasty, ill-advised and extremely partisan legislation, against measures that violate the constitution of the country for party purposes. When I refer to that branch of the Parliament I feel that there never was a time, in the history of the country, when that body enjoyed the confidence of the people as they do to-day. The protection they gave to this country in the rejection of the Yukon measure, and the evidence we now have which hon. gentlemen have given, that they have saved the country from one to two million dollars by the rejection of the Drummond County Railway deal, have given to the Senate of Canada a position in the confidence of independent and intelligent men, of all parties, such as, for many years before, they have not enjoyed. I say more, Sir, that in my judgment the Senate would have been perfectly right to have rejected the Franchise Bill sent up last session. In reference to any one of these measures I have never exchanged a word with any Senator intended to influence his action, or to ascertain what action he proposed to take, nor do I intend to do so in reference to this measure. What I say in reference to that branch of Parliament will be said in my place on the floor of Parliament, but I do say, Sir, that the idea that is attempted to be circulated throughout this country that measures touching the franchise and the redistribution of seats constitute matters specially appertaining to the House of Commons with which the Senate has no right to interfere, is entirely erroneous and outside of all precedent, either British or wherever parliamentary government exists. The Senate, in my judgment, would have been perfectly right, after a majority in this House had an amendment voted down that was reasonable in its character, that any province, the maritime provinces or any outlying province, should have the same protection as that enjoyed in Ontario, when such a proposition as that was made, when a change was proposed in the constitution of the franchise by which this Parliament was to surrender its right and control, one of the most fundamental elements in the possession of this House being that it should control its own franchise—when that was handed over and when it was shown how that was likely to effect the interest of this Parliament, the Senate would have been perfectly justified in throwing out that Bill. There was one argument by which the Government could have got that franchise Bill carried. The statement was made that if the Senate would abandon the amendment in regard to allowing the same rights of appeal to the judiciary in one province as in another, and if that Bill was passed, the Government would use all its power and influence to get the legislatures, where that right did not exist, to change the law so that it should exist. How has that been carried out? We have had nothing laid on the Table of the House yet to prove that the Government acted in accordance with that pledge, but we have very strange evidence to the contrary. In the province of New Brunswick a general election for the local legislature has taken place. There will not be another for four years, so that there was no necessity to push through a franchise law. Under the inspiration, I do not hesitate to say so, of the autocrat of the legislature of New Brunswick, who, we now recognize, sits in this House, and who went down there and used the most gigantic efforts that a public man could put forth, and of the most corrupt character, both money, pledges and promises of public money——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knows that it is unparliamentary to charge an hon. member of the House with corruption.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to say anything unparliamentary. But I was referring to matters that were referred to in this House, and that have been referred to unchallenged by the hon. gentleman to whom these references were made. But I will tell you what I may say and what I am justified in saying that we had a right to believe that when a member of the Government pledged the Senate that, if they passed that Bill, that they would use their influence with the local legislature to give to the electors of provinces the pro-

tection of the judges, we had a right to believe that a member of the Government here would use his power and influence in fulfilment of his pledge. What have we seen? We have seen a legislature, after a general election, when it had no concern or interest in the franchise for three or four years, passing a franchise Bill to take away from the judges the power of revision and handing it over to the sheriffs nominated annually by the Government of the day. Had the Senate known, not only that this promise would not be redeemed, but that the local legislatures were actually legislating with the object, not of affecting their own constituencies, or their own position, or their own friends, but with the object of affecting the return of members of this House—with such a spectacle as that before them, the Senate will act wisely if they protect this Parliament against legislation that is calculated to violate every principle of constitutional right, every principle of fair play and justice, in the interest of a party.

There is no such delicacy in reference to these measures in England. When Mr. Gladstone, at the head of a majority in the House of Commons, passed his Franchise Bill, he was told directly that that Franchise Bill would be rejected by the House of Lords. Did Mr. Gladstone force the measure through the House of Commons and appeal to the country, as the only means by which he could carry it? No, Sir; he recognized the propriety of arranging, with the concurrence of the eminent men of the two parties. such a Redistribution Bill as would warrant the House of Lords to pass the franchise measure which had been proposed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Government of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not consult the Opposition much in 1882.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will come to that in a moment. If the Postmaster General takes the advice he gave to a member on this side of the House a short time ago, and possesses his soul in patience, he will hear something about 1882. The time has perhaps come when it is well to refresh the memories of these hon. gentlemen opposite, with the views they held in 1882, and to contrast them with the views they hold today. I think the incident I have referred to, proves conclusively that, as to the franchise and redistribution of seats, the House of Lords, one of those great British institutions to which we look as an exemplar, dealt with the franchise and dealt with the redistribution of seats as a part of the duty that devolves upon every independent legislature, so as to insure that no unjust party measures are forced through Parliament by a dominant majority in one House, and allowed, sub silentio, to become law without the protest and interference of another. But we are not without a Canadian precedent on this very question. When the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was leader of the Government of Canada, a measure was passed through this Parliament to gerrymander the constituency of West Huron in the interest of a member of this House. The Senate rejected that measure, and I heard Alexander Mackenzie say that which I have no doubt some other members on both sides of the House heard him say—I heard Alexander Mackenzie say: I have no reason to complain of the Senate; they differed from me on two questions that were sent up by the majority which supported me in the House of Commons, one the Nanaimo Railway Bill, the other the West Huron Bill, and I am bound to say, that in both cases the Senate was right. So we see that the only attempt made in dealing with the question of redistributing a seat so as to affect the position of a member of this House, except at the specified constitutional time, was rejected by the Senate, and the head of the Government who suffered from that rejection, himself was compelled to say, that in that case the Senate did what was absolutely right. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is anxious to hear something about the discussion in this House in 1882, and I will favour him. The Hon. Edward Blake, then leader of the Opposition, said:

> Full deliberation is needed for another cause—because this measure is exceptional in its character in this: All other measures of legislation which you bring before Parliament, you submit, when the time of trial comes, to the constituencies which sent you to do their business; you submit to the same men and the same set of tribunals throughout the community; you go before them and you say: "Five years ago you entrusted me with power to act as your representative; such and such things have I done, I bring them before you as the fruits of my labours in that capacity.——

I bring the Yukon Railway Bill; I bring the Drummond County Railway Bill; I bring the Franchise Bill, by which we degraded the House of Commons, in depriving it of the power to legislate with regard to its own franchise—I bring these here to you.

> ——and I ask you who sent me to judge whether I am deserving of your continued confidence or no." But this is a measure, Sir, which proposes to alter the jury, to alter the tribunal, to provide for a different set of jurors to try those who are to come before them very shortly for trial upon the events of the last four or five years. No longer are we to appeal to the same set of men before whom we fought the battle four years ago;——

That seems to be the great trouble with the hon. gentlemen opposite: they fought the battle of 1896, and they won—by a fluke. And, when my right hon. friend was challenged as to the mode by which he got there, he summed it up in these expressive words: Well, we are here, and you are there. That is all he could say. Well, Sir, at no distant

date they have got to go back to the same tribunal; they have got to say to the men who sent them here: There are the fruits of our labours; there is what we have done for you; will you return us to power again? We will see.

——no longer are we to say to them: "You returned me by such and such a majority, or you defeated me by such and such a majority, and I appeal to you, on the one hand, to continue your confidence, or, on the other hand, to reverse your vote of want of confidence on the issues which have been raised during those four or five years." No, it is proposed to provide for a different set of jurors, to whom hon. gentlemen, afraid to appeal to those who sent them here, propose to appeal to vindicate their conduct.

I commend that to the careful consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, to whom it is specially applicable now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose we will have the answer to Mr. Blake's speech.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER. The Hon. Edward Blake continued to say:

I am amused at this commentary upon the boasts of these hon. gentlemen for the last four years, and this testimony to the sincerity of these boasts.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, who led the Government, was not undertaking to change the jurors in violation of the constitution of the country, but he was redistributing the seats, as at the time he was compelled to do by the constitution. Whether he did that fairly or unfairly, I shall not at this moment say, but I shall have a very strong argument later on to prove that he did not act unfairly. Sir John Macdonald was not volunteering to violate the constitution then, but he was acting under the constitution, which compelled him to do as he did. Sir, what would be the indignant language of Mr. Blake, if he were here to-day and saw this attempt to violate the first principles of our constitution, by undertaking, contrary to that constitution and to all precedents, to redistribute the seats in this Parliament? Hon. gentlemen opposite know that, in a year or two at the outside, and before the decennial census, they must go to the country, and they fear to appeal to the same tribunal which has been watching their misdeeds.

Why, all the time they have been telling us how proud they were to consider that the day was approaching on which they would go back to their constituents and invite them to endorse their action. All the time they have been telling us they were growing in strength, growing in popularity, particularly in Ontario. All the time they have been telling us of their superior strength in Ontario, under the returns. I do not know the exact figures; it has not been worth my while to count them up. I suppose they give about three to one in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they say they are stronger to-day and are more than three to one. I do not know in what way they lead themselves to this belief; but I know it to be an unfounded belief. I know this Bill proves, and they have a shrewd suspicion of it, that they cannot carry their present seats and retain their present majority; and this Bill is designed so far as they can make up by legislation for the strength they have lost by their misdeeds for the last four years and by the results to which they have led.

Substitute three years, and it is perfect. That is the comment of Mr. Blake on a redistribution Bill, introduced at a time when under the constitution it was necessary to have one. That was the mode in which he challenged the character of the Bill then brought before the House. My right hon. friend, I see, smiles when he reflects that all that is the evidence of the view that Mr. Blake held as to the effect of that Act. In 1872, the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald said:

In determining the mode of distributing the new seats, the Government took into consideration the principles which have guided the establishment of the elective system in the provinces ever since they have been provinces; and it will be found that in them all, while the principle of population was considered to a very great extent, other considerations were also held to have weight, so that different interests, classes and localities should be fairly represented, that the principle of numbers should not be the only one.

I give that as an answer to my hon. friend—as a qualification of the long quotation he gave from Sir John Macdonald's speech on that occasion—and to show that although Sir John Macdonald did attach at the outset perhaps greater importance than he subsequently did to the question of county boundaries, he never lost sight of the question of population. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, on that occasion, as will be found in "Hansard," at page 1377, said:

At that time, so much in love with the principles of representation by population were hon. gentlemen opposite, that they denounced the Government for not demolishing the small boroughs of Brockville and Niagara. They supported it to such an extent that the hon. member for Lambton moved the following resolution affirming that principle:—

"That the six additional members to be allotted to Ontario are due to the increased population of that province, and should be allotted with reasonable regard to the population. That the Bill be referred back to a committee of the House with instructions to amend the same by allotting members for Ontario in such a manner as to give, as far as practicable, representation to those parts of the population which, by the present division would be excluded from their fair share of political power."

Now, Sir, as I have shown, we have a Bill submitted for our consideration that takes a section of the country where there are 200,000 constituents, who it is believed are of Conservative leanings, and allots to it four members. On the other hand, it takes another section with 200,000 constituents, where hon. gentlemen opposite think they are strong and can return whom they like,

and gives it ten members. That is the mode in which the principle of population is carried out by these hon. gentlemen. Sir John Thompson on the introduction of the Bill of 1892, said :

I may say that we are proposing to introduce this measure in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, which require that after the completion of each decennial census the representation of the various constituencies in this House shall be readjusted on certain well-known and well-defined principles.

* * * * *

The mode of division hitherto adopted has been very convenient, because it corresponds with the county lines. There were three counties in the Island (Prince Edward Island), and they were each represented by two members. In order to make five constituencies it will be necessary to depart from county lines and the readjustment which I propose, and the plan of which I will lay on the Table of the House, is, I think, the fairest that can be suggested with regard to that province. We propose that there shall be five constituencies, named West Prince County, East Prince County, West Queen's County and East Queen's County, and King's County, each having one member. The division is made according to the description of lots in that island, which I think correspond to townships elsewhere, and no lot, according to the original divisional of the island, is divided. The division by population will be thus : West Prince County will have just about 21,000 of a poulation ; East Prince County will have 20,723 (this includes the town of Summerside) ; West Prince will have a population of 22,209 (this includes the city of Charlottetown) ; East Queen's will have a population of 23,466 ; and King's, which includes Georgetown, will have a population of 21,684 ; so that under this plan the population of the island will have been equalized as nearly, I think, as is practically consistent with adhering to the township lines I have mentioned.

I trouble the House with these extracts to prove two things—first, that the principle of population has always been considered even from the first, although not to the same extent, and with increasing weight and importance, always has been considered—not as a hard and fast line by which you must adopt the same unit of population, irrespective of county lines, but to be followed as far as is practicable without doing violence to certain constituencies and time-honoured rights which the electors had possessed. The principle of population was considered as one of great importance. My right hon. friend has discarded entirely the question of population. He has proposed a Bill which will carry out the worst features of county lines and county representation, without that regard to population which hon. gentlemen on all sides of the House have recognized in the past.

While I was speaking of the Senate I forgot to draw attention to the fact that the views I hold as to the perfect right of the Senate are shared by hon. gentlemen opposite, or by the Liberal party, so far as we may judge by past action—not when a redistribution Bill appeared in violation of the constitution of the country, just before instead of after a decennial census ; but when a redistribution Bill was sent up to the Senate by a Conservative Government, in accordance with the constitution, immediately after a decennial census, and when an hon. gentleman who is a member of the present Government, representing the Liberal party in the Senate, moved the six months' hoist, and every Liberal in the Senate, I believe, voted to vote down that Redistribution Bill. That, I believe, was in 1882. I remind hon. gentlemen of this to show them that they ought to look in vain to the Senate as entitled to claim from that body, irrespective of party feeling of any kind, that it should at the bidding of any Government pass a measure that is avowedly, as stated here by the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of the Bill this afternoon, to break down, as far as this Government can break down, the rights and interests and position which hon. members of this House have obtained, and put supporters of this Government in their places.

Now, Sir, there is another feature of this Bill which might not have been expected. As I have said before, the province of Quebec is practically left untouched. There is very little proposed alteration in that province, but taking the question of a due and fair and just representation of the different provinces in this House, what is the position. It happens for the moment, but I am by no means wanting in confidence that at no distant day the position of the province of Quebec, so far as it is politically concerned, will be greatly changed. I see that the hon. gentleman laughs at the suggestion. I would be paying a poor compliment to that province if I should suppose that under existing circumstances, my right hon. friend could look to that great and important province with confidence to obtain a reaffirmation of that support which he enjoyed at the last election. I will not go into the question why. I think, if the right hon. gentleman does look to it with confidence, he will be greatly deceived.

The PRIME MINISTER. Somebody is sure to be deceived.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is quite true. I think I am saying what is no secret to my right hon. friend when I say that no man was more deceived than he in the province of Quebec at the last election. I happen to know that one of his most trusted friends and lieutenants was asked after the close of the polls at the election of 1896 : Where do you think you are ? He said : I have no doubt we are in. His friend, a personal friend, though not a political one, said to him : The polls are now closed, the contest is over, you can afford to be frank, what is your calculation ? He said : We expect a majority of eight in the province of Quebec and thirty in Ontario.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not say that the right hon. gentleman did, but he thought it if he did not say it.

There is one respect, however, in which the province of Quebec enjoys a very great advantage over the province of Ontario. Every one will admit that, under our system, the intention is that the rights and interests of the electorate should be very much of the same character throughout the different provinces. But what is the fact? The fact is that in the province of Ontario you have one man one vote. A man, however large his means, though he may be a millionaire, though he may have the country covered with his property in various directions, though he may have all over the city of Toronto a dozen valuable establishments and places of business, can only give one vote. How is it in the province of Quebec? There a man, without a tithe of the property or weight of influence in the country of the man in Ontario, can give a half dozen votes. Yet my right hon. friend thinks that is all right now. So long as in Quebec he thinks he enjoys a great numerical majority, of course that system is all right and proper. But I draw his attention to it to show that this Bill is not quite so fair and equable as might have been expected.

When we come to analyse this measure—and I draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General, who has given us long columns of figures on the subject, to two or three things that strikes one at the outset. Every public man admits that under our parliamentary system it is most important that the electorate should be equalized as far as reasonable. There are certain things that makes it inconvenient to equalize it, but so far as it can reasonably be done, equalization should be effected. I take Simcoe, and I find that Simcoe has three members with a unit of population for each of something like 28,000. But Simcoe happens to be Conservative, and does any person doubt that if that county were Liberal it would not return four members under this Bill? It has now three members requiring 28,000 of a population to return each. Why is it then that Brant, with a population less than half that of Simcoe, has two members? If Brant is entitled to two, under this changing and remodelling of constituencies, is that fair? Does any one believe that if Brant were Conservative it would not have one member instead of two under this Bill, and that if Simcoe were Liberal it would not have four instead of three. Why, it is perfectly obvious that the thing is done in violation of everything like equalization of representation, so far as population is concerned. It is evidently done for the purpose of giving a double advantage to a county that happens to be Liberal, and less advantage to a county that happens to be Conservative. Take Algoma; that county has but one member, although it has a population of 36,514. Brant has a member for each 15,000 of its population, if you take out the Indians, who have been disfranchised by this Government. You have given two members to Brant, with its 30,000 population, and you give only one to Algoma, which has 36,514 of a population. Does not that revolt against every principle of justice when you come to consider it for a single moment? Take the whole population of Brant, including the Indians, and the unit for its members is 15,608 as against the unit of population for a member for Algoma of more than double, 36,514.

One of your arguments, and it is one I do not intend to discuss now, although it is very interesting, is that thickly settled places, such as towns, do not require an equal representation, compared with rural districts. Then, your argument is altogether against you in the case of Brant, because you give the county of Brant two members, although its population is but 30,000, leaving out the Indians, while you give Algoma, which has 36,000 of a population, or double that of Brant, including the Indians, but one member.

Take the city of London, with a population of 31,977, and you give it but one member, yet you give Brant, with the same population, two members, and you give Norfolk, with a population of 29,842, much less than London, two members.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What year is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The census of 1891, according to which the population of London is 31,977.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman is quoting the wrong figures.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am taking these figures from what I supposed to be a correct source, but of course I am not as familiar with the populations of the various counties in Ontario as my hon. friend is.

Mr. WALLACE. The figures you have given are quite right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear it. I endeavour to give the most correct information I can, and I am stating it as fairly as I can. There is no object in making a statement with reference to the figures to this House that is not fair, because it is easily refuted by gentlemen who know. Now, I do not wish to pursue that subject further. My right hon. friend attached great importance to county boundaries, as compared with maintaining county boundaries, questions of population were of no importance. But what about Quebec? That pro-

vince is left practically untouched. I find a curious illustration mentioned in the press, and I assume that it is correct. It is a curious example of what the hon. gentleman has done in Quebec:

> The first twelve lots in the three first ranges of the said township (Stanfold) which formed part of the parish of Notre Dame, are transferred from the electoral district of Drummond and Arthabaska to the electoral district of Megantic.

Is it possible to do greater violence to the principle——

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will pardon me. I do no violence to the principle. The first three ranges of the county of Stanfold, which were formerly in the county of Arthabaska are now in the county of Megantic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am informed, that you have to cut across lots in order to transfer electors from one county to another for political purposes. If that is not correct, the right hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to correct it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will give authority for that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall be glad to have it. I now come to a point which I regard as a very important one, and that is to endeavour to show that the attacks made upon the so-called Gerrymander Act of 1882 are without foundation. And I would draw the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) as well as of the Prime Minister to this matter. There is only one way by which you can establish that there has been a gerrymander, that violence has been done to the arrangement of constituencies. But, in the first place, I may say that I hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for the great gerrymander in the province of Ontario. That this is a gerrymander I think everybody admits. I do not think there is a gentleman on the other side but will admit that every principle of population and county boundaries and township lines and every other was violated by the Mowat Gerrymander in the province of Ontario. And when the right hon. Prime Minister asked the gentlemen who had signalised his public career more by that act than by any other one act of his life, when they invited him to leave that Government and become a member of this Government, they adopted his policy and were committed to the defence of that Act. But for that Act the Liberal party would not be in power in Ontario to-day. Is there a gentleman on the Government benches who will venture to deny that the present Liberal Government in Ontario owe the fact of their being in power to this gerrymander, that but for it they would have been swept from power at the last election? Then I say these gentlemen are not in a position to wax so exceedingly virtuous in regard to what they hold to be a violation of fair-play and justice under the Redistribution Act of 1882. But, Sir, that Act has remained, with some slight alterations—which were also objected to—in 1893, and it is that Act that they propose mainly to redress by the present Bill. Is it not so? Very well; I was saying that there was only one way to prove that a Redistribution Act does violence to fair-play and justice in the interest of party. And what is that? Before you can maintain your case that a Redistribution Act has had the effect of unfairly affecting the conditions of parties, you must show that, through that Act a minority of votes have elected a majority of representatives. Is not that a perfectly obvious proposition? Can you give any evidence that the Redistribution Act of 1882 unfairly operated against the Liberal party unless you can show that the party that polled the minority of votes elected the majority of members? Now, what are the facts? It is not a matter of argument, but of demonstration. We have the figures. I have here a statement of the official returns of the elections prepared by an officer of this Government, and what does it say? It says that in the province of Ontario the Conservative vote in 1896 was 191,052, and they elected 43 members; while the total Liberal vote in Ontario was 166,335, and they, a minority of 24,717, elected 44 members, or one more than the Conservatives. Now, where is there a fair-minded man, where is there a man of intelligence who will dare to stand up in this House and say that the Gerrymander Act of 1882, amended in 1893, acted unfairly when this was the result?

The PRIME MINISTER. What returns is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the official returns, which are open to my right hon. friend as they are to everybody else. I may be incorrect, but I am stating what I believe to be the official returns. Of course, it must be frankly admitted that there were a number of independent members, and it will not be forgotten—and nobody knows it better than my right hon. friend—that every one of those members would have been behind us if we had had a majority.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to see the independent member on that side of the House who would not be on that side to-day if we were sitting on the front benches. Now, I may carry this argument a little further. My right hon. friend has admitted that no province is gerrymandered by the Conservative party except Ontario. He leaves all the other provinces intact, because they have not been subjected to what he calls the gerrymandering influence. There-

fore, let me go back to Prince Edward Island for a moment. Could anything be fairer than the adjustment of the constituencies of Prince Edward Island? Could anything be fairer than the statement of Sir John Thompson, in which he showed that, without doing any violence to the boundaries, those constituencies had been so divided as to give practically the same number of people the same representation, except in case of the cities where, for reasons which hon. gentlemen opposite hold strongly, the people do not require the same representation. But why is the change now? Why do you separate in the city of Toronto the two members that were elected for the same constituency? Why do you say that in the city of Toronto every man should have one vote and only one? Toronto must be divided into five constituencies by the Bill as remodelled; yet, in face of the declaration that you do not intend to allow the same man to vote for two members except in the city of Ottawa and the city of Hamilton, you separate them in West Toronto. Why should that be done in Toronto, and why go down to Prince Edward Island, and break up these five constituencies now so fairly adjusted? I will tell you the reason why. Because Prince Edward Island, at the last election, went against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He came back with a minority at his back instead of having the whole vote, as he promised he would have. He knows that if he came back at all, if there was a general election to-morrow, he would come back alone, unless these constituencies were gerrymandered. Therefore, every principle is thrown to the winds, there is no principle in reference to county lines, no principle in reference to population, no principle in reference to numerical representation, nothing but the one principle that makes for party gain.

Now, take the whole Dominion of Canada, and what are the facts? At the last general election the Conservative party polled 413,000 votes as against 397,194 Liberal votes. Yet the country was gerrymandered, was it, with nearly 16,000 more Conservative than Liberal votes in the whole Dominion, although the Government have a large majority sitting behind them. There is the conclusive evidence establishing beyond controversy that no injustice was done to political parties in Canada, taking the country broadly: I will not say that there may not be individual cases that would be subject to close criticism; but I say that taking the country broadly, take the province of Ontario, and I can demonstrate that although you have a majority of one in this House, you are in a minority of nearly 25,000 votes. I give that to the House as a reason why this Redistribution Bill is now introduced. These gentlemen know that it is their only chance of coming back, discredited as they have become by their indefensible acts which they have forced through this House. They know that their only hope of salvation, their only hope of escaping the verdict that will overtake them in the next election, lies in re-arranging the constituencies as this Bill proposes. They hope to escape the verdict of an indignant people by clothing, as this Bill attempts to clothe, 15,000 people who are Liberals with more power than 30,000 who are Conservatives, by giving 200,000 people who are Conservatives six members less than are to be returned by 200,000 people who are supposed to be Liberals.

I do not intend to pursue this subject further at the present time than to say that the Bill is its own condemnation. Its introduction is the strongest possible evidence that this Government is afraid to go back to the electorate as they left it. They got their positions, as I have shown on more than one occasion, by professing one policy in one section of the country and another policy in another section. They know that to-day they stand in the position of having violated every promise they gave to the electorate of this country upon which they obtained power; they know that they stand in the presence of an intelligent electorate branded with having been false to every principle they professed from the first hour of their public life down to the present moment. The country has trusted them, the country took them at their word, and it has been deceived. The right hon. gentleman knows it, and his colleagues know it. The gentlemen behind them have been dragged through the mire in support of those measures that have ruined this Government in the estimation of the country. So the only hope left them is to gerrymander the constituencies of the great province of Ontario so as to give them some chance of getting back here. I say that I believe this Bill will come to naught. I believe this Bill cannot become law. I believe it is impossible that such a gross violation of the constitution in the interest of a party, with their flimsy plea upon which it is based, can ever succeed. You may be able to force it through this House, but I misjudge the independent character of the Parliament of Canada if such a measure ever becomes law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I will endeavour to confine myself to a discussion of the Bill itself, and the hon. leader of the Opposition will pardon me if I do not take up all the points he has alluded to, such as the Yukon Railway and others of that class. When, some 27 years ago, I first entered Parliament, I was given to understand by those who were familiar with the rules of Parliament, that it was not considered in good taste, in alluding to what transpired in another Chamber, to mention the Senate by name, but the member must always speak of the matter as something that had transpired in another place. We have one of the leaders of this House to-night, in discussing the question that is before the House, not resting his case upon argument, not resting his case on a fair and full argument addressed to the members of

this House, who are to discuss it, but, with an open shamefacedness—I was going to say, with a want of shamefacedness—addressing himself to the Senator's Gallery, and, before investigation and debate by this House, assuming that he is in a position to insult another branch of the legislature, by saying, that he can count upon them to throw out the Bill, against which he has not used any argument worth being considered in this debate. If there be one instance, and he has given not one (except at the last, when he alluded to two or three counties in respect to which there is alleged to be a disproportion of population, as represented in this Chamber) in which an argument has been used, and one which I have seen in the Conservative press during the few weeks that they have had this measure before them, is, that the city of Toronto, with its added population, from the adoption of the principle of confining within the municipal bounds the people living there, were not receiving their proportionate representation. One other argument was, that the county of Kent, less in numbers than the county of Simcoe, was to get three members because, as they alleged, it was a Liberal county, while the county of Simcoe, which, they alleged, was a Conservative county, was only to get three members; and they pointed out the disproportion. To-day, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) who moved the second reading of the Bill, announced that the Government, after consideration of this question, and while it may not have been deemed necessary in the interest of what is fair and just to cities and towns in this respect, have come to the conclusion that he mentioned, I am at a loss to know what possible valid reason hon. gentlemen can give against the Bill, as it affects that city. With two members for Kent, each of these members will represent more than an equal number in the county of Simcoe, which has three members. If disproportionate representation of counties and cities is to be a reason why this Bill is condemned, then—if I may follow the bad example of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and allude to what is possible to transpire in another place—I would ask him, if he can count for much help in that direction, on account of undue representation, or want of proper representation. Imagine that argument in that other place. The Bill goes before that body—I am drawn into discussion, because that hon. gentleman has made a shameless appeal to that body—but, when they come to look around their Chamber and to recognize the fact that there are 24 members of that House now who represent the whole of the province of Ontario, numbering over 2,000,000 of people, and when they see that one-quarter of the whole number are from the city of Toronto, they will not be apt to think that Toronto is unrepresented.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) answering the newspapers, or answering the discussion by members of this House?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There has not been much discussion by members of the Opposition, and I am answering them both at once, or I am endeavouring to do so. I was pointing out that it may be conceded, in reference to the city of Toronto, that, even with its five members, each of these members will represent a larger number than the members elected, after this Bill becomes law, will represent in rural constituencies. This is granted. It has been a recognized principle in this country, and, I think, in other countries, that cities do not expect, and that they have never received, if they have expected, proportionate representation with rural constituencies. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) knows that in his own Bill that was the case. The hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of the Bill pointed out that no injustice is done to these cities. Look at it from the reasonable point of view—I dwell not now upon the fact that members representing outside constituencies live within the city, and that, while they represent faithfully their own constituencies, they know also what affects the city constituency. When any measure comes before this House, they can raise their voices in reference to how it may affect those constituencies within city limits. I point out another fact to you, Mr. Speaker, a fact that every hon. gentleman recognizes, and which has been recognized by both parties, and it is, that if there be a distinction made, it should be made in favour of a rural population rather than in favour of a city like Toronto. Why? We know that if, during the session of Parliament, there is a measure proposed that affects the city of Toronto, the people of that city know it in the morning. The indefatigable reporter has got a full report of the transaction, and it appears in the newspapers, and, if there be anything affecting the interest of the city, there is no time lost in taking action in regard to it. They can get a meeting of the board of trade or of the city council at an hour's notice. Within twenty-four hours of the meeting you have a delegation of the representative men of the city coming before your committee to present their views. In a rural constituency, the interests of which might be affected by some measure before the House, it is impossible to summon any deliberative body amongst themselves; it is not as easy to get a meeting in such a rapid manner, or to reach the views of the people dwelling in a rural constituency.

Mr. CLANCY. Are these the reasons which induced the hon. gentleman to make up his mind to give the city of Toronto five, instead of four, members?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have explained to hon. gentlemen that, listening to what might be said by hon. gentlemen, with the view of meeting their views, if there is anything in it, that the Government have taken one member away from what the hon. gentleman concedes to be a Liberal riding, and given it to the city of Toronto, that the hon. gentleman claims as Conservative. I am not going to take a position that the hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. It may be, that all the constituencies that they are willing now, for the purposes of this discussion, to give to the Liberal party, may all go to the Liberal party after the passage of this Bill; but I am not prepared to say, that the city of Toronto, which has been given five members, is sure to return five Conservative members, any more than I am sure of saying, that every constituency that is dealt with and finally readjusted by the judges, will return, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, all Liberal members. We do not know what the result of the elections may be. All we have to see to, and what this Bill proposes to accomplish, is, that the voice of the people shall be heard on the floor of this House in a fair, free and open manner, in such a manner as it will send to Parliament men that will speak the voice of the majority, as the voice of the majority will have it spoken. I may be pardoned, and I will take a little longer than I intended just to allude to the reason why this Bill has been introduced, because I dare say, that I am addressing a House in which the majority of the members are not conversant with the subject of the redistribution or the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. I am inclined to believe that the majority of this House were not members of it at that time. I was then a member of this House, as also were other hon. gentlemen I see around me; but to those who were not present at that time, and who may not have read "Hansard," which gives a very fair account of the proceedings that took place, I wish to point out the iniquities of that Bill, which the Liberal party of that day, the Government party of to-day, protested against. There was a great deal of indignation expressed and a great deal of denunciation of the Bill. I can remember how some of the hon. members who were struck at, distinctly and evidently struck at, voiced their indignation. The then member for South Brant had a voice that could be heard, and it was heard denouncing that Bill as iniquitous; the voice of the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) was also heard in strong denunciation. And there was a reason for that. If hon. members who were not present then will take the "Hansard" of 1882 and read the twenty-two amendments that we moved to the Bill, which recite the iniquities of the measure, I believ that they, like many Conservative members of that day—save and except a few who were lost to all proper feeling of what was due between man and man—will blush when they read, and when they understand the nature of that gerrymander. And what was it? A majority in the Parliament of Canada, elected not upon that issue, used their power in this Chamber, without debate and in dumb silence, to vote down amendment after amendment, and not daring to lift their heads when they understood the iniquities which they supported by their votes. And, Sir, the iniquities of that Bill were further exemplified in this, that men who sat side by side in this Chamber, men who dined at the same table, men who were friends socially witnessed the scene in this House of Conservative members so far forgetting themselves that they deliberately, through the force of a majority in numbers legislated to strengthen their own political position. That was bad enough, but that was not all that aroused indignation. They saw members of this House who were brave enough to legislate in order to strengthen their own position, and who were mean enough, at the same time, to plot against their fellow-members in the adjoining constituencies, so as to put them to political death by an Act of Parliament. That was what raised the indignation. It was then shown that this member, and that member, and the other member, and still another and another of the Liberal members who could not be defeated in any other way, were singled out to be legislated out of Parliament, amid the jeers of some of the more gross-minded of their political opponents. The Bill was fought against; twenty-two amendments were moved, each one reciting an iniquity, and these amendments were voted down in dumb silence, forty-two yeas and ninety-nine nays; vote after vote, not a word of defence from the Conservative Government supporters who though they might with downcast heads vote for the gerrymander of 1882, could not for very shame stand up and defend it.

Now, Sir, what does this Bill do? Is there any member on the other side of the House who is struck personally or individually by this Bill? No, nothing of the kind. There are certain members of Parliament on this side of the House supporting the Government who will not have such safe constituencies as they had before, but where is the member who can say he is being legislated out by this Bill. Does my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), whose riding disappears, and disappears not to strike at him, but in conformity with the principle that has been adopted; does he say he is being legislated out of the House by this Bill? Sir, he cannot say so. He lives in the county of Kent, I believe, and that county is to be divided for two members, but that division is not to be made by a majority in this House; that division is not to be made by a revising barrister

of five years' standing, as was the case under the Conservative Franchise Bill; no, that division is to be made by the judges of the land. And what judges? The very highest judges of this land. Who can tell how they will divide the county of Kent? Will my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) say that if a political party divided the county of Kent it could not be so divided as to return two Liberal members.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario have divided it in that way.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will my hon. friend state that it is not possible to divide the county of Kent in such a way as to give a majority to two Liberal members, if it was the desire of this Government, and the desire of the majority in this House so to do? Sir, this Bill takes the division out of the hands of a political majority and gives it to the judges of the land. There is no man struck at individually. It proposes to return to the county boundaries, and that is a principle that the Liberal party has contended for time and again.

Here let me allude to some remarks of the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) appealed to the members of another Chamber in order to strengthen his position with them, in order to coach them, if it is possible to do so; he appealed to them with a shamelessness that is not often witnessed on the floor of this Parliament. He told them they did right in the Yukon matter—though he supported the Yukon Bill himself. He told them they did right in throwing out the Drummond Railway Bill, and he told them they did not do right when they did not throw out the Franchise Act, leaving them to infer that they would do wrong if they did not throw out this Redistribution Bill. He argued that the Senate was within its right when they rejected these Bills, because it merely gave the people the opportunity of pronouncing upon the questions at issue, but he also admitted that if the people had pronounced in favour of any public measure, then the Senate would pass it without the slightest hesitation. That is the argument of these hon. gentlemen opposite; it is the ground upon which they stand, and I will take them upon their own ground. The Redistribution Bill, the second reading of which has been moved to-day, is a Bill which has been before the people of Canada. The nature of that Bill, the object of that Bill, were before the people, were pronounced upon by the people, and this Government was returned to introduce that Bill and to ask this Parliament to pass it. I therefore think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will appeal in vain to any legislative body which has any regard for justice, to throw out this Bill. The people have declared at the polls that they want this Bill. They have declared themselves in favour of this Bill by a majority of their representatives in this House, and with that declaration of the people the Bill will go to the Senate. And, as to the complaint of the hon. gentleman about the passage of the Franchise Bill in the Senate, it may be that the Senate was influenced by the fact that they knew that that very Franchise Bill was a question submitted to the people of this country and approved of by them. They know that the people of this country pronounced for the repeal of the Franchise Act, and the Franchise Act was repealed. And, Sir, we are here to-day carrying out one of the pledges in the platform adopted by the great national Liberal convention that met in this city in 1893. Almost all of the pledges then made have been carried out. This pledge remains to be fulfilled. This pledge the Government intend, as far as it is in their power, to fulfil, as they have fulfilled almost all their other pledges; and should they fail to pass the Bill, they will have been true to what they promised to the people, and upon those who assume the responsibility of casting out the measure the blame will lie, and not upon the Government. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite fight the Bill, and denounce it as an infamous Bill—so infamous that they say that the snow will fly before we finish discussing it. Well, let me say, so far as I am concerned, that if we were seeking party advantage in this matter, the longer the measure is obstructed by hon. gentlemen opposite, the worse it will be for themselves, if I am any judge of the people of this country, and I think I am. I have been in Opposition when we have fought very hard some Bills that were introduced by the Government of the day. I can even remember the leader of the Government of that time lecturing us very severely, and telling us that we were bringing Parliament into contempt with this factious opposition, as he was pleased to term it, and keeping the House in session day after day, as we did, when that Government introduced a measure to throttle the electorate, and to wipe out one of the great political parties of this country. We answered: "We will assume the responsibility; if we are fighting in a way that we ought not, it is to our own loss, for the people will visit our conduct on our heads." But the people said we were right, and they returned us to power. So I say to hon. gentlemen opposite: If you believe this Bill is a monstrous and infamous Bill, it is your bounden duty to fight it. If you are willing to assume the responsibility, do so, confident that your action will commend itself to right-thinking people in this Dominion. Let obstruction be used, if obstruction should be used against this Bill—criticism, full, free, and to

the utmost extent; it is the right and privilege of members of the Opposition to use it. To go beyond that is within their power if they see fit to exercise it. Upon them alone will rest the responsibility. But the question comes to this. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite view the measure from a different standpoint from what I do. Perhaps they can see some injustice, some unfairness in this Bill which I confess I am unable to see. It may be so; but when we go back and appeal to the people, we will suppose that one of these hon. gentlemen goes into the county of Perth and appears on a public platform in favour of the candidate of the Conservative party, and meets with the candidate of the Liberal party; and the candidate of the Liberal party takes up "Hansard" and reads that it was declared in Parliament by the Conservative party that it was a monstrous thing and an infamous thing for you men of North Easthope and you men of South Easthope to be allowed to vote in the municipal county to which you belong, and in which you exercise your municipal rights. Will that strengthen the Conservative party? If in addition it is pointed out that the precious time of Parliament was occupied, not in argument but simply in clogging the wheels of progress, in an attempt to defeat this Bill, will that strengthen the position of the Conservative party? Go into the townships of Burford and Oakland, which by the Act of these hon. gentlemen in 1882 were torn out of South Brant, which had the proper unit of population, as near as might be; so that 5,000 people were taken out of that riding and put them into another county, giving it a population of about 25,000, leaving South Brant with about 21,000. Go to those people, and on the platform say to them: "Men of Burford and Oakland, the Conservative party say that it is an infamous thing for you to vote again in the county of Brant, where you live and do business, where you elect your county councillors, and where all your municipal interests lie." Go into the township of Ancaster, which was torn from the county of Wentworth, in order to put to his political death honest old Joe Rymal, who had the respect of every man on either side of the House. They took that township and tacked it on to the county of North Brant; then they went away west to the county of Oxford, and took another township there and tacked it on to the other end of North Brant, thus putting parts of three counties together, and making a constituency which was 4,000 under the unit of population—all to kill honest Joe Rymal politically. Go to the township of Ancaster, and tell the electors there: "The Conservative party held Parliament till the snow flew, and declared that it was an infamous thing for you men of Ancaster to vote in the county to which you belong." Yes, obstruction is the privilege of these hon. gentlemen, if they choose to use it.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman sit down, please. When the hon. members for East and West York go before those of their constituents, who reside within the municipal limits of the city of Toronto, and some one rises before them and reads "Hansard" to show that it was declared in Parliament to be an infamous thing——

An hon. MEMBER. A diabolical thing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS—a diabolical thing and a monstrous thing for those men to be permitted to vote in the city in national matters with the men with whom they vote on every municipal question, do hon. gentlemen think that they will strengthen themselves wonderfully in that way? If they go to either of the ridings of the county of York from which these portions of the city of Toronto are taken, and say to the electors there: "This is an infamous Bill and we are going to fight it till the snow flies," what will the men of York say? They will say: "We have had three members in the past and we have three members now; we are represented as strongly in the House of Commons as we were before." Do you suppose these men will feel that an outrage has been perpetrated upon them? Why, Sir, it will not bear investigation. Well, how are the other provinces dealt with? How are hon. gentlemen opposite going to go down to the other provinces and justify their threat to keep Parliament here till the snow flies? When it is pointed out to the people on the platform that the proceedings of Parliament were delayed, that tens of thousands of dollars of the money of the people of this country were wasted in obstruction, the electors in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island will say to them, what is the reason of this? Why did you fight that Bill in this way? "Oh, because it was an infamous bill." "Well, well, what kind of a Bill was it?" Why, do you know that up in Ontario they removed some of the atrocities, as they termed them, that were committed in the Redistribution Bill of 1882. The Liberal party took the ground then that the county boundaries should be retained, and brought in this Bill to restore them." The question was then asked: "Did they make the county boundaries?" The answer must be: "No they did not." "Then, who made the county boundaries which had to be removed because they were so monstrous. That must have been done by these men." "No." "Well, who did it." "I cannot tell, they were made some thirty or forty years ago, before this

Government took birth." "Well, how could you blame this Government for that?" "True, but do you not see that some of these counties are entitled to two or three members and they divide them up so that the Liberals will get a majority?" "Oh, is that so? Who, then, did the dividing? Was it the party in the majority in the House? "No." "Who, then?" "I suppose they appointed political partisans of their own to do it, and that is how this monstrous thing was done." "No, they appointed the judges." "You mean revising barristers?" "No, "Well, what judges did they appoint?" "They appointed judges selected from the highest court in the land, men at the very top of our national life in this country."

What, Mr. Speaker, do you think the people will say of those who attack a Bill of that kind, who declared they will obstruct it until the snow flies? Well, they are welcome to all the opposition they can make, if they think it is any advantage to them. In opposing the Bill they are acting within their rights, but the people will have something to say of their conduct. My hon. friend from North Bruce said that he had no objection to the judges deciding the divisions. I would have expected nothing less from the hon. gentleman, knowing his great respect for and knowledge of the judiciary. But what will the people think of those people who thus inferentially insult those judges, who, if there is any gerrymandering possible, are the only ones that can do it? I do not think that the people will take the view which these hon. gentlemen take of this Bill.

These hon. gentlemen say: You are not carrying out the principle of representation by population, which is one of the principles of the Liberal party. Sir, that was one of our principles, in the old times, as between provinces and that principle is embodied to-day in the British North America Act, and is a fundamental principle in the constitution of this country. Representation by population, as between the provinces. But while you can get a unit of representation as between the provinces, no man can devise and no one has ever suggested that you could secure a perfect unit of representation in the electoral boundaries of the different ridings of this country. That unit of representation is not to be lost sight of altogether, nor is it in this Bill. It is to be observed as nearly as possible, and the hon. leader of the Opposition has told us himself that it is impossible fairly to observe it. He has pointed out where differences exist under this Bill, and he has increased the number—I do not accuse him of doing it wilfully—of the population of the city of Toronto. He says Toronto has a population of 200,000, which will give 50,000 to each of its five members. But there are not 200,000 people in Toronto, according to the census of 1891, which is made the basis for the judges to go upon, and which is the last authoritative statement we have of our population. I speak subject to correction, but when those divisions that are to be added to the present electoral district of Toronto are added to it, under the operation of this Bill, there will be 180,000 in that city, represented by five members, so that each member will represent 36,000. And if I am not mistaken, the present member for West York (Mr. Wallace), in his present constituency, is representing 41,857 souls, under the law of to-day.

Look at the electoral districts as constituted by hon. gentlemen opposite in their Bill of 1882, still further confirmed and enlarged by the Act of 1892, when, as was pointed out by the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of this Bill before the House, hon. gentlemen opposite cast aside the views held by Sir John Macdonald relative to the necessity and desirability of maintaining county boundaries, and tried to justify themselves on the plea of equalizing the population in the different electoral districts much more closely than it was possible to do retaining the county bounds. But I venture to say that if you will take their measure and examine the ridings made by these gentlemen, who talk so glibly about the equalizing of population now, you will find greater disparities of population in the ridings, as established by them, than you will in the operation of this Bill and the divisions established under it by the judges of the land. Does the hon. gentleman shake his head? Let me give him a few instances.

The electoral districts of Brockville and two townships with a population of 15,853 were taken out of South Leeds, leaving the latter 22,449. Was there any discrepancy there? Cardwell is formed out of parts of Peel, Simcoe and Dufferin, having a population of 15,382. It adjoins North Wellington, with a population of 24,956, and South Wellington, with a population of 24,373. Durham West, with a population of 15,374, adjoins Ontario South, with a population of 19,033. Frontenac, with a population of 13,445, adjoins South Leeds, whose population is 22,449. Grenville South, with a population of 12,929, adjoins Dundas, whose population is 20,132. North Leeds and Grenville, with 13,521, adjoins Carleton, with 21,746. Lennox, with 14,900, adjoins Addington, with 24,151. Middlesex West, with a population of 17,288, adjoins Middlesex East, with a population of 25,569, and that is one of the counties which those hon. gentlemen gerrymandered. Northumberland West, with a population of 14,949, adjoins Northumberland East, with a population of 21,995. Peel contributed two townships to form Cardwell, leaving it only with 15,466, while York West, which adjoins Peel, with a population of 41,857. Peterborough West has a population of 15,808, while the east riding has 21,919.

Hon. gentlemen opposite may say: But some of these you are not touching at all. I grant that, but are we thereby gaining any advantage? Is there any party advantage being sought by our not touching them? The

right hon. leader of the Government, when introducing the Bill, in the absence of the Postmaster General, explained that we only proposed to rectify the more glaring iniquities of the Gerrymander Act of hon. gentlemen opposite. And where that Act is not interfered with, there is no party advantage to be gained by us, because the ridings are left as they were formed by these hon. gentlemen opposite, who so forgot what was due to every sense of honour, that they deliberately gerrymandered the counties in order to further their own political advantage. Any riding not touched by us is a riding constituted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and so constituted for their own party advantage, under the Gerrymander Bill of 1882, so that we can have nothing to gain by not touching it. If these hon. gentlemen did not seek their own advantage when they cut up 54 counties, threw in townships out of this county into that and vice versa, why did they do it? If they did not cut up every county it was because they believed certain counties were so strong in their interests that it was impossible to touch them in any way and make them more sure and safe for the Conservative party.

We attempt to rectify this wrong; we attempt to keep our promise to the people to carry out that for which we received the mandate of the people, to rectify the grossest feature of that Gerrymander Act, so that the people of this country might not be coerced, so that one political party might not be favoured more than another, but that their free voice should be heard, and that voice should rule, no matter what the consequence was either to Conservatives or to Liberals.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken a good deal about the county of Brant. They would minimize the population of that county. I think the leader of the Opposition said there were 30,000 people there. There are in the county of Brant over 36,000 people, according to the census of 1891, and there are far more there now. I believe that there are over 40,000 people in Brant; but I do not mention that, because the judges are not to consider the municipal census, but will deal only with national figures, properly authenticated by the officers of this House, and I wish to deal only with the figures that the judges must deal with. There are between 36,000 and 37,000 souls in the county of Brant. That county has now two members given it now for the first time under this Bill, if it becomes law. Since the days of confederation, aye, before confederation, the county of Brant had two members. It is not because the county of Brant is, as I was proud to hear the hon. gentleman acknowledge, a banner Liberal county, that it is given two members; it is because, under the rule that is laid down by every principle of fair-play, the county ought to have two members. Is party advantage the object?

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. CLANCY. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is about the answer I should expect from the hon. gentleman? Would he say, that the county of Brant ought to have only one member?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What would he say, then, in reference to the county of Norfolk, which has a smaller population than Brant?

Mr. CLANCY. I would say——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Let me show how this works. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), when speaking on the introduction of the Bill, said—speaking subject to correction—that this Bill would have a bad effect upon him, because—although, be it remembered, the judges, and not this Government, are going to divide the county—the north riding would be a perfectly safe constituency, while the south riding might be a very difficult one for a Conservative to carry. I do not profess to judge of the situation as the hon. member (Mr. Tisdale) does. Now, the county of Norfolk, with some thousands less than the county of Brant, ought certainly, in all fairness, to have one member taken from it before the county of Brant has a member taken from it. To do this would mean that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would be returned by an overwhelming majority, while the hon. member for South Norfolk would be wiped out of political existence. We do not do that: we divide the county; and the hon. member for South Norfolk has an excellent chance to be in this House after the next election representing that riding. Do these hon. gentlemen wish one member taken from Norfolk? The figures between Wentworth and Norfolk are very close, Wentworth having a slightly less population than Norfolk. Without doing great violence to principle, we might give Wentworth two members and Norfolk one. Wentworth would be sure to return two Liberal members, as it did, I believe, from confederation down to the time the Bill of 1882 was passed. But we give Wentworth only one member, while the county of Norfolk, which, for years and years, has returned one Liberal and one Conservative, because it has a few more population than the county of Wentworth, is given two members. And hon. gentlemen opposite talk of an infamous Bill, and say they will sit until the snow flies in order to point out the infamies contained in this measure. Well, I do not think I need to enlarge more on this Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I have no objection. I do not propose to go

into the legal argument, as to whether we have a right to do what we here propose. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in these matters, is a layman like myself, and so I cannot accept him as an authority, though, from his age and his long parliamentary experience, he might be better able to judge than I. Still, this is a question upon which. I fancy, the legal gentlemen in this House will be better qualified to speak. Speaking subject to correction, so far as I can remember, I know of no lawyer of any standing who has taken the ground that it is not possible for this Parliament to bring in a Bill for redelimiting the boundaries of a riding within a particular province. I have not heard that argued inside the House or outside of it, so far as I know, and it strikes me that no one will be found who will take that position.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Not if he has a reputation to lose.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not going to pronounce upon that; I leave the lawyers to talk on that part of the subject. I confine myself to the merits of the Bill, and I speak as I do in order that gentlemen who are now in the House may understand the reason why this great convention of the Liberal party assembled from all parts of the Dominion should take the position they did upon this question. It was recognized that the Bill passed in 1882 was a deliberate attempt to throttle the free expression of the will of the people of this country. Therefore, it was that men from the east, as well as men from the west. joined with the men of Ontario in declaring that this was one of the measures that must be introduced. The Bill of 1882 was a Bill that dismembered counties with a view to drive out of political life men sitting by the side of those gentlemen, and who had always fought them fair. Some of the best men that were in this House at that time were struck at. Some have passed away from these scenes of strife and debate; others there are who have voluntarily retired; but, Sir, there lives in the minds of those who were present, and who know what took place on that occasion, the feeling that never in the Parliament of Canada —save and except when the Franchise Bill was introduced—was so extraordinary a Bill presented. I scarcely know how to characterize it and keep within parliamentary bounds. When they saw men like the genial Liberal whip of that day, who has passed away from these scenes, a man who had the respect of members of both parties in this House, the genial member for South Perth, James Trow. When they saw that man struck at in a cowardly fashion by taking one of the townships out of his riding, because it gave 200 Liberal majority and throwing it into North Oxford that had already 1,000 of a Liberal majority, then they felt that a pass had been reached the depth of which they had not believed it was possible to be reached by men who could be elected as representatives of the people. And so with the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills). His riding was formed at the time of confederation, it was a riding that he had carried time and again, and townships were torn out of his county because they contained a Liberal majority, and were thrown into West Elgin that had hundreds upon hundreds of a Liberal majority already. And that was done in order to compass the political death of a man who was one of the ornaments of this House, and admitted to be so by Sir John A. Macdonald. In my own case, I had a riding that I had won from the Conservative party, won it fairly and honourably, and grew stronger as I went on. But they took out of South Brant Burford and Oakland, that gave some hundreds of Liberal majority, and threw them into another riding to equalize the population, and made it 25,000, while they left South Brant with only 21,000. There was the little township of Oakland, a three-cornered township that squared out the Township of Brantford, and that was 12 miles from the nearest point of the county into which they put it. The township of Burford they took out of South Brant and joined it to South Oxford. This little township of Oakland was 12 miles from the riding into which it was put. It was almost within sound of the bells of Brantford city, the main town of the riding, while the main town of the riding into which it was put was 50 miles away. On the third reading of that Bill I rose and recited these facts, and said that I wanted to ask a question of the gentleman who had charge of this Bill, I wanted him to look me in the eyes, but he sat with bowed head and dared not raise his eyes. Not one word of defence was given, and they voted down my proposition by 99 to 42. Yet that little township of 939 souls that I asked to be put back into the county of Brant, if put back, would have only given the south riding of Brant less population than the riding that was 12 miles distant from it into which they threw this township. That is gerrymander, but there is no gerrymander in this Bill. It is not possible to have a gerrymander in this Bill. If it were possible, and if it were done by political partisans, still there could be very little of a gerrymander as long as you are tied up within county bounds. It would be almost impossible for political partisans to accomplish much of a gerrymander even if they were entrusted with it. The Liberal party have some rights in this Parliament, with their majority they have a right to determine the bounds of the different counties and ridings. But they said: No, we will stand for a principle that will meet with the universal approval of every man of principle in this country. Though we have the right and power, and though we have the

precedent of these hon. gentlemen opposite, we will divest ourselves of the power, and limit the changes within county bounds. Then we will leave it to the judges of the land, those judges shall be taken from the highest ranks and they shall fix the bounds, and when they fix the bounds we will not ask the right, as a majority in this Parliament, to review the bounds that they fixed. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite are going to stay until the snow flies to fight this Bill. Sir, I do not ask them to desist from that resolve. The more they denounce as infamous and as monstrous this Bill, the surer I am that they will meet with the condemnation of every right-thinking man in this country. For my own part, and speaking honestly and sincerely, I am proud to belong to a party that has received this Bill with entire approbation; it is accepted, so far as I can judge, even by those men supporting the Government who will not stand politically as fair a chance as they do under the existing constituency.

Mr. CASEY. Here is one.

Mr. GIBSON. Here is another.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I can point to a lot of them, but not the first word of complaint have they uttered against this Bill, because they recognize that a Government that is strong enough, fair enough, that has confidence enough in the people, to leave these matters to be settled by the highest judges in the land, cannot but meet with the respect and approbation of the country at large. This measure is supported by the men who stood up in Opposition to those who supported the Gerrymander Bill in 1882, by the men who believe that it is manly, just and fair to give both political parties equal rights, so that the voice of the people may be heard, let that voice be pronounced for or against them. I am in favour of the second reading of this Bill. I am proud that this Bill has been introduced into Parliament, so that the people throughout this country will recognize that the principles and operation of that Bill is an announcement and earnest that there are men administering the affairs of this country, supported by faithful men behind them, who are prepared to do what is just and what is fair by all who dwell in this broad Dominion. Therefore, I need scarcely say that I am in hearty sympathy with this Bill, and that I am quite ready, for my own part, to allow all the discussion to take place and all the argument to be sent forth in reference to its principles, until the snow flies. I will say one word more. An hon. gentleman asked if the judges would hear argument before coming to their decision. I have not the slightest doubt that the judges who will be appointed with be able to read, and that they will have "Hansard" before them.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman talking to the judges now?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They will have "Hansard" within their reach, and they will read the arguments that will be adduced. Therefore, any arguments that hon. gentlemen opposite have to address against this Bill, it will be their privilege and their duty to advance these arguments now. The judges will read these arguments, I have no doubt.

Mr. BEATTIE. Do you suppose they will read yours?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I should judge, from the fair and impartial character of the gentlemen who adorn the judiciary of Canada, that they will not read one side alone, and though I may not perhaps be able to adduce as strong an argument in favour of this Bill as hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to adduce against it, I venture to say that if they read the arguments which may be adduced in reference to this Bill, they may perchance read the few arguments I have endeavoured to advance. Therefore, I have not the slightest doubt that, with the census of 1891 before them, with the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite before them, they will avail themselves of every source of information. I have no doubt that they will be able to avail themselves not only of the Dominion census in reference to the inequalities of population of different counties, but also in reference to the population of the townships and the towns and cities comprised within these. With a map before them, which I suppose they will desire to have, they will know themselves where these townships lie and they will have all the sources of information that will be necessary to form a judgment, that they will desire to have, as they no doubt will desire to have, in order to discharge their duty as, I think, every one will admit, they will discharge their duty in such a way as to commend themselves to every person. I only allude to this. I am pleased to see that some hon. members opposite are awakened to what they think is right in reference to this matter, that in a question of this kind arguments on one side or the other only, should not be listened to, but that both sides should be heard. They will hear both sides; they will avail themselves of the arguments pro and con. How was the Bill of 1882 prepared by these hon. gentlemen themselves? Did they want this matter argued by both political parties? No; in a chamber, with closed doors, they summoned their heelers and their party workers from all the different counties, and there they sat down, with a map before them, took this township out of that riding, that township out of this riding, placed this township into that riding, and that township into this riding

and when they had brought the Bill down to the House, without any one knowing anything about it, they wished to force it through by the majority of their own supporters. That is how they allowed both sides to be heard in arguing the question as to what was right and proper in reference to that matter. Let me show what they accomplished bearing in mind that their purpose was to equalize the population. I will give you a few instances. The municipal county of Oxford had a population of 49,857, and can more easily be divided into two ridings than Durham or Peterborough; yet two townships, Dereham and Blenheim, with a population of 9.631, were taken out of Oxford. They were taken out of Oxford, and mind you, we were asked to equalize the population. That was the reason for taking these two townships out. One of the two townships, which together had a population of 9.631, went into Perth, and the other into Brant, and they took the two townships of Easthope, north and south, and Burford from Brant, and put them into Oxford to make up for the population of 9,631 that they had taken out. They added a population of 9,639, or eight more than that of the townships that they had taken from that riding.

Mr. CLANCY. How did these ridings stand then?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman asks how these ridings stood. One of the Easthopes was in North Perth and the other one in South Perth. North Perth was represented by a Conservative and South Perth was represented by Mr. Trow, the genial Liberal whip, who has passed away. They had some hundreds of a Liberal majority in South Perth, and they thought to assassinate Mr. Trow by taking this township out of North Oxford, knowing that they could not assassinate Mr. Sutherland, who had a thousand of a majority. Blenheim, with a population of 5,606, was taken out of Oxford, and put in Brant, because they had taken Burford and Oakland, with a population of 5,797 out of that county. They did that to equalize population. Middlesex, with a population of 64,453, could easily be divided in three ridings. The township of Euphemia was taken from Lambton, South Dorchester from Elgin, and Stephen from Bruce, three different counties, in order to make up the population of Middlesex. Grimsby, in Lincoln, with a population of 2,705, was transferred to South Wentworth in 1892. But that left too few in Lincoln, so they went to the County of Welland and taking the township of Pelham, with a population of 2.554, added it to Lincoln to replace Grimsby. That was their way of equalizing. It would be just as nearly equal in all these cases if they left the townships where they were, but there was the sacred principle of equalizing the population, and so it had to be done. The township of Walpole was taken out of Haldimand and replaced by Wainfleet, belonging to Welland, and the township of Whitchurch was taken out of North York and replaced by transferring West Gwillimbury from South Simcoe to it. I might go on giving numerous instances of this kind to show the members of this House who were not present in 1882 what injustices were perpetrated. And when the great Conservative convention met in Ottawa——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). They never had such a thing as a convention in their history.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did I say a Conservative convention?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, no, they never had such a thing as a convention. But when the great Liberal convention met in Ottawa to deal with grave and momentous matters, they realized that the iniquity perpetrated on the province of Ontario in 1882, was sufficient to warrant the Liberals from all parts of the Dominion, in standing by the declaration, that whenever the Liberal party returned to power it was their bounden duty to introduce a Bill to remedy that injustice. Sir, this pledge, as far as the Government is concerned, has been implemented by presenting this Bill to the House. And if this Bill be defeated by any means or from any cause, the Liberal party will not be afraid to appeal to the constituencies as they are at present constituted; and if we have to appeal on the issue, that the torn municipalities should be returned to the parent trunk from which they were riven, then, I venture to say fair-minded Conservatives will say, that if there is one reason more than another which would lead them to transfer their past allegiance from the Conservative party and give it to the Liberal party, it is that the Conservative party have used their power to throw out an honest measure under which no party advantage was sought to be obtained, but which was placed absolutely and without appeal, as far as the distribution of the townships composing the different electoral districts of the counties are concerned, in the hands of the highest judges of the land.

Sir, I have spoken a little longer than I intended to with reference to this. The scenes witnessed in the House in 1882, the gross unfairness then perpetrated, when twenty-two amendments declaring our grievances were voted down in silence, when these scenes of 1882 come before my mind, I cannot help expressing my indignation, though, perhaps, it is not as keen after seventeen years as it was at that date. When I think that men like Mills, and Alex. Mackenzie, and Trow and Joseph Rymal, and Gillies, of North Bruce, and all of those men who stood here on principle, were attempted to be politically assas-

sinated in defiance of every principle of justice, I sometimes get a little warm. My voice is not so strong as it was at that time, but with such voice as I have I denounce the gerrymander of 1882 now as I denounced it then. Despite the appeal that has been made in this House to another Chamber, I still believe that this Bill will become the law of the land. I believe it, because it is a just Bill, I hail it as a return on the part of the representatives of the people of this country, to the principle of a fair and equitable representation for the Canadian electorate in the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no, it is too early yet. We will be here until the snow flies if the hon. gentleman does not go on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hour is a reasonable one to adjourn, and I can hardly understand why the Prime Minister should insist upon this debate being pushed through on a Friday night with a very thin House.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have been threatened to be kept here all summer, and that threat was made even before the measure was brought down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never heard of any such threat. I have stated from the first that this measure would, I thought, be fully and fairly discussed, but such a thing as obstruction being attempted has never in my judgment, presented itself to anybody. I have not heard of it, and I do not propose to be a party to any such thing. I draw the right hon. gentleman's attention to the fact, that in 1882, he made it a grave charge against the Government that they postponed the Redistribution Bill until the last hours of the session ? But, Sir, that Bill was introduced when the House had been in session eighty-six days, and this Bill, the only Bill announced in the Governor General's speech, has not had its second reading moved until ninety-two days after the opening of Parliament, in the fourth month of the session. I am astonished that my hon. friend should even have moved this Bill on a Friday, because he knows it is not possible to keep the members here on that night. I hope he will not persist in his course in refusing to adjourn at midnight, and if he does, it certainly will not be calculated to advance the business of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) forgets that the circumstances of this session and the circumstances of the session of 1882 are not at all parallel. The debate on the Address in 1882 did not last for more than four weeks, or more, and though the second reading of this Bill is moved on the 92nd day of the session, it was introduced nearly a month ago. It is no fault of ours that it was not taken up before this. When my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) tells me that no obstruction has been threatened, and that he has not heard of it, I must tell him that probably he is the only man in this House who did not hear the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) both say that we would be kept here all summer. More than that, I heard my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) say only this afternoon, that this Bill would never pass.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not refer to any obstruction in this House. I certainly said I did not believe this Bill would become law, but that has no reference to obstruction here. The Prime Minister forgets that owing to the circumstances of the Government, this session was called at a very unusual period of the year, and yet, in the case of the single Bill mentioned in the Governor General's Speech. he has moved the second reading of that Bill only on the ninety-second day of the session.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend tells me that there will be no obstruction to this Bill,——

Mr. WALLACE. Ah !

The PRIME MINISTER. There is the answer. I was going to say that if my hon, friend tells me there will be no obstruction to this Bill, I will agree at once to the adjournment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that I have never been a party to any obstruction of this Bill ; I have never proposed such a thing, or contemplated such a thing. But, of course, I am only one member of the House. I am not in a position to answer for every one ; but it is no part of my policy that this measure shall be other than fully and fairly debated, and I am only saying to the right hon. gentleman what I have invariably said everywhere among my own friends.

The PRIME MINISTER. Exactly ; and I may say to my hon. friend that if he tells me on his authority as the leader of his party that there will be no obstruction to this Bill, I will agree at once to the adjournment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman should press me in that way. He knows that I am as powerless as he is to answer for the action of others. Every member of Parliament is independent. I can only say that I have been opposed and am opposed now to obstruction in regard to this Bill ; I do not see anything to be gained by it ; but I do say to my hon. friend, and I say it in all seriousness, that he will not be consulting the progress of business if he forces the House not to rise at this hour of the night.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I will make another proposal to my hon. friend. We will resume the discussion of this Bill

on Tuesday if he will agree to take a division on it next week, and I will agree to the adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the first day of the discussion on the second reading of the Bill, to which the Government attach such vital importance, it is most unreasonable that the hon. gentleman should ask me to agree that a division shall be taken on the Bill next week. I have stated in full frankness my views in regard to the progress of public business, and the progress in regard to this Bill, and I cannot do more than that. I say that with as much authority as I may have in this House. I say to my hon. friend, I do not propose, and have never proposed anywhere, under any circumstances, that this Bill should be met by obstruction; but it is a measure of grave importance, the very gravest importance, and to say that I am going to be a party to an agreement that a division should be taken next week on this Bill, is what I am not prepared to do, and what I will not do.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will see that I am altogether right. On a measure of this importance he is not in a position to say that there will be no obstruction. I believe my opinion is shared by every member of this House that when a measure of this kind has been debated five days and we are not able to take a division upon it, then the opposition to it can be nothing but obstruction.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman willing to apply that rule to the Bill of 1882?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. With regard to that Bill, which was one that ought to have been opposed more than this—I speak from recollection, but I believe that it was only discussed three days. I speak subject to correction, but I think the debate on the second reading occupied only one day, and we spent a day in committee; possibly we went back into committee afterwards: and on the third reading, when the 22 resolutions were moved, they were moved with very short speeches, without replies being made. If I am not mistaken, the Opposition at that time, speaking through their leader, agreed that the first division should be accepted as the recorded division for all the remaining motions, unless some member objected. This was done in order to expedite the business of the House. I think the hon. gentleman will find that to be correct, so that resolution after resolution was moved and declared lost without the members being called in. That is my recollection of the facility given to that Bill, which, from my point of view, was a Bill that required very much more discussion than this Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. I can call the Minister's attention to the fact that in the discussion of the Franchise Bill of 1885, the Opposition of that day systematically obstructed the business of the House for more than twelve weeks, causing the session to last twenty-four weeks and four days.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was a very bad Bill, and we had to improve it.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it was an excellent Bill in its principle, and one that should have been adopted, that was adopted, and was endorsed by the country. I will just say this much more before the adjournment of the debate, if that is to be—and I am not very particular whether it is to be or not—that hon. gentlemen on the other side have taken a wrong course, in my opinion, if they think, by the threats made by the Minister of Customs from one end of his speech to the other, those made by the Postmaster General, and those now made by the Premier himself, they are going to deter us from discussing this Bill. All these hon. gentlemen are conveying veiled threats of what will happen, if we dare to exercise our constitutional rights that Parliament gives us, in opposing this Bill. No one proposes to do anything but what is legitimately right and proper, and, if we do anything contrary to that, public opinion will condemn us; but I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they are not going to prevent us giving the most strenuous opposition to this Gerrymander Bill by any such threats as they have made.

Mr. McNEILL. I should just like to say to my right hon. friend that if he considers what has been said by the leader of the Opposition dispassionately, he will see that the better course to take in the interests of progress is to allow the debate to be adjourned at twelve o'clock at night. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition said that it was no part of his policy to obstruct the measure, and he went as far as it is possible for any one in his position to go in assuring the right hon. gentleman that he did not wish obstruction, and that he would—at least, I understood him so to mean—endeavour to see that there was not obstruction; but he could not possibly speak for every member on his own side of the House, any more than my right hon. friend could. But I feel quite satisfied that if the Government take the course of forcing on the debate on a very important measure of this kind at twelve o'clock at night, after the appeals that have been made it will not conduce to that pleasant feeling on both sides of the House which would be likely to promote the progress of the business of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I certainly take the word of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition fully, as he gave it, and I acquit him of all intent, as he stated himself, of any kind of obstruction; but my hon. friend

evidently will not answer for his party. If my hon. friend will answer for his party, I am ready to accede to his wishes, even if there be one or two recalcitrants. If he will not speak for his party, I have no other choice than to go on with the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not propose to be a party to any obstruction of this measure, but I say it was very wrong to have introduced this Bill to-day. It should have been introduced yesterday. This looks like a design to take this Bill up before empty benches and prevent the discussion to which a measure of this importance is entitled. It was wrong to force me to reply to the speech on the second reading, on a Friday, when, as the right hon. gentleman knows, the House is usually empty. The right hon. gentleman showed want of courtesy in forcing this measure on to-day, of all days in the week. He knows that to keep a small number of members in this House, on a Friday night, when it is difficult to keep members here, is an act of grave injustice. While I have endeavoured to facilitate the progress of business as much as possible and see no advantage to be derived from anything in the shape of obstruction of this measure, still I think it should be fully and fairly discussed. At this period of the session every one is anxious to proceed with the public business, but I am not prepared to make any engagement that will tend to prevent full discussion of this measure, and I would be acting very improperly in the position I occupy were I to make any such engagement. I have made an appeal that ought to be acceded to without hesitation, and the hon. gentleman will be consulting the interests of the Government, if he is anxious to proceed with public business, by acceding to the reasonable and proper request that I make.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows it, without my telling him, that I would not willingly be lacking in courtesy towards anybody in this House, and to the hon. gentleman himself less than anybody else. If I did not go on with this measure on Thursday, my hon. friend knows the reason.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know why the right hon. gentleman did not go on with the measure yesterday.

The PRIME MINISTER. Because I intended yesterday to finish up the supplementary Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No communication was made to me on the subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. I spoke to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) on the subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before I entered the House, immediately after three o'clock?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so. To-day I said that I intended to take up the Bill, because my hon. colleague, the Postmaster General, has to be away for an important domestic event, Tuesday next, and I added that if the hon. gentleman was not ready to discuss the Bill, we could then adjourn the debate. I did not force my hon. friend to speak. If he spoke, it was simply because he chose to do so. I stated frankly this afternoon——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not hear it.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the Bill was called, I made the statement, in the hearing of everybody, that if hon. gentlemen opposite were not ready to debate, we would adjourn the debate. But the hon. gentleman apparently was ready, and has therefore no reason to charge me with any want of courtesy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it was grossly unfair to move the second reading of this Bill, especially in the manner in which the Postmaster General moved it, and compel a reply on the spur of the moment. I should have much preferred speaking on another occasion. I did not hear the proposal made or would have objected to it. What should have taken place, was that the Bill should have been moved yesterday. Then we would have had opportunity to discuss it fairly. But even the proposition to move the second reading of a measure of this kind, when there was not a fair opportunity to reply to it, was a most unfair proposition. There was no courtesy in suggesting such a thing. It was simply most unfair. I again appeal to my right hon. friend. I have no hesitation in saying that I shall not remain in the House, if the debate is forced on. I shall be obliged to leave the House, because after having spoken at such length, I am not able to remain longer to-night. I shall leave the matter in the hands of my hon. friends to do the best they can, conscious that a grave injustice has been inflicted on the party, a grave discourtesy on myself, and that course of conduct will not promote the progess of public business.

The PRIME MINISTER. As far as discourtesy is concerned, I have only to say to the hon. gentleman that if that is the way he understands courtesy, he need not ask me in the future for any favours.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask no favour.

The PRIME MINISTER. He knows that he asked me not to present the Bill on a certain day because he was to be away.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was the day before yesterday, and I thank the right hon. gentleman for not bringing it on then.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then we will stick to the rules of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. How long is it intended to keep the House in session to-night ?

The PRIME MINISTER. A reasonable time.

Mr. BENNETT. What is a reasonable time is open to a great deal of discussion. What may be considered a reasonable time in our opinion may not be considered reasonable by hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman last week gave the House a test of force, and I do not think it was altogether successful. True, there are not a great many members here to-night ; but if this be kept up until ten o'clock to-morrow morning—and that was considered reasonable time the other night—we will have to bow to the inevitable and stand it. The debate is new, and a large amount of figures have been flashed on us as to population, which we have not had the opportunity of examining into, and we want to fortify ourselves with arguments. This proceeding is grossly unfair. The hon. gentlemen opposite who spoke regaled us with long rows of figures, carefully compiled, but I rather think they stumbled under the weight—the Postmaster General did at all events ; and when these hon. gentlemen succumbed under the load of figures compiled by themselves, surely it is only fair that we should have an opportunity of perusing them in "Hansard." Since my name was dragged into the discussion, since I was quoted as having said that I was prepared to stay here until the snow flies, I can say to hon. gentlemen on this side that if they are prepared to stand on the principle that the whole question of redistribution should be left to the judges, instead of limiting them to certain matters, I am prepared to remain here and keep them company.

The House divided on motion to adjourn the debate.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	Kaulbach,
Bell (Addington),	LaRivière,
Bennett,	McAlister,
Cargill,	McNeill,
Clancy,	Prior,
Earle,	Roche,
Ganong,	Tyrwhitt,
Gillies,	Wallace, and
Guillet,	Wilson.—18.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bethune,	Lang,
Blair,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bourassa,	McGugan,
Britton,	McHugh,
Casey,	McMillan,
Copp,	Morrison,
Erb,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Rutherford,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Savard,
Haley,	Sifton, and
Johnston,	Tucker.—23.
Landerkin,	

Motion negatived.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before we proceed further, Mr. Speaker, I would like again to ask the right hon. the First Minister whether he thinks it seemly, whether he considers it in conformity with parliamentary procedure anywhere, that a measure of such importance as this, the only measure that the Government considered worthy of a place in the Governor General's speech, should be proposed for second reading on the ninety-second day of the session, on a Friday, and the discussion proceeded with at half-past twelve o'clock, with the fact made clear before the House and the country that there are only forty-one members present.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Fifty members present.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are some paired.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite true. I myself was paired with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he being absent I could not vote. Allowing for members paired, let us say there are fifty members present. Now, does the right hon. leader of this House think that he is consulting the dignity of Parliament——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has the right to make a speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am endeavouring to keep close to the point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I suppose it would only be by unanimous consent that the hon. gentleman could speak.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, with the unanimous consent of the House, I would say, without party feeling of any kind, but out of respect for the proceedings of Parliament and out of consideration for the dignity of discussion in the House, I do not believe that my right hon. friend will insist on this discussion proceeding at half-past twelve on Saturday morning, with fifty members present. The hon. gentleman has found every disposition on my part, since the House opened, to forward public business in every way I possibly could. There has been nothing indicating the slightest disposition to obstruct by the Opposition. The right hon. gentleman is not considering what is due to the House, he is not considering what is due to the Government in the promotion of public business—if that is their object—and I make a further appeal to him before being obliged to leave the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think if my hon. friend will pardon me for saying so, the word "seemly" comes with any grace from his mouth, considering the conduct of the Opposition during the present session. We have seen so many things that are not seemly. We have seen a debate

on the Address protracted by a repetition of the same things over and over again for four weeks and more. That was not seemly. We have seen the business of the Government obstructed almost at every turn. I think that on a day like this, and henceforth we should sit at least until half-past twelve if we are to have the blessing of a prorogation. It would have been better if we had consumed the time in proper discussion instead of filibustering as we have for the last forty minutes. But as we are within ten minutes of the time I had set down for the adjournment of the House, and now that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) sees by the division that the House is not with him, I will agree to the adjournment.

Mr. PRIOR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

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

ADJOURNMENT—PRINTING OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE COMMISSIONER OGILVIE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the House if he is in a position to state how soon we may expect to have the evidence taken before Mr. Ogilvie printed. It was ordered by the House to be printed promptly, and it is of great importance in reference to the progress of public business that we should have it as soon as possible. There has certainly been abundant time to have it in our hands if due expedition had been observed.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not admit that. I am sure that all expedition has been observed. I cannot say at the moment when the papers will be ready for distribution, but I will inquire into the matter and will press it as far as possible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will probably be in a position on Monday to say when we may expect this document to be printed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 19th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

APPELLATE COURT FOR YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to bring in legislation this session constituting the full court of the Supreme Court of the Province of British Columbia an appellate court for the Yukon ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That question is now under the consideration of the Government.

I. C. R.—CONTRACTS FOR TIES.

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Dugas) asked :

1. Have any contracts for ties for the Intercolonial Railway been given by the present Government in the province of Quebec ?
2. To whom were these contracts awarded ?
3. Were tenders for such contracts invited through the newspapers ?
4. What is the price per tie ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I will have to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) to move for a return. It is quite impossible to give an answer to that question involving so much minutiæ and detail.

LIGHTING HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT AND DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. By what individual, firm or company, is the electricity for lighting purposes in the Houses of Parliament and the several departmental buildings supplied ?
2. Is it supplied under contract ?
3. If so, what is the date of the contract and for what term ?
4. Is the electricity supplied paid for by the Government at a specific sum per annum, or by the amount of energy shown as passing through metres, or at so much per lamp in position in the buildings ?
5. If by metre, at what rate per 1,000 Watt-hours ? If by lamp, at how much per hour, month or year per lamp ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. The Ottawa Electric Company. 2. Yes. 3. The 1st February, 1898, for one year, and continued for another year. 4. At so much per lamp. 5. $5.25 per lamp per year for first 3,000 ; $2 for each additional lamp.

DR. DEMERS, OF METIS.

Mr. DUGAS asked :

1. Is the Minister of Railways aware that one Dr. Demers, of Métis, is in the habit of constantly

riding on the Intercolonial Railway on a railway bicycle ?

2. Is such a practice lawful and permitted by the authorities of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. I am not aware that Dr. Demers, of Metis, is in the habit of riding on the Intercolonial Railway on a railway bicycle. 2. Such practice is not lawful, and is not authorized by the authorities of the Intercolonial.

I. C. R.—EMPLOYMENT OF OCTAVE VALCOUER.

Mr. DUGAS asked :

1. Is one Octave Valcouer, of Ste. Flavie, in the employ of the Government on the Intercolonial Railway ?

2. Was not the said Valcouer dismissed from the service for intemperance ?

3. What position does he now hold in the service of the Intercolonial Railway ?

4. Why was he reinstated ?.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Octave Valcouer is employed on the railway as a cleaner at Ste. Flavie. He was employed in May, 1897, as a new man, it is not known he was in the service before. 2. There was an Octave Valcouer employed as watchman at Ste. Flavie, who was dismissed from the service in February, 1894, for intemperance. 3. He is not now in the service of the railway. 4. He was not reinstated.

MONEY ADVANCED TO QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. What amount has been expended by the Government on the harbour of Quebec since the 1st of January, 1870 ?

2. What amount has the Government advanced during this period as a loan or loans to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners ?

3. How much of this amount advanced has been repaid to the Government ?

4. What is the present amount of arrears on that account, (1) for capital, (2) for interest ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. The Government has spent nothing directly. 2. $3,748,519.62. 3. Nothing. 4. (1) $3,748,519.62 ; (2) $1,305,315.01.

I.C.R.—COMPLAINTS AGAINST CAPT. REYNOLDS, OF THE "MULGRAVE."

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked :

What was the nature of the complaint lodged against Captain Reynolds, of the Intercolonial Railway ferry steamship "Mulgrave," and by whom ? Has an investigation been held ? If so, by whom and what was the finding ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not aware of any complaints having been lodged against Capt. Reynolds, of the ferry steamer "Mulgrave." An investigation has been held by Capt. Smith, R.N.R., of the Marine Department, into the stranding of the ferry steamer "Mulgrave," on the 3rd of September, 1898. The finding was that Capt. Reynolds was not to blame.

I.C.R.—COMPENSATION TO MR. HUGH MORRISON, RIVERSIDE, INVERNESS.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to compensate one Hugh Morrison, of Riverside, Inverness county, for alleged damages sustained by the crowding out of his dwelling by the building of a "snow fence" along the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government has not decided to compensate Hugh Morrison, of Riverside, Inverness county, for alleged damages sustained by the building of a "snow fence" along the Intercolonial Railway.

I.C.R.—MEN EMPLOYED ON ALBA SECTION.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked :

What proportions of the Alba section of the Intercolonial Railway lie in the counties of Inverness and Victoria respectively ? What is the number of men employed from each county on said section, and by whom recommended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Two and one-fifth miles of section No. 6 are in Inverness county and four miles in Victoria county. Three men are employed on this section. M. A. Gillis, the foreman, is from Victoria county, and the men were appointed by direction of the Minister, except Mr. James McLean. Neil McKinnon, under man, is from Cape Breton county. James McLean, under man, has been in the service since 1892, and was recommended by Mr. T. V. A. McDonald.

BONDS OF PUBLIC OFFICERS IN YUKON TERRITORY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

Have any of the officers employed in the public service in the Yukon district since February, 1897, given bonds under the provisions of section 5, chapter 19, R.S.C., or other statute ?

2. If so, what are their names ?

3. Is it a fact that no name of a Yukon official appears in the returns respecting bonds of public officers laid on the Table of this House for 1896, 1897, 1898 and 1899 ?

4. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, what is the explanation ?

5. Has the Government any record or list under its control or in its possession wherein the names of the Yukon officials appear as having bonds under the statute above ?

6. If so, how many names appear there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. Customs : W. W. Hall, J. E.

Whiteside, F. Charman, W. N. Carmichael, J. A. McMartin, David Stevens and P. R. Steele; Post Office: I. J. Hartman, W. H. Scott, D. A. E. Strickland. 3. The name, D. W. Davis, Collector of Customs, appears on said list. 4, 5 and 6. The names of the officers who have given bonds do not appear to have been filed with the Registrar General. There is no complete list. The organization of the district has been proceeding as rapidly as possible, and it is expected that securities will be completed in a short time.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—VALUATION OF LAND ALONG BALSAM LAKE SECTION.

Mr. GRAHAM (by Mr. Lang) asked:

1. What is the length of the Balsam Lake section of the Trent Valley Canal?
2. Who were the valuators for the Government to value the land along this section of the canal?
3. On whose recommendation were they appointed?
4. How much per diem were they paid as wages, and what was their allowance for expenses?
5. What was the total amount paid to each valuator in connection with this work?
6. Did any of the land owners complain to the Government of any unfairness in connection with these valuations?
7. Have any of the land owners refused to accept the compensation offered them for their land?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The length of the Balsam Lake section is 18½ miles. 2. The valuators are Messrs. Pope and McEachren. 3. Mr. Pope was recommended by Mr. H. Corby, M.P., and Mr. McEachren by Col. Hughes, M.P. 4. They were paid $10 per day and their living and travelling expenses. 5. The total amount paid Mr. Pope was $873, and Mr. McEachren received $1,053. 6. No complaints of unfairness were made in connection with these valuations. 7. Only two of the landowners have refused to accept compensation offered to them for their land.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—PAYMENTS TO MR. F. D. MOORE, LINDSAY.

Mr. GRAHAM (by Mr. Lang) asked:

1. What was the total amount paid by the Government paid to F. D. Moore, barrister, of Lindsay, for conveyancing and other expenses in connection with the purchase of land for right of way along the Balsam Lake section of the Trent Valley Canal?
2. What was the average paid to Mr. Moore for each deed drawn and title passed along this section?
3. On whose recommendation was Mr. Moore appointed to do this work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The total amount paid by the Government to Mr. F. D. Moore, of Lindsay, for conveyancing and other expenses in connection with the purchase of land for right of way along Balsam Lake section of the Trent Canal is $559.43. 2. The average paid Mr. Moore for each deed drawn and title passed is $37.29. 3. Mr. F. D. Moore was recommended by the Hon. John G. Haggart.

PORT OF CHEMAINUS, B.C.—PILOTAGE LIMITS.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Has any Order in Council been passed defining the limits in which a vessel going to Chemainus, B.C., has to be spoken by a pilot before the Pilot Board can collect pilotage from her?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The port of Chemainus is claimed to be within the Nanaimo pilotage district, which was established by Order in Council of the 2nd of October, 1879, to include the port of Nanaimo and all other ports in the Island of Vancouver, excepting Victoria and Esquimalt. Under the by-laws of the pilotage district referred to, approved by Order in Council of the 29th September, 1883, the limits for speaking vessels bound for Nanaimo are defined by the 29th and 30th regulations, and the 35th regulation defines pilotage rates for the Gulf of Georgia and straits navigation. The by-laws do not define any limits for the port of Chemainus for the purpose of compulsory pilotage, but the agent of this department at Victoria advises the department that he understands that a ship bound for the port of Chemainus, if spoken to in Fuca Straits or Haro Channel is charged pilotage by the Nanaimo pilots.

EXPENSES CONNECTED WITH PLEBISCITE IN MONTREAL.

Mr. QUINN (by Mr. McDougall) asked:

Has the Government paid all the expenses connected with the plebiscite of 29th September last in the city of Montreal? If not, what amounts remain unpaid? What has been paid, and to whom?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answer to this question is furnished by the Auditor General. The payment of these accounts rests altogether with the Auditor General. 1. All the claims made by the returning officers in Montreal have not been paid, some of the items being held in suspense awaiting explanations and some having been disallowed on the ground that they were not legitimate charges. 2. Amounts unpaid: The Auditor General reports as follows:

St. Anne—	
In suspense, awaiting explanations....	$ 9 00
Disallowed	328 25
St. Antoine—	
Disallowed	172 99
St. Mary—	
In suspense	47 50
Disallowed	256 96
St. Lawrence—	
In suspense	6 00
Disallowed	144 66
St. James—	
In suspense	12 00
Disallowed	415 23

3. Amounts paid :

St. Anne—	
Wm. Stafford, returning officer.....	$1,774 43
St. Antoine—	
David Seath, returning officer.....	1,530 47
St. Mary—	
Chas. Hébert, returning officer.....	1,719 14
St. Lawrence—	
C. H. Archer, returning officer.....	1,881 70
St. James—	
J. B. Drouin, returning officer.....	1,654 27

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT LEPREAUX.

Mr. GANONG asked :

Is there any customs officer at Little Lepreaux or any other place in the parish of Lepreaux, in the county of Charlotte, N.B. ? If so, what is his position ? Where is his office ? What is his name ? What is his salary ? When was he appointed, and on whose recommendation ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). John W. Mealy was appointed acting preventive officer at Lepreaux on the 14th October, 1898, at a salary of $100 per annum. Inquiry is being made regarding the location of his office.

ANTI-JAPANESE AND ANTI-CHINESE LEGISLATION.

On the order for Mr. Prior's motion for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and reports between the Government and the present Government of British Columbia in regard to anti-Japanese and anti-Chinese legislation.

Mr. PRIOR. I think the right hon. the Premier brought down those papers the other day, and if so there is no necessity for putting this motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have brought them down, and they are now in the hands of the printer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order is dropped.

INLAND REVENUE OFFICE AT VIRDEN.

On the order for Mr. Roche's motion for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Inland Revenue officer at Virden, Manitoba, and the branch at Winnipeg, relative to a registered letter containing $92.20 or thereabouts, said to have been sent in January, 1897, from Virden and delivered to H. A. Costigan at Winnipeg ; for a copy of all reports and correspondence between Dr. Barret, inspector of the Inland Revenue Department, of Winnipeg, and the department referring to this matter, and to all alleged shortages and absence of H. A. Costigan from July, 1897.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order is dropped.

I. C. R. ENGINE AND CAR MILEAGE, &c.

Mr. FOSTER moved for :

Return showing : 1. The combined engine and car mileage—total, and that of the Intercolonial Railway—for each month from March 1, 1898, for the terminals, bridge, and other leased portions of the Grand Trunk Railway, as contemplated in the thirty and thirty-third sections of the schedule to Bill 138.

2. The amounts for (a) maintenance and repairs, and (b) for all other operating expenses, separately incurred by the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Intercolonial Railway each month since March 1, 1898.

3. Copy of returns and information made under section 33 of said schedule for each month from March 1, 1898.

He said : The comma in the second paragraph should be after the word "separately" instead of after the word "expenses." The comma placed after the word "expenses" makes a difference in the reading.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It will take some little time to bring that return down. I cannot promise to have it down for some time.

Motion agreed to.

LETTING OF CONTRACTS WITHOUT TENDER.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia) moved for :

Orders in Council respecting the letting of contracts without tenders, passed since the 23rd June, 1896.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this motion, I think I can assure the House that it will not be necessary for me to trespass long upon its attention, because my object is to get information rather than to press strongly any views that I may happen to hold. But this opinion I hold strongly—and I think it will commend itself to the House—that the Order in Council that was passed in 1880, requiring that contracts for any work costing over $5,000 should as a preliminary have public tenders inviting competition, and thus securing for the public the advantage of the usual commercial rivalry, embodied a wise policy. I think I am not overstating the case when I say that there has been a tendency to ignore that Order in Council, and to ignore generally the wholesome system of inviting tenders. The other day we spent a considerable portion of the time of this House in dealing with a work in the hands of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies)—an important work, which, it is admitted, will cost $40,000, and which may cost more ; and yet there were no tenders. If there were only that one case, I think it would justify a motion like this. But it will be in the memory of this House that last session a great deal of our time in committee was occupied in discussing the cases of one Minister after another who had ignored that Order in Council, and the time-honoured practice of which that Order in Council was partly the expression and partly the foundation. It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that in regard to

a very great work which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) undertook to secure for Canada, he ignored the calling for tenders. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) did the same in a much smaller undertaking, but still one involving a considerable outlay every year on the part of the Government; and last session attention was called in this House to a flagrant case in the Public Works Department, which partly, I suppose, because of the nature of the department, seems to be the great sinner in this respect. Last session attention was called to the case of the Edmonton bridge, where a change was made from ashlar masonry to concrete in a work involving $40,000; and yet no tenders were called for, although the character of the work was completely changed. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to pile up a list of cases against the Government on this subject; but, glancing over last session alone, in a hurried manner, which I was compelled to do, I found that we had before us not only the case of the Edmonton bridge, but the case of the Western Departmental Block, which, I believe—I shall be corrected by the acting Minister of Public Works if I am not correct—involved an outlay of $90,000; and all that work was done by day work—no tenders were called for. Then, we had the telegraph line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, no tenders being called for. Then, we had before us several dredging cases—the dredging of Toronto harbour, the dredging of Coteau Landing, and elsewhere; and in neither case were tenders called for. In each case, when the attention of the Minister of the department was called to it, the same thing happened as happened the other night, when my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries admitted that tenders should in all cases possible be called for. He made the special plea of urgency; but, as was pointed out, there would have been no difficulty in calling for tenders, because the specifications were at hand. Then, last session, there was a case in the department of the right hon. leader of the Government, to which attention was called, that is, the drug supply for the Mounted Police at Prince Albert. There the contract was given to W. J. Fleming without tender, although that gentleman had tendered the previous year and failed to get the contract because his tender was higher than those of his competitors. In the same way the supplies in the Indian Department have been given without any tenders being called for. Instead of the system being to call for tenders, we seem now to be getting into the system of doing the business of the country as much as possible without them. Then, there was in the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) the transportation of the Yukon supplies given to the Boston and Alaskan Transportation Company without tender, and the purchase of the supplies without tender. In the case of Messrs. Bate & Co., no public tenders called for, although the purchase was a large one; and not only no public tenders called for, but the way the tenders were called for, ignoring the merchants and commercial men, who of all others should be considered in that matter as a matter of justice, that is, the merchants and commercial men of the Pacific coast in British Columbia. However, I am not now dealing with the question from the point of view of justice to any section of the community. I am dealing with it from the point of view of the interests of the community at large. I will call attention to one small case that illustrates the danger which necessarily attaches to ignoring tenders. In the case of the Coulonge Slide, a certain amount of work had to be done and a gentleman visits the department and has a conversation with one of the officers. That officer says to him: You may as well have this contract; and not only that, but tells him what he will give him the contract for. It is a contract for supplying timber, and he offers to give it to this gentleman at $22 per 1,000 feet. The offer is accepted, and at the very spot where the timber is to be delivered, it is delivered by a man who supplies it to the contractor at $15 per 1,000 feet. The man, Mr. Tremblay, who got the contract, was not a lumberman at all, and this is what the Auditor General says:

> The Government paid $22 a 1,000 feet to Tremblay for the planks, while it was delivered by Proudfoot on the spot for $15, the Government paying 46⅔ per cent on the first cost to a man who never spent a day on the work.

Further on, the Auditor General says:

> With regard to the supply No. 1, it does seem to require explanation that Mr. Brophy, who knows all about the products of the neighbourhood of the different works under his control, should not have taken care that the owners of the saw-mills at Coulonge were communicated with as to their ability to produce the elm and as to the prices which they would take, before making a bargain with a person who had no mill, and on a basis of getting the logs many miles away, and, therefore, going to the expense of drawing the plank the long intervening distance to the slide.

In his evidence Mr. Tremblay says:

> On or about the 4th June I went to Ottawa from Bryson, being still out of employment, and went to Mr. Brophy and told him, speaking about the plank, that, from my own experience, elm plank would do for the Coulonge Slide. He then said to me: "You are doing nothing here, I will give you $22 a 1,000 for good elm plank delivered at the Coulonge Slide." I said: "All right, I will taken the contract." I came to Bryson, after making the contract, which was a verbal one.

After explaining what he did to secure the lumber, he said that at the suggestion of Mr. Brophy the name of Mr. Bertram was

substituted for his in the contract, and the man Tremblay, as he had some other work to do for the Government, seems actually to have checked his own account, which was put in in the name of Bertram. It struck the Auditor General, as it would any one, that this was irregular, and I just cite it as an instance. It is a small thing, if you like, and does not come within the Order in Council, but it illustrates the danger, in Government works especially, of ignoring the ordinary precautions taken even by private individuals in order to get work done at the lowest rate.

I have referred to the dredge contract. If you will turn to the Auditor General's Report, you will find that he communicates with the department on the subject of the dredge contract for over $5,000, let without tenders. On March 31st, 1898, he wrote the secretary of the Public Works Department:

Sir,—I received yesterday at 4.30 p.m., your application, No. 208, for $20,360, in favour of J. W. Wurtele & Co., for steel plates, etc., for the construction of a dredge-hull. There is a general Order in Council of May 23rd, 1880 (shown at page 20 of my report of 1896-97, and at a similar place in several preceding reports), which fixes $5,000 as the limit of contracts which can be let without public tender, unless special authority be obtained from Council.

The Order in Council of Nov. 25, 1897, which gives authority to contract with Wurtele & Co. and with the Cavanagh Co., for $20,460 each, explains only that "quotations have been obtained." Nothing is said about the existence of a standing regulation, which requires to be abrogated to make the contract possible.

You will find similar case discussed at page R—322 (herewith) of my report of 1896-97.

I do not think that a special exempting Order in Council is complete unless it mentions explicitly the general regulation, whose operation it suspends, and also the fact that it is suspended.

I call attention to the wording of this letter of the Auditor General's, because it points to one of the reasons I have for making this motion. It is not sufficient to mention the reasons given in each case for suspending the Order in Council, but it should also be stated whether, as a matter of fact, the council has been properly informed by the Minister, who has been asking for this overriding Order in Council, because, Sir, it is perfectly clear that a strong, self-willed Minister may, by ignoring this wholesome rule, embodied in an Order in Council, that tenders shall in all cases be asked for if possible—and there are very few cases where it is not possible—actually commit the Government to a certain course in his department, which the Government itself, if properly informed, would not have assented to. What happens then?

Let us put a hypothetical case—and I do not put it specially for this Government, but wish to apply it to every Government, whatever side may be in power. Let us put the case of a Minister who wants to do wrong. The only way he can do it is by ignoring the calling for tenders. He arranges with some contractor to have work done at a certain price. Well, he is in a bad box, unless he can get an Order in Council. He goes and makes any plausible case to Council. If he be a man, as I say, of strong will and great force of character, with the multiplicity of things before the Council, the worry upon the mind of the Prime Minister, and the weight of his own department upon each individual Minister, he may get his Order in Council through. And, once it is through if you seek to expose the transaction, you are not dealing with the Minister, but with the Government, and not with the Government, but with the whole party. The moment we attack that Minister who has got an Order in Council, there are a hundred shields to keep off every arrow you may let fly. A hundred! Nay, every party man throughout the entire Dominion throws his ægis over the guilty Minister. Now, I am putting that purely hypothetical case, but is it not palpable that, in every case where the system of calling for tenders, where public works are to be made, or changes in public works effected, we should have the rule that the Order in Council should forthwith be published, so as to let the public eye on the transaction at once. If, in every such case, the Order in Council has to be published, it would be a great bridle upon the kind of Minister I am speaking of.

Again, in the case of the Berthier channel dredging, the Auditor General has had to call attention to this rule, as I say, of ignoring tenders:

Moreover, although the limit of $5,000 has been exceeded on Mr. Robillard's contract, I do not find any indication of a public call for tenders, as required by the Order in Council of May 23, 1880.

I have sent for the book, and will read that Order in Council later on. With reference to the above, the Minister of Public Works wrote to the Auditor General on July 16th, 1898:

As to not having asked for tenders, I may remind you of the fact that I did not give any contract to Mr. Robillard. It was day's work. And I have a perfect right to do any amount of work by day's labour without asking authority from anybody. The Order in Council of 23rd May, 1880, clearly states that I cannot give any contract exceeding $5,000 without being authorized. But I am perfectly free to do by day's labour any work, whatever the amount may be. However, I stated in the House during last session of Parliament, that I would do away, as far as feasible, with dredging by the hour,——

And so on. Now, what really should be done by the Government, if they wish to follow in the footsteps of their predecessors, if they really wish to be guided by the example of Sir John Macdonald's Government, that in 1880 passed that Order in

Council, when they find a Minister of the Crown evading it in this way—I do not wish to use the word offensively—when they find a Minister saying that he is not compelled to act under the Order in Council, if he refrains from making a contract, and has the work done by day labour, is to supplement the Order in Council of 1880, so as to prevent such evasion in the future. This system is, as a system, liable to more abuse than that of work by contract, as we know. Take, for instance, a case I have not yet mentioned—take the case of the fence around Major's Hill Park. We had that case up last year, and we remember that there was a good deal of laughter; but the humour of the laughter would not be so apparent to the people at large. There was a good deal of amusement at the clever way in which the Minister of Public Works evaded the Order in Council, by saying: This work, it is true, will cost a good deal more than $20,000; nevertheless, in no single year have I spent more than $5,000, and I am doing the work by day labour. Now, I recall the contract that was made for transportation to the Yukon, and also for purchase of supplies; I want to call the attention of the public and of the House of Commons to what was brought out. The hon. senior member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) called attention to the fact that the transportation could have been done for a great deal less than the price the Minister of Militia had agreed upon, if tenders had been called from the shipowners of the Pacific coast. The hon. gentleman stated that one shipowner told him that he would have been prepared to contract at a price, as it turned out, far less than the work was done for. Take, in regard to the large item of $14,000, in Bate's contract. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle) called attention to the fact that no items were given, and it was thought probable that if the merchants on the Pacific coast had got a chance to tender, better prices would have been got there. Now the language of my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) is this:

> Here is what the gentleman says, and I presume this is information he gave to the hon. gentleman's officers:
>
> "We did receive an inquiry from the Government, through Col. Peters, for a tender to carry some 200 tons of supplies for Dawson via the Yukon. We were then in a perfect position to handle the business, and we made a quotation of $275 per ton right through to Dawson City, particularly pointing out at the time that in offering this as a weight proposition we were giving an extremely good quotation, because, as these supplies would run as high as three ton measurements to one ton weight, which, at market quotation of $200 per ton weight or measurement (ship's option) meant that we were quoting $275 against $600."

There is the Order in Council. At that time Sir Hector Langevin was Minister of Public Works, and the hon. baronet who leads the Opposition was Minister of Railways and Canals:

> On a joint memorandum, dated March 20, 1880, from the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that hereafter all public works involving an expenditure of over $5,000 shall be let by public tender and contract, unless owing to urgency or other cause it be deemed advisable to take different action, and that in all such cases authority be obtained by an Order in Council. That, with all tenders submitted, a money guarantee, or approved accepted cheque, shall be given, to be open to forfeiture in the event of the tenderer failing to make the necessary 5 per cent deposit, hereinafter referred to, within eight days after receiving notice of the acceptance of the tender, or of his declining to enter into contract when requested, the amount of such guarantee to be fixed at a sum not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000. That upon acceptance of a tender, and notification by the department concerned, the intending contractor shall, within eight days, deposit with the Government a sum of money equal to 5 per cent of the amount of his contract. That in all cases where tenders have been called for, the lowest received shall be accepted, unless good and sufficient reasons appear for passing over such tender. The Committee shall submit the above recommendations for Your Excellency's approval.

The first sentence is the important one from the point of view of this motion, and I would urge on the attention of the Prime Minister the advisability of supplementing that Order in Council by another one requiring that in any case where a Minister undertakes work by day labour of over $5,000, he shall have an Order in Council to authorize him so to do. Now, Sir, as I told the House, I do not intend to trespass upon its time, but just to bring before its attention a few cases, a few specimen bricks, to illustrate what seems to be a system of departure from the wholesome rule, and which justify me in making this motion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Surely there can be no objection to the way in which my hon. friend has brought this question before the House. It is a fair question for debate. The hon. gentleman has alluded to some contracts for public works in which my department is engaged. The first case he alludes to is the Edmonton bridge. Well, that case was debated last year in the House. It is not exactly a case where a public tender was not asked for. A public tender was first asked on a statement of the engineer in chief of my department, that stone was available; but when it was found that no stone was available, we then decided what was the next best thing to do. Mr. Coste, who was then Chief Engineer, reported to me that in his opinion concrete work was at least as good work as any stone that could be procured there. I may say that since last year I have made frequent inquiry in reference to the use of concrete instead of stone, and all who are conversant with public works know that the use of concrete is

becoming more and more general in public works. A few days ago I was in Buffalo, where they are rebuilding their great breakwater, and if I remember right, they have already rebuilt with concrete about 3,000 feet of the superstructure which had decayed. I have no hesitation in saying, and this is not a party question, that any engineer who will look at the Edmonton bridge will agree that the concrete work which has been done there is much better than any work which could be done with the stone that may be available. But I understand that that is not a case in point. The question is whether I should have asked for new public tenders after I found out that the first tenders could not be adhered to, that is to say, when I found out that the work could not be carried out with stone. Well, the reports are before the House. I may say frankly that I relied then, and would always rely to an extent, on the reports of my officers. The second work to which my hon. friend alluded is the Toronto harbour, and I think I may put in the same category the work at Coteau Landing, and some other works of the same kind. Under the late Administration, for some years, dredging had to be done by dredges hired at so much an hour. I followed the same system to a large extent, not merely because I was desirous of giving out a great deal of work by day labour, but because more works were pressed upon my attention. Hon. gentlemen on both sides who are conversant with the development of our trade, and the consequent necessity of developing our harbours and rivers, will understand that demands for harbour improvements come to us every day. The Department of Public Works, I am sorry to say, is not equipped as it should be, we should have a great many more dredges. I was in the House a few days ago when a debate took place upon this subject, and I may say immediately that the work which we are doing with our own dredges is better done and cheaper done than it could be by contract. I do not hesitate a moment in saying that this is the case with Toronto harbour, with the dredging at Coteau Landing, at Owen Sound and at some other places. And so with the dredging I am just now doing at Goderich. It would be very difficult indeed to give out by contract a great many of these works. I speak now as I would speak if I were on the other side of the House to-morrow. I do not know how long I may occupy the seat I am in now. If my health does not improve I may not be able to remain in this place very long; so I speak with more freedom than I have ever spoken perhaps in the past. What I am doing now, I think any Minister of Public Works would do under the same circumstances. There is a lot of dredging that cannot possibly be done by contract for the reason that you do not know exactly what quantity you will have to take out. In the Toronto harbour, I am just now dredging the entrance. There are engineers in this House who will agree with me when I say that it is impossible to make a survey every day just to see how much mud I will be obliged to remove from this harbour or that harbour. The Department of Public Works has to do one of two things: Either to have dredges of its own to do such work, or to hire dredges, to a considerable extent, at the lowest possible prices.

Now, by looking at the reports, my hon. friends will find that the work we have been doing by day labour, if I may use that word, or by hiring dredges, cost between 11 cents and 13 cents. I think it is rather a small price. I quite admit that there are some dredges belonging to my department which are doing dredging at a less cost, but there are others which are doing dredging at a higher price. All that is a question of whether it is hard or soft material. I must maintain the stand I have taken with the Auditor General. I have represented to him, and I believe it is the true stand, that hiring a dredge at so much an hour is not giving a contract, because I am not giving a distinct quantity of work: I can stop the work of that dredge to-morrow, or at any hour. I cannot call that a contract. The hon. gentleman has alluded to a small incident that occurred between the Auditor General and my department about the Coulonge slides booms. What are the facts? Mr. Brophy is superintendent of my department for slides and booms. There are a good many repairs to be done every year; in fact, every month, upon these slides and booms. Any hon. gentleman who has been Minister, either of Public Works or Railways and Canals, on either side of the House, will agree with me that it would be impossible to ask for tenders every time for small supplies of timber or stone. We would spend more money in asking for tenders than it would be worth. In this case, Mr. Brophy has an interview with a gentleman who had been employed by him formerly, and he asks him: How much can we get such a quantity of elm for? Mr. Tremblay makes a price for him, and Mr. Brophy, who is a man of great experience, gives him a contract at $22 a thousand feet. That was the regular price of the market then. It is possible Mr. Tremblay may have made some little profit. Any man who has been in business, either in his private capacity or in his public capacity, knows that such little incidents are inevitable, that, when you give a job to a man for which you will pay $10 or $15, he will generally manage to save a few cents or a few dollars. In a case like this, it would be quite impossible to ask for tenders for supplies to the extent of $200 or $300. It would make it impossible for any Minister, or for any business man, to carry on his work. Now, permit me, Sir, after having given these short explanations, to allude to

the general system in asking for tenders. Since I became Minister of Public Works, it has been my duty to call for tenders for many works. I would give as instances only two or three cases which have just been under my consideration. When I took office, I found that tenders had been asked by my predecessor for dredging Collingwood harbour. The chief engineer of my department had reported against the lowest tender, that of Messrs. Boon & Armstrong. Representations were made to me that I should give the contract to the lowest tenderer. The late lamented Dalton McCarthy called upon me, and suggested that I should overrule my chief engineer and give the contract to Messrs. Wood & Armstrong. I did so. The chief engineer of my department said: These gentlemen cannot possibly carry out the work that they are undertaing for the sum at which they have tendered; they cannot possibly do it in the time they have specified. The ordinary deposit had been put in my hands, and I overruled Mr. Coste. I awarded the contract to the lowest tenderers. If there was ever a man whose life has been burdened. it is myself in reference to this Collingwood harbour. Our friends from Collingwood came to my department over and over again—they are here to-day—telling me that the work is not being carried out, and that, worse than that, the town is losing a vast amount of trade because the contractors are not carrying on their work as fast as they should. I am asked: Why do you not take the contract out of their hands? It is a contract for dredging, and to dredge harbours requires dredges. If I took the contract out of their hands, I would be obliged either to provide dredges. or to hire dredges, or to ask for new tenders. all of which would take a great deal of time. Another instance. I asked for tenders for several works of repairs in connection with Goderich harbour. Mr. Coste reported against the lowest tenderer. He told me: I have been a divisional engineer in that district. There is one or other of us a fool—either Mr. Maddigan or myself. I say that Mr. Maddigan cannot carry on that work for the price that he has tendered for. Mr. Maddigan was recommended to me by the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, for whom he had done work, and by my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He was a contractor in good standing and repute at the time. I awarded the contract to him. Delays took place, and finally Mr. Maddigan was obliged to give up his work. We have lost a good deal of time; Goderich has lost a good deal of trade, and I have felt a great deal of anxiety about these works, because. at the time, I was much afraid that the spring freshets would carry everything away. I do not make this statement—let the House understand me well—to say that tenders must not be asked for, that tenders must be got rid of every time. I do not mean anything of the kind. But I say, without any hesitation whatever, and supported by three years of experience in the Public Works Department, that the Minister should have great latitude in dealing with tenders. I know that if I were on the other side, I might smile, as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) does.

Mr. FOSTER. You would do more than smile; you would not content yourself with smiling.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would content myself with fair criticism in such cases, because this matter, I believe, is above party politics. We are here to-day; my hon. friends on the other side of the House will be here in the future, as they have been in the past, and they will have to deal with this difficulty. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has lived in England, and my hon. friends, on both sides of the House, have studied English history enough to know that in England they do not work upon the same system. There, tenders are asked from a list of picked men, and not from the general public. Is it not the experience of hon. gentlemen who have been Ministers of Railways and Canals and of Public Works in this country, that the less competent a man is to perform the work, the lower will be the tender that he is inclined to make? The less experience and the less money he has, the more he will be inclined to tender at a low figure. Why, because he will expect that something will turn up. He will not pay his men and often he will not pay for his material. I state here that if I could always find trained foremen, men of experience, I would have no hesitation in pressing upon the Government the advantage of doing as much work as possible by day's labour. In the first place, the workingmen are better treated by the Government than they generally are by contractors, who set out to make a large profit out of their contract. And, Sir, in the end, is not the system of contract by public tender virtually the system of day's labour? If I, as Minister, award a contract to any contractor, will he not of necessity have to do the work by day's labour? I would like to know why the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways and Canals, if it has competent engineers and experienced foremen cannot carry on a public work by day's labour as well as by contract. I do not say that the system of asking for tenders should be got rid of; not by any means; but at the same time I claim that public works when constructed by day's labour are generally better done than if let by contract. I was not in the House for a moment, but my colleague tells me that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) referred to the work done on the Western Block. He will,

I believe, on reflection agree with me that this work being rebuilding and repairing it was quite impossible to make a contract of it. I invite with pleasure members of Parliament on both sides to inspect the work done there; they will be quite welcome, and my officers will be glad to show them that work, and be it said to the credit of my chief architect and the officers concerned, that never in Canada has there been work better done than the rebuilding of the Western Block. I carried out that work by day's labour and I am glad to say by union men. I have recognized the importance of dealing with labour organizations, and I have been treated by them with every degree of consideration. I pay testimony to the fact that they carried on this work not only with a great deal of ability and intelligence, but with a great deal of devotion to their duty. I did not intend to speak at such length, but I think I have endeavoured to answer the objections made by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin). It is a fair matter for debate in this Parliament, and I do not complain of the manner in which he has brought the subject before the House.

Mr. MACKIE. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has not informed himself upon this question or else he would not blame the Minister of Public Works for carrying on the Ottawa River improvements by day's work instead of by contract. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) does not apparently know very much about the way in which public works on the Upper Ottawa have been carried on by his own party. Hardly any work has ever been done by contract there. All these slides have been constructed by day's labour, and the lumber bought by the Government wherever they could buy it on the best terms. It is utterly impossible that slides and such work should be given out by contract. As to this Coulonge slide which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) speaks of, I suppose that during the past eighteen years that the Conservative Government was in power there has been more money thrown away on that slide than on any improvement in the Ottawa River. There has been timber bought for 6 cents, 7 cents and 8 cents a foot, and it has been returned to the late Government as high as 15 or 20 cents a foot, by the same parties pretty much as this last transaction went through I hope the work will be run a little better now as another man is in charge. As I have said, the improvements on the Ottawa River have been done for years and years by day's labour, and none of the work was ever done by contract or could the repairing of these slides be done by contract. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) complains of $22 a thousand being paid for elm planks, but I do not think that is out of the way, because I have seen that paid for pine on the same work.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not propose to know anything personally about these prices, but the point I made was that $22 was paid, whereas they were delivered on the ground for $15.

Mr. MACKIE. I could show the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) where the same thing was done seven or eight years ago. I could show him that lumber was paid 5 cents a foot for, and was charged at the rate of 15 cents to the Government; and not a small quantity either, but hundreds of dollars worth; and not by the man who made the timber, nor the man who handled it, but it was given in another man's name altogether. Now, I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that there was not very much of that work went to the Liberals when the Conservatives were in power. You did not find many Liberals working on the slides or on any Government work in those days.

Mr. POUPORE. As to the question of repairing slides I quite agree with my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) that it must be done by day's work and cannot be let by contract. The price for which timber is bought by parties who are dealing in timber, is not supposed to be the price that the Government has to pay, for the reason that when parties make a specialty of getting out timber, they of course expect to make a margin and no doubt the Government buys that timber at the lowest price they can get it for. It is not supposed that the parties who get out the timber should sell the timber at the cost of getting it out. There would be no sense in that. They get out their timber and they hold it for sale to the Government or any one else who wants to buy it. It does not follow that there has been any steal about the matter, because one man supplied timber at 15 cents and the Government had to pay 22 cents. It only follows that the man who got the timber out made a margin of profit on his timber.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). As this motion has been enlarged upon beyond its original form, I wish to say a word or two with regard to it. The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) referred to the Collingwood Harbour works, but whether it is those who press the claims of Collingwood upon him, or whether it is the contractors, who have made his life a burden during the past year, the hon. Minister did not state to the House. Doubtless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has been pressed to do something on behalf of the town of Collingwood, and in my judgment very properly so. The contract for the work of the improvement of the Collingwood harbour was let to contractors, and the contractors, according to the reports in the department, have not, perhaps, fulfilled their duties as well as they should have done. Under these circumstances the Minister says: What can

I do; it requires time to call for tenders, to have tenders put in and to review and accept the most acceptable tender, and if the existing contract is put an end to, a great delay would ensue. Surely the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not mean by this motion that the Minister of Public Works should not act as any man occupying a position controlling an ordinary business would act. If the Minister of Public Works considers that it is his duty to that section of the country in which a public work is being constructed or carried out, to order that the contract for that work should be put an end to and carried on by day's labour; or that that contract should be extended and extended at once so that the work may be properly and satisfactorily done (the work being of urgent and immediate necessity), surely the Minister should be allowed to exercise his judgment under such circumstances, provided he carries on the work in the cheapest and most expeditious way, and in the way which is to the best interests of the country. Now, if the conduct of the works at Collingwood harbour requires any such treatment at the hands of the Minister of Public Works, surely no hon. member on either side of the House would criticise the action of the Minister, provided, of course, that in consequence of that action the work is carried out in a proper, expeditious and economical manner, having regard to the existing condition and requirements of the work. Why should we wait for tenders? Why should the Minister let the work by tender if it is necessary that it should be done hurriedly, and if it is done in the cheapest way? This, it seems to me, is the answer. But if, on the other hand, there is plenty of time for the doing of the work, I think the proper system is the system of tender, although the Minister has criticised it, and with some effect; because it often happens that the lowest tenderer gets the contract because he is the lowest tenderer, although he is not the best man for the work. But I would submit, with all due deference to hon. members of this House, that in a case of the kind which has been referred to, if it is necessary that the work should be proceeded with hurriedly, or a contract altered or changed, the Minister should see that that is done expeditiously and in the proper way, and no criticism should be made of his action by any hon. member on either side of the House.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) If the answer made or attempted by the hon. Minister of Public Works was meant as the answer of the Government to the real question which is before the House this afternoon, I beg leave to submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not an adequate one. It is quite true, this is a question which we may well discuss without alluding to party on either side. It is a question of a great public principle—the way in which the moneys of the country are expended, and the system upon which Ministers, for the best expenditure of those moneys, and, going a little deeper, for the sake of public morals and honest government, ought to act. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) scurried, in his skirmishing style, inimitable in its way, all around these different points. Amongst other things, he raised objections of different kinds to contract work, where it could not well be done by contract, and the like of that. Now, we may as well meet on fair ground first as last, and say that there are certain works which it is impossible to do by contract and do them well. For instance, there is a work, such as my hon. friend spoke of, which in some of its details, at least, involves the tearing down of a building partially burned or destroyed, and the replacing of that building by a mixed structure. In such a case, where you cannot get sufficiently definite data upon which to base a tender, the Government are perfectly justified in my mind in putting its competent foreman at work and having the matter carried out under him piecemeal; and yet, it may happen, in the course of the dismantling of the old or partially burned building and rebuilding it, that a great deal of the work which supervenes on the first work may be perfectly clear and definite, just as much so for contract purposes as any entirely new work. If the general policy is one of letting work by tender and contract, it seems to me that the Minister is not absolved from calling for tenders for the plain, definite portions of the work, and having them done according to the approved rule. The Minister also urges a case which occurs when great hurry is needed—when a public work having been partially destroyed, and the work of its reconstruction having been delayed for some unforeseen reason, the necessities of business or trade require that it shall be immediately done. In such a case, taking the season and the demands into account, the Minister cannot incur the delay which would be involved in calling for tenders. Granted that there are cases in which that will occur; but after you have exhausted all these cases, in which, perhaps, it is not best that tenders should be called for, there yet remain, as my hon. friend will admit, the great mass of the public works of the country, which may well come under the rule of tender and contract, where there is time enough and to spare for calling for tenders, where the work is plain and definite, and can be contracted for on plans and specifications of quantities. In these cases, then, it would seem as if the Government must do either one of two things. Either they must acknowledge that they do not propose hereafter to carry out the rule which has obtained, which has been legalized, and which ever since confederation you may say, has been the settled rule, although you will, of course, find exceptions to it—and we have not heard from the Minister yet whether it is the intention of the Govern-

ment either to acknowledge their failures in this respect, or they must take the ground that they have repudiated the system of tender and contract. The Minister comes very close to this when he says that he will try to do work by day's work as far as he possibly can; and when he makes an argument—which is intended to prove that after all contract work is simply day's work—that if a contractor has to hire men by the day to do his work, he does not see why a public department is not justified in the same way in hiring men and doing work by day's work. Carried to its logical conclusion that means, of course, that the Government do not any longer take their stand on the ground of tender and contract; but, arguing as my hon. friend has argued, that both are the same thing, the conclusion comes with force to every man who reads his words, that as they are both the same thing, it is just as well that the Minister should do the work as let it filter through the hands of a contractor. My hon. friend mentioned the method prevailing in England. I venture to say that there is no country in the world in which the system of tender and contract is so absolutely and relentlessly carried out in its public works as in Great Britain. If my hon. friend would show as much ingenuity in laying down conditions, in making plain the specifications down to the finest items, and in putting conditions on the contractor which would involve him in great loss if he did not carry on his work according to his tender, provided there was no absolute obstacle in his way, I think he would be doing better for the public expenditures of this country than he is in making these ingenious excuses for violating the system of tender and contract. No one would have any objection to the Minister of Public Works, who has to depend on his engineers, and whose duty it is to have full confidence in them, following the advice of his engineers as far as he can. Always this should be taken into account, that the engineer has not and ought not to have anything to do with either party, or, going above that, with the public rule for the disposition of work. He is to look at the subject from the departmental standpoint.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Suppose I ask for tenders for a dry dock or something like that, and suppose I receive three or four tenders. Then, suppose my chief engineer reports that the lowest tenderer cannot possibly carry out the work for the price he has offered; what would my hon. friend advise me to do in that case?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman my advice very clearly. If I relied on the engineer, and I thought he was a competent engineer, and he satisfied me that the man who put in the lowest tender either had proved in former work for the department not to be reliable, or had so made up the figures for the work that it was absolutely impossible for him to carry it out, I believe the Minister has no other recourse than to rest on the opinion of his engineer and his own common sense, and to say that it cannot be done for that money. That does not abolish the principle of tender and contract, however. That leaves to the Minister the liberty of putting aside the lowest tender and either going to the next or calling for new tenders. My hon. friend said that in England they pick and choose. So they do. So the hon. gentleman in his own department does or ought to, and in the case he has spoken of he should pick and choose, too. His own good sense, with the evidence of his engineer, with the evidence he has of the former work of that contractor, with the evidence of the actual quantities that are to be taken out and the absolute impossibility of doing the work for that sum—all that is sufficient to justify him in picking and choosing and not accepting the lowest tender. But it does not justify doing away with the rule of tender and contract. The English Government knows its men, it studies their history, and records their work, and it does pick its contractors, but it never goes to work and chooses its contractors simply out of its own political party for the time being. It treats them on their merits as contractors, and my hon. friend can do the same. He is not necessarily driven to do away with the contract and tender system, because, at one time or another he may have had to set aside the lowest tender; but he can explain to the House why he has not accepted the lowest tender, and if the grounds are good the House will not fail to justify his conduct.

But there are stronger reasons than those for the good and sound rule that has been laid down. It has been laid down in this country because, taking it all and all, my hon. friend must agree with me, and I hope the Government will also, it is better in the interests of economy and public morals that contracts should be made upon tenders called for and published, so that the public may have information as to the work going on. I think it would be an excellent thing as well that in these important contracts, when Orders in Council are made, they should, as my hon. friend has suggested, be published, so that the conditions may be known. These, no doubt, are the grounds upon which preceding Governments were led to the conclusion that it was better, taking it all together, that the rule should be tender and contract. And why? I think it stands to reason, in a country like this, where government by party is the rule—and I think my hon. friend is on record as having said, whether it be an original remark of his or not I do not know—that you cannot make elections with prayers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is about true, and my hon. friend knows it well.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must know, when ignoring all higher influences, that the moment a Government is released from that public notoriety, influence and check which tenders and specifications and a contract based upon these two impose upon a Minister, that moment the Minister is left open and unguarded to the whole pressure of the party behind him, and all its corrupt influences.

It may not entirely obliterate, it may not entirely do away with the evils that come in the train of party politics, but I do say that if the principle of public tender and contract be efficiently administered, it is a very strong bulwark against extravagance in expenditure and the corrupting of public morals, and I think that these are the two reasons which guided preceding Governments in laying that down as a salutary rule. But my hon. friend has fought shy of the cases in which the Government plainly ignored its duty to call for tenders. What reason, for instance, in the case of the work now going on under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—a work which has been canvassed in this country for many years, which is of the utmost importance, which is not of urgent necessity, in which there is great risk, and which involves from $40,000 to $60,000 of the people's money—what reason do we find in anything my hon. friend has said this afternoon why the Government, why the Minister who has charge of the department, should undertake of his own motion to construct this permanent work in the River St. Lawrence, without ever having canvassed the question in this House, and then without getting a single dollar voted for it, going into an expenditure of half of the total amount necessary, and then, fifteen days before the financial year expires, come and ask for a vote? What reason was there? There were no old ruins to tear down, no rotten timbers to take up, no subaqueous difficulties to be met. There was the ice, and all above it was space and atmosphere, and on the top of the solid ice a certain amount of timber was to be put together, according to certain plans and specifications. No case was ever shown clearer for a proper estimate and a proper figuring out by a contractor, yet about $20,000 was spent on that work, without a contract or tender, and without asking the consent of this House. What reason was there in that case for the department abandoning the principle of tender and contract? Why should the Minister make an illegal expenditure of money without a vote of Parliament, to such a large extent, and without any reason of urgency? The Minister could have had from this very Parliament, to enable him to go on with that work, the assent of Parliament to the expenditure, if he had taken due diligence, as soon as or shortly after Parliament was called together. Anyway, it was the Minister's business to have foreseen this, and to have got his vote before he undertook the expenditure.

There were two things. What did we have? Not even an apology from the Government. They will go to work, without a cent being voted, in a case which was not urgent and was foreseen for years, and incur an expenditure upon individual responsibility of $40,000 or $50,000, and in the next place they spend half the money above ground on as plain a piece of work as ever was undertaken, and they do it without tender and without contract. Suppose you cannot always get the dredge you want. The hon. Minister uttered a trite truth when he said: You cannot dredge a harbour without a dredge, but my hon. friend has been successful in getting men to dredge harbours who did not have any dredges. That was about as near to it as he could come. There are papers before the House to-day, in which it is indubitably shown that a man who never in his lifetime did any dredging, and knew nothing more about it than any other dry goods man, was approached by the department, as the initial letter shows, to know whether or not he would not like to embark in the business of dredging.

What in the world ever possessed a department, under the dictation of a Minister, to indite a letter to a man who was as foreign in all his works and ways to dredging as one of these "Hansard" reporters here, suggesting to him that he might undertake a piece of dredging somewhere—would he? And the next letter says: Yes, he would be glad to do it; had not thought of it before, but would like to undertake it. Have you any dredges? is the next question. No, but I know where they are, and I think I could get some. What excuse is there for a Minister, in the face of an Order in Council and of the rule of Government in expenditure for over thirty years, to undertake a twenty thousand dollar job of ordinary plain dredging in the St. Lawrence River at Coteau without tender or contract? And above all, what excuse is there for him, by a letter, to suggest to a private business man that he might undertake it? It is not undertaken by the man who owns the dredges, but by the man who hires them. The man who owns the dredges does the work, and gets his pay, and the rake-off is to the other. The man who hires the dredges is not in the business as overseer. No. Is he a foreman? No. He knows nothing about it. He is there to take his rake-off, and he takes it. There is no excuse for this in anything the hon. Minister has stated. We can go further, and take that same hon. gentleman, who, in his place in this House, promised and pledged his honour as

a Minister, that, when he got his $75,000 voted for electric lighting of this House, he would call for tenders and ascertain the cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) allow me a word?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly; two or three of them. We have the afternoon before us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I made the statement to which my hon. friend refers—and I made it; I do not deny it—I contemplated putting up a plant of our own. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) himself suggested that, instead of putting up a plant, I should perhaps apply to the electric companies. I did not put up a plant, and I do not see that I had any tender to ask for.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has had his two or three words; but I do not think he has made his position very much better. He acknowledges that he did make a pledge to Parliament, on which this $75,000 was voted. He never came back to Parliament to explain to Parliament that he had changed his mind. That is the Bourassian philosophy again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said in that debate that I might change my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the Bourassian philosophy, worked out in the Department of Public Works. That philosophy lays it down, as a fundamental rule, that you are perfectly honest and consistent, if you say you are going to do so and so, and if, the very next moment, you do something the very reverse—provided that in the meantime you change your mind. The other parties to the contract do not count. The Parliament that voted $75,000 on a certain condition of things, does not count. The Minister changed his mind, and so he is perfectly right and perfectly consistent. We shall have, I hope, in the presence of my hon. friend, something to say later about that lighting contract. I hope that his health will be sufficiently restored to enable him to remain with us a little longer. Some one has suggested that if he is anxious to have a change of air, he might get it without much expense by himself and his party coming over to this side and letting other gentlemen manage the Government for a time. I do not intend to go into a full discussion of this general question to-day. But I do say that since this Government came into power, they have heaped up example after example of this almost repudiation—it is practically and in fact repudiation—of the old principle of tender and contract. It has been done so often that now it does not seem to call for a word from hon. gentlemen opposite. I am inclined to think, however, that the last has not been heard of this matter. Though it is a perfectly open thing to discuss day's labour as against contract, I hold that, before the Minister goes against the experience of thirty years and undertakes to undermine an old system and establish a new one, he should have the courage to get up and say he does intend to do so. Then we can discuss it, and, if the day labour system is the best, let it be so declared after the matter has been thoroughly discussed. But I warn the Ministers, that if they do away with the tender and contract, they are making a future for themselves as compared with which the little hot water resulting from the Collingwood business would be as nothing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), I regret to say, has reopened the case of the Traverse lightship, which I discussed at length the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. And shall likely reopen it again.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad of the discussion; the more it is discussed, the better I shall be pleased.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) did not seem to be much delighted the other day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) does not know how delighted I was. It gave me an opportunity to make full explanations, and it gave me an opportunity to read and place on record Col. Anderson's report, which induced the department to enter on the contract, and which contained reasons which, I think, satisfied gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) will allow me, there is one point which I wished to emphasize, and of which I am reminded by the mention by the hon. gentleman of the engineer's report. Engineers have a duty to perform in advising their Ministers. But, when a Minister tells us that he has virtually set aside an Order in Council and a principle of conducting public business that has been recognized for twenty or thirty years, he is using his engineer's advice for a purpose for which his engineer could not have given it; and, if he did seek to give it for that purpose, he went entirely beyond his duty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not wish to be understood as having advanced that argument. I am not now, nor have I been, guilty of a breach of the rule the hon. gentleman suggests. There is a general Order in Council, which has always been observed in the department which I preside over. When we desire to go counter to that Order in Council, a report is presented in the special case,

setting out the special circumstances which, in the opinion of the Minister, justify the departure from it, and asking the consent of Council. If that consent is given, an Order in Council is passed, which, pro tanto, repeals the general Order. I did not go contrary to an Order in Council; I did not myself undertake the responsibility of the construction of this permanent lighthouse at Traverse without the consent of my colleagues. In the first place, I had three different surveys made by Col. Anderson: and it was only when Col. Anderson satisfied himself beyond doubt that a permanent lighthouse could be constructed for $20,000 or $30,000 less than he had at first supposed, that I entertained the idea of building it immediately; and it was only when it was pressed upon me from London, from Montreal, and from the leading commercial outports of this Dominion, that something should be done, and that at once, to check the unreasonable fear which possessed the insurance public at Lloyd's that the navigation of the St. Lawrence was dangerous—a fear which induced them unduly to raise the rates against our shipping—it was only when I saw that a case of urgency was before me, that I took the action I did. What was Col. Anderson's report, in substance? In the first place, he reported, after examination, that the lightship at the upper end of the Traverse was practically worn out and must be immediately replaced. I had, then, either to replace that lightship with another—and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that I could not replace her with a good lightship with the modern improvements at a less cost than $40,000—or provide a permanent light. And, when I was advised by Col. Anderson, after he had made three surveys in the place, that the permanent lighthouse could be built there, and that it would not only offer additional safety to the ships navigating the St. Lawrence, but probably prolong the safe navigation of that river for three weeks in the fall, and make it navigable earlier in the spring, I did not hesitate a moment longer.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the date of the Order in Council authorizing you to commence the work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I forget the date, it was immediately after my return from Washington. My hon. friend beside me says it was in the month of March; it was before anybody went to work.

Mr. HAGGART. Was it after the House met?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, just before the House met, just about the time. I think I can get the hon. gentleman the date, if it is important. Col. Anderson's last report was made in November. I was in Washington in December, January and February. The moment I got back this urgent matter was pressed upon my attention, and I took action instanter. The hon. gentleman says there was no urgency. Col. Anderson reports that there was urgency. His report says:

> It is urgent that we should build a pier at the Upper Traverse at once.

That is last November. At "once" meant before the next navigation began. Therefore, I had every element of urgency present in this case. The hon. gentleman says that I should have waited till the House met, and until I could have got a vote through supply. Well, Sir, I would have had to lose the whole season. As I explained the other day—I do not want to go over the whole argument—I would have had to lose the whole season and wait for another year if I had not begun the work when I did. It was on the advice of Col. Anderson that I decided to do the work, and to do it under the direct supervision of the department and not by deputy. What does the report say:

> I further recommend that the work be done by the department under its own direct supervision.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the date of Col. Anderson's report subsequent to the interview with the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The date of Col. Anderson's report was back in November.

Mr. BENNETT. But the report where he speaks about its being done under contract?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the one I was reading. It was dated back in November.

Mr. BENNETT. Had he at that time seen Mr. Lemieux?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At that time he had talked with the member for Quebec West a number of times, probably.

Mr. BENNETT. And he knew the wishes of that hon. gentleman as to how he preferred it should be done?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think he did. I do not think the hon. member for Quebec West had any interest, or any preference one way or the other, except the public interest.

Mr. BENNETT. The member for Quebec West stated that he expressly brought up Mr. Lemieux, because he was an expert, a genius, as he said.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, that is all true.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the engineer knew what report you wanted?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is now making a most unjust imputation upon Col. Anderson. Col. Anderson is not moved by considerations of that kind at all. He is an old, experienced and careful officer, with a great reputation. He has been there certainly over twenty years. He has a great reputation, which he is certainly not going to imperil at the request of the member for Quebec West, or anybody else. I will undertake to say that there is not in the departments at Ottawa a gentleman possessing a better reputation in his line than does Col. Anderson. When the hon. gentleman interrupted me, I was reading his report upon the very crux of the question now before the House; and what I understood my hon. friend to say was that if the facts were as I contended they were, they justified a departure from the general rule that applies to the letting of contracts by tender; that is, if the Minister is satisfied, after receiving the report of his engineer, that it is more in the public interest to build the work under the direct supervision of the department and not by tender, then he might do so, and do so in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that. I took occasion to say that a Minister should be very careful as to how he used the report of an engineer to enable him to set aside a general and well-established rule as to the construction of public works, because the engineer's office does not extend that far.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman did not stop there. He said he would have no hesitation himself as a Minister, and he would approve of other Ministers acting in that line, that if they were satisfied from the report of their engineer, and having carefully weighed it themselves, and came to the conclusion that the engineer was right on the facts submitted to them, they should exercise their common sense and conduct the work under the direct supervision of the department—that it was proper to be so done.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very different from this case. My argument was on the case whether the Minister of Public Works should set aside the lowest tender or not. My argument was that if the evidence and the expert testimony were against the lowest tenderer being applied to, or if he were an unreliable person, the Minister had a perfect right to set him aside.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have here Col. Anderson's report upon this point:

I further recommend that the work be done by the department under its own direct supervision. If such work were done by contract the contingent risks would be so great that it would be necessary to put on a large margin to meet them, and the opportunities for slighting work of this kind would offer a great temptation to a contractor. If done by the department, good work and materials would be assured, and the cost would probably be less than by the contract system.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, my hon. friend will allow me a direct question. Does he suppose that this referred to the cribwork done upon ice concerning simply the quality of the timber and the manner in which it was to be put in, and the labour? Did not that refer more to the placing of the thing and the like of that, in the rapids?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It referred to the entire work, no doubt, and referred also, I have no doubt, to the building of the cribwork. The hon. gentleman seems to think the building of the crib does not involve careful work at all, but it did. This cribwork required not only the greatest care in the selection of the wood, and the elimination of all improper material, but the construction of that work had to be done in such a thoroughly satisfactory manner that it could resist all pressure and trouble. Now, the hon. gentleman speaks of the building of this crib as if it could not be done cheaper and better upon ice. But then it has to be floated down and sunk in its place, and the hon. gentleman knows that the greatest possible care must be taken to put it in exactly the spot where it ought to be, and the only spot in which it possibly can be kept. Can that be done by contract? Does the hon. gentleman believe that a work of that kind could be satisfactorily done by contract, that we could have the assurance that a contractor would carry it out as we will carry it out—placing that cribwork down in the exact spot so that it shall not move for years to come?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will credit me, in a former debate we had upon this question, with having said that it might be that good reasons could be urged for the lowering and placing of it in the current, by the Government, with its own officers; but I could not say in regard to cribwork——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was calling that to his attention, that he had admitted in a previous debate that so far as this particular point was concerned, the sinking of that cribwork and filling it with stone, and putting it in the proper place so that it would resist the ice and current, was a most critical and careful piece of work; and he admits we were right in doing that under the direct supervision of the officers of the department who will be responsible for it. Well, that is the very work for which we are taking this $20,000. The hon. gentleman was told the other night that the cribwork was to be taken down and sunk out of this money.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman be candid with the House and say how much of the $20,000 went to the cribwork and how much to float it down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell you exactly. If Col. Anderson had been here Friday and Saturday, I could have given it to you.

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say $500 would float it and place it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But how much will it require to sink it and fill it with stone? Floating it down is a small work. It has to be sunk, and it has to be filled with stone in its proper place, and that will require a large expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the cribwork left Quebec yet?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know whether it has left yet. I gave the assurance of my deputy last week that it would be done and be sunk on the spot on the 23rd. That is the report of the deputy, and the hon. gentleman does not assume, I suppose, that I have any knowledge personally other than that furnished by my officers.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to think that not $500 out of that $20,000 will be required for sinking that crib.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman cannot escape me by saying that. I did not say it was to cost more than $500 to take it from Quebec to the Traverse. I say that when you get to the Traverse you have accomplished very little work until you get it sunk and put in position, and filled with stone. There is where the labour is going to come in.

Mr. FOSTER. That will take you a couple of months.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it will not take a couple of months to sink it. The stone is there ready. The stone had to be brought in bateaux or boats.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they there now?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I do not suppose the boats are lying there in a row, but the stone is all secured, and ready to go in, and it is to pay for them that I want this money.

Mr. BENNETT. Do they charge a demurrage on the boats for the time they are kept there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How much a day would he suggest? I do not suggest that they are kept there. I tell the hon. gentleman the stone is ready and prepared, and would be put in the cribwork as soon as the crib was ready to be submerged. That statement was made on Thursday last. Now I have proved to the hon. gentleman the three things which he said were necessary. First, that it was a case of extreme urgency, national urgency, a case in which the execution of the work was clamoured for by the commercial public and those interested in our commerce on the other side, a case in which the existing work was worn out, and the engineer reported it had to be replaced. I approved of the report of my chief engineer that it was pre-eminently a case where the work should be done under the supervision of the department and not by tender. Having approved of this report I went with it to Council, submitted it to my colleagues, and got Council's approval. I do not know of any work that has come under my observation since I have become Minister, the carrying out of which in the manner in which it has been undertaken could be justified more than the one the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) stood up, made his speech, and sat down without expressing one word as to the general principle we are discussing here to-day. I presume that he could not justify the principle that has been endorsed by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) at any rate. But what about this Traverse lighthouse? The hon. Minister, from the information that we already have, has utterly failed to justify the course he has taken in regard to that lighthouse. In the first place, he told us that it was a case of extreme urgency. That matter has been before the department for all the years that he has been Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. And long years before.

Mr. WALLACE. And long years before.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What sad neglect of public duty there was in those days.

Mr. WALLACE. After the hon. Minister came in three years elapsed before it became a case of urgency. He said that he had a report last autumn from his chief engineer, Col. Anderson, and, although it was a case of great urgency, he waited five months until March, before he took any action.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I told you I was away in Washington.

Mr. WALLACE. I am aware that the hon. gentleman was away in Washington a good deal of that time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was there himself.

Mr. WALLACE. I was there, but——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We were there together.

Mr. WALLACE. I think if there was a case——

Mr. DAVIN. I hope it was not a case of champagne.

Mr. WALLACE. We are not going to say anything about that.

Mr. FOSTER. They hang together on that.

Mr. WALLACE. If it were a case of urgency the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) had his secretary there, and the hon. gentleman should know there whether it was a case of urgency just as well as he should know if he were in Ottawa. He says that it was never thought that it would be possible this lighthouse could be built for any less amount than $60,000 or $75,000, but his chief engineer revised his estimate. He places extreme reliance upon his chief engineer, and I find the habit has grown up among Ministers, when they get into a difficulty, of getting some of their officers, or some engineer, to stand between them and harm. The hon. gentleman says that his chief engineer reduced the cost by from $20,000 to $30,000 for building this lighthouse. I would like to know what it was that caused him to reduce the expense of this lighthouse from $75,000 to $40,000 under the estimate of the same engineer. Has the cost of material decreased in that time? Not one bit of it. I believe lumber is dearer to-day by 15 per cent or 20 per cent than it was last year. There is no decrease in the price of lumber. This stone that was to be taken in bateaux to be used on the work, when the crib goes down, will require the same labour as if the work had been done years ago. What is it that has caused the chief engineer to reduce his estimate? He makes an estimate that the work can be done for $40,000. We have no reason or information given why this reduction in the estimate of nearly 50 per cent was made by the chief engineer. What occurs next? The report was made in November. It was a case of urgency, yet nothing was done for four or five months, until March, until the time that the House was meeting and until the main Estimates were being prepared by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department. Why did the hon. Minister not put that item in the main Estimates?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The main Estimates will be for next year.

Mr. WALLACE. It was a case of urgency; it would have to come before the House and receive the consideration of the House. The hon. Minister waits until the supplementary Estimates come down. He says the expenditure will be for next year. These bateaux with their loads of stone are waiting for the crib which is still in the dock at Quebec, and which has not been floated down, so that nothing will be done until the 1st of July. The hon. gentleman says that this is a case that his engineer reported will be better done without tender. The first reason is that of economy. He says that it would be better done by the Government, because it would ensure the materials being of the best character. It looks to me as if the whole machinery of the department had broken down and was worthless. If they had let a contract, and if they had given the public a chance to tender for the work, their inspector, if a capable man, would be able to supervise every piece of timber that went into the crib as the work progressed. The man who was building it could stand there himself as well as the inspector or the foreman and select this piece of timber, reject that piece, and see that the materials were good. The Government say that the case is urgent, but they have utterly failed to prove there was an urgency about the thing at all, I have demonstrated that the same man could select as good materials as a Government inspector, as he could as foreman of the work. Again, we are told that this work requires great care and precision and that it is vitally important this crib should be dropped in the exact spot. But the Government engineers could do that just as well with a contractor as they could under the present system. If the Government engineer gave directions, as he has to do now, the contractor would have to carry them out. Every statement made by the Minister (Sir Louis Davies) has failed to justify his departure from the salutary rule, that tenders should be asked for and that the consent of Parliament should be obtained before important works are undertaken.

Why, to-day we heard the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) take the ground pretty broadly that it was better that public works should be done by day's labour and under the control of the Minister. Let me give you a sample of how much better it is. The Ontario elections took place in the beginning of March last year, and any one who went to Major's Hill Park in the month of February, could see scores of men digging a trench for the foundations of a wall to go around that park, a wall that is utterly useless and unnecessary. Any child knows that one man digging in the month of May could do more work than fifteen men digging in the month of February, when the ground was thoroughly frozen. It was an utter waste of public money. I saw these men day after day working there, and so far as any utility in their labours was concerned, you might as well get them to dig holes and fill them up again. I have no doubt that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) would like that system extended all over the country, so that the public money might be used for political purposes to help his friends, and not used by him as a trustee for the people, as it should be used. Again, last year we had the Minister of Militia (Mr.

Borden) glorying in the fact that he had not called for tenders. He told us that he had asked pretty nearly every one to tender for the Yukon supplies, but when his statement came to be analysed, we found that he had asked one or two men to tender for groceries, and one or two men for the other supplies. There were no tenders asked for in the proper acceptation of the term, and yet the Minister (Mr. Borden) told us that he was glad to have an opportunity of assisting his political friends. I charge that these gentlemen on the Treasury benches have utterly ignored the principles that have governed the control of public expenditure since confederation. They have ignored the principle that when public money is to be expended every man in Canada has the right to have the opportunity offered him of tendering for the work constructed by such expenditure. Another case occurs to my mind, but I will not refer to it, as the Minister concerned is, as usual, absent from his seat. When that Minister is present, I shall deal with a case in the city of Quebec as to which supplies were offered him and not accepted, and the facts of which I became acquainted with when in Quebec. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) follows, of course, the bad example of the other Ministers. He wants cars, and he wants engines, and he wants sleepers, for the Intercolonial Railway, and he buys them without contract, and he pleads as an excuse that there was urgency. There was no urgency, the thing is absurd. The business of the Intercolonial Railway did not jump up to enormous proportions; it was simply going along in the even tenor of its way, and the Minister knew twelve months or two years beforehand everything that was required by the road. But suddenly he found there was urgency, and he said to the Canadian manufacturers: Can you build these cars and engines in twenty or thirty days? Of course the Government knew that the Canadian manufacturers could not do it in that time, and they utilized that circumstance to take the work away from Canadians and to hand it over to the people of the United States. The interests of the workingman of Canada is not considered, but the interests of the workingman in the United States is looked after, and all on the plea of urgency.

Mr. FOSTER. Nearly half a million dollars.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, nearly half a million dollars in this one case was paid over to the people of the United States when there are thousands of men in Canada today seeking employment and not able to get it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) heard the statement made in the House that the car works in Canada were full and could not take any more work.

Mr. FOSTER. That statement can be controverted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The statement has been made officially and has not been controverted.

Mr. WALLACE. That is all very well; the Government said to the Canadians: Can you make these cars in twenty or thirty days, and they said: No we are full up with employment for twenty or thirty days.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The statement: We are full up for thirty days, was not the statement made.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Well, make it two or three months if you like.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was not the statement, and it is just as well to be accurate about it.

Mr. WALLACE. Whether or not, it does not interfere with the principle. There was no excuse for urgency, because every car and every engine and every sleeper required could have been anticipated for years ahead. It appears to me the Government wanted an excuse to let this contract in the United States, and to let it without tender.

Mr. HAGGART. By private contract.

Mr. WALLACE. By private contract, and without tenders, and without competition.

Mr. HAGGART. Made by the Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) sure it was done without tender? My recollection is not that. I am pretty sure tenders were called for and that the Minister stated so in the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, the Minister has not stated that in the House, so far as I have heard.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, he has.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries show any such statement made to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman withdraw if I show it to him?

Mr. WALLACE. Most decidedly. Then, the Minister of Public Works says they do these things in England; they select contractors, and do not ask the general public to tender, but ask these selected contractors.

But that is quite a different affair from the mode adopted by the Ministers here, who go to one or two dry goods men or grocers, their own friends, and ask them to furnish supplies at their own figures. I am not making any charges against these men who supply the goods; but I say that the practice is entirely wrong—that where large quantities of supplies are required year by year by the Government, they are bound to ask for tenders. They are bound to let every man in Canada who is able to compete for the supply of these articles, have an opportunity of doing so, in justice to these men and in justice to the people whose trustees they are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have found the answer given by the Minister, and I will read it for what it is worth. The Minister was asked on the 25th of May:

How many palace or sleeping cars were ordered by the Government for the Intercolonial Railway, between the 1st January, 1888, and 1st April, 1899? To what company or firm were the orders given? Were public tenders called for? What prices are to be paid for each class of car? Why were not the orders for these cars given to Canadian firms so as to provide work for Canadian citizens?

The year, 1888, is, perhaps, a typographical error for 1898. The answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals was as follows:—

Sixteen palace and sleeping cars were ordered by the Government for the Intercolonial Railway between the 1st January, 1888, and the 1st April, 1899. The orders were given to the Crossen Car Company for eight of these cars, and to the Wagner Palace Car Company for the other eight cars. Tenders were not called in 1888 for five of these cars, but tenders were called for eleven. $14,045 each for five sleepers and $19,940.80 each for eight sleepers, and $9,800 for each of the three parlour cars. The cars recently ordered were obtained from the Wagner Palace Car Company, after tenders asked for and obtained from several large firms in the United States. The department, before making a contract with United States manufacturers, had applied to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, Messrs. Crossen & Co., and Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co. for offers. The two last mentioned firms declined to offer for these cars on the ground that the orders they had then on hand from the Intercolonial Railway were all they could fill within the time allowed. The first two companies would not undertake the work, as their shops were overcrowded with their own work. The department needed these cars for the opening of the tourist season this spring, and had no alternative than to place these orders with the Wagner Palace Car Company, whose tender was the lowest of the United States firms.

That point the hon. gentleman will, of course, withdraw.

Mr. WALLACE. There is just the point that these men could not tender within the time allowed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the work was let by tender. You said it was not.

Mr. WALLACE. Some of it was let by tender, but what kind of tender was it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All these Wagner cars bought this spring were let by tender.

Mr. WALLACE. These five were not let by tender. A portion were let by tender, but it was no public tender at all. Then, he says that two firms, which I assume are Canadian firms, refused to tender because they had already contracts which it took them all their time to fill; and urgency was the plea there made. They had to be ready in time for the tourist season. But they knew two years ago that there was a tourist season. It had not suddenly burst upon them, as the Yukon burst on the Minister of the Interior unexpectedly, and found him unprepared, the tourist season has always been there; so that an excuse of that kind will hardly go down.

The PRIME MINISTER. It will go up, then.

Mr. WALLACE. In my opinion the Government have utterly failed in their duty to the people in this regard. But they do not care; business is business, and you will see what a good time we shall have next year. They go on, utterly regardless of the law, or of what the country requires. Papers are asked for, publications are demanded by Parliament, and the rules of Parliament are utterly ignored. I was looking the other day for a report of the Auditor General which had not yet come down, although the law imperatively required that it should be down months before. The law was disregarded. In this case the interests of the people are disregarded. The interests of manufacturers, and those who should be permitted to tender for public works or public supplies, are disregarded. I think the interests of the country require that we should go back to the old and recognized method.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that there are many rules of parliamentary government which are absolutely disregarded in this House, and this debate is a good example. There was no occasion at all, on the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for this debate which has taken place. What is the motion? It is simply for Orders in Council respecting the letting of contracts without tender, passed since the 23rd June, 1896. On this motion the House has gone into a discussion of the principle which should guide the Government in the carrying out of public works—whether the works should be done by contract on tenders, or whether they should be done by day's labour. On this question the law is very plain. The law says that the work is to be done by contract except where, in the opinion of the Minister, it can be done more advantageously by day's labour. This is section 13 of the Public Works Act:

The Minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all work,——

This is very broad. There are two exceptions, however. The first is :

——except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest,——

In such a case the Minister should not invite tenders or let the work by contract, but proceed himself with it. Then, here is the second exception :

——or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

Now, we know that there are certain works which can be more effectively done by the department than by contract. We have seen examples of that. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that there was an Order in Council to guide the Public Works Department in carrying out this section. An Order in Council was passed in 1880, providing that for all works except those involving an expenditure of less than $5,000, tenders should be called and contracts let ; but this is only for the guidance of the Minister. The rule is that in all such cases the Minister is bound to ask for tenders ; but if it is expedient that the work should be done by day's labour, then he can deviate from the rule. The rule is not disputed by anybody ; but the motion of my hon. friend simply implies that the rule has been departed from in certain contracts let by the Government, and he assumes that certain works have been done without tender ; and he wants to have those cases brought down to the House, and when they are brought down he will be ready to make a case to show that the spirit of the Public Works Act has been violated. Until then, it is premature to discuss that question. When the return is brought down, when the facts regarding all the works that have been done by the Government without tender have been placed before Parliament, then we shall be prepared to discuss the question whether or not it was advisable for the Government to carry on these works without tender, or whether they are justified in doing so. Whether or not they were always justified in doing so, there are cases beyond dispute in which the Government did properly in not calling for tenders. There may be others which require explanation, but then and then alone can the conduct of the Government be impugned.

My hon. friend referred to a case in my department in which, he said, drugs were bought without any tenders. I have no recollection of the fact, but, assuming the statement of the hon. gentleman to be true, that the contract were given without tenders, there was, no doubt, sound justification for it, as we will be able to show at a proper time.

There are other instances of works in the Public Works Department having been given out without tender or contract, which, when the papers are brought down, will be shown to have been the best course to adopt under the circumstances. I submit, therefore, that this discussion is out of order. What we say is, that at the proper time the question, as to whether the Government, in any particular case, acted properly or not in letting out the work without tender, will be decided when that particular case is before the House. At this moment there is nothing before the House, but to allow the motion to go, and it will be granted at once.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). My right hon. friend stated very fairly the question I wish to put before the House, and I think he will agree that the discussion which has arisen has been a very useful one, and that the House is indebted to those hon. gentlemen who have brought into the debate so much information calculated to be of interest to the country.

Let me say a word with reference to the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works. That hon. gentleman laid down a very peculiar proposition. He said that he was in favour of doing as much work as possible by day's labour, and then asked, what was the difference, after all. Must not all contract work, he asked, be done by day labour ? Of course, his reasoning is this : You contend, he said, that I should not have any work done by day's labour, but by contract. But contract work has to be done by day's labour, and, therefore, I am perfectly justified in dispensing with a contract and giving the work out by day's labour. On the same reasoning, I could prove to the hon. gentleman that any pickpocket could be justified in picking money out of another man's purse. He might reason as on the same ground as the hon. gentleman. It is right that you should pay your debts, but, as a rule, you cannot pay them without taking money out of your purse. You, therefore, take the money out of your purse, and that is all that a pickpocket does. The reasoning is exactly similar, and the argument was a most extraordinary one for a Minister to put forward seriously. It reminded me of those syllogisms given to one when studying logic, such as the non-distribution of the middle term.

I confess that I was very much alarmed at the remarks of the hon. Minister, when, after his now long experience—because he has been Minister of Public Works for three years—he told us that, in the administration of a large spending department, he approves as much as possible of giving out the work by day's labour. What does that mean ? Every administration of public works by day's labour is the resorting, so far as it can be done in any department, to personal government. We all know what has been the result of personal government

to the public in every country in which that system has been the rule. There is no country in the world that has suffered so much, that has been pillaged so much, as France, by reason of men administering great spending departments just as they pleased, because that, after all, is what this system amounts to. If the Minister is to build public works by day's labour as much as he possibly can, he is resorting, within the confines of his department, to personal government, and personal government has resulted in the most wholesale pillage in every country where it has been practised. If we may hark back for one minute to first principles, suppose that in private matters you have an agent for some large estate, whom you empower to make contracts with whomsoever he pleased, and either to call for tenders or do what work has to be done by day's labour—that is to say, you take his own honesty and ability as the only guarantees of his good faith and judgment—there is no one who would not say that that is not a sufficient check on the weakness, and the greed, and the favouritism, and the hundred and one temptations to which, in any transaction where money is concerned, a person, left solely to act according to his own pleasure, is exposed. There is no comparison whatever between the temptations to which a private individual, managing a private estate, is exposed, and that to which men occupying the position of a Minister of the Crown, and acting for the public, is subjected, because we know, unfortunately for ourselves, that we cannot get the people of this or any other country to look on the expenditure of public money in the same way as they do the expenditure of a private firm or individual. A man who would be scrupulously honest in his private dealings, will be, as a rule, in the dealings with the Government inclined to the belief that it is no sin against Heaven, no sin against his own honour, to take advantage of the Government, and place more money in his pocket than he is entitled to. Who knows better than the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who has been Prime Minister of a province, or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) who not only is Minister of Public Works now, but has been an active party manager in the past for many years in the province of Quebec, or the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), who has been Prime Minister of his own province, what we all know, that, the very moment you allow a department to resort to the system of doing large public works by day's labour, it is almost impossible to guard against abuse and fraud? From the very moment you have a work in charge of a department and that department doing work, as the hon. gentleman says, by day's labour, that department employing men, that very minute, it is not merely against his own weakness he has to be on his guard, it is not merely against the possible greed in his own bosom, it is not against the favouritism that he himself would desire to show that he has to be on his guard, but he has to be on his guard against rapacity from a hundred quarters in various parts of the country. Nearly twenty years ago an investigation was held, the most thorough, I believe, that has ever been made in Canada, and probably the most thorough investigation that was ever made in any country, an investigation made, I am in a position to say, without fear or favour. Nobody has dared in the course of these nearly twenty years to impugn the good faith or ability with which that inquiry was carried on. It was an inquiry into all the affairs connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway up to the date of the commission issued, I think, in 1880. Some 72 contracts were inquired into. I will quote a few of the decisions of this commission. Let it be remembered that they inquired into contracts let by Governments of both parties and by the Department of Public Works and by the Department of Railways and Canals:

> We think it would be an advantage if no transaction involving an expenditure beyond a specified sum could be arranged for by competition or otherwise, unless such expenditure should be first directed by some higher authority than a department, and unless the report or recommendation of the department in which such direction is asked should, amongst other things, give a written report from its engineer—when the object of the expenditure involves engineering results—and this, whether that report be in accordance or not with the step recommended.

Also:

> That in this work numbers of persons were employed as Government officials who were not efficient in the positions to which they were appointed, having been selected on party grounds, irrespective of the question whether their engagement would be advantageous to the public interests.

That was the conclusion forced on that commission after having inquired into 72 contracts, some of them let by Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, others by the hon. baronet (Sir Charles Tupper) who leads the Opposition, others by Sir Hector Langevin. Another of their general conclusions, was this:

> That the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was carried on as a public work at a sacrifice of money, time and efficiency.

Now, I would press these conclusions on the hon. Minister of Public Works, because I think from the point of view of the efficiency of his department, the principle he laid down was entirely heretical. Here is another quotation from the general conclusions of this commission:

> That large operations were carried on and extensive purchases made with much less regard to economy than would have happened under similar circumstances in a private undertaking.

That the practice which permits a department to originate and enter upon transactions involving the expenditure of large sums of money, and without other authority to award the contracts under which such expenditure is intended to take place, is a disadvantage.

Another conclusion, is as follows :—

It is true that the statute does not require the award to be authorized by the Privy Council, unless where the lowest (available) offer is passed over, but it is suggested for consideration, whether, unless regulations are to be adopted of a more stringent character than those in force up to this time, so as to exclude offers of a gambling character, it would not be well that all contracts involving sums above a specified amount, be awarded only after consideration by some higher authority, for instance, a committee of the Privy Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my object is to get the returns for which I have moved. My object was not to make a case against the Government. I did not speak as a partisan. I spoke simply as one asking these returns. But I confess to you, Sir, that some of the remarks made by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works are calculated to alarm Parliament and should alarm his colleagues. And I would urge them to supplement the Order in Council of 1880 so as to put a brake upon the downward tendency of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), a tendency to depart from the wholesome system of calling for tenders and from surrounding himself with those safeguards, without which a public man, a Minister of the Crown, however virtuous he may be, and no matter whether he be Liberal or Conservative, is apt to fall in the slippery ways in the administration of a great spending department, with its hundred and one temptations, with its hundred and one dangers arising from party influence and human greed.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

THE NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.

(In the Committee.)

On section 9,

Mr. LaRIVIERE. As you will remember, Mr. Chairman, a debate took place in this House on the second reading of this Bill, with regard to these extraordinary bonding powers which this section grants the company. It has been elicited by the debate that this railway was sold under the authority of the courts of justice for the sum of $36,000, that is to say, the 12½ miles already constructed, and the franchise for the rest of the road to be constructed. It is true that we have been informed in the committee that the present owners of the road have spent some $30,000 or $40,000 to put it in such a condition that the Government will allow it to be operated, because hitherto the road has been left in such a bad state of repair that the Government had to step in and stop its running. So it appears that the whole amount that the present owners of the road have spent in order to acquire it and put it in running order is $76,000. Now, we are asked to allow that company to bond the 12½ miles already constructed to the extent of $25,000 per mile ; therefore, if the company issues bonds and sells them, no matter at what rate, they will not only recoup themselves for what they have already paid for the road, but will make a splendid profit out of the transaction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will my hon. friend allow me at this point to make a suggestion ? I am prepared to meet his views, according to instructions from the owners of this franchise. My hon. friend is mistaken in giving the sum of $76,000 as what they have actually paid out ; the sum is $102,000. If his objections to this clause remain the same as those expressed at a previous meeting of the committee, I am prepared to meet them by this amendment :

Provided that with respect to the railway heretofore constructed, and that this Act authorizes to be acquired from such purchasers, bonds, debentures or other securities shall be issued only to the extent of $15,000 per mile and less until the said railway shall be operated by electric power, after which the remaining $10,000 may be issued.

That will meet the views of my hon. friend and the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) the other night, that a certain portion of the securities be held back until they had shown their good faith in carrying out the enterprise.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There is no doubt that the suggestion of my hon. friend goes half way. I want to deprive them of the privilege of bonding these twelve miles until the system will have been completed. My object would be attained by striking out that part of the clause which refers to the road already constructed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Under this amendment they could only issue bonds for the amount of their actual expenditure.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I accept the statement of my hon. friend that already $102,000 have been expended. If I have made a different statement before it was on that made before the Railway Committee by the promoters of this Bill. We were told in the committee that the company had hardly spent $40,000 besides the cost of the road.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is a mistake. The total amount is $102,000.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. When will my hon. friend move his amendment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will move it now.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I do not want to fight this thing out. I was taking part in this debate only from a general stand-point. I am not interested in the locality and I do not want to interfere in the construction of the road, but, from the general stand-point, I thought it was unwarrantable on the part of this Parliament to allow this House to pass a Bill whereby speculators could make a nice speculation, take the money that they can realize and then let the road go where my hon. friend for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) sent another road on another occasion. Does your amendment apply to the whole of the road? I fail to see that that would compel them to build the whole road as this only relates to the portion of the road already completed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This portion of the road was of no use at all until this money was spent on it, and the bonds would not sell for a cent on the dollar until the extension is made complete. I will read to my hon. friend the works that have to be completed before the road will be of any use. Besides the $102,000 expended on the 12 mile section there will be an expenditure of $50,000 for repairs now going on—new ties, ballasting, filling and replacing trestles, and new bridges:—

The extension to Port Dalhousie alone and the conversion of the line to an electrical line will cost as follows, and work will go on this summer:—

Right of way, two draw-bridges and terminals at Port Dalhousie and St. Catharines	$ 80,000
Power plant	100,000
Changing present line to electricity	60,000
New electrical equipment, locomotives and cars, &c	75,000
	$467,000

So my hon. friend will see that with the bonding power we are leaving them they would not have 25 per cent of the money that they have to expend this summer.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This amendment only requires that a few miles of the road shall be operated, otherwise the bonding powers will be resumed just as they are asking for them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They have not only to make this change, but they have this large expenditure.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. You say that the road shall be operated, but you do not say for what distance. If you say the whole system it will cover that point. Say "operated and completed," so that it will cover the whole distance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose there would be no objection to that.

Mr. BRITTON. I perhaps may be wrong, as I was not at the committee, I regret to say, to hear the discussion that took place in favour of the Bill, but the objection to this Bill seems to me to be this: Here are certain persons who come and buy this road, which is in a state of dilapidation, not used at all. They give something like $35,000 or $36,000 for it.

Mr. SUTHELAND. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. BRITTON. I understand that to be the case. It has been stated that they paid some such sum as that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Besides which they accepted liens.

Mr. BRITTON. And it is now proposed to expend a large sum of money upon it. I dare say the hon. gentleman stated that they would expend their money in good faith, but there is no guarantee of this. These gentlemen come here and say that it will cost so much for this thing and so much for the other thing, in all some $300,000 or $400,000. There is no guarantee that these things will cost so much or that that money will be expended. They have twelve miles of road already constructed that by the Bill they are authorized to buy from the present owners. It is the property of this corporation and they have at once the power to bond that twelve miles at the rate of $15,000 a mile.

Mr. CLARKE. But they will have spent nearly $15,000 a mile.

Mr. BRITTON. They have not spent $15,000 a mile. They have spent $36,000, and whatever these liens come to.

Mr. CLARKE. They have spent $100,000.

Mr. BRITTON. Grant that it is $102,000. 12 miles by $15,000 is $180,000 and the difference between $180,000 and $102,000 is a very considerable sum. I do not know what protection there is against their taking that twelve miles of road already constructed and putting bonds upon it to the amount of $15,000 a mile, floating these bonds and doing nothing in reference to it.

Mr. CLARKE. The statement read by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), I think, ought to satisfy the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). The gentlemen who acquired this road do not intend to rest satisfied with fixing up the twelve miles already constructed. That is only part of their scheme. They have to make extensions, one of which is to Toronto. They have already expended $102,000, and they propose to expend $50,000 more, making an expenditure of $152,000. That is on this

twelve miles portion. The extension to Port Dalhousie and the conversion of the road to an electrical road will involve a further expenditure of more than $300,000, making in all $467,000. I think as the gentlemen promoting the Bill have acceded to the wishes of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), there should be no opposition. This is a Bill affecting a large and important part of the province of Ontario. It is a Bill that will substantially enhance the value of every acre of land between St. Catharines and Toronto. It is a Bill that both of these cities have asked Parliament to pass. Some of the leading citizens in Toronto have identified themselves with the promoters in asking for this measure. The fact that their names are connected with this Bill is a guarantee of good faith, that they propose to complete the road. I cannot understand why these persistent objections are being offered to this Bill. None of these objections were raised, except the objection of the hon. member for Provencher, in the committee. The discussion was as to whether the road should be extended from Hamilton to Toronto. After a thorough discussion the committee decided to pass the Bill, and I do hope that there will be no further objection to it. In regard to the limitation of the bonding power for the twelve miles, the city of St. Catharines, which is probably more deeply interested in the successful operation of this road than any other municipality in Ontario, is anxious that the road shall be constructed and operated. The statements made on Thursday, or Friday, in the House aroused the people of St. Catharines, and a special meeting of the city council was called to-day and a strong resolution was passed, a copy of which, I think, has been sent to the hon. member for North Oxford, asking Parliament to pass the measure and asking the representative of the constituency in this House to support it. The council even goes so far as to ask that there should be no limitation of the bonding power given under the old Act to these twelve miles. If hon. gentlemen will permit me, I may read the resolution, which will show that the city of St. Catharines, as represented by its council, is most anxious that this Bill shall pass and that the road shall be built. This resolution was passed to-day:

Moved by Alderman McCarron, seconded by Alderman Woodruff, that whereas Messrs. Powers, Calvin, Herbert and their associates are applying to the Parliament of Canada for an Act to enable them to hold under the Railway Act the property, rights and franchises of the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway, lately purchased by them, and whereas the chief interest the city had in the said road was its extension westwards towards Hamilton and Toronto, and for the purpose of encouraging the building of the road to these points this corporation endorsed bonds of the company to the extent of $80,000, and in addition thereto granted a loan to the company of $40,000; and whereas the right of the said company to complete its line westward would have only expired, if the said road had not been sold, on the 5th day of October, 1901 (60 Vic., chap. 9); and whereas it appears that strong opposition is being developed in Parliament against the passage of the said Act as applied for, and this council consider that the withholding from the present owners of the road of any of the rights possessed by the old company, whereby the construction of the road westward would be discouraged or delayed, would be detrimental to the interests of the city of St. Catharines and adjacent municipalities, and it would be a breach of faith on the part of the bondholders on whose behalf the said sale was had, if they did not do all in their power to assist the purchasers of the road in obtaining what they paid for. Be it therefore resolved by the municipal council of the city of St. Catharines in council assembled, that this council do record its unqualified approval of the Bill now before Parliament, as passed by the Railway Committee, and do hereby request Wm. Gibson, Esq., the member for Lincoln, to give same his support, and that he be specially requested to urge upon Parliament that the undertaking be not crippled by the curtailment of the company's bonding privileges as asked for, especially with regard to the twelve miles of road already constructed, upon which a large amount of money must in the very near future be expended in order to make it useful and safe for public traffic, and that the mayor be instructed to forward by telegram to Mr. Gibson a copy of this resolution.—Carried.

(Sgd.) W. Y. KEATING,
Mayor.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, in view of the strong feeling evinced by the people of St. Catharines, as expressed in the resolution passed by the city council to-day, that this Bill should not be further obstructed, but that it should be permitted to pass Parliament. We ought to reach some conclusion to-night, especially when the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), the chairman of the Railway Committee, has agreed to the proposition submitted by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) that for the present the power to bond the twelve miles section should be limited to $15,000 per mile. That road when completed will be first-class in every particular. It will be an electric road, and the advantages to the city of Toronto from the construction and operation of that road will be very great indeed. Citizens of Toronto are labouring under a serious disadvantage, being practically tied up, except during the season of navigation, to one railway. Competition by this road will also be a very great advantage to the people of St. Catharines, to the people of the Niagara peninsula, as well as to the community resident between Toronto and Hamilton. I do not wish to take up the time of the House further, but in view of the concessions made by the promoters of the Bill as to the limitation of the bonding power on the twelve miles section, I would urge that the committee should now pass the Bill.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not wish to obstruct the Bill or to talk against time or anything

of the kind. I wish to point out, however, that a considerable opposition was manifested against the Bill on the two previous occasions on which it was before the House. The promoter of the Bill, who is also chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Sutherland), has proposed an amendment now which may perhaps meet the views of those who so strongly opposed the Bill on a former occasion, and I ask that in deference to the views of these gentlemen, the committee should be allowed to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BRITTON. There are very few members present in the House and as there will be plenty of time to dispose of the Bill, this postponement I ask will not do any harm. If this is a proper Bill to pass it will pass then. I am a good deal like the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), who says he does not oppose the Bill on personal grounds. I am not specially interested in that part of the country, but it does seem to me that these are dangerous bonding powers to grant to a road situated as this is. They originally buy a few miles of road, then they seek to bond these few miles, first to the extent of $25,000 a mile, and now according to the amendment, for $15,000 a mile. I do not question the good faith of the owners of the line, nor do I deny that they spent some money in addition to the amount they paid for the road. But I do say it is a very dangerous thing to allow the owners to bond this small piece of road without reference to what they may do with regard to the other line. They may or they may not build the line asked for in their charter, but if they get $180,000 of bonds and do not construct, Parliament will deeply regret giving them such powers.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do I understand that the suggestion has been accepted by my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Only one objection was raised to this Bill that had any weight, and that was the objection raised by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) the other night, and by the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) to-night. The promoters of the charter have met that objection to the fullest extent, and if hon. members in this House have any doubt of their bona fides, they are prepared to go further. There is no reason why, in the public interest, this Bill should not pass, and at this stage of the session, with a large number of other Bills on the Order paper waiting to be considered, it seems unreasonable that this Bill should be further delayed.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 10,

Mr. BRITTON. This clause grants this company fuller powers than are usually granted. A small railway company, with a small piece of road, may by this clause fill the whole lake with vessels, and buy or acquire docks, and do a transportation business to any extent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. Even so, who will it hurt ?

Mr. BRITTON. It gives them power "to carry on generally the business of transportation."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In connection with the line.

Mr. BRITTON. Under our law, American citizens are not allowed to own ships here, and when this Bill was originally put forward none but Americans were connected with it. In order to meet the objections raised in committee, certain Canadian names were added, but these gentlemen have not a single dollar of real interest in this company in Canada. This company is allowed the right to build and construct vessels and carry on generally the work of transportation on the lakes. If we give them this power, we are giving them a power, contrary to what heretofore has been considered good policy on the part of this Parliament. It is not like a great railway such as the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. The statement of the Bill that it is a work for the general interests of Canada is only put there for the purpose of bringing it under the Railway Act ; it is not for the general interests of Canada in any other sense. It is not interprovincial. It is simply this short road from some point on the Niagara River to the city of Toronto ; and yet, this small provincial railway company has power under this section 10 to engage in the general business of transportation on any of the lakes of this Dominion ; and we are giving it this power, apparently with our eyes open, to please the genial and charming chairman of the Railway Committee. I would like to please him as much as any one ; but that is what is being done now, without fairly considering the opposition of members who are not present to-night, and who could state more clearly than I can, the grounds of opposition to this Bill.

Section agreed to.

Committee rose and reported Bill, with amendments. Amendments read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 130) respecting "The London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited)."—(Mr. Bain.)

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Canadian Railway Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 136) (from the Senate) for the relief of Annie Inkson Dowding.—(Mr. Clarke.) On division.

Bill (No. 141) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Penberthy Injector Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 144) (from the Senate) for the relief of Abraham Aronsberg.—(Mr. Landerkin.) On division.

Bill (No. 145) to amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, under the name of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FLINT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the position in which an important motion, that stands in my name, occupies on the Order paper, and to ask, whether a particular day cannot be set aside for its discussion. This matter is one of more than ordinary interest at present, owing partly to action taken by this House, and, as there is very considerable uncertainty as to whether it will be reached in the regular order of notices of motion, and as, even should it be reached, there will be but very little time for its discussion, under the rules of the House, and as it will be admitted that this motion should not be disposed of without a fair measure of discussion, I would ask the Government, if a day cannot be fixed for discussing it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government are fully aware of the fact that if this motion with regard to the question of prohibition is left to take its rank on the Order paper, there is no probability of its disposal the present session, and I have no hesitation in saying that, in order that it may have full discussion, the Government will fix a day for the debate. It is not possible, however, for the Government to fix a day now, even approximately, but I may say that, as soon as the debate on the redistribution is concluded and that Bill is disposed of, we will be able to take this matter up.

Mr. FLINT. That is perfectly satisfactory.

THE OGILVIE COMMISSION.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. Prime Minister give me any information as to when the report of the Ogilvie commission will be printed?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am informed by the Clerk of the House that the papers will be ready Wednesday.

MR. COSTE'S TRIP TO THE YUKON AND TO ENGLAND.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the right hon. gentleman able to say anything further concerning the return touching Mr. Coste's report? There was some confusion with regard to it. One had been brought down which did not relate to his trip to the Yukon and afterwards to England. That Order in Council was passed about a month ago.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Does the hon. gentleman allude to the report on the cost of Mr. Coste's expedition? That will be ready in a day or two.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I allude to the report on the expedition last made by him to the Yukon and afterwards to London.

The PRIME MINISTER. As to that, I have no information to give my hon. friend.

THE GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. PENNY. At the request of the Minister of Inland Revenue, I move that the Order that the House form itself into committee on Bill (No. 55) further to amend the General Inspection Act, be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn. The hon. Minister has asked me to bring this Bill in as an amendment to his Bill on the Weights and Measures Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

SMALL FRUIT PACKAGES.

Mr. PENNY. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has asked me to submit this Bill as an amendment to the General Inspection Act, I beg to move that the Order that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 56) to define the size of small fruit packages, be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

THE MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Poupore for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before the House all petitions, applications and letters in relation to the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal.

Mr. G. E. CASEY (West Elgin). In pursuance of my course in moving the adjournmen of this debate, the last night it was up, I propose to say a few words on the

motion. I do not intend to go into the details or figures, as these have been exhaustively dealt with by gentlemen more directly interested in the scheme and more intimately acquainted with the locality. But, as a member for western Ontario, where this scheme is not perhaps so well understood as it ought to be, I feel it my duty to give the House and the country the benefit of such opinion as I have been able to form upon it. Although my own district is in no way directly interested, I believe that the whole of Canada, and especially the whole of Ontario, is interested in the development of our back country and of such mineral and other resources that may be therein. We have too thin a strip of settlement even in this the best situated of all the mainland of the province. If you go 150 miles back almost of any point from the lake, in the province of Ontario, you will find yourself rather in the backwoods, comparatively speaking. Perhaps in most places the margin of full settlement is very much less. This is not such a depth of settlement as a considerable and well-balanced country demands. It is not such a depth of settlement as this grand province of Ontario is fitted to sustain, and to sustain in comfort and wealth. If, therefore, the present scheme commends itself to our judgment as one likely to develop that back country by opening up markets for its products and facilities for new manufactories and industries of other kinds, you may be sure that it will promote settlement in the very near future, and that, with the development of the resources of that country, will come the influx of a larger population, and, consequently, great accession to the province and the Dominion. This scheme does seem to fulfil the requisites to that great and desirable end.

In the first place, I must begin by saying that I fear that a great many of our people, even in the province of Ontario, are ignorant of the resources that exist in the rough or partly developed country, even in the Ottawa valley and the other connecting waterways to the Georgian Bay.

In the South-western Peninsula, a veritable land of Goshen, where every acre is arable and all fruits and grains can be grown, we are too apt to think of this district as a desert, with rocks partly covered with valuable timber, but largely denuded even of that by the ruthless and wasteful lumberman as people are too apt to think him. I am afraid even members of this House who have sat for many years here, on the banks of the Ottawa River, do not know what exists 25 or 50 or a hundred miles up that noble stream and on its tributaries. I confess that after as long a term here as almost anybody in the House it is only within the last year or two that I have been able to get any clear personal idea on these points myself. Within the last couple of years, however, I have made some excursions up the river, and I have found much that surprised and delighted me. There is, along the Ottawa valley, not to speak of a wider district, a vastly greater extent of first-rate farming land than anybody who has not visited that region is apt to suppose. There are mines, of silver, at all events as good as any in British Columbia—and I have seen some of the best there. There is timber still within reach of the river, though not much upon its banks at the present time. Above all—I think I may fairly say above all—there is the greatest series of useful water-powers that can be obtained in any district on the continent of America. I do not think I should be going too far if I said that the water-power of the Ottawa River is available at the different cascades and rapids along its length, is more immediately useful, more practically valuable for manufacturing and for the production of power than the water-fall of Niagara itself. Probably I should not be going too far if I said that an equal number of horse-power could be developed along the Ottawa River. A pleasant peculiarity possessed by the great rivers, almost alone of our great rivers, is that of taking a nice little drop of from 15 to 30 feet every few miles along its course, and of providing in the middle of the cascades a number of islands which will be very convenient places for manufactories, mills and power-houses. We are all familiar with the Chaudière Falls, within the limits of this city, though we hardly realize that it is like the others of which I have just spoken—a series of cascades between islands, for the islands in this case are so covered with structures of various kinds that we forget that they are actual islands and regard them as being artificially constructed. Let us go to the head of Deschenes Lake, upon which stands the town of Aylmer, and we find one of the most remarkable water-falls anywhere, at the Chats. Here is a natural dam of a height, I think of 35 feet and three miles long, with 13 or 14 natural water-falls, which run all summer and capable of producing a vast number of horse-power each. It is the most remarkable series of water-falls that I have ever seen, at all events. The unsubmerged portions of this dam, which appear as islands in the river, are, some of them, of large extent and capable of containing whole villages or towns of workers.

Mr. POWELL. Where is that?

Mr. CASEY. At the head of Deschenes Lake, twenty-eight miles above Aylmer. These islands are so placed that a railway could easily be run from one side of the river to the other, putting all the industrial establishments using this great water-power into communication with each other and with existing lines of railway on each side. Further up the river you come to other powers of a similar nature, at Portage du Fort, Grand Calumet, Allumette, Des Joachims—I need

not go over the list, as you have heard them before ; but they are all of them convenient and accessible for the purpose of establishing industries. When I say they are convenient and accessible, I do not mean that they are now in a state of development to be put to the use of which they may be made capable. It is exactly such a project as this canal that is needed to make the glorious water-powers available for practical purposes. There will have to be locks at all these rapids, and there will have to be dams at the locks to regulate the flow of water ; and where you put a lock, as everybody knows who has lived along the Lachine or Welland Canals, you provide a developed water-power. So, parties who intended to establish industries would only have to make arrangements with the canal company for the use of water-power which would be developed by the construction of the canal itself. Now, through the development of the water-powers of this glorious river there is a tremendous field for future enterprise. We are only at the beginning of the use of electrical power. It seems highly probable that, besides being applied to all purposes of railway locomotion, electricity will become the principle agent in the smelting of our ore, especially some of the refractory ores that are hard to manage in the ordinary way. The Ottawa River is capable of smelting all the ore that can be brought to it from all parts of Ontario, and of running all the railways in this part of the province at all events. The same remark, to a great extent, will apply to the other end of the route, the river which this canal system would descend into the Georgian Bay, where mills, pulp factories and industries of all sorts could be established, as well as at this end of the route.

Now, Sir, I may be asked why a canal through this country would do more to develop it than would a railway. I think I have already partly answered that question by showing how the mere construction of a canal would provide power in convenient form for many industries. I may go a little further. Suppose these industries to be established, they will not only provide freight to be carried by the canal during the time it is opened, but, during the winter time when the canal is stopped by frost, the water powers will be going on, and freight will be produced which will have to be shipped by rail. So this canal will not only provide freight to be carried through its own system, but freight to be carried by existing and future railways in the same district or country. As a through route for grain from the great west, our own and that of the United States, this canal would stand unrivalled. The earlier projectors whom you have heard mentioned, and the statesmen who are not projectors, who have in years past referred to this as a practical route for a canal, certainly had great foresight.

A look at the map shows that if a canal be feasible along the lines on which this is laid down, it is the directest line possible between the upper lakes and the head of sea-going navigation at Montreal. Rival schemes have at different times been proposed, surveys have been made, and a great deal of talking has been done ; but none of them can pretend to compare in directness with the route now under consideration. Referring again to my geographical situation, as a member from western Ontario, I should be naturally inclined, perhaps, to favour the long-proposed and long-talked-of canal from Georgian Bay to Toronto, known as the Capreol scheme. But, Sir, there are various reasons why that scheme, which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) tried to galvanize into new life the other evening, cannot compare with the scheme now under consideration, especially from the point of view of a Parliament looking to that which would be in the best interest of the greatest number of people. In the first place, that canal would not develop a new country of great but unworked resources, it would go almost entirely through a country which is already well settled and developed and supplied with means of communication, largely at the public expense. In the second place—and I think this alone is fatal to the scheme in comparison with the Ottawa and Georgian Bay plan—freight coming from Georgian Bay to Toronto by that proposed canal would be only some fifty or sixty mile nearer Montreal when it got to Toronto than freight would be when delivered at the Georgian Bay terminus of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal. So, that, after all this canalling between the Georgian Bay and Toronto, you would only gain sixty miles towards tide-water, and you would still have the eastern half of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, with its rapids and canals to descend, before you reached the head of sea-going navigation. Now, Sir, that comparison alone is quite sufficient to knock this scheme out. It is 430 miles from the Georgian Bay to Montreal by the proposed canal route ; it is somewhere between 360 and 400 miles from Toronto to Montreal by lake and river navigation, so that you would only be gaining thirty or forty miles towards tide-water by constructing a canal from the Georgian Bay to Toronto, while by constructing something like fifteen or twenty miles of actual canalling on the Georgian Bay route, you would place Montreal in direct communication with the waters of that bay. That consideration alone, I think, is sufficient to turn the scale in favour of this scheme as compared with the other.

But if anything further were wanted, it is the fact that there is a financial proposal by responsible parties before the Government to build a canal from Ottawa to the Georgian Bay ; there is no definite pro-

posal from any parties at all, that I am aware of, to build a canal the other way. The latter is a scheme that has been talked of a great many years, but it is one which nobody with capital has been willing to take up. The present scheme has been talked of for some time, and persons with capital have been willing to take it up, and have shown their ability and readiness to go on with it. So I think we may fairly leave out of the account the talked of, but not proposed, Toronto scheme, in favour of the well-defined scheme which has taken shape for a canal between this city and the Georgian Bay.

In this connection, it is only fair-play and common justice to refer to my old friend, Mr. McLeod Stewart, of this city, and the efforts he has made to secure the construction of this canal, and the phenomenal success that has attended those efforts in the money markets of the old country. I do not think any other Canadian, not a heavy capitalist, has ever had such success as Mr. McLeod Stewart has had in floating a scheme of this kind on the English market. The greatest possible credit is due to his brains and pluck for what he has done in this matter, no matter what the future of the scheme may be.

Now, Sir, I want to say a few words in reference to some remarks by the hon. member for East Grey on the last occasion this scheme was before us. He rather questioned the accuracy of the estimates made by Mr. Clarke, Mr. Shanley and Mr. Bender, formerly Government engineers, and well known men, but it is from their governmental surveys that the figures used in this debate by the friends of the scheme, have been compiled; they are official figures. It is possible that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of the scheme when he spoke had not been perfected by an examination of the profile of the whole Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal scheme, which had been hung up in the lobby of the House a day or two before he spoke on the subject; he is therefore excusable for not having fully realized the facts of the case. He was also in error, as I find from some notes I have here of what he said, in saying that there would be sixty-eight miles of canal to be built under this proposed scheme. As a matter of fact, I understand that there will be only something between twenty and thirty-three miles of canal on the whole route from Montreal to the Georgian Bay, about fifteen miles of which are already in existence between here and Montreal, leaving a balance of something about eighteen miles, probably, to be constructed. As a matter of fact, this is hardly a canal scheme at all, it is a scheme for developing the inland navigation which already exists, by connecting lakes and rivers which are in themselves navigable, by means of locks. Nearly all the so-call canalling on this scheme consists of short stretches between lakes, except one considerable stretch which has been referred to by other speakers.

I think that is all I have taken note of here that was said by the hon. gentleman, to which I need refer on this occasion. The great gain in distance between Liverpool and the western wheat market, by this route, has been already alluded to in this House and I do not think it necessary to repeat these figures. I think it may be taken as proven by statistics, already placed before this House, that this route will vastly shorten the distance between the western grain fields and Liverpool and that it will become the chief channel for such part of the grain traffic as is water borne. I think it would by no means do away with the railways; it would by no means injure their usefulness or receipts. It has not been found elsewhere that canals have been ruinous to railways, in fact, as I think I pointed out a while ago, the construction of this canal would be most useful to the railways in providing freight, both summer and winter, to railways contiguous to it or connected with it at certain points. That is all that is necessary for me to say in this connection in stating my reasons for furthering this scheme. To summarize they are these: First, a cheapening of grain transport, and, second, the establishment of great industries, the development of the water-power situated along this canal, mills for grinding some portion of the grain in transit, pulp mills, saw-mills, factories of all kinds, the development of electrical power, for all purposes and the consequent settlement of this uninhabited region as a result of this great development of industry. For all these reasons I have felt compelled, though I at one time looked upon the scheme as chimerical, to give my warm adhesion and support to it. Of course, I do not know what the Government are prepared to say on the subject, or, whether they are prepared to commit themselves to-night to any definite statement. I do not think that we should be too insistent upon them to say exactly what their opinion is at this moment, though it is doubtless most advisable that their decision, whatever decision they may come to, should be made known to the public. It is well that they should know what hon. members on both sides of the House think upon the question, and I have thought it would be interesting to them to know what a member from a distant part of the province of Ontario, having no personal or local connection with the scheme, thinks about it, and for that reason I have taken up this much of the time of the House.

Mr. THOMAS MACKIE (North Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I suppose that as this proposed canal will pass along the border of my constituency I will be expected to say something in regard to the matter. I shall

not pretend to state all the advantages to Canada involved in this project. I merely want to point out the water stretches along the route. I need not say anything about the Ottawa River between here and Montreal, which is pretty well known, and as to which it will not cost very much to construct a ship canal along its course. I imagine that the most expensive portion of the route will be the first four miles from Ottawa to the head of Deschenes Rapids. From that point there is a water stretch to the Chats Rapids about 30 miles over which there are steamers now running that are drawing from seven to eight feet of water. There is a canal to be built at the Chats Rapids, but it will not cost quite as much as it would have done at one time, because a portion of the work was constructed years ago. Then we go on to the Chats Lake, which takes us through a fine stretch of water for about 25 miles until we come to Portage du Fort. This course runs through a fine farming country. Supplies used to go to the lumbering districts here, but now the settlement is so much improved and farming has taken the place of lumbering to such an extent that the produce of the district has not a local market and must find an outlet at the seaboard. At Portage du Fort there is a succession of rapids but the water is deep. When we get above these there are other stretches and we pass through lakes six to eight miles in length with rapids between them. When we get above Pocket's Rapids at Westmeath, we have a stretch of water for about 60 miles. From there to Des Joachims there is a stretch of about 40 miles and the water is supposed to be about 200 feet deep. There is an inland lake, which, with a short canal into it, would enable us to escape all the rapids. Most of these rapids only require one or two locks to enable us to get over them. At Mattawa we leave the Ottawa River. It is supposed that this canal is going to cost a large amount of money in constructing it along the course of the Ottawa River. I do not think it will if the promoters take the right way of handling the project. There is a large number of stretches of lakes, thousands of square miles in extent on the Upper Ottawa. With very little expense these lakes could be dammed up so as to retain the freshets which come down the Ottawa in the spring. This would regulate the water level during the whole season. We will say that there will be 10 feet of a rise and fall in the Ottawa River. I feel quite satisfied that by damming the Upper Ottawa and reserving the water it could be kept five or six feet higher in the lower Ottawa all season that it is at low water in the summer so that it would not take so much canalling as might otherwise be necessary. We know that great areas are flooded by the water that comes down the Ottawa River in the spring, but the adoption of this suggestion would retain the water and enable you to have sufficient water for the purposes of navigation all summer. The water-powers along the Ottawa River would be enhanced in value by having this steady flow of water all summer. Then we leave the Ottawa River at Mattawa which is 200 miles from Ottawa. The canal, as proposed, will follow the Mattawa, 40 odd miles, until it enters Lake Nipissing, after which there is deep water all the way along the French River until the Georgian Bay is reached and very few locks would have to be built from there through to the Georgian Bay. This scheme has been discussed for many years, and surveys have been made by eminent engineers. I think Mr. Walter Shanly made a survey of the whole route at one time, and he estimated that the canal would cost $30,000,000. That was some forty years ago. I imagine that works that would cost $30,000,000 at that time could be constructed now for $20,000,000.

In those days all great works were constructed by manual labour, and we had not steam drills or steam dredges or any of these modern labour-saving appliances which now cheapen construction. I feel satisfied that at the present day, $20,000,000 would give us that great water route clear through to the Georgian Bay, and I believe, Sir, that without any trouble whatever, we will have an adequate flow of water the whole season around. This route, in my opinion, is feasible of construction, and being feasible it will afford the shortest possible route, and the quickest and cheapest means of transportation from the Georgian Bay to Montreal. The lumber is now getting small on the Ottawa River and its tributaries, and I believe if this canal is constructed, fine timber will be found further back and brought down by vessels and barges for shipment. Let me impress upon the Government that they seriously consider this matter, for I believe that when they get an estimate of the cost of the work, they will come to the assistance of the people and have this canal constructed. I hope, Sir, before two years are past, to see a good section of the Georgian Bay Canal at least under way.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). Mr. Speaker, when the Trent Valley Canal was under discussion in former years in this House, each member representing a constituency in the district was expected to say something in its favour. And, Sir, when the Ottawa Ship Canal is under discussion in Parliament, it not only is a question for the members in the district, but it is a question interesting to members all over the Dominion, because it is a matter which vitally effects the whole of Canada. It is my opinion that the portion of the country which will derive the greatest advantage from the construction of this canal is the great producing areas of the North-west, because the prime question with the producers of that

district is to get their produce cheaply to the seaboard. It is said that the construction of the canal will reduce the cost of transit of our north-western grain to the seaboard, fully 50 per cent. I am not able to verify this statement, but I do know that the Georgian Bay Canal is the shortest and best route to the head of ship navigation, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that a canal running around by way of Toronto would be more beneficial in that respect. At the same time, Sir, I am not able to be so enthusiastic as some of the other members who have favourably discussed the Georgian Bay Canal question. I believe that before the St. Lawrence Canal system was constructed, was the time when this Georgian Bay Canal project should have been carried out. Forty years ago it was a live question in this portion of the country, and I feel sure it will become a live question again, but just how soon I am unable to say. If the proposition, that a British syndicate is to build the canal can be satisfactorily carried out, it may be a live question almost immediately, but I must be permitted to express my individual opinion, that that is hardly the right way to go about the matter. The Government is asked to guarantee 3 per cent interest on $18,000,000 or $20,000,000, for the carrying out of this project, and if that amount be sufficient to complete it, it should, in my opinion, receive the hearty support of every member of this House. We must, however, remember that all the estimates now being made are on the basis of a survey which took place away back in the sixties, and if it is found that the $20,000,000 will not construct the canal, my opinion is that the Government undoubtedly would be called upon to guarantee interest on a further sum.

Mr. POUPORE. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. At all events that is my opinion. Now, Canada can carry a certain amount of indebtedness, and it is my belief, speaking in general terms, that the indebtedness of the country is at present sufficiently large, and that a sufficient sum has been paid out to afford means of transport from the west to the east until we reach further development.

Mr. POUPORE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) allow me one word? The conditions upon which the guarantee is asked are these. The Government is not responsible, nor will the bonds commence to run until after the canal has been completed. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) not to forget that feature of it. The Government do not assume any responsibility now.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not oppose, but I support with all my heart the carrying out of this project just as rapidly as it can properly be carried out. As to the providing of the finances, I simply made the statement that I think we are beginning at the wrong end, and I was proceeding to say further that in the matter of expenditure on public works, this country can bear just so much, and for the present we have reached, perhaps, the limit of large expenditures until we have a large population in Canada. We have expended a large sum of money in the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the construction of the Parry Sound Railway, and at present we are expending a large amount in the deepening of our St. Lawrence Canals, each of which undertaking is affording means of transportation from the west to the east. Now, my opinion is, that if this project will in any way add materially to the burdens of the people, it would be desirable not to proceed at once with its construction; but, if the English syndicate will build a canal on the conditions suggested, and if it will be satisfactorily carried out in every respect, I say with all my heart, let them build it. It is my humble opinion, however, that a more judicious and better way to proceed would be for the Government to come to Parliament for an appropriation to carry out a survey, and to estimate exactly the cost of the construction of this canal. After this is done the question will be in a better shape to be dealt with. I am throwing no cold water on the scheme whatever; I am perfectly in favour of the scheme, but this has been my view from the first, and it is my view now. As to the development of the Ottawa region, and the advancement of our mineral and lumber resources, and the affording of the cheapest and best route for the carrying of the grain from the Northwest to the east, there is no doubt at all that the Georgian Bay Canal is the best scheme. Now, this question has been dealt with at length in a statistical way by other speakers, who are far better posted on the subject than I am. I have simply dealt with the general principle, and have suggested what I think is the best way of proceeding with it. I believe the time will come, whether in the near future or in the more distant years, when this great work will be carried out; and when it is, it will not be simply a matter of local interest, but as a work of great interest to Canada, perhaps greater, than any of the great public works of the past.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I desire with great diffidence to say a few words on this vast engineerng project. I would not presume for a moment to speak with any authority on a matter of this kind; but I think one may form such an opinion on the scheme as to justify him in endorsing it and voting for it, even though unequal to the task of discussing it from an engineering standpoint. Now, Sir, what my hon. friend who has just addressed the House has said is what

weighs most with me in regard to it. I saw a calculation, made by an eminent engineer, as to what the reduction in the cost of carrying the wheat of the North-west would be, if we had the Montreal and Georgian Bay Canal; and it exceeded 50 per cent the calculation made by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards). With a canal like this, you would secure for the vast grain fields of the North-west and for the vast mineral products on the shores of Lake Superior the greatest possible benefit. and you would secure for the people of the North-west what is their great desideratum, to be brought to the sea on approximately equal terms with the people of Ontario. Now, it does not seem to me that the financial objection, which has been stated by my hon. friend, is a very serious one, or one which should make us pause. when we are confronted with a question of going on with this scheme. My hon. friend deprecates adding to the burden of taxation and the burden of debt of this country. There is nobody in this House who would be more earnest in endorsing an attitude of that kind than myself. But, when I look at the proposal of my hon. friend, I do not see that it is a very alarming one from that point of view. It only asks for a guarantee after the canal had been completed and is in working order—after it has become an established fact. And we have the evidence of Mr. Thompson, of Duluth, who, I am told, is a high engineering authority, before the Senate committee, as to the feasibility of this scheme, and not only as to its feasibility, but this eminent expert declares that it has this unique advantage, that no canal scheme that can be projected on this continent can for one moment compare with it, whether you regard it as an outlet for the North-west Territories, or as a vast power-producing scheme for developing the incohate wealth along its border. That being so, I do not think we need have much hesitation in endorsing it. Guaranteeing the bonds on $20,000,000, after the work has been established, does not seem to me to compare in onerousness with some schemes which have been entered into in this House with a light heart. I have been in this House now some fourteen or fifteen sessions, and it has been my fortune to see, session after session, gentlemen who would hesitate to vote a small sum, come down and with a light heart vote millions and millions away for schemes which a great number of them did not understand. But although this is a vast and complicated undertaking, although in its many ramifications it is one that would require great study and some expert knowledge thoroughly to master it, yet, as compared with some of the schemes I have referred to, it is easily understood. There is not one of us who has travelled over a canal, inspected a lock and seen power produced by damming, who cannot understand what a great advantage this great work would be to Canada, if once it had become an accomplished fact. It would not only be a great thing for those vast fields in the North-west and those unmeasured and immeasurable mining properties on the shores of Lake Superior, but it would do more than even the $60,000 a year which the right hon. gentleman proposes to give, to make the city of Ottawa the Washington of the North; and it would add immensely to the wealth and commercial importance of the city of Montreal. Now, I am told that for this great wealth-producing scheme Canada is too small—that we could not bear the taxation. My mind goes back to the first time that I was taken over these buildings, by a Minister of the Crown, in 1872; and, although he was a colleague of Sir John Macdonald, when I praised the buildings—and then the Langevin Block was not built—he said: "Yes, but what a fearful piece of extravagance! They are altogether beyond this country; it was a monstrous thing ever to build it. Canada cannot bear the burden which they entail upon her." Now, we know that these buildings are not large enough. We know that the great mistake that was made was not to have such foresight as would realize the great progress which Canada would make and the great expansion which its business would enjoy.

Sir, I am sure that the most sanguine man amongst us does not realize the progress that Canada will make henceforth every year. We have only to look back to the progress made by the United States. Look back to the time when the United States had a population about the size of ours, and a little later on when that population had to some extent increased, read the speeches of the statesmen in the English House of Commons at the time when the population in the United States was not as large as that in Canada, when the trade of that country would not compare with ours to-day, when its organized and developed works could not be placed in the scale one minute with those of Canada, look also to the progress made by that country since then, and then you will be able to make some forecast of the vast possibilities that are before this great premier colony of the Empire. Looking at ourselves geographically, we are in the process of forming a vast empire. We have the finest wheat lands, both undeveloped and developed, in the world. There is no country in the world to-day that has such a vast prospect, there is no country in the world holds out to the agriculturists of England, Ireland and Scotland and the continent of Europe, such advantages as those great plains in our North-west; and even handicapped as those great plains are by their distance from the sea, I can assure my hon. friend that I could take him to farmers around In-

dian Head. Regina and Moosejaw, who came in there poor men ten or fifteen years ago, and who have since made wealth, who have not only the farms they settled on—the 160 acres and the pre-emption—but have bought Canadian Pacific Railway land. They are land-holders, they are cultivating large tracts, and some of them have $10,000 and $15,000 to their credit in the banks. These are not isolated cases, and they have reached that position in the face of certain enormous difficulties. When you take into account the vast extent of territory they have to travel to get to the seaboard, when you take into account the large amount they have to pay for freighting their wheat to the seaboard, it is a triumphant testimony to the wealth that is at the command of any competent farmer who goes to these plains, that in the face of these difficulties they have been able to make smiling homes and rich farmsteads, and to have $10,000 and $15,000 to their credit in the banks.

You know, Sir, that I, from time to time, in this Chamber, contended strenuously that whatever Government is in power, whether it calls itself Liberal or Conservative, it is bound to do all that it can to reduce the freight rates from the centre of this continent to the seaboard; it is bound to place the farmers of the North-west Territories as nearly as possible on an equality with the farmers to the east and west, who are near the seaboard. Especially is the Government of Canada bound to do that and bound to have the Canadian Pacific Railway co-operate with it, because not merely to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, but other lines of railway, we in the North-west Territories have given the land. It is from us the lands have come. To be sure, you sometimes boast that you have subscribed millions, but if you have, we have given our share, we have given the lands to build this great railway and other railways, and therefore the farmers of the North-west Territories, whose lands have been thus given, are entitled to every possible consideration in order to place them on a level, or as nearly as possible on a level, with the farmers more fortunately situated as to distance.

What I have contended might be done in another way, will be done directly and efficiently the moment you have a canal of this kind constructed. All experience shows us—the experience of the United States, of Hungary, of Germany, of England—that there is no competitor of a railway so successful in lowering freight as the canals; and now I am going to bring before you another astonishing fact. There is no such feeder for the railways, whose freights it reduces, there is no such enricher of the railways as that very canal. In England, on the continent of Europe, in the United States, it has been proved to the astonishment of railway owners, who spent tens of thousands of dollars fighting the canal, that after the canal had been in existence, after it had reduced their freight rates, they have been ready to bless God that the canal was built, because it has produced so much wealth and commerce in the little towns along the routes of both the water-way and the railway, that instead of having their freight lessened, the railways had to build hundreds of cars and increase their engine and their station power, because the little towns and villages that were as silent as the city of the dead, became full of thriving business, owing to the construction of the canal, and the railway had all it could do to deal with the local traffic. So that you need not be surprised to find a man so far-seeing as Sir William Van Horne, the ex-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, endorsing this scheme, because he knows well that the minute you have a scheme of this sort in operation, you will increase the traffic on the railroad. There is wealth along the Ottawa River today, yet that wealth will be but a flea-bite compared with what will exist after this canal has been five years in existence. Towns will spring up that are now not dreamed of, factories will be built, and electric power will be brought into play, that in every kind of production of civilized advance and progressive energy, will be a powerful factor.

I wish to speak on this matter as a North-west man. If anything has to be paid, we will have to pay our share, and by the time we have to pay it, we will have very much more population than now and be better able to bear the burden, but speaking as a North-west man, knowing the advantages this scheme would be to every farmer, and looking forward to a time when not merely this canal with its advantages will be a great producer, but looking forward to a time when our waterways will be properly utilized, so that into the remotest part of this continent we shall be able to send by water, and send effectively, I would hail the accomplishment of such a work as this, believing that it would be of the greatest possible advantage to the North-west Territories, and as I have already said, not only to the North-west Territories, but to Canada at large.

Mr. BRODER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 38) respecting the attachment of salaries of public officers and employees of the Government.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. This Bill has been before the House for the last three or four

sessions, and I think it is just as well that we should discover whether it is to be killed now or whether we are to go on with it. I may say that last session the Prime Minister promised that while he was unable to support it then, if it was brought up this year in some amended form he expected to be able to support it. That being the case, I took measures to have the Bill drafted in the most careful manner——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has spoken on this motion; if so, he is out of order in speaking now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am anxious to have the second reading, and I move it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already moved the second reading.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I merely wished to call attention to one or two points. The Minister of Justice gave me his opinion of the Bill, which is to the effect that there is no constitutional objection——

Mr. SPEAKER. This is the same debate as when this Bill was up on a previous occasion, and the hon. gentleman cannot speak twice. He is out of order in speaking now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. When do I speak, then, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DAVIN. Speak on the motion to go into committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do I speak next year or——

Mr. SPEAKER. When the Bill is in committee the hon. gentleman will have the opportunity to speak.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no doubt from what I know of the members that they will favour the second reading and allow the Bill to go to the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection to the second reading of the Bill. I do not commit myself to the principle, and in such a thin House as this, I would not have the House committed to it finally. We can take the second reading and consider the Bill further at a later stage.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Am I at liberty to reply to that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ADJOURNMENT—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before the House adjourns, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter to which I want to call to the attention of the House. I have here the report of a meeting that was held at Pictou, this report appearing in the Toronto "Mail and Empire," and I wish to call the attention——

Mr. SPEAKER. On the motion to adjourn at this time no speeches can be made except on a question as to whether the House should adjourn or not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I propose to oppose the adjournment if necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order, on such a motion as this, in calling attention to the report of a public meeting.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend wishes to make a personal explanation concerning something in the paper to which he refers.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a personal explanation, of course that is different.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Decidedly, it is a question of personal explanation. I had the honour to be invited to a pic-nic of the farmers of Prince Edward County on Saturday last. At that meeting certain speeches were made, one by myself, and I wish to call attention to a report which does me serious injustice. The report has a subheading "the Yukon iniquity," and immediately under that says:

R. L. Richardson, M. P. for Lisgar, Manitoba, and editor of the Winnipeg "Tribune," spoke on the same topic,——

—the topic mentioned by the previous speaker was tariff rates on the railroads—

——and mentioned incidentally that while the old Government put down the rates one and one-half cents, and were strongly censured by the Opposition, the latter had, since coming into power, not been able to lower them one cent.

I have no conception what that refers to. I did not speak as to the late Government putting down rates. My knowledge of history does not lead me to believe that they ever reduced the rates on anything. Nor did I say anything about this Government not reducing rates. The statement is so different from anything I said that I do not even know what it can refer to. It says also:

He spoke strongly on the abolition of the Senate, and considered it as a needless expense to the country, but at the same time was very thankful they hoisted the Yukon Bill.

It is true I referred to the Senate, advocating its abolition. I believe in the abolition of the Senate and have always believed so. I have no apology to offer for that opinion. But I did not express thankfulness that the Senate had hoisted the Yukon Bill; I did not refer, directly or

indirectly to that measure. As a matter of fact, I voted for the Yukon Bill, and would not take the absurd position of expressing thanks that the Senate had hoisted it. The report goes on to give a list of those who spoke, including Mr. D. D. Rogers, M. P. for Frontenac; J. L. Haycock, ex-M.P. for Frontenac—Mr. Haycock was not at the meeting at all—W. V. Pettet, M.P. for Prince Edward; Arnold McFaul, Honorary County President—Mr. McFaul was not at the meeting—W. B. Scott, vice-president, and A. S Carson, grand trustee, B. F. Wilson, E. T. Dorland and James P. Urtelle. Not one of the last three of these gentlemen named spoke at all. This report refers also to Mr. Goldwin Smith's speech, and I think in justice to Mr. Smith I should make this statement——

Mr. DAVIN. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) is clearly not in order now.

Mr. RICHARDSON Then I will conclude. I merely wished to put myself right. The report of Mr. Goldwin Smith's speech, is, I may say, a tissue of falsehoods.

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

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, &c., in reference to the recent appointment of a postmaster at Clifton, New London, in the province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all correspondence with the hon. the Minister of Militia and Mr. Mark Workman, of Montreal, relating to his contract for militia clothing or other Government work.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all papers, documents and correspondence in connection with the dismissal of John Herns, caretaker of the public building in the town of Napanee.—(Mr. Wilson, by Mr. Prior.)

Return showing: 1. The amount paid in the province of Prince Edward Island since 1896 as fines for the infraction of the lobster fishery regulations, the names of persons so fined, and the amount of fine in each case.

2. A detailed statement of the fines collected.

3. The disposition of those fines.

4. The cost of prosecution in each case.

5. The names of fishery officers receiving a share of such fines, and the amount received in each by any officer.

6. The magistrate or other officer who tried such cases.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copy of all correspondence between the Government and the boards of trade of the Dominion in regard to the passage of an insolvency law.—(Mr. Monk, by Mr. Dugas.)

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, reports, telegrams, &c., in connection with the proposed change of mail arrangements for Grand View, in Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 20th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TIME FOR PRESENTING PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved:

That that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for presenting Private Bills, be suspended in respect to the Bill affecting the Edmonton District Railway Company, according to the 19th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the time has now come in this session when it is really a question whether such a motion as that should receive the attention of the House. I do not say that this is not an exceptional case, but I think it is necessary that at this period a reason should be given to the House for any further extension of the Rule.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is the last meeting the committee are to hold this session, and this Bill had been advertised in several papers, but one paper in the Yukon Territory had not been received, and it was owing to that we suspended the rule. In every other particular the rule was complied with.

Mr. SPROULE. The serious objection is, the continuing to introduce private Bills so long after the proper time has expired.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The reasons assigned by the proposers of this Bill were considered by the committee sufficient for the suspending of the rule. They showed that it was impossible for them to comply fully with the rule, and as there was no private interest in danger, we thought it a hardship to knock them out.

Motion agreed to.

THE STATIONERY SUPPLY FOR MEMBERS.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That the third, fourth and fifth reports of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, be concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what is the purport of this. The report says:

The committee recommend that a report be made to both Houses, calling attention to the fact that a resolution passed by this committee on Friday, 13th May, 1898, and reported to both Houses, and which was concurred in, viz.:—

"That for the next fiscal year and for the future, the members, officers and those on the

official list of the Press Gallery of the House of Commons, be provided for their use with stationery in every particular equal to that supplied to the hon. members of the Senate, and that Messrs. Gibson, Sutherland and LaRivière be appointed a sub-committee to have powers to revise and suggest such alterations as may be deemed expedient therein for the convenience of members, &c.," has not been acted upon, and the committee urge its recommendation to be carried into effect.

If the House has already passed that report, I do not see what further effect the House can give it if they pass it again. If it has not gone into effect there must be some good reason, and perhaps the chairman of the committee can give us that reason. Might I also ask the chairman of the Printing Committee with reference to the stationery for the use of members, as to where it is bought and how it is bought?

Mr. GIBSON. This matter was brought before the Joint Committee on Printing shortly after its organization in the first session of this Parliament, and it was pointed out by the members of the committee generally that the stationery supplied to the members of the House of Commons was very much inferior to that supplied to the members of the Senate. The Senators on the committee informed us that they had an internal committee appointed to regulate all matters connected with the stationery supplied, and it was then suggested that a committee might be appointed from the House of Commons to deal with this question. I may say frankly that I went to the present Speaker of the House, and he told me that he was informed by the Sergeant-at-Arms that this was entirely within his own cognizance, and that the Committee on Printing had nothing to do with it. The matter rested there and then. It was afterwards brought up in the committee—I was not present at the meeting, but, however, I will not go back on the report—and this report was reaffirmed on the 6th of June, and we are asking for concurrence in it. So far as the committee are concerned, they cannot give any explanation to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), further than to say that complaints have been made to them from time to time about the mucilage on the envelopes, about the inferiority of the paper generally, and about the meagre, and might I say measly, quantity of stationery that was supplied to the members of the House of Commons this session and last.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIBSON. For that reason I am glad that the matter has been brought before the House, because if it is in the hands of the Speaker then we know who to look to. It has always been considered that the committee supplied the stationery, and on behalf of the committee I might say that they are quite willing to deal with this matter as they do in the Senate. The privilege has not been extended to us further than the supplying of the leather trunks, and I think the members will agree that the leather trunks given this Parliament will bear comparison with any trunks previously supplied. I may say that every member of the committee is quite in accord with this recommendation which was passed by the House in May, 1898.

The committee that was then appointed by the Printing Committee consisted of Mr. LaRivière, Mr. Sutherland and myself, and I may say frankly that we have never done anything, simply because Mr. Speaker claimed that that was entirely in his own hands. Of course, if the House wants to take the matter up and place it in the hands of the committee, I as one member of the committee am willing to take my share of the responsibility of furnishing the members of the House with good stationery.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In the Senate this part of the public service is under the control of a committee called the Committee on Contingencies. We had a similar institution in this House in former years, but it was abolished, and this service was vested in the Committee on Internal Economy, of which I understand the Speaker is chairman. The House in former years did away with one of its privileges, and I think it was a mistake. It is true, we have now no control over this matter, except in making complaints if we are not properly dealt with, and voting the money for the payment of the service. When we were investigating this matter, we called upon the clerk in charge of the stationery department upstairs, and asked him how it was that the stationery we were getting to-day was inferior to that which we had got hitherto, and we were informed that he had received orders from the hon. the Speaker to purchase the stationery from a certain firm in Toronto, and that samples had been supplied to that firm, and they had pledged themselves to supply stationery of a quality equal to the samples, but they had not carried out their contract. There were no tenders asked for. They were simply asked to supply the stationery of the House, provided that it would not cost any more than that which we had before, I understand, from a firm in Scotland. They were not asked whether they could supply the stationery any cheaper, or whether they could supply the same article, but they were asked to supply an article almost equal to that, and were allowed the price that was paid before. I think this is an unbusinesslike manner of dealing with this matter. At any rate, the House is not responsible for what has been done; but to-day we are face to face with the fact that we are getting stationery which is not equal to what we ought to have as members of this House, and I hope that an understanding will be come to between those

who have charge of that branch of the service and the Printing Committee of this House, which is responsible for the payment for the same. By such an understanding we perhaps would get a better article, and give to the members of the House the satisfaction to which they are entitled.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. member tell us the name of that firm in Toronto ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The name of the firm was not mentioned.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, it was. When we examined the clerk of stationery in the committee, we had from him the name of the firm which now furnishes the stationery. It is the house of Warwick Bros. & Rutter, of Toronto. Now, I do not want to occupy the time of the House except to repeat what the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) have both said, that we were very much astonished last year and the year before to find that the stationery was in such a bad condition ; and as we were members of the committee which was supposed to buy the stationery, we asked the chairman the reason. We were told that the committee were not responsible for it. Then, a committee was struck on the 13th of May, 1898, consisting of three gentlemen, Messrs. Gibson, Sutherland and LaRivière, to look into the matter. They in fact did nothing, because they reported that Mr. Speaker had taken upon himself to see to the furnishing of stationery for the House. We then called upon the clerk, and he told us that he had instructions to buy all the stationery he required from the house whose name I mentioned a moment ago. We have had many complaints from the members that the stationery is bad, and we thought it better to bring the whole question before the House, as we are now doing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that last session several complaints were made to me of the quality of the stationery. I do not know that I had any more right to interfere than any other member of the House, unless as a member of the Printing Committee. I made inquiry of the clerk of stationery, and he told me that there was no complaint of the stationery furnished by the firm named. It is only fair to that firm to say that. He told me that that firm did not supply the envelopes, which were the principal subject of complaint.

Mr. BERGERON. The whole stationery is bad.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. However, the members of the House did seem to be under the impression that the Committee on Printing was responsible for the quality of the stationery furnished. I was not present at the meeting of the committee, but I understand that they thought, I believe unanimously, that it would be a solution of the matter to place it in the hands of that branch of the committee which belongs to the House of Commons, and the chairman has explained the reason why that committee never met or took any action. It is in the hands of the House, I suppose, to say what position they will make of the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a question that ought to be determined by the committee themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. They have determined it. They cannot put their determination into effect.

The PRIME MINISTER. Where is their determination ?

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that the committee went as far as they could. They appointed their sub-committee, and gave into the hands of that sub-committee the charge of the stationery, and ordered them to get it ; but when the sub-committee took steps to do that, they found, as has been stated, that Mr. Speaker thought it to be his duty to attend to the matter. Consequently, the committee came up against a fence, and they have not been able to do anything.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a matter, I repeat, on which we can ask the views of the committee ; and if there is a conflict of jurisdiction there ought to be some means of untying the knot, and giving satisfaction to the House. I would advise that the report be sent back to the committee for their further consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see what the committee could do other than they have done. They discussed the question and came to a conclusion in 1898, a year ago, and their conclusion was endorsed by the House a year ago ; and they simply have not been able to do anything. If we endorse their resolution or send it back to them, it is we ourselves who have to deal with ourselves, because it is the House that has adopted the action of the committee, and, therefore, has undertaken to stand behind the committee.

Mr. GIBSON. The resolution carried a year ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the resolution was carried by the House a year ago. Consequently it is for the House to consider whether its idea, as expressed by the resolution of the committee, which it adopted and made its own, shall be carried out or not. For my own part, I think the better thing to do will be to have the stationery for the use of members selected by the members of the committee of the Printing Committee. The Printing Committee have charge of the printing affairs of the House and they would select the kind and style of stationery they want, I give it simply as my own opinion, that it would be far better for the committee and the House, after the committee has done

its duty by selecting the samples and deciding on the quality of the stationery, to hand those over to the Queen's Printer and make him responsible for seeing that the stationery is supplied according to the sample. We had better keep this matter of peddling around the patronage for the paper we use out of the hands of the Speaker.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If there is a conflict of authority between the committee and the Speaker, I would not interfere to pronounce either one way or the other. On the contrary, I think the sound rule would be, if I may state it so, to support the authority of the Speaker, and I would not be prepared to say who is in the wrong. The best suggestion is to send the report of the committee with instructions to give the matter their consideration again.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not ask them to confer with the Speaker?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. My hon. friend has failed to read the wording of this report. It is only a recommendation that a report be made to both Houses calling attention to the fact that a certain resolution was passed by this committee on Friday, 13th May, 1898, and reported to both Houses and was concurred in. It only calls attention to the report made a year ago upon which no action was taken. I do not know that it would be necessary for this House to adopt this report, which is merely a report to the House for our own information and does not call for any action.

The PRIME MINISTER. The fact remains that there is a conflict of jurisdiction, and the best way is to refer the report to the committee, and if they have to confer with the Speaker, they can do so.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year, three members of the committee were appointed to do what is done in the Senate, but they did not do anything, because they were told they could not do anything on account of the Speaker doing it himself. The question is to de decided whether it belongs to the Speaker or the committee to choose the stationery.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will allow me to make the suggestion, he will see that the course proposed by the right hon. First Minister commends itself to the judgment of the House. Here is a conflict of jurisdiction, and it is only treating a matter of that importance with sufficient consideration that the committee be instructed to confer again on that subject and make a report to the House.

Mr. GIBSON. On behalf of the committee, I may say that we will be delighted to meet the Speaker and decide the question, because there is no other way. And with the consent of the House, I would move that the fourth and fifth reports of the Committee on Printing be adopted, but that the third report be not concurred in, which is the report dealing with the question now discussed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It will be proper to bring to the attention of the House a point which members of the committee seem to have overlooked, and that is that when Mr. Clark, the clerk of stationery, was examined by the committee, he informed them that the promise was made that the stationery to be supplied by the Canadian producers would be just as good as that supplied from Scotland. It is only fair to Mr. Speaker to say that that was one of the reasons why the change was made, and Mr. Clark informed the committee that in view of the fact that the stationery was not so good, a change would be made back to the old system, and we would obtain the proper kind of stationery.

Mr. CLARKE. Has any step been taken since this discussion came up before, to improve the quality? The envelopes used today are not fit to be used.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to renew his question to me, when we are in committee on supplementary Estimates connected with the House I shall be glad to give him every explanation. The motion is that the fourth and fifth reports of the Joint Committee of both Houses on Printing be adopted, and that the third report be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to take this opportunity of calling attention of the committee to paragraph 63 A in the third report of the Printing Committee, page 403 of the Votes and Proceedings. The motion to print the return therein mentioned was a little premature as the return was not complete. It lacks a date. I have spoken to members of the Government and they agree in my view of the matter that the printing could be deferred until the supplementary return comes down and the date supplied.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That matter is submitted to a special committee with instructions to see that it is brought down.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 158) respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company, and to change its name to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)

THE BELLEVILLE AND PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE.

Mr. HURLEY moved:

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 19th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, the 51st rule and also that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for presenting Private Bills, be suspended in respect of the Bill respecting the Belleville Prince Edward bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. HURLEY. This Bill is asked, not for the purpose of building a bridge, because the bridge has been in existence for eight years; but the proprietors failed, and the parties who had a mortgage bought over the bridge. Now we desire to change the name of the company, so as to facilitate the carrying on of the business by the new proprietors.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I had a letter from Mr. Corby, giving the particulars with regard to this matter, and pointing out that there was no opposition on the part of anybody interested. It is a purely local matter.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the facts? We did not hear the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Hurley's) explanation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is a bridge at Belleville, and the object of the proposed legislation is to change the name of the company and to transfer that property to the new company. Mr. Corby assured me that all parties interested were satisfied. In any case, there will be sufficient notice, as there are only a few interested, and all interests can be represented before the committee. No harm can possibly be done, and the measure will be of great assistance to the new company and to the district that the bridge is intended to serve.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This matter was before the Committee on Standing Orders this morning. As the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has said, this is not asking for incorporation of a new enterprise, but to change the name, in consideration of new proprietors having taken over the bridge.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is done with the consent of the old holders. No private interests will be injured, and the public interests will be served by the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE EXCHEQUER COURT AND RAILWAY DEBTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 159) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts. He said: This Bill is a very short one. The object is to meet such difficulties as occurred in the case of Gray and the Manitoba Northwestern. My learned friends of the House will remember that it was held by the Privy Council that, in case where a railway incorporated by the Parliament of Canada ran partly in one province and partly in another, there is no court that has jurisdiction to dispose of the railway: it must be disposed of in its entirety. The object of the Bill is to give the Exchequer Court jurisdiction to deal with cases of that sort.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ALASKA BOUNDARY AND PACIFIC CABLE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would invite the attention of the right hon. leader of the House to a report of what is said to have taken place in the other Chamber, an announcement by the Minister of Justice that a line has been agreed upon for the Alaska boundary. While I am on my feet, I may say also, I am sure the House will be glad to learn from the leader of the Government what the present position of the Pacific cable question is, whether it has been decided that there should be another convention upon that subject generally. The House, I am sure, would desire to be informed what is the position of these two questions.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the first question, the provisional boundary of Alaska, the report of what is said to have taken place in the other Chamber is inaccurate. What the Minister of Justice intended to say, probably, was, that negotiations were going on for the settlement of a provisional boundary. I explained the matter the other day. The proposition was to have a provisional boundary on the Chilkoot Pass, the White Pass and the Chilkat Pass or Dalton trail. On the Chilkoot Pass and the White Pass a boundary has been agreed upon for two years, and there is nothing to be said with regard to that that would not apply to any time within the last two years. With regard to the Dalton trail, negotiations are proceeding, I may say, satisfactorily, for the location of a provisional boundary. I said, in explaining this matter before, that I thought this boundary would be satisfactory. I think it will be. But my hon. friends know that, until these negotiations have been completed, the Government is not authorized to make them public, to give communication of them to Parliament. I have reason to believe, however, that, so far as these provisional boundaries are concerned, we shall reach a satisfactory settlement. With regard to the permanent boundary, the matter is where it was when it was last mentioned in the House.

Concerning the other question to which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has called attention, the Pacific cable, the hon. gentleman knows that this is a matter which has absorbed a good deal of our attention. Unfortunately, as is well known, the Imperial Government did not choose to ratify the agreement arrived at by the Imperial commission in 1896. They rather introduced resolutions based on this agreement. The Imperial authorities, as my hon. friend knows, and as the House knows, rather took another view, and made other propositions. We did not see our way to accept these new propositions. Without

breaking any confidence, and without entering upon a subject on which I have no authority to speak, I am surely authorized to say—I believe I am, at all events—that we made representations to the Imperial Government, and that a conference is about to take place between the agents of the colonies and the Imperial authorities. The Government has decided to appoint my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who is to go to Europe, and Lord Strathcona to take part in this conference with Sir Sandford Fleming, an expert in the matter. Sir Sandford Fleming, I believe will sail this week.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the First Minister as to the transport of goods through the White Pass. I would like to ask, if there is any difficulty in passing Canadian goods in bond through that pass into Canadian territory again.

The PRIME MINISTER. Over the railway ?

Mr. WALLACE. In any way.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) knows that we have had for two years a bonding arrangement on the White Pass. The goods are collected at the Summit House, where we have a station of the Mounted Police. The arrangement has worked satisfactorily, though we have had at times some objection. The American authorities made conditions which we thought were not in the spirit of the agreement entered into. There have been at times some complaints made, but I must say that of late I have not heard any complaints of the passing of goods and the bonding facilities. Some reports appeared in the press recently that there had been difficulties put in our way by the American authorities. But these reports were not confirmed, after investigation.

Mr. McNEILL. Is the right hon. gentleman in a position to say whether his provisional arrangement as to the boundary is to last any considerable length of time ? There was a talk about two years, or can he say whether it is to be of shorter duration ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say to my hon. friend that no limit of time has been at all taken into consideration. I may say further that we intend to press as much as we can a definite settlement of the boundary.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to a return which was brought down with reference to the Central Railway. The Minister of Railways and Canals, so far as these papers go, ends the correspondence about the 8th of September, 1898. Although that ends the correspondence, I do not think it ends the matter, and I have an idea that it may have been transferred to the Department of Finance. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to it, and if there is any further correspondence in reference to it, I would ask if he will be kind enough to bring it down as a supplementary return.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If the hon. gentleman will send me the return, I will inquire.

PATRONAGE OF THE COUNTY OF VICTORIA, N.S.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before you proceed to the Orders of the Day, I wish to call attention to what I consider is an important matter. It will be in the recollection of hon. members of this House that when this Parliament met three years ago, we had on this side of the House the hon. representative from Victoria, N.S., (Mr. Bethune). In some mysterious way that hon. gentleman disappeared from this side of the House and took up his seat on the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member will conclude with a motion ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I intend to conclude with a motion. I think that something has come to light which makes it necessary that this House should learn something more about the mysterious way in which that hon. gentleman was induced to cross the floor of this House, without, so far as I know, making even the ordinary genuflexions before you, Mr. Speaker, in doing so. My attention was called to an article which appeared in a newspaper published in my county a few days ago, which makes that mystery more mysterious, and which, to my minds, calls for an explanation, if not from the member for Victoria, from the Government, and more particularly from the Minister of Finance. The letter appears in the North Sydney "Herald," published in the county of Cape Breton, and is headed "Patronage of Victoria county—letter from Hon. Wm. Ross" :

> Editor Herald : As there appears to be considerable doubt and nervous uncertainty in the county of Victoria as to the person who now holds the Dominion patronage in said county, and to save me the trouble of writing letters on this subject, I quote the following from a letter received from the Hon. W. S. Fielding, dated May 8th :—
>
> "In the meantime, it is as well that all the parties concerned should understand that the patronage of Victoria is being administered under the advice of Hon. Geo. H. Murray. Anybody who says anything to the contrary either makes a mistake or is desirous of misrepresenting things and making trouble."
>
> To this I may add the following letter addressed to me by the Hon. G. H. Murray, when about leaving for London :—

"As I am now leaving for England in a few days, I would be obliged if you would give such matters of federal patronage as may arise in Victoria county during my absence your best attention. I have written to the Hon. Mr. Fielding advising him to accept your views. I would like to have you consult Mr. Morrison, M.P.P., upon all matters which would require local knowledge."

These letters should once and for all settle the question asked by my numerous correspondents in Victoria.

(Sgd.) W. ROSS.

Halifax, N.S., June 7th, 1899.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, I think, as a member of this House, to protest against what I consider to be a gross injustice to the people of the county of Victoria. It is also my privilege, one which I hold accidentally, to be a constituent of the hon. member for Victoria, and as a constituent I think it a great injustice to my fellow-constituents of that county to be treated in that way. They elected an hon. member to represent their interests in this House by the large majority—by a vote for the hon. member of 1,049 against 877—and after he has put in three years' service in this House, they are told to-day that they have practically no representation here that will be listened to, and instead of having a member to look after their county, they are referred to a gentleman who to-day is parading the streets of London, and never had a seat in this House, and as I said before, the county is without representation in this House. I think that the hon. Minister of Finance owes it to the people of Victoria to explain this very strange position, which not only the Government seems to undertake to occupy, but the member for Victoria also. We have had very strange things take place in the past, and it is no doubt within the knowledge of some hon. members of this House that this gentleman to whom the patronage is transferred as a sub-representative of a sub-representative of the county of Victoria was once a Minister of Militia and Defence in this House, and the defeated candidate in that county has to-day the privilege of not only exercising the privilege of the representation of that constituency, but of transferring that duty to another person. I do not know, but I think I have reason to suspect that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has something to do with this matter. It is not many weeks ago that I thought it my duty to refer to him as having had some responsibility in the transfer of the seat of the member for Victoria from this side of the House to the other side. I had reason to believe that, because of the things that have taken place to my knowledge in past years. I have only to refer the House to a letter of Hon. Wm. Ross, written some years ago in reference to certain negotiations which took place between the hon. member for Victoria and the hon. member for Guysborough. I will take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, of laying the letter before the House, as it may help to throw some light upon this mystery:

Halifax, Dec. 19, 1893.

M. H. McKenzie, Esq.

Dear Sir,—My present intention is to leave here on the 26th inst., so as to be in Sydney that night, and be present at all their ceremonies on the 27th. I wrote D. C. Fraser three times, but he is backing and filling, and my present impression is that he will not go. I must be home Saturday night. It is not to be expected that Sam will be ashore before the new year. I will be pleased at seeing as many as possible of my friends at Sydney. On the square, a friend of mine is acquainted with a young man in the "Herald" office, and he says Cahan wrote Bethune asking if there is any truth in the report that he and Fraser have entered into that rotten alliance, and the doctor did not reply, so they conclude the treaty is signed by both interested parties.

They are not in favour of it, stating that Bethune cannot bind the party. Indeed, they understand the wily, sly, sneaking Doctor well, and say that he is thoroughly selfish and cares nothing for party, but all for self. John A.'s conduct cannot be concealed, but Bethune's cant and hypocritical ways make him a more dangerous and corrupt man than John A. You may make what use you like of this information, but be sure to suppress names. The Harris element is stupidly tied to Bethune. When Sam comes home he will have to decide if he will run. If he so states, then that would be worse than dynamite into the camp of those two beauties, who think they hold the political destinies of Victoria in the hollow of their hands. Even one candidate to begin with would create terror and confusion in the camp. Sam must select his colleague with the approval of our friends in the council if he will win.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. ROSS.

Mr. WALLACE. Was the hon. member for Guysborough one of the beauties.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is one of the beauties. I wish to get some information from the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to this statement, which is a very important one, and I think a very serious one. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I suppose it is my misfortune and my lack of intelligence, but I have great difficulty in understanding what the point is that the hon. gentleman desires information upon. If he will be good enough to tell me what it is that he desires information upon it will be a great pleasure for me to give him the information that he desires. What is the point?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The point is this. I want to know why the county of Victoria, N.S., does not have a representative here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman seems to have the view that if an hon. member does not control the patronage of the county that county has no

representative. If that be the case, Cape Breton has no representative, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) does not control the patronage of Cape Breton. That is exactly where the shoe pinches. The hon. gentleman's control of the patronage of the county was the only thing he ever had to put him in, but now that the hon. member for Cape Breton has lost the patronage of the county he has lost any hope he may ever have had of coming back as a member of this House.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman had better wait and see.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman would have done better to have waited before he brought these petty matters up for the entertainment of the House. Cape Breton was taken from his control in the local elections, and the hon. gentleman knows that he made a pilgrimage away from this House one month ago to try and save the remnant of his political influence in the municipal district of Grand Narrows, and there also he was beaten. The hon. gentleman seems to be disturbed because the premier of Nova Scotia has been allowed to offer advice to the Government in certain matters affecting the county of Victoria. There is no reason why we should not speak candidly in reference to these matters. It is a well-known practice under party government that a defeated candidate, where his party is successful, is consulted respecting the patronage in his county. In this case, the defeated candidate, some time afterwards, was appointed to office, and the moment he ceased to occupy an independent position, the moment that he occupied a position as an officer of this Government, then we thought that he should cease to occupy a position as a political adviser. Thereupon, we looked for another, and we found an able representative of the Government in the person of Premier Murray of Nova Scotia, who represents the county of Victoria in the local legislature, and who, we think, is worthy of all the confidence that this Government can give him. The hon. member for Cape Breton says that he would like to have some information as to the mysterious means whereby the hon. member for Victoria, N. S. (Mr. Bethune) crossed the floor of the House. If so, he will have to apply to that hon. gentleman himself, as I have no knowledge of any mysterious means. That hon. gentleman, exercising his own free will, crossed the floor of the House and took his position on this side of the House, and from that moment to this he has given the Government a loyal and independent support. I want to acknowledge that support, and to thank that hon. gentleman for it; and I say it is a support that is all the more creditable to that hon. gentleman because it came without a shadow of any condition in any shape or form. The hon. gentleman did not ask to control the patronage. He was perfectly aware of the fact that the patronage of Victoria would be controlled by the hon. gentleman who had been advising us in the past. The hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune) perfectly understood that, yet, feeling that the policy of the Government in relation to the great public questions was in the true interest of Canada, of Cape Breton, and in particular, in the interest of his own county, he gave us his support freely and unconditionally, and there is nothing in the transaction which does not do him the highest honour.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I confess I am quite at a loss, after the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has taken his seat, to know what he means. He professes to be quite at sea in respect to what my hon. colleague from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) meant. I think my hon. colleague made it tolerably plain. My hon. colleague never claimed that he, or I, the defeated candidates of Cape Breton, were entitled to use our positions as representatives of that county to advise the Government. That is not the complaint at all, and my hon. friend does not make that complaint now. The complaint he is making is of an entirely different description. I am in the judgment of the House when I say that it is a well-recognized principle of responsible government and parliamentary government, and it is a principle to which hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches resort every hour in the day. When they are called upon to state to this House on what grounds they have exercised their extreme power in regard to patronage, in displacing parties from office without any reason assigned, their answer has invariably been that they have done it upon the advice of the representative of the county supporting the Government, or, if it is a county in which the Government have not a representative in this House, then, they state, as the hon. Minister of Finance has stated, that they look to some other person. I quite agree with them in the selection of Mr. Murray, the Premier of Nova Scotia. They were quite justified in this while the representative of the county of Victoria was an opponent of the Government. They have acted quite right in this, and I believe they have followed a precedent which has been recognized by both parties on both sides of this House in referring to a gentleman who holds the position of the local representative of that county and a high position in that province for advice in regard to the county. That is not the point at all. The point is a grave one, in my opinion, and it is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bethune), who was elected by the electors of Victoria to oppose this Government in a straight party conflict, and to support the Conservative party, has changed sides, has left the Conservative party and gone over without having had the man-

liness to assign, publicly or privately, so far as I am aware, to any person connected with the Conservative party, the reason why he has changed his seat in this House. I never questioned his action. I did not consider the action of that hon. gentleman of sufficient importance for me to give it a thought.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When I was instructed that negotiations were being had with that hon. gentleman for the purpose of transferring his allegiance to the party that he was elected to oppose and to abandon the party that the county of Victoria elected him to support, I did not consider it worth my while to exchange a word with him or to have any communication with him whatever. I did not consider his action in this House, or out of it, of sufficient importance to require such information. I felt that, when the county that had elected him had the opportunity, they would mark with proper indignation the action of the hon. gentleman who had betrayed his constituency, as they might be expected to mark the unjustified and unjustifiable action of that hon. gentleman. I quite understand that there are occasions on which an hon. gentleman may transfer his allegiance, but such occasion is only when he can give valid grounds to Parliament and to his constituents for his change. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) is most important in connection with parliamentary government, and it is: that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Bethune) having abandoned his party and become an unquestioning supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, should not be treated by the Government with such personal contempt. The Government could have taken no action better calculated to show that he has deprived himself of anything like respect from the Government he has gone to support, than that they should not consult him with reference to the patronage of the county that he claims to represent—although I confess I agree with the Minister of Finance and the Government in the view, that the hon. member (Mr. Bethune) has proved himself so unworthy the confidence of his constituents as to deprive himself of that respect and consideration that every independent supporter of the Government is entitled to claim at their hands. That is the point which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has found it convenient to run away from. He has not told the House why they have treated a gentleman who supports them and claims to represent Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune) with such supreme contempt as they have meted out to him in this case. I have no hesitation in saying, that if they had no supporter in this House representing that county, that this gentleman whom they consulted was a suitable person to consult, but it was treating the member for Victoria (Mr. Bethune) with contempt that they should go down to Halifax and consult a private individual, a defeated candidate who publishes over his signature to the world, the contemptuous manner in which the present member for Victoria (Mr. Bethune) has been treated. That is the point. It is beside the mark for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) to talk about the position that my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) occupies in this House. He (Mr. McDougall) sits here, as I sit here, sustained by an overwhelming majority of his constituents at the general election, and although when the Minister of Finance purchased the seats——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, purchased the seats——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) withdraw that statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give you the reasons for my statement in a moment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will either be sustained or he will take that expression back; one or the other.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is at all parliamentary to accuse an hon. member of this House of purchasing a seat in Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not done so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has done so, and I appeal to "Hansard" to prove it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I appeal to every hon. member who was listening to him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will now speak on the question of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) had not finished his sentence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I had no intention of finishing the sentence in the manner which the Minister of Finance assumed. I stated that when the Minister of Finance claimed, that since the elections of 1896, the constituency of Cape Breton had, by electing local members of the Liberal party, shown that my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) and myself are not in a position to represent the county of Cape Breton; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) cannot sustain such a contention. I was going on to point out that the Liberals were elected to the legislature in the county of Cape Breton

owing to the inducements held out by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), to the effect that he would perpetrate a complete change of policy by abandoning his own policy, and by adopting the policy which I have fought for in this House and out of it, for a quarter of a century. I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) abandoned his policy, abandoned the policy to which his leader was committed, and made an arrangement outside of this House by which the province of Nova Scotia should be carried for the Liberals, upon principles diametrically opposite to those preached by the Liberal party for years. I was justified in stating that the Minister of Finance purchased the support of the people of Nova Scotia, not for himself, but for the local legislature, by adopting the policy of his opponents and abandoning his own policy. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) taunts my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) on that score, he touches me equally, and I tell him that the mode in which the local elections were carried, only confirms the fact that my hon. friend retains the confidence which the electors of Cape Breton have placed in him for many years, and that I retain that confidence with which they have twice entrusted me. It was hardly worth while for the Minister of Finance to go so far afield, to attack the position of an hon. gentleman in this House whose present and whose future is as firm, if not more so, than that of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) himself, for we know that he (Mr. Fielding) at the last general election abandoned his own constituency and went to an outlying section of the province to be returned to this House. And I am told that hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is now, like Japhet in search of a father, hunting over the province of Nova Scotia to find some other constituency which he may carry. He had two railway enterprises to elect him in this outlying section of the province, but he has not been able to realize expectations and now I am told he is looking for another county to represent. I do not say he may not succeed in getting one, but it ill-becomes an hon. gentleman occupying his position to taunt another member of this House with not representing the constituency that sent him here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I might tell my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) that rumour has it that he is not going to run in Cape Breton, but that he is now looking out for another constituency.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can set that rumour at rest for once and for ever. I can tell the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that if I return to this House, I shall return as the representative of the county that twice, by overwhelming majorities, elected me. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that it would take a stronger opponent than he is to deter me from running in that intelligent constituency of Cape Breton. So much for that. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) put a plain, straightforward question, and the Minister of Finance sat down without answering it. The Minister was asked, why it was that he and his Government have departed from the well-recognized principle of parliamentary government, which provides that the members of the Government should look, and properly look, to the representatives of the counties who support them in this House, for consultation and advice. In failing to answer that question, the Minister of Finance has admitted that the Government have adopted a course which I believe never before was adopted, except under very peculiar circumstances by the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches who have in some other cases made bargains as to the use of the patronage of a county with people not in this House. We still await the answer of the Minister of Finance to the important question put to him.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I would not have spoken at all, only that the junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) referred to me as having had something to do with a transaction which is not altogether creditable. I am sure that no more creditable mission could be assigned to me than to try to convert any of these gentlemen. If I did that, I ought to be regarded as a returned missionary, worthy to receive an ovation which none of them have ever been honoured with. It shows what a small matter will raise such a furore. If the hon. leader of the Opposition had taken the time to inquire why the hon. member for Victoria, N.S., (Mr. Bethune) had left that side of the House, he would find that he came over here for reasons altogether creditable to himself. The hon. gentleman started out by saying that such a thing was never known as a member not having the patronage of his county; then, he tried to show that the hon. member for Victoria was not worthy of that position; and then he returned, by saying that such a thing was never known as a member not having the patronage of the county he represented, and he called on the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) to say why this was not given to him. The hon. gentleman gave the answer himself, by saying that the hon. member for Victoria was not worthy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will take that answer.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am not taking it. I am only showing the strength of the hon. gentleman's argument; I am accepting nothing. The hon. gentleman altogether loses sight of the fact that the patronage of that county—and he knows it

could be in no better hands—was in the hands of those people before the hon. member for Victoria saw fit to come over to this side of the House. I can very well understand how the hon. member waited long to see whether there was any sign of penitence on the other side. He did not want to leave them, for he had been associated with them for some time; he did not do so until he gave them over to that despair and that just judgment that is bound to follow them. But after that he saw the patronage in other hands, so that there was no wrong done in the meantime. I think I can hear the hon. leader of the Opposition, if the opposite state of facts existed. If the hon. member for Victoria had come over to this side of the House, and the patronage had come into his hands, I can fancy in what burning words the hon. leader of the Opposition would have thundered at the corruption, and would have asserted that the hon. member was purchased. These hon. gentlemen seem to think that the hon. member for Victoria ought to be paid by patronage for coming over. They cannot understand anything else. They cannot understand why he should have come over without immediately getting his patronage and his pay. The hon. gentleman came over without asking for the patronage, and he is giving his support to the Government without that support being purchased. It is inscrutable to these hon. gentlemen to find an hon. member changing his views politically without being paid for doing so. The letter which the hon. member for Cape Breton read, as he knows very well, had nothing to do with politics. The meeting which Mr. Ross and myself were going to attend was a different meeting altogether. I suppose a busy man ought sometimes to be able to change his mind, when he finds that he cannot go to a place to which he thought he could go; but let me tell the hon. gentleman, in the presence of the hon. member for Victoria, that the hon. member for Victoria and I never discussed the question of his coming over.

Mr. GILLIES. Then, you were not a pair of beauties.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). No, and I hope we never will be such as the hon. gentleman who made the interruption; it would require a large number of him put together to make a pair of beauties. We never discussed the matter. The hon. gentleman, after he came over, discussed with me the reason why he came; but I never spoke about it, or wrote about it, to the county or anywhere. I only know that I saw a sign of weakening in the hon. gentleman. He had a good training, for in his youth he had associated with respectable people, and I knew that there was hope for him, although he had forgotten himself so far as to make an alliance with doubtful people. But I felt that, after he had sown his wild oats, he would return to those to whom he naturally belonged. But the hon. leader of the Opposition looks at him with contempt, because he did not at once plunge into the work of dealing out offices, and getting the only thing which hon. gentlemen opposite can understand in politics, that is, being in politics for what there is in it. The hon. member for Victoria stands in a different position.

Mr. FOSTER. A great reproach for the rest of you.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). A great reproach to the ex-Minister of Finance, I have no doubt, but none to any one on this side of the House. The hon. member is here of his own free will; and, if he has not the patronage of the county, it is not from any lack of confidence which the Government have in him, but just because he came himself, without asking for such a thing. There will come a time when he will show that he has bathed in the pool of Siloam, and become clean from his surroundings.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. Finance Minister thought it proper to refer to a municipal election which took place in a part of my constituency some weeks ago, and in which I took part. Now, in view of the circumstances connected with that election, I thought the Minister of Finance would have been the last man in this House to refer to it. The man whose election I opposed, as an elector of that district, was elected, and I may now inform the House of the circumstances under which he was elected. A short time before the election had taken place, the friends of the hon. Minister of Finance in that district undertook to make additions to the voters' list, with a view of giving them an advantage in the election; and it turned out, subsequent to the election, or perhaps a few days before the election was over, that a good deal of fraud had been perpetrated in connection with putting these new voters on the list. The facts were inquired into, with the result that it was proven in court that some seventeen names were forged by those who were applying to have the names put on the list. Not only were the names that were put on forged, but the name of the magistrate to the affidavit, supposed to have been taken by those people, was forged; and of these names the sheriff of the county put eight, I am informed, on the list, after calling his court for the consideration of the names to be put on for the 25th of the month, and having ascertained that the 25th fell on Good Friday, without notifying the parties interested, except the party friends of the hon. Minister of Finance, that he should put the names on the list on the 24th of the month. When the witnesses who were called, went to the court on the 25th, they found that the

work had been done on the 24th, and that was all the explanation they could get. If I remember rightly, under these circumstances sixteen or seventeen names were put on the voters' list, and the man who was elected was a friend of the hon. Minister of Finance, with the support of those votes. For months before the election he had gone round that district. He took with him on one occasion, the inspector of fisheries, and visited a river in the constituency, and promised the people interested an expenditure of $500 for the cleaning out of that river, with a view to getting their support in the election. He had the railway people going through the district, buying material for the railway, and he himself had the privilege of buying material for the railway, in order to influence voters. He not only had that, but he had authority to promise to the people of that district employment in the repairs to that railway. Some of those repairs have taken place since, and I had a letter from one of the people in that district, a few days ago, informing me that a piece of work, which had to be done in connection with the repairs of the railway, and which only required fifteen men, had forty-two men engaged on it.

In another case a petition was sent around the district, addressed to the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, asking for aid to a railway, and a few days before the elections an answer was distributed among the electors of that municipal district to the effect that some $1,500 would be spent on that road.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Surely they could not buy your supporters that way?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Certainly, they did succeed in buying support. This thing is going on with the knowledge of the Government here, who are appealed to for this kind of assistance in these contests, and all with the knowledge of the Government of Nova Scotia.

The Liberal party were in power in the municipal government in the county, and they offered every terms they could think of, every inducement they could devise, to influence the electorate to vote for their man. Those were the means by which they secured the return of their candidate by nine of a majority; and I may as well tell the hon. Minister of Finance that the law partner of the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia is the man who secured the exit of one or two important witnesses in a case brought up for fraud against those forgers who took part in preparing for that election.

The hon. Minister of Finance referred to my strength in the constituency I have the honour to represent. Well, Sir, I have represented that constituency almost continually for the last 21 years in this House, and in another House, and I would ask nothing better than that the hon. Minister of Finance should follow me from stump to stump in the next election. He went to my constituency some years ago, and there was not a district where he addressed public meetings, in which my majority was not largely increased, and his own friends advised him to keep out of the county the last election, and no doubt would give him the same advice in another election. I am quite willing, at any moment the hon. gentleman wishes, to try the strength of the two parties in the county of Cape Breton, to meet the hon. gentleman and let him give an exhibition of his strength in that county as compared with mine.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond, N.S.) I regret very much indeed, as one of the representatives of the island of Cape Breton, to find that one of my colleagues from that favoured spot of the Dominion, occupies so unenviable a position as the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune) does in this House. That position has not been at all improved by the attempt of his pseudo-friend, the Minister of Finance, to come to his rescue. During the two Parliaments before the hon. member for Victoria came to this House, that county was represented here by a strong and consistent supporter of the then Government. I refer to Mr. John A. Macdonald, and when that gentleman deemed it advisable, in his personal interests—not because he had any fear of not securing his return—to retire from the political field, what did he do? He put his hand on the shoulder of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bethune) and did everything in his power to have him elected to this House. What did we all do on this side? We went into that county and exerted ourselves, might and main, for the election of that hon. gentleman in the teeth of the fiercest and most unscrupulous opposition, aided and abetted by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). How did we find the hon. member for Victoria treated in this House by his friends? He sat on this side, near where I am standing now, a trusted supporter of our party, sent here by the people of Victoria to support the Conservative party in this House. The lines were well drawn in that county between the two parties. He was put up as our candidate, and every man of us did all we could for him. The other side put up Mr. Sam. Campbell as their candidate. The hon. Minister of Finance and Mr. Murray, the Premier of the province, did what they could for Mr. Campbell. Every political agency that could be used was brought to bear to elect Mr. Campbell in opposition to my hon. friend from Victoria, who was our candidate. When the hon. gentleman came to this House we trusted him, we gave him our confidence, and you may judge of our surprise when we suddenly found him flitting over to the other side, for reasons best known to himself and the Minister of Finance. We find him now seated behind the Minister of Finance and voting with the Government on every occasion; and yet the Minister of Finance has humiliated him by writing a letter down to Halifax to

the Hon. Wm. Ross, who was not a candidate in the election, telling Mr. Ross that virtually the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bethune) is repudiated by the Government, although he deserted his friends and went and allied himself with his opponents. I quite agree with my hon. friends on this side that Victoria county was most ignominiously treated by the Government when the Government showed their want of confidence in the representative of that county in the manner the Minister of Finance did in that letter to Mr. Ross. Upon what principle of representative government can the Minister of Finance justify his conduct in declaring that the gentleman representing that county of Victoria, sitting behind and voting with him, and attending the party caucuses, meeting Ministers and going in their private rooms, is not fit to be entrusted with the patronage of the county?

Talk about parties being defeated in municipal elections, what is the record of Mr. Murray, who is a personal friend of mine as I am of his. Why, he ran, time and again, for the local house in his native county of Cape Breton, and could not get elected. He ran in 1887 for the House of Commons, and was defeated by hundreds of votes. In 1891, he was again defeated by hundreds, and in 1896, when he ran against the hon. leader of the Opposition, he was a third time defeated, and defeated by a thousand votes. Talk about parties being defeated in municipal elections, Mr. Murray ran an election in his own native municipal district, and could not get elected. That is the history of an hon. gentleman who is now entrusted with the full confidence of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, and for whose sake the Minister of Finance spurns his newly-found friend (Mr. Bethune), who now misrepresents the county of Victoria in this House. I am not one of those who would find fault with any one for changing his political attitude, when he does so for a proper reason. Any man has a perfect right, for any good and sufficient reason, to change sides at any time. But when a man walks deliberately across the House and gives no reasons to his colleagues and the people who sent him here for his change of allegiance, his conduct is highly reprehensible.

What about one of the beauties from my province (Mr. Fraser), who never opens his mouth without putting his foot in it? That hon. gentleman was properly designated, yoked as he was by the Hon. Mr. Ross with the hon. member for Victoria, as one of a pair of beauties. He is a beauty. And he sits there, for the last time, I venture to say, for the county of Guysborough, and he knows it. He has been tramping from the east to the far west looking for a place, looking for a judgeship. He would have gladly taken a judgeship in British Columbia, but failed in that attempt, owing to the strong and justifiable remonstrance of my hon. friends in this House who belong to the bar of that province. They said to the Government: If you appoint that man to a position on the bench in the province of British Columbia, we will hold you responsible. They said then very properly: If you are going to appoint a judge for that province he should be a lawyer in some sense. Well, the hon. gentleman is a beauty, but certainly would not fill the bill as a judge. I was delighted when I heard that we were to be spared the terrible public infliction with which we were once threatened of having that hon. gentleman to fill a judgeship down in our province. I was gratified to find that they were going to put him far beyond the Rocky Mountains. But it appears they did not want him there. It is pretty well understood that the members of British Columbia brought to bear on the Prime Minister very strong pressure to have such a calamity averted. I venture to say that if he, the Prime Minister, were at liberty to speak now he would endorse every word I say—that they made such a remonstrance to him that he would not dare to send in the hon. gentleman's name for that position.

Mr. MORRISON. If I may have the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Gillies) permission—I may say that he is enough of a lawyer to know that only a member of the bar of British Columbia is eligible for the position of judge in that province.

Mr. GILLIES. I knew that long ago, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) was quite right in recognizing that I knew it. But it was something the hon. member for Guysborough did not know until he was informed by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison).

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) must confine himself to the matter brought up on this motion to adjourn, and not go into other questions.

Mr. GILLIES. I will do so, Mr. Speaker. I might refer——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may call your attention, Sir, to the fact that attention was drawn to the personal appearance of the hon. gentleman by the letter which brought this discussion before the House.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. Minister of Finance seemed to take great pleasure in taunting, or endeavouring to taunt, my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) with the fact that at the last local election that county was carried by a large majority by the Liberal party. But that is not the question at issue at all. The position he took and the reason given by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), fully explained how that county was carried at the last local election. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who to-day holds the portfolio of Finance in this Government occupies a position, one of the most vulnerable occupied by any man in this House, and he will know it before this Parliament is over, and this House will know it. If it is parliamentary to so designate it, I will say that some of his tricks will be

exposed, and if it is not parliamentary I would say he resorted to artifices in that province that were utterly indefensible. And as the word "humbug" has been held to be parliamentary, I say he carried on a complete system of humbug. What is his career? What is his history? Was he not the Repealer of 1886 and 1887? He sits here now, Minister of Finance of a Dominion that he tried to disrupt and destroy. He was the great economist, and he sank the province of Nova Scotia in debt to the extent of $3,500,000, a province that, when we came in in 1884, did not owe a dollar. Are not these facts? Was he not a constant borrower of the public funds on the eve of every election spending the money all over the province——

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) will not require to be called to order again. He is wandering away from the subject.

Mr. GILLIES. I was replying to the hon. Minister of Finance, and if I went far afield, I am simply trying to follow him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I only cite a few of the matters that will be brought up in detail at another time. The record of the hon. Minister of Finance for the last decade is one of the most indefensible made by any public man of Canada; and he only found his way into this House when the hon. member for the county which he now represents was got rid of by giving him the position of a county court judge.

Mr. J. L. BETHUNE (Victoria, N.S.) I desire to say only a few words at this time. I did not think that I had attracted so much attention among hon. gentlemen opposite. First, I may explain, with regard to this letter which has caused such merriment in reference to the hon. member for Guysborough—the remark in that letter to which reference has been particularly made does not refer to the hon. member for Guysborough but to another Mr. Fraser. The hon. gentleman himself seems not to have known it. The first sentence, it is true, refers to the hon. member for Guysborough—with reference to his going to Sydney, but the other refers to another Mr. Fraser who represented the county in the local House.

Mr. MILLS. He was the father of Repeal.

Mr. BETHUNE. No, it is another Mr. Fraser. All this talk about the hon. member for Guysborough being a beauty, and so on, goes for nothing. I came over to this side because I like it better. I believe I am forwarding the interests of my constituents by being here; I am sure that I am here with the approbation of two-thirds at least, and probably nine-tenths of my electorate. If any hon. gentleman wishes to test that, let him resign his seat and I will resign mine. I am here also because I like the policy of the present Administration; I think it is very much the same as that I advocated when soliciting the confidence of my electors. There are changes, but they are for the better, they are for the extension of trade and the advancement of every interest in the Dominion. But the last straw to break the camel's back was the conduct of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). In the year 1896 I had the honour of travelling with him from Cape Breton to Ottawa, and he regaled me with abuse of the late Government, particularly one of his colleagues who is not in this House now, but is in another branch of Parliament. He discouraged me completely. He abused the Government ever since the death of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, and since the time of the late Sir John Thompson, especially. But passing over all these to the time of the Government of the present leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman was very severe on the present leader of the Opposition, his colleague, for not taking him into his Cabinet in 1896.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is making a statement that is utterly without foundation.

Mr. BETHUNE. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he said more than once——

Mr. SPEAKER. When an hon. member is charged with making a certain statement, and the hon. member who is so charged, gives it an explicit denial in the House, it is the parliamentary practice to accept that denial.

Mr. BETHUNE. I accept the denial, but the facts are so, nevertheless.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask the Chair to enforce the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member who has the floor should accept the statement of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall).

Mr. BETHUNE. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he said more than once: "Why don't you leave that party? I would not stay with them another day." Surely, the hon. member will not deny that I said that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is making a statement which is far from the facts. I made a statement to this effect, and frequently did so, that I did not want to be in politics, if I could help it, that I suffered a great deal from being in politics, and would not remain, if I could find a way to leave them.

Mr. BETHUNE. I said to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) more than once: "Why don't you leave that side of the House? I would not stay with them another day." He must remember distinctly that I said that to him. Now, what led up to that? Those things that I have just

mentioned—among other things, the abuse of his present leader—led up to it. I said more than once: "Why don't you leave that side? I would not stay with them another day, if they treated me in that way." From that on, and all the way up, I was entitled—I do not know if I had better say it——

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is making a statement which is entirely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has placed himself out of order by characterizing a statement of the hon. member for Victoria as entirely untrue. The hon. gentleman understands that that is not the way to contradict an hon. member in this House. It is perfectly proper to contradict him absolutely, but that particular language is not parliamentary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you this, and I think the House is entitled to have an opinion, because this is an important matter. Suppose an hon. gentleman in this House gets up, and undertakes to repeat a private conversation with a member of this House, and makes a statement that is absolutely untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If any gentleman questions what I say on this question of order, he will have an opportunity of stating his views. I am assuming that an hon. gentleman states on the floor of this House a private conversation with another hon. gentleman; suppose it is myself. Suppose I say on the floor of this House that I had a conversation with the right hon. gentleman the leader of the House, and I make a statement that is not true, I may be entirely mistaken. The right hon. gentleman would not say the statement is false, because that means a wilful untruth. But I contend there is no other means by which the right hon. gentleman could put himself in a just and proper position, unless he can challenge straightly the truth of the statement that I am making. There is no other means of carrying on discussion in this House. The difference between charging a member with falsehood, and charging him with making a statement that is untrue, is, that the one is wilful, and the other may not be so. The hon. member for Victoria makes a statement concerning a private conversation which my hon. friend says is entirely untrue. Now, I want to know, if my hon. friend is convinced that the statement is altogether inaccurate, what language is he to use in this House that is parliamentary, and that will challenge the accuracy of the statement? I do not think there is any other mode of dealing with it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. With reference to this point of order; a member of this House brings before it a private letter, written by a private citizen to another private citizen, a letter endorsed by the leader of the Opposition, and endorsed by the member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), can he take refuge by saying that, while he did not object to a private letter, he could object to a private conversation?

Mr. CLANCY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the point of order at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Let the hon. member keep calm. I do not see how they can take that ground, when they have obtained control of a private letter, obtained I know not how, whether with the consent of the writer or not. When they bring that here, how can they prevent another member replying to that letter, as the hon. member for Victoria has done?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has appealed to me. My hon. friend knows that if, unfortunately, there is a discrepancy between two members in a version of facts, of course one is in the right, and the other must be in the wrong. But my hon. friend knows that if, unfortunately, there is a contradiction as to facts, there are certain ways of expressing it. When an hon. gentleman contradicts another member, he implies that what he says is untrue. But my hon. friend knows that the etiquette of parliamentary life does not permit the use of the words "untrue," or "false," or anything of that kind. The balance of authorities go to say that the member must say that such a statement is not in accordance with the facts, that it is inaccurate, or something of that kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. I entirely adhere to the view I first took on this matter. I do not want to be too severe in challenging expressions used by members of this House, but the limitations and courtesies of debate are laid down by the Speakers of the English House of Commons. Now, here is a decision in 1883, which was given by Mr. Speaker Brand:

> It is not in order to apply the epithets "untrue" and "disgraceful" to statements made by an hon. member.

And again, by the same Speaker:

> It is not parliamentary to say that a statement made by a member of the House is not credible.

But there is a way of contradicting a member in the House, and Speaker Brand lays it down this way:

> It is not unparliamentary for an hon. member on his own responsibility to say that a statement made by another hon. member is opposed to the fact.

Perhaps the distinction is not very wide, but the manner of making a statement is polite in one case, and I do not think it is polite in another case. I think that neither the term "untrue" nor "false" should be used by hon. members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. BETHUNE. In reference to the patronage of my county, I may say that I never asked for it; in fact, I refused it, as the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) can testify. He spoke to me about taking the patronage in his department. I refused it, but eventually said that I would accept it, with the proviso that I would consult with Mr. Murray in regard to any recommendations I should make. That was the only conversation I ever had about patronage. I came over without a single word or without any one ever asking me how I was going to vote on the Yukon Bill, and that was the first vote that I gave on this side of the House. No one approached me; I made up my mind, after reading the Bill and seeing that it was a good Bill, to vote for it. Ever since then I have experienced quite a change on the part of hon. members on the other side of the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) made an agreement to see me before the vote took place on the Yukon Bill. I asked him where I would see him, and he said that he would see me in my seat before the vote was taken. I sat there until five o'clock in the morning, but he never spoke to me, and I do not think he cared how I voted. I support this Administration because I believe the Government is composed of true, honest and manly statesmen, and I shall continue to support them as long as I find them acting as they are. I believe they will advance the best interests of the Dominion. I think that is their intention, and under these circumstances, I do not see anything disgraceful in supporting them. A large majority of the people in my county are pleased that I do support them, as time will show.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to recall the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to a return ordered by the House a month ago. The right hon. Premier stated yesterday that he knew nothing about it, because the hon. Minister of Public Works was not in the House at the time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). What is the return?

Mr. SPEAKER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a return ordered on the 17th of May, for copies of all instructions, correspondence, reports, accounts and vouchers connected with the expedition of the chief engineer, Mr. Coste, to the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have it just now. It is in my room.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to what I am afraid is a serious omission in some papers that he laid on the Table of the House a few days ago. I refer to the documents relating to the recent disallowance of certain statutes passed by the legislature of British Columbia. I have had a notice of motion on the paper for quite a time, but the right hon. Prime Minister twice asked me to let it stand when it came up. When the notices of motion were called yesterday, I said that I would move it, only I believed the papers had been brought down. I asked the right hon. gentleman whether he was sure that all the papers in connection with the disallowance of the anti-Japanese legislation had been brought down. He informed me that they were, and that there was no need for me to move. But I have gone carefully through these papers, which have been brought down by the Prime Minister, and I believe that there is a very important document which is not included. If the right hon. gentleman will look at page 27 of the return, he will see that there is a letter from the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to the Governor General, the Earl of Minto, which is as follows:—

Downing Street, 9th May, 1899.

Governor General,
The Right Honourable
The Earl of Minto, G.C.M.G., &c., &c.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 83 of the 24th ult., forwarding copy of a letter from the Department of Justice, representing the desirability of an early expression of the views of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the legislation affecting Japanese subjects passed by the legislature of British Columbia in 1898.

2. In reply, I have to refer you to my despatch No. 92 of the 2nd instant.

I have, &c.,
J. CHAMBERLAIN.

I have looked through these papers, and I have failed to find any mention of the despatch, No. 83 of the 24th ult., forwarding a copy of a letter from the Department of Justice. This letter is of the greatest importance in regard to this correspondence, and I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he knew that letter was there and if so, if he will be good enough to have it brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot answer my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) at this moment. This return

has been prepared by the officers of the department. I understood that they had brought down everything, but perhaps something has been omitted. Does my hon. friend refer to the memorandum of the hon. Minister of Justice or to a letter of Mr. Chamberlain ?

Mr. PRIOR. I refer to the despatch inclosing the report of the Minister of Justice.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will see to it.

Mr. PRIOR. There is another matter that I want to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to, and it is that on the 17th of May I moved for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all letters, telegrams, &c., received by the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. J. I. Tarte, the Minister of Public Works, or the Hon. A. J. Blair, the Minister of Railways and Canals, from the Northern Telegraph Company (Limited), and also for copies of all letters from the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, or from either of said other Ministers to any of said companies. A return was brought down and it has the endorsation :

Papers referred to the hon. Minister of Public Works for report in so far as this department is concerned.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) whether there is any other correspondence that has not been brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Speaking for myself, I do not know of anything more than I have brought down. I have brought down everything I have.

Mr. PRIOR. This return calls for letters from and to the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. There are no letters from either of these hon. gentlemen, and I want to know whether they have any or whether they have seen the return ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not seen the return. I will look at it and see if there is anything I can bring down.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems extraordinary, when an Order of the House for a return is made, that an hon. Minister, to whose department it relates, has never seen it. Surely it was referred to his department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I daresay it was referred to my department, but the officials, possibly, not finding anything on the official file, did not think it worth while to refer it to me, so that I have not had it under my observation.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the use of Parliament passing an Order for papers when a Minister gets up and says that he knows nothing about it. His department is bound to provide information in obedience to this Order, yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) gets up and coolly tells us that he knows nothing about it.

The PRIME MINISTER. These orders are referred to the officers of the department to look over the files and see what is on the files, but my hon. friend does not expect that the Minister will supervise these returns.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, yes. These papers cannot come down without the consent of His Excellency the Governor General, and that cannot be got without the advice of the Cabinet, and not merely one individual member, but the whole Cabinet is responsible.

The PRIME MINISTER. All this is purely ministerial duty. The Governor in Council has nothing to do with that. The order of the House is that these papers should be brought down, and the Government has no discretion but to bring them down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I differ from the right hon. gentleman in toto cælo.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to ask with reference to papers which were ordered by the House last May, concerning the transfer of a property at Grand Narrows. The Minister told me some time ago that he had to send to Moncton to get these papers, and it is extraordinary that such little information as they contain should take six weeks to get. The general manager is here now, and I cannot see what excuse can be pleaded for the delay, unless it is that the Minister is unwilling to give them to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman ought not to say that. He knows that he met the secretary of the Railway Department in the corridor two or three days ago.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A week ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was explained to the hon. gentleman that the secretary had sent two or three telegrams to Moncton urging the papers to be forwarded. I cannot go to Moncton myself to get them. The hon. gentleman knows that the Department has made every effort to get these papers from Moncton. I am not aware that they have arrived yet, but the officers of the department know it is my desire that they should be laid on the Table the very moment they are received.

FAST ATLANTIC LINE.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to again call the attention of my right hon. friend to a matter

of immense consequence, and to which I referred the other day. This Parliament has been in session for three months, and neither the House nor the country has had any information whatsoever from the right hon. gentleman as to what steps are being taken in reference to the Fast Atlantic Service. Some time ago the right hon. the Prime Minister was good enough to say, that steps were being taken by the Government; I now venture to ask him to give some information as to what is being done in regard to this most important matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will be able to make an announcement to my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) within a very few days.

SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES ON BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before we vote any money to Her Majesty, I want to bring before the House a matter which I believe would be more worthy of the despotic Government of Russia than of the enlightened Liberal Government of Canada. Since 1896, we have been hearing of acts of despotism by this Government, but I have to present a case now which excels in despotism any of them yet heard of. There were on the Beauharnois Canal several employees, some of whom had been there since 1871, and had always done their duty well. On the 13th day of May last they were notified that they were dismissed. At this date they had fixed up their little residences for the summer, and cultivated their gardens, as they did yearly in order to obtain some vegetables, for their daily wage did not amount to a great deal. At this date, and under these circumstances, they were notified, without any reasons being given, that they were to be turned out of doors, some of them even out of their own houses which they had built on Government land. When this matter first came to my attention, I hardly believed it could be possible, and I asked the Minister (Mr. Blair) the names of those who were so dismissed and the reason for their dismissal. I was told the names of those dismissed, and the date of their appointment, one of them being appointed in June, 1871, and he is now a man over 50 years of age. I may say en passant that this man is placed in a very awkward position, because being so long at this particular employment he is now unable to turn his hand to anything else. I asked the question of the Minister (Mr. Blair):

By whom have they been dismissed, and on whose recommendation?

And he replied:

By order of the Minister.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave no reason whatever for their dismissal, and he made no statement as to whether they had done their duty faithfully or not. I asked:

Why have they been discharged?

And the Minister (Mr. Blair) answered:

They were discharged because their services were not acceptable.

Again, the Minister gave no reason. I may mention that one of the men employed to replace the man dismissed, is, I am informed, over seventy years of age, and he is expected to work day and night as lockman on the canal. His name is Paquette. The House will see that the reasons given by the Minister do not amount to a great deal, and that the discharge of these men is simply an act of tyranny. He tells us that they are discharged because they are not acceptable to the Ministers, and he leaves us to assume whether they were not acceptable because of their politics or otherwise. As a matter of fact, one of them was a Liberal, although the Minister evidently did not know it. He was appointed in 1894, and he was evidently set aside because he had been appointed by me. Now, I wish to put a statement before the Minister of Railways and Canals, and if the statement is not true he will have to deal with one of his own employees about it. One of these discharged men, named Lefebvre, met Mr. Beique, the superintendent of the canal, and he said to him: "Mr. Beique, we have always been good friends; have you made any report against me, or what is the cause of my dismissal?" And Mr. Beique replied: "I have not reported against you." Lefebvre then said: "How can I get a position anywhere, because if I ask for employment I will be told I do not deserve it, as I must have been discharged by the Government because I did something wrong." Mr. Beique replied: "As to that you need not fear, because I will give you a certificate that you are a good, honest, respectable man, and I never had a better man on the canal than you." Lefebvre then said: "What is the reason I have been dismissed?" And the superintendent replied: "I will tell you the truth. I went to Ottawa lately, and I met Mr. Blair in the passage of the House, and Mr. Blair said to me: If we have an election this fall, have you any men on the Beauharnois Canal who will vote for Bergeron?"

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who said that?

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Blair said that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you say I said that?

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Beique said you said it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did Mr. Beique tell you I said that?

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Beique told that to he man who told it to me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never saw the man in my life.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, wait until I am finished. Lefebvre said to Mr. Beique: "Give me the reason that I have been dismissed," and Mr. Beique replied: "I saw Mr. Blair, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he said to me: If we have an election in the fall, have you any men on the Beauharnois Canal who will vote for Bergeron?" And Beique continued: "I was challenged to give the names of those I thought would vote for Bergeron and your name was amongst the others, and that is why you are dismissed." Now, Sir, that is the reason given by the superintendent of the canal to one of the men who was dismissed, and the Minister of Railways and Canals can settle with his employee as to whether he said it or not. If it is not true that the Minister said it, then the superintendent of the canal deserves censure, but if the superintendent spoke the truth, then the Minister undoubtedly deserves censure. The letter dismissing these men was very curt. This is the one which was addressed to Lefebvre:

Valleyfield, 10th of May, 1899.

Sir,—I have received instructions to notify you that your services as lockman on the Beauharnois Canal shall not be required after Saturday, the 13th of the present month.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your devoted servant,
(Sgd.) J. F. BEIQUE,
Superintendent.

Mr. Joseph Lefebvre.

At the date this letter was written these men had been at work ten days of the season. If they had been notified last fall that they would not be employed again this spring, they would have been able to look out for some other employment, but they were not even notified then that the Government did not intend to employ them any more. Having done their duty, they were under the impression that they would be employed again. They spent the winter there; in the early spring they made their gardens, cleaned their houses, and made preparations to spend the summer there as usual; and on the 10th of May they received notice that on the 13th they would not be required any longer. They were put on the street, although some of them had been there for nearly 20 years; and some of these men have 12 or 13 children, and they have not been able to find any work. And these people have been put out simply because they were not partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is the greatest piece of tyranny we have ever had in this country. I am convinced that the hon. Prime Minister cannot in his heart sanction anything of that sort, for we have heard him say in this House that no man would be dismissed from public employment unless it was proved that he was not worthy of the position he occupied. I put this case before Parliament, and I hope the press will take hold of it. I sympathize very much with these men, not because I know them or because I have probably appointed them, but because they are good, honest, respectable men, the best men that have been working on that canal or on any canal in the country. I sympathize with them because they are on the street. For this the hon. Minister of Railways is responsible, and if I have any friends on this side of the House, when his Estimates come, I shall make him feel it.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would have expected that there would have been some explanation from the hon. Minister in reference to this mattr.

Mr. BERGERON. He has not got any.

Mr. McNEILL. It certainly is one of the most grievous cases that has ever been laid before this House. Although we have had some grievous cases of dismissals since hon. gentlemen opposite have come into power, I think this is one of the most cruel and disgraceful cases that have come before this country or any other under constitutional government for many a long day. If the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is true—and I presume he is in a position to know whether it is true or not—these men have given no cause for their dismissal except that they happened to belong to a different stripe of politics from the Minister. They are respectable men, men who have been conducting themselves with all propriety, men who have been pursuing their work in the most proper manner; and they have been turned out with their families on to the streets, absolutely without means of support, without any investigation of any kind, simply because they happen to be Conservatives. I thought the hon. Minister would have had something to say. I venture to say that the sense of justice of the people of this country from one end of it to the other will be outraged by conduct of this kind; and the Government sit here dumb, without one word to say in defence of their course. It only shows how utterly callous they have become in this respect. So long as I sit in this House, I will raise my voice against conduct so cruel and so unmanly.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Militia and Defence—
Further amount required for annual drill $125,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount in the main Estimates for this?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I may say to the committee that it is intended to reduce the

main Estimates by exactly this amount. This amount is required for the 1st of July, as a large portion of the militia has been sent into camp under the plan of the Major General before that date, and it is proposed to reduce the amount in the main Estimates for the purpose of annual camp by an amount equivalent to the amount asked for here.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand my hon. friend. He had $300,000 voted for this current year, and he is asking now for $100.-000. Does he mean now to spend $400,000 for this current year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean for next year to spend only $300,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the whole of the militia is to be trained each year, the cost of doing so is $400,000 to $425,000, and, if that policy be continued, an additional amount will be required, but I do not intend to ask for that until the supplementary Estimates for next year come down.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not quite the way to treat the House. The hon. gentleman ought to have pretty well established in his own mind how much he proposes to have for next year. He is going to drop off $100,000 in the main Estimates, but has not a single idea that he may not ask the full amount at the end of the next year. What is it that calls for this enormous amount during the present year of $425,000 ? That is an immense amount of money for annual drill, and, while the House is always generous in voting militia estimates, if all the militia estimates are to partake of the buoyancy of this one, the ultimate sum will be enormous.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as the particular item for annual drill is concerned, the amount is not larger than for any previous year, when the whole force was called out for annual drill. It has scarcely ever happened that the whole force has been called out. During the past three years a larger percentage of the force has been drilled and camped than ever before ; but, if the whole force is to be drilled annually, the cost will be about $425,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that twelve days' drill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, in camp ; also drill of the city corps—the whole annual drill.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the city corps taken out for annual drill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This year they are taken out for two days, but they drill at headquarters, in the cities.

Mr. FOSTER. For that two days they are out, you incur all the transport expenditure.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They drill near their head quarters, so that the transport expense is not large ; but we do incur some expense.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of this $425,000 is for transport, and how much for actual service in the field and drill in the armoury?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have here an estimate of the cost of the camps now going on, which perhaps will throw some light on the question. The Niagara camp, from June 6th to June 17th, 1899, costs $42,600. That actual number of men was 3,900. It was composed of a squadron of the Governor General's Body Guards, the 2nd Dragoons, the 3rd Dragoons, the 12th Battalion, infantry, and a number of other corps.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of that is transport ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am unable to tell the hon. gentleman at this moment. I had understood that the estimates of the Department of Justice were going on before six o'clock, and my papers became disarranged somewhat while I was in Niagara, and I have not been able to look into the matter since. I will give the best information I can, and after recess supplement what is required.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better let his estimates stand until after eight o'clock, and let some other estimates be gone on with. The division into transport and other expenses is somewhat an important point, and I do not think we can go on discussing these items without having the information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was my intention, on the main Estimates, to have gone very carefully into this matter, and I have notes in connection with the main Estimates, giving, I think, the information which the hon. gentleman wants ; but, if thought better to give the whole explanation at once, that could be done after recess.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman should bear in mind that we would like to have the estimates of the transport and day for the camp to commence to-day at Niagara. The first camp, from the 6th to the 17th June, is concluded, but another camp opens to-day. I am told that a corps from the county of Lanark starts to-day for the camp at Niagara. They have to go to Kingston, or some place on the St. Lawrence, to get to Niagara. That would mean, I presume, that they would not be in camp

until some time to-morrow afternoon. That is, three days of the week are gone. I presume, they would return so as to reach home before the Sunday of the next week. That would give not more than three or four days of next week, and not more than three days of this week, for drill, and they are supposed to have twelve days' drill. A large portion of the time is, therefore, spent going and coming, and a very large expenditure is necessary for their transport. We would like to have the full particulars.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Are we to understand that it is the policy of the Government to drill the entire militia annually? As a well-wisher of the militia, I would highly approve of such a policy; but, if this is to be a desultory case, it will be so much money wasted.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Speaking for myself, I am in favour of the annual drill, and, since I have been in the position of Minister of Militia, we have had annual drills, to a very large extent, almost the whole of the force being out every year. But I cannot say that the policy has been absolutely settled. I think, however, we are coming to that, and I agree with the hon. gentleman, that, in order to get the fullest results from the expenditure made on the militia, we ought to have annual drill. The money voted by Parliament would do more good, and, though the sum is larger, we shall get far better results than we should, if we drilled only every other year, or drilled only a portion of the force each year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is very undesirable that in a matter of such great importance as that which the committee is now considering, any hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches should speak for himself apart from the Government. If ever there was a question that the Government was bound to consider and to form a policy upon, it is this question as it now stands. The statement made by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt), who understands these matters a great deal better than I do, must carry conviction at once to the mind of every hon. member of the House. To propose the additional vote this year without intending to adopt that policy and carry it out is an absolute loss of the amount of the vote. It seems to me, therefore, before the House is asked by the Government to vote this money the Government ought to determine what their policy is. I do not hesitate to say that, with such information as I can gather in regard to this very important question, I entirely agree with what the Minister of Militia has said. I believe that the only question is not whether the whole force should be called out for annual drill and the expenditure incurred, but whether the 12 days of annual drill is sufficient. I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment, the Government would act wisely if they determine, even at some additional expenditure, to render the militia force of this country as effective as possible, and to deal with the question with such vigour as will give undoubted results, instead of expending the very large amount of money as in the past, I am afraid, has too often been done without accomplishing all that the House has a right to expect. I think that this is a question of sufficient importance to have been determined by the Government, and I believe that a short time would have been enough to enable them to determine whether they would ask for this $100,000 and then abandon this policy, thus rendering the expense practically useless, or adopt the policy of incurring this increased expenditure for the purpose of having the militia as effective as possible.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The demand of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is not unreasonable in itself, but I think it has not come at the proper time. The vote before us is for $125,000 which is already expended or is being expended, as the drill is now going on. So the money must be voted. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman responds to the vote in the manner he does. When the Estimates for next year come before the House, the hon. gentlman will be entitled to an answer as to what the policy of the Government is on this question. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, King's), in opening his Estimates, made the statement that it was the intention to decrease the vote of next year by the sum of $125,000. The question arises, what sum should we expend yearly? But to go on with the discussion of this question at the moment seems inopportune. The financial year is divided awkwardly for appropriations of this kind. Part of the appropriation must be spent in this financial year and part of it in the next financial year. How much should we spend? Should it be $300,000 or should it be $400,000? Should we have a yearly drill of the whole force, or only drill the whole force every second year, as has been done sometimes in the past. The consensus of opinion, as I understand my hon. friend to say now is that no false economy should be practiced in this matter, that we should spend whatever is to be spent to maintain the militia on a proper footing of efficiency. This is the question, and I am glad to see it approached as it is by both sides of the House, not regardless of the consequences, but in the spirit that we must have an effective militia. The Minister of Militia will take this into consideration, and when he comes with his Estimates for next year, he will be able to give the hon. gentleman the answer he asks for.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Militia has not his papers here to-day to enter into the full discussion, but between now and

six o'clock we might as well occupy the time in going over some features of the case. We spend a great deal of money in militia and defence. If it is well spent, that if is there are good results from it, there is sound reason why the people should bear this burden. We have devoted to this service what represents a capital of $15,000,000. We spend annually, $425,000, which is the interest on about $14,000,000. A great many people in the country do not see this matter in the same light as we do here who have discussed it for years. They think the money is not all spent for a good purpose. Now, as the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) said a moment ago, I believe that some improvements should be made. It seems to me if you are to have an efficient militia, eleven or twelve days' drill is not enough. From what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said a moment ago, I understand that the twelve days includes the days occupied in transporting. In my county it takes two days to go to and come from the camp, leaving only ten days actual drill. What can the soldiers learn in ten days actual drill? Still, the expense is there. I understand that we shall come back to this subject later, so I do not wish to go into it generally, but there is just one other point I wish to mention. Battalions going to camp should go there with their own men. I know—and I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Militia does not ignore it—that a good many battalions leave home with hardly any men at all, and pick up their men in Montreal, from among the men on the wharfs, and so on. That is not in accordance with the militia institution as we should like to have it. And I call the hon. gentleman's attention to it, in case it has not been mentioned to him before, that his local instructor or the Deputy Adjutant General at Montreal—I speak of that part of the country because I know it better—should see to it that battalions leave headquarters with their own men. In the cases I speak of, men on the wharfs put on the uniform of Her Majesty, spend nine or ten days in camp and then cease to belong to the militia. That is done on a pretty large scale. This does not bring the results that we should have for such a large expenditure of public money. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Militia says, that the amount of money he is now asking, $125,000, will be deducted from the main Estimates. I see that in the main Estimates he is asking for $400,000. Last year he got $300,000. So it would appear that next year the amount will be $525,000. Even if he deducts this amount of $125,000, the Estimates will be $75,000 more than was given him last year. When he comes here with his papers ready for the full discussion, I should like to have him explain why we are called upon to increase the vote by this amount. If there are good reasons for that, I think the House is entitled to have them. I will defer other remarks that I have to make on this point.

Mr. BERGERON.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Later on, I shall endeavour to give the hon. gentleman the explanation that he asks. I had expected that the full discussion of the militia vote would come up on the main Estimates, and that probably a short explanation would be regarded as sufficient in the case of this item, which is immediately necessary. It is certainly more convenient to give the general explanations and the policy of the Government upon the main Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that is the wisest course to pursue on the present occasion. It would be a pity to depart from what the Minister of Militia and Defence had proposed himself to do on the main Estimates. He is hardly in a position to-day to deal with the whole policy of the Government as effectively as it would be done on the main Estimates. I think we will have to be content to take such explanations as my hon. friend can give in reference to this, and leave the question of the general policy to be dealt with on the main Estimates.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am glad the leader of the Opposition takes that view. It is certainly the most convenient way. The country has before it the very important statement made by the new Major General, which will, no doubt, involve considerable discussion.

Salaries and wages of civil employees.. $9,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This item covers expenditure that it has been the custom in the department, and I think, in other departments, to pay, out of the vote for the next year. A portion of this vote for civil employees for the year now coming to an end, was used in paying expenditures belonging to the previous year. Another portion of the vote is due to the fact that owing to the introduction of the new rifle, which is a very intricate piece of machinery, we have had to employ artificers, men with special knowledge of that rifle, and send them to different parts of the country. They are civil employees under the stores department. The stores department, at the present moment, is under the control of the civil branch. Then, in addition to that, we have purchased the Oliver equipment, of which already a very large number have been manufactured, and we have had to employ additional help in order to take care of that. So that the whole amount here, which is only $2,500 in addition to the amount actually expended last year, is required in the two items that I have referred to.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year $60,000 were voted in that item; that will be $69,000 altogether.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The usual vote for this purpose has been $62,000, and it was reduced last year to $60,000. Out of that, between $5,000 and $6,000 was paid on the previous year, and the additional amount is required to make that up and pay off the expenses which, I say, have been incurred owing to the introduction of the new rifle and the Oliver equipment. I am asking for an increased amount next year, so that we will not have to ask for a supplementary vote.

Military properties $35,000

Mr. BERGERON. We voted $131,000 for that last year, and the hon. gentleman is asking for $35,000 more.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This vote is for maintenance and repairs. A large portion of this is being expended on the Rockliffe rifle range, the new heating apparatus at St. John's barracks, the London barracks, stables for fourteen extra horses, repairs for the artillery barracks at Quebec, fire-extinguishers for military buildings, Toronto, new chimneys on the drill hall, and general repairs, St. John's barracks. The money is now being expended. Contracts were made, and there is not sufficient money to pay the various contracts.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just the great objection. Does not the Minister see that he is coming down here on the 20th of June and asking us for $35,000 additional, which he has actually spent or contracted to spend, and for which he had no authority at all? The hon. gentleman came down last year and, after having looked over his department, he said to Parliament: I want you to pass $131,000 for a certain purpose. He comes down now and says that he has spent $35,000 more than Parliament gave him, has actually spent the money, or contracted to spend it, and he had no appropriation for it at all. It is really a perfect farce for us to come here and listen to a Minister giving his explanations, and then vote the money asked for, and find out when next year comes around that he asks for 25 per cent more, and that he expended it before he asked for it. Now, the hon. gentleman's Estimates are all of a piece with that. With reference to that $25,000, it is all very well to say that we must vote it because it is spent. But the Government had no authority to spend it. They had authority to spend $300,000 and no more, but they spent $25,000 more already on drill alone. That might be called for under the advent of General Hutton, and the new policy which the Government does not say is their policy yet. They are able to say amongst themselves: We will undertake to carry out the policy so far that we will spend thousands of dollars that have not been voted to us, but we cannot say we will do it for another year, we have not made up our minds. And so, with all his Estimates. Here we have nearly $300,000 of an extra vote, almost every cent of which is either now expended or contracted for without any appropriation, and with the Minister in full possession of his senses, looking over his whole fields, coming down last year and asking from Parliament what he wanted for the year's vote and the year's expenditure for militia. It is this practice which this Government is fast making, a rule against which, I think, on both sides of the House, we ought to protest. I think my hon. friend the Solicitor-General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will join with me in that protest. Let him be frank enough and brave enough to say at the time he asks for his Estimates what he wants, even if it is large, and say what he wants it for. Then the House will take it into consideration and say whether it will give it or not. If the House gives it, the Minister has the right to expend it, but if the House refuses it, the Minister has no right to set up his own will against that of the House. If the Minister conceals from the House the expenditures which he proposes to make, or goes on and makes expenditures to the tune of hundreds and thousands of dollars, without the money having been voted and without there being any urgency, it is making a farce of appropriation. Thus, the Minister seems to be becoming an appropriator, to absolve the House of its functions entirely, and he is taking away those sacred functions from the possession of the House. If the Minister had been ill, or away, of if some catastrophe, or some great event had happened, which imported urgency into it, it would have been different, but it is the ordinary hum-drum existence of Canada in regard to these militia matters. You can absolutely expend half a million on properties if you like, but the Minister should say how much he would like to expend and ask the House to give him that much money and then try to keep within it. What excuse is there in regard to these properties in which there is no urgency, of over-expending the vote by 25 per cent and coming down, after it is spent, and saying: Hurry this, because the money is all spent. That is what I want my hon. friend to see. We are not fighting a measure of the Government, or anything necessary to make our militia properties what they ought to be, but for heaven's sake let us have something nearer to the appropriation than getting 25 per cent away from it in a matter where there is no urgency.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden, King's). I admit frankly that there is a good deal of force in what the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr.

Foster) has stated, but I think, he went a step too far when he undertook to say that I had intentionally concealed from the House expenses that I intended to make. That is not true; that is not a fact.

Mr. FOSTER. I said "either that or." I put in the alternative.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have pointed out to my hon. friend, more than once, that the unfortunate practice had grown up—I found it existing in my department when I came in—of expending out of funds voted for one year moneys to recoup or pay off the expenditures which had taken place in the previous year, from the next vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Over-expending in the previous years.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was being done. I did not invent that practice. I am sorry to say that I have not been able to put an end to it, but, in the main Estimates for next year, I have endeavoured, as far as possible to estimate for the full amount we shall want. I think it is better we shall close up this year by taking enough money in the Estimates for the current yaer which closes on the 30th of June, so that we can make a fair start next year, and that is what I have been endeavouring to do in these Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. $35,000 of an over-expenditure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This squares the amount for this year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, it is due to a considerable extent to the expenditure on the Ottawa rifle range, which it was considered very important, in the interest of the militia, to complete and which cost more money than was anticipated.

Mr. FOSTER. How much more?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it cost something like $15,000 or $20,000 more. I shall be able to give a full explanation to the committee, because we are asking for a still further amount and I shall have a statement of every item in connection with that range to place before the committee at the proper moment.

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

After Recess.

Military stores $39,700

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFNECE (Mr. Borden). In order to carry out the camps this year, which are larger than usual, it was absolutely necessary to increase our stores, and we were obliged to purchase marquees, tents, waterproof sheets, blankets, water-bottles, &c., amounting to $39,700. Our stores have been rather running down; they are not as large as they ought to be for the force we have, and, although these stores were purchased specially for the camps this year, they can be utilized permanently, and it was in the public interest that they should be purchased.

Mr. SPROULE. Were the stores purchased by tender?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were purchased at contract prices by the extension of contracts which we had already made with various parties. The marquees were purchased in Ottawa, a large portion of the blankets from W. C. Caldwell, and the waterproof sheets were purchased in Montreal; I forget the name of the firm, but at the contract price and from the contractors of last year. It was a mere continuation of the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Were the contracts which they got last year, the result of tenders?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. EARLE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the accounts for supplies purchased last year, and to certain discrepancies between the cost, as published by the Auditor General, and the cost as given in a return brought down to this House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is in connection with the Yukon supplies, and there is an item later on which will bring that whole question up.

Mr. EARLE. I will postpone my remarks until then.

Mr. CLANCY. Does Mr. Caldwell, from whom these blankets were purchased, live in London?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, Mr. Caldwell does not live in London. He is a manufacturer, and they were purchased direct from him, and he has been supplying the department for many years. They were purchased at the same prices as formerly.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that these supplies were purchased without the Minister having the money to pay for them?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is so. We depended on the generosity of Parliament to give us the money. We could not send the men without blankets.

Mr. SPROULE. I fear the Minister has more confidence in Parliament than Parliament has in the Minister.

Mr. BENNETT. How many years do these contracts extend over for the supply of blankets, and tents, and so on?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Contracts are usually made for specific quantities; but, if we have a contract which we consider a favourable one, and we require more stores, and there is not ample opportunity to ask for tenders, then, upon the recommendation of the officers in the department, we very often extend the contract. That was done in this case.

Mr. BENNETT. How much did the blankets cost?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Eighteen thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars is the amount estimated. That is about the amount required, but, of course, it is not exact to the dollar.

Mr. BENNETT. When was the contract with Mr. Caldwell made?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it was made a year ago.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a very marked difference between the way the Minister of Militia conducts his department and the way the Postmaster General conducts his. When a contract for a mail service, which is usually made for three years, expires, though it may only amount to $40 or $50, the Postmaster General calls for new tenders on the ground that some person might perform the service more cheaply. But the Minister of Militia, who made a contract a year ago for blankets at a certain price, finding this year that $20,000 worth of blankets are required, assumes that the price is the same as in the preceding year, and makes a new contract at the same price. I submit that this is grossly unfair. I understand that the price of wool has greatly decreased since a year ago, and had tenders been called for, the Minister might have made a considerable saving.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know where my hon. friend gets his information. As a matter of fact, the price of woollen goods has increased from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. That is what I am advised.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year wool sold for from 16 to 18 cents a pound, whereas this year it is selling for from 14 to 15 cents. I have seen a thousand pounds sold at 14½ cents. So that the price is a good deal lower than it was a year ago. I would like to ask the Minister what was the amount of the contract for blankets last year, and what was the price paid for them?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to give that information from memory. I may say that I am having careful statements compared of the relative prices, and if these items are allowed to pass, I will promise the fullest information when we come to the main vote for clothing and supplies. There will then be ample opportunity, and I think it will be more convenient, to discuss the matter, as the hon. leader of the Opposition agreed this afternoon that we should go into the whole question then.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a very large item. It seems to be an extension of the contract for one line of goods, amounting to over $13,000, and we have no information as to the cost of the goods under the original contract, or whether it was a large or a small one. I suppose the Minister does not know whether there were more tenders than one?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, there were more.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the proposition of the hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon was not for a limited discussion on the matter now under the consideration of the committee, but rather on the general policy of the Government as to taking so large a sum of money each year for the purpose of drill and otherwise. But what I would like the hon. Minister to answer is whether in asking for tenders last year a specific quantity of blankets was called for, and whether the tender was limited to last year, or did the hon. gentleman give the public notice that the contract would extend over more than one year? Because, apart from what was stated a moment ago, that there has been a very decided decline in the price of wool everybody knows who has taken the trouble to glance over the newspapers. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman, in asking for tenders, called for more than he required at the time, he deprived himself of the chance of a possible decline in the market price of the goods.

Mr. BENNETT. On reference to the Auditor General's Report of last year, I find this item: W. C. Caldwell, 5,500 pounds of blankets, at 47½ cents, or a total of about $2,600. From the smallness of the amount, it would hardly seem that a tender was called for that. I presume this is Mr. Caldwell, the member for Lanark in the local House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is only a small part of the contract.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Minister say whether these are white or gray blankets?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Gray.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say that 47½ cents a pound was a most outrageous price.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The blankets the hon. gentleman has just referred to were white blankets.

Those I am now asking a vote for are gray blankets.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sure that gray blankets were tendered for before at much less than 40 cents a pound. I say that because a firm in my own town was among the tenderers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may not be correct in stating the price. I think the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that there were tenders considerably below that. I found some in the department when I came in; but the blankets which were sent in were not all wool, and were condemned and refused, and we were unable to accept the completion of the contract.

Mr. HENDERSON. Those were not made in my county. The gentleman in my county who tendered did not receive the contract.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It goes without saying that they were not from the hon. gentleman's county, but we did receive blankets of that kind. With regard to the length of time referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I may say that when I came in I found that there were contracts let for three years from the date when the present Government came into office, or shortly before; and there were some contracts for two years, which did not come into force until a year after we came in. The matter was referred to the Minister of Justice at that time, and he thought no Government had power to enter into a contract of that kind. Those contracts were terminated, and since then we have followed the system of letting our contracts for each year.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not what the department is doing now.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I say that having got a good contract, and urgently requiring further goods of the same kind, we frequently, on the report of the officers of the department, ask for an increased quantity. That is what was done in this particular case.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend will see that neither he nor the officers of the department are in possession of information in regard to prices without asking for tenders. No one who is not engaged in the business can tell whether he is getting goods at the proper price or not, in the absence of tenders. That is the only means of determining that question. It is a very easy matter for the hon. gentleman to let a contract for some $20,000, without tender, and then say he let it to that particular party because that party gave very good satisfaction. No doubt the goods delivered in the past may have given satisfaction, but that is no justification for the hon. gentleman taking up the old contract and extending it to further purchases. He had before his eyes the fact that there has been a decline in the prices of wool, and there ought to be a corresponding decline in the prices of blankets. I hope he will be able to offer some better excuse than the opinion of his officers, because they can have no knowledge of the special subject.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me that we should have more information on this item. It looks a little fishy all through, especially when we consider that Mr. Caldwell is a very good Grit. He was given a small contract for $2,000 worth of woollen goods, and was paid 47½ cents per pound for manufactured wool, which, in all probability, he purchased at about 18 cents. Forty-seven and a half cents, to begin with, is a very big price, as any man in the House who knows anything of the woollen business will admit. Wool has gone down since considerably, and yet the hon. gentleman extended the contract on the same basis for $13,000. It is inexplicable that the hon. Minister cannot tell us what is the cost per blanket or per pound, or how many blankets were supplied. He sets up his usual plea of urgency, but I do not see how that plea can hold when the Minister must have known whether he intended having the militia drilled this summer or not; and if he did, he had ample time to provide whatever was necessary. I remember some years ago, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) objected very strongly to what was then the custom of giving the contracts for military clothing to certain firms and then extending these contracts after they had expired. The hon. member said that practically the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company of Hamilton then had the monopoly, although one or two other parties were asked to tender, and he then strenuously contended that had tenders been called for, as they should have been, from the leading firms or the public generally, the militia supplies could have been got much cheaper. I am not saying whether the system then followed was wrong or not, but if it was wrong then, it certainly is to-day, and there are stronger grounds to-day for departing from that custom of extending tenders, because there has been a decline in the price of woollen goods, and they can now be purchased much cheaper than a year ago. I do not understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition could have agreed to let the items go through without information. The Minister asks us to let the items go through on his promise that he will furnish us all the information when the larger items come up. But there can be no justification for his extending this $2,600 contract into a $13,000 contract, and for asking us to let the item pass without giving us the information which would enable us to judge whether the bargain is a good one or the reverse. Whe-

ther there was urgency or not the hon. Minister should have come down here with information that would satisfy the House, and he ought to let the item stand until he can furnish us the information we require. He has practically given us no information.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I am in a position to speak authoritatively on the subject of wools, as I sold wool last week at 13 cents a pound, the lowest price in the last thirty years. Last year, when this contract was let, wool was worth 16 or 17 cents a pound. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has quoted the Postmaster General as having said that, in the case of postal contracts, he is in the habit of calling for tenders periodically. All I can say is that in my riding when a contract, which is held by a Conservative, expires, tenders are called for, but in the case of contracts held by the political friends of the Postmaster General they are renewed on expiry. I only hope that a similar policy is not being pursued by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, as we all like to think that his department is non-political, and certainly had tenders been called for money would have been saved in this case.

Mr. CLARKE. I would just like to ask two questions. First, was this contract awarded to Mr. Caldwell before the preferential tariff came into force? And, second, was it optional for him to fulfil that contract or not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am afraid that I cannot give the information, but I will make a note of the question and bring it down later. If my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will accept my statement, I will make a memorandum and bring down the fullest information I can when these items come up next. I cannot give him any information at present, but it is urgent that the item should go through, and as the main Estimates and the supplementaries have to come up yet, there will be ample opportunity for discussion.

Mr. CLANCY. Did it occur to the hon. Minister, when extending that contract, that his friends, inside the House and out of it, were declaring that in consequence of the preferential tariff, goods had been greatly brought down in price, of course, including blankets. I am afraid he extended the contract without having his eyes open, for the purpose of favouring his friends. Mr. Caldwell is a very respectable citizen, and it is no crime to be a Liberal, but even an advantage when contracts are in question, and I venture to say that if he were a Tory, the contract would have been looked into and the preferential tariff would not have been lost sight of. The hon. Minister must either confess that the benefits which he and his friends have been endeavouring to portray in such rosy hues to the consumers of this country as arising from the operations of the preferential tariff are a myth, or he is guilty of having entirely ignored that preferential rate for the purpose of favouring his friends.

Mr. SPROULE. I hardly think we should be expected to let an important item like this pass on the meagre information we have had. Now, while I do not think there is anything in the preferential tariff to reduce the cost of this article, the very statement the Minister made in defence of what he had done, is a strong evidence that he knows very little about the value of the goods. He started with the contention that woollen goods were considerably higher than they were last year, in the face of the fact that the wool sold at its highest last year, at 18 cents a pound, and that this year the highest figure is 14½ cents, while wool can be bought for about 13 to 13¼ cents. When the manufacturer can buy wool at 13¼ cents a pound and sell it at 47½ cents a pound, after putting it through his cards and machines, it must be evident to everybody that either the farmer is not getting a fair value for it or the manufacturer is getting too much. The manufacturer is selling this wool to the country and the farmer is helping to pay for it. How many farmers will say that it is not a distinct injustice to them that, while the wool they sell is reduced in value, the Government is paying as much for wool as they did last year. And this is done without tender, the transaction being with political friends of the Government. It shows great carelessness on the part of the Government and great injustice to the agricultural class. They are getting a very low price for their wool, and the only way by which this advantage can in part be made up to them is by the Government exercising most stringent economy. The Minister, in asking for this vote, gives us no information; he does not know how much he is paying. He says this is an extended contract, no effort having been made even to ascertain whether they could get the goods for less than last year. As to the plea of urgency, I cannot see any point in that. The Minister of Militia must have known months ago whether he intended to drill the militia or not. Knowing that, it was carelessness on his part or on the part of the officials of the department, to wait until the last hour and then be obliged to make a contract without the sanction of Parliament, spending the people's money without asking Parliament to grant it, and only coming to us after the money is spent. We do not know at what price they have bought blankets, whether at $1 a pound or at 47 cents a pound or what. They make a contract for $13,000 worth——

An hon. MEMBER. Eighteen thousand.

Mr. SPROULE——and we have the Minister's statement that he is giving a contract

for $39,700 worth of supplies, spending the money before Parliament has voted it; and then, in the innocence of his heart, he asks Parliament to vote this money without telling us how he spent it, except that he says he did not invite tenders. Couple that with the fact that his arrangement was made with a political friend of the Government, and it justifies the belief that the Minister has been unmindful of the interests of the country and is not exercising the economy he should exercise.

Mr. FOSTER. In the item of $125,000, to provide for the annual drill, there is included the men's wages, and also, I suppose, the transport——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. I may explain that the item I am asking for will be completely absorbed in the pay of the officers and men and the supplies of food in camp. The transport is not included. It is a matter which comes in later through accounts rendered by the transportation companies, chiefly railways, and will not be paid until some weeks, at any rate some days, later, and, therefore, is not as urgent as this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I to understand that the supplementary Estimates will contain an item for the transport of the men for the current year's drill?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the main Estimate of $430,000 for the next year includes the transport.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is not the transport for next year, but for the current year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The accounts will not come in until after the 1st of July, and this is always the course that has been pursued.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, King's) stated before dinner that the reason for these high estimates was that it had been the bad practice hitherto to pay one year's account out of the next year's appropriation, that he was changing all that, and that, therefore, he had to ask for this large amount. Now, he virtually tells the House that he proposes to take out of next year's appropriation what will be necessary to pay for the transport that takes place during the current year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that there are difficulties with the Auditor General in paying amounts the accounts of which come in after the 1st July. Perhaps in this case there would have been no difficulty, but, as a matter of fact, in any camp which takes place the bills for transportation never come in until July or August. It might be more regular, I admit, to include these with the item which I referred to before six o'clock, and take a further estimate. But that was not included in the account, as I have ascertained since six o'clock, and it is expected to pay the transportation out of the regular vote for next year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not yet told the House what this current year is going to cost for the drill of the soldiers. He took $300,000; he is going to use that; he has now taken $125,000; and he is going to use that. And yet he has got to pay out of next year's appropriation for the transport of the men for this same annual drill which is taking place in the current year. There is nothing in the contention of my hon. friend that difficulties arise, and the auditor has to audit the accounts. But my hon. friend knows there are two months allowed after the 1st of July for the auditing and general winding up of the accounts, and that the appropriation for the preceding year is carried to that extent to wind up accounts which have been contracted in the year that was past. So, there is nothing at all in these little difficulties that my hon. friend conjures up, to prevent his taking a vote for transport and drill for the current year. But my hon. friend acknowledges now that he is not asking the House for all the money necessary for this year's drill, and that he is going to take a portion of it out of next year's appropriation, which he has no right to do. We never know where we are with this hon. gentleman's estimates. Here we come for transport a little later, and we have an amount of $15,000 for transport. The whole vote that was brought down last year for transport and freight was $30,000; so that the hon. gentleman is asking 50 per cent more than he told the House last year would be sufficient for the work he had in hand. He has not only asked 50 per cent more of a vote, but he has actually taken it upon himself to spend the $15,000, and is now coming, ten days before the year is over, to ask Parliament to give him half as much again as he asked for last year, and which he has spent on his own motion entirely, and without a vote of the House. It gets worse and worse, as you go down. Here is "miscellaneous and unforeseen." He is actually asking for a supplementary estimate for $10,000 for miscellaneous and unforeseen. His whole main estimate last year for that purpose was $15,000. He is asking for two-thirds of the original vote as a supplementary, nearly all of which he has spent. He was not kind enough to tell the House last year that he would want $25,000. He slipped in $15,000, then goes to work and spends $10,000 more without any authority. What can we think of this Minister? Or, is it part of a deep-laid plot, whereby the Minister of Finance says to the country: My estimates are not so very great? Is it that the Minister of Finance whispers in the ear of the Minister of Militia and Defence and the other Ministers: Keep

down your main estimates ; only get a part, and I will allow you to have a supplementary next year ? I cannot think the Minister of Finance would do that. I think the Minister of Finance must tell his colleagues: I want you to put to the last cent of what you are going to spend in the Estimates, and we will get the Governor General's signature to authorize for the work of the coming year, and beyond which we are not expected to extend. If the Minister does that, then the Minister of Militia and Defence is adding 50 per cent, adding 75 per cent, adding 25 per cent to the main vote that he asked for the year's services, and, after having spent that money, he comes down and asks for these things ten days before the financial year is over. My hon. friend is a terrible sinner in this respect. He knows it, he confesses it, and thinks he has absolved himself ; and the next year goes and does the very same thing again. With reference to the feed of these troops, is everything tendered for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Absolutely everything, and given to the lowest tenderer. Now, with regard to this matter of transportation, whether we should have included the vote for the transport of troops in the sum for transporting the troops in this vote, there may be some question. But I am inclined to agree, and my hon. friend disagrees. He is disappointed, when I agree with him. It is absolutely impossible for me to please my hon. friend. He stands up here, and he scolds, and, when he makes a point that I think is fair, and I at once admit it, then he is annoyed because I admit it. Now, I say at once that I was not aware that the sum necessary for transport was not included. I think, if I had been aware of the fact, I would have included it. Unfortunately, it is impossible to increase the vote. I believe, according to the rules of Parliament, we can reduce it, but not increase it. Therefore, I am afraid that, unless a further supplementary is brought in, my hon. friend will have to take this vote as it is, and next year we will take a vote for transport out of the same vote in the main Estimates. Now, with reference to transport, let me say a single word. In the main Estimates the sum for transport estimated for the whole year is $40,000 ; for 1896-97 it was $47,000. But since we came in, we have reduced the rate, and this is the point on which, I am sure, we will receive the commendation of my hon. friend. We have reduced the cost of transport of troops by one-third. When we came into office, the rates charged were 3 cents a mile for officers, and 2 cents per mile for non-commissioned officers and men. The transport of one company, say, 42 men and 3 officers, for 100 miles, according to the old rate, was $98 ; according to the present rate, established in August, 1897, the cost would be $60. When the party exceeds 125 men, the reduction will be much larger. The transport of three companies, 126 men and 9 officers, for 100 miles, under the old rate, would be $280 ; the present rate is $176.67, a saving of $104. If they return within three months, the cost under the old rate would be $560, and under the present rate $270. I am sure this is one respect in which the administration of this department will receive the approval of my hon. friend.

Mr. CARGILL. There is a matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister, having been requested to do so by a constituent of mine. It appears that sometime ago a gentleman who was about to go to the Military School at London made application for transport. If the committee will permit me I will read a letter which I have received, which perhaps will put it in better shape than I can. It is as follows :—

Recently Mr. A. G. Stewart, of our town, wished to attend the military school at London, a requisition was furnished him, reading via Canadian Pacific Railway via Streetsville or Toronto, the regular fare of which is $6 (Government pays, I think, two-thirds of regular rates). He should have gone Canadian Pacific Railway to Wingham, 30 cents ; Wingham to London, $2.25. These are regular fares.

On his return he asked the commandant to issue him requisition via Grand Trunk to Wingham ; but no—that could not be done—he must send him via Canadian Pacific Railway, taking a day to make the trip, and the Government whacks up the difference in fares again.

You may think this is a small matter ; but if this goes on all over the country the people are paying sweetly for an "able and economical Liberal Government." You would not pay $4 or $5 extra to send a man to London on your own business. I am a Liberal, but I hate the people to be imposed upon. I am beginning to think that Governments (Liberals or Conservatives) don't care a cent for the interest of the people, the great object appears to be the manipulation of votes.

I might have left that part out, but I want to deal fairly, and put the Conservatives on the same plane as the Liberals. I believe that if the Minister and his department will look into this matter they can arrange to have the transport charges of these pupils greatly reduced. On this one particular item, there is a saving, as I make it, of $2.30 in one fare. This gentleman could have gone from Teeswater by way of Wingham to London for $2.70. In the face of that he was sent over the Canadian Pacific Railway by way of Streetsville and Toronto to London at a cost of $6, making a difference of $3.30 between the two fares. In these Estimates I notice there is a vote of $15,000 for transport. Taking into consideration the saving that there would be on the basis of which I have spoken $10,000 would be sufficient for this purpose. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will look carefully into the matter and see that the cheapest rate is arranged in sending these men to the Military School.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very much obliged to my genial friend (Mr. Cargill), for having called my attention to this matter. I would be very much obliged to him if he would send me the letter, as I was not able to catch all he said, or if he would send me a copy of it.

Mr. CARGILL. I have no objection to giving the hon. gentleman the name of the author of this letter. The gentleman who wrote me this letter is a general agent of the Grand Trunk Railway. He is not located at any particular station, but he can sell tickets from any one station of the Grand Trunk to any other station of the Grand Trunk. I understand local ticket agents are only permitted to sell tickets from their own station to any other station, and I fancy this is the way that this matter was drawn to this gentleman's attention. The party had made application to him for transport charges by way of the Grand Trunk, but he was instructed to go by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway via Toronto to London.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The responsibility for the mistake must rest primarily with the officer in charge of the district, or of the depot who is supposed to be on the watch to guard the public interest in matters of this kind. I shall take care that the matter is looked into and that the blame is traced home to the proper parties. We could have only one object, and that is to have the money voted for the purposes of the militia spent economically so that it will go as far as possible. We do not get enough as it is for the purposes of the service, and I am sure there is no desire on the part of anybody at headquarters, and I cannot understand how there could be a desire in the interest of any railway company on the part of any person at district headquarters to impose on the country as it has been suggested has been done by making these transport charges two or three times what they ought to have been. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the matter, and I will see that it is carefully investigated.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. Minister any more information about this than what he has given?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will promise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), if he will allow the matter to go through, that I will get him a statement of the information as fully as can be got. I cannot give it to him to-night. However, I may say this to my hon. friend that when he says the price of wool is 13½ cents, and goes on to assume that, having paid 47½ cents to the man who supplies blankets, we actually gave him the difference between 13½ cents and 47½ cents, making no allowance at all for the cost of manufacturing, I think he is trying to create an impression in the public mind which is not creditable to himself and not fair to the department. I am not able to say whether the price is 47½ cents or not, but I have promised the hon. gentleman that I would bring the information, and I will bring it when the main Estimates are reached. I cannot do any more than that now. I have already stated that I am not a professional in the matter. I was told that the price of wool had increased at the time this arrangement was made. We bought these blankets in March, speaking from memory, as it was necessary we should have them ready by the early part of May in order to have them examined at headquarters and issued in time for camp. My recollection is that at the time the price of wool was higher than it was at the time at which the contract was made in the previous year. I can only tell my hon. friend what my recollection is, as I have not the figures here to fortify myself. But I think my hon. friend will perhaps allow the vote to go through on the promise I have made to give him information at the earliest possible time.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not propose to lie under the imputation that I have made a statement that is not creditable to my reputation or to myself.

This wool, after it is bought from the farmer passes through the manufacturer's hands only; he pays the farmer 13½ cents a pound for it, and all he has to do is to wash it and grease it and put it through his machinery, and then he sells it to the Government for 47½ cents a pound. No one will deny that that is an enormously high figure. Some years ago I had occasion to send circulars to persons who supplied blankets to the Interior and Indian Departments, and I know that there was a fair margin of profit. It is the duty of the Minister to give us some information, and in the absence of that, I am justified in taking the only information available to me, namely, the price paid on the contract last year, and the Minister tells us that the present supply is under an extension of the same contract and at the same price. When that contract was made last year wool was higher than it is now, and even though the Minister paid a fair price last year that price should undoubtedly be lower to-day. The Minister asks us to let the item go through, and he tells us we will get the information afterwards. That is on the principle of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. The only check the House has on it is to refuse to vote the money. The whole transaction is irregular, because the Minister spent the money before the House voted it, and he spent it without calling for tenders. This item involves $39,000, and yet the rule is that any contract which involves the expenditure of $5,000 shall be thrown open to tender and the lowest tenderer get the contract. The Minister gave the contract

to his political friends, and, apparently, he made no effort to get the price reduced. Yesterday I saw long wool sold right from the farmer's wagon at 13½ cents per pound. and even if the wool was the same price as last year, the difference between 13½ cents a pound which the farmer is paid and the 47½ cents which the Government pays the manufacturer, is altogether unreasonable.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps I had better quote the price of wool, if the hon. gentleman insists on it, and if he confounds white blankets with gray blankets.

Mr. SPROULE. The difference is that the gray are cheaper than the white.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Quite so. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) insists upon saying that we are paying 47½ cents a pound for these blankets, when he does not know anything about it.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that the Minister has refused to give us the necessary information, and that, consequently, we are obliged to take the information available to us. He told us that these blankets were bought from the same contractor and at the same price as last year, and I have the Auditor General's Report before me, which says that they cost 47½ cents a pound last year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said we continued the same contract with the same contractors.

Mr. SPROULE. And at the same price.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am quite sure that the item quoted from the Auditor General's Report does not cover this case. I have here "W. C. Caldwell, Lanark, $2,380, 9,555½ pounds at 40 cents." In spite of that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says we are paying 47½ cents. I did not suppose it was possible for an hon. member of this House to deliberately misread——

Mr. SPROULE. I call the hon. Minister to order. If he looks at L—77, Auditor General's Report, he will see the item 5,460½ pounds at 47½ cents per pound, and I read that exactly as it is there. I do not want the Minister to say that I am misleading, when I gave the only information that is available to this House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not intend to say that the hon. gentleman misread it intentionally.

Mr. SPROULE. You say "deliberately."

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, I withdraw that statement. I have got here the Auditor General's Report for 1897-98, and the item is "W. C. Caldwell, Lanark, contractor, $2,380 ; 9,555½ pounds at 40 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. What page is that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. L—44.

Mr. EARLE. Look at L—77 and you will see the very item as quoted by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule).

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) took the trouble to look at the heading he would find that the blankets referred to were of special weight, and special quality and specially manufactured for the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. What difference does that make when they are bought by the pound ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not say the hon. gentleman wished to misrepresent, but when he attempts to criticise and impute all sorts of improprieties to the Minister, he did not take the care he ought to have taken to satisfy himself as to the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I satisfied myself as to the facts, and I quoted nothing I did not find in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Now, with reference to the wool trade. I am not very familiar with it, but a friend has handed me a copy of the Dry Goods "Review," in which I find the following :—

The advances in fine wools will, it is said, affect a number of lines of woollen goods in the market. The cause generally assigned for the higher prices of wools is the ravages made by drought in Australian flocks. There were, for example, 61,000,000 wool-bearing sheep in New South Wales in 1891 ; in the same colony, in 1898, there were just 41,000,000, and it is claimed that several good seasons are required to restore the Australian wool clip to its former position. Other parts of the world, namely, South Africa, South America and the United States, have been producing less, and, in consequence, the market for fine wools has shown a remarkable buoyancy.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the Minister know that there is none of that kind of wool used in blankets ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am referring to the general condition of the wool trade which the hon. gentleman spoke about.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot pull the wool over our eyes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This paper goes on to say :

As an illustration of this take the price of the grade known as "60's tops"—that is merino wool that has been combed before being spun into yarn—and the quotations of price in the English markets show the following advances :—1899—Price per lb. in pence : Month of January, 21 ; month of February, 20⅞ ; week ending March

4, 20¾ ; week ending March 11, 20¾ ; week ending March 18, 21 ; week ending March 25, 21½ ; week ending April 1, 22 ; week ending April 8, 22½ ; week ending April 15, 24½ ; week ending April 22, 26.

Continental prices have ruled even higher than this. The manufacturers have, therefore, been forced to threaten advances, which will apply to all markets, including Canada, where British and foreign woollen materials are largely purchased. A Bradford report, of May 20th, says :

"The better inquiry for all classes of finer cross-bred wools is fuller sustained, and, as these afford the only good substitute for real merinos, the hardening tendency is not likely to be checked for some little time

"The lower and cheaper cross-bred wools have been distinctly worst to buy in London, and both wools and yarns of this class have been slightly dearer in Bradford, but, as the supply of these wools is both very large and is also increasing, one can hardly look for any continued advance of moment.

"English reports show that the wholesale and retail trades there have been loath to accept the threatened advances of manufacturers. Competent authorities state, however, that some are doing so, and that all must realize the necessity of paying more, or going without the goods."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Time.

Mr. TYRWHITT. It is quite unnecessary for the Minister of Militia to tell us that he knows nothing about wool when he reads from a paper quotations of the prices of merino and South Australian wools. Anybody who knows anything about wool at all knows that the blankets supplied to the Canadian militia are manufactured from Canadian combing wool, the cheapest in the market. While Australian wool and Spanish merino might be worth from 25 to 50 cents when imported, Canadian combing wool is only worth 13 cents.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I beg to differ from my hon. friend. The blankets furnished to the militia for a number of years past have been half shoddy, and in the least dampness they stank very disagreeably. I have no doubt that the Colonel himself knows that what I am saying is a fact. But we are pleased to believe that lately the department have exercised some supervision over the blankets, and have, at least, got all-wool blankets. I am not at the present moment prepared to say anything in regard to the contention of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), as to whether the prices were the lowest that might have been obtained or not. I understand that tenders had been asked for by the department and quotations obtained from the leading men in the business; but we are now getting all-wool blankets instead of half or three-quarters shoddy, as was the case for many years. Those blankets were very disagreeable to the men, and it was very bad economy on the part of the department, because every militiaman and every other person who uses blankets knows from experience that such blankets, besides being very disagreeable, only last a short time as compared with a good all-wool blanket.

Mr. SPROULE. The only trouble with the logic of the hon. member for North Oxford is that it is not based on facts. He says the Government asked for tenders from different firms, whereas the Minister says he did not do so at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understood so.

Mr. CLARKE. Were all those articles for the camps furnished by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, all of them.

Mr. PRIOR. Does the Minister say that when the troops go to camp the supplies of bread and meat and all that sort of thing are obtained by tenders asked from certain people, or from the public ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The whole public, invariably.

Mr. WALLACE. I find that the quotations for ordinary Canadian combing wool are 13 and 13½ cents. It costs 10 or 12 cents to manufacture, which would bring the cost up to 26 cents. Yet we find at one place in the Auditor General's Report that 9,000 pounds were got at 40 cents from W. C. Caldwell, and at another place 9,000 pounds were charged at 47½ cents. I would like to know whether these were the same class of goods, whether tenders were called for, and whether these were the lowest tenders. These blankets are supplied to the department for a long distance ahead, so that the Government cannot claim any urgency in the filling of the contract; and 47½ cents for an article that would cost 24, 25 or 26 cents seems to be extraordinary. The Minister told us last year that he did not ask for tenders for supplies for the Yukon, but he went to eight or ten parties in all for four or five different classes of goods, so that in each case only one or two persons were asked for prices. That is no way to do business. We are called upon to vote enormous sums for the militia, and if we knew that the money was economically expended, I am sure that no vote would be given by this House more cheerfully ; but we do object, and will object, to money being squandered by the Department of Militia ; and when the Minister is called to account in this House, he is not ready with any explanation as to how the money had been expended. He simply asks us for enormous sums of money without any check or safeguard. Evidently he is permitting the officers of his department to run the department and run him too. He comes here without a particle of information in regard to these matters. Somebody throws a newspaper into his hands, when he is called to account by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) for

the price he pays for wool, and he says Cape wools and merino wools are rising in price. He says he does not know much about wool. He knows this, however, that Cape wools are not used for making blankets for soldiers or for anybody else, for that matter, but that Canadian long wools are used for the manufacture of these blankets. I am sure that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is quite misinformed when he says that the blankets formerly used were half shoddy, but that now some attention is being paid to their manufacture. I have seen the specifications and forms of tender, and I know many of the men who in years past have been tendering for the supply of these blankets, and I know that for the last fifteen or twenty years pure wool blankets have been required. We have had an excellent inspector of these goods, Mr. Watson, a man thoroughly competent, and I am sure that he would not permit a single blanket to pass that was not pure wool and that did not come up to the specification. So that the department are not getting better blankets now than they did before, and I am quite safe in saying that blankets ought not to be any dearer than they were when wool was at a higher price. But when that was quoted here at 47½ cents per pound and quoted in another place at 40 cents per pound, we say that both those figures are far too high. Go to any retail dry goods store in Ottawa, and I am quite sure you will get an excellent white wool blanket —which is much dearer than a military gray blanket—for less money than either of these quotations. And these quotations should be lower even than the wholesale prices, because they are the manufacturer's prices. Mr. Caldwell, I understand, is a manufacturer of blankets, so that it is manufacturers prices the Government should have had. To pay 47½ cents per pound for blankets for the militia is absurd, and the hon. Minister will have to explain under what conditions or circumstances such an enormous price is paid, before this vote can receive the sanction of this House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. Minister say that the supplies for the camps are obtained by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does that rule apply to the camp in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER According to my recollection a return was brought down from the department last session, showing that supplies were obtained by asking a selected number of parties to tender and not by public advertisement.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the hon. gentleman's recollection it at fault. In the autumn of 1896, there were only a few days to get the supplies, after the camps were determined upon, and it was thought prudent to place the matter of getting the supplies in the hands of three gentleman—Mr. Chipman, of Kentville, Mr. Dodd, the provincial member for the county of King's, and I think the district officer commanding the district. Those three men made the contracts, and that was the only time, either under the late Government or since, when that course was pursued.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was the case in my mind, and I did not know whether that system is still followed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It has never been followed since. In reply to the hon. member for Grey, I may say that the price 47½ cents was a special price paid for blankets specially manufactured for the Yukon.

Mr. WALLACE. What kind of special manufacture were they ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were heavier.

Mr. WALLACE. That would make no difference as they were sold by the pound.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were manufactured very hurriedly too. The time was short, and we required them in a few days.

Mr. WALLACE. Supposing so, that would not make them cost any more.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was so reported to me. With regard to the other price, 40 cents, I am informed that it is a reasonable price for the quality of goods which we have received.

Mr. WALLACE. How does the hon. Minister know when he did not call for tenders?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We asked prices from various dealers, and we do not always necessarily give the contract to the lowest tenderer. We asked for samples, and upon the report of the inspector as to which show the most value, a contract may be given. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have had a great deal of trouble since I have been in charge of the department in reference to this matter. At that time we were being furnished with blankets which were, as an expert said, half shoddy. These were condemned and the contracts closed, and the excuse made by the men who were manufacturing these blankets, was that the price

was so low—I think something like 37 cents —that they could not furnish an all-wool blanket. We think it is better economy to supply the militia with good all-wool blankets, it has been my object to do that, and I believe we have done that at the lowest price possible. I am prepared to go before any committee and produce the articles we have supplied to the militia and let any committee competent to judge decide whether we have paid extravagant or unjust prices or not, particularly in comparison with the stuff supplied to the department prior to 1896.

Mr. SPROULE. If the committee could not get any more information out of you than we do to-night it would not be worth your while going before them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very sorry I cannot supply both the information and the capacity for taking it in.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Militia was taken in when he gave 37½ cents per pound for hurry.

Militia clothing $20,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This clothing is required to fit the troops out for camp. We found that we were short of certain garments, and it is absolutely necessary to have them ready, and we are giving the work to the contractors, the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Co., who are this year doing a very large part of our work.

Mr. EARLE. I must call the attention of the hon. Minister to a return brought down last year, in which he gives the prices of various classes of goods furnished, and then at the bottom there is a class of goods, tools, hardware, axes, hinges, &c., and in parenthesis "purchased after competitive tender prices have been received." The inference is that in the other cases, no tenders were received, and I notice there are two sets of blankets supplied by J. W. Woods and W. C. Caldwell.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think no tenders were asked for in the case of the Yukon blankets. The blankets now under consideration are ordinary blankets used in the camp, and not the special kind used for the Yukon.

Mr. EARLE. Are the ordinary kinds used in camp paid at the rate of 47½ cents per pound ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, only those specially manufactured for use in the Yukon.

Mr. EARLE. Purchased without tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. SPROULE. How then could the hon. gentleman quote figures at 40 cents per pound, and say I was making a mistake. Instead of my making a mistake he was, either inadvertently or otherwise, keeping back information from the House. He admits that the blankets we quoted were for the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I pointed to my hon. friend that he ought to have exercised a little caution in quoting that price of 47½ cents. If he had looked at the heading of the page, he would have observed that it was headed : "Supplies to the Yukon," and that the 40 cents were for an entirely different thing and come under another vote altogether.

Mr. CLANCY. Are the blankets for the militia all wool ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the difference between those and the blankets purchased for the Yukon ? Both are purchased by weight and both are all wool. They are both purchased by weight, if I understand aright, and both are pure wool, I suppose. Why is one higher-priced than the other ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to give further information than I have already given.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely, the hon. gentleman must have this information. He pays 40 cents a pound for one kind, and declared they were all wool, and 47 cents for another kind that cannot be better than all wool, unless the hon. gentleman has some silk mixed with them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There are different qualities.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) knows much about this matter. He understands his profession a good deal better. In any case, I am not asking him questions.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I suppose a medical man knows about as much about wool as a lawyer, anyway.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) will answer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). We are discussing the item of clothing now.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not suppose the hon. Minister will refuse to answer because we are past the particular item.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will endeavour to have the information for the hon. gentleman at a later time.

Mr. McNEILL. Am I to understand my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, King's) to say that blankets, supplied under a contract calling

for all-wool blankets, would not be all-wool blankets, while those that were bought without contract were all-wool blankets? If so, I cannot understand why that should be. There surely ought to be some officer whose duty it should be to find out if the goods supplied were according to the terms of contract. It seems to me that this whole discussion only emphasizes what has been pointed out before—how very inadvisable it is to have goods supplied to the Government in any other way than by tender and contract. I would like my hon. friend to explain, if he would not mind, why blankets should not be all wool, if supplied under contract which calls for all wool.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say why it is; I simply said they were not, as a matter of fact. One of the reasons may be, that, when tenders are asked for, people are induced to tender who are not financially strong, who are anxious to get hold of a Government contract, and who perhaps hope to bring political influence to bear. Perhaps they put in a tender at a lower figure than they can eventually manufacture good goods for, and trust to their political pull later on to have these goods paid for, though they are one-third or one-half shoddy. I am afraid that thing has happened in the past, and I have endeavoured to guard against it. But my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) misunderstood me, if he gathered from what I said that I have given up asking for tenders. In this particular case, and in the case of blankets for the Yukon, tenders were not asked for; but we ask for tenders for all the clothing and all the other necessaries for the force. Occasionally, when we have a favourable contract and want an additional quantity of goods, we simply enlarge the contract. In that case I act on the recommendation of experts in the department that the price which is recommended to me is fair and the goods up to the mark. That is what I intended to convey, and, if I conveyed a different impression to the committee or to my hon. friend, it was done unintentionally.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) is altogether too exigent in asking information from the Minister. The hon. gentleman made it as plain as it could be made. One set of blankets cost 40 cents a pound, and the other set of blankets cost 47½ cents a pound. The first set of blankets were the best that could be bought, all-wool; the second set of blankets were the best that could be bought, all-wool; 40 cents a pound for one, and 47½ cents a pound for the other. Why? Because the second batch was heavier than the first!

Mr. McMULLEN. Those who are informed with regard to the manufacture of woollen goods for the Yukon, know perfectly well that extra labour is put on these goods. I am sorry that the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) is not here. If he were here, he would not challenge the statement I have made. Forty cents a pound for all-wool blankets is a reasonable price, and, when you buy goods upon which extra labour must be put, as in the case of these blankets for the Yukon. 47½ cents a pound is a fair price. I quite agree that it is a sound principle that tenders should be asked for for all supplies, I care not which party is in power. But, after all, circumstances may arise where it may be necessary to depart from that well-established rule. In the case of these goods manufactured for the Yukon, I do not see how hon. gentlemen opposite, who know that the goods had to be of the best material and the best manufacture, specially heavy and well put together, can say that 47½ cents a pound is too high a price.

Mr. EARLE. There was not a woollen mill in eastern Canada, or in Canada anywhere, that was not manufacturing blankets specially intended for the Yukon trade last year. So, there could have been no difficulty in getting a supply from any of them, except that, possibly, they could not fill orders as fast as they came in. The merchants in the dry goods line in western Canada and on the Pacific coast were all carrying a stock of blankets particularly suited for the Yukon trade.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle) is mistaken. I claim to be a stockholder in a woollen mill, one that manufactures very largely for the Canadian trade, and we did not manufacture anything for the Yukon. The goods for use in the Yukon had to be manufactured in a peculiar way to meet the extreme conditions that prevail in that country, and for that reason you had to use particularly good stock and put extra labour on the goods.

Mr. EARLE. In reply to the hon. gentlemau, I would simply say that he must be mistaken. The only difference between the Yukon blanket and others is, that they are heavier and more closely made. But there is nothing special about them at all, and all the large mills in the province were making blankets that were able to make them at all.

Mr. CLANCY. We hear the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) getting up and defending his friends and assuming to know a great deal. I would like to know where the hon. gentleman got his information when he says there was extra labour put upon these blankets. He stated a moment ago they were not made in his own establishment. Now, I would like to know upon what authority the hon. gentleman is speaking when he is defending his friends? If he is a woollen manufacturer and can say

from his personal knowledge that they were of a different kind in consequence of more labour having been put upon them, that might be good evidence.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reply to my hon. friend, I will say that I have had samples shown me, I have looked at them, and they were recommended by Mr. Ogilvie as the proper style and character of goods to be manufactured for the Yukon district. I have seen them in Toronto. I wanted to see whether we could produce those or not, and I came to the conclusion that it must require some peculiar kind of machinery, and that we had not the machinery necessary to produce the very thick blankets wanted for that district.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence said a short time ago that when he called for tenders, experience proved that he did not get the best results. If that was the experience with tenders generally, I cannot quite understand why it is that he pursues the system of tendering. But the hon. gentleman says that a man tendering has a political pull and can get his goods through ; so, I suppose that a man who supplies goods without tendering does not have any political pull at all. That is a new doctrine.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend did not catch my observation. I said that when we ask for tenders now we ask the tenderer to supply a sample of what he proposes to give us. The old rule has been to have a certain sample in the department, which was shown to the would-be tenderer, and called the standard. Then, there was often a serious question as to whether the sample supplied was exactly like the standard. But now we ask the would-be contractor to send in with his tender the sample of what he proposes to supply. We find the present plan very much better, because we have men in the department who are experts, and can judge as to the relative value. I said that we did not bind ourselves to accept the lowest tender, but to accept the tender which gives the department the best value for the money. That is the system which I endeavoured to explain a short time ago, and which my hon. friend, perhaps, did not catch.

Mr. McNEILL. The question my hon. friend and I were discussing across the floor of the House a short time ago was whether the system of tendering was the better plan. He was contending that he got better goods without tender. If the political pull gets goods through the department in the case of the old plan, the political pull would get goods through the department under the new plan just as well. The question I was discussing with my hon. friend was as to whether there should be tenders at all, and he defended his not asking for tenders on the ground that he got better material. I say that if he got better material when he did not ask for tenders, it was the fault of the department, and my hon. friend is responsible for the department. They should not accept goods if they were not up to the sample. But I think my hon. friend will see from what has taken place now, how injudicious it is from every point of view, to get supplies without tender, if there is time to get them by tender.

Mr. MOORE. I do not pretend to know anything about the exigencies of the case described by the Minister of Militia and Defence, but I do know a little about blankets, for I have sold them for the last 20 years. I know that 47 cents is too high a price to pay per pound for the best blankets made in Canada. I have no doubt you can go to wholesale houses in the city of Montreal, such houses as Gault Bros. & Co., and buy the best quality of white blankets for 40 cents a pound, or less, and you can get English blankets of the same quality for that price. You can get a pair even of the best blankets made in this country for 40 cents a pound, and in such large quantities for less.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, we seem to be getting nearer to the point, and a gentleman who knows something about blankets has been able to tell us just exactly what the price is. The price of 40 cents seems to be the outside price for white blankets. We all know that gray blankets are not worth as much as white. It is a well known fact that inferior wool is put into the gray blankets. The finer wool, the select part of the fleece, is used to make white blankets, the higher grade of blankets ; but the inferior parts of the fleece, that are not worth nearly so much, are used to make gray blankets. Consequently, if 40 cents a pound is a fair price for white blankets, and from my knowledge and experience I believe it is, then gray blankets should not cost anything like as high as 40 cents. I would ask the Minister who is the examiner of these goods at the present time. Is it the same man who acted as examiner under the previous Government?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The present man is Mr. Robertson.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that Mr. Robertson of Hamilton ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is he a practical dry goods man ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it was rather a serious charge that was made against Mr. Watson, who acted as examiner for a great length of time under the previous Administration, to say that he deliberately allowed goods to be put on the Government

which were not at all up to the standard. I confess to knowing something of the nature of the tenders that were called for under the previous Government. My recollection is that they had not only to be all-wool, but that they had to be all Canadian wool. Certainly, Mr. Watson would have been very much to blame if he had permitted anything but an all-wool blanket to be supplied under these contracts. From my knowledge of the man I cannot suppose that he did anything of the kind, and I rather fear that perhaps the hon. Minister and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) were pulling somewhat on their imaginations when they said that Mr. Watson permitted the Government to be defrauded in this manner by having goods foisted upon them which were half shoddy. I do not think the hon. Minister or the hon. member for North Oxford could have been sincere when they ventured the statement that the goods that were delivered under the contracts of the old Government were largely shoddy and very much inferior to those supplied at the present time. It seems to me that that statement has been made without proper consideration, and I hardly think it is fair to the gentleman who examined these goods on former occasions.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I certainly did not intend to cast any reflection upon the gentleman to whom the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) refers. If he had not referred to the matter specially I would not have said anything about it. But the fact is that the blankets were being supplied and I think I have abundant evidence of the fact in the department, which were part shoddy. I do not believe that Mr. Watson was aware of the fact; I am quite sure he was not. I do not impute to him any complicity whatever in the matter, but the fact existed, and I felt it to be my duty to employ other inspectors and other inspectors have been employed since, although Mr. Watson has been employed in the department in other matters, in examining other purchases outside of blankets.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who states that blankets formerly supplied were two-thirds shoddy, if they were white blankets?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were gray blankets, so far as I know.

Mr. MOORE. The prices we were quoting on white blankets were more expensive than those on gray blankets. You cannot get any shoddy into a white blanket at all.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence has told the House that Mr. Watson did not know the difference between a good blanket and a bad blanket. I do not think there was ever a more unwarranted statement made by a member of this House. Many of us know Mr. Watson as a scientific expert in that business, a man whose whole time was devoted to seeing that the article was exactly similar to that which the contract called for. I know, of my own knowledge, of hundreds of blankets being rejected because they, for some reason, were not quite up to the standard. Mr. Watson never permitted a blanket to go through that was not up to standard. Mr. Watson never permitted any of those irregularities that are complained of. The hon. Minister says that he does not blame Mr. Watson. Mr. Watson exercised a careful supervision over these articles, and the hon. Minister cannot produce a tittle of evidence to justify the statement he has made. He has stated another fact to this committee, and it is the only fact of any importance, because every other statement he has made on the question of furnishing supplies, has bemuddled this committee rather than afforded any information. He has made the statement that he has discontinued the practice of asking for tenders in the regular way and adopted a new system under which every man has to send in a sample of his own goods at his own prices. Hundreds of samples may be sent in and they may amount to more than the goods that are to be supplied. The thing is so absurd and so unbusinesslike that it does away with the whole system of tendering. The hon. Minister will be able to say: Mr. Smith's goods suit me very much; of course they are quoted at the highest price, but that does not matter. They are just the class of goods we want, and Mr. Smith gets the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Caldwell.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Caldwell, I beg his pardon. We will call him Smith this time. If you adopt that principle, and the hon. Minister says he has adopted it, it absolutely does away with the safeguard of tendering. The Minister, in the first place, should know what he wants; he should know the size of the blanket required for the militia, the weight, the colour and the quality. The old plan was that there was a sample and a pattern sealed up, and every tenderer had to supply a blanket up to that standard of colour, quality &c., and had to comply with the specifications in every way. Under the new regulation all this is done away with, and the Minister has unlimited power to give contracts to his friends without regard to prices or anything else except the inauguration of a system of jobbery in the Militia Department.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I did hope that when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) assumed the duties of Minister

of Militia we should receive some enlightenment on this wool question, and, in speaking of his assuming the duties, I must admit that it is a position for which he is eminently fitted by his experience in Ontario and by reason of his constantly coming in contact with the agricultural community. We know that a strike has lately taken place amongst the trackmen of the Grand Trunk Railway. Strikes appear to be in the air, and the first thing we know there will be a strike in the Cabinet which will give my hon. friend from North Wellington an opportunity of taking his place as Minister of Militia, the present Minister being promoted to a higher position. We have heard a good deal about the waste of time in this House, but we must all realize that we are not only wasting our own time, but the time of the country, or the country is losing the time which is being wasted here. It appears to me that when the hon. member for North Wellington takes his role as Minister of Militia we may expect him to bring this discussion on blankets to a conclusion by admitting that Mr. Caldwell, being a good, staunch member of the party, it was thought to be in the interest of the party to give him this contract for blankets at a good, fair price.

Transport $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is an increase of 50 per cent—more.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Fifty per cent, I think. It was $30.000 last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The main Estimates calls for $30,000. Now my hon. friend is calling for $15,000 more, or 50 per cent over the original estimate. This $15,000 is all spent. The Minister last year having a knowledge of his department asked the House to give him $30,000 for transport. He has spent that, and spent one-third more without any warrant, and I suppose he is ready to make another confession.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The $30,000 was expended on the 1st of February, but $15,000 out of that sum was incurred the previous year. We should have taken a vote for $45,000, but next year, beginning even on the 1st of July, I hope the vote in the main estimate will be sufficient.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen expenditure $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. That is also a notable item. Last year the total expenditure under that head was only $14,800, which was large. For the current year the main Estimates ask $15,000, and now the Minister asks $10,000, making $25,000 in all.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned, I will not consent to that passing unless there is a most thorough explanation of it. Patience ceases to be a virtue after a certain time. The money is all expended now. It is a perfect contempt this Minister has for Parliament. The members are to him nothing more than wooden heads, automatons. He does not think any more of them than the Government does of the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Bethune), who supports them and to whom they will not give the patronage of his county. What is Parliament to a Liberal Minister of Militia ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The vote we take for the current year is $15,000, and the explanation of the additional amount required is as follows :— $3,000 of the $15.000, as in the case of the other votes I have mentioned, was used to pay expenses incurred the previous year.

Mr. FOSTER. What expenses ; give us the items ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Large sums for printing and stationery were due from previous years, and in addition to that $3.000 were required for the military surveys in July and August.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What previous years ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. 1897-98.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is only one year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This vote is used, first, in paying for compensation on account of illness and accidents.

Mr. FOSTER. How much ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I point out to the hon. gentleman that owing to the fact we have called out a much larger proportion of the militia than formerly, these charges are much higher. They include compensation for the horses as well as for the men who become ill in camp. A part of the item is for reconnaissance service, a most important service which is being carried on at the Royal Military College and for which $5,000 is being expended annually. It is a topographical survey of the frontier of this country, and maps are being made which are most interesting and valuable, and it gives a most important training to the young men of the Royal Military College.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that carried on annually ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is it unforeseen then ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It has been carried on in that way, but I think perhaps it might be separated from this vote. However, the vote is for "miscellaneous" and unforeseen. The third is for legal expenses, the fourth for telegrams and telephones, the fifth for advertising, printing and stationery, and the sixth for sundry expenses. I trust that the vote of $20,000 in the main Estimates will be ample for the next year. We are asking for $10,000 now, which will bring the vote up to $25,000, but at least $5,000 of that was incurred in the year ending June, 1898.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Far from that topographical survey being unforeseen, the Minister will find that it began as far back as 1895, when Captain Lee, of the Kingston Military College, took charge of the survey in the Eastern Townships.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is carried on more extensively now.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister has not given us one iota of information on this matter. He has simply read certain headings under which it is to be expended. He says he wants $10,000, but he does not give the committee the amount he wants under each head. Take compensation: last year it amounted to $437. That is a very small sum. He says that this year more men are called out, and there will be more legs broken and more horses balled, and the like of that, and he will have to pay more. How much more? The hon. gentleman must have made his estimate on some basis; he must know what he wants this money for. It has all, or nearly all, been expended. What has it been expended for? Not a word of information about that. Now, we come to the reconnaissance survey. How much does the hon. gentleman expect to expend for that? How much has been expended during the year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. $5,000 during the current year.

Mr. FOSTER. When does that reconnaissance survey go out?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In July and August.

Mr. FOSTER. When did it go out last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In the same month.

Mr. FOSTER. How long was it out?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About two months.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, what amount was expended? They went out in July, and they came in in September, and all the accounts, without any doubt, are paid. We ought to know how much is paid for that reconnaissance survey.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sorry to say that I have not got the figures here; but if my hon. friend expects a statement, I will bring the full statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we can do that on an item like this. The Minister's duty is to cut his garment according to his cloth—to suit his appropriation to his needs. Every Minister pledges his faith when he asks a certain vote from Parliament. We come to a point where the Minister has expended nearly $25,000, and we ask him how much has been spent on the reconnaissance survey and he cannot tell. He thinks it is within $5,000. Would it surprise him if he had spent only $2,000?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I know that very much more than that is spent. For maps and photographing maps something like $1,500 or $1,800 was spent in connection with the defence committee which sat here last year, and in connection with the staff ride which took place in the west in order to give the officers who have been attending the staff course at Kingston an opportunity to study to advantage. I am sorry to say I cannot give the hon. gentleman the amount.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to say we shall have to let this item stand, it is so gross. The Minister should stop gallivanting around the country. He has had from the 16th of March till the 20th of June to get up the information for these supplementary Estimates, and then he comes and asks us to let them slide through on grace and favour. That is an injustice to the Minister himself. The first thing the Minister should do when he comes and asks for money is to have the information required by the House. The Minister of Militia, being such an awful sinner in reference to his Estimates, should at least have the information; but he does not seem to know a single dollar which he has already expended of this $10,000 vote which he asks Parliament to give him to pay his bills.

Mr. WALLACE. I think any one spending a day in the department could give at least as much information as the Minister has given us this evening on all the items he asks us to pass. He has the assurance, without giving us any explanation, to ask us to pass these enormous sums of money, amounting to a total of over a quarter of a million. He has given no reason that would satisfy a reasonable man, and that is all we ask. We are anxious to make the militia force as efficient as it can be made; but the Minister must give us some assurance that these sums are being properly expended and some information as to what they are being expended for; but he apparently has no care and no knowledge of the details or working

of his department. He comes here after a year, when he should be watching the business of that department day by day, and he has to acknowledge and confess on every item that is brought up that he does not know the first thing about it. When the estimates for the supplies were going through, it was pitiful to listen to his staggering attempts to give some facts or justification for his votes ; but it was all simply guess work. And here we have another exhibition of the same kind.

Mr. SPROULE. It has always seemed to me the natural order of things to have the Minister submit an estimate to the House, and have that based on some intelligent data which he would give the House when the House was expected to vote the money. But that is reversed by this progressive Government. They take the opposite course. They first spend the money, then they fail to get the information and they ask the House to take the whole thing on trust. The Minister says he will get the information on concurrence, and if he cannot, he does not care. I have thought that for the last year or more most of the time of these Ministers was occupied in taking jaunts around the country. They seem to be all the time on the tramp, in Pullman cars, or off to the old country, or down to Washington, or to the maritime provinces, or to the Yukon ; leaving their deputies to run the departments. Then, when they come to the House and submit their Estimates, they ought to be able to give some information, but they cannot. They do not seem to know anything about their departments, and ask the House to vote the money on trust every time. That is the exhibition we have had to-night over and over again, and we had a similar exhibition last year. The thing seems to be going from bad to worse, and in another year or two we will have Ministers on the road all the time and utterly ignorant of what is going on in their departments.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is any money to be spent in the forts of Louisburg and Sydney in making any surveys in connection with the old and new fortifications ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. The survey referred to is a topographical survey of the face of the country along the shortest line between this country and the United States, taking in all roads, and canals, and important strategic points on the frontier. It does not refer to any survey of harbours or points not near the frontier.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did any of the hon. Minister's officers visit these places during the last season ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I sent the chief engineer of the department to visit Louisburg, but I think no work has been carried on there. The only point in the maritime provinces where there has been any expenditure is, I think, Annapolis, the old fort of Annapolis.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What was the object in sending an officer there to make an examination, if nothing is to be done ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. To see the condition of the old fort, and make a report.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To make a report of the old fort ?

Mr. SPROULE. We have about 4,000 miles of coast line ; can the hon. Minister tell us how much of this has been gone over by that topographical survey ? Is it the intention to make a topographical survey of the whole coast, or what portion has been gone over ? If it be the settled policy of the Government to make a survey of the whole coast, why is this item in miscellaneous amounts ? It ought to be in the regular items of expenditure that take place from year to year. It could not have been unforeseen, and the money must be provided on the basis of some policy. What is the policy ? How much ground has been gone over by the survey, and how far is it intended to carry that survey ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may point out to my hon. friend that this is confidential. We are not supposed to publish to the world what we have done, or are doing, or propose to do, in these matters of defence. The survey is a confidential one, which is not shown to everybody, but I will be glad to show it to the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has evidently been concealed from the Minister, too.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the only green spot the Minister has found to-night. Do I understand him to say that a portion of that unforeseen money went for the defence commission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there is a special vote for that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is for making photographic copies of these maps which have been made by the young men engaged in the survey, and for use partly by the defence commission, and partly by the men who were engaged recently in the staff rides, which my hon. friend has heard of.

Mr. GILLIES. In connection with the question of my hon. friend from Cape Breton, I may bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the fact that some of his predecessors in office had taken steps to have some repairs made in order to preserve the

old forts at Louisburg. I think that I had some conversation with the hon. Minister himself on that subject, and he told me that he did intend having something done in that connection, but I fear that, in the multiplicity of other matters during the past year which have engaged his attention —the Yukon and other distant regions—he has overlooked that very interesting portion of the Dominion. I would like to ask him, if he really intends to have something done for these old forts, because the spot is most historic, and filled with reminiscences of the French régime, and, besides, these forts are standing monuments of the bravery of the British forces, and should not, therefore, be allowed to fall into utter ruin. I would, therefore, ask the hon. Minister, if it is the policy of his department, to have the necessary appropriations made for the preservation of these works, and thus do some credit to the department over which he presides.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I must confess that this is a most interesting question to me, and, I think, quite an important one. I think it very desirable indeed that these old historical landmarks should be preserved, and, so far as the sum voted by Parliament would permit, I feel disposed to see that expenditures are made in this direction as rapidly as possible.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Apart from the view of preserving those old fortifications, in view of the fact that that part of the country is now, as regards fortification and protection, in a state very different from what it was in formerly, the hon. Minister would not be doing anything out of the way, if he went a little further, and did something in the shape of ordinary protection to those particular forts, irrespective altogether of what is necessary to keep them in preservation.

Mr. BELL (Addington). This item is of great importance. In reading down the list, I find that I can explain to any of my constituents who may ask me for an explanation, the item of clothing. I could also make a very good excuse for the item of transport; but, when we come to miscellaneous and unforeseen, and we are told that a certain amount was expended on a topographical survey, which is confidential, it seems to me that, apart from that consideration, the hon. Minister ought to give us some explanations that would enable us to justify the expenditure of this amount of money. There is no department I feel more anxious to maintain than the Department of Militia and Defence; there is no Minister I would like to protect more than the Minister of Militia, and I hope he will be able to give us some information which will enable me to justify him, when I am asked to explain what this expenditure is for.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall this resolution be adopted?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; this item must stand until we get the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not ask to have the whole item stand on that account. My hon. colleague has promised to furnish all the information on the main Estimates, and there will be ample opportunity to discuss all the points. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see the advisability of having these items passed within the current year, and I hope they will not press unduly the point now taken, when they have the pledge that on the main Estimates every point may be raised in connection with these items.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Finance should have used a little persuasion with his brother Minister before this. He knows that it is a sad exhibition for a Minister to come down with his items, after he has had a whole calendar year to get ready for them, and then confess to the House that he is not able to give the explanations that are really required. What has the hon. Minister been doing, nights and days, and days and nights, Sundays and week days, up to this moment? This sort of thing is becoming chronic, and is really evolving itself into a complete contempt of Parliament. In the first place, the hon. Minister says: I am not going to be bound by the votes I have obtained from Parliament and my department, but will spend just as much as I like, irrespective of those votes, whether the matter be urgent or not. Who is going to say that this reconnaisance is urgent? What enemy has been coming into the country? So it is with most of the other items. The Minister said: My party is strong, and will see me through; when I want $15,000, I will apply to Parliament, but, if I like, I will spend $10,000 more, without the authority of Parliament, and rely on my party seeing me through. Then I will go on and spend $10.000 more. I know my party will carry me through, and as to those fellows on the other side, and as to Parliament, in these days of progress, Parliament, at any rate, does not count for much. That is the first thing the Minister says, and he and other Ministers are getting into the habit of making appropriations, over spending, and then, just at the close of the year, saying: We want this money to meet our expenditures. And then, to add insult to injury, he wants us to pass it without giving any information. I call the Finance Minister's (Mr. Fielding's) attention to it. His hon. colleague does not even know how much the reconnaissance cost, or how much has been spent—he does not know anything about it. We have a duty to ourselves to perform, and the Minister (Mr. Fielding) should

have been spending some hours of patient labour with his brother Minister (Mr. Borden, King's) behind him, to get him drilled up for the elementary work of giving a few explanations of this simple item. We must make a stand somewhere, and I do not see any better place to make it.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) tell the committee if these gentlemen are permanently employed is making the reconnaissance surveys. I see here the names of Mr. English, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bogert.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Capt. English is one of the professors of the Royal Military College, and these others are cadets in the college. One set of men is taken out, perhaps, two years, and then a new set is taken out.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not questioning the pay they are receiving. They are given a certain number of days, one at $8 a day and expenses—Capt. English—and the others $3.50 a day and expenses. Are these cadets ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What work do the cadets do ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They make a complete survey of the country as to the roads, the location of every house and building, the height of every hill, and so on—it is a most complete topographical survey and it requires scientific knowledge ; and it is at the same time, very valuable to the country. It is also of great utility to the young men themselves. I do not think that the prices paid are out of the way for the work that is done.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Do I understand that these men are cadets getting their education at the college ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, this employment is during vacation.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) And when they get through a certain course of training others are taken in their places ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) So they are getting their training in the college and the Government is paying them for the work they do besides. That looks awkward to me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand, there are two points involved here. One is the improper practice of asking a small vote and expending a much larger sum, and some discussion has taken place upon that. It seems an extraordinary condition of things. Another is that the Minister, having spent for this financial year $10,000 more than the vote of $15,000, is unable to tell the committee anything more, practically, than he has spent that sum of money. He is unable to give even the heads of the expenditure. The topographical survey represents a comparatively small portion of this amount, as the Minister will admit. Now, I had some experience as a Minister of the Crown, and I cannot understand a Minister being left in the position before this committee that the hon. gentleman occupies—without the information usual on an occasion of this kind, where explanation of expenditure is to be made. It is a matter of a very short time for a clerk. The Minister has all the assistance required, and when a Minister is to ask for supplies, the first thing he naturally gets is a statement of the expenditure that has already been made and an estimate of the heads of expenditure for the coming year. And the hon. Minister will see that he puts himself in a position where reasonable men may suspect him in this connection, when so simple information, information which he would reasonably expect the House to want when he is asking sanction for this expenditure, is withheld or not given. Now, he knew to-day that he would have to ask the House for this extraordinary vote, to ask not only this side of the House, but hon. gentlemen behind him, to practically indemnify him for an absolutely illegal act. Perhaps, that is too strong a word, but, at any rate, the House will understand what I mean.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. The hon. Minister has exceeded the authority given by the Supply Bill of last year and by this committee. This that is now before us amounts to nothing more nor less than an indemnity at the hands of the House for spending more than he was authorized to spend. He is not asking the House for authority to spend money, the money is gone. What he asks is that, under the circumstances, we approve of his having anticipated what he believed to be the view of the House. Now, unless we are going through a mere farce, unless this is a sort of slot machine affair, we are entitled—no, it is not a matter of being entitled, but we are bound—to ask for the items of expenditure, barring, of course, anything that the Minister says is of a confidential character in connection with defence, details of plans, &c. ; but nobody asks that these be exhibited. It seems to me we have a very important duty before this item passes, and it is to get some ground for arriving at the conclusion that, under the circumstances, the expenditure ought to have been incurred or, having been incurred, can fairly be approved by the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to stay here and do no work. I think the Minister of Finance had better drop this item. This item would not have taken 15 minutes if the information had been at hand. I made my protest on the over expenditure, as I did in all the other cases. There was some information in the other cases, there is none in this.

Mr. SPROULE. Before six o'clock there was certain information asked for which was not forthcoming, and on every item we have dealt with since then, we have been treated in the same manner. The hon. gentleman does not appear to know any more about his department than a man living in Africa. Now, there was about $47,000,000 voted last year to carry on the affairs of the Government, and if every Minister had over expended in the same proportion as the hon. gentleman, we would have expended up to the present time pretty close on $60,000,000, and it would have been done with the same propriety as the Minister has made this expenditure, that is to say, without any authority. The information the hon. gentleman has given the committee does not justify us in passing this item. It is not enough for him to say that he will bring down this information on concurrence, because practically the money is spent already. If the Minister is either too lazy, or too indifferent, or does not know enough to get up the information in his department, then I submit he should resign and allow some other person to be put there who would furnish the committee that information before they are asked to vote the money.

Mr. CLANCY. For the same service in the year 1896, $13,133 were spent; in 1897, $13,048; in 1898, as appears by the Auditor General's Report, $14,803. Now the hon. gentleman comes to that same year, 1898, having exceeded the former year by at least $1,000, and asks for $10,000 more with practically no explanation. I am afraid the committee would have to close their eyes and turn their backs upon their duties if they assented to that item going through without the hon. gentleman giving the fullest explanation.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to talk as if supplementary Estimates were an entirely unknown quantity. I have been in the House for a number of years, and I never knew a session of Parliament in which there were not supplementary Estimates for the current year. The ex-Minister of Finance charged that I was almost committing a crime because I failed to estimate last year the full amount of money that I required for all the services. I venture to say that it has never happened in any year that any Minister has been able to get through the year without coming to Parliament and asking a further sum as supplementary Estimates. That never happened in the hon. gentleman's time, nor under the Mackenzie Administration. In a country like this, which is growing, and in a department like this, with constant new orders necessary to be promulgated, and constant changes in the administration of the military branch, it is absolutely impossible to estimate very closely. I have made inquiry just now as to this item, and I am told that a large part of it is for printing and stationery, $10,000 or $12,000 of the whole vote. I am further informed that until the accounts are in for the end of June, it is impossible to say exactly or even approximately what amount will be required. The money that is voted will not be spent if it is not required, and I am informed that this vote is required. I have told the committee that a portion of the vote for the year, $15,000, was used, as I have admitted has been customary in my department, in paying expenditures incurred in the previous financial year. That has happened in this vote to the extent, I am advised, of $5,000. As I said before, I am asking for a vote in the main Estimates of $20,000, which I am informed will be required for the next year. I want to close up completely the accounts of this year so that no portion of the next vote, as has happened in the past, shall be required to liquidate any of the liabilities of this year. So that, taking $5,000 difference out of the vote which was passed in the previous year, and adding that, there will be left $5,000 to be used in the present year, making the expenditure of the present year $20,000, which is the amount I estimate will be sufficient for next year. I do not want to ask any favours of the hon. gentleman at all. I dare say that their criticism is intended to be fair, although I think that their characterization of me and of the administration of my department is, perhaps, a little extreme. I think that they couple their criticisms sometimes with terms, as to gadding about the country and so on, that they might very well spare. But I say to the hon. gentleman that this money, if voted, will be spent in a way that will promote the welfare of the militia. It will be submitted, as the hon. gentleman knows it must be submitted, to the eye of Parliament and to the country. This vote, I believe, is required. I have given the best information as to the direction in which the expenditure is to take place, and I should be very glad if the hon. gentleman would allow this vote to pass. I promise him on the main Estimates, where there is a similar item, that I will give him the fullest details in reference to this which can be got in the department. I will take pains to have a statement made out to-morrow.

Mr. CLANCY. As the hon. gentleman is going to have a statement out to-morrow, I would like to ask him to have a statement made out in regard to the printing. He has just stated that the necessary printing will amount to about $10,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Or $12,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is for the whole year.

Mr. CLANCY. Ten or twelve thousand dollars for the whole year. During the last three years the printing cost $5,000 for one year and $6,000 for the two subsequent years. I hope the hon. gentleman will be in a position to explain why it has jumped up to $10,000 or $12,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will be able to explain it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what we ought to know now. Does the hon. gentleman think that it is sufficient to come down to the committee in order to get it to pass an estimate, to say two things, first, that this expenditure is necessary, and, second, that it will be submitted to the eye of Parliament after it is expended. If these two statements are sufficient to carry a vote through, what a fine time a Minister would have and what an utter, screaming farce it would be to call two or three hundred men together to vote supplies! When the hon. gentleman states that about three or four hundred dollars was all that was necessary for printing and cannot explain why the estimate for printing is 50 per cent more than last year's vote, and 60 per cent more than the preceding year, I think we should know what has happened to make this difference.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A new edition of the rules and orders, which is a large volume, has been issued. The present General Officer Commanding desires to communicate with the officers of the militia by means of the printing press and twice a week he issues orders. They are really daily orders, but they are only issued twice a week. This costs money. I looked into it very carefully before I authorized the expenditure, and I thought it was well worth while to try the experiment, and so agreed to it. This is one of the causes of the increase. The rules and orders is another, and in the changes which are going on now, and the establishment of new branches of the service, a very great deal of printing has been necessary. I believe it will be found that it is a good use to be made of public money to print fully the instructions and directions so that they may be placed in the hands of every officer in the country. This is what is being done and that will account for a large part of the expenditure asked for in this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) is simply wasting the time of the committee. It is impossible for you to get the supplementary Estimates through to-night. It is impossible to get your supply Bill; you cannot get it. What is the reason that the hon. Minister wants to stick at this item and obstruct the whole business of the committee? He says that he will bring a statement down to-morrow. Let that item stand and we can go on with the others, but for heaven's sake do not let us stultify ourselves by passing items without information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Let us reserve that item and take the next, relating to the Royal Military College.

Royal Military College, including an increase of pay to Prof. Worrell, $200, and to Prof. Chartrand, $200..... $10,400

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This item is due to the fact that the attendance at the college has been considerably larger than was anticipated. It is really a matter of book-keeping, because the money which the candidates pay in comes back into the treasury or to the Receiver General. Really, this does not involve any expenditure of money, because it balances on the other side of the account.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was received from the fees of students attending the Royal Military College last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About $17,000.

Mr. FOSTER. $17,000 extra.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. How many students attended the college last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Seventy-five.

Mr. SPROULE. Does each pay a fixed sum or is it on a scale proportioned to the number of subjects that each takes up?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, they pay a fixed sum.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is that sum?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Three hundred dollars for the first year, and $350 afterwards.

Mr. BELL (Addington). I see that additions are to be given to Prof. Worrell and Prof. Chartrand. What were their salaries previously?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. One thousand dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. How many years is the term composed of?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Three.

Mr. SPROULE. The first year $300, the second $350, how much for the third year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. $350.

Mr. SPROULE. That is, $300 for the first year, $350 for the second and $350 for the third. There are 75 students. How many

first, second and third year men ? Perhaps if the hon. gentleman has not the information now we will get it when the main Estimates come up.

To purchase of Hamilton rifle range..... $3,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the total value of the range ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, there was $5,000 voted last year, and it was found that $3,000 more would be required. I can give the hon. gentleman the exact information. That is to purchase the site.

Mr. FOSTER. $8,000 for the site ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, $3,000 for the site. It will cost $5,000 to construct the range. There has really been nothing done, because we have only now expropriated the land.

Mr. FOSTER. You will not need this vote then.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The $5,000 was voted specially for construction.

Mr. FOSTER. I can hardly conceive that before you got your land, you would so word a vote that it would be all for construction, and not to pay for the purchase of the land out of it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman desires it there is no particular urgency about this.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just putting so many words in your Supply Bill, because you cannot use the money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will reserve the item.

To complete payment for London property.. $1,090

Mr. FOSTER. Does this finish that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is one of your legacies.

Mr. FOSTER. Somewhat.

Defence Scheme Committee..... $6,100

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A Governor General's Warrant was obtained to meet this expenditure. The defence committee was composed of Major General Leach, Capt. White, of Royal Navy, Col. Dawson, of the Imperial Army, and Major Lake, former Quartermaster General here ; all Imperial officers. This amount is required for their subsistence, transport, and expenses. There is embraced in this estimate the sum of $685, being for 137 days' pay at $5 per diem, to Mr. Charles Panet for services as secretary of the commission ; and $123 for 123 days' pay at $1 per diem to Mr. Claire Hugg for services as messenger.

Mr. FOSTER. These allowances were fixed by the British Government ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was this not foreseen and voted last year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was the subject of correspondence between the Imperial Government and this Government after the close of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Carried.

Arms, Ammunition and Defences—
For accoutrements..... $100,250

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is really a revote. There was an item of $150,000 voted last year which we expected to be able to use, but the Auditor General declined to allow it to be used because the expenditure was not incurred prior to the 30th June last. I am asking for $100,000 now, and in the supplementary Estimates of next year the $50,000 will be included, so that we are asking the revote of the $150,000.

Mr. PRIOR. Is this vote for the Oliver Equipment ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. Would the Minister tell us whether this equipment is finding favour in the permanent corps and the other corps, to which it has been issued ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We took a great deal of pains with reference to this matter. A dozen sets of the Oliver Equipment and two or three other equipments were made and sent out to the different depots and thoroughly tested, and the reports we received were that the Oliver Equipment was unquestionably the best. On the strength of these requests it was recommended by the staff here and adopted, and I have heard no complaints up to the present moment.

Mr. PRIOR. It seems to me that although the straps may be very good they have the old fashioned pouches, and any militia man who has been in the field knows that with the small ammunition in use at present for the new rifle, where men are going at the double or lying down, it is impossible to keep these cartridges in the pouches. I have heard complaints as to this from a great many, and I was anxious to know whether any such complaints had reached the department. Does the hon. Minister know if the Oliver Equipment has been sent to the rifle corps in the interior of British columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe it has not yet been sent.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope the Minister will see that it is sent right away, because they are very anxious to get to work.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The arms have been sent, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any portion of this vote used for purchasing arms?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps this might be a convenient time to get some information from the Minister, as to why he gave his sanction to the sale of a large number of the old rifles at 25 cents each.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Sanction was given upon the recommendation of Col. Lake, Quartermaster General; and for the purpose of relieving the department from the care of this large quantity of rifles, which were obsolete and useless and expensive to keep. As soon as it was determined to sell these rifles, tenders were invited in all the leading newspapers in the Dominion. I had occasion, in reply to a question to read to the House, the advertisement which was issued, and which, I think, was current in all the leading newspapers for two months. Tenders were received from a dozen different firms, and the highest tender was accepted. I may say that all the rifles, so far as I know, were purchased in Canada, and are in Canada now.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, there must be something wrong about the Auditor General's Report, because the last information was. that they were sold to a firm in New York.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFNECE. That was a small lot which were sold prior to the sale of this large lot. The same firm tendered for the large quantity, but at a price very much lower than we received.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not understand that there were any tenders asked at all.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes; I read to the House the advertisement and a statement of all the newspapers in which it appeared, and I think it ran for two months.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember some years ago applying to the department for rifles for cadets, and the department would not grant them unless the parties would enter into a bond to be responsible for the return of these rifles, and the price put upon them was $15 apiece. You could not get one of them for less than that amount. So that to sell them for 25 cents apiece seems extraordinary. If it had been known in the country that they could be purchased for that sum, I think a great many would have been purchased in the country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is undoubtedly true. I do not know what the bond to which the hon. gentleman refers to was; but at that time that was the standard rifle of the country. It has since become obsolete, a new rifle having taken its place, and it could not be used, because it would involve the danger of mixing two kinds of ammunition. It is useless, and worse than useless, because it would entail expense on the department to take care of it, and we require the room in our stores and armouries in order to take in the new rifle. I may say that we have still a large number of the old rifles. The hon. gentleman has referred to the granting of rifles to schools and cadets. We are doing that every day, and I think we have an ample number for all purposes of that kind. Certainly, 30,000 rifles still remain unsold. We are glad to issue them to all cadets free.

Mr. PRIOR. Would the hon. Minister supply public school cadets in British Columbia with these rifles, if application were made for them?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. I am very glad to hear that. While this vote is on, I would ask the Minister, if he will look into the matter of these pouches. I would not like to set up my opinion against that of the General, but I am strongly of opinion that cross-belts, such as Australians and ordinary sportsmen use, are far the best for soldiers to carry their cartridges in. These belts have a little pocket for each cartridge. I would like the Minister to inquire about them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for calling my attention to that; and if he, as an experienced officer, would be kind enough to write me a letter, pointing out the particular thing that he suggests, I would be very glad to take it up.

Amount required to pay cost of maintenance of prisoners in Yukon territory $10,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The average number of people in the cells of the guard-rooms last year was about 60, and the cost of maintenance was about a dollar a day.

Mr. PRIOR. I have seen an item in the papers about sending some of the long-term prisoners to the coast, and keeping them in New Westminster.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are not to be sent until after a certain period.

Mr. BENNETT. Although it is not included in this item, I would like to ask the Solicitor General a question relative to the superannuation of county court judges of Ontario who have exceeded seventy-five years of age. A little while ago, the statement was made in the press that such was to be the policy of the Government. I think I asked the question in the House early in the session, and the answer was,

that it was pending consideration. I think it is very harsh to keep these judges, some half dozen in number, with a sword hanging over their heads; and it is even harder on the gentlemen of the same political faith as hon. gentlemen opposite who are making pilgrimages here, looking for judgeships. It should be known what the policy of the Government on this subject is.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will admit that that pilgrimage has not begun since 1896, but has been in operation for a number of years. My hon. friend will remember that last session a Bill passed this House for the purpose of superannuating judges who had reached seventy-five years of age. That Bill met with a very sudden end in the Senate, and, so far as I know, it is not the intention of the Government to renew that legislation this session. After that Bill met its fate, I think there was some discussion in regard to allowing these judges to retire on full pay; and, not speaking for the Government, but speaking merely as a member of the bar, I think that any judge who has reached seventy-five years of age, should be entitled to retire on full pay.

To provide for living expenses of one judge in Yukon territory $1,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I sent to the Solicitor General a memorandum in order to call his attention to papers which I would be glad to have, in connection with this and the following item, that is to say, a copy of the Order in Council or any correspondence fixing the allowance for living expenses.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The request is a proper one, and no doubt between this and to-morrow afternoon I will be able to furnish the papers my hon. friend asked for.

To pay Hon. Mr. Justice McGuire travelling expenses on the occasion of his return to the Yukon territory to resume his judicial duties in the North-west Territories.. $293

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no statutory provision which would cover these expenses, and therefore we take a special vote.

To pay amount for supplies to Judge Dugas in the Yukon..... $957 35

Mr. FOSTER. What are these supplies?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will bring down the account to-morrow.

To pay for law-books, &c., and freight thereon, obtained for the use of the Bench and Bar of the Yukon Territory.. $2,500

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is the intention to provide for the Yukon such a nucleus of a law library as has been provided in the North-west Territories, and I think it is very essential and proper that we should do so in order that the judges who go into that country, and cannot possibly bring in a supply of books, should have access to the books they may require.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

To pay for stationery, &c., and freight thereon, obtained for the Yukon Territorial Court..... $500

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is for typewriting supplies, stamps and paper, and cost of freight for the use of the clerk.

Contributions to Canadian Law Library, London, Eng..... $250

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is a contribution by the Dominion Government to the law library which was established in London to be used by the Canadian lawyers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exclusively.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is used practically by the Canadian lawyers, but not exclusively, because I remember last summer seeing English counsel engaged on Canadian cases consulting our books. I saw there the reports of the Supreme Court, all our statutes and some French authorities from the province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this library kept?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Upstairs in the High Commissioner's office. There is a contribution from the province of Ontario, and I think in some of the other provinces also.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a very good idea, I think.

Expenses of Chief Justice Strong in connection with sittings of Judicial Committee of Privy Council..... $1,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Government in a position to make any statement with regard to Chief Justice Strong's position—whether it is proposed in the ensuing year that he shall retain his position as chief of the Supreme Court of Canada here and perform these duties as he did last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no change.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It does seem to me that unless the experience of the Chief Justice has been to the contrary, it is a very small sum to cover the purpose intended to be covered by a gentleman holding his position in London as a member of the Judicial Committee and living there. It is putting him in a very invidious position, compared with the ordinary law lords with whom he has to associate. As one member of the House, I am willing that, not an extravagant, but a fitting allowance, should be given to the man

who goes abroad to represent Canada in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I shall take note of what my hon. friend says, and would like very much, if possible, to make an increased allowance. Chief Justice Strong renders very important service to us over there. His knowledge of the law of the province of Quebec is very great, and he is in a position, when cases from that province come up, to render very valuable service to it and the whole Dominion. When we give him less than the allowance given to a counsel who goes over to plead a case it seems to me we are practising false economy. I am sure that the right hon. Prime Minister sees the force of what has been said on both sides and the necessity of making some arrangement to have the amount increased. Of course, I am not supposed to know what is going on on the other side.

For professional services, to Mr. C. J. R. Bethune $75

Mr. PRIOR. Is that the member for Victoria ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They would not give him a dollar.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Solicitor General may have occasion to be absent, and expressed the desire that we might take up his main Estimates, and I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite have given their consent to this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Solicitor General spoke to me and asked me to speak to other members of the bar on this side. Those to whom I spoke were quite willing to expedite the passage of these Estimates, under the circumstances, reserving one item for the purpose of general discussion. It does not matter which item we reserve.

Circuit allowance, British Columbia.... $13,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there any special item in these Estimates or in contemplation to provide for the sitting of a full court at Vancouver, where it now sits, as well as at Victoria ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not aware of any provision having been made, but I think it would be proper that such should be made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has there been any correspondence between the local and the Federal Governments on that score ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not in a position to say.

Enforcement of the Alien Labour Law... $4,000

Mr. CLANCY. Who has been appointed agent of the Justice Department at Wallaceburg, Ont., for the purpose of enforcing the Act ? The Solicitor General will probably call to mind that I asked last session if an agent had been appointed there, and the reply was "yes." I have failed to learn from that day to this who that agent is.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give the name now, but if the hon. gentleman will send me a memorandum I will have the information at question time to-morrow.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the Solicitor General say whether an agent has been appointed or not ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot. I know that the department has agents in all the judicial districts of Ontario, and my impression is that they are instructed to see to the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act. The infractions of the law are first reported to the Department of Justice which then decides whether action is to be taken, and instructions are sent, not generally, but in each particular case. I will be happy to give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. CLANCY. A request was made last year that an agent should be appointed at Wallaceburg, Ont., to enforce the law, and after some delay the Solicitor General told us that an agent had been appointed there. So far as I know no agent has been appointed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If I said last year there was an agent appointed at Wallaceburg it was because I had the information from the officials of the department. I certainly would not have given my hon. friend that answer if I had not authority for it. However, I will verify the statement and be able to answer to-morrow.

Exchequer Court of Canada..... $10,650

Mr. GILLIES. I asked the Solicitor General last year with regard to making provision for the more speedy trial of actions arising out of collisions at sea. According to the practice that obtains in the province of Nova Scotia, and I believe in the other provinces as well, the chef justice is judge of the Exchequer Court, in all actions formerly tried by the Admiralty Court. The Solicitor General agreed with me last year that this was most inconvenient for persons residing at a great distance from the capital of the province, where the chief justice resided. If a collision takes place on any part of the coast, the party complaining must go to Halifax and have the necessary affidavits made there, and the warrants issued from there, and by the time he has that done the vessel against which the claim is made may have gone to sea and is for ever beyond the jurisdiction of the court. Last year I suggested that the county court judges might be made judges ad hoc, and the convenience of the public would be served by such appoint-

ments. In our province there are seven county court judges who could be made judges ad hoc, giving them power to attach any vessel, and then all subsequent litigation could take place before the Exchequer Court judge. If the Solicitor General made such a provision it would not entail any further expense upon the department, nor would it interfere in the slightest degree with the emoluments of the Exchequer Court judges in the different provinces, and it would be a great convenience to the public.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) says. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), as well as himself, have already discussed the matter with me several times. I can only say, as I said last year, that this is a condition of things that ought to be remedied. If a collision occurred on any part of the Nova Scotia coast under circumstances such as the hon. gentleman mentioned, there would be a case of hardship which must in the end defeat justice. I think the difficulty might be obviated by having a deputy registrar at different points on the coast where a case was likely to occur, who, under the admiralty practice, has authority to issue in the first instance a warrant, and when the warrant is executed the whole matter can be tried in the regular way before a judge. There is no possible inconvenience in that. It is a grievance that ought to be remedied. When my hon. friends brought this matter to my attention last year, I discussed the matter with the Minister of Justice, and then understood that some provision of this sort would be made. But I think the registrar of the Admiralty Court at Halifax has authority to appoint deputy registrars.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, he has to be constituted by Order in Council.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then, the matter might be disposed of in the manner suggested by my hon. friend. But, as I said before, this is a hardship which I think can easily be remedied, and ought to be remedied. Last year when we discussed it fully I think the member for Yarmouth made some representations to the department in writing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the case of British Columbia, which is very similar, the Solicitor General will recollect that two months ago, at the request of the chief justice, who is the local judge in admiralty, I asked him to discuss with the Minister of Justice the propriety of obtaining an Order in Council to constitute Vancouver a registry. There we have two judges, we have Judge Martin at Victoria, who is the local judge, and we have the chief justice at New Westminster, and he suggested in court that this subject should be brought to the attention of the Government. It is the very inconvenience which is now found on the Atlantic coast, but with this difference, that we have the two judges in the cases mentioned, and all that is needed is an Order in Council to constitute Vancouver a registry.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That has been done in Ontario, if I mistake not.

Mr. GILLIES. The Solicitor General will remember that the Admiralty Act passed in 1891 provides for these deputy registrys or courts. It does not require any legislation here at all.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the papers and correspondence relating to the case of Thomas Maher, who was kidnapped by an official of the United States, have been laid upon the Table two or three weeks ago. Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps on the part of Maher to demand reparation for the ill-treatment he received?

Mr. COWAN. I may remark that I brought this matter up in the House a few weeks ago. I was in communication with Maher, and also with his solicitor in Detroit, and had an interview on the subject with the Department of Justice to-day, who decided that they would take the matter up immediately. I may say that the cause of the delay —I do not know whether the Solicitor General is aware of the fact or not—was on account of the boat being subsequently seized by the American customs officer. The House may remember that Maher was arrested on the Canadian shore and taken from his boat. The boat remained on the Canadian shore, and the American official went to the Canadian side and took the boat, and it was sold in December last for $15. I was trying to get information through Maher and his Detroit solicitor of what had become of the boat, and I only received that information last night, and had the interview to-day with the Department of Justice in connection with it. While I am on my feet I would like to draw the attention of the Department of Justice to the Admiralty Court for the province of Ontario. If I mistake not, the Solicitor General is in error in thinking there are several such courts in Ontario, there is only one. We in the west have considerable inconvenience by reason of the regulations in connection with the Admiralty Court there. We have a deputy registrar at Windsor, and the general registrar at the city of Toronto. When a writ issues in a case where both the solicitors reside in the city of Windsor, or in any western town, in making the search is is difficult to find where process was issued and the nature of papers filed. It does seem to me that we might utilize the county judges which we have in Ontario, some of whom have had wide experience in admiralty practice. I know, for instance, that the senior judge of the county of Essex had rather an extensive practice in admiralty. It seems to me that Ontario should be divided into several districts, with one central admiralty district and one judge for each district. That

would save the expense of the judge travelling all the way from Toronto to hear these cases. With all due deference to Judge McDougall, one of the best judges on the Bench, at the same time I think his standing is no higher than that of the senior judge of the county of Essex. This is a regulation that might easily be made, with a saving of expense and it would certainly facilitate the practice both of clients and solicitors in the west. I may also state that the Western Bar Association have laid the matter before the late Government time and again, and passed a resolution to that effect.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite agree with the view taken by my hon. friend of subdividing the admiralty district so far as that can be done conveniently. I would call his attention to what takes place in England. There you have but one Admiralty Court for the whole of England, and that court is in London, notwithstanding that London is not by any means the great seaport town of England. You must necessarily have in these matters some sort of unity. The best we can do is to follow the precedent set on the other side.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask if the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) is the mouthpiece of the Justice Department. The Solicitor General has not answered my question.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I think he has not lost anything by the delay, as the hon. member for South Essex has much more recent information from the Department of Justice than I have. If the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) will allow me, I will adopt what my hon. friend from Essex has said and repeat the statement he has made upon his authority, because I have not looked into the matter myself.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for Essex did not make any statement that throws any light upon the question that I asked. I asked if it is the intention of the Government to take steps to procure compensation to Maher for his illegal arrest ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think that is a question that ought to be put to the right hon. Prime Minister. I do not think it is a matter which affects the Department of Justice particularly. That would be a matter of policy for the Government to decide as to whether or not it is their intention to take proceedings in reference to making a claim for the outrage —I cannot find any other word to qualify it—to which this gentleman was subjected, and if my hon. friend will repeat the question to the Prime Minister or allow me to call his attention to it, I may be able to have authority for the answer.

Mr. COWAN.

Mr. QUINN. Before the item is passed, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to the question of the Admiralty Court at Quebec. We have no Admiralty Court and no office of the Admiralty Court in Montreal, and I know that numerous petitions have come to the Government asking that they establish, at least, an office of the Admiralty Court in Montreal. Now, we not only have to go to Quebec to argue a case, but we are obliged to engage counsel in Quebec to take charge of a case arising altogether in Montreal. I think that if my hon. friend is going to accede to the request of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) he should do the same thing in regard to establishing the registrar of the court in Montreal through whose office procedures might be filed in order to promote the trial of cases originating at Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is a question which, I am aware, is engaging the attention of the members of the bar in our province, and there undoubtedly exists reasons, so far as Montreal is concerned, why this change should be made. The suggestion was that we should appoint a deputy registrar of the Admiralty Court, who would be a resident of Montreal, and would issue writs there in the usual way, and that the judge of the Admiralty Court should go to Montreal whenever required for the purpose of trying cases there. That would be one way to remedy the difficulty, and I understand that this suggestion received the approval of the bar of Montreal. I quite appreciate that the members of the bar should be granted the request that the hon. member for St. Ann's division, Montreal (Mr. Quinn) makes.

Mr. PENNY. I am not a lawyer, but I wish to say that this question has had a very great deal of attention in Montreal, and that it is the desire of the merchants and those who have to do with shipping, that an Admiralty Court should be established in Montreal. It has been a very great source of annoyance, not only to lawyers, but also to merchants and those who have to do with shipping to go to Quebec whenever they have had any matter of business with the Admiralty Court. I think, if it is possible to establish an Admiralty Court in Montreal it would be a great benefit to all those who have to do with the shipping business.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I propose that we reserve this item No. 51, on the arrangement that was mentioned, and pass the other one—that we reserve the general item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We will take up No. 52 and allow No. 51 to stand.

Mr. SPROULE. We can deal with any item on that one.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The whole matter remains open.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... $93,100

Mr. BERGERON. Is the commission over?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am under the impression that the commission has ceased to sit, and that its report has been made.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it ceased to draw pay?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It will when we get the supplementary Estimates through. There is a small item of $53.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did it cost altogether?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked a question as to what this commission has cost, and I have it here in the expectation that the question will come up to-morrow, but I may give the information now:

James Noxon—
Remuneration, $2,520; disbursements, $752.43.
O. K. Fraser—
Remuneration, $2,320; disbursements, $566.56.
D. A. Lafortune—
Remuneration, $2,340; disbursements, $39.75.

Mr. CLANCY. That is only for last year Can the hon. gentleman give us what it cost altogether?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That, I think, is all the expense connected with the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. Some of these commissioners acted at Kingston also. I will look up the question and see.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the total amount of the whole investigation, including Kingston?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give that; the question is put thus:

What is the total cost to date of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary commission of investigation?

The answer is: $18,076.17.

Mr. QUINN. Does that close the matter?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I really think it does. There is a small item in the supplementary Estimates of $53.

Mr. QUINN. I am only asking the question by way of suggestion to the hon. Solicitor General. I think it would be well to have a receipt in full from these gentlemen.

Dorchester Penitentiary $49,800

Mr. SPROULE. I think we should have some explanation of this increase of $1,200.

Mr. GILLIES. There was an investigation in this penitentiary. Can the hon. Solicitor General inform the committee what was the cost of this investigation?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give the cost of the investigation. There has been considerable delay in connection with this matter. The Order in Council was passed in September, 1898, appointing the Hon. David Laird to act as commissioner, but he declined to accept the position. Subsequently Mr. Daniel Macdonald was appointed by Order in Council on the 22nd of October, 1898. Mr. Macdonald was notified of his appointment on the 26th of October, 1898. He having also declined to act Mr. E. N. Bill was appointed by Order in Council of the 24th November, and notified of his appointment on the 3rd of December. The commission has been in session since that time. I have sent down for an interim report, but I have not yet received it, as to what has been done.

Mr. GILLIES. What is the cost of it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give that, because the remuneration which is to be paid has not been fixed. There is to be one commissioner and a secretary. The secretary's allowance is $10 a day while engaged on commission work.

Mr. GILLIES. Has the commisioner been paid anything yet?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot answer that. My impression is that he would not have been paid anything yet, because the rate of his per diem allowance has not been fixed.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you say that the secretary gets $10 per day?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is my information.

Mr. BERGERON. How much is the commissioner to get?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Something in the same proportion.

Mr. GILLIES. Who is the secretary?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. James Friel, of Dorchester.

Mr. QUINN. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me for going back to the item of Dominion police, I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to grant the petition of the police for increase of pay?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not aware of such an application. If there is one it has not been brought to my notice. There is an item of $2,200 in the supplementary Estimates to provide for extra remuneration on account of extra services rendered recently.

Mr. QUINN. I understand a petition has been sent in by the police asking for increase of pay.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is quite possible without my knowing anything of it. I am asked the reason for the increases in Dorchester. There is an addition of $400 of salaries, because a guard has been added to the staff. There is an increase of $800 in maintenance caused by increase of population. The discharge expenses have decreased $300 and the working expenses increased $500. The reason for this last is because the wood on the reserve is becoming scarce and it is necessary to have a greater quantity of coal. Industries are being decreased $200, because the requirement of the farm are not so great next year.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... $41,200

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In this there is an increase of salaries of $1,100, because two guards have been added to the staff. There is an increase of $400 in maintenance, due to increase of population. I may say that the average population last year was 80, while the present population is 111.

Mr. CLANCY. This is the growing time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Unfortunately yes. Working expenses have decreased $700. This saving is effected by the use of a more economical kind of coal.

Mr. QUINN. I suppose the increase of maintenance is due in each case to the increase of number.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not always. On the whole, there has been a very great saving, notwithstanding that the population has increased from 1,100 at which figure, it stood in 1894, to 1,460, the expenses have decreased from $464,000 in 1894 to $356,000 last year.

Mr. QUINN. In maintenance ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In expenses. I think cost of maintenance was decreased also. I cannot speak from memory, but if the hon. gentleman will consult the report of the Minister of Justice, he will find the cost of maintenance, and I think he will learn that it has decreased at St. Vincent de Paul and Kingston—that is per capita.

Mr. QUINN. So the increase would be on account of the increase of number ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

British Columbia Penitentiary $47,700

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is here an increase of $2,000. The inspector reports to me that this amount is needed to provide building material to commence the building of a new wing. The institution has been overcrowded and some 50 convicts have been transferred to Manitoba. The construtution of additional accommodation will occupy several years and the present amount is required to meet the requirements of the present year.

Mr. BERGERON. Who makes the repairs ? At St. Vincent de Paul the prisoners did it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And it was an extremely costly luxury to use the services of the prisoners there. It may be that the work of the prisoners could be utilized to advantage in some ways in connection with the construction, but the wall at St. Vincent de Paul cost a great deal more than it should have cost because the prisoners were employed on it. About 60 per cent of the stone paid for never went into the wall, being actually destroyed by the prisoners or caused to disappear in some way. I cannot say whether the prisoners are or are not employed in this work in British Columbia.

Mr. BERGERON. It is generally done.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I know it, but I cannot say whether it is done in this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who has succeeded the late warden ? Was he an officer already in the service or was he a new man brought there ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have no present recollection of the change.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Solicitor General tells us of prisoners being transferred to Manitoba. How does he keep his accounts, in that case as between Manitoba and British Columbia ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think there would be any accounts as between the two penitentiaries. The acounts of the two would be kept clear. If a prisoner is transferred from British Columbia to Manitoba the increased cost would fall upon Manitoba.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are bringing convicts from the Yukon now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To British Columbia, yes. These transfers happen every day, convicts being moved from one place to another where there is better accommodation.

Mr. QUINN. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me for going back to the item for Dorchester. I see he asks an increase of only $1,200, but there is an item of $6,000 in the supplementary Estimates to meet the expenses of Dorchester penitentiary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is to meet the expenses of the commission that has been in progress since the middle of December. The commission consists of one

commissioner, and Mr. Friel is the secretary. The remuneration of the commissioner has not been fixed yet, but the secretary is paid $10 a day while engaged in the work of the commission.

Mr. QUINN. That is not part of the regular expenses ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No ; I trust we are going to have an end of that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Solicitor General says that the pay for the commissioner has not been fixed. I would call his attention to the general Order in Council of September 21st, 1897, fixing the pay of these commissioners at $10 a day. It is in the Auditor General's Report.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not the Auditor General's Report before me ; but if the hon. gentleman will look at it I think he will see that this refers to St. Vincent de Paul and Kingston.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, it is general.

Rate of remuneration which should be allowed commissioners appointed to hold inquiries or investigations into public matters or departmental business under chapters 114 and 115 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

And it provides that it shall not exceed $10 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have done a good day's work, and, as it is now half-past twelve, the hon. gentleman would consult the convenience of the whole House, if he would consent to adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been making some progress in the last fifteen minutes, very encouraging and gratifying progress ; but in the early part of the day we did not do very much, and I suggest that we go on with the supplementary Estimates, with the understanding that any item that is controversial be held over.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure my hon. friend will not ask us to come here at three o'clock and ask us to stay after 12.30, especially as we have to go to work at ten o'clock in the morning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not making very great progress with these estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not our fault.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whatever the cause may be, it is very slow ; and, unless we can make a greater degree of progress, I think it is only reasonable that the House should be asked to sit later than we have been doing. If we are to get this session through at a reasonable time, we shall have to work harder.

Mr. FOSTER. Human nature has its limits.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The limit used to be three o'clock in the morning under the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may go on if he chooses, but I can assure him that he cannot hope to make very much progress.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to say a word. When the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance, and objections of this kind were taken, he was always ready with excuses, and he made us stay till two or three o'clock in the morning. There are other members of this House who are anxious to get through, and I appeal to the Opposition, if it is fair for them, when a certain hour arrives, to ask the Government to stop the work just to suit their particular convenience. Hon. members of this House know that we have been compelled to stop here till three or four o'clock in the morning by the same hon. gentleman who wants us to adjourn at twelve o'clock.

Mr. BERGERON. You kept us here for five months.

Mr. GIBSON. I am sure that the country is watching the proceedings of this House ; and we ought to be willing to go on at a reasonable hour, like this, with the business in order that the session may come to a close by the middle of July. As one member of the House, I am ready to inconvenience myself, by staying here and attending to the business of the House as long as any one else ; but we ought to do it in a reasonable way, and I protest against the Opposition blocking the business of the House, when an hour has arrived when they want to go home. I remember being told that if we objected going on with work, we might quietly take our hats and go home. I have seen times when this House argued by the hour over matters of no value, involving only a few dollars, and then, when the last days of the session were reached, millions were voted without any consideration whatever. I am sure that, in the interest of the House and of members who attend to their parliamentary duties faithfully and honestly, the members of the Opposition ought to be willing to make better progress.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use of the hon. gentleman talking about progress being made, when we have put through the whole of the estimates of the Justice Department from simple grace and favour ? The hon. gentleman knows that those estimates usu-

ally take up a whole day's sitting. We have allowed them to go through, simply because we want to make some progress, and wanted also to convenience the Solicitor General, who is going away ; but, when we have done that, and have reached this hour, we should not be asked to sit longer. I remember often, when Sir Richard Cartwright would simply close down his desk, and say : Human nature has its limits, and I will go no further. I do not want to be quite so emphatic, but I must protest against our sitting any longer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What is the answer to the hon. member for Lincoln, that Parliament usually, at this period, when the Estimates were before us, has sat until two o'clock, and very often three, in the morning ?

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say, we will sit that late before this session is through ; but, when we have passed a generous slice of the Estimates at this hour of the night, with the idea of going home, I do not think that hon. gentlemen on that side ought to ask us to sit here longer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the risk of differing from some of my colleagues, I will accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion ; but, at the same time, I must intimate that we shall hereafter have to ask the House to sit much later than this, if we are going to expedite business.

Mr. FOSTER. And if the Ministers have their information all ready.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid all the information that can be furnished will not satisfy the hon. gentleman.

The committee rose, and reported progress, and the Chairman (Mr. Bain) took the Speaker's Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. This is entirely out of order. The Deputy Speaker cannot delegate his powers, and we should have here in the Chair either the Deputy Speaker or the Speaker himself. The Deputy Speaker cannot delegate his powers to any member of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is anxious to go home at this hour, I will, without discussing the point, move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, we can go on with the other estimates.

Mr. BERGERON. You cannot move back into committee.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

Mr. FOSTER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 21st June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY COMMISSION.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total cost to date of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary commission of investigation ?
2. Are there any claims still unpaid in connection with said commission, and what are said claims ?
3. What amount was paid to each commissioner ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. $18,076.17. 2. Estate of the late E. A. Meredith, 12 Sundays previous to passing of Order in Council allowing Sundays, $120 ; R. J. Ellbeck, payment for 53 days at Brockville by order of the commission, $6.50 per day, $344.50 ; O. K. Fraser, supplementary account, $54.55 ; total, $518.05. 3. Jas. Noxon, remuneration, $2,520, disbursements, $752.43 ; O. K. Fraser, remuneration, $2,320, disbursements, $566.56 ; D. A. Lafortune, remuneration, $2,340, disbursements, $39.75.

ATLIN LAKE DISTRICT—BREWERY LICENSES.

Mr. McINNES asked :

1. Have any brewery licenses been issued for the Atlin Lake district ?
2. If not, why not, and when does the Government intend issuing licenses for that district ?
3. Are there any breweries now operating in the said district ?
4. Has any brewery plant been imported into the said district with the sanction of the Government ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. No. 2. As Atlin Lake is an unsurveyed and not regularly settled locality, under the provisions of section 7 of the Inland Revenue Act, the Department has no right to issue any licenses until specially authorized by Order in Council. The Government does not consider that, up to the present time, the conditions of that section of the country would justify the issuing of licenses. 3. None that the Government is aware of. 4. No.

RIFLE RANGES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. McINNES asked :

1. Has application been made for a rifle range in the city of Victoria ? If so, when ?
2. Has any petition been received against establishing the range at Oak Bay ? If so, from whom, and what are the grounds of objection ?

3. Has any petition been received against establishing the range at Esquimalt? If so, from whom, and what are the grounds of objection?

4. Did the Government expropriate any of the land covered by the new D. R. A. range at Rockliffe, near Ottawa?

5. Is the Government aware that the old range at Clover Point, Victoria, has been closed?

6. What action does the Government propose taking to provide a rifle range at Victoria?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Yes, 25th of November, 1898. 2. Yes, from "The Victoria Golf Club"; Fred Peters, on behalf of Oak Bay Hotel, and Sir Charles H. Tupper, Robert Cassidy and other residents of Victoria. The reasons alleged were: (a) A range would destroy one of the most beautiful areas of residential properties; (b) a rifle range there would be a distinct source of danger to those travelling along the provincial government's road; (c) passing on the links of the Golf Club, it would be also a danger to golf players; (d) the road is exposed to ricochets of wide shooting; (e) the nature of the ground would not tend to the development of good shooting; (f) it would be dangerous to steamers and shipping going between Trial Island and the shore. 3. No. 4. Yes. 5. It is no more used by the Department of Militia. 6. The matter is now under consideration.

DREDGING IN RICHMOND COUNTY, N.S.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. What amount was expended in dredging the harbour of Descousse and around the public wharf there from the 1st day of June, 1891, to the 23rd June, 1896?

2. What amount, if any, has been expended in dredging this harbour since the 23rd June, 1896?

3. What amount was expended in dredging at the two entrances of St. Peter's Canal, viz.: at the entrance, at Bras d'Or Lake end, and also the entrance at the Atlantic end, between the 1st day of May, 1891, and the 23rd June, 1896?

4. What amount has been expended in dredging at the points mentioned since the 23rd June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. $3,610.58. 2. No expenditure. 3. This work is under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals. In 1892-93 dredging was done at the Bras d'Or entrance to the canal to the amount of $1,067.03. 4. No expenditure by this department.

WEST ARICHAT BREAKWATER.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. What amount was expended in repairs upon the breakwater at West Arichat, county of Richmond, N.S., between the 1st day of May, 1891, and the 23rd June, 1896?

2. What amount has been expended upon this breakwater since the 23rd June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. $2,015.88. 2. $700 was voted last year, of which we spent $285.15 during the present fiscal year, and the work is now proceeding with the balance.

BABIN'S COVE WHARF.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. What was the cost of construction of the public wharf at Babin's Cove, Arichat, county of Richmond?

2. When was the said wharf constructed, and what was the full amount expended thereon from the 1st of October, 1891, to the 23rd June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. $3,155.04. 2. The wharf was commenced in December, 1893, and completed in October, 1894. The total expenditure to date is as stated above.

DESCOUSSE WHARF.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. What amount was expended in the construction and repairs of the public wharf at Descousse, in the county of Richmond, between October, 1891, and 23rd June, 1896?

2. What amount has been expended on the said wharf since 23rd June, 1896, up to the present date?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. $5,693.66. 2. No expenditure.

EMPLOYMENT OF JOSEPH CLARKE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Was Joseph Clarke employed at any time in the Yukon district by the Government?

(a) If so, in what capacity?

(b) Was he at one time in the Mounted Police force at Fort Macleod?

(c) What was his record in the force?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. (a) Stenographer to the Gold Commissioner; (b) yes, from August, 1892, to 19th April, 1893. He was in the police force from the 25th March, 1892, to 19th April, 1893; (c) fair, until he deserted on 19th April, 1893. He surrendered himself on the 9th August of the same year, and was fined $100. He was supposed to have been induced to desert by another member of the force, who deserted at the same time. I was not aware of the fact that he had been in the Mounted Police or that he had ever before been in the Government service until the question was put by the hon. member.

HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Who is the permanent keeper of the Hope Island lighthouse, Georgian Bay?

2. If any person has been so appointed, when was he appointed, and upon whose recommendation?

2. If there is no permanent appointee to such position, is it intended to appoint a person permanently, and if not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Charles Vallée. I think I told the hon. gentleman the other day that he had not been appointed permanently; but I find that he was appointed by Order in Council of the 20th April, 1899. He was formerly assistant to Mr. Marchildon, and he was placed in charge by the inspector of lights, when Mr. Marchildon was suspended. He was recommended by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Has the Government awarded the contract for the erection of the drill hall at Vancouver, B.C. ?
2. If so, to whom and at what price ?
3. How many tenders were received for the work; from whom were they received, and at what figures ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The contract has not yet been awarded. The matter is before Council, and, pending the awarding and execution of the contract, it is not usual to make public the names of the tenderers nor the amounts of the tenders.

EMPLOYMENT OF E. McKEOWN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. What was E. McKeown (H—26, Auditor General's Report) employed to do in the Yukon provisional district ?
2. What was his record according to official report and records, if any, in the Department of Justice ?
3. What was his occupation when appointed ?
4. How much public money has been paid this officer to date ?
5. If he has left the service who now performs his work ?
6. Does any record exist which shows what work was done by this officer, and if so, where is it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. E. McKeown was employed in detective work in the Yukon provisional district. 2. The Justice Department has no record. 3. This is answered by the answer to No. 1. 4. $2,881.15. 5. He has left the service. I do not know whether any one is employed in the same capacity or not. 6. I presume his record would be with the Commissioner of the territory. There is no record here in the department.

THE ACTIVE MILITIA FORCE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

(a) Is the Department of Militia and Defence aware that some of the majors of field batteries in brigades have been asked to resign on the ground that they are commanding officers whose tenure of command had expired ?

"The Militia Act," Chap. 41 of the Revised Statutes, section 22, which reads: "Of what corps the active militia shall consist."

The active militia force shall consist of regiments and troops of cavalry, regiments and field batteries of artillery, companies of mounted infantry, companies of engineers, regiments and batteries of garrison artillery, battalions and companies of infantry, and naval and marine corps in such proportions as Her Majesty appoints; and the strength of each such regiment, troop, battery, battalion, company or corps, shall be regulated and officers appointed thereto from time to time by Her Majesty.

(a) 1. Does not section 22 of the Militia Act distinctly authorize the establishment of a larger corps or unit than a field artillery battery ? (b) Were not regiments and companies of garrison artillery previous to 1893, called brigades and batteries just as field artillery corps are now called brigades and batteries ? (c) Is not a field artillery brigade under this section 22, a corps or unit like a battalion, a field battery, a corps like a company or (the unit called) a garrison battery in section 22 ?

2. Have not a field artillery battery and a garrison artillery company (increased establishment) nearly the same establishment (except horses), namely, one major, one captain, three lieutenants, and a total of one hundred of all ranks ? (b) When two, three or more field or garrison artillery batteries are united to form (organize) a larger corps or unit, are the majors of the field artillery commanding officers and the majors of garrison artillery not commanding officers ? (c) Are the lieutenant-colonels of field artillery brigades, commanding officers ? (d) Are the majors of field artillery brigades, commanding officers ? (e) If so, under what regulations or provision of the Militia Act is the status of field artillery officers different from the garrison artillery officers ?

3. Inasmuch as in the list of regimental establishment of the permanent force and active militia for the financial year 1898-99, issued with general order dated July 1st, 1898, the 4th, 7th and 9th Field Batteries have no establishment, have no existence except as part of the 2nd Brigade, are the three majors on the establishment of the 2nd Brigade, commanding officers ? (b) If so, under what authority or regulations ? (c) And where, in the regimental establishment, is the independent unit they command ? (d) Do they appear in the list of officers commanding corps, militia lists, January and April, 1899 ?

4. By Regulations and Orders, Militia of Canada, 1898, paragraph 76,—as far as practicable with due regard to the public service and military requirements are not all promotions in corps by seniority (b) And do not the majors of the cavalry, garrison artillery and infantry, succeed by seniority to be lieutenant-colonels ? (c) Are the field artillery majors of a brigade less efficient, or why should they alone not succeed by seniority to be lieutenant-colonels ?

5. If it be true that the strength establishment of the 2nd Field Artillery Brigade is 306, the strength establishment of the 2nd Battalion is 668, what senior captain of the 2nd Brigade was appointed 11th June, 1884, senior captain of the battalion was appointed 10th April, 1885 ? (b) Are the majors of the 2nd Brigade so much less efficient than the majors of the 2nd Battalion, or why should they not succeed by seniority like the infantry majors to the command of their corps; a corps of less than one-half the strength of the 2nd Battalion ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have divided these various questions into subdivisions, alphabetically arranged, and beg to reply as fol-

lows :—A. Yes. 1. (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) No.

2. (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) Yes. (d) Yes. (e) There is no difference.

3. (a) Yes. (b) The custom of the militia of Canada. (c) It is not shown. (d) Yes.

4. (a) Yes. (b) Yes ; if qualified. (c) There are no regulations. 5. (a) Captain (Brevet Major) J. S. Hendrie, 4th Field Battery. Captain (Brevet Major) W. C. Mutton, 2nd Battalion, Queen's Own Rifles. (b) Vide answer to 4 (c) above.

The above answers are furnished by the Major General commanding the militia.

MR. COSTE'S TRIP TO THE YUKON AND ENGLAND.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When motions were called, I was unavoidably absent, having been called out of the House, and with the unanimous consent of the House I would beg to move :

That the papers laid upon the Table of this House respecting the trip of the chief engineer of the Public Works Department to the Yukon and his trip to London, as per Ref. No. 118, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIMS AT MACAULEY POINT, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) if he will kindly hurry up those papers that were ordered with regard to the claims at Macauley Point in British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for reminding me of this. The papers were handed me yesterday, and with the permission of the House I will lay them on the Table.

DISALLOWANCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA STATUTES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) called my attention yesterday to a return which was brought down a few days ago, and which he said was incomplete in two particulars. First, that it did not contain certain letters written by the Department of Justice, and second, that it did not contain the despatch of the Colonial Secretary, despatch No. 92. I now bring down the papers from the Department of Justice that were missing, and beg to inform my hon. friend that he will find despatch No. 92 at the bottom of page 26 of the return.

SUPPLIES FOR JUDGE MAGUIRE AND JUDGE DUGAS IN THE YUKON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Might I ask the hon. Solicitor General if he is able now to comply with the request I made in the Committee of Supply last night for any written instructions relative to the living expenses and the supplies provided to Judge Maguire and Judge Dugas in the Yukon ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The sub-items of item 73 upon which I promised to furnish last night additional information are the following :—

To provide for living expenses of one judge in the Yukon territory.....	$1,500 00
To pay amount for supplies, Judge Dugas, in the Yukon	957 35

No new Order in Council has been passed making provision for the living expenses of the judge of the Yukon territory, but there is in the statute authority under which an Order in Council can be passed ; and the Minister of Justice instructs me to say that this first vote is taken, subject, if it is passed, to this money being used for the purpose of meeting the living expenses of the judge in the Yukon territory under the statute. As to the amount of supplies for Judge Dugas, when Mr. Dugas was appointed, he received his travelling expenses which enabled him to go into the Yukon territory. After he arrived there, he found it necessary to make a purchase of some additional supplies which he thought were necessary, and he reported that these supplies which, if he had purchased them in eastern Canada would have cost $230 to $250, actually cost the amount here set down. After the bill for supplies was sent to the Department of Justice, that the judges might consult further about the matter, the bill was sent to the commissioner for investigation and report. When the bill is returned, if it is found in order, it will be paid ; and this item is taken for the purpose of paying the bill when it comes back duly certified.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite follow the Solicitor General. May I further inquire under that head, in view of what was stated in the Committee of Supply, whether there is any correspondence touching the question of living expenses or the question of supplies, with either of the judges ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is none with reference to the living expenses, but there is a personal letter written by Judge Dugas to the Minister of Justice on the subject of supplies. I saw that letter to-day. I am not sure that I have authority to say that I would bring that letter down without consulting the Minister. It is not, if I am properly informed, on the departmental file yet. It accompanies the account, and explains to the Minister why the liability was incurred. I see no objections to producing the letter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On that, no doubt, we shall have further inform-

ation to-morrow. My point, as the Solicitor General understands, was to ascertain exactly what the understanding was with either of these judges as to the emoluments of his office. Of course, Judge Maguire was a judge of the North-west Territories, and was directed to proceed to the Yukon. Judge Dugas was a magistrate, I believe, in the city of Montreal. I desire to know whether when this gentleman undertook the duties in the Yukon, there is any official arrangement with them or understanding that they should be given anything over and above a certain amount, and, if so, I want to see the written record of that arrangement.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no written record and no written arrangement on the subject, but there was an understanding that they should have living expenses. I understand that Judge Maguire took his place at the general mess, and will make no claim to any special amount, except as Parliament may vote a special amount to enable him to go to and from the Yukon country. Judge Dugas' claim is for some additional allowance above the ordinary mess.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was no written document in regard to their having the right to live at the public mess ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, I understand not.

ANTI-JAPANESE AND ANTI-CHINESE LEGISLATION.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I may say that the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has just answered a question in regard to disallowance of a British Columbia statute, evidently misunderstood my request. I invite the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the letter that he says he has brought down. What I asked for is the despatch No. 83 from the Governor General to Mr. Chamberlain, not from Mr. Chamberlain to the Governor General. I want the despatch brought down that inclosed the opinion of the Department of Justice. I do not see that here.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think it is there. I know nothing of it and will have to inquire. I will give the answer to-morrow.

DELEGATION OF MR. SPEAKER'S POWERS.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to bring to your notice, Mr. Speaker, a matter which you might explain. Last night the House was adjourned by Mr. Bain, of Wentworth. I do not know whether the powers under which he acted were delegated by the Deputy Speaker ; if so, it was not in order. I was told afterwards that his powers were delegated by you. Your word will explain the whole matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. You do not want us to be sitting here until this time ?

Mr. BERGERON. No, but we want to know whether things are carried on in the proper way or not. Mr. Speaker has the right to delegate his powers, but the man to whom he delegates them has no right to delegate them to another person.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a very fine point.

Mr. BERGERON. A very nice one.

The PRIME MINISTER. A fine one, I said.

Mr. BERGERON. We want to know whether, yesterday, as a day, counts for something or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may explain, for the information of the House, that before I left the Chamber during last evening, about ten o'clock, I specially requested Mr. Bain, of Wentworth, who was presiding over the committee, to take the Speaker's Chair for me, after the committee had got through its work and close the House for me. I asked him personally, and, of course, I had an absolute right to do that in the absence of the Deputy Speaker. If he had been here, he would have done it, no doubt.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLANCY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he can conveniently give me an answer to the questions I put last night when the House was in committee ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In answer to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clancy's) first question, I may say that the agent of the department at Wallaceburg, appointed in connection with the Alien Labour Law, is Mr. O. Allen.

ARREST AND IMPRISONMENT OF THOS. MEAGHER.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I may also inform my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) that, as appears by the papers brought down by the House, there has been considerable correspondence between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the authorities of the United States in regard to the case of Mr. Meagher. As my hon. friend knows, what amounts to an apology has been offered by the United States authorities for any violation of the personal liberty of Mr. Meagher, and with that apology or explanation, the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared, through the home authorities, that it is content. In addition to the ques-

tion of personal liberty, a question comes up respecting a boat taken from Mr. Meagher The attention of the department was drawn to that only within the last two days. No request was made before by Mr. Meagher, or by anybody for him, that the Government should take any further steps in the matter, and it was impossible to take steps until a request was made by him or some person acting for him. The question of the boat was brought up the day before yesterday, and will be dealt with by the department.

STEAMSHIP COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (East Queen's, P. E. I.) I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), or, as he is absent, of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who, I understand, is acting for him. I would like to ask if the Government has made any arrangements for providing cold storage and steam communication between that province and Great Britain ? Last year and the year before last, I brought this question before the House, and I got the answer then from the Government that they were in correspondence with steamship owners for a service between that province and Great Britain.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is making rather too much of a speech to ask a question.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask the Government what steps they have taken, or have any arrangements been completed, towards establishing this service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Last year the Government made arrangements under which four steamers were to make different sailings from the island to Great Britain, but the third or larger vessel would not go the fourth time, because the depth of water at the railway wharf was not sufficient. We obtained another vessel in her place, which went home late in December with a large cargo. Early in the spring we began dredging to make a proper dockage for these large ships, and that work is being proceeded with, and is verging towards completion. Early in the spring, having talked with my hon. friends the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and with their concurrence, I communicated with several steamship owners to see if we could obtain a steamer. The correspondence went along for over a month or six weeks, and I was not successful; they could not give us a steamer. They thought that a special steamer would have to be constructed for that service; and failing, by private letters to the different steamship companies, to obtain a suitable steamer, we have advertised for tenders for the service, and those tenders are returnable on the 15th of July. I am not sure whether we will be successful, but we are doing everything that possibly can be done to obtain a suitable boat. All the information has been communicated to the Charlottetown Board of Trade, who take a lively interest in the matter.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the hon. gentleman tell me when those tenders were called for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The public call for tenders was made within a very few days; but the private call for tenders has been made some time. I wrote to Mr. D. E. Campbell, agent of a line in Montreal—I forget the name of the line—and corresponded with him for a length of time about it. Finally he gave me an answer about four weeks ago that he would be unable to provide a steamer this year. But I am in hopes the public call for tenders which has just been advertised, will result in our getting a boat.

Mr. MARTIN. The point to which I wish to draw attention is this: That this correspondence has been going on for two years, this year tenders have been called for——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Tenders were asked for privately from these gentlemen early in the spring, in the month of May, and I was not able to secure from them by correspondence a satisfactory reply. Failing in that, we have now issued a public call for tenders, anybody may come in, and I am not without hopes that we shall succeed.

SUPPLY—ELEVATORS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a most serious charge made against my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), our representative from the west in the Cabinet. I have in my hand the Winnipeg "Daily Tribune," of which the issue for June 3rd contains an article, an extract from which I wish to read to the House. It is as follows:—

That the Douglas Elevator Bill should have been defeated in committee came as a decided surprise even to those who are well aware how far machine politics has led us away from government according to the will of the people, and how near it has brought us to government

according to the will of great corporations. For when the Bill was introduced, Mr. Sifton, the member of the Government within whose department such matters come, and who could ensure a majority for the Bill, spoke in its favour, and announced that he would give it his support. Then we had the appearance in the inspired press of editorial articles pointing out the justice and necessity of the measure.

The elevator-owning grain-buyers, however, sent representatives to Ottawa, or rather, the chief members of those combines went there in person. What means they used to secure the support of politicians and of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have nothing but circumstantial evidence to tell us. That the representations they made in private were more potent than their public representation of familiar sophistry, is evident from the result. The committee of the Bill was composed equally of western Liberal members and of members who habitually support monopolist interests. Mr. Sifton, being also a member, held the deciding vote. To the deep regret of every ally of the western settler, Mr. Sifton was not present when the Bill came up in committee. Two other western members, one Liberal and one Conservative, were also absent. The monopolist members of the committee thus outnumbered the members in favour of the Bill, and the first clause, securing the right to build small elevators or flat warehouses, the essential portion of the Bill, was voted down. The committee then adjourned indefinitely.

Dr. Douglas, the author of the measure, is a strong supporter of the Liberal Government, and has up to the present been an equally strong personal supporter of Mr. Sifton. His confidence in the Minister of the Interior has, according to his published interview, received a severe shock. In this interview, published elsewhere in this issue, he explains how this Bill was defeated. "It is a terrible blow to our whole west," he says, "and of course we know where to place the blame. It was the cold steel of Clifford Sifton that did it. * * * There is nothing left that will relieve the people who have been suffering for years. The mischievous scheming of Clifford Sifton is the cause of our defeat."

This interview appeared in a Toronto daily some time ago, but we have not yet seen any contradiction or correction of its statements. The charge is a most serious one, and if the explanation of the defeat of the Bill thus given is well founded, many a western settler will share in Dr. Douglas's indignation at the course followed by the representative of Brandon constituency in Parliament, and the representative of the west in the Government.

That interview appears in the "Evening Telegram" of May 19th. It is headed:

SIFTON KILLED THE BILL.—ELEVATOR MONOPOLY TRIUMPHED.

Ottawa, May 18.—"It was Sifton's cold steel that did it; it was nothing else."

The words came from Rev. J. M. Douglas, a Government supporter from West Assiniboia, and their inspiration was in the defeat of the Bill designed to curb the elevator monopoly in Manitoba and the North-west. Some of Clifford Sifton's prettiest scheming was revealed in this second knock-out blow to the hopes of the westerners, who have been, and still are, at the mercy of the elevator men.

Canadian Pacific Railway influence in the Cabinet defeated Douglas's Bill last session. Aware of the strong feeling in the west against the elevator evil, that was as far as the Government dare go. When the Bill appeared again this session, the Administration, particularly Clifford Sifton, gave it apparent endorsation. The measure had the Government's best wishes, Laurier and Sifton said, and then the scheming began. They would not trust Douglas's precious creation to the mercy of the Railway Committee, which not only had many other things to do, but might be inclined to view with some hostility a measure antagonistic to the wishes of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A special committee, Sifton insisted, would be a proper body to handle the case of the people versus monopoly. A special committee was thereupon appointed. Its members were of Clifford Sifton's choosing, and, from the standpoint of monopoly, the choosing was done well. It was essentially a farmer's grievance which Douglas proposed to remove, yet by a process of reasoning not beyond the comprehension of the ordinary man, the Minister of the Interior concluded that there should be a total absence of farmers on the special committee which was to decide the fate of the Bill. To give his intentions some slight colour of good faith, Richardson, Oliver, Douglas and Rutherford were made members of the committee. Every one of the other six could be depended upon to safeguard the interests of the railways. Two of them, Haggart and Tisdale, were objected to by such a staunch Tory as Dr. Thomas S. Sproule, M.P., when their names were proposed for a similar committee the other day. It was in vain that Douglas and others protested against the committee as appointed by Clifford Sifton. The ten of them met together to-day, and soon the Bill upon which the whole Canadian west sets so high a value, was rejected on the following division:—

For—Richardson, Rutherford, Oliver, Douglas.—4.

Against—Bertram, Haggart, Tisdale, Fisher, Casgrain, Rosamond.—6.

No sound argument could be urged against the Bill. Geo. H. Bertram insisted that a case had not been made out, and Sidney Fisher, who travels in the disguise of a practical farmer, was not willing to grant his suffering brethren relief. He had the presumption to suggest that an inspector be appointed to look into the complaints, and that idea will be put forward when next the committee meets. But for the approaching by-election in Winnipeg, the chances are that Douglas's Bill would to-day be in the fulness of life. The powerful elevator interest of that city were naturally enough rabidly hostile to the measure, and fear of the injury they would be able to do the Liberal candidate in the coming fight led to the scheming which easily won out when the clash came to-day.

Rev. J. M. Douglas is an angry man. A thorough partisan, he declined to reserve criticism of the Government for the iniquitous treatment of the people he represents.

"It is a terrible blow to our whole west," he said, "and, of course, we know where to place the blame. It was the cold steel of Clifford Sifton that did it; it was nothing else. He may hope to carry Winnipeg by such means, but I have my opinion of the elevators of Winnipeg if they respond to such detestable tactics. We are offered something—an inspector; of what consequence is a beggarly concession like that? My whole Bill is not killed, but there is nothing left that will relieve the people who have been suffering for years. The mischievous scheming of Clifford Sifton is the cause of our defeat. That is a strong statement, but it is a fact that no one can get away from."

Mr. Speaker, this is an interview with the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I am not going to discuss the fate of the Bill. The fate of the Bill is an important question, but the fate of the Bill is a trifling question compared with the serious charge that is here brought against a Minister of the Crown. I did not bring this matter up for the purpose of attacking the Minister; I brought it up because he represents us in the Cabinet, and to have a statement like that made in regard to the Minister who represents the west in the Cabinet, and made also by a supporter, is a most serious matter. I have no desire to amplify. All I can wish now is to hear what is the explanation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, I may say, without saying much more on the subject, the anxiety of my hon. friend the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) lest, perchance, something might be said that would injuriously affect the reputation of the Minister of the Interior. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has been, and is, trying to protect my reputation. I appreciate this as one of the indications of that hon. gentleman's efforts in that direction. The matter which the hon. gentleman has referred to is one which it is quite proper to bring before the House, and, in speaking of which I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion or in declaring my position. I do not know, Sir, that it is of any great interest to know what the editor of the Toronto "Telegram" thinks about me. Anybody who has paid any attention to the remarks of the Toronto "Telegram" for the last two years, would not require to have the time of the House of Commons taken up for the purpose of further informing him of the opinion which the editor of the Toronto "Telegram" does me the honour of entertaining in regard to myself. The editor of that paper has a perfect right to have whatever opinion he chooses of me, and I presume I have the same right to entertain whatever opinion I choose in regard to him. I do not, however, take so many occasions of expressing my opinion in regard to him as he does in expressing his opinions in regard to me. I shall not waste the time of the House discussing newspaper articles, because it would be truly a waste of time, if members of the Government were to take up the time of the House in discussing all the motives ascribed to them in Opposition papers, and in papers which are semi-Opposition, semi-independent, and sometimes ministerial, for one reason or another, from time to time. The position in regard to the Bill of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is simply this. That hon. gentleman has entertained strong views upon a certain question. That question is as to whether legislation should be passed by this House compelling railway companies in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to confer certain facilities for the shipment of grain which they do not now enjoy. The opinion which the hon. member entertains is, that certain regulations should be enacted by this House to the effect that individuals might place upon the property of a railway company a flat warehouse, under certain conditions, practically unrestricted. I think that is a fair statement of the position of the hon. member for East Assiniboia upon this subject. The matter came up last year; I have forgotten exactly how it was disposed of last year, but this year it came up again. The hon. member for East Assiniboia brought in a Bill this year, of which, as it appeared to me at the time, the question of flat warehouses was only a secondary and less important part. He brought in a Bill which provided a general system of regulation and inspection of elevators, and in which he provided for the particular privilege which he has in mind, and which he advocates very strongly, that flat warehouses might be erected wherever persons who might make application for the purpose, desired to do so. The Bill came before the House, and, in speaking of it, I said that we approved of it in a general way, that is to say, we approved of the general principle of regulation. I referred to the general principle of regulation as one which I approved of, and I suggested that we should send the Bill to a special committee for the purpose of its being fully and carefully considered. The matter was sent to a special committee, and, inasmuch as a serious portion of the charge against me is, that the committee was constituted by me, or at my suggestion, in such a way that it would not deal fairly with this Bill, I desire to read the names of the members of that committee:

Messrs. Bain, Bertram, Bourassa, Campbell, Casgrain, Davis, Douglas, Fisher, Haggart, Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière, Oliver, Richardson, Roche, Rosamond, Rutherford, Sifton, Tisdale.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if a committee of this House were appointed to select a committee that would represent the business capacity and the independence and the good judgment of the House fairly well, for the purpose of dealing with a matter of that kind, a better committee could not be selected. The House will observe that the representation of western members on the committee is very large, and that was because the western members were particularly interested in this question as affecting Manitoba and the North-west almost exclusively. It is only necessary to read the names of the members of the committee to dispose entirely of the idea that anybody could possibly unduly influence its decision. The Bill went before the committee, and I was present at the first two or three meetings and listened carefully to the discussion which took place. The result of the infor-

mation I derived there, in addition to what I knew about the subject before, brought me to the conclusion that I was prepared to support strongly the features of the Bill relating to the regulation and inspection of elevators, but I was not prepared to support that provision which provided for the unrestricted erection of flat warehouses upon the railway property and alongside the elevators. Whether I arrived at that conclusion rightly or wrongly, it was my opinion, and I may remark that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who was upon the committee with me, entirely shared my view. In that we differed from my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who brought in the Bill. My absence from the committee was altogether accidental. It was not for the purpose of shirking the vote. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and every other member of this House knows, that whatever advantage there may be in a private member absenting himself from a vote—and the advantage is very questionable—there is no advantage to a member of the Government so doing because a member of the Government must assume the responsibility. When my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) found that his Bill was defeated, he naturally assumed that as my colleague the Minister of Agriculture voted against the Bill, I would have voted the same way if I had been present. That would not necessarily follow, but as a matter of fact if I had been there, I would have voted with the majority of the committe and against the provision of the Bill relating to flat warehouses. On the other hand, I would have voted in favour of the provisions of the Bill relating to inspection. That states clearly and definitely what my position in the matter is. So far as the killing of the Bill is concerned, as I have said, my absence from the committee that morning was altogether accidental, and I had no idea that a final vote would then be taken on the Bill. A few days afterwards I saw my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and I asked him if he desired to go on with the other provisions of the Bill which did not meet with the disapproval of the committee, and expressed to him my willingness to help him through with that portion of the Bill which I approved of. My hon. friend (Mr. Douglas), however, was not disposed, as I understood him, to go on with the Bill, and I asked him to let me know if he did wish to go on so that I might give him my aid. As to whether the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) used the expression which the newspapers attribute to him, I do not know. I am quite sure I never asked him and I have not any intention of asking him. What I know is, that in my conduct with respect to the Bill there was nothing that was not perfectly straightforward and perfectly in accordance with my duty as a member of the Government, and I am quite prepared to take the responsibility for anything and everything I did in that connection. As the suggestion has been thrown out, that the Bill was unfairly dealt with, I particularly desire to call the attention of the members of the House to the personnel of the committee, which I think is an ample guarantee that the Bill could not otherwise than have been fairly dealt with.

Mr. WALLACE. Let us hear from the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. GEO. H. BERTRAM (Centre Toronto). The question raised by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) requires some little consideration from the members of the House who were members of that special committee. I think there was some reflection cast on the committee by the writer of the articles read to the House, because it is intimated that the "cold steel" he speaks of as being given to the Bill by the Minister of the Interior, was given in the selection of the committee, who it is suggested would not deal with the question on its merits. Now, it never disturbs me what appears in newspapers against anything I say or do. Newspapers are at perfect liberty to express any opinion they choose about my conduct, but I take the liberty of saying, that if any newspaper, or any member of this House, states that I was influenced, or could in any way be influenced by anybody or any corporation in my consideration of a question of this kind, that newspaper or that member makes a statement that cannot be supported by the facts. I had a strong sympathy with that Bill, and when a large body of elevator men came here from Winnipeg to oppose it, they were desirous of seeing me but I refused to have any conversation whatever with one of them. I said I was prepared to listen to the arguments advanced before the committee with a perfectly frank and open mind, and to give my decision according to the merits as they presented themselves to me. It is unfair that any newspaper or any member if there be one, should cast a reflection upon the members of that committee. I attended the meetings with the firm intention, that if there was any monopoly which in my judgment was injurious to the interests of the farmers of the west, I for one would do everything in my power to break up that monopoly. I had no sympathy with monopoly, and I so stated in the committee, but I could not agree with the remedy that was proposed by the promoter of the Bill, even if there was a monopoly. I gave my reasons for opposing the Bill in the committee, and I had no other reasons than those given. The statements regarding the Minister of the Interior and the reflections cast upon the members of that committee, are not creditable to those who made them; for I am sure that every other member of the committee, as

well as myself, acted in what he believed to be the best interests of the country. Members of Parliament may differ; members will differ on public questions; every member has a right to his own opinion, but no member and no newspaper has the right to say that a member of this House privately holds a different opinion from that which he gives public expression to. So far as I am concerned, I state here, that any one who says I was appointed on any committee because I might be influenced in some direction other than for the public interest, is making a statement which cannot possibly be supported by the facts. I stated at the time that the promoter of the Bill did not make out the strong case I expected he would make out, and I gave my reasons for believing that to be the case. So that the statements that have been appearing in the newspapers from time to time are, in my judgment, void of the truth. I believe every member of that committee acted in accordance with his own judgment as to what was in the best interest of the country, and that no influence of any kind was brought to bear upon him, either directly or indirectly, in regard to his action as a public man.

VALLEYFIELD COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. BERGERON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, for the House to go into Supply, I desire to bring to the notice of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the fact that a great many complaints are made in Valleyfield and in Beauharnois in regard to the operations of his officer there. One of the most important manufacturers in Beauharnois told me the other day that he has the invoice of goods that have been in Valleyfield for the last ten days, and he has not received them yet. Many other people in Valleyfield complain of the same thing. This may be due either to lack of knowledge or lack of industry on the part of the officer; but I believe it is due to the fact that he spends most of his time in writing in a Grit newspaper in Valleyfield, abusing me and the Conservative party, and neglecting his work. It is my duty to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact, and I do so hoping that for the future this man will have less to do with newspapers, and will stick to his office, and do the work which he is paid to do.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I will make inquiries in reference to what the hon. gentleman has said; but I fancy that it will not be because he does not attend to his duties if complaints are made against him. I fear it will be rather because I have been trying, through economy, to carry on the work of the port with perhaps less men than I am able to do.

Mr. BERGERON. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, seeing that by the returns he has collected something like $38,000, I do not think that he can have time to attend to a great deal more than his duties. His salary, I think, is about $500.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, very small.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would only be about 1½ per cent for collection, which, I think, is lower than is paid in almost any other port in the Dominion. However, I am not attempting to say that what the hon. gentleman has mentioned is something that it is not worth while to inquire into. If it be unfortunately true that some merchants have been delayed in getting clearance for their goods, it may be that I do not give a collector sufficient help. However, I will inquire into the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. If I may be permitted to put my hon. friend's mind at rest, I will say that the officer who was in charge before, and who was dismissed by this Government for no reason at all but partisanship—a fact which they have recognized by paying not only his salary, but his pension—collected the last year he was there over $90,000, besides doing the work of excise and the collectorship of canal tolls. That was Mr. Danis, who was dismissed simply because he voted for me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. BERGERON. This is pro bono publico, Mr. Speaker—more so than a great deal that is said here.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot help that.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope my hon. friend will see to it.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister might have stated, when he made his explanation, that the collections at Valleyfield are of a special character, not like the usual business of other ports; but there are enormous manufactories there, which bring in large quantities of goods that are dutiable. So that while the payments into the customs may be very large, the work of the department is not large in proportion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Beauharnois may not have a right to speak a second time, but there is an hon. gentleman in this House who has a right to speak, and we on this side of the House are very anxious to hear from him; and from the debate that has taken place here to-day, we ought to hear from him, that is the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. FOSTER. I had hoped that the hon. Minister of Customs, before he sat down, would have made some statement with reference to what fell from the lips of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr Bergeron), namely, that this gentleman, who is a paid officer, and who is supposed to be a non-partisan officer, as that is the principle on which the Government acts, is continually employed in writing partisan newspaper articles against an independent member of Parliament. My hon. friend the (Minister of Customs) forgot that point. Is he going to condone it by silence, or does he really approve of it, as we must take him to do when it has been so pointedly brought to his notice, and he says nothing in the way of reproof.

Mr. BERGERON. I did the same thing last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it really a principle upon which our hon. friends opposite intend to go, that they will dismiss peremptorily, without investigation, on the mere call of a defeated candidate or a member of Parliament, a man who exercises simply his undoubted right of voting for a Conservative, on the ground of political partisanship, and then they will employ a man, and pay him with our money—it is not the money of the Minister of Customs, but the money of the people of this country, Conservatives and Liberals alike—his $500 a year, for doing what? Making a few collections and bespattering Liberal-Conservative members of this House with his vile articles in the newspapers? Is that going to be done, and my hon. friend has no voice in the matter at all? Dozens of men have been dismissed without the least investigation, without a charge being preferred by anybody but a defeated candidate or a member who wants the place for one of his heelers, on the ground of political partisanship; and yet my hon. friend employs and pays with the people's money a man who is continually writing articles against an independent member of Parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. He is the editor of the paper.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said I would inquire into the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear you say that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I certainly said it, and I do not propose to condemn any of my officers without investigation.

Mr. BERGERON. The very same thing was said by the Minister of Railways and Canals last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Beauharnois has already spoken twice.

Mr. BERGERON. I will do it at another time. You will not save any time by this.

SEIZURE OF TRAPS AND ROPES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) Before the motion is put, I would like for a few moments to call the attention of the House to a return which was brought down on the 1st of June of this year in reference to the seizure of traps and ropes belonging to Benjamin Compton & Co., of Belle River, in the province of Prince Edward Island, by the cruiser "Acadia." This company is a small firm in Prince Edward Island engaged in lobster fishing, who had their traps seized a few days after the expiration of the fishing season. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that when the fishing season is over, it takes quite a number of days to take the traps in. When there are 700 or 800 or 1,000 or 2,000 traps several miles from the shore, perhaps ten miles, it is almost impossible on the very day the fishing season is over to take these traps ashore, and I am assured by some firms in that business in the province that it is not usual. In this case, these men, who were actually poor men, had their traps and ropes to the value of $150, seized by the "Acadia" within a few days after the close of the season. It appears that the Department of Marine and Fisheries refused them an investigation. There is no presumption at all alleged that these poor men were fishing. It is, on the contrary, alleged that on the very day the fishing season was over, they closed up their factory and did not bait their traps for three days before the expiration of the fishing season. Yet in the face of that, this cruiser seized the traps, and those poor men, who demanded an investigation, had no remedy.

I have something else to complain of in the return brought down. It begins with a letter from one of those men, Francis Cook. That letter refers to a statement delivered to the Minister of Marine on the second day of August, but that statement is not in this correspondence. Whatever object the department had in suppressing that statement, I do not know, but the fact remains that it was suppressed. If the department received that statement, it should certainly be included in the correspondence brought down. I find also that this letter, which is signed by Francis Cook, disclaims any such thing as a violation of this law. Mr. Cook says:

> They used every effort to take in their traps, but the season was inclement, and it was impossible on the very day the season closed to do so.

This will appear more clear, as I proceed with this correspondence. I find also here a statement signed by Commander Spain, which has reference to some papers in connection with this matter, which were left with the Minister of Marine in his house in Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I notice that, and have written to Commander Spain, asking about it. and asking if he has the papers, and if so, to send them to me.

Mr. MARTIN. What about that other letter ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No letter of the 2nd August can be found in the department.

Mr. MARTIN. I happen to have a copy of it here, which the company sent to me. Let me read the words that Commander Spain used.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no doubt about the words, and I have written Commander Spain, asking for the papers.

Mr. MARTIN. The papers were given to the hon. Minister by Commander Spain in his house in Charlottetown, with a full report on the matter. It is quite evident that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had no personal knowledge at all, for, otherwise, he would not have written Commander Spain after Commander Spain had given him the papers at his house. I hope it may augur well for those poor men that the hon. Minister did not study the report of Captain Spain at all, and I trust that, when he reads that report carefully, he will come to a different conclusion, and will see that these poor men, whose property was ruthlessly seized without any just cause, will be reimbursed their loss. This property was seized by the cruiser, and taken to Charlottetown, and there sold for a trifle. The whole thing, costing about $150, was sold, at a hole-and-corner sale in Charlottetown, without the knowledge of the company, for $8.95, and the expenses of the sale and seizure had to come out of that, so that there was scarcely anything left.

I have here the statement made by those men. I have the statement made by C. L. Barnes, of Murray River, which is included in this correspondence. Mr. Barnes makes this statement with regard to this seizure :

> First, that no violation of the law was directed by me, and I am assured none was allowed by the manager.

Here is the excuse which he gives for having those traps out for a few days after the close of the fishing season :

> Owing to peculiar circumstances, many of my traps were several (7 or 8) miles from the shore. Promptly on the 16th July—that is exactly the close of the fishing season—arrangements were made for the landing of the traps and gear, and every available hour thereafter was occupied in the effort. From Thursday, 17th July, until the seizure, a schooner was watching every opportunity of wind and tide to effect the landing of the gear, and in the meantime the fishermen, commencing with those traps nearest the shore, were constantly employed, when the very inclement weather would permit, in landing the traps.

According to this statement, those poor men made every effort to land their traps. They began the very day after the close of the season, and there can be no presumption that they were fishing at all. They were, instead, engaged in landing their traps. Further on, the statement is made, that they had not baited their traps within three days of the close of the season, and Mr. Barnes goes on to say :

> As a trawl line was stripped of traps it was ballasted by a weighted trap near the middle, and the buoys used as marks or guides to the other trawls. These were the ropes seized by the "Acadia."

I think Commander Spain says that the Minister himself was actually on board.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MARTIN. Commander Spain writes:

> The Minister will remember passing and remarking on these very traps when he was on board the "Acadia" last season.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was a fortnight previously.

Mr. MARTIN. It does not matter. At any rate, the Minister was on board the "Acadia," and I think it is becoming on his part, though a belted knight now, to look after the interests of those poor men. I will, however, proceed to show the House the letter I am quoting from, signed by those men, and which states that the ropes that were seized by the cruiser were at the time being used by these poor men in taking in their traps. These were the ropes seized by the "Acadia."

> When the outrage was perpetrated our fishermen and manager were employed in taking traps ashore.

That is the statement made. That is a very singular thing. Does the Minister pretend to say, can he stand up in his place in this House and say, that the fishermen of Prince Edward Island, on the 15th of July last, on that very day, every fisherman began to bring in his traps ? Is it the practice to do it ? I do not think the Minister will say that it is the practice ; because, if they stop fishing—and there is no presumption that these men were fishing—and if they do not bait these traps, it does not matter how long they are left out.

> When the outrage was perpetrated our fishermen and manager were employed in taking traps ashore, and had a boat loaded at the time. This,

with the manager's explanation, made it manifest that we were using every effort to fulfil the law, and should show the department that the act of Commander Spain, whose sailors, by his orders, cut the trawl line from our boats and destroyed the traps in the presence of my men, was wanton and unnecessary.

Cut the trawl from the boat actually, when they were taking in their traps. Here is a statement that will have weight with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He knows the harbour, and he knows that it is a very poor harbour and that it is almost impossible to land these traps without accident. They say :

The winds, tides, currents, &c., make Belle River a place of peculiar difficulty to navigate, especially with heavy laden boats, and the Government would do well to consider this fact in making decision in this matter.

The letter closes asking for justice. There is another statement, a letter written by the Minister himself. He writes to Dr. Barnes, in answer to that gentleman's letter of 29th April, 1899. Among other things, he says :

The facts were represented by your attorneys at great length,——

I do not know whether a brief was given him orally or whether a written statement was made with regard to the act ; but the presumption is that they gave him a written statement. The Minister refers to it here and we have nothing of it in the correspondence. So, there are three important parts of this correspondence that are not here. I do not say they are suppressed with the intention of hiding the true state of affairs ; I can only say that they are not here and, therefore, that I cannot refer to them.

——and the matter received the closest investigation and every consideration. These traps were seized by my officers some eight or ten days at least after the close season had begun.

That is the correspondence, so far as we have it. Now, here is a letter dated 2nd August, which does not appear in the correspondence at all. I do not know whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had seen it, but it would appear that he had not, because it is not brought down. Had he seen it, he might have come to a very different decision in regard to the confiscation of the property belonging to these poor men. And I think that coming from that province, he should have some sympathy with these poor men, under the circumstances I have related. They tried to fulfil the law ; they tried to have the traps in at the proper time. They had stopped fishing. I would not like to defend the men if I thought they were guilty, but I am given to understand, and I believe it, that they had stopped fishing. That being the case, this is an instance of peculiar hardship, and one which, I hope, the Minister will look into. I will not take up the time of the House by reading all this letter, but I will read a part of it. It is from Benjamin Compton & Co. :

As we had permission from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to ship our goods without being stamped, having sold under contract, we were therefore compelled to have our goods in Charlottetown before the 20th July.

So, according to this, the hon. Minister himself may have been the means of getting these poor men into this trouble. He gave them permission to ship their goods without being stamped, and so to remove them to Charlottetown. The time expired on the 20th June. Before that day arrived these poor men, I suppose, would have to have their goods at the point from which they were to be shipped to Great Britain.

We came to Charlottetown on Wednesday, 17th July, and returned Thursday night, and intended to take in the remainder of the traps and gear on Friday and Saturday, but owing to wind and rough weather, we were unable to even make an attempt to leave the shore. In order to allow our boats to leave the shore, the tide, where our factory is situated, must not be lower than half-tide, owing to the flats which extend out for a long distance.

That is a very important fact for the hon. Minister to know—that these men could only engage in the work of landing these traps at certain times of the day, when the tides were high.

And during the week following Saturday last mentioned, when the tides were suitable it was very foggy, and it would be useless and dangerous to start out ; so we were positively unable to land any traps during that week.

There is a week gone, very unsatisfactorily accounted for, and good solid reason given why these poor men found it impossible to have their traps landed at the time specified.

Thinking we might have further trouble to land the traps with our boats, we engaged a schooner from D. J. McMillan——

Here is a statement I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to. These men do not appear to have left their traps longer than they were compelled to leave them.

——to take them all in one load. She was prepared to do so last week, but could not do so on account of the weather. In the meantime, the "Acadia" destroyed 133 traps and took 1,400 fathoms of new rope, valued together at $150.

So, I am not astonished that these poor men make a demand for reparation for the wanton destruction of property by the "Acadia," and I do hope the Minister will give this matter his serious consideration. When he studies more closely the report of Commander Spain—and I suppose he has studied, or, at least, looked at it—and take into consideration this letter, which, as I say, evidently he has not seen, and all the circumstances in connection with the case, I am sure he will see his way clear to reimburse these poor men the loss they have sustained.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This matter has already received the very close attention of the de-

partment. I regret very much that my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) should give his countenance to the assertion that these men have been badly treated.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman cast any reflection on the truthfulness of those men ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means. I am not referring to these men. I am referring to his action in this House as a member of Parliament. I regret very much that he should give his countenance to men who were engaged in fishing under the circumstances in which those men were. We have been trying for many years to put a stop to illegal fishing after the 15th of July, enormous sums of money are spent every year in that effort. The best lobster packers assist the Government in so doing, but it is felt that unless the illicit fishing which takes place after the 15th of July can in some way be suppressed, the whole industry will be entirely destroyed. I have made most strenuous efforts at great expense to put a stop to this illegal fishing for the past three years, and I am proud to say that my hands have been strongly upheld by most of the largest lobster packers all over the maritime provinces. There are a certain number who will insist on fishing illegally, in spite of all law and regulation. I need not do more than state to the House the facts as reported officially by Commander Spain to me. Commander Spain is a very experienced, a very careful, and a very prudent officer. He does not pounce upon traps which are found after the close season opens, and seize them and destroy them ; he always gives a reasonable time for the owners to take them in. But I would appeal to every hon. member from the maritime provinces, if 15 days after the legal season expires, and hundreds of lobster traps are found at some miles from shore with lobsters in them, whether the officer would not be liable to dismissal if he did not seize them. Commander Spain reported on the 20th of December to me :

These traps (of Compton & Co.) were destroyed by the "Acadia" on the 30th day of July last in Northumberland Straits,——

That is 15 days after the season expired when they could be legally fishing.

——being found in the water some 15 days after the commencement of the close season. The excuse the owners made in their letter to the Minister on the 2nd of August last was, that the weather had been so stormy and bad that they had been unable to take them in. The Minister will remember passing and remarking upon these very traps when he was on board the "Acadia" last season.

That was about the 18th of July when I was going down to the Magdalen Islands, but they were not destroyed then because it is supposed they were going to take them in in a day or two.

The excuse made by these people is not correct. The weather had been fine for some considerable period before the 30th, and the traps should have been taken in. There were lobsters in some of them, and the necessary action was taken in this case, as in others all around the coast.

What could be done, because these people were friends and supporters of mine, the hon. gentleman does not suppose that I take any pleasure in destroying the property of this kind or that Captain Spain takes pleasure in destroying property of this kind. What is to be done ? Five miles from shore hundreds of lobster traps are found 15 days after the time expires for fishing. The officer takes them up and he is told he is not to destroy them. If the officer of the Government would not be sustained in enforcing the regulations we might as well dismiss them and let everybody use traps whenever he pleases.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak again.

Mr. MARTIN. But I have an explanation to give.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a mere personal explanation.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not submit to the hon. gentleman's attributing to me a desire to defend illegal fishing. I do not see that the hon. gentleman has proved that there was illegal fishing. He made from the very first——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can make no reply, only a personal explanation.

THE NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Yesterday I called the attention of the Government to some returns that I had asked for in regard to the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited). I stated that some had been brought down from the Public Works Department, and I asked whether there were not some more to come down from other departments. I see to-day that not a word has been said and no papers have been brought down, so I think it my duty to bring the matter before the House. I do this because I think it will show a most extraordinary state of affairs in the Government ; it will show, at all events, the extraordinary manner in which this business Government, as they call themselves, carry on the business of the country with business men. I also feel sure that when I have finished what I have to say—it will take me some little time, because there are lots of letters to read—the members of this House on both sides will think that the Government has a very poor

idea of business morality. It is a matter which I think reflects very little credit on every one of the members of the Government who have been concerned therein. Now, there are some gentlemen on the other side of the House who are interested in one of these Bills under discussion, and, perhaps, some gentlemen will wonder why they do not bring this matter before the House instead of myself. Well, I do not know whether it is that their party fealty makes them sit quiet under any amount of injustice sooner than bring it up and bring discredit on the Government, or whether they do not take any interest in the matter at all. But I bring it up, because, in the first place, I believe that a thing like this is a great blow to the fair fame of Canada, and also because several gentlemen interested in both these Bills are personal friends of mine, and they are not here to defend themselves, and I think it only right that somebody should get up and defend them. Now one of these gentlemen is a man of high standing, the Hon. James Roche, at the present time, I believe, a member of the English House of Commons; another gentleman is Mr. Holt, also a member of the English House of Commons. They are interested in this Bill, together with one or two gentlemen who are members of this House. I will give a short statement of how the matter stands so far as I can.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman referring to a Bill that is on the Order paper?

Mr. PRIOR. No. During the last year there were two Bills passed by the Parliament of Canada. One was Bill (No. 119) entitled an Act to incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company. The other was Bill (No. 139) entitled an Act to incorporate the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company. The first Bill bore the names of John Morris Catton, of London, Eng., William Stewart Rainbow, London, Eng., and Charles Thomas Dupont, of Victoria, B.C. The incorporators of the other Bill were: The Right Hon. Lord Thurlow, London, Eng., Theodore Van Puten, London, Eng., Edward Friedburg, Surrey, Eng., William Braid, Vancouver, B.C., William Naismith, Vancouver, B.C., Allen Haley, Windsor, N.B., and Isaac Burpee, St. John, N.B. Having moved for these papers, I asked the Government yesterday whether there were not some more to be brought down, because I knew for a fact that more correspondence had passed between the members of the Government and the company than was laid on the Table. I asked for the telegrams and cablegrams, and papers received by the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, by the Hon. J. I. Tarte, Minister of Public Works, and by the Hon. A. G. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals, and also copies of all letters from those gentlemen. Well, Sir, there is not a single letter brought down from any of the Government except from the Minister of Public Works, and on these papers is noted the fact that they are referred to the Minister of Public Works for report in so far as his department is concerned. I do not know whether this is the usual course; I presume it is; but the fact of the matter is, that there is not a single paper brought down showing that there has been any correspondence with the right hon. leader of the Government or with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not know what the reason is, because I know such correspondence did take place. Whether it is that these hon. gentlemen are ashamed of the correspondence that did take place, whether they are ashamed of the documents they put their names to, or whether they are purposely suppressing them, I cannot say. I cannot believe that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did not know that he had had correspondence with one or more of these companies. The Order is as plain as possible. It asks for letters or papers signed by him, or written by him, to any particular company. It seems to me that this matter of building a telegraph line into the Yukon must have been brought up in Council, and, therefore, every hon. Minister must have heard the particulars, and must have heard the whole thing being discussed. With the permission of the House, I will now read the correspondence. I would not do so, if it were not necessary that I should do so. I do not think hon. gentlemen will be able to understand the matter, unless I begin at the beginning and go right through. In these papers which have been brought down, the first letter is dated 3rd September, 1897. It is from the United States Electrical Supply Company, of New York, per W. J. Clarke, to the Commissioner of Public Works, Ottawa, Canada, in which the company offer to undertake the work of building a telegraph line into the Yukon. They say that they have had large experience, and hope that they will be allowed to tender for the same. The next is an answer from Mr. Roy, Secretary of the Public Works Department acknowledging the letter, and stating that as yet no decision has been arrived at by the department concerning the matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What is the date of that letter?

Mr. PRIOR. The 20th of September, 1897. The next letter is dated the 26th October, 1897, and it is from Ashcroft, B.C. It is from Daniel O'Hara, acting as secretary of a meeting held there in regard to many matters, amongst which was the telegraph line. There was a meeting held at Ashcroft on the 25th of October, at which several prominent gentlemen were present, amongst them the Hon. C. F. Cornwall, who was formerly a Governor of British Columbia,

and, amongst other matters discussed, is the telegraph line. The following resolution was adopted :—

Resolved by the people of Ashcroft and vicinity that, being familiar with all the circumstances in connection with opening up of telegraphic communication with the gold-fields of the North-west, and Omenica, Cassiar, Peace River and other important sections, we are of the firm conviction that the most feasible, if not indeed the only practicable route, is to build such line from Quesnelle via the old telegraph trail to Telegraph Creek, on the Stikine, and via Lake Teslin to Dawson City, thereby taking advantage of the large sums of money expended in seeking the most practicable route by the company known as the Overland or Collins line in the early 60's.

Resolved, that the provincial government be and are hereby requested to take such action in regard to improving the overland trail from Quesnelle to Telegraph Creek, bridging such streams or establishing ferries as are found necessary, removing fallen timber, &c., &c., and that such action be taken by having parties of men sent in to Quesnelle, Hazelton and Telegraph Creek at the earliest possible date in the spring, and to be engaged in such actual work on the trail not later than March of next year, so that the trail may be in condition for travel for the thousands that will pass over it, beginning as early as April next.

I have just read that to show that the people of British Columbia, who are on the spot and have seen a good deal of the country, think that this is the best line. The next letter is a very important one. It is dated the 30th of November, 1897, from Montreal, and is signed by Mr. Charles R. Hosmer, who is now, and, I suppose, was then, the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company. It reads as follows :—

4 Hospital Street,
Montreal, Nov. 30, 1897.

Dear Mr. Tarte,—The question of telegraph communication with the Klondike has, during the past few months, received my most careful consideration, and from many inquiries I have made in all directions I am thoroughly convinced that the only feasible way by which a telegraph line can be constructed and maintained afterwards, is by the extension of the present Government line from Quesnelle, through Fort Fraser, Hazelton, Telegraph Creek, Lake Teslin and Old Fort Selkirk, to Dawson City. I inclose you a sketch showing suggested route, with approximate distances. I might say that this route is practically the one surveyed by the Russia-American Telegraph Company in 1866-67, and that the telegraph line was completed, and in working order, to about Hazelton, when word was received that the Atlantic cable had been successfully laid, which necessitated the abandonment of the project.

I would suggest that the Government undertake at once the construction of that portion of the line between Quesnelle and Lake Teslin, an approximate distance of 740 miles. From inquiries made, I understand that there is a fairly good supply of black pine and spruce along this line, particularly between Quesnelle and Hazleton (320 miles), and I would advise the using of the native timber along the route for the poles. These should last at least five or six years. This 470 miles, with the establishment of stations every 40 or 50 miles, I would roughly estimate as costing about $250,000, which would mean an interest charge to the Government of $6,000 to $7,000 per annum. I think——

I want the House to remember this.

——I might almost safely say to you that if this line were constructed, I could get our Canadian Pacific people to take it off your hands and operate on a basis that would return to the Government 4 per cent of the outlay, or about $10,000 per annum.

I need not point out to you the vast importance of telegraph communication with that country. The interest charge of $6,000 or $7,000 a year could be saved many times over in numerous ways in the administration of the country alone. Each one of our telegraph huts or stations might form a North-west Mounted Police post, and the adoption of this all-Canadian line would quickly and safely open a new route and territory.

I hope the Government will consider the matter of sufficient importance to warrant their ordering the work started at once, and that you will not be obliged to await the sanction of Parliament, otherwise it will be impossible to get the line in operation so that it will be of any service during the coming year. Later on, the telegraph line might be continued from Lake Teslin to Dawson.

I need not add that I would be very glad to be of any service I can to you in this matter.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) CHAS. R. HOSMER.

Hon. J. Israel Tarte,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing was done after that letter. There is no more correspondence then for something like eighteen months, or a little under. Evidently, the Government did not think it was wise to build the line then. Nothing more was done, and no further correspondence was had, until the letter written on the 11th of April, 1899. There is no reply to Mr. Hosmer's letter brought down, and evidently the Government did not act on it. The next letter is, as I say, dated on the 11th of April, 1899, and it was signed by Allen Haley, H. S. Holt and James B. Roche, shareholders in the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, Limited. It is addressed to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and it is as follows :—

Ottawa, 11th April, 1899.

The Hon. J. Israel Tarte,
Minister of Public Works of Canada,
Ottawa.

Sir,—Referring to the interview which the undersigned, Dr. Haley, M.P., one of the provisional directors of the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited) and chairman of the provisional board of that company, Mr. H. S. Holt, of London, England, chairman of the directors of the Commercial Telegraph Construction Syndicate (Limited), and the Hon. James B. Roche, of London, England, had the honour to have with you yesterday, and in accordance with your suggestion we have the honour to submit to you the following memorandum with regard to the construction of a telegraph line from Skagway to Dawson City, in the Yukon district :—

The Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited) was incorporated by an Act of the

Canadian Parliament passed at its last session, chaptered 111, for the purpose of, amongst other things, constructing and operating, as mentioned in clause 3 of the Act (copy inclosed), cable and telegraph lines between Vancouver and Dawson City.

The company has an authorized capital of £100,000, and the Act of incorporation provides that as soon as 25 per cent thereon has been subscribed and 10 per cent thereon has been paid into a chartered bank, a board of directors shall be elected by the shareholders.

In October, 1898, the Hon. James B. Roche, one of the undersigned, having previously visited the Yukon district, decided to take up the matter of the construction and operation of a cable and telegraph line to that country, and arranged with the provisional directors of the Canadian company to proceed to London and take steps to obtain subscriptions for the company's capital, to make the necessary arrangements for the purchase of material, for the making of surveys, and for the construction, in the first place, of the land portion of the telegraph line from Skagway to Dawson City, and later for the laying of the cable from a point on Vancouver Island to a point north of Juneau.

Before returning to England, in October last, Mr. Roche visited Washington, D.C., and arranged with the United States authorities to procure the requisite permission to lay and land the submarine cable through American waters and upon American territory for the necessary distance, and as incidental thereto for the construction of the land line between Skagway and the summit over the small extent of the American territory between these points.

On his return to England no time was lost in taking steps to arrange for the raising of the necessary capital for the contemplated work, which resulted in a company, "The Commercial Telegraph Construction Syndicate (Limited)" being formed in the latter part of January last for the purpose of entering into the various contracts which the operations of the Canadian company rendered necessary.

I may say that I first met Mr. Roche in British Columbia after he had returned from the Yukon.

This syndicate has contracted with W. T. Henley's Telegraph Works (Limited), of 27 Martin's Lane, Cannon Street, London, Eng., to undertake the construction, laying and erection of the land line. Henley's Company is the most responsible cable and telegraph construction company in England, and has lately laid the cable from Halifax to Bermuda. Mr. Sydney Gedge, M.P., is its chairman, and will no doubt answer any inquiries.

The wire necessary for the land line was ordered at an early date and has been made. One-half of it was shipped from Liverpool on 15th March, 1899, and is at the present moment on its way to Vancouver.

A survey of the route of the land line has been made, and upon the report of that survey, the contracts referred to have been entered into. Arrangements for the delivery of the necessary telegraph poles have also been made.

Mr. Holt, who is the chairman of the syndicate, and Mr. Roche came to Ottawa this week with the necessary authority to subscribe the necessary capital stock in the Canadian company, and to make the requisite payment thereon as required by that company's Act of incorporation. The Canadian company has been duly organized by the requisite amount of the capital stock having been so subscribed, and the requisite amount paid in thereon, to the credit of the company in the Bank of Montreal, at Ottawa.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you will see that they left nothing undone that was called for by their charter.

Before returning to England last October,——

That was six months before this letter was written.

Before returning to England last October, Mr. Roche had acquainted the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals with his connection with the charter of the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), and of his intention to proceed to arrange for the carrying out of its object, and it was not until two weeks ago that he learned with great surprise of the intention of the Dominion Government to construct as a public work a telegraph line over the same route as that authorized by the charter of the Canadian company.

In view of the expenditure and preparations which the company above mentioned have already made and arranged for, to carry out the above telegraph and cable scheme, and of the fact that the construction and operation by the Government of another line of telegraph to serve the same purposes might seriously prejudice the carrying out of the cable portion of the company's scheme, the undersigned would respectfully submit, as there can be no necessity for two lines of telegraph over the route in question, the Government should not proceed with the building of its proposed line.

The companies intend going on at once with the construction of the land line from Skagway to Dawson City, and expect to have it completed and in operation early in July next. The undersigned begs further to state that if the Government decides to abandon the construction of its proposed line the companies will take over at cost and charge all material that the Government may have acquired for the purpose of such construction.

By the charter of the Canadian company, and by the general Acts respecting telegraph and marine electric telegraphs, the priority of Government messages and the fixing of the rates to be charged by the company on all business are fully provided for.

We have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servants,
(Sgd.) ALLEN HALEY.
(Sgd.) H. S. HOLT,
(Sgd.) JAMES ROCHE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What is the date of that letter?

Mr. PRIOR. The date is the 11th April, 1899, and it is addressed to the Hon. J. I. Tarte. The next letter brought down is from Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister of Public Works, dated 15th April, four days after the above letter, and addressed to Allan Haley, Esq., M.P., It is as follows:—

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, 5th April, 1899.

Dear Sir,—The hon. the Minister has had under consideration the letter you have sent to him in reference to the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, which, as you state, has taken

active steps towards the construction of a line of telegraph from Skagway to Dawson City.

The hon. the Minister thinks you will easily understand that the fact that charters are granted to companies for the purpose of constructing works over a certain territory does not preclude the Government of Canada, if it thinks such a course advisable, from undertaking the construction of such works.

I may say, however, that the hon. the Minister has never been officially apprised, as he should have been (the matter being of his department),—

I wish the House to pay particular attention to those words, "the matter being of his department."

——of the intention of the company, and he regrets that it is only when he has taken all the necessary steps for the purpose, despatched a party of men to undertake the construction, purchased the materials required, that it is brought to his knowledge that a chartered company is about to undertake the same work.

The hon. Minister further believes that if any disappointment is experienced by the company, it is largely and, in so far as he is concerned,——

Mark the words, "so far as he is concerned."

——absolutely due to the fact that he, as the responsible Minister in charge of the construction of telegraph lines, has not been informed in time of the fact that an action parallel to his own was intended to be taken by the company in question.

He regrets that matters are now in such a position that he does not see how it is possible for the department to withdraw from its present situation.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) A. GOBEIL,
Deputy Minister.

Allen Haley, Esq., M.P.

On the 21st April, or seven days afterwards, there is a letter from Mr. Allan Haley, to the Minister of Public Works, which reads as follows:—

Ottawa, April 21st, 1899.

The Hon. J. I. Tarte,
Minister of Public Works.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 15th instant, signed by your Deputy Minister, in reply to the communication which Mr. Holt, Mr. Roche and myself forwarded to you on the 11th instant on the subject of the construction of a telegraph line between Skagway and Dawson City. I may say that, although your deputy's letter bears date as already stated, on the 15th, it only reached me at the House of Commons about 5 o'clock this afternoon.

As you may remember, our letter of the 11th instant was written upon your suggestion for the purpose, as you stated, of enabling you to bring this matter before the Government in Council, which you said you intended to do, but your deputy's letter does not indicate that the matter has been submitted to Council.

As was stated in our interview with you, as well as in our letter, Mr. Roche, when he first took up the matter of the construction of the line in October last, acquainted the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals of his intention in that respect, having been given to understand and believing that the head of the Department of Railways and Canals was the proper member of the Government to approach on the subject. From time to time since then, the Minister of Railways and Canals has been informed of the steps that were taken, and the progress that was being made in the matter. Under these circumstances, we do not think that the representatives of our company can be blamed for your want of official notice of the fact that the construction of the telegraph line by our company was being arranged for. We further have to state that the fact that the Minister of Railways assured Mr. Roche in October last that the proposed construction by the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company of the telegraph line in question would be looked upon favourably and have the sympathy and support of the Government, is, in our view, a sufficient reason why the Government should not have undertaken and should not now proceed with the construction of a line for the same purpose. As the only difficulty suggested in the way of your department withdrawing from the proposed construction of the line in question appears to be one arising out of the expenditure which your department has already incurred in the matter, I cannot see why it is impossible so to withdraw in view of the fact that the companies which my associates and myself represent, have already, in our former letter offered to indemnify the Government fully in respect of that expenditure, which offer I now beg to renew on their behalf.

It is, I presume, unnecessary to urge what must surely be admitted, that two lines of telegraph through the district of country in question are quite unnecessary, and in view of the facts above, and in our former letter, stated, we consider that we have the right to insist that there should be a reconsideration by the Governor in Council to build this line as a public work, and we have, therefore, most respectfully to request that you will for that purpose bring the matter before Council at the earliest possible date.

Awaiting your reply,
I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ALLEN HALEY.

The next letter is from J. Israel Tarte:

Office of the Minister of Public Works
of Canada,
Ottawa, April 27th, 1899.

Allen Haley, Esq.,
President Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir,—In answer to your communication of April 21st, and to follow suits to the conversation that I had with you, I beg to say that I was authorized by His Excellency the Governor General in Council to go on with the construction of the telegraph line from Skagway to Dawson, with the ultimate object of constructing also a line from Quesnelle to Dawson. When I was so authorized, your company had not given to myself, or to the Governor in Council, any intimation that you intended going on with the work authorized by your charter.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how many members of the Government a company is to give notice to. One would have supposed that if they had given notice to the Minister of Railways and Canals, even though not the proper Minister, he would have sent the notice to the proper Minister. He goes on to say:

I feel that it is in the public interest that the

line from Quesnelle to Dawson be proceeded with as soon as possible, and, in fact, the present portion of the line that we are constructing will be used as part of the line from Quesnelle to Dawson. In my conversation with you yesterday, I stated that no guarantee having been given to us that your company or any other company would be ready to go on with the construction of the telegraph line on the basis pointed out in this letter, the Government does not see anything else to do than to go on with the work which is now under way.

I may say that we have received reports from the officers in charge of our line that the work is proceeding speedily.

However, I will always be glad to receive any offer from your company, without pledging myself to accept any such offer.

Truly yours,
(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

This, Mr. Speaker, constitutes the whole correspondence that has been brought down to the House by the Government; but, as a matter of fact, I know that that was not all that took place. I do not know that I can give all that has taken place, but I can give a good deal more than has been brought down to the House. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated that he had brought down everything that was in his department, so far as he knew. The last letter I read was answered by Mr. Haley the very same day on which it was written, and it seems to me extraordinary that that letter cannot be found in the Department of Public Works; and it is another extraordinary and very suspicious circumstance, to my mind, that that letter was the only one in which the Minister of Railways and Canals was directly concerned. It was as follows:—

Ottawa, April 27th, 1899.

To the Hon. J. Israel Tarte,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of yours of to-day in regard to the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company matter.

With reference to your statement as to your want of notice of the intention of our company to go on with the work, I can only repeat that the Hon. Mr. Blair, the Minister of Railways and Canals, informed my co-directors by letter that his department was the proper one to communicate with on the subject, and that they accordingly did so as early as October last, and from time to time since then. I do not, therefore, think that it can be said that the company did not take the proper steps to communicate to the Government their intentions.

You stated to me yesterday that you had a strong preference for the all-Canadian route. I communicated this to my colleagues upon the board, and they ask me to acquaint you with the fact that if the survey will show that this line is feasible, they are quite prepared to abandon the cable portion of their scheme and make the communications between Vancouver and Dawson City by land only.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) ALLEN HALEY.

Now, I have here some letters which Mr. Roche's solicitor has put into my hand, and which he states are true copies of the correspondence which has taken place, none of which has been brought down by the Government. Here is one from Allen Haley, H. S. Holt and Jas. Roche:

Ottawa, Ont., April 18, 1899.

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
G.C.M.G., M.P.

Sir,—We have the honour to address you as the head of the Dominion Government on the subject of the construction of a cable and telegraph line from British Columbia to the Yukon district. On yesterday we had the honour of an interview upon the same subject with the Hon. Mr. Tarte, his department being, as we understood, the one under which the construction of the proposed Government line of telegraph to the Yukon was being undertaken, and in accordance with his suggestion we wrote him on the 11th instant a letter, of which the inclosed is a copy. On the following day, as we regretted to learn, Mr. Tarte was taken seriously ill, and as the result has been confined to his house and unable to attend to business ever since. Owing, we presume, to Mr. Tarte's illness, we have had no reply to our letter, and as it is of the greatest importance to the companies that we should have a reply at the earliest possible date, we respectfully request that you would take up the matter with a view to giving us an answer. We may further say that we understood from Mr. Tarte that the subject was one which would have to be dealt with by the Governor in Council, although in accordance with his suggestion the letter was addressed to him, and we therefore consider that we are quite in order in addressing you as the head of the Government for the purpose of having the subject dealt with.

We have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
(Sgd.) ALLEN HALEY,
(Sgd.) H. S. HOLT,
(Sgd.) JAMES ROCHE.

I do not see any reply to that, and I am informed that no reply was received. On the 27th of April the following letter was sent:

Ottawa, April 27th, 1899.

To the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
President of the Privy Council,
Ottawa.

Sir,—

Re the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).

Referring to our interview with you this afternoon, and in compliance with your request, we have the honour to submit to you the following facts:—

There is no use my reading the whole of this letter, because a great portion of it consists simply of a copy of what was sent to the Minister of Public Works, setting forth the whole circumstances. It states that the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company was incorporated, and goes on to say:

Whilst in Ottawa last October, Mr. Roche acquainted the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals with his connection with the charter of the above company, and of his intention to proceed to arrange for the carrying out of its objects, and he received from Mr. Blair a letter on the subject, of which the following is a copy:—

Department of Railways and Canals, Canada.
Minister's Office,
Ottawa, October 6th, 1898.

Dear Mr. Roche,—I am very much pleased indeed to learn that it is your intention, representing the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), to proceed without unnecessary delay with the construction of the telegraph line from the coast into Dawson City, to be followed thereafter with resonable despatch by the laying of a cable or cables from Vancouver to the point of connection with the land line.

The Government is extremely desirous that private enterprise should take up this work, and that it be prosecuted without delay; and the needs of the district are such that we believe an enterprise of that nature would be found extremely profitable. You may rely upon receiving the countenance and approval of the Government in carrying this enterprise forward to a successful issue.

Yours faithfully,
ANDREW G. BLAIR.

J. B. Roche, Esq.,
Albermarle Hotel, New York City.

Yet this was not brought down. And the Minister of Public Works has continually told these gentlemen that the Government had no advice that these gentlemen intended to go on with the work. These gentlemen, in their letter to the right hon. the First Minister, continued as follows :—

In another letter by the Hon. Mr. Blair to Mr. Roche, the former wrote as follows :—

"Since you were here I had a call from the gentleman who represents the other company incorporated at the last session of Parliament.

That is the company incorporated as the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company. This letter is from the three provisional directors to the right hon. First Minister, after they could not get any satisfaction out of the Minister of Public Works, and they quote the letter of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). What is the date ?

Mr. PRIOR. On the copy I have here there is no date. The letter is from Mr. Blair to Mr. Roche, and is signed "A. G. Blair" :

Since you were here I had a call from the gentleman who represents the other company incorporated at the last session of Parliament. He evidently came in consequence of newspaper statements respecting your action, and is the bearer of cable messages from the gentlemen in England connected with the other company, desiring to know how far the Government is committed to yourself,——

That is Mr. Roche.

——and intimating that if matters had not gone too far to be recalled, or if we were not open to treat with them on similar terms, it would hardly be worth while for them to proceed with their undertaking. I mention this so that you may learn what is moving——

He is posting the other company.

——and as an additional reason which may urge you to such activity in the prosecution of your enterprise as is practicable. I told this gentleman very frankly that my department had an understanding with you, and that we were giving you the preference, at least until we were satisfied you were delaying in pushing the work unduly; and I said that upon that point we would be in no position to form an opinion until next spring.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) ANDREW G. BLAIR.

The letter to the right hon. First Minister then goes on to set forth the circumstances just as they are set forth in the letter to the Minister of Public Works, and then proceeds as follows :—

From time to time, after Mr. Roche's return to England, the Minister of Railways and Canals —the proper Minister, as Mr. Roche understood, to communicate with on the subject—was informed of what steps were being taken and what progress was being made in the matter in England.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who states that ?

Mr. PRIOR. This is a letter to the right hon. First Minister from Messrs. Haley, Roche and Holt.

Mr. Holt, who is the chairman of the syndicate, and Mr. Roche came to Ottawa on the 9th instant with the necessary authority to subscribe the required capital stock in the Canadian company, and make the requisite payments thereon as required by the Act of incorporation, and the Canadian company has been duly organized by said requisite amount of stock having been subscribed, and the necessary amount paid thereon to the credit of the company in the Bank of Montreal, Ottawa. It was not until about ten days before Mr. Roche and Mr. Holt left London for Canada (on the 27th March), that they heard with great surprise of the intention of the Dominion Government to construct, as a public work, a telegraph line over the same route as that authorized by the charter of the above company. They at once informed the Minister of Railways and Canals that they were leaving for Ottawa immediately.

Then it goes on :

It was only after the arrival of Mr. Roche and Mr. Holt in Ottawa that we learned for the first time that the construction of the proposed Government line was in charge of the Department of Public Works, and we submit herewith a copy of the correspondence which has passed between the Minister of that department and ourselves on the subject.

Mr. BERGERON. And those papers are not brought down.

Mr. PRIOR. None of them.

We think we should point out in addition that the subscription of the necessary capital was obtained upon the assurances given us, as above, that we might rely on the support of the Government, and we now think we may fairly ask the Government to abandon the construction of a rival line of telegraph.

That letter was from these gentlemen, the provisional directors, to the First Minister. No answer was given to that, so far as I can

find out, and on the 8th of May another letter was sent signed by Allen Haley and James Roche. Mr. Holt had then gone to England. This letter is to the right hon. First Minister:

Sir,—Re Northern Commercial Telegraph Company.

In accordance with your request at our interview of the 29th ult., we forwarded you a memorial of the whole facts in respect of the matter, and you stated that you would bring the subject before Council on Monday last (May 1st), and that we would receive an answer on the following day.

We have not had any reply or even any acknowledgment of our memorial.

As we have on more than one occasion on behalf of the company stated, at the request of the Minister of Public Works, our readiness to reimburse the Government for any cost they have been put to in preparing to commence the work themselves, we must now withdraw this offer, it not having been accepted, and we having decided to commence our line forthwith.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

(Sgd.) ALLEN HALEY,
(Sgd.) JAMES ROCHE.

I am told that there is no answer to that, and nothing more has been heard about it. I can only tell you what I have been told by Mr. Roche's solicitor. That is the whole correspondence I have in my hand. The first portion was what the Government brought down, and the second, and most important part, is what the Government did not bring down. I cannot believe, for one moment, that the Government did not know that that correspondence had taken place. I cannot for one moment believe that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was not cognizant of the fact that he had months ago written letters to these gentlemen urging them to build a line and telling them that they would have the Government support, and he must have known also that the Minister of Public Works, who had been before Council, as I presume he had, had got authority from Council to build a line on the same route as that on which those gentlemen had got a charter.

I might also state, before going further, that the other company, the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company, had also been at work. They had got the capital subscribed, they had spent quite a large sum, so I am informed by the directors who have written to me—over 400 pounds sterling—in getting that company started, they have paid the expenses of sending out an engineer to the Pacific coast, they had sent him to New York, and then further and had paid his expenses, and when he got there, of course they had to recall him. They also made an issue of stock on the market in London, and now I am informed that they have sent, through Lord Strathcona, a claim against the Government for damages. I refer now to the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company, which is now called the British Columbia, Victoria and Dawson City Telegraph Company.

The hon. Minister of Public Works is not here or I would put the question to him, but perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways will tell us whether he did or did not give any notice to his colleague the Minister of Public Works, before these gentlemen came from London, of their intention of building the line, of what they had been doing and, in fact, the whole information he had from them. Did the hon. gentleman give the Minister of Public Works notice of this or did he keep the whole of this information to himself, and let the Minister of Public Works go on building the line and let these other gentlemen go on spending their money? The Minister of Public Works was asked, as well as the right hon. First Minister, to bring this matter before the Council. Did they do so? I presume they did. I presume that the hon. Minister of Public Works did bring it before Council or else how did he get the money to proceed with the work his department is now doing in the Yukon? Did he get a Governor General's warrant? There is no parliamentary vote for it, there never was any vote for it, so far as I know last session, there certainly must have been some kind of hole-and-corner proceeding which nobody knew anything about except those interested.

There is another thing to which I wish to refer. The hon. Minister of Public Works, in one of his letters, states that he had no knowledge as to the standing of the company, its financial standing, whether it was capable of carrying on the work. I was informed in this House by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the 15th of May, in answer to a question I put him, and the question and reply is here in "Hansard":

Mr. PRIOR (by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

"1. Is it not a fact that the English representatives of the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), now in Canada, have communicated to the Government the readiness of the company to commence forthwith the construction of the Dawson and Skagway telegraph line under their charter?

"2. Have the Government received information from the High Commissioner for Canada, in London, that the company which the gentlemen represent is quite capable of carrying out the work, and whether, under these circumstances, the Government proposes to undertake the work themselves, in opposition to an Act of Parliament granted last session to the above named company?"

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The company mentioned only communicated with the Department of Public Works—which is in charge of the construction of telegraphs—about three weeks ago, its readiness to construct the telegraph line from Skagway to Dawson.

Do you mean to tell me that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was so ignorant of the correspondence that had taken place

between these gentlemen and the Minister of Railways and Canals ?

Active steps had been taken by the department some time before for the construction of the telegraph line in question. 2. On the 22nd April, Lord Strathcona telegraphed, at request of company, that their finances were ample. I may remark, with regard to question 2, that it is argumentative in its character, as many questions are that are now being put on the list.

Now, Sir, after they received that telegram, surely they had no compunction of conscience about trusting these gentlemen with carrying on this work. It is not a very expensive work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask what company was referred to in Lord Strathcona's telegram stating that its finances were ample ?

Mr. PRIOR. That referred to the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), the one with which the correspondence was held which has been read. It seems to me there must be an extraordinary state of affairs in the Cabinet when, in serious matters like this, dealings with gentlemen of high standing both in the financial and political world in England, charters can be given by Parliament, capital can be subscribed and the work actually commenced ; when correspondence can be carried on with one member of the Government, a gentleman at the head of one of the largest departments under the control of the Government; when letters can be received from him stating that the Government is prepared to back them up in every way and hopes to see them put the work through as quickly as possible, and, after all, when these gentlemen come to Canada they are told that they have made a mistake, that they have got to the wrong department, and they go to the Minister of Public Works and he tells them that not a word has been said to him or to the Government. So these gentlemen, who, perhaps, do not know as much as we do as to what is the proper department——

Mr. FOSTER. From whom did they get their charter ?

Mr. PRIOR. From the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. And from the committee over which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) presides.

Mr. PRIOR. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) suggests, before they can get their charter, it must be approved by the committee over which the Minister of Railways and Canals presides. If it is the case that the Government are at loggerheads, that they do not trust one another, that even in Council when one Minister proposes a matter, the other Ministers clear out, it seems to me that I have not done very wrong in bringing the matter before the House. To my mind it is a most lamentable exhibition of want of confidence between the Ministers or of jealousy. The Minister of Public Works stated in some letters that were written that this matter was one of too great value to be carried on by a private corporation.

An hon. MEMBER. There ought to be something in it for the boy.

Mr. PRIOR. That is the only conclusion you can come to. I may be right or wrong, but I venture to think that it should be a principle with the Government that, where a matter of public interest can be undertaken and carried out by a private corporation and by private enterprise, the Government should not step in and compete with them. I do not think it is fair. And as regards this matter being too valuable, too much money to be made out of it, as the Minister of Public Works said, if gentlemen look at the charters they will see that the Government and Parliament took powers to keep down the rates, to cut them down at any time if they were exorbitant—in fact they could cut down moderate rates if they chose. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals, as I have said time and time again, told these gentlemen they were to go on with the work as quickly as they possibly could, that the Government would support them and wanted to see the line constructed. This will be seen by the correspondence. The Government, no doubt, has a right to build the line. But I ask : Is it in the interests of the public that the Government should step in and build a line that they must have known was being carried out by companies that had plenty of backing, that had commenced already, had ordered their material and were actually on the ground with some of it ? To my mind, this is a great breach of faith and one that is bound to injure the credit—yes, the credit of Canada—in the money markets of the world. We are trying to get all the capital we can into Canada, especially into British Columbia ; and if the people of the financial world see that, no matter what charters they get from the Government, the Government can step in on the ground that the concession is a valuable one and compete with them, or even knock them out, it will check the inflow of capital. In regard to that, I would show what the railway and shipping "World" of March last says with regard to the other company—the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company :

We were recently informed that this company had let a contract for the construction of the line, and that the resident engineer had been despatched to British Columbia to start the work, so that no doubt considerable expense has been incurred. When the prospectus of the debenture stock was issued, we felt compelled to criticise it adversely on account of the visionary estimates it contained ; but we want to see the company get fair-play, and now that the Government has

decided to build a line and ruin the franchise, the company is certainly entitled to liberal compensation. If there are reasons to-day for the line being built by the Government, they doubtless existed a year ago, and the two charters above mentioned should not have been granted. The fact that the C., B. C. & D. C. T. Co. was issuing debentures and preparing for work was given wide publicity, and yet it does not appear that the Government notified the company of its intention to render the charter valueless. This mode of procedure is unworthy of a Government, and is calculated to seriously prejudice Canadian interests in Europe. If capitalists once came to the conclusion that they are not to be treated honestly by the Government, and that after proceeding in good faith to carry out the powers unanimously given them by Parliament, their franchises are to be arbitrarily rendered worthless, they will leave such investments severely alone.

I think this opinion must be the opinion of any right-thinking gentleman in this House. Evidently, the Government have been looking up the letter they received in 1897 from Mr. C. Hosmer in which he told them that this was a valuable franchise and the Canadian Pacific Railway would build it and hand it over to the Government for a certain concession. I presume that is what the Government is building on now. I do not want to say anything more. Other hon. gentlemen, I hope, will take the matter up. It seems to me a disgraceful affair—I cannot make use of a less expressive word—that the Government should pretend to these gentlemen that they had never received any notice from them, and should build a competing line which is going to ruin these two charters. I also think that both of these companies, which have spent large sums of money, should either receive compensation from the Government or be allowed to go on with their work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Perhaps it would be well that I should state to the House at this stage what my knowledge of this matter is. As the hon. gentleman has devoted a good deal of time to it, has read the correspondence, and has undertaken to characterize the conduct of the Government in terms far from mild, it may be as well that I should for that reason also put the whole facts before the House, so far as they are within my knowledge. In the first place, the hon. gentleman alluded to the fact that there had been some correspondence, as he stated, from Mr. Roche and others to me, and from myself to them, which had not been brought down. I want to say in respect to that, that there was no intentional withholding of any correspondence which I had with the gentlemen he has named. I explained to the House yesterday that I was not acquainted with the fact that this return was being sent in, or that it was before the House, and that I would have my officers see whether there was any correspondence which could properly be brought down, and if so, it would be brought down. I gave these instructions. I was not prepared for the hon. gentleman bringing this up again to-day, or I would have takn extraordinary pains to hurry the inquiry and ascertain as to that without delay. I can only say at this stage that all the letters which were written by me to Mr. Roche have been read to the House. They only consist of two, copies of which the hon. gentleman appears to have in his possession, and which he has read to the House. I have no doubt those copies have been furnished by Mr. Roche. Mr. Roche has not said, and Mr. Roche will not say, that he ever wrote a letter to me. He certainly never did. I have none from him in my possession, except it might possibly be a short note which I will refer to later, and which would not be at all material to the examination of this question, or to the forming of a judgment upon it.

My first connection with the matter arose from being the Government member upon the Committee of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. Two Bills came before that committee during the session of 1897, and were dealt with by it. The gentlemen who were promoting those Bills respectively, more especially the gentlemen who were promoting the Northern Commercial Company's Bill, were in communication with me in respect to it, I presume by reason of the connection which arises between promoters and the Government member of that committee in respect to such Bills, they assume that so far as any particular member of the Government would be supposed to have cognizance of the policy of the Government in respect to the incorporation of companies, and generally in respect to telegraphs. I was that member. It would be, of course, a different question if the Government should decide upon the construction of a telegraph line; then the subject would immediately pass under the direct control of the Minister of Public Works. But that stage had not been reached. These gentlemen my hon. friend has mentioned here, the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Haley), the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville), I think, and I am not sure but what there may have been another member—at all events, those gentlemen were in frequent communication with me while the matter was before the Committee of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. After that, they advised me that some English gentlemen would take hold of the Northern Commercial enterprise, and carry it through, and one of them introduced Mr. Roche to me. He came to the office and told me he had been looking into it, that he had been in communication with our friends who were incorporated in the company, and he was anxious to know what attitude the Government would take with

respect to it. I told Mr. Roche very frankly that the Government felt the necessity of having a telegraph line built through that country as speedily as possible. I told him we had not undertaken it before, because we were in hopes a private company would take it up, but that it would need to be taken hold of with energy, with promptness, and that no delay could possibly be allowed, because the subject was of such importance, it was so vitally necessary to that section of the country that we should have telegraphic communication with it, that no delay would be countenanced by the Government. These gentlemen, members of Parliament, friends of the Government and incorporators of this company, asked me to write a letter to Mr. Roche which would express the views of the Government on the question. That was the letter which was first read, and which is dated the 6th of October. I did not fail in the conversation I had with Mr. Roche, to assure him that this enterprise, if it was to be taken up by his company, must be taken up energetically, it must be taken up in a business way, and with the intention to carry it through, otherwise the Government would certainly take it up itself. After writing that letter to Mr. Roche, I think I received a short note from him in which he told me that he was then about leaving for New York to sail for England to have this matter immediately put through. That was in October; it might be the 6th, the 7th or the 8th. I am not sure but it was the 6th, the very date of that letter which was referred to. He said he was going to New York, and he asked me in a confidential way to let him know if I heard that there was any disposition on the part of anybody interested in the other company to move in the matter. I certainly did prefer the company which is known now as the Northern Commercial Company, so far as my own preferences were concerned as a member of the Government. On examination of the routes which are laid down for these two telegraph lines, hon. members will perceive that the line which the Northern Commercial Company is incorporated to construct was the one which could be built the most speedily, and which would give us connection with Skagway with the least delay, and that it was very much the more preferable route, and I expressed myself in that manner. Now, Sir, having received a request from Mr. Roche, either verbally or in writing—I do not wish to commit myself to a direct statement as to whether it was verbal or in writing, I think it may have been in writing—asking me to let him know if anything was going on which would show there was activity on the part of the rival company, I told him I would do so if I heard anything, and he gave me his address, and I sent the note which has been read secondly by my hon. friend, the date of which he does not appear to have in his possession. That letter was written confidentially by me to Mr. Roche, and whatever Mr. Roche may be, whether a member of Parliament or not, and I understand he is a member of Parliament, I have no hesitation in saying that he is no gentleman. I cannot conceive it possible that a gentleman having asked another to make a confidential and friendly communication to him, would make use of that communication in the public press. He published both of those letters in the London papers for the purpose of serving his own ends, in entire disregard of what would obtain between gentlemen. I do not hesitate to say that, and I am not only saying it here, I am repeating what I have stated in effect to Mr. Roche himself when he came here a short time after action had been taken by the Government, and I think shortly after the session of Parliament. Mr. Roche called upon me after the opening of the session of Parliament, and said that he had been made aware of the fact that the Government was moving in respect to the construction of the telegraph line. I said to him at once: Mr. Roche, I am bound to tell you, sir, that I feel, in making use, as you did, of confidential communications, which I sent at your request, and in a friendly manner, and by publishing them in the public press in London, you have acted in such a way as that I do not think you have any right to expect any further consideration from me, nor do I think——

Mr. PRIOR. Were those communications on public business?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, Sir; this second letter was a private communication, confidential communication; it was so understood by Mr. Roche, and it was invited from me as confidential and friendly communication. After this communication, which I speak of as being confidential, was sent by me to Mr. Roche——

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether these letters were marked "confidential"?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say whether they were marked "confidential" or not.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. Minister copies of them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have copies of them.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, why cannot you give us the information?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not seen them since they were written; I cannot say whether they were marked "confidential," but that question

does not enter into them, and I wish to say further that Mr. Roche did not pretend that, because they were not marked "confidential" he was justified in using them. He offered some lame explanation and admitted that they ought not to have been used, and acknowledged the confidential character of the communication in his conversation with me.

Mr. PRIOR. Nobody who knows Mr. Roche will ever say that he wants to make any lame excuses.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Prior) may have that opinion of Mr. Roche. I can only point to the use he made of the letter which he had invited me in a confidential way to write to him, which was not the use I would expect that a gentleman would make of a communication received in that manner. That is my opinion of him, and I state it openly and without hesitation. After having written that letter, which was close upon the 6th of October, I wish to inform this House that down until the time that the Government had taken action, that it had decided that it could delay no longer the construction of the telegraph line from the Yukon country, from the 6th of October down until that time, no one, either verbally or in writing, by telegraph or by letter, Mr. Roche, or any one on Mr. Roche's behalf, gave to me the slightest information, or intimation that they were intending to carry on this work, or that they had made any progress in that direction. There was, I believe, a total blank between these dates, and as the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) is in close communication with Mr. Roche, he will be able to ask Mr. Roche to put him in possession of the copy of any communication which he ever caused to be sent to me between the dates I speak of, from the 6th or 7th or 8th of October, down to the day when the Government came to a decision in respect to this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. At what date did the Government decide?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember.

Mr. WALLACE. We want to know that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give it to you; I do not carry it in my mind, but we will be ready to furnish hon. gentlemen with all the information.

Mr. PRIOR. Will the hon. gentleman let us know when the Order in Council was passed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. We want to know. The hon. Minister is able to give the House the date of the 6th of October.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I give it because the date has been given here. We will furnish hon. gentleman with the date when the Order in Council was passed. I want to state that, speaking for myself, and so far as I know, for every member of the Council, there was no notice, no communication of any kind, or description, received from Mr. Roche, or on behalf of Mr. Roche, stating that he had moved one peg from the moment that he left this side of the water with the avowed and declared intention of immediately taking this work up and pushing it through.

Mr. PRIOR. Did you not get any letters?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, sir. I desire to say, in the most unqualified manner, that I never heard from him until after action was taken by the Government. When the date of the session was approaching, and when the spring was opening and we were feeling that it was time that some action should be taken with respect to this matter, the subject was brought up. I do not know whether I would be free to state what took place in Council——

Mr. WALLACE. Did not the hon. gentleman know from these letters that have been read that action was being taken?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not know of these letters until they were mentioned here.

Mr. WALLACE. Mentioned here?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Until they were mentioned here in Ottawa.

Mr. WALLACE. They were published in the London "Times."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say they were published in the London "Times," because I do not know. I say they were published in a London paper, so I was informed. I cannot say that, because the first intimation I had of their publication I received from the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) reading from a London paper.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was from the "Financial Times," of London.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That is different from the London "Times."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know that Mr. Roche, when I mentioned the subject to him and complained of his conduct, admitted that they were published in the London papers. The papers that they were published in was a matter of indifference to me. I did not inquire and I do not know. I think I am free to say this much, that when the subject came under consideration in Council it was remarked upon that neither of the companies that had

been incorporated by this Parliament at the last session, had made any move whatever towards pushing this work through, so far as we knew. And if I were free to say what statement I made to Council on the subject —I do not know that I am, but, if I were, hon. members would know that Council was in full possession of the knowledge that these people of the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, who had expressed, through Mr. Roche, their intention of going on speedily with the work, had never moved a step since October last, so far as my knowledge extended. Thus, it was necessary that something should be done, and Council came to the conclusion which they did reach in the matter. These are the facts substantially as they are in my possession, and I invite the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) now to call upon Mr. Roche, to furnish him with a copy, or I would ask him to furnish the original, or the press copy, of any communication which he himself ever forwarded to me on the subject, from the 6th of October until after Council had decided this question.

Mr. PRIOR. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) a question? In regard to the British Columbia and Dawson City Company, have the Government had any information from them that they were carrying out their work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None whatever, so far as I know. I never heard from them until very recently, and until this subject came up. I understand now that they were trying to organize their company in London, but as to whether they were organizing or not I cannot speak with confidence. It appears to me that the conclusion which the hon. gentleman drew from the facts, which he stated to this House, was an entirely unwarranted conclusion even from these facts. The hon. gentleman has said that the conduct of the Government was most disgraceful in reference to this subject. I want to say, if I can form any judgment as to what is proper conduct, the company have no reason to complain of any treatment they received either from the Government as a whole, or from any member of it. So far as I can form an opinion on this question, that is the judgment I have formed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question before he sits down, because this is a very important matter, one of the gravest that has come before this House. He attaches great importance to not having heard anything from the company. Now, the communication that the hon. gentleman had in Ottawa on the 6th of October with this company was to the following effect:—

> I told these gentlemen very frankly that my department had an understanding with you.

In a letter, written the same day, he said to the Commercial Company:

> I am very much pleased indeed to learn that it is your intention, representing the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), to proceed without unnecessary delay with the construction of a telegraph line from the coast into Dawson City.

My hon. friend has formed a very natural inference as to why these parties came to him, because they knew that he was chairman of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and, therefore, they would naturally go to the chairman of that committee, which had passed the charter for them, as the proper Minister to deal with. They did so. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) informed the company that he was very glad they were going to proceed with this matter; but he did not stop there, for on the same date he wrote a letter to that company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS: What date is that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER: The 6th October; both on the same day. Another company approached the Minister, and the Minister, having had communication with this Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, informed them:

> I told these gentlemen very frankly that my department had an understanding with you.

Instead of raising a doubt as to his department being the proper one for them to negotiate with, he told another company, their opponents and rivals, that he could not do anything for them, because his Department of Railways and Canals had an understanding with the Commercial Telegraph Company. I draw the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) to the fact that this occurred on the 6th of October. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) very well knows that companies are not organized in a day. He knows that this gentleman had to go back to London, that he had to make all the preliminary arrangements for floating the company, and getting the capital together, and that, in the very nature of things, he could not take any action, further than making preliminary arrangements, until the spring opened. I would like, before my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) sits down, that he should address himself to that question, as to where his difficulty arose from the fact of their making no communication to him. There was no time. They had the company to float, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) knew on the 20th March was floated, because I read to him from the "Financial Times" the use that had been made of his letters in floating the company. The company, therefore, having been floated to a large extent on the authority of the Minister of Railways and Canals, before he advised his colleagues to build the line themselves, he certainly should have informed

them that he promised this company they would receive the support of the Government in promptly carrying out their undertaking. He was bound to ascertain what steps they had taken in the undertaking he had with them already, that they would do this work. Therefore, I cannot see what point my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) makes, when he states to the House that, when the Government acted, he had received no communication from the company. There would have been no time for them to communicate. It was only on the 27th of March that they learned it was the intention of the Government to proceed with this work, and the moment Parliament opened, I drew the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) to this as a very grave and important matter in connection with which the undertakings of the Minister were apparently being overthrown by the action of the Government of which he was a member. I now draw attention to that, in order that, before concluding his remarks, the Minister should clear up that point.

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

After Recess.

THE NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY.

Mr. CALVERT (by Mr. Clarke) moved third reading of Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. In the absence of Mr. Maclean, I move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend it so as to provide that the maximum first-class passenger rate on said railway shall not exceed two cents a mile.

I may say, in support of this motion, what is known to almost every member of this House, that if there is any railway in Canada which ought to be able to carry its passengers at that low rate, it would be a railway through this section of country, which is one of the best settled portions of the province of Ontario or of the Dominion of Canada. In addition to that, I am informed that this railway is intended to be an electric railway, and if so, I do not think there is any electric railway in Canada charging more than 2 cents a mile, and, therefore, it would not be any hardship on this road to impose that restriction upon it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I hope my hon. friend will not press that amendment at the present time. The section through which a portion of this road is built, and through which the company wish to build, is desirous of having further railway communication; and if, as my hon. friend says, it is to be an electric road, there is no doubt that its rates will be in accordance with those of competing roads and will not be anything like 2 cents a mile. Unless a general Act were passed, I think it would be unfair thus to handicap this enterprise. While there may be a great deal to say on the general principle, I hope this amendment will not carry as an amendment to this Bill.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 152)—from the Senate—respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 151)—from the Senate—respecting "The Canadian Northern Railway Company."—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 150)—from the Senate—incorporating the Imperial Loan Investment Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 157) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Bill (No. 158) respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company and to change its name to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

THE NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

House resumed consideration of the motion of the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House again to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the hon. Minister of Railways had not finished his speech at six o'clock, and I do not see him present to continue the explanation which he desires to give the House. As the Minister has just come in, I would ask, whether it would be in order for him to continue his explanation. It was only owing to his absence that I was about to say a few words.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not yet said what I proposed to say in answer to the question that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition had asked me. I understand the hon. gentleman to have made some reference to one of the letters which I have written, and to have said, in that connection, that there ought to be at least some months allowed Mr. Roche within which to arrange this business, and that the action which the Government had taken, assuming that they were under obligation by reason of what had taken place on the subject, was taken without their having allowed the time to Mr. Roche which they should have

allowed him under the circumstances. I have just to call the attention of the committee to the copy of the letter which the hon. gentleman read this afternoon to the House, and the committee will see at once that, so far as I was concerned, I gave Mr. Roche no assurance that the Government would be under any obligation to wait his convenience, or that the Government would wait any particular length of time for him to set to work and get this enterprise under way. My letter has already been read, but I would like to read it again, in view of the statement I made before recess:

> I am very much pleased indeed to learn that it is your intention, representing the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), to proceed without unnecessary delay with the construction of the telegraph line from the coast into Dawson City, to be followed thereafter with reasonable despatch by the laying of a cable or cables from Vancouver to the point of connection with the land line.
>
> The Government is extremely desirous that private enterprise should take up this work, and that it is prosecuted without delay; and the needs of the district are such that we believe an enterprise of that nature would be found exceedingly profitable.

This is the assurance which the letter contains:

> You may rely upon receiving the countenance and approval of the Government in carrying this enterprise forward to a successful issue.

We had a good deal of conversation, and I have been recalling that conversation as well as I could, having regard to the lapse of time, and I am quite clear that Mr. Roche did not understand, from anything which I said to him, that the Government, so far as I was entitled to speak for it in the matter, would hold itself bound, in any way, to stay its hand in the prosecution of this work. I was quite sure, in my own mind, that until Parliament met, and I think I so stated to him, there would be no action taken, and I believe that if that company had gone to work actively, had taken the enterprise up immediately as Mr. Roche expressed his ability to do, there would have been no disposition on the part of the Government to act. Mr. Roche knew from our conversations, that if he wanted to be in the field first with his telegraph line, he would have to go into it without delay; and in the course of these conversations, he stated, not once but many times, that he had been all over this ground, that he had gone to British Columbia, that he had been through this country, representing, as I understood, a syndicate of capitalists, and that he had studied the situation and come to the conclusion that the proper way to get into that country with a telegraph line was to build one from Skagway through to Dawson, and to connect British Columbia, either at Vancouver or Victoria, by a cable with Skagway. That was the matured scheme he had in his mind and he stated further to me, if I am not mistaken, that he had been down to Washington prior to this, and had made arrangements with the Washington Government. All this took place before he had a word of conversation with me or before I knew that an individual such as Roche had any existence. He said that he had made these explorations in British Columbia before Parliament had actually granted this charter, and he left on my mind, as strongly, as clearly as one could, the impression that he had all the means and was ready to go right ahead with this work without delay. Seeing that he had been through British Columbia, that he had gone over the territory to find out where it was best to locate a telegraph line, and had been to Washington to complete his arrangements—all these would naturally justify one in believing that he was not a mere charter-monger, but a man who had his financial backing secured, which would enable him to proceed without any delay. That was the situation then, as Mr. Roche impressed my mind.

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition calls my particular attention to this paragraph in my letter in which, he says, I spoke of there having been an understanding between my department and Mr. Roche. This letter is a letter written by Mr. Roche on the afternoon of the same day as that on which the one I have now read was written. Mr. Roche would know perfectly well the extent and nature of the understanding, he would know it was no understanding intended to tie, so far as my action could do it, the hands of the Government in any respect at all. He would know that it depended on the expedition with which he acted, whether or not he would be left in possession of the field for telegraph purposes My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition claims that it would take four or five months before Mr. Roche could get home and do his financing, but I have pointed out already that he did not represent to me that he had any financing to do, that he did not approach me as one who was not fully equipped for the purpose of going on with the work. Quite the contrary. Just look at the facts as they exist. Mr. Roche represented himself to me as having acquired this Northern Commercial Telegraph Company charter. That charter was a Canadian charter. He would not have to go home to England for the purpose of getting any Bill passed there or any charter granted there. He had a charter here, and that charter required that the company should have a meeting and organize here and deposit a certain amount of money. Is it not perfectly idle for anybody to tell us that it was our duty to wait six months or until the month of April, for Mr. Roche to come out here for

the purpose of organizing his company? Will any one say it was the duty of the Government to have waited until he chose to move before taking any action in the matter, or that we were under any obligation to ask Mr. Roche what he had done? I did not consider myself under any obligation to ask him what he was doing. I did not even know his address.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose you did not know Dr. Haley's address.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did, but Mr. Roche was the man who was carrying this thing through.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Roche, M.P., England, would have found him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Roche left my office, assuring me that this thing would be taken up right at once, without any delay. He even told me they would have a cable laid this summer. He knew further that the Government were immensely impressed with the necessity of having a telegraph line through this season, and he knew, from my conversation with him, that the Government would have to take action at the coming session of Parliament, and that the ordinary time for the sitting of Parliament would be very much earlier than the time at which it did take place this year. And yet what occurred? Not a move was made. So far as we were concerned, we had not an intimation from the company, indeed the company was not organized until a month after they had notice that the Governor in Council had taken this action.

Mr. SPROULE. When did the Government decide to take action or pass the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My impression is that it was on the 3rd of March, and that is the impression of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. In the first place, Mr. Roche did not have any assurance from me that the Government would hold itself bound to stay its hand, nor did he have any promise from me that any length of time would elapse before governmental action would be taken. He did not ask for it. All that Mr. Roche and his friends desired of me was that I should write him a letter which would show that there was a friendly disposition on the part of the Government, and you can see from the language of this letter that it did not give them assurance of anything beyond that. He was told simply that the preference of the Government would be for the building of a line by a private company rather than by the Government, and if they went on and pushed the work, the Government would countenance and approve of the enterprise. Mr. Roche asked me, and I said I would unhesitatingly ask the Minister of the Interior, when they got in there, whether he could make any arrangement with respect to the use of the telegraph by the Government.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr Blair) knew they had bought the wire?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not know. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has mentioned that, because the first thing Mr. Roche said when he came here during this session was that they had the wire already, that this company, the Henley Company, or whatever the name was, had furnished the wire, and it was then at Vancouver. I said: If you are able to satisfy the Government that the work will go on speedily, the Government will let you take it up and I advised him to put himself in communication with the Minister of Public Works, in whose department the work of carrying on the construction would be. And he did so, I believe. The Minister of Public Works, I also believe, ascertained from Mr. Roche that there was no wire at all at Vancouver for the company. Mr. Roche afterwards told me that he had been under a misapprehension, that the wire had been blocked somewhere on the way. And when I gave the Minister of Public Works that explanation—because I think the general feeling of the Government was in favour of having the work done by private enterprise if we could be assured that it would be pushed forward vigorously—when I said to the Minister of Public Works in explanation of Mr. Roche's first statement as to the wire being in Vancouver, that it had been blocked somewhere on the way, the Minister of Public Works, I believe, made inquiries and could not find even that the wire was on the way.

Mr. PRIOR. Did Mr. Roche tell that to the hon. gentleman personally, or did he write him to that effect?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have just said that, while I may have received a short note from Mr. Roche to the effect I stated a moment ago, I never received a letter from Mr. Roche in my life. He told me, on his first visit during this session, that the wire was in Vancouver.

Mr. PRIOR. That was in April?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that was in April. He said afterwards that he was mistaken, that the wire had been stopped somewhere on the Northern Pacific—I think that was the line of railway on which he said it was being sent. And, as I say, the Minister of Public Works, I believe, made inquiries and satisfied him that there was no wire for the company anywhere on the coast.

Now, there is one thing that I may freely say, and that is that even if there had been no letter written by me, the disposition of the Government was to deal with any responsible company rather than to take up the work as a Government work; and when this gentleman came out here, if he had satisfied the Minister of Public Works that he was prepared to go right on vigorously and push the work through, I believe the Government would have been only too glad to have given his company their countenance in the matter. But the Government felt that if the necessary assurances could not be given, if there was likely to be delay, it would be prejudicial to the interests of that section of the country. The main point was to get a line of telegraph there as speedily as possible. If any hon. gentleman says there is anything which made it the duty of the Government to wait any longer than we did wait, I do not know where it is to be found.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did not wait until Parliament met and supplies were voted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Government had to determine upon a policy. So far as Mr. Roche is concerned, the Government was under no obligation in any case or from any point of view to wait beyond the time it was necessary for them to mature their policy for the session. The Government took this up before the House met, so that we might be in a position to declare to Parliament at the earliest moment when we might be called upon, what our policy was.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman say if there was anything given by Parliament for it?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Where?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). In the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. But where?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In the Supply Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Whereabouts in the Supply Bill?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Right there before your eyes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year's Supply Bill?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Prime Minister name the item?

The PRIME MINISTER. "Public Works, telegraph line in British Columbia."

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) take "Hansard" and the Estimates and tell what that vote has been for years and years? Does he mean to tell this House that that was a vote which was to provide for the beginning and prosecution of this work, the building of a new telegraph line into the Yukon territory? Will the First Minister from his place——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have only one word to say, and if I may be allowed——

Mr. FOSTER. The fact is, there is no appropriation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the date for the meeting of Parliament was approaching, this subject was brought up as a subject which it would be proper and necessary to deal with without further delay. The Council was in possession of all the facts which I have stated now to the House, including the fact that this Northern Commercial Company had given assurance that they would take this thing up and put it right through; and when inquiry was made it could not be ascertained that they had done anything. So far as my knowledge and information went, I was obliged to report to my colleagues in Council that I did not know of their having done a single thing. Nor did I know of their having done anything. Nor is there now any evidence that they had done anything. I cannot well see how they could have done anything very important, how they could have incurred obligations or contracted liabilities when they never organized the company until a month afterwards. Now, there is no foundation, it does appear to me, for the strictures which my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) has passed upon the action or inaction of the Government. And all the stories with which my hon. friend has regaled himself and his friends on that side of the House as to disputes and differences in Council, as to differences and strife in Council over this matter—all these are simply figments of the hon. gentleman's imagination.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the Minister inform the House when the order was given to Charleson and Co. for the supplies?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not in my department, but I am told it was about the 13th of March.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that I was not in a little earlier to hear the explanations which the Minister of Railways and Canals gave in reference to the point to which I called his attention, as I thought it was a very important one. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the fact that he had not had any communication from this company was a sufficient reason for the

Government undertaking the construction of this work themselves. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that his communication with this telegraph company had taken place on the 6th of October, and that any person who is acquainted with these matters knows perfectly well that it takes a considerable time to organize a company in London.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The company is a Canadian company, and was organized here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But that is only the commencement of the undertaking; that company has to obtain the capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They had the capital long before that. If they ever had it, they had it before then.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But it is not customary for capitalists in an important enterprise, nor is it practicable, to arrange the capital for a large enterprise of that kind until they are in a position to put the lgislation that has been obtained formally before the public; and the very communications that took place between the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, as contained in his own letters, are the best possible evidence that it was necessary for them to take measures to obtain in London the capital which this enterprise required. Now, I may say that I happened to be in London at the time these companies were floated, and I felt it my duty, as the House knows, the moment I saw a statement made in the Speech from the Throne, which I think was the first intimation that we had in this country, or that any person had anywhere that the Government contemplated engaging in this work—the moment my attention was drawn to that, I felt it my duty, in the debate on the Address, to draw the attention of the Government and of the Minister of Railways and Canals promptly to correspondence over that hon. gentleman's signature that was entirely incompatible with the statement that the Government intended to go on with the work. I may say that it is impossible, in my judgment, to attach too much importance to the action that members of the Government of Canada may take, and especially to the action that is taken by the Government, in regard to matters of this kind. We all know that with the boundless resources which Canada possesses, it is of the greatest importance, where there are sound and practicable enterprises that afford a fair prospect of being undertaken, that the capitalists who are induced to put their money into these enterprises should have absolute confidence in the declarations, not only of the Government of Canada, but of the Ministers composing that Government. I say that in my judgment no more fatal blow can be struck at the interests of Canada, nothing can be more damaging to the best interests of Canada, than for any members of the Government to place themselves in a position that destroys the confidence of the British capitalists in their statements. This is not the first occasion, I think, on which members of the Government have failed altogether in adopting a course which is calculated to promote the interests of the country. I drew the attention of the House a year ago to the very remarkable course pursued by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he publicly advised the people of Great Britain, at a speech delivered by him, and reported in the papers, not to invest money in the development of the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend questions the accuracy of that statement, but I happen to have under my hand the proof that will settle that question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I used no such language as the hon. gentleman attributes to me; I advised caution and prudence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman what he said, by reading from a paper, one of the most extreme supporters of this Government that is to be found in Canada or elsewhere, that is the "Canadian Gazette," of London, which is published, as everybody knows, under the immediate auspices of the Government, and never loses an opportunity of praising everything that they do, and defending the Government under all circumstances. I am now quoting from one of their own organs, from a report of a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Tenbigh, in Wales:

> Later in the day Sir Louis Davies attended a luncheon given in his honour, and replying to the toast of his health, gave an interesting account of the various provinces of Canada, and the immense and unlimited resources of Canada. With reference to the newly-discovered Klondike gold fields, he said he had been asked by many men if he could advise them to send their sons out to the fields, and he answered emphatically, "No"; and when asked if it would be wise to invest money in companies for developing the fields he replied, doubly emphatically, "No."

Was I right or was I wrong when I stated that the hon. gentleman had used the strongest language he could use as a Minister of the Crown to prevent British capitalists from investing their money in the development of the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is not purporting to read a report of my speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am reading now from the "Canadian Gazette," a verbatim report of the hon. gentleman's speech.

As a member of the Canadian Government, he knew what he was talking about. They were doing their best to establish a provisional Government in that region, but they advised that every one who could possibly wait should delay going to the Klondike fields for the present, and he hoped that his words would go further than the room in which he was speaking.

This was at a time when, under the excitement produced by the discoveries in the Yukon gold fields, people were flocking there from all parts of the world, and when the hon. gentleman, as a Canadian Minister, said that he had been asked whether he would advise British subjects, people in England, to go there, he said: No. And he said: When I am asked whether I would advise people to invest capital in companies for the development of these gold fields, I say, doubly emphatically, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I advised them to wait for further information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) can find any terms in the English language stronger than that, better calculated than that to deter and prevent capitalists in England, whose attention was then being invited to this subject, from investing their money, I can only say he will have greater ability than I give him credit for. I know of no means by which, as a Minister of the Crown, he could have taken a more determined attitude to prevent British capital, at a most important crisis, at a time when it is desirable that British subjects should go into that country, from being invested in that country, than those which he used. The hon. gentleman, a few days afterwards, was collared by the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville), who told him that he was organizing a company, and there was no doubt at all that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) was trying to throw cold water on it. In the face of this statement, which was made, and which was repeated before a section of the chamber of commerce afterwards, the hon. gentleman puts his name to a letter to the hon. member for King's, which I will read to the House; and I may ask hon. members of the House, whether they think this mode, adopted by an hon. Minister of the Crown, is likely to promote the interest of Canada. The letter is dated London, July 30th, 1897, a week afterwards. The hon. gentleman put his name to this letter, which was published in the prospectus of the company with which the hon. member for King's was connected—the Klondike, Yukon Pioneers (Limited). It is as follows:

London, 30th July, 1897.

I have received your note of to-day's date telling me that a syndicate is being organized to open up and develop the Klondike Yukon country. I have no hesitation in saying that the policy of the Government is and will be to assist in the opening up and development of that rich country, and I need not say to you that we shall be glad to look favourably upon every bona fide company which has that for its object. Your personal connection with such a company would be an additional guarantee of its bona fides, and I will be glad to hear that it has been successfully launched.

(Sgd.) L. H. DAVIES.

This is the position of a Minister of the Crown. He invites the people of Great Britain to believe that there is no person they could confide their capital to with better prospects of favourable results than with the hon. member for King's. Here you have a Minister of the Crown one day saying that he would advise neither the people nor the capitalists of England to invest anything in the development of the Canadian Yukon gold fields, and you have him, a week afterwards, putting his name to a document which largely resulted in the floating of this company. The promoters of this company, the men who put their capital into it, are resting their claims to-day largely upon the fact that they were induced to do so by this letter, over the signature of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he is now held responsible, and the good name of the Government of Canada is being seriously affected by the course which that hon. gentleman has pursued. Then, we have the "Financial Times," of December 14th, 1898, saying:

In a leading article yesterday we criticised the curious prospectus of the Canadian, British Columbia and Dawson City Telegraph Company (Limited), which was inviting subscriptions from the public for £225,000 in 5 per cent first mortgage debentures at 95. * * *

From subsequent inquiries we have made, our surprise at the omission of any reference to the existing scheme is rendered infinitely greater, for we find that those behind the Canadian, British Columbia and Dawson City Telegraph Company (Limited) were perfectly conversant with what the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company was doing. This is made clear by the following letter, addressed last October, by Mr. Blair, the Canadian Minister of Railways and Telegraphs, to the gentleman who was arranging the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company matter.

I find no reference to "private" in this letter. I do not believe it was a private letter; I believe it was a letter placed in the hands of the promoters of this company by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), exactly as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had placed a letter, over his signature, in the hands of the hon. member for King's, to aid and assist in floating a company. I believe there is something curious and suggestive in the fact that the

hon. gentleman, on the 6th October, informed this company that he was

> Very much pleased indeed to learn that it is your intention, representing the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), to proceed without unnecessary delay with the construction of the telegraph line from the coast to Dawson City, to be followed thereafter with reasonable despatch by the laying of a cable from Vancouver to the point of connection with the land line.

That is not a private letter. It is the letter of a Minister of the Crown; it is a letter of the chairman of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, under whose supervision this charter had been placed on the statute books of Canada, and for which fact, objected to in part by the Government, they will be made largely responsible. The letter is dated the 6th of October, 1898, and says, in part:

> I told these gentlemen very frankly that my department had an understanding with you.

I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, was that a private understanding? Is that the mode in which Ministers deal with these questions? Have they private understandings?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The understanding is stated in the letter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Have they private understandings with the promoters of companies? He says it was a private understanding.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, he denounces the gentleman with whom he had this communication, on the floor of this House, as no gentleman, and on what ground. He had approached him as a public man, not as a private individual, as a Minister of the Crown; he had approached him as a Minister who had led him to believe that this matter was in his department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are you professing to quote what I said?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have quoted your exact words, word for word, what you said. I say that the hon. gentleman wrote a letter to this gentleman to convince him that this matter was entirely in his department, because he said:

> I told these gentlemen very frankly that my department had an understanding with you.

These gentlemen to whom he refers, were organizing a company for the same purpose, and who had also approached him, and he writes to the gentleman with whom he had had the previous communication: I have been approached by other parties, but I have refused to give them any assistance.

> I told these gentlemen very frankly that my department had an understanding with you.

Was that a private understanding? If so, the hon. gentleman puts himself in a very equivocal position in this House. If Ministers of the Crown are going to take hold of promoters and have private understandings with them, it is time this House should wake up and see what the real position of matters is. It was not a private understanding. The hon. gentleman was approached as the Minister at the head of the department who led this gentleman to believe that it was a matter in his department, because he said that his department had had this understanding with him. He was approached by this gentleman, not as a private matter at all, but to know what he could expect from the Government of the day. The Minister had already told this gentleman that the Government would give him every assistance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the Minister (Mr. Blair) wrote that he was pleased to learn it was their intention to proceed without unnecessary delay with the construction of the telegraph line from the coast to Dawson City. He informed this gentleman, that having been approached by another company he told the other company they were too late, as his department had an understanding with the Commercial Company, that the Government would give them their assistance. Does the Minister (Mr. Blair) deny that? Here is what he wrote:

> I told these gentlemen very frankly that my department had an understanding with you, and that we were giving you the preference.

Does that mean anything or does it mean nothing?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had a letter from me to show what it meant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, he had two letters from you; one to show that you were delighted they had taken hold of the enterprise, and the next to show that you had refused to give any assistance to a rival company, because you had agreed to give this company the preference. This was a business transaction between the Minister and this gentleman. It did not pretend to be secret or confidential; but to-day the Minister denounces this gentleman because he used these letters, believing and knowing that they were public.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) seriously pretend to be attributing to me the language he does, believing that I used it ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say I have got it over your own signature.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am asking the hon. gentleman whether or not he pretends to say, in Parliament, that I said that both these letters were private and confidential letters ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) says he did not denounce the gentleman to whom he wrote these letters and state he was no gentleman, for publishing these letters which were private, then, I say that "Hansard" will prove that I am right and that the Minister is wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "Hansard" will prove nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What will "Hansard" prove ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "Hansard" will prove that I stated to this Parliament, that I wrote a second letter to this gentleman which was confidential, which he knew was confidential, and that he was no gentleman when he published that second letter. That is what "Hansard" will prove, and that is what the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) heard me say, and yet he deliberately misrepresents me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have both of these letters in my hand, and neither of them is private, and neither of them is confidential. Mr. Speaker, if they were private and confidential, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) ought not to sit any longer on the Treasury benches as a Minister of the Crown. If this pledge to give the aid and assistance of the Government to the company, to stand in with the company, and to refuse to have anything to do with the rival company, if that is a private communication it carries with it a damning insinuation as to the position of the Minister, which ought to deprive him of sitting here as a Minister of the Crown.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is quite free to entertain any opinion he pleases ; it is a matter of indifference to me, but he must not say that I said something which I did not say.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have said that the Minister declared that these letters written by him were of a private character. But he dare not say now they are private, because if he does he convicts himself of standing in with the promoter of a private corporation, to co-operate with it and to give it the support of the Government as against another corporation. If he says he did that privately, why should he do so ? The only excuse the Minister can have for writing such a letter is, that he was acting in the interests of the country, endeavouring to get capital invested for a valuable object, and if that be the case, as it must be, then the gentleman receiving that letter had a perfect right to use it for the purpose of strengthening his hands in securing that capital. Here is what the Minister wrote, and in its very nature it is a public communication :

> The Government is extremely desirous that private enterprise should take up this work, and that it should be prosecuted without delay, and the needs of the district are such that we believe an enterprise of that nature would be found extremely profitable.

Sir, I say that that letter was intended to, and did give most valuable assistance to the gentleman concerned in raising that capital. When an important and valuable public work is proposed, and when a charter has been given by the Parliament of Canada to enable parties to prosecute that work, I say that the Government of Canada were right in strengthening the hands of the parties by stating that the Government would appreciate the work. I am not attacking the Minister for promising the aid and assistance of the Government in a public way, but I am attacking him for that, having thus committed the Government of Canada, having thus committed himself in the most emphatic way to the support of this company, and when this company expended a large sum of money to carry out his suggestion, he should turn around and allow the Government to destroy this private enterprise. Strange things as the present Government of Canada has done, I cannot believe that the First Minister and his Government, with these facts before them, as they are before this House to-day, would decide to step in and use the public money of Canada to destroy an enterprise which they had encouraged. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, down to this very hour the Government has no authority from Parliament to spend a single dollar of public money in such an undertaking. Without warrant, without authority, without the knowledge of this Parliament, they propose now to go on with the public works which will strike down the private enterprise they pledged themselves to support, and with reference to which a Minister of the Crown told them they had a preference from the Government, and might rely upon the assistance of the Government. If the Minister of Railways had stated these facts to the Government as they stand before the House to-day, I cannot believe that the Government would have taken such a course as

they now propose. And if this Government would do such a thing, then it is a great misfortune for Canada that it has such a Government. This is not merely a question affecting this company alone; it is a question affecting the good faith of Canada. If Ministers of the Crown are so reckless as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was more than a year ago, and as the Minister of Railways and Canals is to-day; if Ministers are so reckless as to pledge the support of the Government to the undertakings of private corporations, and then destroy the fruits of the labour and expenditure of these private corporations, if they are so reckless as that, then we have come to a pretty pass indeed. And, Sir, the Government did this without the slightest intimation to the company, as is told by the promoter of this Bill who is a member of the House of Commons of Great Britain. He tells us that it was on the 27th of March he received the first notice that the Canadian Government were not acting in good faith with him, and that then he was proceeding in making all his arrangements, and doing everything necessary to carry out the enterprise in the most thorough manner If the hon. gentleman had ascertained that these parties, in whom he had confidence when he wrote these letters—for I presume he must have taken the trouble to learn what their position was before he would commit himself to such statements as these—were unable to carry out the work, and that, notwithstanding that they were well disposed, the work was going to lag and fail in their hands, then, acting fairly and above-board, he would have withdrawn that preference which he had declared, over the signature of the Minister of Railways and Canals, he would give to that company. But what are the facts? It appears that Lord Strathcona has been communicated with, and he has cabled to this Government that this company have all the resources and ability necessary to carry this work to completion. That is the position; and, in my opinion, no more fatal blow could be struck at the credit of Canada. Attempt to float a fast line service in England to-morrow, and what will you be met by? I do not believe that this Government have ever recognized the importance, not to themselves, but to Canada, of the Government of Canada keeping good faith with British capitalists, and here is a most signal instance of it. Let them attempt to float in England to-morrow a fast line service, which depends on an Act of the Parliament of Canada and on the action of the Government of Canada, and they will be met at every turn by British capitalists who will say: We cannot touch that enterprise, because, after we have spent a million or half a million dollars, the Government will tell us that they have changed their minds, and are going to build and operate a fast line service themselves. The importance to Canada, in the first place of bringing British capital into this country cannot be overrated; and, to avoid making it utterly impossible for the soundest and most judicious financial enterprises to be undertaken by the aid of British capital, the very first element of success is, that the Government of Canada shall be regarded as the Government of England is regarded: so that, when their faith is pledged to an enterprise, it can be confidently relied upon, and, when private capital is induced on the pledge of the Government to take up a great enterprise, Governments may rise and fall, half a dozen may succeed each other, but whatever Government is in power shall feel bound to carry out in good faith that pledge, whether they approve of the enterprise or not. Not only are the Government of Canada bound to adopt such a course in reference to all these enterprises, that what they do shall be above-board and carefully considered, but, when the faith of a Minister of the Crown is pledged to give aid, and support, and countenance to the enterprise, they should hold that as a most solemn and sacred obligation. They owe that, not merely to themselves or to this House, but they owe it to this country; because upon the maintenance of good faith in relation to these enterprises depends the only hope by which Canadians can take into that great money market of the world the soundest enterprises which have any Government subsidy or aid connected with them. If you admit that the Government have induced private capitalists to embark their capital in what was declared by the Government of Canada to be an important enterprise, in which they were interested, and to which they had decided to give the preference to a particular company, you cannot say that it is open to them, without a word or a line of communication, to turn round and say: We have changed our minds; we have come to the conclusion that this is a work which will afford more patronage to the Government and enable us to provide for a lot of hangers-on, who are daily tormenting us for places and emoluments, and we have come to the conclusion to throw over your company and take up the work ourselves. And they take it up without the consent of Parliament. I felt it my duty, the moment the statement was made that the Government contemplated taking up this enterprise, to put before the Minister of Railways, in the debate on the Address, the position in which the Government stood. I asked the Minister of Railways, during that debate, to do himself the justice of relieving himself from the position in which he was placed in reference to this matter, and to explain to the House that, while he had confidence in those parties, the whole thing had broken down, they had been unable to carry out their undertaking, and had been told that the Government had undertaken to carry it out themselves. But not a word of explanation did we hear from the hon. gen-

tleman down to the moment this afternoon when the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) put this matter plainly and succinctly before the House—as far as he could do so, with this garbled correspondence, which, it appears, is the only information the Opposition have been able to obtain. It is not merely hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House who have taken exception to the course of the Government on this matter. There is not an independent member sitting on the other side of the House, there is not a member of the Government who has been cognizant of the actual position of things, who does not feel that the Government have entered upon a course that is utterly indefensible. There is not a business man in the country, whether Conservative or Liberal, if this question were put to him, as a matter of plain, simple business, who would not say that the Government of Canada had failed in what it owed to itself, to Canada, to everything like fair, and just, and honourable management of public business. You could not select a dozen of independent, intelligent men of any stripe or party who would not give heavy damages against the Government of Canada for the position in which this company has been placed—for the cruel and indefensible wrong that has been done to it, by the Government stepping in and blighting all its prospects, and going back on the pledges and declarations of a Minister of the Crown. The Minister of Public Works, it appears, when he learned that his hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, was assuming to deal with this question of telegraph lines, said: Oh, I think you will have to hear from me; I have got a few friends whom I have used before, and whom I want to use again. And, just as the Minister of the Interior sent up a crowd of his friends into the Yukon to perform duties for which they proved to be utterly unfit, so the Minister of Public Works, without the authority of Parliament, without the authority of anybody—because the Government of Canada, it appears, are not his masters, but, he theirs—says he is going to take hold of this matter, and is going to sweep aside the Minister of Railways and his promoters, who had gone in on the pledged faith of the Crown, and is going to send one of his own men to carry out the work, in order to provide for a horde of his own hungry hangers-on. I say it does not require a long speech, it requires simply to state the facts as they are set forth in the garbled correspondence. Why is it that the correspondence with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is not brought down. That is covered by the motion. Was the Minister of Railways ashamed of the correspondence he had with these gentlemen? Was the right hon. the First Minister ashamed to have the wretched disclosures made that would be made if the correspondence between himself and these gentlemen were included in this return? The right hon. gentleman had a most important correspondence with one of the most independent and intelligent members of this House, a supporter of this Government, who had been induced to lend his aid to the organization of this company, and that member approached his leader with a respectful memorial signed by these British capitalists who had been induced to take hold of this undertaking upon the pledged faith of a Minister of the Crown. Did that memorial not require a reply? Was not that a matter that demanded, not that Mr. Gobeil should give the go-by to the whole affair by writing a letter saying that Mr. Tarte was master of the situation, and nobody else could have anything to say in a work of this kind, except under the authority of that great despot of this Government. The House, Sir, has been treated with contempt. Why? Because these hon. gentlemen were ashamed, when they came to look this disgraceful transaction in the face, to bring down the public documents that this House had ordered, and which, as Ministers of the Crown, they are obliged to bring down in order to put a faithful and complete knowledge of the transaction before the House. If acts of this kind are to be continued, if one Minister after another is to be allowed to show such an utter disregard of what his official position, of what his own duties, as a member of the Government require, in dealing with great capitalists and great and important enterprises, the people of Canada will have good reason to deplore that the hour ever came when the duty of administering the affairs of this country was entrusted to gentlemen who seem to know neither what their own honour, their own character as public men demands at their hands, nor what the best interests of Canada demands at their hands as well.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In the course of my public life of more than twenty years now, I have heard very extraordinary propositions put forth by my hon. friend who has just addressed the House, but I must say I never heard a more reckless one than the one to which he has just given utterance. If it be summarized in a few words, it amounts simply to this, that private interests are to take the lead of public interests.

But before I proceed further, let me address myself to a personal matter brought against me by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) as well. In the return brought down in answer to an Address of the House, voted some few weeks ago, calling for correspondence between Mr. Haley, a member of this House, and Mr. Roche and myself as Prime Minister, no correspondence of mine appears. The

reason is simply this, that the letters which was sent to me by Mr. Haley and Mr. Roche were referred by me to the Department of Public Works, and I did not file them in my department, but turned them over to my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works. I answered these communications, but not having put the matter on record in the Privy Council, I did not file my answers there but kept them in my own correspondence, and the reason why no correspondence of mine appeared in the return brought down is because the clerk of the Privy Council, in preparing the return, took what was on record on the files but of course had no access to my private correspondence. I hand, as every Minister does, these motions to the clerk who has to deal with them, and he looks over the files and copies what is on the files, but as this matter had been referred to the Department of Public Works, the Minister in charge of which was unfortunately ill, and as the answers which I gave to the correspondence sent to me I did not file in the records of the Privy Council, these answers were not copied by the clerk. But I have them here and shall read them to the House. I received a communication between the 11th and 15th of April, which I answered on the 19th of April, as follows :—

Ottawa, 19th April, 1899.

My dear Haley,—I have received your letter inclosing copy of your memorial to the Minister of Public Works. The subject therein referred to is very important, and, as you are told by Tarte, it will have to be taken up by Council. Tarte has been kept away from his office by illness since a few days, but it is probable that he will be able to resume his duties within a day or two, and we will then take up your memorial without delay.

My hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works, was ill longer than I anticipated. I thought at the time that he was simply suffering from an indisposition, but it turned out to be a very serious illness. More correspondence followed, and on the 3rd of May, I wrote as follows :—

Ottawa, 3rd May, 1899.

My dear Haley,—I have your letter of this day. I had understood in the last interview that I had on the subject therein referred to, that you would call at my office on Tuesday, May 1st, and that I should then be prepared to discuss the matter with you and your friends and give you an answer. You state in your letter of this day that you have been expecting an answer from me since the 1st of May, and that you did not even get an acknowledgment of your memorial. There has been a misunderstanding either on your part or mine, but it is not material to go further in this. At all events, let me say that I will be glad to see you at any time that may be convenient to you re the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company.

That reply shows that I had seen Mr. Haley and his friend Mr. Roche and that I desired a further interview with them to discuss the matter more fully. I had answered, as it was my duty, all the communications sent to me and had arranged for an interview, as I thought with Dr. Haley and Mr. Roche. It appears, however, that there was a misunderstanding, and they wrote me and I answered accordingly. This is all the information I have to give in reply to the statement made by the hon. gentleman that I had in some way, unknown to myself, not complied with the order in this particular and failed to all rules of honour. I may repeat what I had occasion to say once before that I am the guardian of my own honour and do not care to thrust the hon. gentleman between me and my honour.

I now come to the merits of the case. If the position taken by the hon. gentleman be summarized, as it ought to be, it simply amounts to this, that in this matter public interest should have been sacrificed to the private interests of this company. What are the facts ? In the last session of Parliament, two companies were given a charter to construct a telegraph line from Vancouver or Victoria in British Columbia to Dawson City. One of these charters is held by the company which has been in question all afternoon, the Northern Commercial Company. The other company interested, is the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company. Here I pause a moment to ask why is it that two companies were chartered to do the same work—to construct a line of telegraph from the capital of British Columbia to the capital of the Yukon. It was not expected that both companies should go on and build the line.

Mr. PRIOR. They were two different routes.

The PRIME MINISTER. Going to the same point. I dare say that the routes were not identically the same, but when I am told that there are two different routes, that is simply playing with words, if the two routes vary from each other only a few miles in distance and are intended to connect British Columbia with the Yukon. I do not know that if one line had been built, the other company would have gone on with this work.

It is said that we are damaging one company because the Government is constructing the telegraph line. Then what would have been the damage to the other company if one company had constructed the line ? The ground taken by the hon. gentleman this afternoon was that there was room for only one telegraph line, and two companies were chartered. And why was that done ? Because, as we know very well, it takes time and money to float one of these companies, and success is not always sure ; and Parliament had no hesitation in giving two charters in the hope that one would be successful. Now, only one company, so far as we know, proceeded with the work of organizing

under this charter. The other has done some tentative work but it did not amount to anything. The only one that did anything to be considered here was the Northern Commercial Company. Now, let us see how that company proceeded. It was chartered on the 13th June, 1898. From the 13th June, 1898, to 6th October following, nearly 4 months, not a thing appears to have been done by the company. On the 6th October, Mr. Roche, who represented himself as connected with the company appeared on the scene. He had an interview with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, who gave him a letter which has been read. I take the gist of that letter in the very words given by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and as given by the Minister of Railways and Canals, which was: very well, you want to construct a line; we will favour you, provided you go on promptly with the work. That was the condition the Minister of Railways and Canals laid down upon which the Government would favour the company. Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), I ask every gentleman of this House, did Mr. Roche, or the company he represented, comply with this condition; Did they go on promptly with the work? What does the record disclose? It discloses that November, December, January, February passed and March was entered upon and not a thing was done by Mr. Roche or that company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PRIOR. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) pardon.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, not a thing was done from 6th October to the 16th March. Not one tittle of evidence appears that Mr. Roche had done a thing at that time when Parliament was summoned, to redeem the promise which the Minister of Railways and Canals had exacted from him, that he would go on and promptly finish the work.

Mr. PRIOR. That is not correct.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the use in the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) saying that is not correct. He spoke for three-quarters of an hour this afternoon, and what did he show Mr. Roche to have done from the 6th October until the day Parliament was summoned? Not a thing appears in the record, not a thing appears in the speech of the hon. gntleman to show that Mr. Roche did one single thing to carry out the promise that the Minister of Railways and Canals had exacted from him. November passed, December passed, January passed, February passed, and March was reached, five months had elapsed and not a thing was done, and now the hon. gentleman tells us that we were derelict in our duty when, finding the company had not done anything we determined we would not lose another season but would go on with the work and have the telegraph established at once. But there is something more. We have a new doctrine in parliamentary ethics announced to-day by the leader of the Opposition. It is no longer the interests of the country that are to be considered when a public work should be constructed—and I challenge anybody on the other side of this House to rise and say that it was not a work of primary necessity to have, in this year 1899, a telegraph line to the Yukon. No one will rise to say such a thing. It was the work of immediate necessity.

Mr. PRIOR. That is right.

The PRIME MINISTER. "That is right," says the hon. gentleman. We were right in so doing.

Mr. PRIOR. I did not say that.

The PRIME MINISTER. According to the hon. leader of the Opposition, having decided on the construction of the work we should have folded our arms and waited to see what the company was doing, which, for five months had not shown itself. The first thing you should have done, says the hon. gentleman, was to ascertain where Mr. Roche was, what was his address, what he was doing, whether he was moving in this matter or standing still. Had we done this, what would have been the result? More delay and the loss of this work this session. We determined that we would have no more delay. I am as much guardian of my own honour as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is of his, but I place myself not only in the judgment of the people but in the judgment of the people of England itself, when I say, that having waited for five long months, we were not called upon to wait an hour longer. The hon. gentleman challenges us upon this, and I readily accept the challenge he has thrown across the floor, and I place myself in the judgment of the people of Canada to-day to say whether, after waiting five months to know whether Mr. Roche was going on, to know whether or not his company was ready to carry on the work, we were not right in deciding that we would consult the interests of Canada and not the interest of Mr. Roche and the Northern Commercial Company. Now, we determined to go on with the work. I thought we had passed the Order in Council on the 3rd of March, but I see that my memory was at fault, and it was on the 13th March. Parliament was summoned to meet three days later. And this is the announcement that His Excellency made to the House and to the country:

The returns from the Yukon have so far proved sufficient to meet the heavy expenditure it was found necessary to incur for the purpose of preserving law and order, and it has been thought expedient in the public interest to authorize the construction of a line of telegraph for the pur-

pose of maintaining speedy communication with the people of those distant territories.

That was the announcement, and we determined that we would take advantage of a vote which we had for a telegraph line in British Columbia to commence work immediately.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me—or will he consider it an interruption—to ask him to point out the votes in the Supply Bill? He said before recess that he could point them out.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I will point them out. Here is an item: "Telegraph line, B.C., $12,000."

Mr. FOSTER. That is the vote my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken.

The PRIME MINISTER. We determined that we would take advantage of the money we had in hand to prosecute the work immediately, and I am happy to say that we have a telegraph wire from Skagway to Lake Bennett, and from Lake Bennett now under construction to Lake Atlin, so that news can be had from that section in four days' time. We intend to prosecute the work all summer and to have it completed during the present season. And there is not a man who will question the wisdom of the policy we are carrying out. It was on the 16th March we made the announcement I have just quoted. On 11th of April Mr. Roche, who had disappeared for five months, who had not been heard of since the 6th of October, appears on the scene with a memorial which the hon. member for Victoria has read this afternoon.

Mr. PRIOR. The right hon. gentleman says they have never heard of Mr. Roche. Had he not been in correspondence with the Minister of Railways and Canals during that time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The hon. gentleman surely is not intending to offer me a wilful and deliberate insult.

Mr. PRIOR. No, I do not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I told the hon. gentleman that I had not been the recipient of a letter from Mr. Roche since the 6th of October, directly or indirectly, or had any communication with him at any time. The hon. gentleman asked me that, and I answered, No. Now, I ask him to withdraw the imputation that he is making.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, there is something more. There are none so blind as those who will not see, and none so deaf as those who will not hear. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) heard this afternoon, and the leader of the Opposition heard this afternoon, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals declare again and again: If Mr. Roche has any scrap of paper from me to him, or from him to me, I ask him to have it produced. He did more, he asked the member for Victoria to communicate with his friend, Mr. Roche, and ask him to produce any other paper that he might have, either going from him or coming to him. Why, Sir, what will convince the hon. gentlemen? The hon. gentleman has the answer of the Minister in his own words, and he has only to communicate with his friend and client, Mr. Roche, to ascertain whether Mr. Roche has communicated with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. He has the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he will get no different answer from Mr. Roche. Now, as I said, Mr. Roche appeared again on the scene on the 11th of April, after having been lost somewhere, heaven only knows where, from the 6th of October until the 11th of April. He comes here on the 11th of April in the character of a much-injured man, and tells us that he is ready to go on with the work. Ready to go on with what work? Mr. Roche told us at that time that he was not ready to go on with a cable from Victoria to Skagway. When this company was incorporated in the month of June last, he had an option on a double scheme, either to construct a telegraph line by a cable or to construct it overland. Mr. Roche offered for our consideration, on the 11th of April, the scheme for constructing a cable. We considered that proposition, and I do not violate any Cabinet secret in declaring my own conviction, and I believe it is the conviction of everybody else in this House, that the line which we must have to communicate with the Yukon is not a cable which would lie in American territory, but a line on all Canadian territory. Therefore, we did not entertain the offer of Mr. Roche. It is true that Mr. Roche took some precaution at that time, and got Lord Strathcona to wire us, which communication was placed before the House a little later, that the means of the Northern Commercial Company were ample. I do not question their means, they appear to be ample. But the scheme was one that we could not entertain. What we wanted, and what Parliament would sanction, was a line established this year which would connect Skagway with Dawson City, with a spur from Bennett to Atlin Lake, and then down towards Quesnelle. That is the scheme that we have in our minds, and that will be carried into operation next year. Again, I place myself in the judgment of this House whether, in deciding to have a communication with the Yukon by an overland line instead of a cable, we did not serve the best interests of Canada. Now, Sir, these are the reasons which governed our action. What is there, then, in all these charges that have been hurled against us? If ever there was a tempest in a teapot, we have had it to-day. It is not even a tempest in a teapot, but it is an attempt to find fault where there is no fault to be found,

it is an attempt to charge the Government with unjust conduct where our action has only tended to serve the best interests of our common countrymen.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has made an appeal ad misericordiam to his followers behind him. He knew very well that this matter was a somewhat serious one, and with that sophistry which he knows so well how to employ, he has endeavoured to stem the tide which he saw was clearly going against him. But this is not a matter for impassioned discussion, this is a matter for cold, keen and deliberate analysis. I propose to analyse this question to a slight extent, and not to take up too much time in doing it. I will take up, first, one point that has been treated, that is the point as to information being supplied by the Government. Either this is a Government composed of Cabinet Ministers, which has a solidarity of its own, or it is simply a set of strands, thirteen in number, having no union one with the other. Day after day we are treated to this spectacle, that when a return is asked for and the Minister brings down the return, it is immmediately found to be in some important respects defective, because the other departments than the one presided over by the hon. Minister who has brought it down, has not paid any attention to the order, and, consequently, has not fulfilled its share of it. Well, Sir, I say that when this House passes an order and says to the Government, as this inclusive order does, that they are to produce all copies of letters, when they name the different Ministers, as this one does, and says, also copies of all letters from the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, when the Ministers sitting together as a Government propose to send that return to this Parliament, it should come as the return embodying the whole information, and it does not lie within the province of any one Minister to get up and say: Oh, I heard nothing about this, I did not know that it referred to me. It is the Government's duty to send in that return, and the Government is composed of all the members of the different departments. Now, when the House in good faith makes an order, and when the Government lays on the Table the return to that order, the House supposes that it has all the information, and goes on to discuss the question. If it had not been the good fortune of the House that in the member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) we had information which otherwise was not open to any member of this House, we would have discussed and passed this whole matter on insufficient information, and we would not have had the right of the case. As it is, we are in this position now, and brought to that position by the Government of the day, that when a return purporting to be full information is laid on the Table of the House, no member of this House is justified in feeling that it has complete information. We do not know it until we have gone to work by a committee, or have ferreted it out for ourselves. The lamest excuse that was ever attempted in this House was the answer my hon. friend attempted to give for not bringing down this part of that return. Why did he not bring it down? His name is mentioned specially. How long has it been in preparation? Four or five weeks. My hon. friend found it in three or four hours when he found that he had to, but up to that time he conveniently forgot to find it, or he had his papers so mixed in such an unbusinesslike way that they were not found, and he took the onus as the head of this Government of putting on the Table of this House his solemn pledge that this was full information when it was not full information, when some of the most essential particulars were left out, more particularly that with reference to the correspondence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) as well as his own. So that the first point which we protest against is the unbusinesslike, the neglectful, the shuffling way in which the Government does its business, and the total lack that there is of the credit which men can give on the floors of this House to any return that these gentlemen bring down purporting to be information which is asked for, and which has been ordered by the House itself.

So much with reference to that. Now, there is a much more serious point, and it is one which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as a politician of one year's standing, ought not to have fallen into, but which, as the leader of the Government, it is simply a shame and a disgrace that he has fallen into it. He has the effrontery to state, in the presence of this House, that there was a vote for this made and passed in the Supply Bill. I will hazard my position in this House, and I will leave it to-morrow if I am not right, that there is not one dollar bill in that Supply Bill which can, except by malversation of public office, apply to this matter of building a telegraph line into the Yukon. My right hon. friend stated to-night that they had a vote in the British Columbia section of the Estimates for building this telegraph line. They have no such vote. Will the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) say what vote it is?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). A large sum has been voted for this purpose, and if my opinion is worth anything, I think this is an entirely legal and proper application of the money.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will explain to the House and the House will be its own judge. Let us be cool and calm, and not partisans for a while.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I know it is a difficult thing to ask hon. gentlemen opposite some-

times, but yet I hope they will. In the first place I will take the Estimates for the last year, on which the Supply Bill is founded. That is a vote of $12,000, which the hon. Minister of Finance stakes his reputation, as the Minister of Finance of this Government, is a proper vote to take that money from for the construction of this telegraph line into the Yukon. What is it? It will be found on page 79 of the Estimates. What is it for? It is "Public Works, Collection of Revenues." It is only to pay for the staff and operation of the Government lines at present in British Columbia. "B" gives the details: $12,000 for telegraph lines in British Columbia; staff $9,065—the men engaged by the Government, paid to attend to the telegraph wires that are now in the possession of the Government and who work from December until the next December. Of that $12,000, $9,000 odd is to pay these men their salaries and allowances. $2,935 of this $12,000 to pay what? It goes to pay for the staff and repairs for these same Government telegraph lines which are being carried on and operated in the province of British Columbia. That takes up your $12,000. The hon. Minister of Finance, the right hon. First Minister and the Government of the day had no more right to take that money and divert it from the payment of the salaries of the staff and the repairs of these lines, at present in operation, than they had to take the vote for the Experimental Farm and give it over to the building of a railway into the Klondike. What is the constitutional law? What is essential to parliamentary government? What are the rules laid down ever since responsible government obtained in Great Britain and her colonies? What is the first principle? The first principle is that, in the House of Commons, specified votes must be brought down; the next principle is that the votes, as specified, must be expended, and the third, as a guard to that is, that there shall be an effective audit so as to see that this is done and to see that not another cent is expended except that which is provided for by the appropriations of Parliament. My right hon. friend who leads this House and his Finance Minister stake their reputations that this amount was a vote from which they could take money and devote it to the building of a telegraph line into the Yukon district. Anyway, if they are to take it, I want to know if this line that my hon. friends are building now is in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When we get into Supply we will have these items discussed, and we will furnish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with all the information.

Mr. FOSTER. That is so, but the hon. gentleman knows that this is British Columbia vote and the very fact that even if it were for the construction of telegraph lines, being confined to British Columbia, in the specification, it would prevent these hon. gentlemen from diverting it to build a telegraph line in the North-west Territories or in the Yukon district.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the expenditure is small, and that all that has yet taken place is in British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it is. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries says "hear, hear," as if he were out of his difficulty. Suppose we take him down to his own island where you have a piece of the Intercolonial Railway. When you have provided a certain amount of money for a part of that railway in Prince Edward Island to pay for station agents, to pay conductors and trackmen, and the cost of operating, does the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries say that they would be justified in taking that money to build a line of railway from one point in Prince Edward Island to another? Exactly parallel. I would like to know, whether if this money has been taken from these operators' salaries and allowances, these men staying out of their money? Are they doing their work and getting nothing for it? Here you are right down to the 21st of June and eleven-twelfths of that money has gone into the pockets of the men for whom it was voted, and who have earned it up to date. Will one-twelfth of that $12,000 serve to build a telegraph line into the Yukon? Is it that they have stolen the money from these men who earned it, who want their pay and who, I believe, have got it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was going to set an example of keeping cool.

Mr. FOSTER. I am, but it is mighty hard to keep cool in the face of a transaction like that. I am in earnest; I am dead in earnest, but I am not mad. If I were mad I would talk different from what I do. Suppose that it is found out that these hon. gentlemen, when Parliament was to meet here on the 16th of March got together in solemn conclave, three days before, exactly, and passed an Order in Council authorising an expenditure to be made of one or two hundred thousand dollars, or more, that they had not struck a stroke, that they had not bought a pound's worth of anything, that they had not done anything at all to forward the operations, but just sat down in Council, in time to anticipate Parliament, and made a prospective appropriation of $100,000 or $200,000 to build a work which had not been discussed by this House; suppose we find that these hon. gentlemen had done, as they have done, with the revenues of the Yukon, which the law declares shall go into the hands of the Receiver General and shall

not go out of the hands of the Receiver General until they are paid out under an appropriation of this House; suppose that they have stood between the customs revenue and Receiver General, and before this money dropped from the officer's hands into those of the Receiver General laid violent and illegal hands on it, and expended it for purposes never contemplated by this Parliament and never authorized by this Parliament; suppose it is found that these gentlemen have done this last year, whilst the law and every constitutional principle brand it as malversation of the public funds for any member of the Government to do so—and a member of the Governement has no more right to do so than the Whip on either side of the House. What member of the Government has the right to stand in between a custom-house officer collecting the rates at the customs-house, and the Receiver General, or the bank into which the law says he shall deposit that money, and say to this individual officer: Don't you deposit that in the bank; hand it over to me. I have some expenditure I want to make and pay for with that money. That is what these gentlemen have done over and over again. These Liberals, these constitutional rulers, these men who were to teach Canada a new and a brighter way, standing, like brigands and highwaymen, between the officers appointed to collect the revenue, and the majesty of the law, which tells these officers, on the peril of their reputation and their position, to put that money in the hands of the Receiver General, no matter who stands in the way. When a customs officer is on the way to the bank, will he give up the money of Canada to a highwayman with a pistol? No, he will lose his life first. But he must give it up to this Government, who stand before him and demand: Never mind what the law says; you give me that money, and I will spend it just as I like, on matters which were never discussed in Parliament, and for purposes that were never authorized by Parliament. And yet my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will stand up there and appeal to his followers for pity. He needs to appeal to a wider constituency than these men behind him, for he will go out into this country branded as the leader of a Government who has undertaken, himself and his thirteen, to make appropriations out of moneys not voted; not only not voted, but moneys which have not been placed to the credit of the Receiver General, where the law says the money shall be placed. That is what these gentlemen on the Treasury benches have done. Will the Minister of Finance tell me to-night that, out of the $12,000 vote, they have defrayed the expenses they have up to this moment incurred? Granted that you have not paid one of these officers, out of that, $9,000 for salary; granted that you have kept them out of the money all the year, and that you have the whole $12,000; have you up to this date of the 21st of June only expended $12,000? If you have, then I think Mr. Roche was just about as far ahead as you were. But, Sir, these gentlemen in British Columbia got their pay, and the Finance Minister, to save his head, has not more than $1,000 or $2,000 of it, which he might have stopped from them for the month of June or the month of May. Then, the Government have spent only $1,000, or, may be, $2,000, and yet they declare that the reason they went back on Mr. Roche and his company was, because they had not used due diligence, and got wire on the ground, and poles on the ground, and were not ready to complete their work. The men earned their salaries and got it, and the Government have only spent $1,000. But the Government incurred more expense than that. They did not have a Governor General's warrant, and where did they get the money? They took it from the collecting officers again, and coming down a little later for a Bill of indemnity from this House, to save them from the punishment which the law properly provides for brigands who stand in front of an honest man and his duty, and tell him to forego his duty and give them the money.

Now, I think that is an important point. I have treated it earnestly; I have treated it just as strongly as I could, but I have not treated one-thousandth part as strongly as it ought to be treated. I call upon the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I call upon the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Somerville), these sturdy defenders, in former times, of proper appropriation and proper expenditure; I call upon them to stand by me in denouncing this nefarious operation by the members of a Government who pretend to respect the law and the constitutional practices of this country. Will they?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I hope not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) is utterly demoralized. I did not appeal to him, but I will not yet forego my appeal to these other two gentlemen.

Now then, I come to the next point, and that is, with regard to this private letter business. Nobody wants to misrepresent the Minister of Railways and Canals. No Conservative wants anything better, from a party point of view, than just to let the Minister of Railways and Canals take his own sweet, blundering way in this House. That is quite sufficient for us. If he says he did not mean to say that the two letters were private, we will be perfectly content with him saying that one letter was private. Again I ask the House, and I ask the country, if it is an edifying thing to have the representatives of our Canadian Government, in the department where the charter originated, and where the promoters of this

company thought the executive power remained; is it not an edifying thing to have that Minister sit down and write a confidential letter to the promoters of one company, in the terms that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) indicted that letter to Mr. Roche? It was a most unfortunate plea that the Minister urged on the spur of the moment and before he thought of the consequences. He thought it would be a fine thing just to rise in his place and to say: Oh, Mr. Roche is no gentleman; that is a confidential letter. Does the Prime Minister make it a practice to allow his Ministers in the spending departments, with that immense influence they are rightly supposed to have—does he allow them, in all these great public undertakings, to write private and confidential letters to the promoters of one of rival companies, and to pledge their influence, under the confidence seal, to one, rather than the other? I think not; and, if the Minister of Railways had that to do over again, I do not believe he would be so quick to enter the plea that it was a confidential letter. A confidential letter we cannot suppose it to be. It was a letter upon a public matter of great public interest. And what is the purport of this? The Prime Minister has declared that the great plea was urgency, and yet up to the 20th of June, if we are to believe the Minister of Finance, they have not, as a Government, spent more than $1,000, or $1,500 at most.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, they have not spent more than $12,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not care how much they spent; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) must not quote me as saying something I did not say.

Mr. FOSTER. I must make my argument. The Minister of Finance, when he was cornered, and the Prime Minister, when he endeavoured to answer the question, both of them stated they took the money out of that $12,000 vote for British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the hon. gentleman was beginning to ask questions as to the source of the money, my reply was, that if he would wait until the Committee of Supply, we would give him the details.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Did not the Minister of Finance cite that as the vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Part of the money came out of that vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Finance tell me what the other part came out of?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In Committee of Supply I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the information.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance is not doing his duty now. We are discussing this question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is travelling wide of the question.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not travelling wide of the question. The Prime Minister tried to settle the question by saying there was a vote for this. I challenged him to name the vote, and he named the vote as "British Columbia, $12,000," and the Minister of Finance, to back him up, also stated that was the vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you not taking it out of that vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will be glad to give my hon. friend all the information in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance knows that a Government that felt strong in its own cause, would not give such an aswer to the independent members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. We are discussing this now, and there is a question of constitutional practice of great seriousness and moment before the House. More than that, there is the word of the Prime Minister at stake. The Prime Minister pledged his word to this House, that he undertook the work with a vote for it, which he named, and the Minister of Finance, to back him up, said: Yes, that is the vote. Now, when I argued it down to show the Minister of Finance that he could not get more than $1,000, or $1,500, out of that vote, says: Well, there may be other votes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say there may be other votes. I said part of it came out of that vote, and I said the hon. gentleman would get all the information in Committee of Supply, when the question is under consideration. It is not under discussion now.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says it is not under discussion. Is that the appreciation he has of the question before Parliament?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the appreciation he has of the word of his Prime Minister? The Prime Minister says, "We did this on the vote in the Supply Bill," and then reads the item, and it is challenged, and the Finance Minister gets up and backs up the item. And now he says this discussion is not germane. He should make good the word of the Prime Minister and himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will make it good.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman so little regard for his word or for the position of the First Minister that he refuses now to give the House the information? He is Finance Minister, and he could point out where the rest of this money comes from.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will at the proper time.

Mr. FOSTER. The proper time is now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Or else these gentlemen stand convicted of quibbling in a way that is unworthy of any Government—stand convicted of more than quibbling; stand convicted of actual misrepresentation before this House. What will happen to-morrow morning? The wires have been at work to-night, and every Grit newspaper in the country will to-morrow morning have the knightly word of the First Minister that the Government had an appropriation for building the Yukon telegraph line voted in the Estimates last year, and put in the Supply Bill; and if the papers would just get the whole of it, they would put alongside of that what comes out in the argument, that out of that vote, which was for an entirely different purpose, they could not get more than $1,000 or $1,500. They would have this additional fact, that when these two gentlemen were cornered, they had not a word to say for themselves, only that by and by when we got into Committee of Supply we will discuss this question. I am satisfied to leave it right there—perfectly satisfied. Now, let us go on for a moment to the letter that the Minister of Railways and Canals declares was a confidential letter. The Prime Minister said that one reason why they did not take the route of the company was because the route of the company was on wrong lines. I hope the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Haley) will just take that into his head. This company wanted to have the line part cable, and the Prime Minister said that he and his Government scouted the idea of part cable. They want an all-land line on British territory. And yet Mr. Blair, an influential member of that Government, in October, 1898, declared this:

> The Government is extremely desirous that private enterprise shall take up this work, and that it be prosecuted without delay; and the needs of the district are such that we believe an enterprise of that nature would be found exceedingly profitable. You may rely upon receiving the countenance and approval of the Government in carrying this enterprise forward to a successful issue.

What enterprise? A cable to Skagway, and a land line from Skagway on. Just above that, in his letter, Mr. Blair says:

> A telegraph line from the coast into Dawson City, to be followed thereafter with reasonable despatch by the laying of a cable or cables from Vancouver to the point of connection with the land line.

There was the scheme, and there is the endorsation of the Minister of Railways and Canals—the endorsation of the Government on it. In October, 1898, no loyalty so great as to prevent a cable line up to Skagway. Three months afterwards such a growth of loyalty that the scheme is entirely unworthy of the attention of this Government. A disloyal line—you cannot have any cable line. And yet Mr. Roche, Mr. Haley and Mr. Holt for their company, signified to this same Government, led by this same right hon. gentleman, that they were quite willing to forego the cable part of the enterprise, and build the other, making it a land line. My hon. friend's argument can be sized up at its exact worth on that presentment of the case; and to my mind, it is not worth much on that line. The right hon. Prime Minister said that this company had done nothing—that they had unduly delayed. I will ask this House just to take the simple circumstances into account. The Prime Minister thought it was a suspicious circumstance that there were two companies incorporated to go to the same point. But they go to the same point by entirely different routes; that was their proposition. Dawson City is one point, and some point on the coast, which may be a thousand miles from that of the other company, is the other objective point—one for one company and the other for the other company. And yet my hon. friend thinks it was a suspicious circumstance that two companies were incorporated to build a telegraph line over that extensive country, centreing at Dawson City, but on the coast a thousand miles apart as to their points of departure towards the south. And yet he and his Government have subsidized railway after railway to pass from one point to another point within a stone's throw of each other all the way, and did not think it a suspicious circumstance at all. How hard pressed my hon. friend must have been for an argument to support himself and his Government in this matter when he had recourse to an argument like that. But my hon. friend says these men did not show any urgency. I leave it to any business man. They first got their charter in June, 1898—just one year ago. In that time, what have they done? They have organized their company, they have made certain contracts, they have got their subscriptions of money, which is no light thing, they have paid in their proportion to the bank, and they have the cablegram of Lord Strathcona to show that they are abundantly able financially to carry out their undertaking. It seems to me that my hon. friend was not so exi-

gent in this House in connection with Mr. Petersen and the fast line. Mr. Petersen was simply a ship broker. He did not build ships; he did not raise the money to build ships. He simply got a contract, and went to the mother country to broker it. My hon. friend allowed him to broker it for one year, then for another year, and then for part of another year; all the time stoutly asserting, against the appeals of this side of the House, that Mr. Petersen should be allowed time. Here is a company which got its charter in June, 1898, to build a telegraph line into a new and unknown country, where there are not settled conditions, and yet that company, within the space of nine months, was organized, and had its contract made for the wire, and its wire shipped and on its way to this side. My hon. friend said that the wire had not got to Victoria, but it is beyond doubt contracted for and on board ship. And then, what did Mr. Roche do? He and his co-directors went to the lord high admiral, the same man they had to bow and cotton to when they were getting their charter through the Railways and Canals Committee, and who they supposed rightly was the man with whom they had to deal in his executive capacity. They came to him in October, 1898, four or five months after they had got the charter, and had a conference with him. He told them in this private confernece, and put it down as well in the letter which he wrote to them, that he and the Government approved of this scheme, wished them success, and promised them their co-operation, provided they would use reasonable despatch. In addition to that, fearing that a rival company might strive to make a little capital against this company, he wrote a letter, which he now declares to be private and confidential, in which he warned these men that the other company were trying to get in, but that he had given them the preference and did not propose that this other company should get in ahead of them. On that assurance, given by this Minister for himself and the Government, these gentlemen went home under what idea? Under the idea that it would be impossible for an honest and straightforward Government to cut the ground entirely from under their feet without at least giving them notice. But the hon. Minister says he could not find Mr. Roche. Oh, no. The Minister of Railways and Canals can find a man when he wants to, you may depend upon that. The address of the member for Hants was well known. A telegram sent to the member for Hants would have brought Mr. Roche's address inside of an hour. A telegram to Mr. Roche himself would have got Mr. Roche, who is not an unknown individual.

After having assured them of the co-operation of the Government, as a Government, and after having assured them that, by his watchful assiduity, no rival company should get the contract ahead of him, it surely was not too much for Mr. Roche and his co-directors to think that before the Government would go to work and cut the ground from under their feet, they would at least call on the company to implement their bargain and go on with their work at once.

What more? I suppose that Mr. Roche, being a member of the British House of Parliament, has his own ideas of British constitutional practice. As a member of Parliament, he knew that these gentlemen had no appropriation to carry on the work, and had not submitted a plan to Parliament. The Minister of Railways and Canals told him, over his own signature, that the Government would not form an opinion until next spring—that is, this spring—and yet, Mr. Roche is blamed, as a member of the British Parliament, where things are carried on constitutionally, for believing that in the Canadian Parliament they would be carried on in the same way, and for coming to the conclusion, beyond a doubt, that, as the Minister of Railways has said, even an opinion could not be got until next spring, and that afterwards Parliament had to be reckoned with and a vote got before any expenditure could be incurred.

Relying on all those things, Mr. Roche and his co-directors had plenty of ground for believing that this Government would not undertake the work without at least giving them notice to go and implement their contract at once or else the Government would take it up.

As to the urgency, how much further ahead is the Government to-day, with its $1,000 or $2,000, that it has filched from the hard-working operators of the telegraph line, if the word of a Minister is to be taken to-night, than it would have been if this company had carried out its work, as it was financially and abundantly able to do. What could have been done in the winter months? The Government did nothing in the winter months. They did not make up their minds until the 30th of March, when the Order in Council was passed, and not a stroke of work could be done until after that. They delayed still longer. The matter was brought to their attention in 1897 by Mr. Hosmer's letter, but they delayed the work for a whole year, and not until eight months afterwards, not until the 13th of March, 1899, did they pass the Order in Council. There is nothing in the plea of urgency. The company, if it had been allowed to implement its bargain, would have done so with as much speed and facility as the Government could show, and the line would have been built before the snow flies, as it is to be now. Where was the urgency? Law and order? There is no difficulty about law and order in the Yukon. This Government has to-day hundreds of men and is spending thousands of dollars more than necessary to keep law and order in the Yukon. It was simply a matter of communication, and the company could have built the line by the end of the

year, which is all the Government expects to do.

I do not propose to continue the discussion longer, but I do want to emphasize the first, and especially the second, point. With regard to this latter point, it is simply a business matter which business men may very well judge. Any Government must be careful in its governmental dealings with corporations, which it alone can call into existence. It gives the franchise, it makes these companies undertake the responsibility under their franchise, and it must be careful that it does not forfeit the faith which is implied in the granting of a franchise; and the least that could have been done and should have been done by the Government, was to have called upon these gentlemen, after the assurances given them by the Minister of Railways, to implement at once their charter and carry the enterprise to a conclusion to the satisfaction of the Government.

This conduct of the Government will hurt the standing and credit of Canada in Great Britain, there is no doubt about it. Men do not subscribe money and put in their means, on the faith of a charter in Parliament, and have their money rendered useless to them and their enterprise taken away from them on so insufficient a plea, especially when they have the pledge of a Minister and the Government. Without warning, without a call, without a single note, their franchise is completely obliterated, as far as any practical benefit is concerned, and they are left high and dry.

What has taken place? The Government is embarking on an enterprise which will be infinitely more expensive, which will cost this country a large capital sum, and afterwards a large sum for operating from year to year, which will add one more to the works that already overburden the Government of this country, and which ought to be given over to private capital and private enterprise. The Government wants to use this line simply for its governmental messages, which will only be a one-hundredth or a one-thousandth of the number of messages that will be sent in there as the country grows and develops. The franchise that was bestowed on this company would have taken all the trouble and expense of operating away from the Government and would have given the governmental messages at the lowest possible rate—the rate fixed by themselves—and never would have entailed any responsibility on the department. In this matter, there was nothing better to do than to give it into the hands of a responsible company and fix the rate as the Government are empowered to do by a condition of the charter.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I think it would be well to still further investigate the coure taken by the Ministers who have had this matter in hand. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) told us yesterday that he did not know that this return was asked for on the 17th of May, five weeks ago to-day. Well, I wonder what the Ministers are doing. I wonder what they suppose their duties to be. When we require information about the Intercolonial Railway, we are told that the Minister is so busy that he cannot furnish the information. When we require any information about any matter the Minister is so busy that he cannot give it. Though it is their duty to appear in this House to answer questions and meet the charges made against their departments, the almost invariable custom is for a Minister to absent himself, so that the speakers on this side, so far as the Ministerial benches are concerned, have frequently to talk to empty benches. This is an affront to the representatives of the people. We come here to discuss public questions to ask for information—and that is one of the most important duties that we, as members of Parliament have to perform. And yet, we are prevented from getting that information. The Minister of Railways and Canals solemnly assured us yesterday—and I presume that for the purposes of this Parliament we have to accept his explanation—that he knew nothing of these matters being inquired for. I have had control of a department of Government, and the invariable rule in that department was, when the Parliament of Canada, the highest court, the greatest authority in Canada asked for information, passed a resolution that the head of the department was to furnish information, why, the whole machinery of the department would stop, if necessary, until that information was procured. But when we ask the occupants of the Treasury benches for information we are told: You asked for papers last session, some of them may be down this session, and some of them may not be down at all. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is so indifferent, he treats the Parliament of Canada with so little respect, that though an order of the House for him to produce certain papers, the Minister of Railways and Canals being specifically mentioned as one of the parties who had this correspondence in charge, after five weeks, he tells us that he knew nothing about it. What are his officials doing? What was the Minister himself doing that he should treat the Parliament of Canada with such contempt as is shown by such statement as that he made yesterday? The next thing he tells us is that, of course, as he knew and as these gentlemen knew, when this ceased to be a mere general question and became a practical question, when this got away from the committee of this House of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines where he had control, of course, it went into the Department of Public Works. I think that is news to a good many members of this House. For

my part, I have been a member of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for many years, and it is news to me that the Department of Public Works and not that of Railways and Canals has to do with the construction of telegraph lines. But, be that as it may, how is a gentleman coming from England and going before the committee, seeing the Minister of Railways and Canals in full control, directing the affairs of the committee and declaring the policy of the Government to know that, as soon as the Bill passed that committee and was accepted by Parliament it went to a department that was presided over by a different gentleman altogether. Why did he not tell the gentleman that when he was here? Why did he not tell him that when he wrote these letters? What does the first of these letters say? It conveys the impression all through that the Minister of Railways and Canals was in control of these matters:

I am very much pleased indeed to learn——

—Writes the hon. Minister to Mr. Roche—

——that it is your intention, representing the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited), to proceed without unnecessary delay——

"I" am very much pleased—

——with the construction of the telegraph line from the coast into Dawson City, to be followed thereafter, with reasonable despatch by the laying of a cable or cables from Vancouver to the point of connection with the land line. The Government is extremely desirous that private enterprise should take up this work;——

Is there any indication there that another department has control over this matter? He is giving them the policy of the Government, and urging them to go on.

——and the needs of the district are such that we believe an enterprise of that nature would be found exceedingly profitable. You may rely upon receiving the countenance and approval of the Government in carrying this enterprise forward to a successful issue.

I will refer a little further on to the "countenance and approval of the Government." But I refer now to the fact that he was indicating by every means, that he was the Minister in charge of the affairs and that when he spoke of approval and countenance he was speaking for the Government, assuring these gentlemen that all they had to do was to go ahead and they might feel certain that a Government representing the Dominion of Canada would deal honestly and fairly with them. What does the next letter say? He writes this gentleman another letter. He tells him about meeting the opposition company and says he gave them no countenance and support, assuring him that his heart and affections were with the Northern Commercial Company and asks him to go ahead.

I mention this so that you may learn what is moving, and as an additional reason which may urge you to such activity in the prosecution of your enterprise as is practicable. I told this gentleman that my department had an understanding with you.

What is the meaning of these words? Did not that say as plainly as words could say it that his department was the one which had control of these matters? Why, he was deliberately misleading this gentleman, if we take the words for what they mean; unless he knew that his department was in control. Every line of this correspondence shows that the Minister supposed and assumed that he had control of the telegraph lines of the country; and if we are not to assume that, but if we are to assume something else it must be something that is not creditable to his honour and integrity, which we should be very sorry to do. He says:

I told this gentleman very frankly that my department has an understanding with you, and we were giving you the preference, at least until we were satisfied that you were delaying in pushing the work unduly.

Very well, they never made an inquiry as to how the work was going on. Did the hon. Minister tell this House when the Order in Council was passed authorizing the construction of the telegraph line?

Mr. FOSTER. It was on the 13th March, three days before Parliament met.

Mr. WALLACE. Has he told the House what steps were taken that led up to the decision of the Government to pass the Order of the 13th of March? Did he tell this rival company what he indicated in his letter to Mr. Roche that he would tell them, because it is laid down here:

We were giving you the preference, at least until we were satisfied that you were delaying in pushing the work unduly, and I said that upon that point we would be in no position to form an opinion until next spring.

He knows that he sent these men to the old country, and he knows that they had to raise the money, that they had to formulate their plans, and buy the material. They had all these things done before the 13th of March, they had the whole business, so far as it could be done in England, completed, and on the 27th of March, Mr. Roche reads in England that the Government were constructing this line themselves. He cables out a protest, because of a gross breach of faith made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, as indicated in these two letters. The Minister says that Mr. Roche is no gentleman, and therefore that he is justified in taking any measures that he pleases. Did he know that Mr. Roche was no gentleman when the Government decided on the 13th of March to construct the line themselves? He tells us that he had not a word of communication with Mr. Roche except

writing him those two letters, that he had no letters from him with the exception of a short note indicating that he had received a letter or something of that kind. He says now that Mr. Roche is no gentleman, but Mr. Roche might very properly make a retort of a tu quoque character. After making arrangements in October, with winter setting in, when he was going to the old country to complete his plans, for he was not to make the arrangents until the next spring—then without communication with Mr. Roche, without ascertaining, so far as these returns show, or any information we have received shows, without communication of a single line to Mr. Roche, without a cablegram saying to him : If you do not go on the Government will proceed at once with the construction of this work, without doing anything of the kind, the hon. gentleman ignores the whole arrangement, and goes into the work himself. Mr. Roche and his colleagues in this enterprise had been given the solemn assurance of the Government, they had their Bill passed through Parliament with the honour of Canada pledged that they would be used fairly and squarely, after the Government giving them the charter that they applied for, they find, without a note of warning, that the Government have started a rival line. Sir, I say it was a gross breach of faith, one that they have not justified, and the people of Canada will hold their heads in shame when they look at the course of a Government acting so unfairly.

Then we come to the next question : Was it good policy for the Government to undertake this enterprise ? Where there is a necessity for spending a quarter, or half a million, or whatever sum may be required to establish telegraphic connection, constitutional usage requires, and the law of the land requires that the Government should come to Parliament and at least go through the farce of getting the consent of Parliament. Their duty was to come here and to explain their project. Three days before Parliament met they decided upon it. It reminds us of another scheme that came before Parliament when a bargain was made three, or five, or six or seven days before Parliament met, the celebrated Yukon Railway. There is a remarkable similarity in the fact that just before Parliament meets this scheme is passed through by Order in Council. They have the utmost contempt for the views of the Parliament of Canada. Though they have a majority here they do not think it worth while to ask their consent. They had no legal authority for pushing this work on, Parliament had not consented, Parliament had never been consulted in the matter. They had no authority for the construction of these telegraph lines. But what of that ? They are getting accustomed to it, they snap their fingers at Parliament. Last night we saw the Minister of Militia and Defence asking for $274,000 that he must have before the 1st of July, when 95 cents out of every 100 cents of that money was already spent. The money is gone without even a pretext of asking Parliament for it. There is no limit to what these men will do. "Wait till you see what we will do next year," as the Minister of Public Works said, and all the other Ministers are trying to emulate his example. They snap their fingers at Parliament, disregarding public opinion, and disregarding the sentiment of the people of this country. They are going ahead. They say the by-elections show that they have the confidence of the people. They know better than we know, though we have a pretty good inkling into the methods by which they have carried those by-elections. I say, such a flagrant disregard of law, such a violation of the rules which should govern in dealing with men and with corporations, such want of good faith, has never been exhibited to my recollection in this Parliament of Canada, and I am sure it will meet with the utter condemnation of the people of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Excise—Further amount required for preventive service $1,000

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I had occasion to explain, on the main Estimates the necessity under which I was to ask a higher amount for that service. We had been spending $15,000 a year for several years, and last year we reduced it to $12,000. But that was too great a reduction, and I am now obliged to ask for $1,000.

Weights and Measures, and Electric Light Inspection—	
Salaries	$4,025
Contingencies	1,000
Electric light—	
Contingencies	1,400

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. In 1896-97, the first year I was in charge of the department, the salaries for weights and measures were $56,850. In the following year, 1897-98, we reduced the estimate from $56,850 to $49,000, a diminution of $7.000. Last year we took off again $7,000, so that three years ago it was $56,850, the next year it was $49,000, and last year it was $42,000. We found out that, in our attempt to economize, we had gone too far, and this is why I am under the obligation of asking for this amount of $4,025. It will be seen that we are still asking much less than the average.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, if instructions are being sent to the inspectors of

weights and measures in regard to the use of a certain kind of testing machine for testing grain. As I understand, the Bill passed last year brings the old tester into disuse, and provides that in future it would not be permitted to be used. Have any instructions been sent to the inspectors of weights and measures, calling their attention to the new law ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have not inspected the small tester which my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) alludes to, which has a capacity of one-sixteenth part of a bushel, for several years, and I am not aware that we have sent out any instructions to draw the attention of the officers to the fact that in future no test can be applied except by the use of a full bushel. The law is perfectly clear, the tester used formerly cannot now be used, the test must be made with the whole bushel.

Mr. CLANCY. I believe that the department has not thought proper to order an inspection of the tester that has been in use. I imagine, from the discussion that has taken place, that the reason is, that they do not care to identify themselves with the use of it, and, therefore, did not order an inspection. Of course, I am speaking subject to correction, when I make that statement. I need hardly call my hon. friend's attention to the necessity of any device that is being used being inspected. My hon. friend well knows that it is not a proper thing to permit the use of any machine or device for the purpose of determining or weighing, or which may determine the value or weight of any grain, without having an inspection of it made. Since this tester ceases to be a legal instrument for testing the weight and value of grain, I think I may fairly urge upon the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that a bushel measure, for the purpose of inspection, should come into operation now, and that the inspectors' attention should be called to the change in the law and to the use of nothing short of a bushel.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am not aware that any tester has been constructed for a bushel measure, such as the small tester, which only holds one-sixteenth part of a bushel. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) had the occasion of seeing these testers in practical use. We were looking at them in my department last year, and my hon. friend remembers seeing the arrangement that was made to test one-sixteenth part of a bushel ; but I am not aware that, since the passing of the new law, fixing the whole bushel as the size of the instrument to be used in future, that any such instrument has been constructed. The old-fashioned tester has not been inspected for several years. We do not inspect it any more ; we do not look upon it as a legal measure, and any one who makes use of it in the future, under the amendment of the law of last session, commits an illegal act.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman must see that it is important that instructions be given to the inspectors of weights and measures for the reason which I will now explain. Under the law as it now stands, there is no doubt that every person who uses one of these testers, for testing one-sixteenth part of a bushel, is liable to prosecution ; but they can avoid these prosecutions, which are expensive, to those who feel aggrieved, by giving instructions to the inspectors of weights and measures to not permit the use of this former tester in future. That would put an end to it, as the hon. Minister will see, and, by taking the other course, it would leave it open for every individual in the country to be driven to the unpleasant course of prosecuting those who might be using that old tester for testing one-sixteenth part of a bushel. I will venture to say that 99 out of 100 of the people to-day are not aware that it is illegal to use the tester that was formerly used. I think the hon. gentleman will see the necessity of calling the attention of the inspector of weights and measures to the change.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) is quite mistaken as to the law. As I understand the law, it is, that if a dispute arises between a buyer and seller of grain, the testing of it by the use of one of these testers is not a legal decision. You must use a bushel measure, or a half-bushel measure, or some special measure that is authorized by the Government. I presume that a bushel measure, or a half-bushel measure, or a peck measure, that is authorized by the Government, would be legal. But, if the buyer and seller mutually agree to settle the price of grain as the tester designates its weight, I do not understand that the law fixes any penalty. There is no penalty to prevent a man using it, if he likes. It is not legal, but if the buyer and seller mutually agree to accept the test as indicated by the tester, then, there is no law to fine them for doing it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see, by reference to the statute, that it declares, in one of the subsections, that no weighing machines shall be used for the purpose of weighing or determining the weight of any of the articles mentioned in the section—16, I think, of the Weights and Measures Act—of a less capacity than one bushel. That is the law, in the absence of an express agreement to the contrary. I appeal now to the Minister of Inland Revenue, if that is not his conception of the law.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The statute reads :

No weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weight of any of the articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act shall be of less certified capacity than one bushel.

My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will remember that last year I could not agree with him, and I thought it was scarcely fair to interfere between the buyer and the seller when both of them agreed to use a certain measure by which they could readily ascertain the intrinsic value of a bushel of wheat. According to the arrangements generally made in Ontario there is so much allowed for each pound over 60 pounds and so much deducted for each pound under that. I thought it was a very convenient thing to permit a small measure like the one-sixteenth of a bushel which could be handled by the buyer of grain in his own office, to test not the weight but the value of the whole cargo. We made experiments in the department with regard to this small tester in the presence of several members of Parliament, and we found by it that there was a certain small loss to the seller, but not a considerable loss. Consequently my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) thought he was justified in pressing the matter. During my absence the amendment to the law was inserted in the Senate, by which the use of the small testers of one-sixteenth of a bushel was abolished, and by which the purchaser was limited when testing to a whole bushel. I shall make it a point to ask our officers, as they go along with their inspection of the general weights and measures, to inform the public and buyers of grain that in future they are to use the whole bushel instead of the one-sixteenth measure.

Mr. SPROULE. It is desirable that this should be done, because I know the practice continues of testing grain by the one-sixteenth of a bushel. Many of the millers do it in entire ignorance of the change in the law. I spoke to some of them about it, and they contended it was perfectly legal to test the grain as heretofore by the one-sixteenth of a bushel. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) says that when an agreement is come to between the buyer and the seller it is a legal measure, and if it were a stipulated contract I suppose it would be. But let me point out that the seller has nothing to say about it. The buyer says: I will give you so much for your wheat standard, and the farmer does not know he has any option whatever, but thinks he is obliged to take what is offered him. He does not know he has any redress; he does not know but what the buyer is carrying out the law strictly, and so the buyer assumes all the right without any contract being entered into between the seller and himself. It is not enough for the Minister of Inland Revenue to say that he has not instructed the inspector to inspect these small measures, because it is not legal to use them. I know myself that the public and the buyers, many of them, do not know it is illegal to use these small measures and so they continue to use them.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have not inspected them for years past, even before the amendment to the law was passed. I now believe that it would be wrong on my part to refuse to enlighten the public and the buyers through our inspectors, as to the change in the law.

Mr. SPROULE. Even though they are not inspected it was quite legal to use them until last year. I know for a fact that millers are using these small testers yet, and I believe they are doing it because they do not know it is illegal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I hope the Minister of Inland Revenue will consider this matter before he sends out any such instructions. These small testers are used not to weigh the wheat, but only to determine its value. You cannot determine its value accurately by sight or by examination so well as you can by weight. If you take a certain quantity—it may be a quart or a pint, it does not matter what the quantity may be—even if you take a tin pan, and test it by that, you determine the value of that weight. That is what the tester is for. In old times, before the tester was used so universally as it is now, the farmer who bought dirty and poor grain, and was careless in cleaning it, always got more than it was worth, and the man who brought clean grain always got less than it was worth; but by the system of testing, every man gets what he ought to get. There is no better method of determining the value of grain. I have used it invariably during the last five or six years in my own business, and I venture to say that you could not buy grain from the farmers of West York unless you did use a tester. They complained bitterly in the city of Toronto last year when the grain was light and poor because a tester was used, whereas this year, when it is large and plump, it is bought by sight without the tester. What they complain of is that the tester is not used every year. I say that no fairer way was ever adopted for determining the value of grain between the buyer and the seller. If the buyer and seller are both satisfied with it, I think it ought to be allowed to remain.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell) cannot be a close reader of the press, or he would have seen that last year and the year before several agricultural societies passed resolutions condemning the tester as unfair to them. I myself saw a load of grain sold at 80 cents a bushel on the standard; but it was reported back to be under standard, for it

was only fifty-eight pounds to the bushel, and the standard was sixty pounds. That was by the tester; but we took a bushel of the same grain out of the bag and it weighed sixty-one pounds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You did not weigh it rightly.

Mr. SPROULE. It was weighed on scales that had been tested. It is easy to make a mistake with the tester. If the grain is poured into it from a considerable distance above, it will weigh more heavily than if it is poured in lower down, because it packs more closely in one case than in the other. In that case the farmer was cheated out of 3 cents per bushel for that grain. Notwithstanding what the hon. member says, I know that the farmers are very much dissatisfied with the tester. Time after time during the last year and the year before they have discussed the question at agricultural gatherings, and in every single instance they have passed resolutions against it.

Mr. McNEILL. I am very much gratified to find that the Minister has made the change that he has made in the law. I think that change is entirely in the right direction, and it would be very unfortunate if any return were made to the old system of testers. I do not know what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) means by saying that the testing of grain is the fairest way of selling it. We all know that the weighing of grain is the fairest; but the point is whether you weigh fairly when you weigh in these very small measures. The Minister has informed us that the department have made a careful examination, and have found that the tester did not weigh fairly; and after that statement of the Minister I cannot understand why the hon. member should wish to have this unfair method continued. It is a question in which the farmers are very much interested, and they are undoubtedly not satisfied with the system of using these small measures. If the buyer of grain wishes to test it, let him conform to the law and use a bushel measure, and there will be no complaint.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How can you use a bushel measure? If you take a small measure you can tell how much a bushel will weigh. Then, after you determine what it is worth to the miller, you weigh it on standard scales, of course, and you pay the farmer for the number of bushels as shown by the scales. Here is an absolute and sure test that will tell at once whether the grain will weigh sixty or sixty-one pounds, and the convenience of it is that you can take the tester on a load of grain or anywhere else.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman asks me a question, and he says this is an absolute and sure test; yet the Minister has just told him that it has been determined in the department that it is a perfectly fallacious test. Yet the hon. gentleman, who is a buyer, tries to induce the committee to believe that it is a fair test. I am very much surprised to find that any member of this committee should make a statement of that kind, and more especially surprised that a gentleman personally interested in the matter, as my hon. friend is, should have made such a statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not personally interested and it makes no difference to me. It is in the interest of the buyer and seller both.

Mr. McNEILL. To have a false test used?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not a false test which is used.

Mr. McNEILL. Settle that with the Minister.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You can take four pecks and make a bushel, but you cannot take four pecks and make a bushel out of it unless you are exceedingly careful in weighing it.

Mr. McNEILL. The smaller the measure the more fallacious it is.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not at all.

Mr. ROGERS. From my own personal experience, I have seen a great deal of injustice done by means of these testers. The tester may be in the hands of an honourable man, like my hon. friend from Kent, but, unfortunately, in the hands of a dishonourable man, it is the easiest thing in the world to make a very great margin in the interests of the buyer. Any farmers that I have spoken to are very much pleased with this change. No injustice will be done by it, because every man in business always has a measure, and this stamp measure will be cheaper than the others.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think the hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell) stated the case quite clearly. He knows perfectly well that even in the hands of persons who desire to do perfectly right, injustice will still be worked. What was the result of the test made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue? He was good enough to send down in the city and buy a bushel of wheat weighing 62¾ pounds. That was tested, and when the tester had been applied sixteen times, it was found that the bushel was 10½ ounces overweight. That represented a loss to the seller in consequence of the very thing pointed out by my hon. friend from East Grey, who showed that by means of loose filling, air spaces got into the grain and the grain appeared lighter, and the result was that the price was lower. Sixteen tests were made,

and out of the sixteen only five went 62 pounds. Eleven were less than 62, only 61 pounds. Therefore, my hon. friend knows perfectly well that there is no means of using a tester of a sixteeenth of a bushel, which is not entirely erroneous, even supposing that men generally are disposed to do the fair thing, as no doubt they are. I have no hesitation in saying that it is impossible to do the fair thing under such circumstances. The farmers do not desire to deprive any purchaser of grain of the means of determining the value. It is proper to have a tester, but still more proper to have a tester as nearly as possible unerring in its result. My hon. friend from Kent says it is very inconvenient to use a bushel. What is his habit when he goes to a farmer's wagon? He says: If the grain tests 60 pounds, I will give you so much, but if it does not, I will give less, and if it tests more I will give you more. It seems to me it is very farfetched to say that it is not easy to test a bushel. All we have to do is to fill a bushel measure and set it on the scales, and that will fix the price. Why do the farmers urge that this change should take place? The Millers' Association formed a rule, which the hon. gentleman religiously follows himself, and it is this. I quote it from the Senate "Hansard" of last year. Wheat weighing 60 pounds, or standard, the price per bushel would be 60 cents, supposing that to be the price per standard bushel. If it tests at 59 pounds, one cent would come off, although the 60 pounds have to be given in every instance. If it tested 58 pounds, two cents would come off. If it tested 57 pounds, five cents would come off. If it tested 56 pounds, eight cents would come off. If it tested 55 pounds, twelve cents would come off. If it tested 54 pounds, sixteen cents would come off. If it tested 53 pounds, twenty cents would come off. Yet, although the wheat tests 53 pounds, the farmers would have to give the 60 pounds in every instance, and twenty cents, or 33⅓ per cent, would come off the price. Whether that be a good or a bad rule I am not going to discuss, because it is not pertinent to this matter. There may be that difference in the value of the wheat, but what the farmers want is that there shall be an absolutely fair test, and they now ask that the wheat shall not be tested by fractions of one-sixteenth of a bushel, but by a whole bushel and nothing else. There is another thing to which I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman, and that is the practice of filling in from a little funnel. That funnel creates air spaces, which will affect the bushel measure, because that was the cause, to a great extent, of the disparities in the bushel measure. Let me show what the effect will be. Here is a table showing how it would work out. For a bushel of 60 pounds, you would get the standard price of 60 cents per bushel. For 61 pounds, you would get a cent added. For 62 pounds, you would get two cents added. For 63 pounds, you would get three cents added. For 64 pounds, you would get four cents in addition. Now, just see how that operates in both ways. If the wheat is four pounds short in the test, eight cents comes off. But if it is four pounds in excess, only four cents is added. But suppose you take a bushel of each, one four pounds short in the test, and the other four pounds in excess, and mix both together, you would have two bushels mixed of 60 pounds each, or standard wheat, yet four cents per bushel would come off, the producer in spite of that.

My hon. friend thinks that a tester of one-sixteenth of a bushel is popular. Well, I can say it is most unpopular. The farmers are perfectly willing to have a measure just as fair to the producer as to the seller, and desire to have the present state of things put an end to as quickly as possible.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If we have not interfered so far, it is because really we are not called upon to interfere, because, while the duty of the department of weights and measures is to test all the weights and measures, we are under no compulsion to notify the people that they have no right to use a thing like a tester which has not been inspected for several years. At the same time, if by giving that notice we can prevent anybody from being placed in the painful position of being liable to a fine and punishment, I would certainly make a point of sending the information to the officers so that they may give it to the people with whom they have to deal. This is the law, and we cannot do otherwise than observe the law.

Inspection of Staples—To meet the expenses of members of the Grain Standards Board and Winnipeg Grain Exchange who were summoned to Ottawa for consultation in respect of legislation now before Parliament $600

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask if Mr. Smith has been appointed in the Toronto division, and if so, what is his salary? Mr. Smith formerly resided in Orillia.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Smith was appointed Deputy Inspector of Weights and Measures, and his salary is $500 or $600. I cannot give the exact figure at the moment.

Mr. BENNETT. He came from Orillia, and I want to know where he is now stationed.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He belongs to the Toronto division. Each district to be inspected by a certain set of officers covers several counties. Mr. Smith wanted, if I remember well, to reside in Orillia, and we found no inconvenience in his residing there.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the date of the appointment of Mr. Murdoch, who came from the county of Grey ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is Inspector of Weights and Measures, and was appointed about two years ago.

Mr. BENNETT. The reason I ask is that about two years ago, the Minister superannuated Mr. Bolster, a man in the prime of life and quite capable of performing the duties of his office. The ground given for this superannuation was economy. I see the hon. Minister is keeping up with his colleagues in superannuating one man to make way for another. He has appointed Mr. Smith who practically performs the same duty.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, Mr. Smith replaces Mr. Todd. I did not replace Mr. Bolster.

Mr. BENNETT. Whom did Mr. Murdock replace, then ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not remember at the moment.

Mr. SPROULE. He replaced Mr. Lyon.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I appointed Mr. Smith before Mr. Bolster was superannuated. As my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) reminds me, Mr. Murdoch replaced Mr. Lyon.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister might at least have given Mr. Bolster the preference to succeed Mr. Todd, rather than to place Mr. Bolster on the superannuation list and then make a new appointment. I simply asked the question for the information of the people in my own constituency, where it was well known that Mr. Bolster was discharged in the prime of life, and as well able to discharge the duties of office as Mr. Smith, his successor.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. What was Mr. Bolster's age ?

Mr. BENNETT. I could not say exactly ; I suppose about 57.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When the hon. gentleman knows the age, he will see that I had the right to superannuate him.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these grain men salaried by the Government ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Who pays them ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is only for travelling expenses ; they do not receive a salary.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government appoints them, does it not ?

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And pays them for their services ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The Government pays them only for travelling expenses out of the funds allowed for the inspection of standards. But in this case, I do not know if my hon. friend is aware that about a month or six weeks ago——

Mr. FOSTER. I did not want the explanation on that ; I want to know if these men, appointed, as I understand, by the Government to fix the standard of grain, are salaried ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, they are not paid ; but their travelling expenses are paid. One or two come from Montreal, one or two from Toronto, and some from different parts of the North-west —there are sixteen altogether. They are not paid a salary, but their travelling expenses are paid.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) does not understand me yet. I understand they are not paid a salary. Are they paid an allowance ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, only their travelling expenses, when they meet in Winnipeg to discuss the standard.

Mr. FOSTER. But this vote is not for this.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, this is a special case that arose about six weeks ago when the question came up of amending the law in regard to inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend brought them down for advice.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Customs—Amount required to wipe off old supense account at the port of Montreal $1,764 30

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) explain this item ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I find they have what is called a Suspense Account there that has been running for years, and it seems very desirable that it should be declared off and not allowed to remain longer on the books. There different amounts running all through all these years represent expenses at that port for which no departmental authority has been given. This account has been running from 1868 to 1890. The collectors under whom the expenses were incurred have passed away, and there is now no way to recover the money. It is better to have the account cleared off ; we do not want such an account on the books.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose this is for bills contracted ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature of them ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are varied. For instance, in February, 1868, cash disbursed in the Spellman case, paid by the Excise Department, $108.44.

Mr. FOSTER. What is my hon. friend going to do with that item of $108 ? Is he going to pay the Excise Department that money ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No ; I am going to get a vote, and wipe out the whole suspense account.

Mr. FOSTER. If he has $1,764.30 put in his hands, he is going to pay that out to somebody.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Pay it to the port of Montreal, that this may be written off.

Mr. FOSTER. Has a bill been running since 1868, and not been paid yet ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has never been paid ; it stands there.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any man living in Montreal to whom the Government owes $108 since 1868, and has not got his pay to this day ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The collector would pay it ; but the collector did not get departmental authority for doing it, and he charges it to suspense account.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, has the collector laid out of it from 1868 to the present time?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He has not paid it out of his own pocket ; he probably paid it out of his contingency fund.

Mr. FOSTER. And he got his contingency fund from the Customs Department ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. It is paid, but the books are not clear. It runs on in that case.

Mr. FOSTER. What runs on ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The suspense account runs on, but we want to have it cleared off. You do not want to keep a suspense account on the book. This represents a great number of items due to the department, and there is no possibility of recovering them.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are you going to pay this money to ? There is nobody it is owing to.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will have to go to the port to balance these amounts.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you owe the port of Montreal $108 since 1868 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, what do you want to pay it for ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The collectors at the port of Montreal would owe this to the department, not having had departmental authority for this expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did they get the money ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They got the money out of the contingencies, which is in their hands.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it is already paid. Why do you want to pay it again ? The hon. gentleman does not understand it ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understand it, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman does not understand it, too.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we ought to have more explanation than the Minister has given. Is the present collector responsible for that amount ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Was his predecssor responsible for that amount ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is dead.

Mr. WALLACE. The two previous collectors, before Mr. Ryan, are dead, too. If this has been paid out of contingencies, what is the object of Parliament voting the money ? There is nobody to whom that amount is owing. When the next session comes, we will say : What has been done with that $1,764 ? The Minister, I think, laid down the doctrine, a year or two ago, that you can take money out of one appropriation and use it for another. I think that is a very improper doctrine ; it defeats the purposes of Parliament, which votes the money for a specific object. Suppose the hon. gentleman uses this $1,764, according to the doctrine that he ennunciated, for any purpose he likes in his department. We want to know what he is going to do with that money. Would he apply it to the hiring of customs officers that he may think are necessary ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly, I could not do anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman must know that. Here are a large number of items in this account that stand in the Montreal books, and that were there when my hon. friend was Minister in the department. These items were paid without the departmental authority ; they are owing to the department, and we want to have these paid. The collectors under whom these disbursements were made have passed away. We want to clear the

books, and, therefore, ask Parliament to make an appropriation of money, so that these amounts may be written off and settled. If the collectors were alive, we might call upon them to pay these amounts themselves, but they have passed away.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister tell us to whom he is going to pay this money and get a receipt ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We will send it to the port of Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. What will the port of Montreal do with the money ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The port will use it to balance these accounts.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where will the money go ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will come back into the Receiver General's hands.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the good of voting money out of one pocket and putting it into the other ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Because you cannot close the account in any other way, and hon. gentlemen are not making themselves look more intelligent than others by asking such questions. I do not think it is well to leave an account of that kind, to leave open a suspense account from 1868 down to 1899 on the books. We propose to close it. We find no such amount in any other port. It must have been allowed under the old régime to run along in that way.

Mr. WALLACE. The more the hon. gentleman explains it, the more he confuses the issue. Suppose a cross entry were made, would not that accomplish the purpose ? You take that $1,764, and send it down to the port of Montreal, and tell the collector to do what with it ? To wipe off those accounts. Then, with the wiping off of those accounts, where does the money go ? The money should come back to the Parliament of Canada then, as a further collection of revenue. But there is no further collection of revenue. Under what heading will that money come back ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It comes back to the Receiver General.

Mr. WALLACE. Under what heading ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I do not know under what heading you may send it under. I suppose you may send it under the heading of amounts paid in for standing suspense account.

Mr. WALLACE. I humbly submit that there is no such account kept by the Receiver General as a suspense account in regard to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it to go to the Montreal office or the Receiver General ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Montreal office must do something with the money. The hon. Minister says that it is sent back to the Receiver General in Ottawa. The suspense account of the department is money advanced, and which at a later date must be accounted for in the way that Parliament has voted the money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is not there supposed to be this amount of money in the hands of the collector of the port of Montreal which is not in his hands ?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it must be so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it is not paid it is in a suspense account. This should have been repaid out of contingencies, but it has not been recouped by the parties who owed it, and the authorities cannot collect from the parties. Therefore, it stands, having been paid out of contingencies, but without departmental authority. As they cannot collect it, they have put it into suspense account.

Mr. QUINN. It seems to me that it is merely a matter of book-keeping. The officers of the port of Montreal have made certain expenditure which have not been accepted by the department at Ottawa, so that these amounts have been placed to the charge of suspense account for the last twenty-two years. The collector at the port of Montreal says : I have had nothing to do with the payment of this money. I found this amount of $1,764. I want that wiped off ; I want to have my accounts put straight. If you vote this money the hon. Minister of Customs sends it to Montreal and the collector at the port of Montreal sends it back to Ottwa.

Mr. FOSTER. Then where will it go ?

Mr. QUINN. Then there is no further accounting for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Auditor General has no authority to allow these items now, but when this is passed, he will allow them, and this account is balanced.

Mr. QUINN. So he will if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) brings in an account which will say that the collector at Montreal is authorized, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, to charge this $1,764 to meet this account. What are you voting this money for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not a question of money at all.

Mr. QUINN. You are voting this $1,764 to the Department of Customs to spend in some way. This money is to be spent.

How is it to be spent? I could understand that this House might authorize an entry to be made in the books in order to balance the account, but if you authorize the payment of $1,764 to the collector, or the Minister of Customs, you are authorizing this payment for the purpose of wiping out an account which is dead or which is utterly worthless.

Mr. FOSTER. We want the items of this account.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will give the items:

1868—Cash disbursed in the Spellman case, to be paid by the Excise Department	$108 44

Mr. FOSTER. You have to look to the excise department, then? If that is a debt of the excise department the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue will have to bring in a vote to pay it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am getting a vote to authorize the payment of items that comprise this suspense account.

Mr. FOSTER. These are items which have been paid twenty-five or thirty years ago.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am asking a vote to enable the collector at Montreal to wipe out this debt and to do it in such a way as it will be accepted by the Auditor General.

Mr. HAGGART. There is only one way in which these accounts are straightened. They are generally placed before the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee have not the power to discharge them altogether. The proper way is to bring in an account to discharge these accounts.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It can be done in the way that I am proposing. My officers have agreed that this is the only proper way that this can be done, and it is to ask Parliament for a vote that will unable us to clear off the books. We want to wipe this out, but we must have the authority of Parliament to do it, but if Parliament will not do it, it will simply remain a suspense account on the books.

Mr. WALLACE. I remember that some years ago the Public Accounts Committee dealt with a similar matter. The then hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) brought in a resolution for a precisely similar matter. In that case there were moneys that could not be collected and a resolution was passed by the Public Accounts Committee, after investigation by a sub-committee and a full explanation. The committee wiped off this amount and permitted a cross entry to be made. That is a parallel case to this, and I know that is the way in which it came before Parliament. In this case this $1,764 goes down to Montreal; it wipes off these charges and is sent back, I presume to the Receiver General at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The money does not go at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Something must be done with the money. Mr. John Lewis, the collector in 1868, disbursed $63.94, and he took that out of the contingencies account and paid himself. Mr. Lewis is dead, and his heirs have no such claims against the Government. Now, the Minister tells us that the money was not authorized to be taken from that account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is only technical.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Railways says no, but the Minister of Customs says yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is another disagreement amongst themselves.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know which of them to believe. Perhaps I had better ask the Prime Minister about it?

The PRIME MINISTER. Since my hon. friend appeals to me, I am willing to give him an answer. I do not pretend to be a man of figures, but I claim to have a fair share of common sense, and if we apply the rules of common sense to this we can understand it. I remember this case of Spellman. It was an illicit distilling case, which took place in 1869, and there was a lawsuit over it. Mr. Villeneuve took a carter to Laprairie and he had to pay that carter. The proper way to do business was to come to the Government and ask for a special appropriation, but at that time the old Conservative party was in office and they were not very particular, and instead of taking an appropriation the money was paid out of contingencies. Mr. Lewis did not want to pay the money out of his own pocket, and so he charged it to the contingent account, and paid himself. Mr. Lewis paid Mr. Villeneuve, Mr. Villeneuve paid the carter, and Mr. Lewis paid himself out of the contingent fund. Since 1868, the office at Montreal has been the creditor of the Government to that amount, and we simply want to make the books square. We might bring in a special Act of Parliament to cover the matter, but we say it would just be as well to vote the money now. We send the cheque to the collector at Montreal, the collector enters it on his book, and the cheque comes back to the treasury. It is a mere formal transaction and it is the common sense way of doing it.

Mr. WALLACE. That cheque comes back to the treasury as part of the revenue of the port of Montreal, while it is no such thing. It means a false entry and cannot be justified.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is to blame for not settling the matter when he was in office.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know whether it was brought to my attention or not. It comes before the Parliament of Canada tonight, and the Prime Minster tells us the cheque will be sent to the collector at Montreal and will be sent by him to Ottawa. They have no right to include that as part of the revenues at Montreal. Suppose it were a million dollars, would it be proper to add that million to the revenues of the port of Montreal and say: See how much our business is increasing?

The PRIME MINISTER. We are losing too much time over this, and if it cannot be passed let it drop.

Mr. HENDERSON. My difficulty is as to how the Receiver General is going to enter that amount again. Will he enter it as revenue from the port of Montreal, or will he again enter it on the suspense account, and then five years hence require an Act of Parliament to clear it up?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have lost enough time on this, let it drop.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should let the Minister have it just for an experiment, and then let him explain to us next year how he managed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The item is carried.

Additional amount required for salaries and contingencies, Ontario..... $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a large increase.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is mostly in the city of Toronto, where our contingencies will be something like $3,000 more than we estimated for. There is over $1,000 in cartage alone. Then we had to place two officers at Depot Harbour for supervising the transfer of grain, which is altogether a new service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cartage for?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In the large cities the department pays the cartage on goods to the examining warehouse.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister has not yet explained, except in the most general terms. On such large sums he must give us fuller explanations.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot give fuller explanations. In estimating the amount of $300,000 for the province of Ontario, with new services arising and new expenditures, especially in a growing time, it is impossible to give a closer estimate. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) could never do so, and that criticism might come from some one else, but not from him. When I came into office I found that I had to pay some thousands of dollars of the hon. gentleman's debts out of the appropriation then made. I think this is a very close estimate. There is $1,000 required for increased cartage in the city of Toronto. Then it was not known that there would be such an immense traffic at Depot Harbour as to require two men there.

Mr. FOSTER. What are those men getting?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $500 each, I think.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister of Customs is inaccurate in his statement when he says he had to pay debts which I had left as controller. I think nine months elapsed from the time I resigned my position till he came in, and I would like to know how he paid any debts incurred by me.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am speaking of the department at the time I came in. I will say debts that were not provided for by the hon. gentleman, because he took an underestimate.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister is wrong. I resigned on the 12th of December, and the Estimates for the following year were not then put in. So that I was not responsible for the Estimates that were made after I ceased to be Controller.

British Columbia and Yukon District—
Additional amount required for salaries and contingencies out of which may be paid additional salaries to permanent customs officers, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $32,085

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I wish to reduce this item to $16,519.68.

Mr. FOSTER. We want a full explanation of this. In the first place, what was the amount voted in the main Estimates for British Columbia and the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In the main Estimates $75,915 and in the supplementaries $12,000, or a total of $87,915. We had to bracket them in a measure, owing to the officers being at the White Pass, which though in British Columbia, was where Yukon business was attended to.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman want this large amount of $16,519 for?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is largely in the Yukon district. One reason why we say "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary." is that the department considered it very desirable that in the appointment of officers in the Yukon for the collection of revenue, instead of appointing officers new to the service, whose salaries would be fixed at the time, we should take from the offices at Victoria, Vancouver and New Westminster thoroughly trained men, so that they would be in a position to handle that business more effectively than it could be done by new

men. These men were taken from the ports I have mentioned. They were on the permanent list with a fixed salary. When we sent them to the Yukon we had to give them larger salaries, and, therefore, these words have to be used.

Mr. FOSTER. Had their places to be filled, where they come from ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. This item provides for their whole salary and the extra allowance.

Mr. WALLACE. The ex-Minister of Finance asked, what were the appropriations for British Columbia and the Yukon last year. The hon. Minister said $95,915, and, in reply to the ex-Minister of Finance, he said that was the appropriation for the two. I see, however, that it is an appropriation for British Columbia alone.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is $75,900 and $12,000; $75,000 in the main Estimates and $12,000 in the supplementaries, for British Columbia and the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. There are $15,500 taken for the Yukon, page 67 of the main Estimates for 1898-99, and $25,000 for the Estimates of next year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would have to be added.

Mr. FOSTER. $91,415 for both ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. What were the receipts from the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. During the past year we could not get the receipts in regular order, but I will give what we got. In the Chilkoot and White Pass, from the 26th February, 1898, to the 1st February, 1899, the receipts were $317,772.60. At Tagish, from September 3rd, 1897, to June 3rd, 1898, they were $41,797.09. At Dalton Trail, from June 30th to August 16th, 1898, the receipts were $11,205.38. At Dawson, for 1897-98, the receipts were $63,185.39. At Dawson, from the 1st July, 1898, to March 31st, 1899, $200,393.32, making a total of $634,353.77.

Mr. FOSTER. This $16,519 which the hon. gentleman is estimating for, has that amount been all paid to these gentlemen sent to the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No; part of that will be for the staff at Vancouver as well.

Mr. WALLACE. Then that $634.000 are practically all the receipts you have on record in the two years.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. These are the receipts given me within that time.

Mr. WALLACE. Which commenced about a year ago.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There may be moneys that are not yet received. At two ports there are no collections reported since.

Mr. WALLACE. Dawson still remains a port. Does the hon. gentleman tell us that he does not get returns ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, we get returns from Dawson.

Mr. WALLACE. One would gather that the Minister does not get the money, but they spend it as they go along, at their own sweet will.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The reason I strike the $15,000 out is that there is an item we have to account to the House for by and by. In British Columbia, the following increases have been made. At Kaslo we had to have a new clerk, Mr. Sutherland, at a salary of $900, and a new landing waiter at Nelson.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men are there in the office at Kaslo now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1898 I find only one. Whether the business required another one since——

Mr. FOSTER. Kaslo has not been growing, you know; it is Nelson that has been growing.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister nearly two years ago estimated for two customs officers in Kaslo. At that time he explained the increased demands in British Columbia and mentioned the extra officer at Kaslo as one causing an increase. As he mentions another one, that would seem to be three in Kaslo. The business at Kaslo is not as great as it was three years ago, when one officer did all the work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I see the receipts from Kaslo last year were $9,341. Mr. Sutherland was a preventive officer before. The collector at Kaslo is Mr. J. F. Mackintosh.

Mr. WALLACE. That is only two men, and you had two men before. Why do you want this $900 increase ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. At New Westminster we had to appoint a new clerk at $720, also two preventive officers. Then the contingencies have been increased.

Mr. WALLACE. We would like an explanation about Kaslo.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have had to make a number of additions at Vancouver, the business having increased very largely. Chief Inspector McMichael, of that division, went out there and overhauled the books and the office and found that the place was undermanned, and has been for a

considerable time. It was absolutely necessary that we should have more help.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men did you add there ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About ten men. Some of those who were put in the Vancouver office were to replace men who had been sent to other places. One went out to Atlin, I think, one or two to other places. But we had to have considerable additions to the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no man added at Kaslo ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Bostock) tells me there is.

Mr. FOSTER. How many in Kaslo now, then ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bostock) tells me there are three.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not see why that should be ; Kaslo is not one of the growing towns.

Mr. BOSTOCK. As I come from that constituency, perhaps I may be allowed to explain. At the time when the work was done by one officer as referred to by the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), Kaslo was an outport. Since that time it has been made into a port. Mr. Mackintosh is the collector. There is a landing waiter, a Mr. Vroom, and it is necessary for him doing the work of the outport to have a clerk. Mr. Sutherland is the clerk. It is true that trade fell off at Kaslo for a short time, but owing to the development of the country at the head of Kootenay Lake the business is increasing there very fast.

Mr. CLANCY. Was this inspector, Mr. Sutherland, appointed on the recommendation of the chief inspector ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In some cases the chief inspector did report names.

Mr. CLANCY. I mean did he recommend the appointment of an additional clerk ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think all the changes made in the district of British Columbia were made on the report of the chief inspector. He made a tour of British Columbia, as well as Vancouver, and gave me a full report of all the ports. I do not know whether I carried out all the recommendations that he made, or whether we are one or two men short. But I may say, speaking generally, that the reports of the chief inspector guided us in the matter. As to the recommendations of the individuals. I have a good deal of confidence in my hon. friend who represents that riding in giving me suitable names.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is asking for $16,500 extra in this vote. Is this amount owing to these men for salaries, or have they been paid ? They have presumably been paid their May salaries, and, if so, the June salaries are all that remain. It seems to me that these men are either waiting for back pay or else they have been paid.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The salaries will amount to considerable for the month of June.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is asking for $16,500 for salaries mainly, I suppose. Well, how much is contingencies and how much is salaries ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot tell you that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then let that one be, and go to the next.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is that of any importance ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is of importance.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then the hon. gentleman wants me to bring a list of the amounts paid for salaries in British Columbia, and the amounts expended in contingencies separately ?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know how much for contingencies and how much for salaries. Suppose there are $14,000 for salaries, are these gentlemen waiting till this Supply Bill passes in order to get their salaries, which is now almost due, or have they been paid from any other source, and this is really recouping it ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. All right.

Additional amount required for printing and stationery..... $9,000

Mr. FOSTER. What was the total vote last year for the current year in the main Estimates for printing and stationary ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you now ask for $9,000 extra ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is a great deal of expenditure through the preferential tariff. Double books have to be kept now. The account for ten months is $22,339.46, and there are three months of printing accounts to pay, so we estimate we will require that extra amount.

Mr. WALLACE. If the amount of $22,000 for ten months, add one-fifth of that, and you have $27,000 altogether. Then, why is it that $25,000 has been voted ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are three months of printing accounts to pay.

Mr. WALLACE. Does that include the last three months ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would be to the end of the year.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the amount of the three months' printing accounts ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My officer estimates that our accounts will require this $9,000 to bring us out even at the end of the year.

Mr. WALLACE. How much are the three months' accounts ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not got them here.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you received them?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We cannot have received them yet, because this carries us to the end of the year.

Mr. WALLACE. You say $22,339 have been spent in ten months ; then add one-fifth for two months, or $4,468, and you have a total of $26,807. But $25,000 are voted, leaving a deficiency of $1,807. Why does he want five times that amount, or $9,000 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There will be more than that, because there are three months of printing.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the amount of one month's printing ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We cannot tell what the requirements of the stationery may be.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister has not demonstrated where the $9,000 are to go. We want to know.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is to go for printing and stationery.

Mr. WALLACE. But the Minister cannot even conjure up where he can spend that on printing and stationery. He says that he has spent $22,339 in ten months. At the same rate, for two months it will make a total of $26,827. But the hon. Minister says that there is one month's printing that has not been provided for yet.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said three months.

Mr. WALLACE. Add $1,000 for one month's printing, and that will make $27,807 ; $25,000 was voted. That would leave a difference of $2,807. Yet the hon. Minister is asking for $9,000. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what he requires it for ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the accounts here. If you want it you will have to wait.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister's statement is that ten months' printing has cost $22,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are some acounts yet to be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Ten months' printing cost $22,000. Three months' printing at the same rate does not give you more than $27,000 of a total.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will have to get a better explantion than I have given.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has asked for $34,000. You had better let that stand and take the next item.

Additional amounts required for maintenance of and repairs to revenue cruisers	$10,000

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The vote was $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And this is $10,000 more ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How many steamers does the Customs Department keep up ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have the "Constance," which is considered a Government steamer. We used the "Stanley" for a few months, and we had also another boat hired after the "Stanley" went off. The "Stanley" was too expensive. The "Constance" cost in the neighbourhood of $18,000. The sum of $8,000 has been expended on the "Stanley." There will have to be repairs made to the "Constance." I think it will be somewhere about $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the "Constance" in service now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, then, there is no use of my hon. friend taking any vote for repairs, because he will only have about eight days to do the work in now, and she is in service.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. She was repaired when she was laid up. The "Gladiator" is the boat that we engaged. She cost about $1,250 a month. The "Constance" cost in the neighbourhood of $18,000 ; of course, that is an estimate. We have to estimate, because she is running in May and in June. The "Stanley" was used during last summer, and when she was taken off the "Gladiator" took her place. The expenditure has been considerably increased by the demands of the preventive service, but during the year we have had several seizures resulting in a considerable amount of money for the treasury. More than that, all this preventive work has resulted in a large increase to the revenue by way of prevention, but the credit of it does not appear in the customs returns. It appears from the returns of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not explain why $10,000 is asked, or for what it is to be used. We are all agreed as to the preventive service. What I pointed out

to my hon. friend is that he is estimating for $2,000 for repairs to the "Constance," when the "Constance" is in service and it will be impossible for him to do anything with this vote. It will be useless to him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The estimate is made up in this way. The "Constance," to the 31st of December, 1898, cost $12,867.20, then from the 1st of April to the 1st of July, 1899, including half pay for the winter months, say $6,500. For new shaft and repairs, say $2,367.

Mr. FOSTER. Has that been put in?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That was done when she was laid up?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so. That is $2,367. From the 1st of July to the 1st of October, 1898, $7,836.02. The "Gladiator," in 1898, cost for two and a half months, $2,389.22.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the "Gladiator" a steam vessel?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. A tug?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. How did the hon. gentleman arrange for it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We engaged the tug for so much, and the whole expenses are paid by the proprietor. For the two and a half months it cost $2,389.22, and for this spring we estimate two and a half months at $2,500, making $4,489.22. That is a total of $34,012.44, and the vote being $25,000, it will require $9,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the "Gladiator" being used?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. On the Cape Breton coast principally. The "Stanley" was used in the Baie des Chaleurs and in the lower St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend propose to use the "Stanley" again?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not; she is too expensive.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the Minister give us some information about the amount of the seizures, so as to justify this extraordinary increased vote for the "Constance"?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Since the season, the preventive officers have seized seven cargoes of liquor on board, and the vessels and cargoes sold for $13,381.49. The number of seizures made by the staff from the opening of navigation in 1898 to date is 102.

Mr. WALLACE. I find the seizing officers on board the "Constance" only received $950.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I hope her preventive work will show through the increase of revenue in the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister now gives the excuse that the "Constance" prevents smuggling by her presence.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is what I say.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is a very difficult thing to figure out; you can only guess it. This increased expenditure is quite unjustifiable.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is a question on which we may differ. The increase in excise revenue has been over $1,000,000. But, of course, I do not claim that all that is due to the preventive service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole vote stands over, but only for the purpose of considering these small items.

Yukon Provisional District—
Yukon and Lewes Rivers—Improvements, &c., and telegraph lines..... $25,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item, together with the item 107, of $2,500 for telegraph lines in British Columbia, has already been discussed to some extent by the House. On the 13th of March an Order in Council was passed authorizing that certain steps should be taken to construct a telegraph line into Dawson. It was felt that it was desirable, even in anticipation of the appropriations for the coming fiscal year, that a party should be despatched to that country, in order that we might do some preliminary work before the year opened, and thus be in the best possible position to take advantage of the present season. I think the public opinion of the country will justify the Government in taking that step, even though they had to anticipate the votes of the coming year, and use an appropriation which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will say was not, at the time it was voted, intended to cover that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Which sums?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I claim that the vote covered the appropriations, although it is quite true, when the Minister obtained them, he did not say they were intended for this service. The amount of money expended up to the present time is comparatively small. The purpose for which the party was sent out was not merely for the construction of a telegraph line, but also for undertaking certain works in connection with the improvement of the rivers on the line of travel from the White Pass into Dawson. Therefore, in considering this matter, it must be remembered that the sums to which I am referring now, were not entirely for the telegraph, but for a service including work on the rivers. The party was under

the direction of Mr. J. B. Charleson, who received $13,000 as an advance for the general purposes of the party. Of this sum, $8,000 is represented by a cheque which was issued by the Minister of Public Works and charged against an item of $25,000 which was appropriated for surveys and inspections generally—not for one province merely, but for all the provinces.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is that item to be found ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in the general appropriations of the Public Works Department of last year, chargeable to income, and is under the head of "miscellaneous." He will find the corresponding item for next year in the main Estimates, at page 55.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister tells us that last year that sum of money was voted, and I presume was expended. Will he tell us how it was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to turn up the Auditor General's Report, which is just as accessible to my hon. friend as to me.

Mr. WALLACE. When a Minister claims that that item is applicable to the work of building a telegraph line, he is bound to tell us how it was expended in the past to justify such an expenditure this year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That portion of it will not be applied entirely to the construction of a telepraph line, because the party sent out is not only charged with that work, but with improving the navigation from Skagway to Dawson. How this vote was expended last year is set out in the Auditor General's Report at page Q—209, which covers several pages, and the total amount expended appears to have been $16,887.47.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Minister of Finance state what they did ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot refer to what they have done, because the party has only recently gone out, and the work is now in progress. I can only tell him what the contemplated works were.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that this amount was expended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $13,000 was an advance to Mr. Charleson. I presume he has spent it. $8,000 was charged to surveys and inspections ; $2,500 was charged to the vote for telegraphs in British Columbia which has been referred to several times to-night ; and $2,500 was charged to dredging in British Columbia. That is all the money that has been paid up to the present time. It is proposed in the supplementary Estimates for the coming year to take a considerable vote for carrying on the work, unless something is done to change the policy of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where have they done the dredging ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My deputy tells me that a letter from Mr. Charleson says that the dredging has been done on Six-Mile River in British Columbia.

Mr. EARLE. There has not been a particle of dredging done in British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Finance Minister state who the party are that work there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The party are composed of Mr. J. B. Charleson as superintendent——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is he ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry to say I have not the honour of his acquaintance, but we will have his photograph produced, if necessary.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the Minister, if Mr. J. B. Charleson, at the head of this party, is the Charleson who obtained a very unenviable notoriety in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass investigation, and the appointment of men sent out to the Crow's Nest Pass, and the subsequent history with which his name is connected ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the pleasure of knowing. I did suppose that the officials of unenviable notoriety were entirely under the previous Government. How can I tell as to the particular colour of Mr. Charleson's hair ?

Mr. WALLACE. We want to know if the Charleson who is sent out in charge of this party is the man who disgraced Canada——

Th MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is safe to say that no person in the employ of this Government ever disgraced Canada. The hon. gentleman has in his mind certain transactions that took place before 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be very smart——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is as smart as the inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. The inquiry is this. The Government has employed one Charleson and sent him out in charge of this party, and the question is a very proper one ; it is whether this Charleson is the same Charleson who was mixed up in the Crow's Nest labour business, and with those promises made to workingmen in various sections of the country, relying on which they went west, and which led to all the difficulties that occurred.

There are some members of this House who think that Mr. Charleson did not cut a very creditable figure at that time, and they want to know if this is the Charleson who is now employed by the Government. We do not want to know the colour of his hair or to have smart replies, but we want the answer to that question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman does not want the informaton, because he has given us the information himself.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not given the information. I ask if this is the same man.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman can ask the Public Works Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not propose to ask the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman means to keep us here——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I mean to stay as long as the hon. gentleman. We may as well understand this at once. I am prepared to give my hon. friend every information, but the question was this, whether Mr. Charleson is the same person who disgraced Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not putting the question whether a man disgraced Canada or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was the question put.

Mr. WALLACE. It was not.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know if Mr. Charleson, who is in charge of this party, is the same man who was mixed up in the hiring of labour in the Crow's Nest Pass ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can ask the deputy of his department who was there, and until that information is given he will not get this vote.

Mr. WALLACE. I ask the Minister of Finance, not if the man had an unenviable reputation, but whether the Charleson mentioned there was the same who was mixed up with the Crow's Nest Pass matter ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who disgraced Canada, you said.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that on a subsequent occasion and repeat it, and the Minister, with his usual flippancy and impertinence——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member has made an offensive remark, which I ask that he withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). The point of order is well taken.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the word 'impertinent" ? There may be two meanings. If a gentleman makes a smart reply to a question for information, that is impertinent to the subject, and the gentleman who makes it is guilty of an impertinency. That is perfectly parliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no objection to a discussion on the point.

Mr. WALLACE. If the statement made by the Minister of Finance was not an impertinency, I do not know the meaning of the word.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think you do.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know those "smart Aleck" phrases which the hon. Minister of Finance is so fond of using in this House on every occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, withdraw.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman was not discussing the general subject.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Chairman says that the word impertinency is not applicable and should not be applied to the Minister of Finance in this House, then I say that, in the words of the Speaker yesterday, for the purposes of this Parliament, we will not repeat the assertion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman must take it back, he must withdraw it. It is not enough that he shall not repeat it.

The CHAIRMAN. If my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is discussing a point of order it is my duty to hear it, but I must insist that the point of order be discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have a clear statement of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is whether the statement made by an hon. member in the committee, that the remarks of another hon. gentleman are an impertinency, is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very well put, and the real point of order. A gentleman discussing a question uses a certain argument. An opponent gets up and says he thinks that in that discussion the remarks of the hon. gentleman were impertinent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking the question of order as stated by the chairman, and it was well and fairly put. A remark is either pertinent or impertinent. It is pertinent when it touches the question and impertinent if it goes away from that question. That is what my hon. friend said he meant, that the remarks of the Minister of Finance were not pertinent to the question being discussed. and they were not. When my hon. friend asked if this man Charleson was the man who was mixed up——

The CHAIRMAN. My hon. friend is departing from the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) asked whether this was the same Charleson who was mixed up in the Crow's Nest Pass business, the hon. member for York said with reference to the remark of the Minister of Finance in reply, that he thought it was impertinent, that it did not touch the question, and it did not. It was not pertinent to it.

Mr. GIBSON. He said with his usual flippancy and impertinence——

Mr. FOSTER. The word is perfectly parliamentary as applied to an argument.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does appear to me that there can be no doubt in the minds of any gentlemen present as to the language used by the hon. member for West York. He was referring to the Minister of Finance and said that he spoke with his usual flippancy and impertinence. That is the expression which I think struck everybody as being entirely out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I take the question as stated by the chairman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I submit whether or not it is a debatable question at all. You, Mr. Chairman, heard the language used, the hon. member admits that was the statement made, and I appeal to you for a ruling on the question now.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister has not stated the case, as I understood it. The hon. member for West York said that the Minister, in his usual flippant and impertinent style. These are the words in "Hansard."

The CHAIRMAN. I will now rule upon the point of order.

Mr. WALLACE. As I am one of the parties interested, I would like to make this statement. I asked the Minister of Finance whether this Mr. Charleson was the one who was connected with the Crow's Nest Pass business. The Minister of Finance stated that he did not know whether he was or not. that he did not know the colour of his hair. I then referred to the unenviable notoriety of this man, and I said that, in my opinion, that answer was flippant. Do you agree with me, Sir, in that? I ask your ruling now?

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. WALLACE. ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. The answer was flippant, and I say it was not pertinent. When I asked a question as to the identity of the individual, it was not pertinent to say: I do not know the colour of his hair; and, therefore, not being pertinent, it must be impertinent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has said it the second time, and I ask your ruling, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling is, that the word "impertinent" is unparliamentary, unless the explanation goes with it, that it was not used in the ordinary sense in which the word is generally used. On this occasion, the word, as used by my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), was unparliamentary.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we shall have to appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The ruling is, that to use the word "impertinent" with regard to the argument of an hon. member——

Mr. McMULLEN. No, with regard to himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman can appeal, but he cannot discuss the appeal.

Mr. FOSTER. I am willing to take "Hansard's" report.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to appeal?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the grounds of my appeal. The Chairman rose, after the occurrence had taken place, and stated the point of order. He said the point of order was, that the hon. gentleman had applied the term "impertinent" to the Minister of Finance, in his reply to the statement of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). My argument was, that "impertinent" was as parliamentary as "pertinent" would be.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. It is on that point that I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. My point of order is this——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have the floor.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have the floor on a point of order.

Committee rose, and Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Brodeur) took the Chair.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, it is my duty to report to you that a point of order was raised by the Minister of Finance to the effect that an hon. gentleman had referred to his observations as impertinent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is making this report ?

Mr. FLINT. The point of order was raised, and, after discussion, I ruled that the observation applied was out of order and unparliamentary. From that decision an appeal has been taken by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. And the decision was ?

Mr. FLINT. That the use of the term "impertinent," as applied by one hon. member to another, was unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is, whether the decision of the Chair shall be sustained ?

House divided on the question :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Blair,	Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Bostock,	Landerkin,
Bourassa,	Livingston,
Brown,	Mackie,
Campbell,	McClure,
Casey,	McGugan,
Champagne,	McHugh,
Copp,	McLellan (Prince),
Costigan,	McMullen,
Cowan,	Marcil,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Meigs,
Davis,	Parmalee,
Edwards,	Paterson,
Erb,	Rogers,
Fielding,	Rutherford,
Fisher,	Sifton,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Stenson,
Frost,	Sutherland, and
Graham,	Tucker.—39.
Johnston,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	Prior,
Clarke,	Taylor,
Earle,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert), and
Foster,	Wallace.—10.
Henderson,	
Monk,	

Motion agreed to, and Chair sustained.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I now ask, in conformity with the ruling of the Chair, that the hon. gentleman who used the objectionable word be asked to withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a decision from the Chair that the hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression.

Mr. WALLACE. In conformity with your decision, I withdraw the word impertinent, and I hope the Minister of Finance will no longer continue to humbug this committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The observation the hon. gentleman has made is quite in order, which is a very unusual thing for him, but it is not exceedingly appropriate. I now proceed to consider the question before the committee. I was about to read a telegram received from Mr. Charleson when the interruption occurred. It is dated :

Tagish House, Upper Yukon, via Skagway,
Fast Sound Boat and Vancouver,
3 p.m., May 25, via Vancouver, B.C., May 30.

A. Gobeil, Deputy Minister Public Works,
Ottawa.

Telegraphic communication over your own wire from this point to Skagway completed and in perfect working order. Dam, telegraph stations and beacons on batture at Caribou Crossing completed. All obstructions removed from Six-Mile River. Lifting barges at work will follow ice through. First-class building, to be used as office for Crown timber agent and telegraph operator here, completed. Poles distributed to White Horse Rapids, wire and insulators at McClintock. Any telegrams will reach me there. Balance of wire will be distributed on barges. Trail all cut out as far as line is constructed. Everything perfectly satisfactory. Pushing through to keep within very letter of my instructions.

J. B. CHARLESON.

That is the latest report we have from the gentleman who is in charge of this party.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is this Mr. Carleson ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is a gentleman employed by the Minister of Public Works to proceed to the Yukon district in charge of this work.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there more than two Charlesons in the Public Works Department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised there is only one in the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he the elder or the younger ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is only one, therefore there can be no elder and no younger.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the person who is out there is the same Mr. Charleson who has been employed by the Public Works for a number of years, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, for several years.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he the same man who was employed in procuring labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Crow's Nest Pass business is not in the Public Works Department, and I am unable to give my hon. friend any information about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the Deputy Minister of Public Works will give the information to the committee. I am asking whether this is the same man who was employed at the time in getting labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I really have made legitimate inquiry, and I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information. We have no information in the Public Works Department in relation to the Crow's Nest Pass. I understand that Mr. Charleson, since he was employed several years ago, has not been employed in any other department than that of the Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. While in the employment of the Public Works Department was he engaged in getting labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I really do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he ask the deputy who is there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did, and the deputy informs me that he has no information on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. The deputy does not know ! Then I am bound to say that the deputy is a deputy who ought not to be in the service of the country ; he shows himself a perfect partisan. Do you mean to say that the Deputy Minister of Public Works, when that matter was discussed here over and over again, when the Minister of Public Works discussed it with us in this House, and it was a matter known all through this country—do you mean to tell me that the Deputy Minister of Public Works, who went through the whole of it, does not know whether it was that Mr. Charleson or another ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is pure assumption.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Here is the Deputy Minister sitting cheek by jowl with the Minister of Finance, sitting within two feet of the Minister of Finance, and it is absolutely impossible that any one in this Chamber will credit the statement that that deputy is not able to give a definite statement on that point. There is not a member in this committee who believes for a moment that the Deputy Minister of Public Works is not able to give an honest statement. I do not hesitate to say that if the Deputy Minister has told the Minister of Finance that he is not able to inform him on that point, he is not giving an honest statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I listened to the discussion that took place in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass labour troubles. All I remember hearing in the discussion was that some of the men were hired by a man named Charleson. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen are going a long way when they say that the Deputy Minister of the Public Works Department must necessarily know whether Mr. Charleson was engaged in employing men for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Deputy Minister of Public Works has told the Minister of Finance that he does not know whether it is the same man or not, and it seems to me that this committee must accept that statement as correct. I think it is a most improper thing for any hon. member to give the lie to a prominent officer of the Government who comes here for the purpose of giving information to the Minister. For myself I have been free to accept the statement as that gentleman gave it to me, but I venture to say that hon. members on that side of the House will not approve of a statement of that kind.

Mr. CLANCY. When this question was discussed last year, the hon. Minister of Public Works, as "Hansard" will show, admitted that this was the Mr. Charleson employed in the Public Works Department, but he qualified it by saying that Mr. Charleson had no instructions to hire men, and, therefore, he did not assume responsibility for him. The Deputy Minister of Public Works must have remembered this discussion, and he must, therefore, have known that this appeared to be the same Mr. Charleson. If Mr. Charleson was charged with questionable conduct while in the employ of the Public Works Department, and if he has been put in a position of trust now, is it an unfair question to ask, if this is the same man, and whether he should be placed in a responsible position ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) must see that hon. gentlemen around him are as forgetful as the Minister of Finance, because, if they knew all about it, they would not ask these questions. They have professed to ask these questions for information. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says that the hon. Minister of Public Works said last session, that the gentleman referred to was an officer of the Public Works Department, that Mr. Charleson, who was said to have employed men on the Crow's Nest Railway, is the same Mr. Charleson who is now in the employ of the Public Works Department.

Therefore, the hon. member for Bothwell has answered the question. He has referred to a statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I have no doubt the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works is there, and the Minister could answer the question, if I could not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the attack on the Deputy Minister is most unfair. He appears here, in his official capacity, to answer questions in connection with the department, and I am sure there is not a gentleman in this House, or out of it, who would say that, in regard to a matter of interest that has taken place in this House, a Deputy Minister is called upon, even if he should have some recollection of it, to make a definite statement. We cannot even keep it in mind as to what takes place in this House. My hon. friend says that Mr. Charleson was guilty of misconduct. I challenge that, and I say that there was not a word to prove that he was. I only want to say that he was quite within his rights in doing what he did, and he was only doing, after hours, something in the interest of the workingmen of his locality. What I want to say is, that I regret that these hon. gentlemen should have attacked an official of the department. Even if it were admitted that he might have had some imperfect recollection of the newspaper references, and even of the "Hansard" references to this man, that would not justify the attack that has been made upon the deputy. No person would say that an official of the department should come here, and be asked a question like that. Suppose he said that he was the same man, what knowledge has he of the matter in his official position. The question is raised for the purpose of throwing some reflection upon Mr. Charleson and upon the hon. Minister for having employed him. I have listened to-night, since this discussion arose, to try and find out if I could gather what in creation the hon. gentleman was driving at, what Charleson he referred to, but he did not give us any distinct explanation. I know one Mr. Charleson, who was in the employ of the company that built the Crow's Nest Pass road. That was the young man. This young man was never in the employment of this Government, or any other government. He was never in the employ of the Public Works Department, so far as I know. I do not know his Christian name, but I know he was in the employ of the company that built the road, and that he was a son of Mr. Charleson who was sent out in charge of this work. I believe that Mr. Charleson, notwithstanding the fact that his conduct has been criticised by hon. gentlemen, is a competent and experienced man, well able to carry out the duties assigned to him, and I will be very much surprised, after his work is completed, to find that there is any charge proven of misconduct or want of attention against him.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot see what the object of this discussion in regard to Mr. Charleson is, except that he was the man whose name was mentioned in connection with the department. I took occasion to make some inquiries from Mr. Haney and others, at the time of another investigation in regard to the trackmen, and the explanation I got was, that Mr. Charleson was assisting men from this district to get employment. I do not think, outside of temper, that any member of this House would so unfairly attack an official of the Government, and ask him questions outside of his department.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) to say that we are doing anything unmanly in speaking of a public official.

Mr. BRITTON. Are you not doing it ?

Mr. BERGERON. You do not know what I am going to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman should address the Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. I want you to stop these hon. gentlemen interrupting me before you interrupt me. I want to be fair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Sit down. The hon. gentleman has just declared that I have acted unfairly.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not said so yet, but I am going to say that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman will have no objection to withdraw that statement.

Mr. BERGERON. No, Mr. Chairman, before you do anything to me, you should prevent those hon. gentlemen interrupting me. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) got up, and said I was doing something wrong, before I had said a word.

Mr. BRITTON. I asked you a question.

Mr. BERGERON. You never did.

Mr. BRITTON. I asked you a question.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to know, whether we are here to have free discussion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman will withdraw the expression he used, in declaring that I was unfair.

Mr. BERGERON. I think you were. I have not said it yet; I reserve it. I say, before I had said a word, an hon. gentleman got up on the other side. You put me down; this is not the first of it. It is a matter that has occurred very often before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the point of order; let us have it.

Mr. CASEY. The point of order is, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is imputing improper conduct to the Chair, and that the hon. gentleman knows better, so that he is wilfully and maliciously imputing improper conduct to the Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. There is another point of order for you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) has referred to a member of this House as acting wilfully and maliciously——

Mr. CASEY. If the Chair rules the word "maliciously" is out of order I will withdraw it. I used the word for the reason that the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) has been a Deputy Speaker, and he is supposed to know the decencies of debate, and ought to observe them. When he is found breaking them one is tempted to express the idea I have already expressed in language which has been ruled to be unparliamentary. My point of order is, that he is covertly casting imputations upon the Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) raised no point of order. He only rose to use an expression which he knew would be ruled out of order.

Mr. CASEY. My point of order is, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) insinuated that the Chair treated him unfairly by ruling that his interruptions were unseemly and unparliamentary.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. gentleman should not use the word "insinuation."

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) pointed out to you, Mr. Chairman, the fact that several members on the other side of the House had violated the rules of Parliament, and that you did not reprimand them. I heard the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) address the hon. member for Beauharnois across the floor personally and he was not called to order. The hon. member for Beauharnois did the same thing later, and he was called to order. I do not say that you heard the member for Beauharnois, Mr. Chairman, but I do say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) simply called your attention to the fact, as he had a perfect right, that hon. members on the other side were violating the rules of Parliament with impunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) declared that I was unfair when I asked him to withdraw some expressions which I considered unparliamentary. Besides that, I heard the hon. member for Beauharnois addressing the members of the committee instead of addressing the Chair, and I called him to order.

Mr. BERGERON. And you never called the member for Kingston to order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. I am now told that another hon. member did the same thing, but I did not hear him.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I know you are deaf on one side.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. I am surprised to hear the member for Beauharnois use such a remark. I will not proceed further; I will simply ask him to withdraw the expression.

Mr. BERGERON. Which expression am I to withdraw?

Mr. CASEY. The imputation concerning the Chair.

Mr. BERGERON. I said he was deaf on the right and heard better on the left. I will say he hears on both sides and that will settle it. We know the Chairman interrupts any one on this side of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. We will now proceed with the discussion of the item.

Mr. BERGERON. I say the Chair does not hear very well on the right when any one on this side of the House is interrupted. My hon. friend from Kingston interrupted me, and he was not called to order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will be good enough to proceed with the item.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope it will not be forgotten that you must hear on both sides in future. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) attributed to us unmanly conduct when we speak on public matters.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I said unfair.

Mr. BERGERON. We are here discussing public business. I would be the last one to say anything of a man or a Deputy Minister who cannot defend himself in this House. But at the same time, I want to let the Government know that we must have information on these points. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked a fair question about Mr. Charleson. That is a name we have heard very often in this House. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) does not know as much of that family as I do, but we have heard of the father and the son and the more we hear of them the better it is for us before the country. My hon. friend the Deputy Minister—I may call him so although he is not a member of this House—knows very well what we mean when we ask about the other Charleson.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. J. B. Charleson is his name.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the other one?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. There are two Charlesons in the Public Works Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed there is only one in the employ of the Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, I am asking this question in a fair spirit, and I believe that two of them have been employed by the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) asked the question in sincerity, and I may tell him that I am informed that there is only one Charleson in the employ of the department. There is a storekeeper in the city named Charleson, but he is not in the employ of the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the initials ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. W. G.

Mr. BERGERON. What I want to say is this, that there are two Charlesons, father and son—most intelligent men, both of them. They were doing business with the local Government for a long time when Mr. Mercier was in power ; they are doing business here now, and it was quite natural for the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) to ask which of them it was, because the two of them have been employed by the Department of Public Works.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BERGERON. They have been ; we had it from the Minister of Public Works himself last year. One of them is employed permanently—J. B. ; he has been since 1896. W. G. has also been employed and paid public money through the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MACKIE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ? The Charleson who was on the Crow's Nest Pass was employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway ; that was J. B. The young man was never employed by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is entirely astray. J. B. was employed by the Public Works Department.

Mr. MACKIE. Not at that time. He was employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is astray. J. B. was in the employ of the Public Works Department at that time, and he had the purchasing of supplies ; and W. G. was the man who engaged men to work on the Crow's Nest Pass, through his papa.

Mr. MACKIE. I know that he was employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman has heard of that ; I am giving him facts. I am told that W. G. has a store in Ottawa, and he has been employed by his papa, through the Department of Public Works, to choose men to work on the Crow's Nest Pass. Now, I want to say that the son sells goods to the Department of Public Works through his papa.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. And my hon. friend from York asked the Minister of Finance this question. We do not hold him responsible, because he is acting for the Minister of Public Works ; but if he wants to get these estimates through, and we will help him to do so, he should give us every possible information from the Department of Public Works through the Deputy Minister. If he had done that, we would have had all this information, and we might have got through with some other items. But until we get that information, and we are entitled to it, we will not make much progress.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The question before you, Mr. Chairman, is the remark made by the ex-Minister of Finance in respect to a gentleman present, an officer of the Government, who is not in a position to defend himself.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I just wish to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not yet heard what I am about to say. The point we are discussing, and which has given rise to some feeling in the House, is this. This Charleson business, I confess, I do not understand myself. I know there was some talk in reference to Mr. Charleson some time ago. Now we hear of two. The Minister of Finance was asked whether this was the same man or not. I think the Opposition have a right to ask that if they like, as they can ask a great many questions. The Minister of Finance said he did not know anything about it. They said : You can ask the deputy of the department. The deputy of the department is asked by the Minister ; and, I understand, that when the deputy of the department is here to give information, it is official information. He is not here to give what he hears through a newspaper or in any other way ; and when he states that he has nothing official to give, we are told that a man who will say that is not fit to be in the public service. That was the point before this committee, and it is for hon. members of this committee to say whether that is fair or whether it is not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have listened to the discussion that has been going on for some time, particularly the latter part, and I de-

sire to say a word in reference to the lecture on parliamentary etiquette which we had from the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). It occurred to me to be very remarkable indeed for that hon. gentleman to make the speech he did to-night, when it is in the recollection of this House that within the last 24 hours that same hon. gentleman attacked an official of the Government, a gentleman who, I believe, is in the employ of the Government at the present time, and was in the employ of the former Government, and who is not in a position to defend himself. Last night, the hon. member for North Oxford accused that gentleman of having done something that was unworthy of any man in the employ of the Government, and if he was guilty of it, he ought to be dismissed at once. That official was charged by the hon. member for North Oxford with having accepted blankets for the Department of Militia, although they were half shoddy, a charge which, I think, should not have been made by the hon. gentleman unless he was absolutely sure that it was true. He may have made the statement in the heat of debate, or, perhaps, without due consideration, or possibly he did not intend that full weight should be given to the words he gave utterance to at the time. But in so doing he established a precedent in this House for making attacks on officers in the employ of the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who was the officer ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I refer to Mr. Watson. If it is fair in one case, it is fair in another. I am not saying that there is any justification in either case ; but I think it would have been just as well if the hon. gentleman who made the attack last night had been challenged by the Ministers of the Crown and brought to task, as well as a member on this side of the House, for making a statement with reference to another member of the Civil Service. To my mind, one case was just as bad as the other. The remarks made by the hon. gentleman last night established a precedent, so that there is, perhaps, some excuse for what is said to-night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did not say that a member of the House had not a right to attack an official of the Government or the Government. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has undertaken to put words in my mouth which I did not use. I did say that the attack made to-night on the Deputy Minister of Public Works was unfair, and I say so still, and I believe every member of this House says so. Now, my hon. friend goes further and says I attacked an official of the department. He will not find one word in my remarks last night that refers to any official of the Government, but because I said that the previous Government did furnish to the volunteers of Canada half shoddy blankets when they had advertised for all-wool blankets, he tried to draw the inference that I cast the blame on some officer. I blame the Government. I do not know the official the hon. gentleman refers to, but if I were aware that any official of the department had so neglected his duty as to accept articles that were not of the proper value, then I say he would be a proper subject for attack, and should be attacked. I never for a moment to-night said that either the Government or an official of the Government could not be attacked, but I do say that to-night, in this particular case, the attack was very unfair, because the gentleman attacked could not reply. I understand that in my absence my statement with regard to the blankets was questioned, although not by any hon. member who is in the force and who has had experience. I can tell my hon. friend that if he wants an investigation, I know what I have said to be true, and every officer in the force knows it to be true. There was an investigation before the officer of the department, and it was proved that the blankets were half shoddy.

Mr. PRIOR. No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I say yes. I defy the hon. gentleman to ask for an investigation.

Mr. PRIOR. Where was the investigation held ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. An investigation was held before the Public Accounts Committee, and an examination of the goods was made, in my own presence, in the department, and I saw the blankets.

Mr. BERGERON. When was that ?

Mr. PRIOR. Was there any gentleman present who knew the constituency of a blanket ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know what my hon. friend intends to insinuate by that.

Mr. PRIOR. I insinuate nothing, but I mean what I say.

Mr. GIBSON You know more about nails.

Mr. PRIOR. I know enough about nails.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I make the statement in this House, and I appeal to my hon. friend whose corps—he is out of the battalion now—was supplied with the same blankets, to stand up and say whether my statement is not true.

Mr. PRIOR. The blankets we had supplied us year after year I never heard any complaint about.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have answered the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) with regard to the statement he at-

tributed to me, that an official should not be attacked. I never said anything of the kind. All I said was that in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the House, the attack made on the Deputy Minister was very unfair.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been trying for the last fifteen minutes to get a chance to say a word. No one feels more strongly than I that an official, who has no representation in this House, ought not to be unfairly treated. He cannot talk back, and he has a certain position which members of the House, of course, should have regard for. We all say things at times in the heat of argument, or on the spur of the moment, which it would probably be well to have left unsaid. For the life of me, I cannot recall just now how strong language I did use, but it is just possible that, in the provocation of the moment, when I was asking for a bit of information that I thought we should have and rather insisting on getting it, and when I tried to get it from the Deputy Minister, and the answer came that he did not know, which seemed to me very unreasonable, I perhaps made use of an expression which was much stronger than I should have used. If I did, so far as I did, I am very frank in saying that I would rather I had not used it. I would be the last person to take an unfair position in criticising an official. I hope that hon. gentlemen on the other side will take this as a fair and frank retraction of any hard words I may have said with respect to the deputy. If the House will allow me, I do not think it is in the temper to sit here and attempt to do much more business to-night, and I would suggest to the Finance Minister and others on that side whether we had not better adjourn now and get back here to-morrow and endeavour to do more business.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In your improved condition, I think we had better go on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not taken any part at all in the debate for the last hour. I do not know that it has been very creditable to the House, but I am more than pleased with the ample and frank withdrawal which my hon. friend has made of his remarks regarding the Deputy Minister of Public Works. These heads of departments occupy a singular and curious position in the House. They are bound to be here to give information, and ought to be treated with courtesy and respect. They are not able to reply back, and it does appear to me that to say anything against their character or imputing improper motives to them, or say anything, we would not say them face to face, is taking an unfair advantage of our position. There were things said to-night with respect to the Deputy Minister which I thought were harsh and uncalled for, and I am very glad they have been withdrawn. I would say to my hon. friend, in all seriousness, that we have done no work to-day at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the fault of the Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I submit that it is nothing of the kind. We have been here since three o'clock in the afternoon, and have not carried $7,000 of votes yet, and we will be here until next December unless we get on with business better.

My hon. friends opposite know that we have to get on with the business. We do not want to sit here all night. It is not for our health that we are sitting here, and it is not by adjourning every night from twelve to one that we can hope to get through at all. I submit now that we should have a little business done even at the close of this day.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend had better not press the present item, because a great deal of discussion will take place on it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has been the subject of discussion since three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will take my suggestion, he will let this item stand over, and let us take up the other, which will not cause so much discussion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What more discussion does the hon. gentleman want?

Mr. BERGERON. The remarks made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries are very unreasonable. He knows that the only chance we have on this side of bringing anything before the House is when the Government wants to go into Supply. As far as this item is concerned, a great deal of discussion took place this afternoon, and my hon. friend will understand that not only do we want to further discuss it, but there are many questions we have to put to the Government concerning it. Since I am here, I have not heard one word of explanation why the Minister of Public Works went and spent $25,000 on building that piece of telegraph line, when there were negotiations between some parties and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways and Canals about the same work. I leave it to the Minister of Marine, who is a very reasonable man, whether we should pass this item hurriedly, and whether we have not every possible right in our position, to ask every possible information about it.

Now, my hon. friend says we have been here a long time discussing this matter. That is quite true, but we have had no reason given by the Minister of Finance who re-

presents the Minister of Public Works why this money should have been spent without the authority of Parliament. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for not having a complete information on the details of this work, for it is not his department. But he will understand surely that we naturally desire to know the reason why this money has been spent without the authority of Parliament ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He will tell you.

Mr. BERGERON. No, we have asked for it, but we have not received that information yet.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You were asking about Charleson.

Mr. BERGERON. That is drawing a red-herring across the trail. Charleson does not amount to much in relation to this particular point.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOms. But the hon. gentleman has not asked for the information he now speaks of. He has a right to it, but he has not asked for it.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will allow me—we have been on this item two hours, and we have not had from the Minister of Finance why this money was spent without asking Parliament. And when we hear, as we did this afternoon, of correspondence between private individuals and the Minister of Railways and Canals in connection with a work of this kind, it seems to me important that we should understand what we are doing. And when my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) asks that the item should be allowed to stand and something else be taken so that we may make some progress, it seems to me most reasonable. I leave it to gentlemen opposite who have been here for years. The hon. Minister of Customs and I have been here for twenty years, and we know that under the late Government, no item of $25,000 was ever voted without the fullest information being given as to reasons for it. Why, my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows that never was an item of $10 voted under the late Government without giving every possible reason why. And to-day we are asked to agree to the expenditure of $25,000, and expenditure which is entered upon without the sanction of Parliament, and we find, moreover, that there is a kind of imbroglio about this work. The Minister of Public Works spends money without the authority of Parliament for this work. The Minister of Railways and Canals, and even the Prime Minister, gives letters to a private company that he will go into agreement with them. We do not know where we stand, and should be guilty of neglecting our duty if we did not ask for information not only as to this expenditure but as to the policy of the Government for the future with regard to this subject. We are told that we ought to vote this item on the ground that we have done very little work to-day. But it is suggested, and very reasonably it seems to me, that we should leave this item aside and go on with something else. Of course, we are quite prepared to stay here as long as the Minister of Finance wishes, but we understand that the members of the Government want to go home, and I am sure that nobody is more anxious to close the sitting and go home than I. Why not leave this item aside and go on with other matters ?

Mr FOSTER. Of course, if we must go on with this, we must. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) kindly separate in his vote what is for British Columbia and what for the Yukon ; and if he can divide, will he also say what amount is for river improvements and what for the telegraphs. I do not think the item has been properly expressed, as two different things are confused.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the request of the hon. gentleman is not unreasonable. But the difficulty is that a general authority has been given Mr. Charleson who is in charge of the party, and until we get his returns, we can hardly divide the amount. But as far as we can judge the proportion will be one-third in British Columbia and two-thirds in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The telegraph line has been built from Lake Bennett, to which point the White Pass Railway line extends, to Lake Tagish, a distance of 52 miles. I said Six-Mile River was in British Columbia, and my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) corrected me. I do not pretend to be exactly informed and accept his correction. But Tagish to which the telegraph line has been extended is in British Columbia.

Mr. PRIOR. What did the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) mean when he quoted Mr. Charleson as wiring that a telegram could come over our own line from Skagway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it was from Tagish to Bennett.

Mr. PRIOR. I think he said over our own line from Skagway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be incorrect. The White Pass Railway telegraph line extends from Skagway to Bennett, and we have made a connection with it at Bennett.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the paper he read from, I think he will see that I am correct.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The words used are "over our own wire from

this point to Skagway." That hardly describes it. We have a wire from Tagish to Bennett, and from that point we have an arrangement to use the White Pass line.

Mr. WALLACE. The railway would, of course, have a telegraph line alongside of it, and it would be absurd, I suppose, to attempt to build the line parallel with it. Now going back to the other question, the employment of Mr. Charleson on this work, I think that that was not a very good appointment. Mr. Charleson we have ascertained now, after a good deal of beating about the bush, Mr. J. B. Charleson, was the individual who was connected with the Crow's Nest Pass business last year, although an employee of the Government during all that time. A commission was appointed by the Government to investigate the grievance and wrongs inflicted upon Canadian workmen who had been sent out there. The report of that commission, after investigating the matter, condemns in the strongest terms from start to finish the acts of Mr. Charleson declaring that he misled the men who were engaged. The report is before me now. The Minister of Public Works, who justified and defended Mr. Charleson as much as he could, said a year ago:

> As for Mr. Charleson, he is not in town now; as soon as he comes back, I will ask him to give an account of what he has done, and if he is not in a position to give me a satisfactory explanation, he will have to take the consequences of what he has done.

An hon. MEMBER. What Charleson is that?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. J. B. Charleson.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the papa.

Mr. WALLACE. At any rate, he is the one who is in charge of this construction of the telegraph and the other works that the Government are undertaking. The Minister of Public Works said that he was going to make an investigation as soon as Mr. Charleson returned, and, if Mr. Charleson was not able to give him a satisfactory explanation, he intimated that he would dismiss him. Well, Parliament has never yet received any report of that investigation that the Minister pledged himself to furnish Parliament with regard to Mr. Charleson's conduct. The first news we get from him now is the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Charleson is placed in charge of this party, and that he was advanced $13,000, and he is sent out there, with a staff of men, to dredge rivers and construct telegraph lines. That $13,000 will not go very far, and he will require more money. We find here that certain officers have helped themselves, somebody helped themselves, to $106,000 of the customs revenue out there, and to $92,000 of the Dominion lands revenue.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not fair in saying that the officers have helped themselves, without waiting till we reached the item, and asking for explanations.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems to me that they have helped themselves. But the Minister knows that this $13,000 will not go a long way out there in dredging rivers and building telegraph lines. Then what are they to do? It occurs to me that they will go on and help themselves to the public funds.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where are they to get them?

Mr. WALLACE. The customs are collecting a large amount there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What has Mr. Charleson to do with the customs?

Mr. WALLACE. What was done with the $106,000 of customs revenue that was handed over by the customs officers to somebody? I presume not 10 per cent of it, certainly not 20 per cent, was expended by the Customs Department. That same process may be going on, unless there is a more strict surveillance over the conduct of Government affairs in that country. Could the Minister tell us when these men went out there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The party arrived in Vancouver on the 18th of March. They left on the 11th of March.

Mr. WALLACE. When was the Order in Council passed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the 13th of March.

Mr. WALLACE. That makes the matter still worse. There was no authority, not even an Order in Council, or a Governor General's Warrant, for sending away this expedition. When did they arrive at Skagway?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the 30th of March.

Mr. WALLACE. They could not have done very much towards dredging rivers or building telegraph lines before the 1st of April. But the strange thing about it is, that this expedition should have started before an Order in Council was passed, or any legal sanction had been given to this work to be done. We should investigate this matter a little further, and find out why Mr. Charleson was appointed manager of such an important enterprise. We got a telegram today, dated the 25th or the 30th of May—which was it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is dated Tagish House on the 25th May, and Vancouver on the 30th.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the distance of the telegraph that they built independent of the railway company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 56 miles.

Mr. WALLACE. Was there a staff sent from here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About ten or twelve went from Ottawa, while others were employed out there. We have no information as to the number taken except those that went from Ottawa.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the names of those who left here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Charleson, Mr. Richardson, an officer of very great experience on the Canadian Pacific telegraph service, Mr. Taché, an engineer of the department, Mr. Boyer, his assistant, and the chief carpenter, named Lafortune, a stenographer and a type-writer named Gobeil. The other names the deputy cannot recall, but we will get them later.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this J. B. Charleson has not been for the last few years purchasing agent for the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, Mr. Charleson has been employed as supervisor of labour. There is an officer named Breton, who is the purchasing agent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did Mr. Charleson purchase supplies for the contingent he took out ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was advanced $13,000 with the liberty to purchase whatever he would require.

Mr. TAYLOR. As a matter of fact, did he purchase a large quantity of supplies here —a car-load of wire ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were some supplies ; we have not the returns from Mr. Charleson, but he did purchase supplies before he left Ottawa.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are there no accounts in the department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that goods were ordered by Mr. Charleson, but he has not yet returned any of the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was ordered ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One hundred tons of wire.

Mr. TAYLOR, Was that ordered from his son ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some portion of these supplies was supplied by W. G. Charleson.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is he a son of J. B. Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One is the son and the other is the father. I do not know which it is. Wire, W. G. Charleson ; insulators, the Potter Association, of St. Johns, Quebec ; brackets, Firstbrook Bros., Toronto ; poles, J. Y. Rochester, formerly of Mattawa ; spikes, W. G. Charleson.

Mr. BERGERON. Read the prices.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an estimate, which, I presume, corresponds with the prices paid : $9 per mile of 8 BB wire, $2.50 per hundred pounds ; insulators, $86 per 1,000 ; brackets, $26 per 1,000 ; poles, $3, distributed ; spikes, $2.50 per keg—12 kegs.

Mr. BERGERON. Are those the prices for all the goods that were bought ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The prices are given for each of these articles. The prices for food supplies are separate.

Mr. BERGERON. We only want to have the things bought from Charleson.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who were the food supplies bought from ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Messrs. Bate & Co. There are no accounts rendered ; Mr. Charleson purchased them.

Mr. EARLE. Were they freighted by the Government to the coast ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were delivered at Bennett. We purchased them at Ottawa prices and the Government provided transportation.

Mr. BERGERON. All these things were bought without tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were no tenders.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the total amount of money spent by Mr. Charleson before he went away ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quotations for wire were asked from several parties and Mr. Charleson's was the lowest. I have no memorandum showing the total amount spent. These are the estimates based on the quotations received.

Mr. EARLE. Have you any prices for the provisions purchased here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Bate & Co. rendered accounts to the department, but as Mr. Charleson has not certified these, they were forwarded to him to be certified, and we have not the accounts at present. We can get duplicates from Messrs. Bate & Co.

Mr. EARLE. I would be glad to have them, because there are some transactions with Messrs. Bate & Co. which should be discussed in this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will get duplicates from Messrs. Bate & Co.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand the Minister to say that wire was bought from W. G. Charleson without tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quotations were asked from three parties, and Mr. Charleson was the lowest.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were the others ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Lewis Bros. of Montreal, is one, and the deputy cannot recall the name of the other.

Mr. BERGERON. Were any of these prices asked of concerns who make wire in addition to asking them from a third party ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Prices were asked from dealers, not from manufacturers.

Mr. BERGERON. W. G. Charleson keeps a retail store in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And it is from him the Government got these goods without tenders. How much was spent in Ottawa, before the expedition left ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Deputy says the accounts which have been forwarded to Mr. Charleson to be certified. amount to between $5,000 and $6,000. That will be paid out of this $25,000. These are the accounts which have been rendered to the department, but there may be others which have not been rendered.

Mr. BERGERON. It may amount to double that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Possibly, but not likely. People who have accounts against the Government, are quick to render them.

Mr. BERGERON. Not when they have to be certified by a man in the Klondike. Does this $6,000 come out of the $13,000 advanced to Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The $13,000 was for expenses up there.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the $13,000 placed in Charleson's hands before he went away ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in cheques, to be accounted for.

Mr. BERGERON. Without any authority from Parliament ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not admit that. I have already explained that $8,000 of that $13,000 came out of a vote of $25,000 for surveys and inspection ; $2,500 from a vote for telegraph service, and $2,500 from a vote for dredging.

Mr. FOSTER. It is absolutely necessary now to distinguish between the amounts taken from river improvements vote, and from telegraph line vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to await Mr. Charleson's returns before we can divide them.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot believe that the department would send out Charleson without instructions as to how much he was to spend on telegraph lines, and how much on river improvements.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, yes. The Department of Public Works will do that for Charleson.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Charleson had a letter of instructions. This was only the beginning of what, if Parliament consented, would be an extensive work. The river improvements are estimated at $50,000, in addition to the telegraph line ; but he could only do a small portion of it until Parliament made the appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the engineers of the department report would be the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Government, of course, is only committed to the amount placed at the disposal of Mr. Charleson. It is estimated that there would be about 550 miles of telegraph, at $225 to $250 per mile, representing a total expenditure for telegraph lines about $130,000. Besides that, there were the following works : Dam at Cariboo Crossing, estimated at $6,000 ; removal of rock, Six-Mile River, $2,000 ; removal of Rock, Thirty-mile River, $30,000 ; removal of rocks at Five-Finger Rapids, $5,000 ; removal of rocks at Rink Rapids, $1,000 ; estimated for contingencies and superintendence, $6,000—total, $30,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is that based upon ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The report of Mr. Coste.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this all based upon an exhaustive examination and report by Mr. Coste ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is from Mr. Coste's report.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Mr. Coste also report upon the line of telegraph ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not the chief purpose of his report, but he makes some reference to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the country so clear there that you can locate the telegraph line without a survey, and, if there is a survey, what is the cost of that survey ? I imagine the country there is of such a description that you do not have to make an elaborate survey before you place your telegraph lines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the contrary, by changing the location, we expect to save distance. There is considerable room for surveying and also for the improvements in addition to what Mr. Coste did.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend kindly give the estimate of the cost of the surveys in this projected work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I am not able to divide the item of surveys from the rest. Until the accounts of these expenditures are rendered, we shall hardly be able to make the division.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the Minister of Finance to say that he gave Mr. Charleson $13,000 in a cheque, which was divided into three appropriations, one for surveying, one for dredging and one for telegraph lines in British Columbia. I want to know to what other appropriation he placed the amount to which he committed the Government in the purchase of $16,000 or $8,000 worth of supplies that Mr. Charleson was authorized to make before he went.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be taken out of the appropriation we are now asking.

Mr. TAYLOR. The debt was contracted and the country committed to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose it was.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is the appropriation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no other than this. It is a fair question whether it should not be divided in the item ; but that has not been done.

Mr. EARLE. Did Mr. Charleson make any purchases on the coast ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that he purchased dynamite, and he might have purchased some other things. We have no other report as to that.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it possible that we vote money in this House for a certain purpose, and afterwards find that that money, without any authority from Parliament, is diverted to other purposes, because that is what we are having now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not admit that there has been any diversion. We claim that this is for the purpose for which Parliament appropriated it in a general vote.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not believe the Minister of Finance intends to divert any ; but the people of this country have been told, and we make it our boast on the hustings, that not a cent of the people's money is voted without our knowing for what purpose it is to be spent. But I am taking the simple fact that moneys were voted last year for dredging purposes, and that the Minister of Public Works is using that money to build a telegraph line without any authority from Parliament and without any authorization from anybody, while there were some people discussing with the Minister of Railways and Canals whether they should build a telegraph line or not at that time, and communication was going on between the Prime Minister and some companies as to whether they could depend on the good faith of the Government or not. I sympathize with the Deputy Minister of Public Works, and I would be the first to rise and vindicate him, because I know him to be an honest man. But I sympathize with him, when he has to come to this House and explain things that have been done by a man who has not the lest notion of the dutes of a Minister of the Crown, but will take moneys that have been appropriated for other purposes, and, without the authorization of Parliament or anybody else, will give those moneys into the hands of Mr. Charleson. He knows Mr. Charleson. Where are the vouchers to-day ? The hon. Minister knows the humiliating position in which the Government stands. It may be a small amount, but the principle is the same. The Minister of Finance finds that $13,000 has been put into the hands of Charleson by the Minister of Public Works, and he would like to put the acccounts before Parliament, but he cannot do it, and I will tell him why. Because he does not know Charleson. But the Minister of Public Works knows him ; he knows his chums ; and he puts $13,000 into the hands of Charleson, and you will never hear of that money again. More than that, you will have to pay accounts for that money except what was paid to his son in Ottawa before he left. Is that the way the people's money is spent? Yet we are asked by the hon. member for North Oxford to vote nicely and with a smile $25,000. I say that we would not deserve the position we occupy here as a criticising Opposition if we allowed the money to be voted without asking for every possible detail. Whom should we believe, of all the Ministers ? Shall we believe the Prime Minister, who has been in correspondence with a private company which propose to build that telegraph line ? Shall we believe the Minister of Railways and Canals who has been in communication with a private company to build that line ? We had the proof this afternoon, when we found that papers which had been asked for by the representatives of the people, had not come to the hands of the House. We have not been given the papers, but we have them from another source, from the people who have been swindled, who have been deceived, who have been laughed at by the Government. When honest and respectable people thought they were dealing with the authority of the Government, we find that, without the authority of Parliament, and without his colleagues knowing anything about the matter, the Minister of Public Works was having a little discussion with his friend Charleson, in which he told him. "There is a little bit of money to be made

for you. I will give you $13,000 cash, which I will steal from the appropriations of Parliament voted for other purposes." You can go to your son's store here in Ottawa and buy $5,000 or $6,000 worth of goods from him before you start and then you will go on to the North-west and do something about starting that telegraph line, and after you are gone we will get Parliament to vote another $130,000." The Minister of Public Works did this job just as he did some dredging at Coteau, when he gave the work to the father-in-law of his son. I can sympathize with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who is obliged to come here and defend things which I am sure he would not do himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what time the goods left for the coast which were ordered by Mr. Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Shortly after Mr. Charleson left.

Mr. TAYLOR. When were the goods purchased from Bate & Son and from Charleson's son here in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No doubt we can get duplicates from Bate & Son and Charleson of the accounts.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood that other parties were invited to bid for the supplies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were in the case of the wire. The inquiries for the wire were not made by Mr. Charleson, but by the department before he left.

Mr. TAYLOR. At what date were inquiries sent out for these supplies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It all occurred within a few days of the time Mr. Charleson left.

Mr. FOSTER. Between the 1st and 11th of March.

Mr. BERGERON. Without any authority even from Council.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the department bring down the date ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No doubt.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that Charleson and his party left Ottawa on the 11th and Vancouver on the 18th, and that the first time the Government dealt with the question was when they passed the Order in Council on the 13th.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter was being considered and discussed by the Minister, and the Order was passed on the 13th. Of course, the matter would have to be discussed in Council some days before the Order was passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the 13th March, the Order in Council was passed and the Government decided to go on and build a telegraph line as a Government work, and repudiate the pledge they had given to a private company chartered by this Parliament. But previous to the decision of the Government, the Minister of Public Works appointed an official and started him out and committed the country to an expenditure of $18,000 on supplies, besides giving Charleson cheques. The Government took the money out of three votes for other purposes and started Charleson on the 11th, two days before the Order in Council was passed committing the Government to that policy. If there ever was a job clearly evident it is this. Charleson went to his son's store and purchased a carload of goods at retail prices. If the Government want to purchase them for cash, they can get them for $1.80. On the wire, I am satisfied they could save from 30 cents to 50 cents a hundred by buying it from the manufacturers in Montreal. Mr. Charleson is a friend of the Minister, and his son keeps a store down town ; the goods were bought from the son, with a profit to him of $100 or $200. Surely, the Government will not ask, under the circumstances, that this vote should be put through without the papers and the information that has been asked for. Our duty to the people compels us to call for this information. The idea of a Government, entrusted with the people's money, countenancing such a job as this appears to be. But the Government, when they are asked for these votes, say : We must have them ; we will sit up all night, and you must vote them. No matter how we may insult you, as the Minister did——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not insult anybody.

Mr. TAYLOR. You certainly did. When my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked a reasonable question——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend thumped the desk, and I told him that was not going to frighten anybody.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite they will not get their Estimates through in that way. They are not going to bulldoze the Opposition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And we are not going to let the Opposition bulldoze us.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Opposition have treated you courteously, and will not be bulldozed. These gentlemen began declaring that they would sit here all night——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would it not be better if neither of us were to try bulldozing ?

Mr. FOSTER. But it came from the other side first.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Get down to business.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) asks us to get down to business, and I am free to say that if the estimates were in his hands we should get through sooner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He did not get through very well when he had estimates to put through.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think he did pretty well. He had no job such as this to defend. I think this is the worst that has come before the House this session. The papers brought before the House by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) included a letter written by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, declaring that he would render all assistance to these people to build their line—and you can read a meaning between the lines of these letters written by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Public Works. And now the Government repudiates these letters and take up this enterprise as a public work, so that it will cost the country two or three times what it would have cost if built by private enterprise. It will cost the country ten times for interest what it would cost to pay a private company for telegrams. Of course the great point was to give Mr. Charleson and a lot of hungry heelers a job to go into that country as prospectors, all expenses and wages paid, and every opportunity to loot the mines of that country. The Government tried to give away that whole country last session. This is just as bad a job, but on a smaller scale. Talk about this being a business Government, I do not see any evidence of good business management in this.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not carried ; my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) has a good deal to say. I think it must be apparent to the hon. Minister that we shall make more progress by leaving this item over until we can get further information required about it, than we can by sitting here all night.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the House, if it were here, would come to the conclusion, as the few who are here, I think must have already come to the conclusion, that the suggestion I made some time ago was a fair and wise one. Surely the Government cannot think it fair that a question such as this should be decided at this time of the morning, and before this small remnant of the Committee of Supply. There is more in this than a mere $25,000. We are really deciding upon a very important question, that is, whether it is better for the Government to build this line or allow it to be built by private parties, by a telegraph company. I have no hesitation in saying that I am entirely opposed to the Government undertaking this work at present, a work which will not only be an expense now, but will involve an annual expense for years to come.

Mr. GIBSON. Will not the Government get their receipts from the line ?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will go on with my argument. I am not speaking aside from the question ; I am speaking directly to the question and to earnest, and I believe honest business men who are here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Always except the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). It is a fair question for debate whether this should be undertaken by the Government or left, as most of the telegraph lines are left for private corporations to build. In the first place, a private corporation finds its own money, asks no subsidy, involves no expense to the Government. The Government has control, and, when it gives a franchise, can stipulate a low rate for Government messages, because they are giving a valuable franchise. It would not be too much to ask any company to which we give a privilege of that kind, to send Government telegrams free of expense, and you would find telegraph companies to admit that. It is a valuable franchise, and the Government would have a right to put a fair condition with reference to its own messages. Now, there are two kinds of votes that are taken by the Minister of Public Works with reference to telegraph lines. On page 54 there is a vote for constructing an alternative line connecting Cape Beale with Victoria, by extending the French Creek-Alberni line southwardly to the south-west coast of Vancouver Island, $4,600. That was in last year's estimates ; and there is an item for the same in the present Estimates. There is also one to connect Nicola Lake with the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraph system, $3,000. Here is a plain expression of Parliament, it is for building a telegraph line, not for maintaining it. My hon. friend knows that he dare not stand up here as Minister and say that he would be justified in taking that $3,000 and using it for constructing a telegraph line between Tagish and Lake Bennett. Now, you leave those Public Works appropriations, and come on page 79 to the appropriations for a totally different purpose. These appropriations are for the operation of works already built, and not for the building of new works. Such an appropriation is the $12,000 for the maintenance and opera-

tion of telegraph lines already built in British Columbia. For instance, it reads : " Collection of Revenues—Telegraph lines, British Columbia, $12,000." Below the details are given, $9,065 are appropriated for operating the telegraph lines which are already built. This amount of $9,065 is for operating these lines, and the hon. gentleman knows that he has no authority to take a single dollar of that money and divert it from the operating of the lines already built in British Columbia. $2,935 is appropriated for repairs and staff and this makes up the $12,000. What is the doctrine that the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government lay down? When Parliament distinguishes between two sets of appropriation, the one amount to build telegraph lines in British Columbia, the other to operate lines already built and specifically states its ground for each, my hon. friend lays down the doctrine to this House that you can divert this money which was voted by Parliament for the staff and operation of the telegraph lines in British Columbia, and that you can build new telegraph lines with it in British Columbia and in the Yukon district. That is a doctrine which I do not believe will be accepted by this House. The hon. Minister of Finance is teaching us the lesson that after the Government come down and get their appropriations which are specifically entered under their several heads for specific purposes as soon as Parliament is dissolved the Government can go to work and turn this vote and that vote and another and all these votes from the purpose for which they were appropriated by Parliament and use them for different purposes. This is the doctrine that is laid down absolutely and in cold blood by the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government, a doctrine which would be scouted in the British House of Commons, a doctrine which no Minister there would think of propounding, which the hon. gentleman knows is not only wrong but is absolutely vicious. He is not only violating the sanction of parliamentary appropriation, misusing money, involving a malversation of public funds, but he is teaching to the civil servants and the spending officials in this country that a vote does not mean anything and that a pledge to Parliament is nothing. The difficulty of the Finance Department from confederation up has been to get officials to pay more scrupulous regard to parliamentary appropriations. The Finance Minister rises now and teaches these officials the vicious and corrupt lesson that they need not be careful at all as to the parliamentary purposes of the appropriations, but that they can divert money from the appropriations and spend it in any channel. It is a trick that argues cleverness and they have a perfect right to do it with the example of their own Ministers and the Government to back them up. How long can you go on that principle without a total demoralization of the whole principle of expenditure and the whole service of Canada. Not one single dollar of money ought to be taken, or can be taken, unless it is illegally and wrongfully taken by the Government, or the Minister, for any other purpose than that for which Parliament has appropriated it. When Parliament appropriated $12,000 to operate lines of telegraph in British Columbia did it mean that $6,000 or $3,000 or $2,000 was to be taken to build telegraph lines in the Yukon? It never meant that. It is a wrenching not only of the meaning of the appropriation, but of the very basis of the principle of appropriation and of expenditure in this country. Now, let me take another example. The dredging vote for British Columbia, was voted for dredging in British Columbia, and when it was voted it was explained in answer to questions that were put across the House, where this dredging was to be done. Now the hon. Minister of Finance says that it is good doctrine and a proper thing to do, when they are in a difficulty and want to do something that they have no authority from Parliament to do, to take a portion of that dredging vote and expend it to do dredging in the Yukon territory. Surely, when they come to think about it, Ministers and Governments and members of Parliament, entirely apart from party, are not going to endorse a course of action of that kind. Year after year we have taken a vote of from $20,000 to $30,000 for surveys and inspections in the Public Works Department. Take the whole course of expenditure of that vote for the last twenty years. Ever since I have been in Parliament it has been there for one single purpose and it has not been taken for construction purposes. What is it for? Some constituency of some hon. member wants a public building or public work. The public Works Department says : We have no appropriation for it, but we will make a survey of the river, or the harbour and we will find out whether it is feasible and what the cost will be. That vote has never been taken for the purposes of constructing telegraph lines or making river improvements anywhere. That is now what is being done. The principle is absolutely and entirely a principle which cannot be denied and when the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government do utter violence to that principle in that way, they are doing an illegal and wrongful thing. They are doing just the same as if they were taking the money out of the treasury which had been appropriated for a special purpose and had used it for purposes which they had never explained to Parliament and which were never authorized by Parliament. These are the three votes out of which the Minister has taken an allocation of $13,000, and gone to work building telegraph lines and improving rivers in the Yukon District. They had no appropriation for that purpose, which means that they never got the consent of Parliament for a dollar for that work. Without authorization, without any discussion in this House, without a dol-

lar of money appropriated, they are powerless to do the work except it is so urgent that it comes under the clause for a Governor General's warrant. The Government entered upon this decision on the 13th of March, just three days before this House met, and without a vote of Parliament, and without a Governor General's warrant, they wrenched the money from an appropriation for an entirely different purpose, and they set this work into operation. Last year they could have got a vote from the House, or else they could have waited to get a vote this year. They have violated the principle of appropriation, and they have gone further and violated the principle of expenditure, where Parliament expresses its will as to what it wants done with the money it entrusts to the Government to spend for it. If this Parliament approves of it, it takes the onus of approving of a thing which no thoughtful man unbiassed by party, and which no constitutional Government on British principles would for a single moment entertain. That point has to be made stronger in a full House, and that is why I assure the Minister (Mr. Fielding) that he is not wise in pressing this matter now. First, there is the question whether the Government shall do this work, or whether it shall be done by a private corporation; then, there is the question of spending this money without authority, and then there is the question of wrenching money from an appropriation which it was never intended by Parliament should be devoted to this work. These questions must all be discussed. And, how did the Government go about the work? They took a man named Charleson who is in the employ of the department. I will not discuss Mr. Charleson's antecedents, but, at all events, he is a sub-officer in the department, and I believe he has nothing of the technical engineering knowledge which one would think would be necessary for such an occupation. The Government have evidently given him some powers which has entirely throttled the department here for the time being, and, with reference to which Parliament is not informed. Before the Minister presses this vote to a conclusion, he ought to bring down the instructions which were given to Mr. Charleson, and under which Mr. Charleson is expending a large amount of the unvoted money of this country; worse than that, of the money filched from the purposes for which it was voted by this House. We have a right to know how much of this money is going to river improvements, and how much to telegraph building. They have a purchasing agent named Breton in the Public Works Department, and it transpires now that he is not the man who purchased the supplies. Charleson is given the full power of purchasing his supplies, and he does it without tender and without contract of any kind. A large proportion of these supplies are bought from his son, who conducts a retail establishment in Ottawa, and I do not know whether it is true or not, but I know it is said that Mr. Charleson, senior, has an interest in that business of Mr. Charleson, junior. The most vicious principle is introduced, that you not only discard tender and contract, but you give to a gentleman whose son runs a retail store the permission to purchase supplies from his son by retail. All this is wrong. Suppose that this Parliament decided that the Government was not to proceed with that telegraph as a Government work. Who would pay for these supplies? The question is asked only to show what a vicious principle it is for the Government, without authorization to incur bills on the faith that by and by this House will pass a vote for them amounting in all to $160,000. The grave questions which are to be settled in this connection, make it fair to ask that this vote shall not be pressed to a conclusion at this hour in the morning. I do not ask to have business retarded—not at all. There are dozens of items in the supplementary Estimates which we can go on with, which are not of this importance, and which do not involve these large questions. What I did was simply to say that the Minister of Finance would better deal with the question itself and get on better with business, if he would allow this item to stand, and go on with other items which are not so large in regard to the principles involved.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman think he could enforce his view any more clearly or strongly than he has done now?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I could enforce my view in a full House. I do not think that four o'clock in the morning is the best time for doing it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did the hon. gentleman not enforce his view in a full House this afternoon?

Mr. FOSTER. That was quite a different question. It was not the initial question. When you take a vote for a telegraph line, you make it impossible for the House to debate whether they shall make a Government work of it or leave it to a private corporation; and that is the question which I do not think ought to be forced at this hour of the morning. I am willing to stay here just as long as hon. gentlemen wish and debate these questions; but I simply state that as a fair thing to be done. Before this vote is passed, we ought certainly to see the instructions that have been given to Mr. Charleson, and the division between the amount for river improvements and the amount for surveys and telegraph lines. After that, if hon. gentlemen want to take up other items of the Estimates, I am at their service. Though it hurts me as well

as others to do that, still I am willing to do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. One would suppose, to listen to the hon. gentleman, that the Government never constructed telegraph lines in the North-west before, but left them to private companies. Years ago we constructed extensive telegraph lines in the North-west as Government works.

Mr. FOSTER. We have built a Government railway, the Intercolonial; but that does not settle the argument, or imply that the Government shall undertake to build 500 miles or more railway without asking the consent of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is quite true, but the hon. gentleman says that this line ought to be constructed by a company. Why change at this particular juncture the policy that has been followed for the last twenty years? My hon. friend will admit, and I think the entire Dominion will admit, that it was an absolute necessity in the interest of trade that we should have telegraphic communication with the Yukon district as rapidly as possible; and the Government engaged a company that was supposed to be in a position to build that line; but after four months, the company had literally done nothing, and the Government undertook the construction of the line themselves. Now, the ex-Minister of Finance has contended that it is wrong to employ Mr. Charleson, and alleges that the father bought supplies from his son. Now, what is the fact? The Deputy Minister of Public Works states that prices were asked for the wire that was supplied, and that the lowest price was quoted by an American firm. Whether it was got through Charleson of Ottawa, a son, or other relative of this man, we do not care. The Government got the wire at the lowest price quoted by any firm in Canada, England or the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have got the word of the Deputy Minister of Public Works that such is the fact.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not care whether the Minister of Public Works states it or not, he could have got it cheaper.

Mr. FOSTER. He only asked three people.

Mr. McMULLEN. He got it at the lowest price. My hon. friend would also lead us to suppose that Mr. Charleson bought a large quantity of supplies from his son in Ottawa. How much was bought? Not over $40 worth altogether—12 kegs of nails; and there was not much chance of boodle in that. The hon. gentleman has tried to make a mountain out of a mole hill. I do not say that the Government should not see that appropriations are made for carrying out public works; but there are exceptions to all rules. Here was a pressing emergency for the immediate constrution of a telegraph line to the Yukon district, and the people of this country will endorse the action of the Government in trying to provide that communication at the earliest possible moment. The wire was bought on the best of terms and a small supply of other goods not amounting to $40, in which there was no room for any boodling.

Mr. BERGERON. It was not $40 but $13,000 that was put in the hands of Mr. Charleson to spend.

Mr. McMULLEN. That will be accounted for, and if not properly accounted for, then will be the proper time to take action.

Mr. BERGERON. Parliament never authorized this in any shape or form. Even if the Government could say: True, we spent this money without the authority of Parliament, but we had to do it, and here are the vouchers, and everything was had at the cheapest rate by tender. But we have not the accounts, and the hon. gentleman himself was much more exacting when on this side, and would not allow the Government to get a cent of public money without knowing where it was to be expended.

Mr. EDWARDS. How is that to be found out at this moment?

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask the Minister of Finance to leave that item stand until we have got the information we are entitled to.

Mr. EDWARDS. It would take months.

Mr. BERGERON. In his own business would the hon. gentleman pay out $25,000 without knowing where it was going. Where would those fine works be at Rockland if he did business on that principle?

Mr. EDWARDS. It is not a parallel case at all.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course not. Spending Edward's money and the public money is not the same thing. I would ask the Minister of Finance to let the item stand until we get the information the House is entitled to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is asking us to wait two or three months until Mr. Charleson returns from the Yukon and we can get a full statement from him. This expenditure is of a character which must be entrusted to some person. The hon. gentleman thinks that Mr. Charleson is not a proper person, but what is the sense of postponing the vote. All the information which can be had, the Deputy Minister says he has given.

Mr. FOSTER. The letter of instructions ought to be here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The instructions must be to a large extent indefinite—to lay a telegraph line to an unknown country.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman state now how the department have reached the conclusion that $25,000 are needed. He will not contend that it is unreasonable for us to expect that the department should be in possession of sufficient information to guide him in fixing the sum to be expended. And that discussion, as my hon. friend sees, has been entirely fruitless. Nobody seems able to give us the information as to the sum that was necessary. I do not mean that a definite fixed sum should be named, but it should be given within some limit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From the nature of the vote the amount could not be fixed or definite. The Minister of Public Works could not tell how many miles of telegraph line could be built or how much dredging could be done up to the 1st of July. This money is to pay for work now actually going on. The Minister now, under the advice of his officers, must make the best rough estimate he can, but nothing definite can be known until the work is done. If I thought there is any information that could be brought down at a subsequent time that cannot be brought down now, I would agree to the request. But I know it cannot be done, so what is the use. We have had this long sitting and have passed just three items—$7,000 in all.

Mr. BERGERON. But this $25,000 is only the commencement——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But we must bring down another amount in the Supplementary Estimates for next year, and there will be further opportunities for discussing it.

Mr. BERGERON. But the hon. Minister of Finance has put the case as clearly as possible. We are starting on a large scale and do not know where we are going. We are asked to vote $25,000 without any data from the engineer or anybody. The Minister of Public Works has given $13,000 to Mr. Charleson, a man—I am prepared to say it, if I alone express the opinion—in whom I have no confidence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the hon. Minister of Public Works has confidence in him.

Mr. BERGERON. That amounts to nothing with me, for I have no confidence in the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) were in office the present Minister of Public Works would have no confidence in him.

Mr. BERGERON. But I would not ask for $25,000 if I could not explain what it was for.

Mr. EDWARDS. But if you could not explain ?

Mr. BERGERON. If I were in office I would not dare to come before the Parliament of Canada without being able to explain all about the money I wanted. This $25,000, we are told, is the commencement of some $160,000. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is an old parliamentarian, knows that if we accept this we accept the principle.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not ask you to accept it ; you can put yourself on record against it.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman means that we can divide the House. But we know what that means—that we shall be voted down by sixty majority. Hon. gentlemen opposite will vote anything. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) will vote $25,000 of the public money without knowing where it goes. but he could not do it in his own concern. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to have a short memory. We remember how my hon. friend from North Wellington kept us here for 48 hours over a vote of $16,000 to build a post office at La Prairie. It may have been a bad vote, but every detail from the first stone of the foundation to the last nail in the roof was before the House. And here we are asked to vote almost double that as the beginning of a much greater expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. And the money has already been spent.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and without the authority of Parliament. And we have heard correspondence this afternoon that indicates that the Minister of Public Works, without consulting his colleagues, has taken money from different appropriations, a thing he had no right to do, cheating and deceiving the Auditor General, and devoting that money to a telegraph line, concerning the beginning of which we know a little, and concerning the end of which we know nothing. And the hon. Minister of Public Works puts $13,000 in the hands of whom ? An engineer ? No, Mr. Charleson is not an engineer. A man who knows about building telegraph lines ? No. A man who, in Quebec, where he is known, has not the confidence of anybody ; an election heeler ; a man who is good in election contracts to go around bribing people ; a very intelligent man, but one who does not carry the confidence of the people among whom he is known. Where has that money gone ? My hon. friend from North Wellington said that only $40 of it was spent in Ottawa. Where is the rest ? And yet my hon. friend (Sir

Louis Davies), a man of fairness, an honest man, asks us to vote this large amount without further information. I say this is not treating the representatives of the people as they should be treated. And this is done by a Liberal party that claims to be a part of the world-wide Liberal party which plumes itself of having won and defended and maintained the rights of the people. It seems to me the proposition I made is a fair one, and I repeat it—to leave this item over and go on with other business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are you opposed to building a telegraph line to the Yukon ?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend knows that that is not the question. We are here to see that things are done in a parliamentary way. Why did not the Minister of Public Works say last year that it was to build a telegraph line from such and such a place ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Public Works at that time hoped that the work would be done by private enterprise, and the Government favoured that, and it was not until it became apparent that private enterprise was not going to carry out the work, and that the people of the Yukon were to be left without telegraphic communication for another year, that the Government determined to grapple with this question and put it through ; and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) will take the responsibility of attempting to defeat this enterprise. The hon. member for Victoria is more responsible, and his constituents will know it, than any other man in this Dominion for this attempt to thwart the carrying out of that telegraphic communication.

Mr. PRIOR. Have I said one word in regard to this since we went into Supply ?

Tht MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know whether you said anything or not. What has the hon. gentleman been doing while sitting here all night ? He is an ex-member of the Government, a leading man of the Opposition, and is he not here among the leaders of the small band who are preventing this vote going through ?

Mr. PRIOR. Have I stopped it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What have you been doing here all night ?

Mr. PRIOR. Sitting here, like the men behind you.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you in favour of it ?

Mr. PRIOR. No, I am not.

Mr. WALLACE. I am ready to tell the Minister of Customs that I am opposed to this item, and I am opposed to the corrupt principle involved in it. I was a member of the Committee on Railways and Canals that gave the two charters and approved of the construction of that line when the Minister of Customs was not there. I have endorsed the principle of opening up our country in every proper way, but does that mean that I am to endorse every scheme of plunder and all illegal acts that the Government has committed ? There is a desire for plunder, and the public mind is being filled with the idea that there are men in that Government, and behind that Government, whose aim and object it is to plunder the people of this country.

Mr. FROST. Give the names of the men behind the Government who want to plunder the country.

Mr. WALLACE. Their name is legion. Does not the member for North Leeds know that there is scarcely one of his colleagues that is not looking for an office of some kind ?

Mr. FROST. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been any distributions of timber limits ?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know that the Government has any timber limits.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was none left.

Mr. WALLACE. But I know there has been a distribution of mining claims that are worth tens of thousands of dollars, and dredging river claims. I know that a prostitute in the Yukon district was given a mining claim for a $10 or $20 deposit, and sold it out for $60,000, and the Government think that is a splendid transaction.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do you speak from personal knowledge ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am telling what the records have disclosed in Parliament, and the hon. member will find still further disclosures before many days are past. I say that the country is watching the actions of these hon. gentlemen, men who have been the enemies of this country, men who are trying to smash confederation, the repealers of the union, the men who denounced confederation. They have now got into the citadel, and what are they doing ? They are insidiously attempting to break up the fabric of confederation, now that they are inside, the same as they did when they were outside. They are also attempting to feather their own nests. We know that, when we see Ministers of the Crown who were bankrupt the day before they came into the Government, and who are to-day rolling in wealth and luxury. I would like the hon. Minister or the lynx-eyed watchman who

was on this side of the House, the hon. member for North Wellington, who has shut his eyes to all the iniquities, because he is looking for a position himself——

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not true.

Mr. BERGERON. That is unparliamentary.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will withdraw the statement, but it is certainly altogether aside from the truth.

Mr. WALLACE. What are the principal features of this proposition? They require some consideration. The important question is: What is to be the policy of the Government? Is it to be the policy of the Government to start in building telegraph lines? The hon. member for North Wellington said that this was the old policy of the Government, that for the last twenty years they had been building telegraph lines all over the country. I beg to differ with him. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie when they were undertaking, as a Government, to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, built telegraph lines in advance of the railway which was quite consistent, as it was necessary that they should build these lines, but since the time of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway passed out of the Government the Government has ceased not absolutely to construct telegraph lines, but has practically ceased from the construction of these lines. The line to Battleford was built in advance of the railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway run from Calgary to Edmonton?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether that is the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a baby question; any child ten years old knows that it is not the main line.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend says that they only built telegraph lines for the Canadian Pacific Railway. They built a line from Calgary to Edmonton before the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was thought of.

Mr. WALLACE. I said nothing of the kind. I said that the Government at the time they were undertaking to build the Canadan Pacific Railway, built telegraph lines in advance of it. They built a telegraph line to Battleford intending that the railway should run to Battleford. The telegraph line was built, but the railway is not built this day to Battleford.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They built a line all the way down towards Labrador.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not a telegraph line in ordinary acceptation of the term. It is a line for the protection of vessels in connection with navigation, in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and not a commercial telegraph line.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you opposed to the opening of telegraphic communication with the Yukon?

Mr. WALLACE. I say no, I am not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the question involved here.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the question involved here.

Mr. WALLACE. The question is what is to be the policy of the Government? Are they going into the construction of telegrapn lines as a commercial undertaking? Have they got a single line in Canada to-day for that purpose?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Where.

Mr. DAVIS. The one running to Battleford. It does not pay for the "grease of the wheels." I mentioned that line that had been constructed in advance of the railway twenty years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was constructed in 1880. What is the use of talking about it. That is the line from Battleford to Edmonton.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not speaking of the line from Battleford to Edmonton.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, the hon. gentleman spoke of a line built from Battleford to Edmonton.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, would you kindly exercise your power and prevent these continued interruptions. This is an attempt to prevent free discussion in this House. I do not think we will permit that. The policy of the Government has not been declared. They have not come before this House to say whether they are going into the business of constructing a telegraph line from somewhere in American territory and running it into Canadian territory. They did not come before us and say: We are going to sink a cable from our northern possessions in the Yukon down to Victoria, or some point on Vancouver Island. They did not come and state their policy, but they sent a man up there without an Order in Council, without the instruction of the Government. Somebody sends him. Who was it? The master of the situation. The man who has left to-day for Europe,—the hon. Minister of Public Works. Before an Order in Council is passed, before a single particle of authority was given by the Government, the expedition is organized, supplies are purchased every preparation is made and they start on their journey on the 11th

of March. An Order in Council is passed two days later, and Parliament meets three days later, and there is not a word to Parliament about it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it is in the Governor General's speech.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I did not read it, and I would like to see it. The Governor General's speech was delivered on the 16th of March, and anyway this expedition started out without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. PRIOR. The Governor General's speech was after they made up their minds to do the work.

Mr. WALLACE. Here is the information we have in the Governor General's speech :

> It has been thought expedient in the public interest to authorize the construction of a line of telegraph for the purpose of maintaining speedy communication with the people of these distant territories.

It does not say where this line is to commence or where it is to end, or the means by which this communication is to be given. Even to-day we are vouchsafed no information as to the policy the Government will pursue in respect to it. I should think these gentlemen on the Treasury benches would blush at the correspondence read this afternoon by our hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), and at the violated pledges made by a Minister to the Northern Telegraph Company. The Government tell us now that their object is to give speedy telegraph communication with Dawson, but I do not know that sending out a man with $13,000 is the way to build a telegraph line very speedily. We find that this man Charleson is sent out with nine or ten men, and it is stated that Charleson never built a mile of telegraph line in his lifetime. Can any Minister inform us as to that.

The ordinary business rule to be followed, when you have a certain work to be done, is to give it to a man who understands that work. But this Government, when they want any dredging done, go to a newspaper man in the one case and a tailor in another. They get any and every sort of men to do their work without regard at all to their qualifications, but solely from some political motive. In this case the Government did not even take the precaution of asking Parliament to vote the money, but they took the money out of the appropriations for another purpose altogether, and handed it over to Mr. Charleson to be spent by him at his sweet will and pleasure, and when we ask for some details, we are told that the whole thing was on a grandly indefinite scale and that it is utterly absurd to expect any information whatever. The whole history of this business is very peculiar. We find the Minister of Railways and Canals pledging his faith and the faith of the Government to a private company which had obtained a charter for this work. But after that company had been organized and had made its contracts for the material and was prepared to push the work speedily through, the Minister of Public Works decided to take a hand in the enterprise and he quietly brushed the Minister of Railways aside and undertook to do the whole business between himself and Mr. Charleson. Evidently there is a higher power in the Cabinet than the Minister of Railways and Canals or the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Customs, for I cannot believe that the Minister of Customs, of all men, would be a party to such a scheme, such a deliberate violation of the pledge of the Government, and of the unwritten law of the country, that when we give a company a charter to do a certain work we should give that company a fair chance to perform the work. The Minister of Public Works, however, organized his scheme, equipped Mr. Charleson, furnished him with money to buy supplies, and then, after the money had been spent, gets an Order in Council to authorize its expenditure.

The country will look with alarm upon the record of these transactions in Parliament. They will come to the conclusion that the Government are ignoring Parliament, and showing their utter contempt for their supporters sitting behind them, and these hon. gentlemen are sinking their individuality and their freedom, because they are looking out for offices for themselves and quartering their relatives on the country. The Government know that they do not need to consult these gentlemen. The Minister of Public Works on the 13th of March got his Order in Council passed. He came into Council, and he had an appropriation to get. I can imagine the amazement of his colleagues when he told them that he proposed the construction of this telegraph line ; and when they objected and said, "We do not want to engage in the construction of telegraph lines, and Canada has not a dollar to appropriate for that purpose," the Minister of Public Works swept away these objections in a moment by saying, "I have settled the whole matter already ; the expedition have gone out under the charge of Mr. Charleson ; they reached Winnipeg two days ago, and I now want the Order passed." I would like to see what convinced the members of the Government. I would like to see the instructions given to Mr. Charleson. Were they go-as-you-please instructions ? "You start for the Yukon, and all you have to do is to build telegraphs or do anything else you like ; but be sure to get a few good mining claims for the boys." I presume that was the instructions that carried conviction to the Ministers. The Minister of Finance complained a while ago that the instructions had not been asked for. Would it be considered an impertinence if I were now to repeat the question in the humblest way, what were Mr. Charleson's instructions ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will you wait for the answer ?

Mr. WALLACE. I will sit down and wait till the document is read.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Sit down, then. The hon. member for York, N.B., in speaking a little while ago covered considerable ground ; and if I did not reply to my hon. friend, it was only because he repeated what had already been said over and over again. The hon. member for Beauharnois, at great length, contended that hon. gentlemen opposite had demanded information, and could not get a particle of information as to where this telegraph line began or ended, or anything else. All that was a freak of the hon. gentleman's imagination. I think I can say that every fair question that has been asked on this subject during the whole night has been answered, and that the only information that was not produced and that could not be produced at the moment was the letter of instructions to Mr. Charleson. I admitted the request for those instructions to be a proper request, although I did not think it could be obtained at the moment ; but one of the officials was sent to the department and got the document, which I have and will read ; and if hon. gentlemen will compare the terms of the instructions with the imaginings which have been indulged in as to their character, they will find the comparison interesting. I may say that the Minister reported to Council on this subject on the 3rd of March, the matter was discussed repeatedly, and the Order in Council was not actually signed till the 13th. This letter, which is signed by Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister, by direction of the Minister, is dated the 10th of March, and is addressed to Mr. Charleson. It is as follows :—

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, March 10th, 1899.

Sir,—The hon. the Minister, having decided upon the construction of a telegraph line to connect with Dawson City, in the Yukon district, and the improvement of the waterways now being used as a route to reach the same city, has directed me to inform you that he has been pleased to place you in charge of the party which is to proceed immediately to undertake the construction of the said telegraph line and execute the improvements recommended to be made on the rivers, &c., forming the water route above referred to.

The report made by the hon. the Minister to the hon. the Privy Council, a copy of which is hereto annexed, describes at some length the steps to be taken in order to achieve the object sought by the Government, and you may consider the report in question as being part and parcel of the instructions sent to you, and utilize the same for your guidance.

In a concise way, the works which you are hereby instructed to undertake and carry to completion, may be summarized under the following heads :—

1st. The construction of a telegraph line from a point on the Canadian territory at the head of Lake Bennett, following the shores of that lake and following the lakes and rivers up to Dawson City.

2nd. The examination for a telegraph line connecting at a point on Lake Bennett, to be selected by you, and reaching through the Atlin district, to the head of Teslin Lake, then going southwards to Telegraph Creek to Hazleton, and connecting with the Government telegraph line at Quesnelle.

3rd. The improvement of the rivers enumerated in the annexed report, and also in the report of the chief engineer of Public Works, a copy of which I have also annexed to the present instructions.

4th. The construction at Dawson City of buildings that may be decided upon as absolutely necessary, after consultation with Mr. Ogilvie, the administrator of the Yukon territory.

5th. The examination, while the line of telegraph is being constructed, of the country lying alongside the water route to Dawson City, with a view to the possibility of constructing a road through that section.

For the purpose of carrying on the works contemplated, the following officers have been detailed to accompany you to assist you in having the works performed, viz. :

For the works to be done in the rivers—Mr. J. C. Taché, an assistant engineer of the department here, with a salary at the rate of $2,800 per year, with, as his assistant, Mr. Aurélien Boyer, at a salary of $150 per month.

For the construction of the telegraph line—Mr. J. F. Richardson, hitherto connected with the Canadian Pacific Telegraph offices, at the rate of $2,500 per year.

The gentlemen above named have been instructed to report to you in order that you may give them the necessary instructions, and they will receive from you from the time of their departure, to-morrow, until such time as they will return after the completion of the work, all the instructions of any nature whatsoever concerning their personal movements, the work to be performed, the materials to be purchased and the men to be engaged, in fact all the instructions which it will be necessary for them to receive.

They will not be allowed, unless previously authorized by you on a proper requisition to purchase any materials, engage any men, fix any salaries, determine any route to be followed or work to be performed, and any expenditure incurred by them under your authority will have to be supported by proper vouchers, which will be duly transmitted to you, certified by you, and, in turn, transmitted to this department to be used as vouchers for the expenditure so made.

By direction of the hon. the Minister, letters of introduction, which are herein inclosed, have been obtained from the hon. the Minister of the Interior to Mr. William Ogilvie, administrator of the Yukon, from the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence to the officer commanding the military contingent in the district, and from the controller of the North-west Mounted Police to the officers commanding the various posts on the route, and those various officials will be expected to render you all the services and give you all the co-operation which you will require for the performance of the work entrusted to you.

For the improvement of the rivers, it is suggested that the engineer, Mr. Taché, will first begin his operations on the Thirty-Mile River, then on the Five-Finger and Rink Rapids, and later on on the Six-Mile River and at Caribou Crossing on Lake Bennett.

For that purpose you will have to provide the necessary dynamite for blasting the rocks that

have to be removed, as well as the tools required for the removing of the pieces of rock after blasting.

As there is also a wing-dam to be constructed at Caribou Crossing, it will be necessary that Mr. Taché be equipped with the requisite tools for manufacturing the timber required, should there not be, as perhaps probable, any lumber mills in the vicinity.

While these works shall be in course of execution, and well taken in hand by trustworthy persons, under the guidance of the engineer, it will be advisable for you to direct Mr. Taché, during the course of the summer to examine with attention the other portion of the lakes and rivers where no work is now ordered to be performed, in order that we may ascertain what additional work may be required and may have to be preformed either during next summer or during the succeeding summer season.

As regards the telegraphic construction, as it is desirable that sections of the line be put in operation as soon as practicable after the construction of the pole and wire line, you will please arrange for the necessary material to be forwarded at once, in order that as soon as a stretch of 35 or 45 miles is completed, the same can be operated for the convenience of the travellers and of the Government service on the route of the line. It might also be advisable, should it be found by you that the authorities of the White Pass Railway will not reach the head of Lake Bennett early this season, that you should construct a line of telegraph south-westerly from the head of Lake Bennett, either to connect with the telegraph service of the railway, at its present terminus, or at Skagway itself, the construction on American territory having been arranged in 1897, as you will see by the annexed correspondence which took place between the Colonial Office in England and the Government of Canada.

As regards the tariff to be fixed for the use of the telegraph line, it has been, after discussion with the superintendent of the telegraph service, decided to fix it on the basis of 50 cents for 100 miles of telegraph for 10 words, and a proportionate rate for the shorter sections, or say, a rate of $2.75 from Dawson to the foot of Lake Bennett and 15 cents per word additional.

This is a point, however, upon which you may have a consultation with Mr. Ogilvie and his Council, as soon as there is sufficient length of line constructed to bring up the question of tariff.

It is the desire of the hon, the Minister that you should proceed to Dawson City as directly as possible, taking, however, the time to arrange for your men, provisions, &c., at Vancouver and Skagway. See at the latter place about arranging for either and interchange of telegraphic messages with the White Pass Company or for establishing our own line to Skagway ; arrange there or at Skagway for the transportation of the materials, men, &c. ; see that your telegraph superintendent, Mr. Richardson, will be in condition, with the necessary number of men, to begin work within the least possible time at the head of Bennett ; see also that engineer is set to work on the Thirty-Mile River, and then proceed on to Dawson.

This course which is mapped out, will naturally be subject to variations which circumstances may appeal to you to make as you may proceed on your journey.

I have been instructed to place in your hands on your departure the sum of $15,000, which will be handed to you by the accountant in several cheques of various amounts, and whatever portion of the same will remain in your hands when reaching Dawson, you will kindly deposit in the Bank of Commerce, now in operation in that place.

That is to say after a vote has been given.

Mr. BERGERON. No, that is not it. It means that he can draw for more money whenever he wants it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It means that after the vote has been given money will be provided. That is the understanding in the department and no other arrangement has been made.

The hon. the Minister will arrange that you will be enabled to draw on the branch of the Bank of Commerce at Dawson after the funds now given to you shall have been expended, such further sums as may, from time to time, be required for the performance of the works herein outlined.

It is the desire of the hon. Minister that you should, during the course of your journey to Dawson, as often as practicable, keep the department informed of the progress of your journey and of the work, and that you will use all your energy in having completed, before the season of navigation, the works on the rivers which must be performed on the ice, and have the others completed as soon as possible afterwards.

As for the telegraph line from Bennett to Dawson, communication is expected to be obtained by wire between Dawson and Skagway no later than the beginning of November next, and, if possible, earlier.

Of course, the nature of the work you have to perform is, of a necessity, only outlined in these instructions. It would be idle to go into special details, a great deal of the country to be travelled over being still unexplored, but the hon. the Minister relies on your past experience to see that advantage be taken of everything to ensure the work being well carried out.

If possible, your vouchers for the materials, purchases, salaries of men, &c., &c., should be despatched to headquarters here at least every two or three months, and your reports oftener, if at all practicable.

You will kindly instruct the officials detailed to accompany you on this work that they are not to engage, while under the service of the department, in any speculations, purchase of mining property, mining rights, timber limits, &c., &c., and you will notify them that they will be subject to immediate dismissal from the service of the department if they contravene this order.

I would also advise that you would instruct them that no interviews are to be granted by them to newspaper representatives in reference to the details of the work to be performed by them, or giving any information whatsoever concerning the nature of the duties that they are now entrusted with.

Your salary, as chief of this expedition under the present instructions, will be $4,000 per year.

I have only now, on behalf of the department, to wish you to get safely through the work which you have been entrusted with, and hope that we will all have reason to congratulate ourselves upon the performance of the same.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. GOBEIL,

Deputy Minister.

J. B. Charleson, Esq.,
Department of Public Works,
Ottawa.

I beg to say that I regard that as a very admirable letter of instruction, carrying out everything that any member of this House could desire.

Mr. FOSTER. The letter is a long one and most important one and its production now shows how important it was that we should have had it when we commenced to discuss this vote. The basis of the operation is laid down in it. The Minister himself did not know it—of course he could not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I answered every question asked me.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister did not know the plan of operations and could not be expected to, as it is not in his department. But if he had brought that letter—and the department should have furnished him with it—early in the discussion, we should have had much more information than we have been able to go upon. I am not unreasonable in asking for information. When a Minister is asked for information he should bring it down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This information was asked for late in the night.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked for it early. "Hansard" will show that. There is one other piece of information that has been promised by the Minister—duplicates of bills contracted here in the city. I am not going to ask the hon. Minister to produce them during this sitting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not them, but will apply for them.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to say that this vote shall not pass until you have the return vouchers from Mr. Charleson, that would take a long while. The matter which has been discussed may seem trivial to hon. gentlemen opposite, but these departures from appropriations which we have pretty thoroughly discussed during the sitting we have had are very important in my opinion. Whenever hon. gentlemen undertake to make appropriations for themselves without regard to Parliament and engage in business of this kind in the very teeth of Parliament, they may expect a protest from this side of the House, and it will be a protest which will be determined and long and as sturdy as we can make it. We cannot do otherwise and do our duty. I am not going to prophesy but I take it as a matter of assured fact that the doctrines laid down by gentlemen opposite with regard to the diversion of these votes are such as will not be assented to by this country. You cannot carry on Government if you are going to change these appropriations as you please. The hon. gentlement need not expect that they can make appropriations for themselves and violate these rules and then come to us and say: Pass this, and it will be passed. We have a duty to perform, and we will do it if it takes us a long time. I speak for myself, and, I think I speak for gentlemen on this side, we are not opposing this because we are opposed to the opening of telegraphic communication with the Yukon territory. It is simply folly to put that forward as a serious argument. I take the full responsibility of opposing this vote because of the manner in which this affair has been conducted. Speaking for myself alone without binding others, I am opposed to the Government undertaking this when a commercial corporation is willing to take it up and complete the work without expense to the country, giving the country the benefit of reasonable rates for Government dispatches. I am opposed to the powers given to gentlemen like Mr. Charleson in this matter—but it would take hours to discuss that. It would be necessary also to see in print and properly understand these instructions and know how far they go. So far as I am concerned, and I am sure all on this side, do not propose, further than entering our protests against the method shown in this case, to obstruct this vote. We are not obstructing it and have not obstructed it. We have discussed this matter on principle and as thoroughly as we could. Hon. gentlemen, therefore, can take this vote, and having taken it, I hope we shall be allowed to go and get breakfast and prepare for the day's work. Before the next item referring to this work comes up, we want these full reports of Mr. Coste and the engineers upon which this has been undertaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Are they not down. I think they are upon the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear that. If there are engineers' reports on the plans I think we have a right to have them.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) saw fit to make an attack on me and accused me of being the main cause of this vote being so long in passing the committee. The hon. gentleman said he would take good care that my constituents knew I had done my utmost to prevent the building of a telegraph line into the Yukon. I hope he will do what he can to let every one know that I took part by my presence in the effort to get further information with regard to this matter. Every one of my constituents, I know, will back me up in what I have done in attempting to show up this most outrageous proceeding on the part of this Government. I am not going to say anything further than this. When the hon. gentleman said I had been taking part in the discussion he said something wide of the facts. Since I brought the matter up this afternoon I had not opened my mouth until this moment. No threats of the hon. gentleman will stop me from doing my duty in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. I am ready to submit to the judgment of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), but, I desire to say that I hope this thing will not happen again and that we will not find ourselves in the same position that we are in now. I want to emphasize what my hon. friend has said that it is a pity that we should wait until six o'clock in the morning for the information which the hon. Minister of Finance should have given us if he had taken the pains to get it about five hours ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not asked for five hours ago.

Mr. BERGERON. We have asked for every possible thing under the sun. I think I am covering the ground pretty well. This letter, which apparently satisfied the hon. member for York, N.B., does not satisfy me. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works has dictated that letter, and I know what it means. It seems to me that we should have been in possession of more information in regard to the whole question. I want to get at the facts and to show what kind of a transaction the whole thing is. I will ask the hon. Minister of Finance now, as that letter says that Charleson is to let them know and what he has done, if he can give us any information as to what he has done since he was given this $13,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I read a telegram from Charleson before the hon. gentleman came in.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the date of that telegram ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 25th of May.

Mr. BERGERON. When did Mr. Charleson leave ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the 11th of March.

Mr. BERGERON. You have had one telegram from him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are several earlier reports.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are they ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have not been askd for.

Mr. BERGERON. How can we ask for reports when we did not know until that letter was read that these reports had been made. I am convinced that the whole transaction is a bad one, and I want to find out by the mouth of the hon. gentleman that it is a bad transaction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid it is hopeless to expect me to persuade the hon. gentleman that it is a bad transaction.

Mr. BERGERON. We want these reports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These reports are on file and I have torn one of them out of the official books and placed it on the Table. I will have copies made and bring them down at a later stage, but I do not think it is reasonable to take them out of the official files.

Mr. WALLACE. When these hon. gentlemen came here and asked for an appropriation of $25,000 they should be prepared to give the fullest information as to the scheme that they have on hand. An Order in Council was passed on the 13th of March after the whole expedition was organized and on its way up there. It is not doing justice to Parliament, or to the country, or to the Ministers themselves, unless there is something, or something that they want to hide behind it, and we are not anxious to have the Government branded with such imputations as that. We have the document read giving instructions to Mr. Charleson. This is the most extraordinary document, I venture to say, in all the records of Parliament from confederation down to the present day. Mr. Charleson is told to dredge all the rivers he can find, almost any place, to remove the boulders, to carry dynamite, to construct a telegraph line from Lake Bennett to Dawson City, then to build a line to Teslin Lake, and from Teslin Lake to Quesnel—hundreds and hundreds of miles of telegraph line. All he has to do is to go ahead for two or three months and see how much money he can expend. He is told that ample provision will be made for him.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Mr. Chairman, do you not think that we might come to some conclusion and adjourn. We are wasting a great deal of time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has the floor.

Mr. WALLACE. The Chairman is a little ahead of his time, because the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) got up to make a statement to which I did not object, and, as I did not object, it was not the province of the Chairman to object. I say that such extreme powers have never been conferred on public officials as those that the hon. Minister of Public Works has given to Mr. Charleson. There is practically no limit to the power of spending money.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why not let the item pass as the information has been produced.

Mr. WALLACE. Producing this document does not give a justification for passing the item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not make a particle of difference whether the item passes or not.

Mr. WALLACE. When the hon. Minister of Finance read that telegram to the House with a triumphant air, we were not expecting that there were other reports beside that. We are told now, that Mr. Charleson has made several reports. Well, we would like to see those reports. Is it wrong to ask the Government to furnish us with the reports they have received as to the progress of the work, how much money Mr. Charleson has expended, how much more money they want, and also the fullest information as to the policy of the Government in the construction of these works? In listening to that document I was unable to find a single limit placed on Mr. Charleson's power to spend money. It gives him the most ample powers in that respect ever given to an official of the Government. I think, after the disclosures made by this document, we require a little breathing spell.

Mr. EDWARDS. In the few years that I have had the honour of a seat in this House I must say that this is the most extraordinary case I have ever known—not so far as the case is concerned, but so far as the Opposition is concerned. We had an all-night sitting in 1889 or 1890, at a time when Sir Hector Langevin, who was Minister of Public Works, refused to give information which was in his possession. We sat till nine or ten o'clock, when Sir John Macdonald was sent for.

Mr. BERGERON. He carried his point, at any rate.

Mr. EDWARDS. He did not carry his point. The Opposition on that occasion carried its point. What have we here to-day? We have had a discussion for the whole night, not for the production of documents which the Government have refused to produce; nothing of the kind, but condemning the principle on which this line is being built. In this case, unusual means are required for the carrying out of this work. From the explanations which we have had from the Ministers of the Crown, I say that the means by which the Government are proceeding to build this line are perfectly justifiable, and the country will justify its construction. Now, what in the world is the sense, so far as the construction of this line is concerned, of asking for information that cannot be given until the line is completed? There is no kind of sense in it at all, and the whole thing is obstruction and nothing else—most disgraceful obstruction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, this is the first time I have been out of order since I have had a seat in this House. I will say it is most extraordinary and nonsensical. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that none of us would go on with expenditure in this way in carrying on our own enterprises. How much do these hon. gentlemen know of such matters? We have to spend tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars on things which are reported on after the expenditure has taken place, and on business such as the construction of this line can be carried out in this way.

Mr. BERGERON. Keep it up; it is good. You are helping us now.

Mr. EDWARDS. This debate takes place all night, and the statement is made that until certain results are shown, the item shall not pass. At a later date the letter of instructions is asked for. The letter is produced, and there is not a line in that letter which changes the situation a single particle. Now, with regard to the qualifications of a man for the building of such a work, I will just say this from practical knowledge, that no man in Canada can be more qualified for it than a man who has a knowledge of the woods and the lumber trade; and so far as any little technical knowledge of building a telegraph line is concerned, it is the smallest thing in the world to get a man with that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have a special technical man engaged, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. EDWARDS. A great deal has been said about Mr. Charleson's character. As to that, I know nothing. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to know something; perhaps they have very good reason for knowing something. I do not know anything against his private character; but so far as his qualifications for carrying out this work are concerned, I think he is eminently qualified for it. As to unnecessary expenditure of money and the absence of any check upon him, I will say at once that there cannot be the immediate check on that expenditure that there would be on a work carried on here. But my opinion is that Mr. Charleson will carry out the work as expeditiously as any man in Canada. The hon. member for Beauharnois, in discussing this, put a parallel case before us, and what was it? He took the post office at Laprairie as a sample. There is a case in which you can get estimates, but in this case it was perfectly impossible to get estimates. Now, instead of having this silly nonsense of an all-night sitting, what would be perfectly justifiable on the part of the Opposition, if they thought proper to do so, would have been to move a vote of censure on the Government for the policy they have pursued in this matter. But sitting as we have done to-night is not an example of common-sense

or proper parliamentary proceedings, but an exhibition of the greatest nonsense we have ever had in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. We have just had an example of what party spirit will do with a man. My hon. friend who is a man of the greatest common-sense, makes this exhibition simply from his zeal for his party. The hon. gentleman says he knows nothing about Mr. Charleson, and then he says, "I am convinced that the gentleman is fit for his position." He has no other reason for saying that than that the Minister of Public Works said so.

Mr. EDWARDS. What I say is that a man having a knowledge of the lumber trade and of the bush business is one of the best qualified for this employment, and that I know Mr. Charleson to possess. His personal and private character has been attacked. I have not heard anything against Mr. Charleson, but I do not pretend to know anything concerning him in this respect.

Mr. BERGERON. But the hon. gentleman was satisfied to have the Minister trust $13,000 to this man about whom he knows nothing, and have him draw on the Government for any amount of money.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister knows him, no doubt.

Mr. BERGERON. And the hon. gentleman says that in his business tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent without asking a report——

Mr. EDWARDS. Let us be fair. What I said was that in such work as Mr. Charleson is doing, the lumber business for instance, tens and even hundreds of thousands of dollars must be expended, no report of which is given until after the expenditure has taken place. Our operations are too far extended—covering hundreds of miles—for reports to reach the head office until after the expenditure has been made. We have to have trusted employees to spend this money.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the very word—trusted employees. But Mr. Charleson is not a man to be trusted.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not know anything about that.

Mr. BERGERON. And yet you will support the Minister in putting practically an unlimited sum of money into this man's hands.

Mr. DAVIS. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) cannot be supposed to know everybody the Minister employs.

Mr. BERGERON. No, but, in his own business, he would not put money into the hands of a man he did not know or who was spoken against by men to whose word he should pay attention to. If any such thing as this had been done when the Conservative party were in power the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) would have stayed here for two or three days to protest against it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The country was not discovered then.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) ought to be in bed. Sitting up to this hour ages a man, and the hon. gentleman will be too old even for the Senate. Now, as to this letter that we have heard read, I admit that it is a well written letter. If the Minister of Public Works can do anything, he can write a letter. But, particularly in the case of his writings, the smoother they are and the better they read the more dangerous they are. I have here some correspondence which I shall put on "Hansard" some day; I have a letter which, though it bears the name of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, I am sure, was dictated by the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It should have been as he is responsible for it.

Mr. BERGERON. And I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) would have been glad to have had the Minister of Public Works here to take the responsibility.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we have been getting along very nicely.

Mr. BERGERON. We are enjoying it very much. But, before we leave the point we were discussing, I think my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) as a man of business should explain to us further how his business experience justifies such action as the Minister of Public Works has taken in the case of Mr. Charleson. I ask him, seriously, if he would, in his own business, put tens of thousands of dollars into the hands of Mr. Charleson and have no vouchers or any way——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) evidently thinks that Mr. Charleson should have left a bunch of vouchers before he went away.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is showing his impracticability and want of business knowledge every moment. There can be no report of expenditure, there can be no vouchers until the expenditure has taken place. But in this case, as in the others to which I have referred, every dollar entrusted to the agent is to be accounted for, and if it is not properly accounted for there will be justification for finding fault.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). Shall this item be adopted ?—carried.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend will now agree to the committee rising.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fos-

ter) will give us a few items before we rise. There are some items here that there is no reason for opposing.

Mr. FOSTER. If they are not contentious items, they will pass without a loss of time after we meet again.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the hon. gentleman should give something—I never knew a committee——

Mr. BERGERON. We have practically voted half a million now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The items voted amount to a little over $30,000.

Mr. WALLACE. But there is a million behind the last one.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the Minister of Finance make up his mind, are we going to stay longer, or are we going home?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are a couple of items in the same department, at the end of page 15, amounting to $12,900, one of which we have talked out in connection with the others.

Mr. BERGERON. Very good.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion carries would my hon. friend indicate what is to be taken up at the next sitting.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As far as I understand the right hon. Prime Minister's mind, it is his intention to go on with supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Supplementary estimates?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.30 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 22nd June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. RICHARDSON presented Fifth Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House, as follows:—

The committee recommend:

1st. That Mr. Wilfrid Larose be appointed to fill the vacancy on the staff of translators of the Official Report of the Debates at the same salary as is paid to the other members of the staff, but that for this session he be paid for his services the sum of $400.

2nd. That the clerk of the committee be paid the sum of $200 per annum from the beginning of the present session.

3rd. That Mrs. Alphonsine Raby, widow of the late Mr. A. Raby who died on the 4th instant, be paid the sum of $100, which amount he (the same as the other members of the staff) would have been entitled to receive had he lived up to the 8th instant.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the said report be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

STEAM TUG "SHAMROCK."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (by Mr. Foster) asked:

1. How much was paid, if anything, to John C. Kaine for his steam tug "Shamrock," for the buoy service between Quebec and Montreal?
2. How much was allowed, if anything, to John C. Kaine for giving up his contract when the Government took the work over?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The amount agreed to be paid to John C. Kaine for the "Shamrock," including all her appurtenances, furniture, extra gear and tackle for the buoy service, was $21,500. 2. Nothing.

BRITISH COLUMBIA STATUTES.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Has the Secretary of State received the statutes passed by the legislature of British Columbia at its last session?
2. If so, on what date were they received?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The statutes passed by the legislature of British Columbia at its last session were received by the Secretary of State on the 27th April, 1898.

THE NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House upon a statement which appeared in the columns of the "Presse," of Montreal, of the 19th instant. The article in question is to the effect that I have bought a steamer, the "City of London," to ply this year between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé. That

paper further states that the "City of London" is subsidized by the Dominion Government. I declare that the statement in question is entirely groundless so far as I am concerned. But I am free to say that it was at my special request that the Government have been subsidizing these two last years, to the extent of $5,000, the company which undertook to open through communication between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé, and I am happy to say that, owing to our efforts, that subsidy, which has been increased this year to $7,500, will be voted again this year. The contract between the Government and the North American Transportation Company is not yet signed, but I was given the assurance that it would be ratified within a few days. Although I did spend much time and energy in securing for my constituency the establishment of that line, I must declare that I have not the least interest, either directly or indirectly, with the company that is operating it.

THE YUKON LIQUOR PERMITS.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to a return brought down with reference to the correspondence on the Yukon liquor permits. No correspondence has been brought down, with the exception of that between the North-west Council and the Government and this department here. There does not appear to be any correspondence between private individuals and the department, and there seems to me there must be some correspondence of that kind.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). There is, I understand, a considerable amount of correspondence, and I called the attention of the officer of the department who is charged with the preparation of the return, to this fact. He said there was a very large number of files which had to be searched through, and he was working through them and the correspondence will be brought down as soon as possible. There are two or three bundles relating to correspondence in respect of the Yukon district, and a large amount of work is necessitated going through an enormous number of files to obtain the correspondence desired.

THE CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister of Finance found out yet whether there is any extension of that correspondence about the Central Railway in his department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I will have the file searched through, and will send over instructions to that effect.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Geological Survey—
To pay Mr. John McLeish, B.A., difference in salary between the rate of $400 per annum and $1.50 per day from 6th July to 31st December, 1897, and $400 per annum and $1.75 per day from 1st January, 1898, to 30th June, 1899, per Orders in Council of 31st January, 30th June, 1898, and 31st January, 1899, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act or any other Act..... $429 39

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The explanation of this item is as follows: The Geological Survey Act provides that certain qualifications are required of persons appointed under section 42 of that Act. The latter portion of the first clause, after providing what the qualification shall be, says that the person shall serve two years of a probationary period in the department. The director of the Geological Survey always interpreted that to mean, and assured me the intention was, that the person having the qualification, his appointment should be a probationary one. But after this increase of salary had been paid for a certain length of time, the Auditor General took objection, holding that the officer could not be appointed until he had served two years. The director was quite sure that his interpretation was correct. The matter was referred to me, and I said that the only way was to send it to the Department of Justice. This was done, and the Department of Justice decided that the Auditor General was right. I had given no attention to the matter, accepting the director's reading of the statute. The Auditor General said he must charge up against this officer's salary the amounts which he had received under the increase. I am introducing an Act for the purpose of affecting the interpretation, and I am asking this amount to cover the amount of salary the officer is entitled to. He will get $1.75 a day from the time the new Act comes into force.

Mr. FOSTER. For every day in the year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think so.

Mr. WALLACE. This provides up to the 30th of June, 1899. What will the Minister provide after that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is now being paid $400 a year. As the Auditor General charged against the increased payments which it was held could not be legally paid for some time—the officer did not get anything at all. This will place the officer in the same position as if he had been paid $1.50 for the first period and $1.75 afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has disclosed a rather odd situation. Here is a Minister who is supposed to understand the administration of his department, proposes to Council something which could not legally be done. The Minister of Justice, who sits with the hon. gentleman at Council, presumably, sanctions it, and the order is passed. The Auditor General raises objections, and when the Minister of Justice is appealed to, he decides that the Council, of which he is a member, passed an illegal order. The hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) was quite right in saying that he had not given the matter much attention. Only in that way could he absolve himself from the charge of serious lack of knowledge as to the condition of official appointments in his department. I do not take exception to the rate of salary; as I do not think it is too much for these men to receive.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman has pointed out a thing which is not unusual. I have known cases in which the courts have been acting under a certain decision for years, until some counsel challenged the accepted reading of the law. Where the judges find that they have been wrong, they do not hesitate to say so. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) experience in administration must have taught him that it is impossible for a Minister coming into a department to give a legal opinion on every statute under which he is acting. He could not even read them, to say nothing of interpreting them. The director of the Geological Survey, a thoroughly qualified officer, makes a certain recommendation. No question arises as to its being authorized by law. And so the matter goes on until the question is raised. The late Government acted under the same interpretation, and paid their officers in the same way.

Indian Affairs—Ontario and Quebec—	
To provide an additional amount for relief, medical attendance, medicines and seed grain in province of Quebec.	$1,500
To provide for the payment of 50 pupils at $60 each at the Mount Elgin Industrial School.....	3,000
To provide an amount to meet the legal expenses in the trial of the Moses brothers, Indians	830
	$5,330

Mr. BENNETT. I had intended to avail myself of the debate on the Budget to refer to the lumber question as dealt with by this Government. But as the Budget debate was closed hurriedly, I did not get an opportunity. I propose, therefore, to avail myself of the present occasion to discuss the matter briefly. I need not go into the whole question of the lumber policy of the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government; that has often been gone over in this House. But I intend to make a few remarks with respect to the inaction of the Government in not placing customs duties on lumber entering this country from the United States, and also as to the inaction of the Canadian Government in not placing an embargo on the export of logs similar to that imposed by the Ontario Government. I have not the figures under my hand showing the quantity of logs cut on Indian lands and exported during the last year.

I would point out to the House that there are two classes of logs which in the past have been shipped from the province of Ontario to the United States. First, there are those which are cut under licenses issued by the Ontario Government, and in the second place, there are logs cut under licenses issued to parties to cut on what are known as Indian reserves. We in the province of Ontario, and more particularly on the Georgian Bay, are pleased to know that the Ontario Government, by their very salutary legislation, which we hoped would have a wholesome effect on the Federal Government, have prevented the shipment to the United States of large quantities of logs, as in past years, by placing an embargo on such shipments. We had hoped that the Dominion Government would follow that example in respect to all logs cut on Indian reserves. But a little time ago, in answer to a question put by me, the Minister of the Interior stated that it was not the intention, if I recollect aright, of the Government to place a restriction on logs this year cut on Indian reserves. When I say this year, I refer to those that might have been cut in the winter of 1898-99. Now, while in the province of Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada we have had what is practically an open door to the United States to ship in here large quantities of lumber brought into daily competition with our own lumber, we have practically done nothing at all, by way of reprisal or otherwise, to meet this invasion of our own markets. The House will bear with me while I quote a few figures compiled from the Trade and Navigation Returns as to the extent of the trade done by the American people in Canada in the matter of lumber. Turning to page 524 of the returns of the present year, I find that the following large quantities of the products of the forest, and field have been brought into the province of Ontario alone. I will read a summary, which is as follows:—

	Free of Duty.	
Shingles	$19,772	
Lath	8,450	
Sawed boards (dressed on one side)	384,767	
Timber or lumber (hewn or sawed).	462,363	
Railroad ties and fence posts.....	68,236	20 p.c
Oak	484,782	
Pitch pine	295,748	
Cherry, chestnut, hickory and whitewood	227,280	
Shovel handles	16,275	
White ash	12,783	

Total of wood imports—$2,527,509.

Now, Sir, all the articles that I have enu-

merated here, or the bulk of them, are admitted into this country free of duty. On the other hand, while we are permitting the people of the United States to bring in that large quantity of material free of duty, we are subjected to the annoyance, when we attempt to enter the American market, of being met with almost prohibitory duties on our lumber. By way of comparison, I will read the following table :—

	If Imported into Canada.	If Imported into United States.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Timber or lumber of wood	Free.	
Whitewood—Sycamore and basswood	.....	1 00
Pine and other woods	.....	2 00
Additional, if planed or finished	Free.	0 50 per M.
" " and tongued and grooved	0 25 p. c. ad val.	1 00 "
" " both sides, and tongued and grooved	0 25 p. c. "	1 50 "
If any country or dependency impose export duty upon saw-logs, round unmanufactured timber, stave bolts, shingle bolts or heading bolts, or a discriminating charge on boom sticks or chains used by Americans in towing logs, the amount of such export duty, tax or other charge, shall be added as an additional duty to duties already imposed.		
Clapboards, pine or spruce	Free.	1 50 per M.
Shingles	"	0 30 "
Laths	"	0 25 per 1,000 pieces
Fence posts, railway ties, posts, rough, hewn or sawed	"	0 20 p. c. ad val.

The result of these regulations is that the lumber export trade from Canada to the United States has been greatly hampered; so much has it been hampered that we saw, in the early part of the year, a large deputation of the representative lumbermen of Georgian Bay and different portions of Ontario, gathered here to meet the Government on this question. The chief argument adduced at the time, as I understand, was the plea that the Government should admit duty free the lumber of the United States into Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Against that it was argued very strongly that the producers of lumber on the Georgian Bay were in a position, by reason of water accommodation, to ship into Manitoba and the North-west on practically as good terms as the exporter from the United States. Be that as it may, the lumbermen on the Georgian Bay strongly contend that having purchased, as they did, these timber limits at very high rates, and having now as in the past they had the United States as a market for a great deal of their surplus lumber, that trade is now stopped and that market is shut off from them. That is a special annoyance in the present year, owing to the fact that in the United States there is a great demand for lumber, according to their public press. In the Detroit "Free Press" of January 25th, of this year, a very extensive lumberman, Mr. Pitts, made the following statement :—

The fact is, we are on the verge of a lumber famine in the United States. Business is good, people are building, and the demand for lumber exceeds the supply. Before the end of 1899 lumber will go up $4 a thousand, and this will not be due to the tariff, but to better conditions throughout the country. If we are unable to get Canadian logs, there are 27 large mills from Saginaw to Cheboygan, capable of cutting 540,000,000 feet a year, that will be idle. And if these mills operate, two-thirds of their product will go through the box factories and planing-mills of Michigan towns.

Now, Sir, it would appear from that statement that the trade of Canada would be very much increased in the shipments of lumber to the United States if we had a fairer market open to us than there is at present; and it is to be regretted that the Federal Government have not seen fit to follow the lead of the local government of Ontario and place an embargo on all logs cut upon Indian lands, which would have had the result of causing a large increase in the business on the shores of the Georgian Bay. On behalf of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I would respectfully urge upon the Government that in the coming year an embargo should be placed upon all logs which are cut on Indian reserves, thereby overcoming the discrimination that now exists between the policy followed by the American Government and that followed by the provincial government of Ontario. Furthermore, I have this to say, that the Government has had ample opportunity of making a change on the question of tariff regulations on lumber as between the United States and Canada. As is shown by the returns from which I have read,

over $2,000,000 worth of the products of the forest are being imported into Canada. While I have no figures to give as to the exports to the United States, still, I think it is to be regretted that while we have these very articles in such great abundance in the country that they should be brought into direct competition with those from the United States, and if the people of the United States wish to place, as they have placed, a hostile and arbitrary tariff against Canadian lumber, it is only fair that they should be accorded similar treatment at our hands. I will give some instances of this competition. There was imported during the past year close upon $300,000 worth of pitch pine. This has been brought directly into competition with the coarser grades of lumber entering into the building of bridges and other heavy works. As to the question of manufactured lumber, or lumber dressed farther than on one side, there is an item of importation amounting to $384,000. We in Ontario can, just as well as the United States, manufacture this lumber, plane it and have it shaped and grooved, employing a large amount of labour in our own country rather than have the mortification of seeing this article imported from the United States. I can only trust that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) will not only see that during the coming winter, 1899-1900, logs cut on Indian lands shall be manufactured in Ontario, but that the Government shall so amend the customs regulations as to place on American products entering Canada at least similar duties to those now imposed against Canadian exports entering into the United States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), if he applies his argument to timber cut on Indian reserves ?

Mr. BENNETT. That is all I understand the Dominion Government have control of.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me first give an explanation of the vote as read. The first item is $1,500 to provide an additional amount for the relief, medical attendance, medicines and seed grain for Indians in the province of Quebec. The appropriation for this service, $3,600 was entirely exhausted early in April. The winter has been severe, and the demands made upon the department correspondingly heavy. In July of last year it became necessary, owing to an epidemic of measles, to send a doctor to the lower St. Lawrence to attend the Indians of Betsiamits, Mingan and Seven Islands. The cost of this service, $600, went far towards exhausting the vote, as it was unusual and unprovided for. Only two or three bands in the province of Quebec have funds from which their destitute can be provided for. In addition to medical attendance, medicines and relief, the vote bears the cost of seed grain, which is given to Indians who require it for their small fields and garden plots. As to the next item, to provide for the payment of 50 pupils at $50 each to the Mount Elgin Industrial School, I may say that we formerly paid this out of the Indian School Fund. The Indian School Fund became impaired some years ago, and then it became exhausted, and it is necessary to provide for the payment of 50 children by an appropriation of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. How many pupils are there altogether ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are 100. There is no change in the number of pupils. The old fund is exhausted, and we have to provide a fund by an appropriation of Parliament for this expenditure. The next item is $830 to provide for the legal expenses incurred at the trial of two Indians. The amount is simply to pay the fees of counsel.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was the trial ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was at Port Arthur.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the hon. Minister comes to the lumber question, I do not apprehend that there was a very extensive quantity of lumber cut on Indian reserves and shipped to the United States. I have not the figures, but my argument is not so much as to the quantity as it is to the fact that the action which I suggest will prevent the anomaly that now exists. Logs cut on Indian reserves are now entitled to be shipped to the United States, while those that have been cut on Ontario Government lands are not, and, as a result, an opportunity may perhaps be afforded of mixing logs to an extent that could not possibly arise if an embargo were placed on logs cut on Indian reserves.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As to the question of the advisability of placing some such restrictions on the manufacture of timber cut upon Indian reserves, as have been placed on timber cut on Ontario Crown lands, I quite admit that the subject is one which requires a great deal of consideration at the hands of the Government. I am quite prepared to go this far and to say that at the present time there is an incongruity in the fact that the timber policy of the two Governments in this respect is not harmonious. I think my hon. friend will admit the force of what I say when I point out to him that we are not at this moment in a position to take up, consider fully, and deal with this question. The fact is, as hon. gentlemen know, that the question of the lumber duty is one of the most important questions under consideration by the Joint Commission which is still in existence for the purpose of settling diffi-

culties between the United States and Canada, and I think hon. gentlemen will admit that while these negotiations are in progress it would not be a desirable thing for this Government to make a change in its timber policy, or in its policy upon the lumber question, because, it would be regarded in a hostile move made while the negotiations were in progress. I think my hon. friend will admit that. It is only a question of a few months and I think it will readily commend itself to my hon. friend's judgment, and to the judgment of the House, that it would be an unwise thing to unnecessarily complicate the question for the sake of a few months. There is another question in connection with it, which I think my hon. friend, as a lawyer, will at once recognize, as importing a difficulty into the Government's position upon this question. I do not wish to be misunderstood; I do not wish to be understood as laying down a proposition on this question because I have not taken the opinion of the Department of Justice upon it, as I certainly will do later. It is that we have to consider the fact that the Government in acting in connection with Indian lands is in the position of a bare trustee. The Government has no interest whatever in the timber; the Government holds the timber surrendered by the Indians as a bare trustee having no beneficial interest in it. The law is very strict as to the responsibility of a trustee as to the disposition of a property. My hon. friend, I am sure, will agree with me, that no lawyer would say off-hand, positively, that he could advise the Government without consideration, that there was no danger of liability. It is a matter to be carefully considered as to what the position of the Government would be in regard to the Indian fund, which they knew at the time they made it would certainly have the effect of depreciating the value of the timber and causing the receipts to become considerably less. So far as the timber cut on Dominion lands is concerned, our policy is not affected particularly, because we have no Dominion lands in the province of Ontario from which timber is cut. The lands, so far as I am able to say at the present time, which are affected, are absolutely Indian lands, and are held by us as trustees. In addition to that, we have to go carefully into the question of our liability to the holders of the licenses to cut. That I am not in a position to give an opinion on off-hand and without referring the question to the Department of Justice, as to whether we could make a regulation which would affect these people who have acquired timber berths at public competition. Both these questions will be considered, as soon as the reason for not dealing with them, namely, the negotiations between the two countries, is removed.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. BENNETT. As to the first reason given by the Minister, the complaint is, that, when the Ontario Government had taken the initiative, early last year, the Government here did not follow their line of policy so as to make it applicable to the logs that were cut in the past winter. I fully realize that the Government could not now, at this late hour, make the law retroactive, but they knew of the policy adopted by the Ontario Government, and they might well have followed suit. As to the question of this Government's liability to the holders of licenses, I assume that the federal licenses are in the same terms as the licenses issued by the Ontario Government, namely, that the Government at all times have the right practically to act as they please, and, consequently, if the Ontario Government had the right to make this regulation under their licenses, if the terms of the licenses be the same, the Government here would have the same right to act. As to the point taken by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that it would have been detrimental to the interests of the Indians, I can tell him that the increasing demand for stumpage on the north shore of the Georgian Bay would have the effect of producing a higher price than has heretofore obtained. If this embargo were placed all around, we would see Americans coming over, much against their own will, to manufacture on the shores of the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not profess to be familiar with the condition of the lumber market in the district referred to, but does not my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) agree with me, that the effect of such a regulation with regard to timber on Indian reserves would for some time to come at least be likely to cause a fall in the value of that timber?

Mr. BENNETT. That is a fair subject for argument. You would have the American buyer coming here, who wishes to take the logs out of the country, and you would have the Canadian buyer competing with him, who wishes to manufacture in the country. That competition would arise, owing to the demand for lumber in the United States. The contention of those conversant with the business is, that you would then have the American saw-mills located in Canada, and competing against Canadians, and, owing to the increased demand in the United States, the price would be at least as good as it is to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I never could understand the insane policy followed by both the Conservative Government and the Liberal Government with reference to this question of putting an export duty on logs. For fifteen years I have endeavoured to convince Parliament that it was most unwise that we should allow this thing to continue from year

to year. During the passage of the Dingley Bill and the passage of the Wilson Bill, we had the same argument presented to the House as has been presented by the Minister of the Interior to-day, namely: Oh, we are negotiating with the United States, and we do not want to disturb the amicable relations between the two countries, and we will hold our hand a little longer, and, if they do not do something in the United States, we will then move. That is the same old cry for the last fifteen years past.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) does not want to misrepresent me. What I said was clear. I said that I thought the question should not be dealt with until a few months hence, when the negotiations were disposed of. There was nothing in what I said which would warrant my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) in stating that I thought it was a question which should be put off indefinitely.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want to misrepresent what the hon. gentleman said, nor did I do so. I stated that, for the last fifteen years, we have had the same argument presented for delay. We were told negotiations were going on, and that nothing would be done. But, when the negotiations had passed, nothing was done still. My fear is, that, when these present negotiations are finished, the Government will follow the same policy of doing nothing as has been pursued heretofore. I never could understand the insane policy of it. To my mind, it is nothing less than insanity to allow the valuable raw material of our country to be taken out of the country in such a way that its value is destroyed to the people who own it, and its value enhanced to the people who are getting it. We are giving away a valuable asset of Canada, and getting nothing in return. I see the hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) is not paying heed to what I say. If I can get his attention, I shall continue to speak; but, if I cannot, I shall refuse. We are treated, every time we present an argument to this House, in the same way. It is not respectful to the House, nor to the member addressing the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I apologize to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I accept the apology, but I do not think the offence should be repeated so often. The Minister stated that the Government were the trustees of this valuable property for the Indians, and he argued that there was a legal question as to the right of the Government to place a restriction, because thereby it might depreciate the value of the property which the Government held in trust in the interests of the Indians. I think the loss that might be sustained in the reduced value of the logs, would be more than made up by the employment that would be given to the Indians in the manufacture of the lumber in this country; for the mills on the north shore employ a large number of these Indians. We have been told that the license-holder has a right under his license to take the logs out of the country. I do not think that is the case; and I have always held that the same rule applied to licenses issued by this Government as to provincial licenses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is one of the questions that would have to be settled by careful legal examination.

Mr. SPROULE. I am only giving the opinion that there is a reserved right in the Indian Department, just as there is in the provincial government, to make changes or impose such restrictions on license-holders, such as increasing the stumpage dues, as may be found desirable in the interest of the Indians of the country at large. But whether that is so or not, I do not think there is any justification for the great delay that has taken place in determining this question. It must be determined some time, and the earlier the better, because the product is always growing less, and after it is gone there will be no need of restrictions. There is another reason why I think this question should be considered at the present time, and it is this. I am told by parties in the locality that the privilege which license-holders have of taking logs from the Indian reserves enables them to smuggle logs belonging to the Crown Lands Department of Ontario, claiming that they are from the Indian reserves. The logs are all put into the stream together, and it is easy for these people to mix them together. I am told that to prevent logs belonging to the provincial Crown lands being taken out, the provincial government has been obliged to appoint a number of constables to patrol the district. I am told that this is a fruitful source of trouble at the present time. While these considerations apply to logs taken from the Indian reserves, I cannot see why the government do not avail themselves of the power they have of putting an export duty on logs. They undoubtedly have that power; there is no question of their jurisdiction. There is no question either of export duties being any interference with the license of a license-holder. If the same object can be accomplished in this way by the Government, without doing an illegal act to any person, why do they not avail themselves of this right? We have been allowing that country to be pirated for many years, to the detriment of the whole country, but especially to the detriment of the people living in my section, who are more particularly interested in the product. This business has been going on for the last fifteen

years, and there is no excuse for the long delay in dealing with the question. A year ago the Ontario Government were compelled to take the matter up, by the sheer force of public opinion. An election was coming on, and public sentiment was so strong that they could not avoid taking action. Both parties in the Dominion have been equally to blame for putting off the question. I do not blame the present Government more than the late Government. If they had gone through the country and had seen what was going on, they would not have waited the length of time they have done in putting on the necessary restrictions. Every day we delay dealing with the question is a day of injury and injustice done to the people in that portion of the province of Ontario, and to the people of Canada generally.

Mr. IVES. I do not intend on this item to go into the whole matter of the action of the province of Ontario, or into the question of an export duty on logs, pulp-wood and other matters, as I intend to take an early occasion on going into Supply of dealing with this question. But I think the Minister's reason for deferring action in regard to an embargo on the export of logs from the Indian reserves until the final winding up of the International Commission, is a good one. This is a comparatively small matter; and it would certainly seem to be a foolish thing to further complicate the question, in view of the early sitting of the commission, by so small a matter as the imposition of an embargo upon the export of logs from the Indian reserves. As my friends who were here in 1879, when I first came into this House, know, I have always been in favour of export duties on both logs and paper material. I think I have the honour, if it is an honour, of having moved the first resolution in the House in favour of the imposition of an export duty on logs. While I took that view of the subject at that early day, and have always insisted on it, I still think that the action of the Ontario Government was an illegal act, which, if tested in the courts, will not be sustained, and I think the present Government should have disallowed that Act. I do not see why the province of Ontario should be allowed to create other provinces of the Dominion. I think its action interfered with the question of complications which disastrously affect trade and commerce, which is beyond the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario altogether; and that action is now recognized as the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement of the lumber question by the International Commission. The Dominion Government, which has to deal with the general question of trade and commerce, should have dealt with the question of an export duty on logs, and will have to deal with it. If we do not get free lumber, or what satisfies us in the direction of free lumber, by a treaty with the United States, then the Government must act; and when they act, they must act all along the line, with reference both to logs and to paper material. If they want their action to be felt in the United States, and if they want to bring about a change of heart and policy on the part of that country, they can more easily bring that about by preventing the export of pulp material than the export of logs. They can more easily bring that about by preventing the export of pulp material than by preventing the export of logs. As I intend bringing this matter up when going into Committee of Supply at a later date, I shall not now go further into this item.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman is a little astray when he says he introduced the first resolution in this House on this subject. I think a resolution was introduced long before he sat in this House. I have a distinct recollection, if my memory is not at fault, of a resolution of a similar character which was introduced by the hon. member for Hamilton. The hon. gentleman has expressed the opinion that the action of the province of Ontario in opposing an export duty on logs is illegal, and yet, at the same time, he says that he is in favour of imposing an export duty, so that in the one breath he contradicts what he says in the next. I see that only yesterday the newspapers published an intimation that the Attorney General of Ontario is disposed to grant a fiat to enable the interested parties to bring the matter into court. Although not a lawyer, I venture to say that when the question is tested in the highest court, it will be found that the province of Ontario is entirely within its rights in putting this restriction. I do not think you will find many prominent lawyers in this country will agree with the hon. gentleman in the opinion to which he has given expression.

Mr. OSLER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior if his attention has been drawn to the interesting archæological report of the province of Ontario for 1898. That report contains, on page 90, a very interesting reference, by Dr. Secord, to the large Indian reserve near Brantford, and his report is continued by Mr. Boyle, The state of affairs revealed by Dr. Secord and Mr. Boyle is not creditable to this country. Dr. Secord writes, under date of December 1st, 1898, a report to, I presume, the Ontario Government, in which he draws attention to the fact that on this large reserve of 4,000 Indians, situated within 12 miles of Brantford, the death rate is 30 per 1,000, or three times that of the rest of the province of Ontario, where it is about 10 per 1,000. Notwithstanding that excessive death rate, he says that this band of Indians has in-

creased from 2,600 in 1868 to 4,000 to-day. On that reserve all the old heathen rites are still continued, and the state of disease and filth and the unsanitary condition of the reserve is something simply horrible to contemplate. It is not an uncommon thing, Dr. Secord says, for young adults to pick the worms from their noses and throats, and disease permeates the whole tribe. Apparently, no attempt whatever is made to improve this state of affairs. The Indians drink the water from the surface—and from small wells two or three feet deep—and typhoid fever is prevalent there all the time.

The doctor lives in Brantford, twelve miles away, and is also the health officer. A good brick dwelling has been erected for his use on the reserve, but he seems to prefer living in Brantford. Dr. Secord further adds that diseases of an insidious character prevail, and ignorance, filth and indifference are the rule, and he suggests that a small hospital should be erected on the reserve and the reserve be put under the Health Act.

Not only the doctor, but the superintendent and paymaster are non-residents, necessitating the Indians going to Brantford for their treaty money, and the results are shameful. A little inquiry about Brantford will show that by the connivance of some of the agents Indian money is unlawfully intercepted and does not reach the hands of the Indians. Still less inquiry would show that much of what they get is put in jeopardy by their having to pass by the dealers in fire-water and the like, before they can get back to their homes. Mr. Boyle thus comments on Dr. Secord's report:

> Dr. Secord's communication is most suggestive, and demands the immediate attention of all concerned. Among such a community as the Six Nations, that there should be utter ignorance of sanitation and treatment of disease is not to be wondered at, when we bear in mind how difficult it has proved to awaken intelligent attention to such matters among our own people. The Indians are the wards of the Dominion, and unless the Indian Department proposes to adopt the inhuman belief that the best Indian is a dead Indian, steps should be at once taken to improve the condition of things on the reserve. Apparently no attempt is made to improve this condition of affairs, and it is going on now from bad to worse.

I see in the statement of accounts, on page 520 that the agent, Mr. Cameron, has a salary and allowance of $1,540, and that Dr. Secord's salary and allowance is $2,850. Yet, neither of these gentlemen, who are in charge of this reserve, think it worth their while to live on the reserve. This report must have been brought to the attention of the Government long before this. Surely the Government, or some members of it who live in that district, must know something about the conditions of these Indians, and yet, no attempt whatever is made to better their condition or wipe out what any one who reads this report of Mr. Boyle, must consider a most disgraceful state of affairs. Canadians have always been credited with looking after the welfare of their Indian wards. There is a sum of about $800,000 capital, I believe, to the credit of these Indians, and surely out of that sum proper hospitals and sanitary arrangements could be established. That such a state of affairs as is here revealed should exist within twelve miles of Brantford is something which it will be hard to make the people of Canada believe. I draw the hon. Minister's attention to this report, and I hope that, without delay, steps will be taken to wipe out this disgrace to Canada in our dealings with the Indians which is revealed in this report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I admit at once the gravity of the remarks made by my hon. friend (Mr. Osler). With regard to the facts, I may say that, in the first place, the agent is Mr. Cameron, the superintendent of Indian affairs upon the reserve, who was the agent under the late Government, and whose practice as regards residence and visiting the reserve is just the same to-day as it has been in the past four years. I am informed by our inspectors, whom I have several times consulted on the question, that Mr. Cameron is a very good and efficient officer, who understands the working of Indian affairs on that reserve thoroughly, and that it would be very difficult for the department to get a man who could do the work better or as well. As to the question of residence, Mr. Cameron has always resided, I believe, in Brantford, and his view has always been that he is in a better position to attend to the Indian business residing at Brantford, by visiting there three or four times a week, than if he resided permanently on the reserve. The practice now is what it has been for many years. I am assured by the accountant of the department that payments were made on the reserve and not at Brantford. The question of medical attendance has received considerable attention from the department. I understand that Dr. Secord, who makes the report which has been referred to, is the physician for these Indians. He has never made a report of this character to us, as I am told by the officers of the department. I may explain, in justice to Dr. Secord, that he was down here last session and I discussed with him sanitary measures upon the reserve, and he insisted strongly that a hospital should be built on the reserve. I attached great importance to his recommendation, and felt disposed to ask Parliament for the necessary vote, but in view of other increases of expenditure in the Indian Department, I thought well to let it stand over. As my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) is aware, there is no end to the demand from the Indian reserves for the expenditure of money, and it is difficult to know where to draw the line. The inspectors of the department, particularly Inspector Macrae, are very

familiar with the state of affairs on the reserve; and I think the view of the department was that the hospital requirements of the Indians would be as well served by the hospital at Brantford as by having a hospital on the reserve. You cannot deal with an Indian as you would with a white man. If it were understood that when an Indian was sick he would be taken care of, half the reserve would be sick. You must deal with the Indian as you find him. After considering the question and consulting the officers of the department, it seemed to me that it would not be advisable to establish a hospital on the reserve. I thought that possibly I could go down there and make an examination, but, up to the present time, I have not been able to convince myself that I ought to ask Parliament for the necessary money for this hospital. It was suggested that the hospital should be built and charged to the funds of the band, but some of the Indians were here and strongly opposed that idea. We cannot legally do such a thing without their consent, and it would be difficult to get their consent.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the unsanitary condition of the reserve—drinking surface water, and so on?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have had no such information, so far as I am aware. It seems strange that Dr. Secord should have reported that way to another body and not to us. He may have thought that the case was sufficiently covered by his statements to me with regard to hospital accommodation and medical attendance. I do not like to make a positive statement on the point, but I will have an examination made at the files of the department, and, after dinner, I will let the hon. gentleman know whether any such report has ever been made. In any case, it has not been brought to my attention. My hon. friend, doubtless, knows that the Six Nations Indians are supposed to be rather advanced Indians. They are very independent and self-reliant, and much inclined to resent interference by the Government in their affairs. It is by no means a case in which the department can say that this or that is to be done. When anything needs to be done requiring the co-operation of the Indians, the superintendent must meet the Indian council and discuss the matter, and even in the most trifling matters, he sometimes has serious difficulty in getting the Indians to agree with the views of the department. I can assure my hon. friend, in view of the statement he has made, I will have an examination made; I will send a competent inspector at an early day to examine and report.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should the Indians be compelled to drive twelve miles for medical attendance? When the doctor gets a salary, why should he not live upon the reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I discussed that with Dr. Secord when he was here, and had it in my mind to make an order that he should live upon the reserve; but, after discussion, I decided that it would be inadvisable. There are two doctors constantly on the reserve, while Dr. Secord lives in Brantford. The Indians make a practice of coming to Brantford, and many of them prefer to have one of the doctors of the band in the city so that they may consult him when they go in. The doctors upon the reserve can be consulted by any of them at any time.

Mr. SPROULE. There is probably another difficulty in the way. I do not think we have the right to establish a hospital there, as that would be a matter relating to public health, and so one for which the province is responsible. This Government can establish marine hospitals, but they could hardly justify the establishment of a hospital on the reserve by giving it that name.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I wish to be fair to all parties. Speaking from recollection, I think that Dr. Secord told me the Ontario Government were prepared to give the usual grant if we established a hospital. It is a question of putting up a building.

Mr. SPROULE. The hospital must be established under provincial authority, and then you might get assistance for it. Another thing is to be said in connection with the heavy death rate, and that is that, as is known by every medical man, when the Indians come in contact with the conditions of civilization, the death rate among them is high. Consumption is prevalent among them, and the better the houses they have the more rapidly they seem to die off. That is the case in the northern districts of Ontario. Of course, poor sanitary conditions increase the evil. I still think the doctor ought to live on the reserve; and if the Indians are not paid on the reserve, they ought to be. If they can get the money in the city and can get whisky, they will buy whisky and other things of little value to them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I know the instructions to be definite that the payments should be made on the reserve, and I am assured by the accountant of the department that the instructions are carried out.

Mr. OSLER. I will give my authority, a gentleman well known in Toronto, Mr. J. C. Hamilton, barrister, who has taken great interest in Indian affairs for many years. He has investigated this matter, and writes to me, "not only the doctor,

but the superintendent and paymaster are non-residents, necessitating the Indians going to Brantford for treaty money and goods." Mr. Hamilton, who, no doubt, is quite willing I should make use of his name, writes me that information as positive.

Mr. SPROULE. I think another of the troubles in connection with the Indians is, that, whenever epidemics or infectious diseases break out, there is no proper provision for isolating the patients, but they are allowed to mingle with each other, and the disease spreads very rapidly, causing a high death rate. Then, I am told that the law regarding vaccination is not carried out properly amongst the Indians. Sometimes a number of them are vaccinated, and then a long term elapses during which there is no vaccination whatever.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Every precaution possible is taken to secure their vaccination. There is no want of care on that point.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to be corrected on that point. I would say that another requisite for their health is the sanitary condition of the place. That has to be carried out under the provincial authorities. But it might be very much better than it is at the present time, and, if improved, would reduce the death rate materially. I have always thought that it might be well to have a union of interest between the provincial health department and the Department of Indian Affairs down here, whereby hospitals, if such are necessary, might be erected and conducted under the provincial law, while the larger part of the expense should be borne by the Indian Department here. As it would be principally for the benefit of the Indians, it would be proper to lay the larger part of the expense upon the Indian Department.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). There are many people in Ottawa who know more about the reserve and habits of the people who live on it, than the people do who live within a few miles of the reserve. One of the great troubles that exists up there is the peculiar relation that the Indians on the reserve bear the province of Ontario. While they are in Ontario, they are not in as close touch with Ontario as the rest of the people. Their schools are not managed in the same way. They are apparently entirely independent of the province, and hardly regard themselves as citizens of Ontario. It strikes me that one of the best things we can do for these Indians is to rid ourselves of the charge of them, and let them come under the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. Let their schools be managed like the schools of white people, and under the same laws. Now, I know Dr. Secord very well, and I am familiar with the conditions of the Indian people there. I am satisfied that any statements the doctor has made, either in his reports to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs or to the provincial authorities, are absolutely correct; they are not varnished; and any statement that he makes is given upon the authority of a man who is thoroughly qualified to discharge the duties that are involved in his office. He has only the welfare of the Indians at heart; he is doing the best he can to instruct these people in adopting sanitary methods. Everything that he has said in connection with the drinking water of the reserve is absolutely correct. The Indians know nothing whatever of the laws of health, or the science of the preservation of life. Every effort is being put forth to instruct them, but they do not readily adapt themselves to our methods. They do not regard as dangerous things that we regard as extremely dangerous. They live together, sometimes ten or thirteen persons in one room. If there is a case of consumption among them—and consumption is a very prevalent disease—patients are not isolated in the slightest degree, but all live together; and you see how, under such conditions, the death rate is likely to materially increase. I think it is about 30, or more than that, per thousand, being almost two and a half times more than it is throughout the province of Ontaio. Now, I think there is a fit field for the erection of a hospital: and, at the time I was asked to become vice-president in the scheme that Lady Aberdeen inaugurated, I wrote her, telling her that one of the very best fields for this hospital scheme was right there, near the city of Brantford, where some 4,000 people are living in absolute neglect of those very sanitary conditions that they ought to be instructed in. The chiefs are apathetic, and do not know what needs to be done. We have 4,000 people there, emerging from a condition of barbarism in the past to one of civilization, without knowing how to adapt themselves to those ideas that are absolutely necessary to change an Indian into a white man. Now, the Indian is a man whom you can trust, generally; but you cannot trust him to look after his health. I think there ought to be an entire severance of the Dominion from the management of the affairs of the people on this reserve. I think they should be placed under the authority of the Ontario Government, which is more in touch with them, and can look after them much better than we can.

As to these statements made against the doctor not living on the reserve, there is not much in them; I can assure you of that. I am quite familiar with the affairs there. The doctor has two assistants, qualified practitioners, who are there all the time, and he himself comes down once a day, and is there about three nights in the week, when he is present constantly. You have not the

slightest idea of the medical work that is involved in taking care of those 4,000 people, much more than there would be for a similar number of white people.

Neither can a successful objection be raised against the superintendent living in Brantford. He has always lived in Brantford. Brantford is the place where most of these people deal. It is convenient of access, and they can always see him there. He pays the money to these people on the reserve, and, when they get it, they do not spend it in drink, because amongst the Indians very few are addicted to it. Many of them would drink, if they had an opportunity, but in Brantford it is very hard for an Indian to get drink. These reflections on the Indian are entirely uncalled for. I am satisfied that the attention of the Government has been brought to necessity of better sanitary arrangements being inaugurated on the reserve, and any recommendation the doctor makes is entitled to the most serious consideration, because I am satisfied he is not animated by a desire to advance his own interests as much as to advance the interests of the people who live on the reserve. However, knowing, as I do, their condition, and knowing, as I do, the efforts that have been put forth by the English Church, the Methodist Church, and the religious organizations up there, to give them the benefits that civilized people get, I still regret to say that they are backward in a great many things. As agriculturists, many of them are making improvement, but in the direction of adopting sanitary methods that we adopt in our own houses, and that we try to encourage in the houses of other people, they are absolutely ignorant. When attacked by typhoid fever, they do not pay the slightest attention to diet. A man does not care what he sets before him. Where we are so particular, they eat everything. They have not yet skilled nurses. They have a nurse up there, trained in a hospital, and who has been brought to the reserve, and she has done very good work. I think the Government cannot do better than listen to the recommendations that have been made by the doctor, and listen also to the petition of the Indian Council to give these people an hospital. There is nowhere in this country it could do more good, nowhere could it be run at less expense, and nowhere would the educating influences of a hospital be of such service as upon the reserve to-day.

I can assure our friends here, who may be animated by the proper motive, that everything is being done by those who have the authority to promote the interest of the Indians, and I trust, now that attention has been called to the matter, the hon. Minister will listen to the recommendations that have been made by Dr. Secord, that he will place this hospital upon the reserves no matter at what expense. If it is at the expense of the Dominion of Canada it will be money well expended. We know that large sums are being spent on enterprises that I do not have quite so much sympathy with as I would have with this Government realizing how much we owe to these people in the past by making an appropriation for this hospital. We are sending millions of money to distant lands for missionary purposes, while we are neglecting at home the demands of 4,000 people, who are as much in need of all the help we can give them as are the people in distant lands, and I may say it would be a matter of sincere congratulation for this House if we were to make an appropriation of $5,000 or $10,000 for the purpose of carrying out Dr. Secord's recommendation and erecting this hospital. These Indians do not believe that they have been treated fairly by the Government. They know that their money has been misappropriated in the past, and I took occasion last session to bring before the House the case of the Mount Elgin Institute, where over $3,500 of their money was taken without their sanction, and appropriated to build a school-house some 70 miles away from where it was of any earthly use to the people on that reserve. I do not refer to the present Government or to any Government, but having taken that money and expended it in a manner that is of no earthly use to the people on the reserve, the least we should do would be to appropriate that amount to provide for the building of this hospital. They have eleven schools up there, conducted at their own expense ; they are doing their very best to educate their children, and we might help them by doing what they want and that is, to spend more money for their own benefit. They have applied for the appropriation of a certain portion of the money for the hospital building, but I think it would be a graceful act if we were to set aside a sufficient sum of money for this purpose, and build the hospital for them. I can assure this House that the officials in charge there are doing the best they can with the means at their disposal, and I hope that no one will cast any reflection, either upon Dr. Secord, or upon Mr. Cameron, who is a most efficient agent, and who has been discharging the duties of that position for the past seven or eight years.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am very much obliged to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), for making a statement in regard to a matter which is entirely within his own personal knowledge. The only thing that appears to me to require to be remedied is the unsanitary condition of the reserve, and that is a thing that can only be done with the co-operation of the Indians themselves. If any hon. member of this House has had any experience, such as I have had, in the administration of a Health Law, he will know that it is a most difficult thing even to get intelligent white people to properly observe the regulations,

and it is still more difficult to get Indians to observe them. The House will see the difficulty of getting these Indians, who are simply emerging from barbarism to civilization, to understand the necessity of a proper observance of sanitary regulations. The report of Dr. Secord says that he is paying special attention to this, but I can assure the committee that I am making every possible effort to see that every possible improvement is made in the line suggested.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) must be struck by the report coming from a single reserve of so desperate a state of things. There are many other Indian reserves in the province of Ontario from which we have no such reports. Does it not occur to the hon. gentleman to be a very extraordinary circumstance, when there are two physicians on the reserve and one living at Brantford, that such a state of things, almost beyond description, should have occurred, and that this is the first time that the attention of the department has been called to such an extraordinary state of things ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The inference I would draw is not that such a state of affairs, as Dr. Secord describes, does not exist on this reserve, although I do not suppose that Dr. Secord, in calling the attention of the authorities to it has toned it down at all, but it is that I would be inclined to believe that some other reserves may be in a somewhat similar state, and may require similar examination. That would be applicable to reserves where the population is somewhat dense, but it would not apply to other reserves where there is only a small population.

Mr. CLANCY. Either Dr. Secord has given this report a high colouring, or some one has been sadly remiss in his duty. I happen to live close to an Indian reserve, and I have had some opportunity of knowing, although not in detail, the state of the health of those people. No such state of things exists as is spoken of in this statement, but the Indians are just as my hon. friend described them. They are a class of people who resent changes made by any Government, and the present condition of things is probably due to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and my hon. friend (Mr. Heyd), who spoke so eloquently a moment ago, and who almost melted into tears on account of their condition, who recommended that men should be dismissed who knew the condition of the Indians, who knew their wants and that others be put in their places. The Indians, resenting that, would remain in their homes, almost in a dying condition, rather than go to a new physician appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. If there is a state of things such as has been described, it may be traced largely to these gentlemen themselves. I know the case of Walpole Island, where a gentleman against whom nothing could be said, was given his walking ticket. He was told that he had been an offensive partisan ; there was no trial held, but some conspirator took it into his head that he wanted his place, and he got his walking ticket. A great many of the Indians would not go for medical attendance to the appointee of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), and if there is such a condition of affairs as has been described, I am afraid the hon. gentleman is indirectly responsible by listening to the appeals of his own friends, who want the places at the expense of these Indians. The Indians are prejudiced against coming into contact with these new physicians, and they would rather die in their homes, so strong is the principle of association, than go and seek medical attendance from those whom they do not know. This is only one case, because changes were made both in agents and physicians very generally. A change was made at Brantford. Dr. Secord lives in Brantford, and there are two physicians under him. It ill-becomes Dr. Secord, after living two years in the city of Brantford, to make a report of that kind, and to tell the hon. Minister of the Interior that it is not necessary for him to live on the reserve. I can quite understand that Dr. Secord could find most cogent reasons why he should not live on the reserve, but I cannot understand why the hon. Minister of the Interior should be so easily influenced as to conclude that he could attend to the wants of the Indians better by residing in the city of Brantford. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) knows perfectly well that there was a good deal of feeling among the Indians and that they protested strongly when the changes were made. He knows that the Indians of Walpole Island protested by petition against the action of the department, and that the same thing occurred in many places in Ontario. If that report be true, as stated here, then there is something wrong, and that wrong may be traced largely to the department. The Minister can rectify it to some extent by compelling these men who have sought new positions to attend to their duty rather than making these alarming reports.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Without entering into the political question which has frequently been discussed, I say to my hon. friend in good faith and frankness, that if the statement is made by any hon. member either in the House or by correspondence, that any Indian physician is not attending to his duty as he should, I will have a thorough investigation made and that physician will be dismissed without fear, favour or affection if the charge is found to be true. If the hon. gentleman calls on me he will be satisfied that I will take action fairly and fully. As to the Brantford reserve, I hardly think that what has been brought

to the attention of the House in any way reflects upon the department. Quite the contrary. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) must see that what is reported is not the creation of last year, but the result of a state of affairs that has been going on for years. What occurs now is, that this gentleman whom we have appointed is taking sufficient interest in his duties to make these reports for the purpose of calling the attention of the proper authorities to it, with a view that a remedy may be applied. I am satisfied that much will be found to exist which ought not to exist, but I wish to state that I do not think it is a thing that can be rectified all in a minute. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) fully understands that these things must be done with the loyal co-operation of the parties affected, and that can only be accomplished by gradual reform.

Indians, Nova Scotia—
Additional amount for medical attendance and medicines $700

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a constant pressure on us for help, and it appears that during the last year, and particularly in the maritime provinces, these medical bills have been larger, the report being that grippe and pulmonary complaints have been very prevalent amongst the Indians.

Additional amount for seed grain, Manitoba and North-west Territories..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIN. Why is this vote required for the additional purchase of seed grain? What was the sum in the main Estimates?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The main Estimate was $1,570.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of the Interior will remember that I called his attention to the condition of the reserves, consequent upon the dismissal of experienced officials, and that I asked for returns as to the crops of some of the reserves. I ask now whether there has not been distress upon the reserves, especially in the North-west Territories, in consequence of the change in the officers, and whether the necessity of calling for the large sum of $2,000 extra is not owing to the fact that several reserves in 1898 became quite demoralized in consequence of experienced officers being removed. The Crooked Lake Reserve, for instance, was one of the most successful reserves, and the Indians used to exhibit fine crops and cattle at the exhibition, but in 1898 all that went into a hopeless state of demoralization, and that, I believe, is a reason why this large sum is required to meet the distress on the reserves.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The changes that were made in the reorganization of the Indian Department were made altogether in the interests of economy, and without exception, with the advice of the former Indian Commissioner. I went into the matter myself with extreme care, together with the present Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, then the Indian Commissioner, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will admit that no officer of the department was ever better competent to deal with that question. Certainly, I advised with the trusted officer of the department, and I acted largely on his advice. Of course, I take the whole responsibility of what has been done. I do not wish to throw any responsibility upon him. Some of the changes, perhaps, were not advisable in one or two cases, but on the whole, I think, they were extremely desirable and have worked out beneficially, resulting in the saving of a considerable amount of money, while the affairs of the reserve are administered quite as well as they were before.

Mr. DAVIN. What reserves in the Territories require this seed grain?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. First, there is $280 for agencies generally. Then, it is to be sent to the following agencies: Moose Mountain, Hobbema, Edmonton, Carlton, Duck Lake, Saddle Lake, Muscowpetungs, The Pas, Clandeboye, Manitowapah, Birtle, Battleford. The Crooked Lake reserve does not figure.

Mr. DAVIS. With regard to this item of $2,000 for the purchase of seed grain for the Indians, which the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has been talking about, it appears to me it is put in the Estimates because the Indians are doing more work and have a larger acreage under crop this season, and for that reason want more seed. As regards the appointment of the new officials having the effect on the Indians which the hon. gentleman stated, I do not think there is anything in it at all. On the Battleford reserve, in one year, under the late agent, nearly all the cattle died and the Indians were very hard up; but under the new agent we have not had anything of that kind at all. As the Indians own the cattle, when the cattle are sold the Indians get the proceeds, and now they are doing remarkably well. In Duck Lake agency I know there is a great deal more land under cultivation than before, because the instructors are good, live men who know all about farming, and are helping the Indians along. The instructors are not cobblers and tailors, such as we had before, but live practical men; and this is true of all the agencies in my district. I suppose this accounts for the $2,000 which the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. DAVIN. I will direct my question again to the hon. Minister. I would like to ask him whether as a fact the Crooked Lake

agency did not get demoralized and fall from a condition of great efficiency to one of demoralization in consequence of tried officers having been removed. The first question is, did not the Crooked Lake agency fall into a state of demoralization in 1897-98?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the changes were made in connection with the Crooked Lake reserve, charges were made that the changes had resulted badly for the reserve. I held a special consultation with the Indian Commisioner, and directed his attention to these statements. He assured me that there was nothing whatever in them, but that on the contrary the reserve was in a better condition than ever before. He was quite satisfied that after the changes he had recommended, the administration of the reserve had improved in efficiency rather than deteriorated. I do not say that I inspected the reserve myself; I am speaking from the report of my responsible officer.

Mr. DAVIN. The Indian Commissioner would naturally give as couleur-de-rose an account of the reserves under his charge as possible. Apropos of the whole vote, I wish to call the attention of the Minister to Mr. Smart's report for 1898. On page 22, he says:

> The area of land under cultivation, during the year 1898, aggregated 111,880 acres.
>
> In considering the amount of crops secured relatively to the acreage farmed, a distinction must be made between the area described as under cultivation which includes fallow lands, new breaking and "made" pasturage, and the area actually seeded down, which was in the spring of 1897, 40,368 acres.
>
> The crop of cereals, vegetables and roots harvested in the fall of that year amounted to 1,120,900 bushels, and of hay and other fodder 76,458 tons were secured, the increase over the preceding year being 101,500 bushels and 2,164 tons respectively.
>
> It is regretted that there was not a proportionate increase in the value of farm produce, which in the aggregate only exceeded that of the preceding year by some $20,000.

What I want to ask the hon. gentleman is this: was there an increase in cultivation and produce in 1898 over 1897?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give that information to my hon. friend off-hand; I will have to look it up. But because there was an increase in the agricultural product of the Indians upon these reserves in 1897 over 1896, it does not follow that if there was not an increase in 1898 over 1897, there was, therefore, any fault in the management.

The hon. gentleman will, on inquiry, find that a similar condition of affairs existed several years ago. The crops vary in different years in different localities. Manitoba some years ago produced more grain than it has ever produced since, but it does not follow that the people are not progressive or that cultivation has fallen back, but simply that the crops in that particular year were unusually good. Last year the crop of the Territories was much better than that of some parts of Manitoba, and some years the crops in both the Territories and Manitoba are not as good as they are in others, so that my hon. friend cannot draw any conclusion from comparing the product of the reserves in one year with the crop in another year. That is no indication at all that the management is any better or worse.

To provide an additional amount for annuities and gratuities to Indians and half-breeds in the Peace River and Athabasca districts, comprising the proposed new treaty..... $12,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As I have already explained, the Government has taken steps to negotiate a treaty with those Indians. We intend dealing with them on the same basis as in the treaties made by Governor Morris with the Indians for the ceding of territory in the North-west, that is to say, $7 per head of gratuity, and $5 each of annuity. The Indians number 2,700, and the half-breeds 1,000, or a total of 3,700. In the main Estimates we provided $32,400, and require $12,000 additional, or $44,400 altogether, to pay the Indians and half-breeds on the basis I have mentioned. I am estimating for the half-breeds as well as the Indians, because the commissioners have authority to treat with the half-breeds as Indians, if the half-breeds so desire, and take them into the treaty. But if not, we ask for authority to treat the half-breeds as we did the half-breeds elsewhere, and give them scrip. But to facilitate the making of a treaty it was deemed advisable that we should have a sufficient vote to enable the commissioners to take them into the treaty, if they so desire.

Mr. DAVIN. What are the names of the commissioners and their whole staff?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are two commissions, an Indian commission, and a half-breed commission, for this reason: An advertisement had to be sent out a year ago, informing the Indians that the Indian commissioners would be at a certain point at a certain time, and it is necessary that the commissioners should be there at that time. But, if they had to stop at Little Slave Lake, where the half-breeds are found, they could not keep their appointment with the Indians at Great Slave Lake. The half-breed commissioners, however, have instructions to act under the supervision of the Indian commission. The Indian commissioners are: The Hon. David Laird, J. J. McKenna, an officer of the department, and James H. Ross, of the Northwest Government, and along with this commission we have asked the Reverend Father Lacombe to go, not as a member of the commission, but in an advisory capacity.

Every one who has lived in the North-west for the last fifteen or twenty years, Protestant and Catholic, knows well that there is no man in the North-west looked upon by the Indians with the same reverence and affection as Father Lacombe.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nobody could be sent with the commission more likely to smooth away any friction. I saw him personally, and urged him strongly to give his services to the Government, and, after some hesitation, he consented. He is not a member of the commission, and has no power to decide anything, but simply acts in an advisory capacity. Mr. Harrison Young, of Edmonton, is the secretary of the commission. Mr. C. H. West, M.D., is the physician, and along with them go two men acting as general clerks, Mr. A. J. Conroy and Mr. W. W. Martin. The half-breed commission consist of Major Walker, of Calgary, and Mr. J. A. Côté, an officer of the Department of the Interior, two clerks —one an English-speaking man, Mr. Charles Mayer, formerly of Prince Albert, and lately in the immigration branch of the service —and a younger man, named Prudhomme, French secretary of the commission. We have provided by Order in Council that the commissioners who are in receipt of salary—that is, Mr. Laird and Mr. McKenna—will get $6 per day additional to their salary. I have submitted a vote to Parliament to authorize us to pay that. Nothing has been paid on account of that, but we are submitting a vote to Parliament to get authority to pay it. We are giving Father Lacombe $10 per day, whilst away. The secretary, Mr. Harrison Young, and Dr. West get $6 a day. That is their entire pay, because they are not in the service. Mr. Conroy gets $100 a month, and Mr. Martin $75 a month. On the half-breed commission, Major Walker gets $10 a day, and we are asking authority to pay Mr. Côté $5 a day additional to his salary. The secretaries get $100 a month each. The additional staff are: an interpreter, a cook and two servants. There will be ten mounted policemen and an officer, who will escort the party and transport the supplies. The supplies were purchased under contract. Tenders were advertised for, and the contract was given to the Hudson's Bay Company. Some small additional supplies were purchased from the Hudson's Bay Company at the contract rates.

Mr. FOSTER. What extent of territory will these men have to travel over?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The desire is that they shall go as far as Great Slave Lake, but it is impossible to form a positive opinion as to what ground they can cover. Their instructions are to go as far as possible and to accomplish as much as possible. Everything will depend on the facility they have in dealing with the Indians.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the hon. Minister aware whether arrangements were made for meetings with the Indians at convenient places, as was done under Mr. Morris?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, notices were sent out. I may explain that in the fall of 1897 I first went into this matter, expecting that I should be able to send out commissioners in the summer of 1898. But it was found impossible to get the notices to the Indians in time. We have been getting these notices out for nearly eighteen months. Printed notices have been sent out to the officers of the Mounted Police, the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, traders, missionaries, and everybody who could take them out. As wide a knowledge as possible has been furnished the Indians of the places where the commissioners are to be.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the hon. Minister an estimate of the supplies that will be needed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I explained that the supplies were purchased after tenders had been advertised for, the contract going to the Hudson's Bay Company. Last fall, when I was in Winnipeg, I had a discussion with the Indian Commissioner, Mr. Laird, and Mr. Chipman, the chief commissioner of the Hudson's Bay Company. We arrived at the conclusion that an additional quantity of supplies would be wanted. I asked Mr. Chipman if he would supply them at the same prices and would credit us at the same rates with supplies that were not actually taken. This was agreed to. The supplies were as follows:—

224 sacks of flour	$3,827 00
1,104 lbs. of bacon	2,191 22
5,050 lbs. of tea	1,594 54
3,614 lbs. of tobacco	2,867 14
Total	$10,479 90

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to this large sum of $13,000 to provide an additional amount for the purchase of supplies for destitute and working Indians in Manitoba and the North-west Territories—this is in addition to $178,000 that the hon. gentleman was voted under the main Estimates. Did the hon. gentleman call for tenders for these supplies?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Speaking generally, all the supplies of the Indian Department are purchased by tender. The only things not so purchased by tender are some small items of implements, medicines, and so on.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman say what the reserves are for which these additional supplies were got?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The following is the statement:—

Supplementary Quantities of Flour, Bacon and Beef allowed over and above Quantities provided for in Estimates—

Swan River—	
70 sacks flour	$112 00
1,000 lbs. bacon	105 00
Moose Mountain—	
25 sacks flour	42 50
250 lbs. bacon	26 25
1,500 lbs. beef	75 00
Crooked Lake—	
150 sacks flour	300 00
4,000 lbs. beef	200 00
Assiniboine—18 sacks flour	30 60
Muscowpetung's—500 lbs. bacon	53 50
Touchwood—7,500 lbs. beef	375 00
Carlton—1,000 lbs. bacon	109 00
Battleford—330 sacks flour	722 70
Onion Lake—112 sacks flour	329 28
Saddle Lake—	
137 sacks flour	356 20
1,000 lbs. bacon	127 37
Ammunition and twine	100 00
Edmonton—	
1,000 bush. wheat, to grind	600 00
10,000 lbs. beef	500 00
2,000 lbs. bacon	225 00
Hobbema—	
4,000 lbs. bacon	450 00
1,000 bush. wheat, to grind	600 00
Morley—	
39 sacks flour	68 25
35,000 lbs. beef	1,750 00
Piegan—268 sacks flour	459 20
	$12,622 43

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to the last item, will the hon. gentleman say why he found it necessary to get this additional amount to purchase cattle? The aim should undoubtedly be to make the Indians, who have got splendid pasturage for their cattle, turn their attention to improving the stock. They have been supplied with a thoroughbred bull, and by this time they ought to be able to supply all their own cattle.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is for the purpose of buying thoroughbred bulls. Everybody who has given attention to the development of the North-west knows that nothing is so important as the improvement in the quality of the cattle. I have been told by Gordon and Ironsides, cattle buyers, who practically have a monopoly of the whole cattle export trade of the North-west, that as a result of the policy of the late Government in connection with this matter, and which I am pleased to take up and follow out, that is the policy of furnishing thoroughbred bulls for the reserves, these cattle buyers have told me that they have found better cattle for export purposes upon the Indian reserves than anywhere else in the North-west Territories, except in two or three localities where the ranching companies have paid much attention to it. I have given some attention to this particular subject, and am asking for this vote for the purpose of carrying that policy a little further. I will give my hon. friend the names of the reserves where I intend to supply cattle: Piegan, 10 yearlings; Bloods, 16; Morley, 9 (two years); Blackfoot, 4; Duck Lake, 5; Carlton, 4; Battleford, 4; Clandeboye, 3; Berens River, 5; Manitowapah, 4; Portage la Prairie, 2. Forty-nine animals have already been bought in Ontario by Mr. Thos. Harkness, at an average price of $91.50.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would ask the Minister to refer to item 67, to provide an additional amount of medical attendance and medicine in Nova Scotia—is any part of that for the county of Pictou?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what particular counties the accounts come from. There are some outstanding accounts in Nova Scotia. It is altogether likely some of them are from the county of Pictou.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). This sum is not intended to raise the annual payment, but merely to pay arrears?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Just to pay increased accounts that have been incurred this year, to close up the accounts.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). In the county of Pictou the amount is only $75 in all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have tried to keep down the expense as much as we can, but there is a continual pressure to increase.

Mr. DAVIN. I approve of the hon. gentleman's policy of bringing in thoroughbred bulls, and I would suggest that it would be well to bring in some thoroughbred stallions to put on the reserves. At present the Indians get $10, $15 or $20 for their horses. Now, the Indian is a natural breeder of horses, but he has to be taught to breed cattle. Occasionally you will see a good horse, but as a rule their horses are very inferior, owing to the poor class of stallions they have. Now, the poor stallion does not merely do harm to the breeding on the Indian reserve, but he sometimes strays further afield, and the result is injurious to the quality of the horses of the white settlers, who sometimes find their mares throwing an inferior animal in consequence of an Indian stallion that, to use Shakespeare's phrase, would insist on going elsewhere and fishing in peculiar waters.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That question has been considered by the inspectors, in connection with the improvement of the breed of cattle. But there is a difference between the two questions. The price of thoroughbred bulls is $90 to $100. $5,000 goes a long way in improving the breed of cattle, but it would go a small way in the purchase of thoroughbred stallions.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. gentleman would find that $5,000 would go a considerable distance in providing good, serviceable

stallions, not an animal that would take a high prize, but an animal that would give the Indian an improved breed of horses, and the result would be that they could get $75 or $80 a horse instead of getting $20 or $30. The moment the Indian saw that he could obtain a better price for his horses, he would try to improve the breed. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman, with regard to this item, whether he asked for public tenders in all cases ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, by public advertisement.

Mr. DAVIN. Has he issued schedules in all cases ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The only supplies that are not purchased for the Indian Department by tenders are some little things, very trifling amounts, which are purchased by the agents locally. The Indian supplies generally are purchased by public tender. Schedules are furnished, and I believe the supplies are purchased at very low prices.

Mr. BERGERON. May I ask the Minister a couple of questions, as I was not here when vote 66 was carried ? A month or two ago some petitions were sent in to the hon. gentleman from the Indians at Caughnawaga about the election of their chief. I was asked to act for the Indians, and I declined. I would like to know how far these petitions have been acted upon ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I remember the case which the hon. gentleman refers to. I would not like to make a positive statement until after adjournment.

Mr. BERGERON. We want, if possible, to avoid anything such as happened at St. Regis. What about the St. Regis Indians ? I see by the papers they have had an election on the reserve and it seemed to me as if the chiefs were not quite satisfied with the election. Is the election for life or only for three years ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a matter that I am quite familiar with, because it has been receiving my attention quite lately. I found in the department a serious difficulty by reason of the fact that at the time when my attention was called to it, the Indians upon the St. Regis reserve had practically set the law at defiance. I am speaking from the information which is furnished me by the permanent officers of the department. The Indians had practically set the department at defiance ; they had practically told the agents that they would obey the law if they felt so disposed. Some years ago when a warrant was sent for execution the constable was summarily run off the reserve by the Indians. The difficulty seemed to be that right alongside of the boundary there is an American reserve and the American Indians are extremely turbulent, much more so than the Indians on our side. The department had long ago applied the elective system to this tribe, and when the department ordered that an election should take place the Indians refused to obey that order. Different deputations waited upon me in regard to the matter. One deputation came and said they wanted the old tribal system, and another deputation said that they were good, honest, law-abiding Indians, that they were prepared to fall in with the views of the department and do what we wanted them to do, but they said : The department will have to back us up and prevent us from suffering violence at the hands of the Indians who are opposed to the wishes of the department. Further than that these well-disposed Indians said : If you do not do that, if you permit the Indians who are disaffected to bully the department, our lives will not be worth living on the reserve. We, who have been disposed to fall in with the wishes of the department will be told that we have nothing to say about the affairs of the reserve, and these other disaffected Indians will carry matters with a high hand. We had on the one hand a parcel of people who were well disposed and who were asking us to carry out our own regulations, and on the other hand we had a band of turbulent agitators who said that they would not carry out the wishes of the department. The agitators appeared not to be large in number, but they were turbulent in character. After making a careful examination and going into the matter carefully with Mr. Macrae who has a specially good knowledge of the Indian character, who has been inspector, in Ontario, Quebec and the Northwest, and is, I think, as well qualified to judge of what is to be done in dealing with refractory Indians as any of the officers in the department, I came to the conclusion that the only thing to do was to assert the authority of the department and carry out the law. It was a perfectly intolerable state of affairs that they should say that a writ of the province of Quebec could not be executed on this reserve. They said : We will not allow anybody on this reserve that we do not want, practically saying that they proposed to set the Government of the country at defiance. I made up my mind that this state of affairs must be remedied at whatever cost, and consequently we ordered that another election should take place. I asked the Department of Justice to send Col. Sherwood, Chief of the Dominion Police, there to see that the elections were properly carried out. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is familiar with what took place there as it appeared very fully in the press. A very unfortunate occurrence happened there. The chief of police was violently assaulted, and believing that the Indians intended to kill him he fired a shot. An Indian suddenly turned when the shot was fired and it proved fatal. I went into

this matter very carefully and came to the conclusion that, beyond all question, Col. Sherwood was not to blame, but that on the contrary, he was entitled to the greatest credit for the forbearance, coolness and nerve he showed in refraining from firing until he did. The Department of Justice was asked to take proceedings for the purpose of the punishment of these Indians. There was a good deal of bluster for some time, and the hon. gentleman is aware from the press that it was a difficult situation to deal with, but we decided to deal with it firmly. We did not make a show of force, but the Indians were told that they were going to be arrested, and they finally surrendered themselves. With all the persons charged with the preventing the election and all the persons charged with the assault on Col. Sherwood the department made no conditions, but after a consultation with the hon. Solicitor General, who was acting for the Department of Justice in the matter, it was decided that they should be allowed to go back to the reserve and that they should not be proceeded against, or at all events they should be remanded under recognizances to appear when called for. Then I sent an officer of the Indian Department to the reserve with instructions to hold the election in accordance with the terms of the Act. Mr. Macrae has just returned, and he reports to me that he has held the election in accordance with the terms of the Act. Consequently, the department has fully carried its point. Of course there was a good deal of grumbling amongst these malcontents, and I have no doubt there will be. I think we may congratulate ourselves upon the fact that the Indians have recognized the authority of the department and the authority of the law and the position now is that the affairs of the reserve will be carried on as are the affairs of the other reserves. One point I want to make. It has been said that to some extent the difficulty arose because the department had done away with the old tribal system of electing the chief. As a matter of fact these Indians do not know what the tribal system is. They have no information on the subject. They talk about a return to the tribal system, but if you ask them what that system is they do not know. It is just a vague story that goes around from one to another, but they do not know what it means. The fact is that the men who talk about this make it a pretense to protest against the law. They desire to resist the proper enforcement of the law while all the ordinary and well-disposed people are willing to obey it. Everything is now going on satisfactorily.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that all those Indians who were arrested and brought to the jail at Beauharnois have been allowed out upon recognizance?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Every one of them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; most of them, I think, have been allowed out on bail. All have to furnish bail, some not only in their own bonds but in the bonds of others.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought some two of them had been kept in jail. Have any of them been kept in jail?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, they are all released.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they bound to appear before the court, or are they out indefinitely on bail?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me explain. The present position is that they are all bound over to appear at the next court of competent jurisdiction which takes place in about nine months in that district. I may say that at the present time the intention is that, if everything goes right and they behave themselves, nothing will be done.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the department retained the services of a lawyer there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. At Beauharnois?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not just sure what form it took, but there was a lawyer retained to act for the Indians, that having been found to be the best way of proceeding.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the name of the lawyer?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Brossoit.

Mr. BERGERON. What did Mr. Brossoit get from the department for his services in connection with that matter?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. His bill was taxed by the Justice Department at about $470. Such an account as that comes to me, and if I recognize it as being due I send it to the Justice Department to be taxed. There was no doubt it was proper for us to pay the amount, because I directed that a lawyer should be employed.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the money been yet paid to Mr. Brossoit?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I believe a cheque has been issued.

Mr. BERGERON. What was Mr. Brossoit's claim?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The accountant tells me that he thinks Mr. Brossoit rendered an account for $600, and it was taxed down to about $470. If the

hon. gentleman wants the exact figures I will give them.

Mr. BERGERON. If it is not too much trouble to the Minister, I would like to have the amount of Mr. Brossoit's claim, and the amount which was paid him on it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very well.

British Columbia Indians $3,200

Mr. McINNES. I wish to avail myself of this occasion to call the attention of the Minister to a certain condition of affairs in connection with Indian reserves in British Columbia. On the west coast of Vancouver Island there have been some valuable deposits discovered of gold, silver, iron, copper and other minerals. There has been a great deal of prospecting done there in consequence. It so happens that there are quite a number of Indian reserves on the west coast, and these prospectors have in many cases located claims, which turned out to be on Indian reserves. Upon their applying to have these claims recorded, they have been told by the mining recorders that the claims being on Indian reserves they could not be recorded, and when these parties have in turn referred the matter to the agents of the Indian Department, so far as I know, no action satisfactory to them has been taken. I have been credibly informed that in one case there is only one Indian surviving who is living upon the Indian reserve, and if that be true, it is in the power of that one Indian to absolutely prevent any mineral development within the territory of the reserve. It is certain that so long as there is a conflict of jurisdiction between the Federal and the provincial governments, there can be no possible development of the minerals within these reserves, and inasmuch as I know for a fact that some very valuable deposits have been discovered on what are Indian reserves, and it is desirable they should be worked, I would suggest to the Minister (Mr. Sifton) that no time be lost in framing some kind of a regulation to enable them to be worked, or that he should have a conference with the provincial authorities with a view of deciding on some regulations so that the mineral deposits on these reserves can be developed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a very important point, and it is a subject which is surrounded with great difficulty. The title to the precious metals on Indian reserves has been in dispute for some years past, and has given rise to very great difficulty in the administration of Indian affairs. The well-known case in regard to the railway belt in British Columbia resulted in the decision that the precious metals belonged to the Crown, as represented by the province; that the Crown had a prerogative right to the precious metals in lands which ever had been Crown lands in the province. As a result of that decision, the provinces immediately set up a claim that the precious metals within the Indian reserves belonged to them. Hon. gentlemen can see very readily what an unsatisfactory state of affairs that is. In the first place, we have the Dominion Government representing the Indians in administering the reserves, then we have the provinces setting up a right to the precious metals below the surface, and then we have the fact that whatever right the provinces may have to the precious metals, no regulations which they could make would authorize any one to go upon the Indian reserves for the purpose of mining, without the consent of the Indians properly obtained. We therefore have a very complicated state of affairs. Up to the present, the Dominion Government has always resisted the claim of the provinces to the precious metals within the Indian reserves. The difficulty arises in Nova Scotia, Ontario and British Columbia, and it actually prevents a satisfactory administration of the minerals on these reserves. I have lately—largely on account of statements made to me by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. McInnes)—given instructions that the officers of the department shall endeavour to prepare a set of regulations which will permit of the precious metals upon these reserves being mined, and if it becomes necessary to prevent a conflict of jurisdiction, I will endeavour to see that an arrangement is made with the provinces whereby the right of the people to operate under these regulations shall be recognized. On the whole, I do not think there will be much difficulty about that, and I hope to be able to carry out the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. McInnes).

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the case of the Songhees Indian reserve in Victoria. Some time ago, I moved for and received all the correspondence that had taken place between the Dominion and provincial governments in reference to this matter, and I am sorry to see, so far as I can make out from the correspondence, that the whole matter is at a deadlock.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Prior) will admit that is not my fault.

Mr. PRIOR. I will admit that, so far as I can make out from the correspondence, the Minister has done his best to come to an agreement with the provincial government, and I also believe that the members of the provincial government have done their best to agree; but the contentions of the two governments are diametrically opposite. The facts are these. We have an Indian reservation in Victoria, inhabited by a small number of

the Songhee tribe. It has been in their possession from the time of Governor Douglas, in the old Crown Colony days. I think it is stated that he made over the Indian reserve to them in fee simple. Again, the fact remains that the people of Victoria are very anxious to have these Indians removed, as they are a menace to the town in many ways. There are very few of them, but they stick to their reserve, which consists of 119 acres, and is just across a narrow portion of the harbour from the city. There would be no trouble, I think, in getting the Indians removed if the Dominion Government would give up their contention that the money to be derived from the sale of the reserve is to go into the Indian fund of the Dominion Government. But, as long as the Dominion Government adheres to that contention, I do not think any arrangement can be made, because the provincial government contends that, as soon as the Indians are removed from that reserve, the land reverts to the province. The hon. gentleman sent Mr. McKenna, one of the officers of his department, to British Columbia to try to come to an arrangement with the provincial government. But, according to the correspondence, no agreement has been come to, and at the present time the matter is no more forward than it was two years ago. Can the hon. gentleman suggest any course that would bring about a compromise on this question? It seems to me there ought to be no difficulty. The provincial government offered to put the Indians on a new reservation, and pay the expense of removing them, on condition that the Dominion Government should agree that the old reservation was to be transferred to the province. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give the matter his earliest consideration, because it is a burning question in Victoria, outside of politics altogether. Every man in Victoria wants to see the Indians removed. Whether the land goes to the Dominion or to the province, is a matter of very little consequence to them, so long as the land can be made available for railway purposes or some other purpose.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite recognize the importance of the matter which the hon. gentleman has brought to my attention. About a year and a half ago the matter was urgently brought to my attention. It was represented to me that the people of Victoria, the authorities of the city, and the authorities of the province, were extremely anxious that proceedings should be taken for the removal of these Indians from the reserve near the city of Victoria, and the property acquired by the province or local authorities. I recognized the force of the suggestion that had been made, and, when I took charge of the department, the position was this. The department was being bombarded because it had not acted—because it had refused to negotiate with the province. I said at once that there was no reason why we should not meet the province and do what was reasonable and fair. I sent Mr. McKenna to Victoria to look into the whole question. He was selected because, some years before, he had made a report on the law relating to the Indians in British Columbia, and was very familiar with the whole subject. He went there, and negotiated for some time with the members of the government. Subsequently, I was there myself. The position, as the question came before me in the first instance, was this. The department was being asked to co-operate with the provincial government for the purpose of getting these Indians off the reserve, and we made a proposition, which the hon. gentleman has no doubt read. That proposition did not look to any benefit being derived by the Dominion Government. On the contrary, the Dominion Government agreed to assume the responsibility of taking the Indians from that reserve and placing them on another reserve, if certain things were done by the province, none of which would bring any benefit whatever to the Dominion Government. We simply acted as trustees. When I was in Victoria, I met the members of the late provincial government, and had a conference with them on the subject; and I was astounded to find that what they wanted was, not to get the Indians off the reserve, but to make some money out of the transaction for the province. It was not a case of wanting me to agree to the removal of these Indians, and to go to the expense of their removal, without the Dominion Government deriving any benefit, which I was perfectly willing to do; but they said that this was a valuable property, and that the provincial government wanted to make something out of it. I said that was an entirely different question; I had not understood that there was a financial question involved. I said to Mr. Eberts, the Attorney General, that I had understood that they were acting simply as a public-spirited body for the purpose of doing something for the benefit of the city of Victoria; and I was willing to help them. But I said to Mr. Eberts that the Dominion Government were in the position of trustees, and that we could not do more than the law prescribed. He raised the question of title. I said: "I cannot settle the question of title, neither can you; we are both lawyers, and one will have one opinion, and the other another opinion; but when the question is settled, the Dominion Government will abide by the decision. We do not tie ourselves up in advance, nor ask you to do so; we simply ask you to say that you will accept our proposition that any money derived from the sale of the property shall be dealt with in the way the law provides." I am still perfectly willing to carry out that proposition, and, if there is any money which by a subsequent de-

cision is decided not to belong to the Dominion or to the Indians, but to the province, it will go to the province. I am willing to facilitate the decision of the question in any reasonable way. I think my hon. friend will admit that that is all I can possibly do. As representing the Indians, I can do no more than administer the trust as the law says I shall. I cannot give away trust funds without making the Government liable.

It being Six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PRIOR. When the House adjourned at six o'clock, the hon. Minister of the Interior had just finished making a statement to the House with regard to the way in which the Songhees Indian reserve stands at present. I think his remarks went to establish that the title to these lands had not been determined by a court of law.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The position is this. The Indian reserve was established before confederation, and the provincial government maintain that all that the Indians have is the usufructuary right of being upon the land and having the benefit of it so long as they choose to occupy it, but that as soon as they leave, their right expires, and the title is in the province. I do not positively say that that is not so, but I simply say that in my position as a trustee of the Indians, I cannot admit that pretension. If a court of law holds that that is so, that decision of course will relieve the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs of all responsibility. I must, however, have a valid decision, and it is the duty of the Government not to prevent that argument to go by default.

Mr. PRIOR. It seems to me that the Government should refer the question to the courts and have it settled at once, because until it is settled I suppose nothing can be done with regard to this and other reserves, the titles of which may be in dispute. I understand that it would be wrong for the Government, as trustee of the Indians, to give way, but it would be much fairer if the province or the city of Victoria, in this instance, would get any benefits that might accrue from taking these Indians and putting them on another reserve. When that reserve was given years ago, the land was of very little value, but it is now exceedingly valuable, and the rise in value is not due to anything the Indians have done but to the way in which the inhabitants and ratepayers of the city, right opposite the reservation, have built up the town. That being the case, I must say that if anybody is to get any benefit from the sale of this reserve, it ought to be either the province or the city, preferably the city. However, this matter is fully understood by the Minister and the provincial Government, and I do not suppose that anything I can say can throw any light on the subject. The only thing I can say is that if the title is in doubt, that doubt should be settled without delay, and I hope the hon. gentleman will do his best to have it settled and get these Indians off the reservation and settled somewhere else, and let the party entitled to it get the benefit.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I sympathize very largely with the hon. gentleman in his desire for a settlement. And I have in contemplation a proposition to the provincial government, which, I think, cannot be objected to, which will give them the opportunity of settling the question, if they are willing to do it.

Mr. MONK. I was not here when the decision arose as to the validity of the Indian title, but has it not been decided, in a case in the province of Ontario, that the Indian title reverts to the Crown, as represented by the province, should the Indians leave the reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As a lawyer, the hon. gentleman is perfectly familiar with the cases of which there are a number. In the St. Catharines Milling case, the decision of the judges went very far, and it is upon the strength of that decision that the provincial government takes the stand it does. But my hon. friend will see that the Indians have the right to stay on the reservation, and nobody else can have any right to it as long as they stay there, and it is my duty to see that the Indians, if they do leave, are put in as good a position as they would have been in if they had not moved.

Mr. PRIOR. Might I ask the hon. gentleman why these $2,000 are asked for in the item to provide an additional amount for surveys and reserves commission in British Columbia? There used to be a commission. Was not the Hon. Peter Reilly Commissioner for Indian reserves, and was he not put on the retired list because there was no more work to be done?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are accounts outstanding which it requires $2,000 to pay.

Mr. PRIOR. This was money spent without a vote?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We had a vote for expenses in connection with the reserve commission in British Columbia, but the expenses over-ran the amount voted.

There was a clerical error in resolution No. 69, made in the making up of the details. Under that resolution, there is an item to

provide an additional amount for the purpose of supplies for destitute and working Indians in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, $3,000. In giving the details, I gave them, showing $12,800 odd. The next item is to provide a gratuity to Clara Baker, equal to one year's pay of her husband, W. M. Baker, who was killed while on duty. $400. That should have been $480, the error being a clerical one. I propose to decrease this $13,000 by $80 and to increase this other item to $480, which will not change the total amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although the supplementary Estimates are of chief importance for the moment, there are a few items in the main Estimates relating to the Indian Department which are almost of equal importance, for the reason that they apply to annuities to Indians falling due in the first week in July, and other like matters; and while we can explain to white men the cause of delay, it will not be so easy to explain to Indians. I think it would be desirable, if the committee would consent, that we should pass for a moment from the supplementary Estimates and take up the Indian items in the main Estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. What difference will that make, if the assent is not given to the Bill?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We may have to take our Supply Bill in instalments, and if there is a first Supply Bill, it is well that it should contain these items, as the difference may be that between keeping faith and not keeping faith with the Indians. The principal item I propose is item 211 in the main Estimates. There are a number of items that are not controversial, and we might run through them. But if it is decided to take only the one item, I shall not object.

Mr. FOSTER. We had better take up this item 211 section by section.

Removal of Lake of Two Mountains Indians from Oka to Gibson $200

Mr. FOSTER. How long is that going on?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am afraid for a good many years yet.

Mr. SPROULE. That is rather an unsatisfactory answer. I think that item has appeared in the Estimates every year while I have been in this House over 20 years. If there is a settled policy with regard to this matter, it ought to be possible to carry it out within a reasonable limit of time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may explain that the department is under obligation to pay for the removal of those Indians who express a desire to leave. No money was spent under this head last year. The fact is that the arrangement made has turned out practically a failure, but we are bound to provide the money in case it may be needed.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that if any of the Indians desire to leave, this is to provide a fund for their removal?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes

Survey of Indian reserves..... $500

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these surveys going on?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When Indian lands are surrendered for sale, we have to send a surveyor to survey them.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent under this head last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Four hundred and ninety dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this apply to the survey of Indian lands on Georgian Bay, which has been taking place in late years?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; where the Indians have a fund, the survey is generally charged to that fund, but where there is none, we have to take the money voted by Parliament.

To assist in the suppression of the liquor traffic among Indians belonging to bands in the older provinces, which have no funds of their own $500

Mr. FOSTER. What was done with this last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the facts as to that at hand. This is to provide a fund for incidental expenses. For instance, when an agent enters prosecution and has to employ a lawyer, we have this $500 to pay any expenses. It is to cover any special expenditure that may be incurred for this purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there many complaints on this score? I have been going through some correspondence of the department concerning attempts to suppress the selling of liquor to the Scugog Indians. I judge that there is not much success attending the efforts made to keep the Indians from being supplied with liquor. The correspondence I had covered two or three years, and it seemed to me the same Indians were drinking and drinking about the same amount. The great difficulty seemed to me, in the first place, to get the Indian agent to act promptly, and, in the second place, to get the evidence to convict the white provider of the liquor. But my hon. friend ought to be able to state generally if there is any improvement in that respect.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I realize the importance of the subject, but the question of preventing Indians from getting liquor is a most difficult one. There is some town near almost every Indian reserve, and there are a number of unscrupulous men who make it a business to

supply Indians with liquor. While I was a resident of the North-west, I acted for some years as the representative of the Indian agent in one or two divisions, and had a good deal to do in connection with the attempt to prevent the sale of liquor to Indians. It is a most difficult thing to accomplish. A man may be fined for supplying liquor to Indians, and a few months afterwards we find somebody else endeavouring to do the same thing. I had a special conference with the inspector, Mr. Macrae, two or three times in regard to this subject, and he has undertaken to give it special attention, as a result of which we may look for some little improvement in the future.

To provide for the erection of a lock-up at St. Régis $500

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Everybody will understand the necessity of that. There has been no lock-up on the reserve, and if there had been one when the original troubles took place some years ago, this later trouble might not have occurred. There are 500 or 600 Indians on the reserve.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to the Minister that it was supposed this afternoon we would go on with the supplementaries. I want to reserve one item in these Estimates for general discussion for those gentlemen who are not now present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will allow the two votes which will include annuities to go through, we will be glad, on anything that is reserved, to allow the whole matter to be taken up.

Indians, Manitoba and North-west Territories—Annuities and commutations $135,825

Mr. FOSTER. Does this vote take in the annuities for the Peace River and Athabaska district?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Last year we voted a gratuity of $7 per head, and that is dropped out. We pay the gratuity when the treaty is made. But we estimated for it in the supplementaries which we went over this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to do with these treaty Indians in the next financial year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We pay them an annuity, but the other was a gratuity. The gratuity which was voted for the current year we will send to the commissioners and check it off for the current year. It will be actually paid by them during the next fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the gratuity for the current year.

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They only get a gratuity once. They get a gratuity of $7 per head, and an annuity of $5 per head. We have estimated for the gratuity in the supplementaries of this year.

Mr. FOSTER. While the Indians remain under treaty you do not allow them to change their annuity into a lump sum?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. There have been a few cases of that kind in the past, but I have never done it.

Implements, tools and hardware..... $12,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This estimate covers the cost of implements and tools to replace those that are worn out and useless; it covers also those that are required by the Indians who are commencing farming operations, and having been in the industrial schools, require to be assisted. All the persons who leave the industrial schools require to be assisted. A large portion of the estimate is for the purchase of materials to make necessary repairs. In several of the agencies there are Indians who have chiefly maintained themselves by hunting, and who now desire settling on reserves and commencing farming. We are increasing the vote to give some assistance to them in the way of implements, wagons and harness. This applies to the Blackfeet reserve to some considerable extent. The Indians of the Blackfeet reserve particularly will want this year a small supply of wagons and harness to enable them to put up hay for their cattle. I am informed that the Blackfeet and the Piegan Indians are showing greater aptitude to stay upon the reserves and engage in farming operations than formerly, and the commissioner thinks that it would be good policy to assist them by giving them a little more help.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend do with the graduates from the industrial schools? A boy comes out of an industrial school after he has gone through his course. What aid is given to him in the way of implements, or the like of that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are willing to do everything we can to get them to settle down and go farming. I may say that there is very great difficulty in arriving at the proper policy to pursue in regard to the Indians that come from these industrial schools. I found a policy, when I took hold of the department, of permitting Indian boys and girls to remain in the schools much longer than, in my judgment, it is good policy to do. The authorities of the schools seemed to manifest a fear that if the pupils were allowed to leave the schools, they would not turn out well. I think that that was not showing much faith in the work, because I thought that after

these boys and girls had completed their course at the schools they ought to be turned out to work and allowed to maintain themselves. I have pressed that upon the Indian Commissioner, from time to time, as vigorously as I can and also of the necessity of restricting the age limit within which Indian girls would be permitted to stay in these industrial schools. The difficulty, I may say, applies more to the girls than to the boys, because the girls do not manifest any desire to go back and live on the reserves, and hon. members will understand that it is not desirable that they should go out from the schools unprotected and with no person to look after them. As far as possible the commissioner is pursuing the policy of trying to get them to settle down and live a civilized life. When the young men are willing to do that assistance will be given under this arrangement.

Mr. WILSON. To what extent?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Fifty or sixty dollars is the amount which is generally expended for the purpose of assisting the pupil to start in his occupation.

Mr. FOSTER. In whatever trade he goes at?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It depends a good deal on the trade.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that in the way of tools or implements? I suppose tools and implements are given, and not money?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How are these tools bought; by tender or by giving an order to some firm?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The articles are, generally speaking, purchased by tender. The Indian Commissioner makes an estimate each year of what he will require, and under this estimate tenders are advertised for in the ordinary way. If any small amount is required beside the larger amount which the tender calls for, suddenly, or where time is an object, the commissioner buys it if he considers the price to be reasonable, but the amount purchased in that way is trifling.

Mr. SPROULE. What arrangement is made for the care of these tools from year to year? It is said that they sometimes take bad care of them. Is there any effort made to instruct them to take care of the tools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. We have upon the larger reserves farming instructors, and I understand that they are almost without exception capable men. Speaking from recollection, there are some reserves where the number of Indians is not sufficient to warrant the maintenance of a separate farming instructor. The agent in such a case is generally a farmer, and the agent, and in the other case, the instructor, have to pay special attention to the care of the implements and to the farming operations of the Indians. Great success has attended the efforts that have been made to get the Indians to raise cattle. I cannot say that such great success has attended the efforts that have been made to get them to follow farming in the way of raising grain. Their nomadic habits are hard to eradicate; it is hard to get them to settle down to sustained labour. But the raising of cattle is much more in accordance with their disposition, and they are much more successful in that than in other farming operations. However, I think, on the whole, that satisfactory progress has been made.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you find, on the whole, from your returns, that they are taking up agriculture? Do they raise much more grain, vegetables and roots for their own use than they did a few years ago? What is your experience?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our experience is that there is a gradual and steady improvement. Of course, I could not give the hon. gentleman exact figures without taking the statistics from the report. The hon. gentleman will find them pretty fully in the reports of the different agencies.

Mr. WILSON. You say you buy these implements by tender. Do the parties tendering supply them as you want them, or do you buy them in quantities and keep them in store?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The general custom, I think, has been that they are supplied and warehoused, to be called upon when wanted.

Mr. SPROULE. In this case I notice that there is an increase of $4,000. Is it expected that you will have a larger number of industrial school scholars to take up agricultural life in the coming year than heretofore?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The principal increase is on the Blackfeet and Piegan reserves.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the Blackfeet and Piegan reserves? Do you expect a larger number to take up agricultural pursuits this year, or the coming year, than in the previous year? If it were otherwise it must indicate that they are taking very poor care of their implements, for being once supplied they should not require to have an increased supply.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The principal increase is for the purpose of supplying the Blackfeet and Piegan Indians with implements, with the implements they

have not heretofore had, so that it does not indicate any lack of care on their part. I do not, however, want the hon. gentleman to think that I am saying that the Indians take first-class care of their implements. The agents and instructors are instructed to see that the implements are properly cared for.

Mr. FOSTER. When we come to discuss the item which has been reserved, I trust the Minister will be prepared to give the committee a brief but at the same time full statement, concerning the operations and results of the Indian educational system for which we are paying an immense amount of money. I have never yet been satisfied, that we got a return for the nearly one-half million dollars we are spending yearly for the education of the Indians. The annual report of the Minister, no doubt, gives a great deal of information, but if the hon. gentleman would make a short and comprehensive statement of this in the House, it would be the best way to give a general publicity. I would like him to give the committee shortly, but as fully as he can, the results of the Indian school system, industrial and otherwise. I wish, also, he would give what are the results that are coming in the way of agricultural progress. Are we making any progress in reclaiming the Indians from their wasteful and nomadic habits of life, down to the settled condition of an agricultural population? Our money has been poured out like water for these two purposes, and I have never be convinced that we are getting what we ought to get in return for the immense amount of money we expend. I wish information with reference to these young boys and girls who come out of the schools where we educate them for two or three years. What becomes of them? Do they drift into the old tribal state; do they go to ruin amongst civilization, or do they set out for themselves in any condition of life, which, while not on the plane of our civilization, perhaps, is still a distinct advance over Indian life.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will be happy to give the House full information as to this, and also my own views on the subject, which I have formed as the result of living in the North-west for years. I have to some extent modified my views by my experience in the department, but I am bound to say that I do not give full approval to all that we are doing in connection with Indian education. I will explain my reason for that when I make the statement to the House. Hon. gentlemen will understand, that a Minister taking charge of a department with a large and expensive system established, does not feel free to inaugurate an entirely new system, and thus destroy the effect of the money which has been previously expended. I will be glad if the House will, on an opportune occasion, take a few hours to discuss the matter.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. McMULLEN. The request of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) is an opportune one, and I am glad the Minister of the Interior has promised to make such a statement to the House. For many years, when in Opposition, I criticised the expenditure connected with Indians in the North-west, for I never could see that the country got the benefit of the money expended. I trust that the Minister will be able to make some suggestions with a view of cutting down the expenditure in connection with these Indian institutions. It is well that the country should deal kindly and liberally with the Indians, but, at the same time, I fear that the country receives no adequate return for the money spent.

Mr. DAVIN. As to the question of the Indian schools in the territories, it is very natural that the results should seem to be inadequate. To educate the children of savages taken from the tepee, is, of course, an arduous task, but the results have been surprising. The adaptability of the Indian child for education, and especially for technical training, is of a high order. Where the education of the Indian fails, is, that when the child is taught to read and write, to cast accounts, to understand a trade, in fact, to become useful members of society; then the adolescent seventeen or eighteen years old goes back to the tepee, and one year there, while it will not entirely destroy the technical or literary education, will in a very short time entirely destroy—especially in the case of the girls—all the practical training by which good habits have been imparted. Although I am a supporter of these schools, I will go so far as to say, that unless the Indian Department in some way provides that the children of our Indian schools shall be launched for life, it is very hard to resist the contention of those who maintain that the money spent on this education is to some extent thrown away. The argument of those who oppose our efforts to educate the Indians have a tremendous support from seeing numbers of these children going back to the habits of the savage who has to be cared for by the Government. But, even so, I would not yield to the view which gentlemen on both sides of the House take, that we are to look at the money spent on the education of the Indians in the same way as we would look upon money invested for other purposes. If you invest money for any other purpose, I admit at once that the true tests are: What are the results, does the success balance the outlay; but I will not admit that principle in the case of Indian children, for I contend that we have a duty to discharge to those people. We have taken their lands; we arrested them in a stage, no doubt, of very primitive progress, but still a stage of progress. If left to themselves, they probably would have worked out a civilization, and gradually have passed through the various stages which our own race have passed through,

passing from the savage to the quasi-civilized man, and then to the man of complete civilization, which most of us flatter ourselves, I am afraid vainly, we belong to. There is scarcely an Indian school in the North-west Territories which I have not visited, and there is not one of them—I will be perfectly frank about it—which, while sometimes filling you with surprise at the capacity of the Indian child for receiving education, will also fill you with discouragement and sometimes even with despair, because undoubtedly you see great rocks ahead. When you trace the history of one child after another who has gone to these schools, you find in many cases that they go back to the tepee, and then relapse into the position of the reserve Indian. I grant that it is discouraging; and you could make a strong argument on behalf of those who doubt the wisdom of spending so much money on the education of the Indian child. So that I would urge the Minister to consider whether he cannot go a step further. What occurs to me is that it is very undesirable to take into these schools children that any man of common sense will know cannot be educated into useful citizens; but if the children were selected, and then the department, carrying its guardianship still further, after teaching these selected children a trade, would take care to launch them in life, it would be more advantageous to educate fewer, and to perfect, so to speak, the civilization of the fewer, than to educate, as at present, a certain number up to a certain standard, and have them when called on to pass examinations and make apparently a very respectable showing; but when you come to look at the result as swelling the stream of civilized life, you find that after all very little has been done. Seeing that efforts are made to lower the cost of our Mounted Police, while keeping it up to its present standard, the educated Indians might be made use of for scouts. A small force under the control of the commissioner, and officered, of course, by white men, would cost very little. All they would want would be ponies and rations. By and by the population of our territories will be greatly increased, and the problem of dealing with the North-west will be multiplied, and new problems will suggest themselves; and I am inclined to think that a subsidiary body to the Mounted Police, composed of young educated Indians used for scouts for service along the border or in any portion of the country where pure scouting would be required, would furnish almost an ideal force. While admitting that there is a great deal to be said in the way of adverse criticism, I think that Parliament, conscious of what it owes to the redman, and what it has taken from him, and of our duty as guardians, will never be ready to look at this matter as one of mere pounds, shillings and pence.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the Minister tell us how many scholars are attending these schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The number of Indian children attending day schools is 2,476, boarding schools, 902, and industrial schools, 1,146.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the department supply them with books, maps and everything they require?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. In the industrial schools we pay so much a head. Most of the schools are managed by the religious denominations, subject to supervision by officers of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there many of these denominational schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the general system.

Mr. GILLIES. How many are engaged in teaching in the day schools, and what is the average salary of each teacher?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are seventy-two teachers of day schools, one teacher for each school. The standard salary paid is $300. I would not say there is no exception to that, but that is the general rule.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice, in a tabulated report given in the Auditor General's volume, G—12, a statistical review of the whole situation, and I find that the item of supplies for the destitute is a very large portion of the whole vote. It amounts altogether to $182,718, and in some of the agencies I see that it is almost tantamount to keeping the whole crowd, unless they are very numerous. One of the agencies cost $37,493 for supplies for the destitute, and another $26,000, and another $17,000, and so on. It would look as if in some of the agencies destitution is the rule.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The item is for supplies for destitute and working Indians. It is quite impossible on some reserves to get the Indians to do any work, unless the agent supplies them with food and other necessary provisions while they are doing that work. That is why in this item we use the words "supplies for destitute and working Indians." Then, we have in this vote the money necessary for the purpose of supplying cattle with hay. The cattle are the property of the Government, and the Indians, when attending to the cattle, have to be supplied with provisions by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. The heading in this tabulated summary is rather a misnomer. It ought to be: "Supplies for destitute and working Indians." But evidently these Indians do not do much work. The whole amount of seed that has been supplied to

them on the Blackfoot agency is $108, and they had to get $37,000 worth of provisions. The whole amount of agricultural implements supplied them is $377. It would seem as if almost the sole business of that agency was to consume the food supplied for the destitute.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the hon. gentleman the divisions of this particular vote. The entire vote for the North-west Territories amounts to $175,-459. Out of that, the food supply was $151,-380; ammunition, $3,970; clothing, $6,080; medicines and medical attendance, $11,060; hospital, $2,915; small items, $1,050.

Mr. FOSTER. What about this agency which eats up $37,400--the Blackfeet agency?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The larger portion of the expenditure is for the Blood, Blackfoot and Piegan reserves, where up to the present the Indians have not done a great deal in the way of agriculture, but are just beginning to show an aptitude for it. On the more advanced and older reserves, the Indians are largely self-supporting.

Mr. FOSTER. On what system are these supplies given?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Daily rations are supplied, just like military rations.

Mr. FOSTER. What do the Blood and the Blackfoot agencies contribute in the way of getting their own living?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have been doing some hunting. They go away during certain seasons, hunting, and they have been doing a little in the way of raising cattle, but not very much. Up to the present their subsistence depends on hunting and what they get from the Government. The increase in the vote for agricultural implements is due to the fact that they are manifesting a little more aptitude and desire to settle down on the reserve. I might give one fact as an indication of what the officers of the department have been doing for some years past, and I have made no change in that respect. I found that they had been buying supplies for the reserve from the Indians, and that they had been paying the Indians higher prices for beef than the beef could have been purchased for by tender, and they did it to encourage the Indians to raise beef which the Indians themselves are eating.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a case where an Indian, for once, got ahead of the white man.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are the children on the reserve compelled to attend those schools?

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are not sufficient schools. The Government is constantly being urged to provide more schools.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the number you have given include the very considerable number of children taken charge of by the various religious denominations and being educated in denominational schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Practically, there is no system of denominational schools, except that supported by the Government.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite understand there is no Government system, but I understand that the different religious denominations are educating Indian children and supplying them with clothing very largely. Are those the same children that you have charge of?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No doubt they are. A church may have large schools and get from this Government a grant of so much per head of the pupils. There may be fifty more pupils in any one of those schools than we are paying a grant for. Adherents of the church contribute money for the schools, and in most of the schools, particularly the boarding schools, there is a considerably larger number of pupils than we are paying the grant for.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. Minister tell us the number of denominational schools, the denomination to which they belong, and the number of pupils attending each?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are 72 day schools with 2,476 pupils. Of these schools, 47 are Church of England, 10 Roman Catholic, 3 Presbyterian and 12 Methodist. Of boarding schools there are 29 with 902 pupils. Of the boarding schools, 8 are Church of England, 14 Roman Catholic, 5 Presbyterian and 2 Methodist. There are 10 industrial schools with 1,146 pupils. Of these schools 4 are Church of England, 3 Roman Catholic, 1 Presbyterian and 2 Methodist.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is given to each of these schools per scholar?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They vary. That is one thing I intended to refer to when I speak on the subject at length. I will give a regular scheduled statement. There seems to have been no regular rule adopted. The accountant of the department tells me that the amount runs from $100 to $125; my own recollection is that there are some as low as $80, and some as high as $150. I have the information here, but it is in a form which would require the reading of a good many pages of the report to give the hon. gentleman what he wishes to know.

Mr. SPROULE. In the statement he is to make, will the Minister be good enough to say what amount is given to each school per scholar, and what percentage of the full number attending each school is paid for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very well. In the item of day, boarding and industrial schools in which $276,473 has been asked, there is, as hon. gentlemen will see, a reduction of $15,195. There is a reduction of $19,200 by reason of the fact that last year there was a vote for building the industrial school at Elk Horn which was burned down. There is also a reduction in the number of pupils at Brandon.

Surveys $5,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR Some of the reserves in the settled part of the North-west Territories are not actually occupied by Indians. In these cases we are getting them surrendered and surveyed so that they can be settled upon. The money can be funded for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think my hon. friend could take this out of the general vote for surveys of the North-west. Why debit that to the Indians? This is really an advantage to the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know that I would consent to that. But it occurred to me that it might be made a charge against the reserves under sale.

Mr. FOSTER. When the reserves are sold does the money go for the benefit of the Indians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, it is funded for their benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that the cost of survey should come from that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has never been done, but I think it might be done.

Sioux $5,057 50

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman buying Sioux, or what is this vote for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for the reserves on which are the Sioux Indians who came across from Minnesota and who settled on reserves west of Brandon. This is for the general expenses of the reserve.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are there on the reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are several reserves—Bird Tail, 73 Indians; Oak River, 302 Indians; Oak Lake, 61 Indians; Turtle Mountain, 11 Indians.

Grist and saw-mills..... $1,097 50

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these mills are operated for the benefit of the Indians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to bring that point up again, as I have not the information at hand.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that the items charged are too small in some cases to employ men to run these mills. On what principle do you run them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The department has a miller to take charge of the mill, whose salary is included in the vote for general expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you grind any grain in these mills for the white settlers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

General expenses..... $128,025

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote covers practically the entire salaries in the Indian service in Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these millers have you?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Two or three. We pay them $40 a month and expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this item of general expenses, it bears a very large proportion to the total vote for the Indians. It is nearly one-fifth of all the money spent on the Manitoba and North-west Indians. That seems an immense appropriation. For instance, the commissioner's office in Winnipeg costs nearly $34,000, then, there is a very large and expensive department here at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Practically, the commissioner's office as it before existed, has been entirely abolished, that is to say, the commissioner does not do departmental work at all. When I took charge I abolished the system whereby the commissioner did departmental business directly with the agent. The agents corresponded with the commissioner, to whom their returns were all sent in, then they were checked over and had to be sent down down here and gone over again. There may have been an object some years ago in this system when the communication was very slow, but there is no object in doing so now. The commissioner at Winnipeg has to oversee the work, he has to receive and check over the reports of the inspectors, he has to make recommendations in respect to all the work for the next year. He is responsible for the whole work, but he does not do it in detail. He gets information from the inspectors' reports, and checks up what is required for each year, and makes the estimate for the year. We make our estimate upon that. The staff consists of the commissioner himself, his secretary, an accountant, who spends part of the time here and part of the time

there, who was the chief clerk in the commissioner's office at Regina, Mr. Paget. The commissioner gets $3,200, the secretary, $1,500, Mr. Paget, $1,500, a stenographer, $600, another stenographer, $280, a clerk, $900, office boy, $360, and there are $800 for clerical assistance. There are none there but who are absolutely necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Now that we have an Imperial limited running through, and telegraph wires at hand, what is the necessity for having a re-duplication in Winnipeg of the office here? It is now only about 40 hours between Ottawa and Winnipeg, or two nights and a day. Only one day of real working time is saved. Then the telegraph wire is an instant communication. Has not the time come when that office, so far as it is a re-duplication of work here, or a checking over of work which might be done here—when that office might be absorbed entirely in this?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The chief argument against the hon. gentleman's suggestion is that the travelling expenses of the officers going up there and coming in here, would necessarily be very heavy. For instance, if the commissioner is at Winnipeg, the various inspectors doing their duties in the North-west come down to Winnipeg and discuss the matters with him. He gets their reports, and it is much more satisfactory to have a personal discussion with the commissioner than merely to report. I do not see how we could manage to make any saving if the commissioner wished to carry on the work in that way. If we had the commissioner here the inspectors would have to come down here to consult with him, and he would probably have to go out there quite often. It seems to me that for the present, at least, not much would be gained by bringing them down here. I do not think the system would be quite as efficient. The inspectors coming into Winnipeg maintain to some extent personal relations with the work of the department, and that is a distinct advantage in the way of keeping up efficiency. I do not think that the work could be done so efficiently if we did not have the commissioner located at Winnipeg.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is reasonable as far as the commissioner himself goes, and I suppose the commissioner must have secretarial work beside in that office. But there are seven salaries. Why should you have an accountant there. What you want to do is to keep within touching distance of your inspectors. You have to make your inspectors responsible for the work of the agents. When you say that you want to keep them in touch with the department here you can do that under the present circumstances by having your commissioner in Winnipeg where the hon. gentleman can have communication with him personally, and frequently. But why have a whole system of accounts up there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have said something which has misled the hon. gentleman. I do not mean that there is a system of accounts kept there, because there is not. Mr. Paget is specially well acquainted with the accounts of the agencies. It is difficult for a man who has not special knowledge of the accounts to get along when the Estimates are being made up. The commissioner makes up the Estimates that the department passes before recommending them to Parliament. All these items which are voted are worked out almost to a single cent, and this involves a considerable amount of work. The commissioner has a very considerable amount of work in cutting down excessive demands that are made by the agencies, and he requires a man for doing that who is thoroughly versed in the accounts here and at the agencies. Mr. Paget has been doing that work, and he is specially fitted for it. He spends a portion of his time up there, and after he is done, he comes down here to the department. In addition to Mr. Paget there is a secretary, Mr. Lash, who manages the office when the commissioner is visiting the agencies. There are also two typewriters and two clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. There are seven men paid, and $800 is taken for clerical work besides. What strikes me is that the work which my hon. friend has done there could be done here. You must have your commissioner in Winnipeg and he must have a secretary, but what is the need of having four or five men besides? What are these other men doing besides the commissioner and his secretary? We have two typewriters, one clerk at $900, and a junior at $360.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will see that the commissioner carries on a very considerable correspondence.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he has to have a secretary and a typewriter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can only say this, that the staff think that they have been over-worked rather than under-worked, and the suggestion was made to me, when a change was made in the commissioner's office that the staff ought to be made larger. I refused to sanction any additions because I think the same thing as the hon. gentleman, that the work of the commissioner's office should be minimized as much as possible. I quite appreciate what the hon. gentleman says, and my own desires are in the same direction as his, and if there is any possibility of reducing the staff I am prepared to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, there is a great amount of correspondence.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The inspectors come into the office, when they are in Winnipeg and a good deal of their correspondence with agencies is conducted through the office. That adds a certain amount of work.

Indians, British Columbia—
Salaries $19,840

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Chairman, in connection with these Estimates for Indians in British Columbia, I would like to call the attention of the hon Minister of the Interior to a peculiarity in connection with these expenditures which I have noticed in the Estimates for a number of years, and of which I have never received any explanation. I find by the Indian Report that last year the Indian population of British Columbia is given as 24,973; the Indian population of Manitoba as 6,716, and of the North-west Territories as 14,600. That is to say, the total population of the whole of the prairies, Manitoba and the North-west Territories, amounts to 21,316, whereas in British Columbia we have an Indian population of 24,973, over 3,000 more. Notwithstanding that, in British Columbia there are over 3,000 more Indians than on the prairies, we find that for the coming year there is proposed to be expended for the prairie Indians $766,047.50, and for the British Columbia Indians $124,710, or in other words, just one-sixth of what is proposed to be expended upon the Indians of the prairie. There may be some explanation of this, and I should be very glad to hear it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give my hon. friend (Mr. McInnes) the explanation. The explanation is that the Indians of British Columbia are very much better able to take care of themselves than those of the prairies. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Indians of British Columbia are, as a rule, men who work for wages, and are fairly well able to take care of themselves. I may say to my hon. friend that in discussing the question of Indian administration there with public men, some of them have suggested to me that the Dominion Government did too much for the Indians of British Columbia, as they were perfectly capable of taking care of themselves. I am quite sure that my hon. friend would not suggest, for the purpose of increasing the expenditure there, that we should practically waste money in pauperizing Indians who are doing pretty well for themselves now. The policy of the Government is to try and get them to take care of themselves as rapidly as possible. The Indians of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are the hardest Indians in Canada to deal with, because of the fact that they are the farthest removed from the ordinary type of the workingman. They are the hardest to get settled down to work.

Mr. McINNES. I am pleased to hear the opinion of the hon. Minister of our Indians, and to hear it echoed by the House. I have no doubt that the Indians of British Columbia are superior to the Indians of the prairies, and that they are practically self-sustaining, for whereas the Indians on the plains have now to have $190,000 spent to relieve their destitution, the Indians in British Columbia only require something like $3,500. That proves it. I did not have any special reference to the amount proposed to be expended in the way of relieving distress; I had more particular reference to the maintenance of schools; and there is no reason given in the Minister's explanation why the Indians on the prairie should have greater educational facilities than the Indians in British Columbia. For the education of the Indians on the prairies there is no less a sum spent than $276,433; but for a similar purpose in British Columbia, with more Indians, there is expended the comparatively insignificant sum of $59,000. If our Indians in British Columbia are more intelligent, more energetic, and more thrifty, as the Minister says, then, that is the very reason why they are more susceptible to education and should have a larger grant for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. McInnes) would not suggest that we should start in to administer the department on the basis of evening up the expenditure, on the ground that the Indians of one part of the country were getting more than Indians of another. That might be a good thing theoretically, but it is not practical. I have recognized the fact that the Indians of British Columbia were not getting such assistance, educationally, as they ought, and I have made some slight move in the direction of remedying that. Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. McInnes) will appreciate my desire to cut down the expenses, as far as possible.

British Columbia Indians—
Office and miscellaneous (including hospitals, irrigation and dyking, suppression of liquor traffic)..... $10,920

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot find the Auditor General's account for expenditure in miscellaneous in British Columbia. There is one thing which seems to be always with us; that is, that reserve commission in British Columbia. That has existed from time immemorial, and seems to have everlasting life, as long as the funds last.

Mr. GIBSON. A good salary attached to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, good salaries; but are we never to get to the end of the work

of the reserve commission in British Columbia ? What is that commission doing now besides taking in the salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The information we have from the inspector is, that the work has been pretty nearly completed.

Mr. FOSTER. That identical information met my ears in 1882, when I first came into this House, and every year I was a Minister it was the one explanation that was given.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It struck me exactly as it struck the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), and I am sure the hon. gentleman will give me credit for cutting the expenditure down.

Mr. EARLE. Who are the commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Vowell is the commissioner on behalf of the Government.

Mr. EARLE. But he is a salaried officer, and his pay does not come out of this vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Judge O'Reilly was the commissioner.

Mr. EARLE. But not at present.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We retired him, and I think he was entitled to a pension.

Mr. EARLE. But not from your department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. Mr. Vowell has had charge of it since.

Mr. EARLE. Mr. Vowell is the Indian agent, and his salary would not come out of this vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. These are simply the expenses of doing the work, when a party is sent out to make a survey.

Mr. EARLE. My impression is, that the work of surveying is entirely over, and that the only work now being carried on is office work. While we are on this item, I would like to ask the Minister in regard to an application made for a school on the west coast of Vancouver Island, or for an additional allowance to the Kuper Island School at Alberni.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, we have a vote for a new school.

Mr. EARLE. I would suggest to the Minister that before establishing a school there, he should have the matter looked into very closely, because I think that the greater number of Indians are at Barclay Sound, while there are very few at Alberni. The Indians at Barclay Sound are located in nearly the same locality, so that a school there would reach almost the entire population of the west coast Indians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Since I gave instructions to have the item included in the Estimates, the fact to which the hon. gentleman refers has been called to my attention, and the item has been left subject to the consideration whether the money is to be paid or not.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not got to the bottom of this commission, and I propose to spend a few moments to find out what it is doing.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The sum asked for on account of surveys and reserve commission is for the purpose of having the reserves already laid off surveyed and completed, as much confusion and inconvenience often arises in connection with unfinished reserves, especially when the same are allowed to remain seven or eight years in that condition. Some of the localities where such surveys are yet to be made are remote, and consequently high prices are necessary. Then there are several localities not yet visited by the reserve commissioner, where reserves have to be made for the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite understand that if you have surveyors, you must have axemen and survey men ; but why do you require a commission ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That I have done away with. When I came in, a separate gentleman who was reserve commissioner, but I did away with that office, and transferred the duties to Superintendent Vowell.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, all that is being done in surveying is being done by surveyors ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how many Indians there are in the province of Nova Scotia, and the counties in which these Indians are ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will find the information on page 410 of the report of the Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. GILLIES. I would draw the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that though the Indians of Nova Scotia, especially the Micmac tribe, are constantly decreasing, the expenses in the way of salaries and medical attendance are increasing. This year, in the main Estimates, a vote of $300 is demanded for the medical attendance of the Indians of Nova Scotia, about 2,000, and in the supplementary Estimates, the hon. gentleman is asking for $700 more. Then, for salaries we have the very large sum of $1,100. So that in salaries and medical attendance alone, for the few Indians down there, we are spending

$4,100; whereas for assistance to the Indians we spend only $2,000. I wish to draw attention further to the fact that in the Estimates for former years, for medical attendance in Nova Scotia, when the population of the Indians was greater than now, the sum was much less. In 1894, the vote for medical attendance was only $2,000, when the Indians were very much more numerous than they are to-day, and yet, to-day that service is costing $3,000. In my own county, where the number of Indians is only 120, the medical attendance of last year cost $133.98. The Indians in the county of Richmond are all on the Salmon River Reserve, and that reserve is five or six miles away from where the attendant physician lives, so that I can scarcely understand how the sum for medical attendance should amount to so much, particularly in view of the fact that the charge for medical attendance upon that very reserve years ago was in no year over $50 or $60.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) for drawing my attention to a matter with which he is, no doubt, personally more familiar than I. I may explain to the House that there is a constant contest between the officers of the department and the gentlemen who do this work with regard to these accounts. In 1895-96, the last year of the administration of the late Government, the amount expended on this service was $2,997. In 1896-97 it was $2,977, being $20 less, and in 1897-98, $3,005, so that, there has only been a variation of a few dollars in those three years. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we are doing the best we can to keep the accounts down as much as possible.

Steamer "Vigilant" $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are you doing with that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was built in 1890 for the use of the agent on the north-west coast.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it used exclusively by the agent?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, it cost $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What size is it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have seen it and I think it is about 45 feet long.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not quite large enough for an excursion steamer?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is just a small steam yacht.

Mr. FOSTER. Not used for jaunting purposes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the "Quadra" is the one that my hon. friend and his colleagues used.

Mr. FOSTER. At the present time it is being quite extensively used.

J. A. Macrae, inspector of Indian agencies and reserves $1,600

Mr. FOSTER. Are you giving him an increase of salary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $200.

Mr. FOSTER. How long ago was he appointed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He came to Ottawa in 1894. Previous to that he was inspector in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, certainly in the service of the department. I can remember myself that he has been working for the Indian Department from 1885.

Legislation—
Senate $6,573

Mr. SPEAKER. In connection with this item of legislation, I would like to say a few words, with the permission of the committee, about a matter which was discussed a few days ago when I was in the Chair, and of course could not correct any misapprehensions. Before I give up dealing in any respect with that stationery item, as I intend to do, I would like to say a few words with regard to it, so that it may be a little clearer perhaps than it is to-day. As to the amount applicable for the purchase of stationery for this House, in 1896 a motion was carried in the House to the effect:

That the practice of supplying each Senator and member of the House of Commons with a leather trunk and a box of stationery be discontinued in future, and the Order of the House sanctioning the same be rescinded.

Now, up to that time there was a vote of $12,000 for stationery for the use of the House of Commons. This resolution having passed, the Government reduced the vote from $12,000 to $8,000, at which it has remained since. Of course there has not been the same opportunity of purchasing stationery and filling boxes for members of the House with the $8,000 vote that there was with the $12,000 vote. After that reduction had been made the Committee on Printing, in 1898, recommended in one of their reports, which was carried:

That the members, officers and those on the official list of the Press Gallery of the House of Commons, should be provided for their use with stationery in every particular equal to that supplied to the members of the Senate.

Well, there was no change in the vote for that purpose, and the hon. members of the Senate, I understand, receive very fine boxes of stationery. Boxes of stationery have been abolished by the action of this House, so that the report of the committee in 1898, and which was repeated again in the report that was brought before the House the other day, seems rather inconsistent with the

action of the House, and in view of the amount of the finances at the disposal of whoever has to deal with the stationery. Now, after the session of 1898, when the suggestion was made that although the House had decided not to have stationery trunks for the members, still stationery trunks should be supplied to the members—when that was passed, the head of the stationery department, Mr. Clarke, came to me and asked what he was to do about it. That was since last session. He asked if it would be safe for me to give him an order for stationery in every particular equal to that supplied to Senators, and he informed me it would require a very much larger sum than the vote passed last session for that purpose. I communicated with the leader of the Government to ascertain if I would be warranted in supposing they would increase that grant for the stationery estimate, and there was no encouragement whatever given to me that that would be done. Therefore, I instructed Mr. Clarke to confine his purchase to the $8,000, which he did. Then, when the other day, the report was submitted to the House again repeating the suggestion about the very fine stationery we should get, Mr. Clarke wrote me a letter as to the purchase for the next year, and pointed out in that letter that it would cost $8,730 more than the vote of $8,000 which was in the Estimates, the usual vote as it now stands. I wrote to him that I could only repeat what I had told him before that the Government refused to increase the grant for stationery above $8,000, but that if the Printing Committee would provide the funds for that purpose, well and good, otherwise he would have to keep within the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this vote supposed to cover? Is it the stationery the members use, or that which is used by the press, and the clerks, and the general staff of the House of Commons?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is supposed to cover 291 persons altogether, who get a supply of stationery, and who get the trunks of stationery. There are 213 members, 9 of the "Hansard" staff, 10 translators, and the Clerk tells me an average of 56 reporters in the Press Gallery, and 3 officers of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What, 56 reporters! There is not room in the Press Gallery for them all.

Mr. SPEAKER. They are officially certified members of the Press Gallery. For the Senate only 80 trunks of stationery are supplied, and they have $6,000 to do it with, while we have $8,000 for the whole number I have mentioned. Then in addition to these I have mentioned, all the officials of the House of Commons, in all the departments, have received out of this supply of stationery all that they want during the session. The members receive all that they want during the session, all that they requisition for. Thousands upon thousands of certain kinds of envelopes, for instance, are used by the members. The press are supplied during the session. So the demands upon the stationery are very great, and it is exceedingly hard, I know, for the clerk of the stationery department to meet the requirements of the House without going further.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the requisitions for stationery countersigned by the Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. No. During the session an hon. member gets what he wants.

Mr. FOSTER. Any one of the 291.

Mr. SPEAKER. Any one of the 213, at any rate. Members of the House get what they want, and others who are on the list get what is reasonable, as asked for from time to time. Some hon. members seem to require a very great deal more than others during the session.

Another point I would like to say a word about is as to the parties supplying the stationery. I was informed that ever since confederation much the largest portion of the stationery had been purchased from firms in Great Britain, and very little in Canada. About two years ago Mr. Clarke reported to me that some excellent samples had been submitted to him of pads and envelopes and other stationery by Messrs. Warwick Bros. & Rutter of Toronto, at fair prices; in fact, he said they had showed samples as good in quality as the English and quoted the English prices. I told him it was a pity not to buy part of the stationery in Canada if it could be had as good and as cheap as it had been got from England. In 1897 and 1898 Mr. Clarke ordered pads and other goods to the extent of about $1,000, and in the present year, he extended the order for envelopes, &c., to the extent of $2,372. He ordered altogether from Canadian firms $2,479. He ordered from firms in Great Britain $5,478 worth; from Bavaria $112; from the United States $260, and from the Government stationery office, $102.

Mr. FOSTER. What came from Bavaria?

Mr. SPEAKER. Faber's pencils, I believe.

Mr. WALLACE. Were the goods ordered from Canadian firms of Canadian manufacure?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand so. It will be seen that less than one-third of the whole vote of $8,000 was spent with Canadian firms even this year. Early this session Mr. Clarke reported to me that among these supplies were envelopes from Messrs. Warwick Bros. & Rutter, which were very inferior, and not up to the sample. He said the same thing, to a certain extent.

had occurred in the case of that firm last session, and they had promised most faithfully that they would not do it again if he would give them another chance. Well, it was so very annoying and so very unfair that the House should be treated in this way that I ordered Mr. Clarke not to give this firm another order. He has ordered the bulk of the supply for next session from the old firms in the old country. He found that we wanted some envelopes and could not wait for them to come from the old country, and he reported that he had some excellent samples from the Barber & Ellis Company of Toronto, and at a little cheaper rate. I told him to fill up what he would need this session. Those envelopes have not yet come, but they will be used for the remainder of the session.

Mr. SPROULE. Was any reduction made in the account of the firm that supplied the inferior envelopes ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, but the orders have been stopped. The supply was needed immediately for the use of members, and the envelopes came in small lots, Mr. Clarke informs me, and he could not return them without leaving us without any.

Mr. SPROULE. I should have thought that the clerk of stationery, when he found the envelopes not up to sample, would take it off the account.

Mr. SPEAKER. I asked him that very question, but he explained to me that the envelopes were coming in small lots and were needed. Now, these points, I think, cover the means that have been at the disposal of the stationery department ; and they also show that some hon. members were somewhat mistaken when they said that I had undertaken to take all the orders away from the old firms in Scotland and give them to some Canadian firms.

When I became Speaker, I found that the stationery department had been under the control of previous Speakers, and I continued to give general attention to it, depending very largely on the experience and ability of Mr. Clarke at the head of the office. Now, I need not say how pleased I will be to be relieved from having anything to do with this stationery business. In fact, I feel that I have responsibilities and duties enough without that somewhat thankless work. I do not know how it came to be in charge of the Speaker, except that it was part of the internal economy of the House which he had to attend to. But from this day, I certainly will very respectfully decline to take any charge of it, and the House will no doubt arrange how they can best deal with it for the future.

Mr. ELLIS. I was not here when this subject was discussed the other day, but I have attended pretty regularly the meetings of the Printing Committee. That committee is, of course, a joint committee, and it often occurs that members of the one branch of Parliament who find that the supplies are not as good as those given to the other naturally talk over the matter at the committee. And when some of the supplies partake of the nature of gilt clocks and things of that kind, there is naturally a desire all around that there should be gilt clocks all round, and that there should be an understanding of the whole business. No question arises as to the stationery for the trunks—that was not seriously discussed. The question that was discussed was the complaint of many members that the stationery for use in the House was not of such a character as should be furnished to members of Parliament. The envelopes have not enough mucilage to seal them. My own judgment, as a member of the committee, is that the whole service for Parliament should be one service, that is, there should be no difference made between one branch of the legislature and another ; and whatever is furnished should be furnished by some authority treating both branches alike ; and of course exercising the greatest economy consistent with doing the work properly.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask who makes the selection of stationery ? It seems to me that the experience of the last two years at least has been such that we might well offer to dispense with that kind of stationery we have received, and save that much money, for the simple reason that members of this House are all supplied liberally on application with the stationery they require during the session.

Now, I presume that no hon. member of this House wants a particle of paper more than is absolutely necessary. I will have nothing to say as to the character and the cost of it, on the whole, which has been fair, but what has been called stationery, put in the trunks, is of no use whatever. No hon. member can use it, when he goes home. It is not suited for any gentleman to use. It looks very much like a job lot that is put into the trunks. I am not going to ask who makes the selection of the stationery, and what induces any person to pack members' trunks with that kind of stationery. It is no use, either at home or here. So I say, let us not go through the mockery of receiving stationery. Let us save that sum of money, or let us be consistent, and have stationery or not, and I am not urging that point. I quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. gentleman who spoke last, that the Senate and the members of this House should receive the same stationery, and I think we had better settle the whole question during the present session.

Mr. FOSTER. Who does make the selection ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Clarke makes the selection.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine, on suggestions and advice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Clarke has made the selection since I have been in the Chair, following out what he did before. That was when there was $12,000 in the vote; but since then the vote has been reduced to $8,000, so that there has been no proper vote to give really valuable trunks and stationery. He has tried to squeeze what he could out of it for the members, and I believe he has run his stock very low by reason of his attempt, out of a very much smaller sum, to give some kind of trunks to the members. He has run his stock so low that he believes he will not be able to give any boxes of stationery next session. He made the selection. Of course, he had to give much less value in stationery than he had done before, when he had more money; but, as to the selection he has made, I think I mentioned it once before this session, that if hon. members wished a different kind of stationery than that which is placed in their trunks, they can send up and get from Mr. Clarke, if he has it in stock, a different kind of stationery of similar value.

Mr. OSLER. I think on one occasion I remarked that the only economy the present Government had effected since they had been in office was to do away with hon. members' stationery trunks, but it appears that there has not been much economy. I would suggest, that if stationery is to be supplied, it should be simple and of the best character. If you supply paper, supply the best paper, the best pens, the best pocket knife. The various articles that are supplied should be of the best. Let it be as simple as can be, but it should be of the best, and I am quite sure the selection of it can be left with all confidence to Mr. Speaker, under the direction of the House. The paper should be simple business paper, and these little articles of stationery should be simple and of the best.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the House will distinctly understand what I said about that. I hope the House will provide some other means of selecting and attending to the stationery. I think it is hardly consistent with the dignity of the Chairman of this august assembly that he should be looking after different kinds of stationery, and I am sure it is not an agreeable task. I wish the House particularly to take it off my hands.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me that a false impression has been conveyed by the report of the committee on printing to this House. It certainly was conveyed to my mind, and I suppose to the minds of hon. members of this House, that the hon. Speaker had not done his duty. I am very pleased to learn that Mr. Speaker was not to blame in connection with this matter. When the vote of the House was reduced, hon. members cannot expect to receive the same quality and the same amount of stationery. The impression left on my mind was, that Mr. Speaker had not done what the committee thought he might have done, with the amount placed at his disposal. Hon. gentlemen will see that they could not by any possible means be furnished with the same amount of paper, or paper of the same quality, with a much smaller amount of money. I, for one, do not care anything about a trunk; but, if we are to have stationery, I am thoroughly in accord with the suggestion that it should be good. Perhaps we do not control what goes on in the Senate at all, and anything we say here cannot affect the expenditure there, but it has always been the desire that the House of Commons should have just as good material as they have in the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. We want to get through the Estimates, but I think this matter should be settled by common consent. I might have said it bluntly the other day, but I said what Mr. Speaker has said here, that I thought it would be just as well to relieve Mr. Speaker of the trouble of looking after the paper for the members. It is not a pleasant thing to come in contact with two hundred hon. members, every one with a different idea as to the kind of paper he should have. I believe that if we had the general assent of the House, that what we want is good, plain, serviceable stationery, the whole matter might be left with the efficient clerk of stationery. I believe that if Mr. Clarke was not interfered with, and simply had the assent of the House that what was to be given was simple, plain, but good stationery, we would get it, just as well as we ever would get it. We cannot vie with the Senate. In the first place, we cannot bring the Senate down, and, in the second place, I do not think we should go up to the height of getting brass clocks. We might as well let the Senate manage their own stationery. They are a luxurious and select body, and they will have such stationery as they want. I believe that this House will not care to go so high. My view would be, that if it is made known by common assent that we do not want any furbelows, but we want good, plain stationery, we could leave the vote with the clerk of stationery and he would provide it. I had a little curiosity as to how we get 291 recipients of stationery. They must be largely multiplied, if there are 56 reporters around these precincts. I think that at the present time you will find that there are not more than 30 or 35.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a press association in connection with the Gallery here. They organize themselves, and I think they are responsible for their organization. They have certain privileges connected with this

House, a good many privileges, and, as far as I am able to judge, they are pretty strict in the admissions they give to their Press Gallery. Every session there is a new organization among them, and the secretary of the Press Gallery sends to the Speaker the full list of those who are elected members of the Press Gallery. That list is not completed at once, but within a few weeks of the beginning of the session it is completed. That list I have always sent to Mr. Clarke for his guidance, and to the Sergeant-at-Arms for his guidance, as to the members full list of those who are elected members for the Press Gallery who have the privileges of the House and of the Reading Room as well as the members of Parliament. Mr. Clarke assures me that 56 is the average number for some years, and I think it is 52 this year.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is done through the secretary of the organization, of course it could not be done in any better way.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is done well. I have heard of many instances where newspaper men were not accorded the privileges of the Press Gallery, and when they came to complain to me, I referred them instantly to the organization of the Press Gallery, which, I believe, is entirely above party.

Mr. FOSTER. In every sense superior to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as I can make out, they are very strict and careful in that matter.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not quite agree with what my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) says, I think we ought to have some kind of a strong box to hold our stationery in. A year or two ago we got a paper box or a card box of some kind, and it all went to pieces. We should have a deal box or a hemlock box or some such thing, no matter how coarse it be, to contain our stationery until we get home.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should now adjourn.

Mr. BRITTON. There are in Ontario, as I suppose there are in other provinces, what are called county library associations. They are sustained, first, by a membership fee, second, by a grant from the Law Society, and third, by a small grant from the Ontario Government. Application has been made to this Parliament to furnish to these associations, numbering about twenty in Ontario, a copy of "Hansard." These associations are established in the county towns, and although mainly intended for the legal profession, the general public has access to them. It would not be a very great expense to furnish these different associations with a copy of "Hansard," and I think it would be money well spent. "Hansard" would be more read there than in other places, except, of course, in Parliament during session. It would be very valuable in giving the discussions which take place on the legislation of the country. I admit there is a good deal of "Hansard" that never would be read by anybody, but that is, perhaps, the misfortune of having the debates published in extenso. Still, there is so much that is valuable, valuable for the public and specially valuable to lawyers, that I submit that Parliament should furnish the extra amount required to supply these county libraries with copies of "Hansard." I trust that this suggestion will meet the approval of the House.

Mr. GIBSON. Almost every week the Committee on Printing has before it applications for the blue-books issued by Parliament. The other day there was an application from the city of Toronto asking for bound copies of the parliamentary publications, but although the matter has not been finally disposed of, the committee thought that they were meeting all requirements when they supplied the books in unbound form. Incidentally, the question of supplying "Hansard" was brought up, and it was pointed out by some members of the "Hansard" committee, that in almost every case where application was made for the bound copies for law societies, the member for the district could supply them with one from the two copies he receives every year. I submit, that if you are going to the expense of furnishing the law societies and free libraries with bound copies of parliamentary publications, the appropriation made by Parliament to the Printing Committee would not suffice. It is quite an easy matter for the member representing the locality to give the extra copy of "Hansard" he receives to the law society or public library in his district.

Mr. BELCOURT. I quite agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). It seems to me that the expense involved in supplying law associations with a copy of "Hansard" would be quite justified by the advantages derived from it. These law associations are open not only to the members of the bar, but to the judges throughout the province; and I think it is important that the judges should be made aware of the debates of this House affecting public legislation—for instance, legislation on the Criminal Code, amendments to the criminal law and legislation on procedure in election matters. The opinions which induced the members to pass legislation might very well be at the disposal of the judges throughout the country, and I think the expenditure for this purpose would be justified.

Mr. BENNETT. I was asked some little time ago by the Bar Association of the county of Simcoe to assist in securing this grant, if possible, and I can heartily concur in what has been said by the two hon. gen-

tlemen who have preceded me. In answer to what the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), the chairman of the committee, says, I have this to say, that where a member has always had the two copies of "Hansard," if he has presented one copy to a friend, it is rather hard that he should have to turn round now and break into the series by giving one of his copies to a law association. I agree that for lawyers and others interested in the profession to be enabled to refer to "Hansard" at a central place in every county town, would be a matter of great convenience.

Mr. MORRISON. I would be inclined to support the suggestion that "Hansard" be sent to the various law associations, if it were also sent to other associations which are just as important or even more important than the law associations. I would suggest that copies of "Hansard" be sent to the various farmers' institutes, the medical associations, the mining institutes, the fruit-growers' institutes, the canners' association, the license victuallers'——

Mr. FOSTER. The high-binders.

Mr. MORRISON—and in fact to all members of the community who are interested in legislation, quite as much as lawyers can possibly be. I cannot see how hon. gentlemen can escape from supporting that suggestion. In fact, I think the argument is stronger in favour of having "Hansard" sent to these different associations, because they have not the same facilities for going through the frightful mass of stuff that appears in "Hansard" from session to session; and if the hon. member for Kingston will support my suggestion that "Hansard" be sent to these different bodies, I would have much pleasure in supporting his suggestion; but certainly I think there should be no invidious distinction. Seriously speaking, I fail to see why "Hansard" should be sent to the law associations. My hon. friend from Kingston states that there are 20 law associations in Ontario. There must be as many in Quebec. In British Columbia we have five, and there will, of course, be more in a few years as population increases. Then there are similar associations in the maritime provinces, in Manitoba and in the Territories; and I see no valid reason for supplying all these bodies with "Hansard." It is not the question of expense at all; it is the bad precedent that would be established; and all these other associations have as much right to be furnished with copies, particularly the farmers' associations. Personally, I oppose the suggestion of my hon. friend from Kingston, that "Hansard" be sent to the law libraries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think a good many members of this House will agree with me that we are overloaded with lawyers, and I am afraid that if we supply all the different lawyers' associations with "Hansard," those who are not lawyers will be crowded out of this House. I am very much afraid that if the judges read "Hansard" they also will become politicians, and it is desirable that they should remain entirely independent and unbiassed. But, joking apart, I would have no objection to supplying the different law associations with copies of "Hansard," but to do so will increase the cost. I think mechanics' institutes might very well be supplied, and farmers' institutes too, if the lawyers are to be supplied.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not agree with the view of my hon. friend that the result of the free distribution of "Hansard" to the law libraries would be to bring more lawyers into this House. I am sure that if the lawyers read half the stuff they would find in "Hansard" they would not want to come here at all. However, there is a serious aspect to this matter. We make laws here, and naturally our intention and our desire must be that the laws we make should be thoroughly understood, especially by the judges who are called on to administer the laws and by the lawyers who take part in their administration. If we want the laws which are passed here to be properly understood, it seems to me of the first importance that the reasons and explanations given in this House when the Bills are introduced and discussed on both sides should be accessible to those who are called upon to administer the laws. I will give the House one illustration of what I mean. It will be remembered that in 1886, as a result of the general election, there were a good many contestations of elections. For the first time the question was raised as to the six months' limitation; that is to say, when an election was contested, if six months were allowed to elapse without following up the first proceedings, the whole contestation failed. That question was discussed, with different results in all the provinces. One case was decided one way in Quebec, another case another way in Ontario, and other cases a different way in the maritime provinces. Finally the question was solved by reference to "Hansard," where the speech made by the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Justice Fournier, on introducing the Bill, explained the whole difficulty. So that all of those cases finally turned on the construction put upon that clause by the gentleman who introduced the Bill in this House. That is one case which illustrates the usefulness of "Hansard," and I am not one of those who believe that after we have considered and discussed a Bill in this House, no good will result from a reference to that discussion by those who want to understand the law. I do not think we should reflect upon ourselves by saying that a great deal of information is not to be derived from our discussions in this House upon the legislation

introduced here. I will conclude by repeating that our object should be to facilitate a proper understanding of our statutes, especially on the part of all those connected with the administration of justice, and in this respect "Hansard" is extremely valuable, because in the debates on the different statutes will be found what was the intention of the House in passing them. I may say, therefore, that my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) has given a very valuable suggestion which I hope will be put into effect.

Mr. McNEILL. Though I, more frequently than otherwise, am not in accord with the hon. Solicitor General, he and I sometimes do agree, and I certainly do agree in what he has just stated. It is very seldom, however, that I find myself in accord with any opinion expressed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but tonight, for a wonder, I find myself now in that position. I agree with that hon. gentleman entirely, that "Hansard" should, if possible, be supplied to the different mechanics' institutes throughout the country. I made that suggestion myself in the House some years ago. These institutes are the places where the reading young people are likely to assemble, and it is very important that they should have an authoritative document, such as the "Hansard," to refer to. They see certain statements in the newspapers, in which they are very much interested. One newspaper says one thing and another the opposite, and if supplied with "Hansard" they would have an opportunity in their discussions, of going to the fountain head and finding out the facts. I believe that "Hansard" is a most valuable work of reference, and I should be sorry indeed if this House should ever contemplate as I have sometimes heard it proposed, doing away with "Hansard" altogether. I would, on the contrary, like to see it supplied to every mechanics' institute in the country, as well as the law libraries mentioned by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton).

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) I have much pleasure in endorsing the remarks fallen from the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), as far as "Hansard" is concerned. "Hansard" should be found in all the law libraries, not only in the province of Quebec but throughout the Dominion. I may further say that, in my capacity of professor at Laval University, I am of opinion that "Hansard" should be also supplied to our universities. Last year, an application was made to the Debates Committee by the law faculty of Laval University for a complete series of "Hansard." I do not know whether our request was acceded to, but I think we are entitled to it. I think that for our studious youth who are going through their curriculum in our universities to be enabled to refer to the report of our proceedings in this House would be a matter of great convenience and interest. As the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has just remarked, "Hansard" is very valuable not only to those who are engaged in politics but to lawyers and to all those who are connected with the administration of justice. For instance, we have our "Criminal Code" which was discussed at great length in this House in 1892. Those who have not the advantage of having a copy of Mr. Crankshaw's work on the matter, which gives a complete summary of those proceedings, have to refer continually to "Hansard" because it is in the report of these proceedings and of the reasons and explanations given in the House when the statutes are introduced and discussed that is to be found the intention of the legislator. The same remark applies to our commercial law. We have, it is true, the work written on the matter by Mr. Girouard, now a judge of the Supreme Court, which contains all the proceedings and the debates which took place in connection with the bills of exchange and promissory notes. But there are many other matters in connection with which one has continually to refer to "Hansard," as, for instance, the Banking Act. Our courts of law are continually called upon to interpret the laws passed by this House. Now, in order to facilitate a proper understanding of our statutes, reference must necessarily be had to "Hansard," because it is in our debates on the different statutes that will be found what was the intention of the framers of the law. Therefore, the suggestion made by the hon. Solicitor General has my heartiest support, and I hope the House will show more liberality than they have done in the past in supplying the law libraries and our universities with this publication.

Mr. MONK. I have much pleasure in endorsing the suggestion expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). I would be particularly pleased to see the "Hansard" distributed to our universities. Its distribution would be conducive to great good among our studious youth. I would even go a step further and say, as far as the province of Quebec is concerned—and I think the other provinces as well—that it would be a great advantage to have "Hansard" distributed to the institutions of higher education. Great good would be derived from the distribution to those institutions of higher learning of the results of our deliberations in this Assembly, and the suggestions made have, therefore, my heartiest support.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that, within my experience as a member of the Debates Committee, these ten years past, in every case when an application from some institution of learning or some society was made to the committee for

copies of "Hansard," it was invariably complied with, in the case of societies provided with reading rooms or libraries.

It may be that in some cases when such applications were made by societies having no permanent place of meeting, those applications were not complied with. Such was the case when it was found that the copies of "Hansard" asked for were for the exclusive use of the secretary or some other officer of the society. In such cases we have refused it, but in every case when it was shown to our satisfaction that there existed a library or a reading-room provided for the members who wished to derive information from the perusal of the report of our proceedings, we always acceded to the request of the applicants. As to those institutions which have expressed the wish of being supplied with "Hansard," we always furnished them with it, whether in the case of universities, or law libraries or otherwise. "Hansard" is actually distributed to all those institutions having applied to the committee for it, and if there are some which are not yet supplied with it, that is simply owing to the fact that they did not apply for it.

Mr. SPROULE. We have often had the question raised whether it would not be wise to do away with "Hansard" altogether on account of the considerable increase in the expense from year to year, and that increase would be certainly much greater if the suggestions we have just heard were put in force. I was rather amused at the reason given by the hon. Solicitor General for supplying the law libraries of the country with this publication. The reason he gave was the great difference of opinion among lawyers on the interpretation of our statutes, which, he said, the distributing of "Hansard" to them would to a great extent do away with. Why, even if you should distribute "Hansard" as suggested, you would rarely get two lawyers to agree on the interpretation of any clause of any statute. If it is for the purpose of disseminating knowledge, I agree that it would be wise to put as many copies of "Hansard" as possible within the reach of the legal fraternity, but by the same parity of reasoning you might go further and distribute "Hansard" to the mechanics' institutes and all the free libraries of the country, and there they would be just as available to the lawyers as to the general public. I do not see any reason why you should give "Hansard" to one institution and refuse it to another, but if we were to supply it to all these institutions, it would not be many years before you would have a resolution in the House to do away with "Hansard" entirely.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

Mr. WALLACE. I fail to understand why the Government should not continue the business of the House to a more reasonable hour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am rather disposed to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), but I made a bargain with my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), some time ago, that we would let each other off about eleven o'clock.

Mr. WALLACE. He has gone away, and we are here ready to transact business, and I do not see why we should be prevented.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will give my hon. friend ample opportunity to-morrow night.

Mr. WALLACE. There it is again—Friday night.

Motion agreed to, and the committee rose and reported progress.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 160) to amend the Companies' Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We dealt with the resolutions respecting bounties on iron and steel, but the Bill was not introduced, and I ask that the resolution be received, that I may place the Bill of it before the House for the first reading.

Resolutions reported from Committee of the Whole on a certain proposed resolution providing for the gradual reduction of the bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada, authorized by chapter 6 of the Acts of 1897, &c., were read the second time and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 161) to provide for the gradual reduction of the bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada, authorized by Chapter 6 of the Acts of 1897.

Mr. WALLACE. The Bill, I presume, is that the bounties continue until 1902 and are gradually reduced thereafter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bill is in accordance with the resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. What does the Government intend to take up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I neglected to ask the right hon. Premier, before he left the House, but I think the intention is

to take up, first, the supplementary Estimates, and then the main Estimates.

Mr. CLANCY. There are many items in the main Estimates that it is hardly fair to go on with on Friday, particularly in the evening. There is generally a slim House on Friday evening and it will probably be even thinner than usual to-morrow, because the session has been long-continued, and members find it necessary to go home.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that case, I do not see what we can do but take up what one of my hon. friends humourously calls the "Retribution" Bill. But that also might be regarded as not quite fair.

Mr. CLANCY. It would not be fair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. However, sufficient for the day is the good thereof. We shall see what to-morrow brings forth.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 23rd June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That the third report of the committee on Printing of both Houses of Parliament be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that report was referred back to the committee.

Mr. GIBSON. After the statements made by myself, Mr. Speaker, in the Committee of the Whole House, last night, the matter was brought up in the Printing Committee this morning. As the understanding of the House was that you wished to be relieved of the duty of selecting stationery, it was thought that the report of the committee might be adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER. That does not settle the question of order, however. The report was referred back, and this resolution cannot be passed in the present position of affairs. I think the committee will have to report again, and that report will be considered.

ANTI-JAPANESE AND ANTI-CHINESE LEGISLATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) to the return in regard to the disallowance of certain legislation in the province of British Columbia. The other day I brought down a report on this subject, and some time afterwards my hon. friend called attention to the fact that a certain portion of the correspondence had not been brought down. I inquired and found that the hon. gentleman's complaint was well founded, and brought down the missing correspondence the day before yesterday. Yesterday the hon. gentleman said he had not got what we want and spoke in this way:

I invite the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the letter that he says he has brought down. What I asked for is the despatch No. 83 from the Governor General to Mr. Chamberlain, not from Mr. Chamberlain to the Governor General. I want the despatch brought down that inclosed the opinion of the Department of Justice. I do not see that here.

If my hon. friend will look again he will see among the papers the despatch he wants.

Mr. PRIOR. That is quite right. The two were together when the right hon. gentleman brought them down, but I understood him to say that he had brought down a copy of the despatch of the Minister of Justice only.

TEMISCOUATA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McALISTER moved that the petition of the Temiscouata Railway Company for leave to present a petition for a private Bill be now read and received.

The PRIME MINISTER. Explain.

Mr. McALISTER. The Temiscouata Railway Company's Bill was passed in 1897, and expires the end of this month, and the company are asking now for leave to introduce a Bill to continue the Act in force.

Motion agreed to.

THE YUKON—MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the 9th June a motion was carried in this House ordering the printing of the evidence that was taken in the commission held by Mr. Ogilvie and laid on the Table of this House by the Minister of the Interior. This is the 23rd of June, and I would like to know whether the Government is able to explain the delay, which seems to me extraordinary, or to expedite compliance with the House by the Printing Bureau. I am particularly anxious to have this evidence. I have been waiting for some time to present a motion of a very serious character which I feel it my duty to move in this House, touching the conduct of the Government and the members of it and the officers under it in the Yukon district; and it seemed to me that that evidence, being in the Depart-

ment of the Interior for so long and then laid on the Table of the House and then ordered to be printed, ought to be in the hands of the members of the House. I desire that members should have that evidence in order that they may fully appreciate the value of the motion I propose to move. I have mentioned on one or two occasions the fact of this delay in printing, and desire to have it expedited. I understood from the right hon. Prime Minister sometime ago that he would use his efforts to expedite the printing. I should be very glad if the right hon. gentleman could say when we may expect it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows that the Government has no control over the printing of the House——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No direct control.

The PRIME MINISTER. But I am informed by the Clerk that the printing is done and that the work is now being put into book form. It is a large document, more than 300 pages. It will be distributed on Monday.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. MONK. I ask leave to direct the attention of the Government to a motion for a return which was carried in this House on the 23rd April last for a statement of the travelling expenses of the Superior Court judges coming from different parts of the province of Quebec to the city of Montreal. As we have the Estimates under discussion just now, and as I am informed there is a project to ask for the salaries for three new judges in the city of Montreal, I think that report would be of great importance, and I would ask the Government when it is to be brought down ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say that this report is ready, and will be brought down on Monday.

THE NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the telegram and cablegram to Lord Strathcona, High Commissioner, in regard to the financial standing of the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated, in reply to a question of mine in this House, had been received by the Government, were not brought down amongst the papers. The Order of the House was issued for the same on the 17th of May, and I would ask the right hon. gentleman, if he will see that it is placed on the Table as soon as possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

The PRIME MINISTER. You will have it on Monday.

QUEBEC COUNTIES AND THE PLEBISCITE VOTE.

Mr. MOORE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to some papers that I asked for in connection with the polling in certain counties in the province of Quebec in the plebiscite vote last fall, and which have not come to hand. They were ordered five or six weeks ago. Only one return has been received, about three weeks ago, that for the county of Kamouraska.

The PRIME MINISTER. That report is being prepared by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is not an officer of the Government, but an officer of this House. However, I am informed by him that he is proceeding with it. I have not seen him for some time, but I know that he is working at it, and it will, no doubt, be brought down at an early date.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he not an official of the Government ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He is an official of the House, first.

WORKING RULES OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a special despatch which appears in the Toronto "Evening Star," of Wednesday, June 21. The "Star' is a paper which generally supports the hon. gentlemen opposite, and this special says :

> Ottawa, June 21.—It is understood that the Government intends to bring in legislation this session providing running rules for railways, so that all roads may take advantage of them, instead of every road having its own rules, which causes confusion in the case of companies that have running rights over other roads.
>
> The Government Bill, when introduced, will be referred to the Railway Committee so that its details may be thoroughly threshed out. Some time ago the Grand Trunk adopted the American rules because a good portion of its system is in the United States. There was some dissatisfaction about the change among the employees, and the trouble is said not to be entirely disposed of. The course which the Government intends pursuing would settle this matter.

I would like to know, if there is any truth in the despatch, that it is the intention of the Government to introduce such a measure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I can probably give the hon. gentleman the information that he requires. He will recollect that last session some discussion took place with respect to

approving the rules which had been laid before the Governor in Council by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I stated then that the rules had been approved, but I promised the hon. gentleman himself, I think, that I would communicate with the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the subject, asking them to delay bringing the rules into operation, in order to afford the men an opportunity of stating any objections that they might have to those rules. I did have such correspondence, and the rules were laid over for some time. I notified the officers who represent the labour association, of the fact that the rules were being deferred until they could be heard, and I asked them to name a day when it would suit their convenience, and I would be glad to hear them, and to notify the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as the desire seemed to be that I should be present on the occasion. The communication which I sent in this way was not answered. I sent another, and it resulted in a message being left at my office by one of these officers, stating that there were really no objections to the rules. The rules then, I suppose, would have gone into operation, but shortly after that I was advised that these officers who had acted in this way, had not been duly authorized by the society; I think they said there was some misunderstanding. Following upon that information, I again communicated with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and asked them, if they would further delay bringing the rules into operation, as there might be some objections. I may say that, just before this last occurrence, a body of rules was received from the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, which they desired the Governor in Council to approve. These were dealt with in the same way; they were approved before I had understood from the officers whom I supposed represented the association, that there was any objection to these rules. Then, having heard that these parties had not been fully advised of what was going on, and that they desired still to look into the matter, I communicated with the Canada Atlantic Railway people, and, as a result, these rules have not gone into operation. The present situation of the matter is this: Upon consideration, it appeared to me that it might be desirable to amend the General Railway Act, so that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, should be authorized to frame a body of rules, either by itself or through some competent body, for general application to all the roads in Canada that are under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. That view having been concurred in by my colleagues in the Council, I have had drafted a section to add to the General Railway Act, and a Bill containing this section is now before the Railway Committee. It appeared to me that these general amendments were of such a nature that it was desirable the Railway Committee should discuss them, and make any desirable suggestions that could be incorporated in the Bill. The Bill is now before the committee; it was received at the late meeting of the committee, but, owing to there being a very small attendance of members, I suggested that it should remain over and be made the first order at the next meeting, when we are likely to have a large attendance. That is the position.

SUPPLY—THE QUEEN vs. CLARKE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. By arrangement with the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I wish briefly to bring up a certain matter. I may say, at the outset, that, owing to the courtesy of the Minister of Justice, I have been able to get some papers which deal with the claim of Mr. Clarke. His counsel, Mr. W. Myers Grey, lost his papers in this matter at the time of the fire in New Westminster, and, having asked me to bring the matter to the attention of the Government, I was dependent on the courtesy of the Minister of Justice for obtaining the only information that I have in the matter. The plaintiff in this case, whose lands were expropriated by the Crown, was offered the sum of $150 or thereabouts, and the matter went finally to the Exchequer Court, where he recovered a judgment of $11,000 and costs; the costs and principal amounted to $12,303.05. That judgment was obtained during the time of the old Government, on January 20, 1896. Some delay occurred; whose delay it was, is not important to Mr. Clarke or to Mr. Grey, so long as it was not theirs. Some delay occurred in the amount of the judgment being tendered to the plaintiff; and, in a memorandum that has been sent to the Department of Justice, I find the following facts stated:—First of all, those that I have mentioned, the date of the judgment and the amount; then, the fact that the cheque for this amount was not issued until the 28th of April, 1896. The claim is for the difference in the interest that was running from the date of the judgment until the time of this payment, and, of course, the interest subsequently. Reference is made to the legislation, where the rate of interest is stated at 4 per cent, which may be paid on a judgment. Mr. Grey, in his memorandum to the Department of Justice, shows that, where the Crown is authorized to pay interest in that sense on a judgment, it is practically peremptory, and not merely permissive, for the Government to pay interest until the money and costs are paid.

The practice bears out that construction, as is shown in the rules of the Exchequer Court to which he refers. In this correspondence which I have before me—it is not complete, I admit—I cannot find any reason why Mr. Grey's client, Mr. Clarke, has not had the advantage of the practice in this case, and has not had the full amount of the interest on his judgment. I need not say any more, Sir. The correspondence continues from September, 1896, down to January, 1899, and the complaint is made by Mr. Grey, in part of the correspondence, that he could not obtain answers to his letters. Therefore, I suppose that is one of the things that goes to show why his claim for interest on the judgment has been unpaid. I call the matter to the attention of the hon. Solicitor General, and I would be glad to know on what ground he has gone on in resisting this claim.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The plaintiff claimed by his petition to recover from the Crown $20,778, and the Crown offered him $149. After protracted litigation, it was decided that the plaintiff was entitled to recover $8,600, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent on $2,500 for ten and one-half years, and on $4,000 for seven and one-half years. This judgment was rendered on the 20th of January, 1896. The judgment was not entered—I think it may be fairly assumed, because of the neglect, or of the action, of the plaintiff's counsel, until the 24th March, 1896. Then, the judgment, which was entered on the 24th March, 1896, reached the Finance Department on the 25th April, 1896, and a cheque was issued for the amount and sent to this gentleman on the 1st of May, 1896. Surely, there is no serious ground of complaint because of delay, when a cheque for a judgment, entered on the 24th of March, did not issue until the 1st of May, especially in view of the fact that this large amount of interest was allowed, interest on a portion of the sum for ten and a half years, and on another portion for something like six years. In any event, the judgment, after it was recorded and communicated to the Department of Finance, was paid by the Department of Finance, and a cheque sent for the amount within a very few days after this occurred, and previous to the 1st of May. Then, there appears to have been some correspondence in reference to it. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows perfectly well that the Crown cannot be made to pay interest on a judgment, except there is a statute or a contract. In reference to this judgment, there can be no contention that the Government would be under any obligation to pay interest upon a contract, so that the whole matter depends upon the construction that can be placed upon the statute which refers to the payment of interest. That statute provides that

The Minister of Finance and Receiver General may allow and pay to any person entitled by the judgment of the court to any moneys or costs, interest thereon at a rate not exceeding 4 per cent from the date of such judgment until such moneys or costs are paid.

So that, in this case, it was entered on the 24th of March, communicated to the Department of Finance on the 25th April, and paid on the 1st of May. Subsequently, the Department of Finance, in the exercise of the discretionary powers conferred by the statute, allowed interest for one month on this judgment. The judgment was rendered on the 20th January in British Columbia, and it was paid on the 1st of May, and, if you allow eight or ten days from the time that the judgment reaches the Department of Finance to elapse until the matter is decided, and until the Department of Justice consider whether an appeal is to be taken, and if, after these ten days have expired, you allow one month's interest, I think there is no great cause of complaint.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There does not seem to be much to discuss except the hon. gentleman's statement as to the date of the judgment. The hon. gentleman states that the judgment was in March.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think I gave the date of the judgment as the 20th of January, 1896, but it was only entered on the 24th of March.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose that is a grievance that the Crown has taken advantage of, the date when the entry was made. I suppose it should have been entered on the 20th of January. Perhaps, on reconsideration, the Government will bear that in mind. I am sure they would not wish to take advantage of any technical point, although the strength of the Solicitor General's statement is really based upon the date of the entry being in March, as against January. I would be glad, if the matter could be reconsidered in that spirit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I may state what is the general practice of the Finance Department in reference to the payment of these judgments. The statute which has just been referred to gives the Minister of Finance discretion as to the payment of interest on a judgment rendered in the Exchequer Court. We have adopted a practice in the matter, which, I think, is fixed by Order in Council, that, where there is any delay which can be attributed properly to the Government, interest will be paid, but where there is no delay chargeable to the Government, interest shall not be paid. We regard the money as payable when the certificate of judgment is filed in the Finance Department. Before we make the payment, we allow ten days to elapse for the department to make inquiry into the matter, and for the consid-

eration of the matter by the Department of Justice. If there be any delay after the ten days, we may pay interest, but for any delay that may occur between the date of the judgment and the filing of the certificate we can take no action whatever. If we do not pay after the expiration of the ten days from the filing of the certificate, we allow interest at the rate of 4 per cent to the date when payment is actually made.

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

(In the Committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), if he has been able to get the information promised on the 21st of June in regard to there being correspondence with the judges touching an amount in his supplies, in which he said:

I am not sure that I have authority to say that I would bring that letter down without consulting the Minister. It is not, if I am properly informed, on the departmental file yet. It accompanies the account, and explains to the Minister why the liability was incurred. I see no objections to producing the letter.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will inquire.

Intercolonial Railway—
To build rest-houses at nine engine stations $4,360

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to drop that item; therefore, it will have to go into the supplementary Estimates for next year.

Intercolonial Railway—
To provide new machinery at Moncton shops $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am advised that it will become necessary to get some machinery of a larger size, as we have very much larger engines, necessitating larger plant, hoisting apparatus, and the other machinery necessary for our purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman an estimate of the kind of machinery and the cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may state that we will have to ask a similar amount next year, as this will only suffice in part for our purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the items of machinery and their cost which make up the $5,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As I have said, this amount will be inadequate for all our requirements, but with this vote will be purchased a planer, hoisting apparatus, emery tool grinder, air motors, and it includes the cost of setting up that machinery. These are special machines made by special manufacturers, and they will be got from the manufacturers direct by the department, and of course without tender.

Mr. SPROULE. Will you get them in the United States or in Canada?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Part in the United States, and part in Canada.

Intercolonial Railway—
Rolling stock $20,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to enable us to get as speedily as possible twenty more refrigerator cars. We purchased last summer a number of refrigerator cars, but there has been a great demand for more, and we have made arrangements so that if this grant passes we will immediately get twenty more of these refrigerator cars.

Mr. SPROULE. How many refrigerator cars have you on the Intercolonial Railway now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Twenty-six.

Mr. FOSTER. What will these cars cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total cost of each car will be $1,012; the car itself will cost $972, and the addition is for the air brakes.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these cars obtained?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are being made by Rhodes & Curry. They made the others, and the order was extended subject to the understanding that we would get a vote from Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these cars cooled by ice or by the ammonia process?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we have not yet tried the ammonia process on our system.

Prince Edward Island—
To purchase wharf at Mount Stewart... $3,500

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This was a new wharf built by the provincial government, and it cost them, I believe, the sum which is mentioned here. There is quite a little freight brought to the railway by coasters to this port, and we found it necessary to acquire the wharf and run our track down to the water. It was owned by the provincial government.

Mr. FOSTER. What evidence of cost came before the Minister?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our engineer, Mr. Mackenzie, looked into the matter, and reported to us that the price was reasonable.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a new wharf or an old wharf ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood it was a comparatively new wharf, and had only been a short time built.

Mr. FOSTER. It is rather important to know whether it is a new wharf or an old one, because I have no doubt the provincial government would be glad to get some more of its wharfs taken. Several years ago a thorough examination was made of the wharfs in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and the Dominion Government took over a certain number of them, many of them not in the best state of repair. No doubt the provincial government would be glad to get these old wharfs off their hands. I wish to know is this one of the old wharfs existing at that time or has it been built since ? If it was built by tender and contract as a new wharf, the cost could easily be ascertained, but if it is an old wharf it would be pretty difficult to tell what it is worth. Is it in a good state of repair now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, my deputy tells me that it is in a very satisfactory state, and he approved of the arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine it was built for other purposes than to accommodate the Intercolonial Railway. Can the Minister say why we could not obtain the user of it without purchasing it, and becoming responsible for its maintenance ? Do we charge wharfage ? I suppose we must give the use of it to others.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The railway runs round the head of Hillsborough River, and this wharf is well located for coast business. Many vessels brought traffic to that point, and in the interests of the railway it was desirable that we should secure a wharf in that particular locality. At all events, it was so reported to me, and I approved of the proposal.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you the report of the engineer that it was necessary to get this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether we have a report that it was necessary ; but we have a report as to the reasonableness of the price.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, we have a report that it was necessary. The wharf is a small affair at the head of the river at Mount Stewart, from which point the railway branches off to Souris and Georgetown. This wharf was built by the local government, but it was not strong enough to carry the railway. The railway had to have a wharf at that locality, this wharf was selected, the engineer approved of the selection and the price, $3,500, and agreed to report in favour of its purchase. I have not seen his report ; but when the Minister of Railways last year went to Prince Edward Island, I went with him to the place, and he went down and inspected the wharf before paying the money for it. It is the only place in that part of the country where grain or any other produce that comes by train, can be shipped to schooners.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the provincial government a system of tolls on the wharfs it owns ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot say positively.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Yes, it has.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The switch runs down on the wharf, and the vessels load beside it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister propose to leave this wharf open to the public, and, if so, to charge tolls or make it free ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It cannot be used by the public to any extent, as it is too narrow, and the railway tracks run on it. I suppose it might be used by the general public also, but it belongs to the Dominion now and is paid for. It will enable a very large section of country to ship their grain straight to that point ; otherwise, they would have to take it to the buyers at the different stations and from these points send it to Charlottetown.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I understand the Minister to say that it had to be strengthened by the Railway Department, and rails had to be laid on it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that strengthening process done ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It had just been finished when I was there last year. The workmen had not left. The rails were laid.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it amounts to just this : The wharf has been bought, the strengthening process has gone on at the cost of the country, the property has been taken over, and the Minister of Railways did all this without any authorization at all and without any vote. After it is all done—bought, strengthened, and the user of it taken over—then the Minister thinks that probably it is high time for him to come down and ask for a little money. Up to that time he was lord high admiral, who

went around and dispensed these buying privileges along with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as though it was their own money they were spending; and not till it came to the time to pay did either of these gentlemen think there was an institution called Parliament, and that there was an old but now pretty obsolete rule which used to bind Governments and Ministers in this country, that before you make a purchase you ought to go through the form, at least, of consulting Parliament and getting the authorization of Parliament and a vote of money. That never was thought of till eight days before the end of the fiscal year, when the note pressed for payment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is such a small affair that the Prince Edward Island Government and the Intercolonial Railway and all railways are accustomed to buy any switches for traffic without coming and taking a special vote of Parliament every time.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has thrown off the mask entirely. Up to this time there has been something like an apology when members of this Government have proceeded illegally and wrongfully to acquire property without a vote or means of paying for it, and without any authorization. But to-day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stands on his legs and declares that it is not necessary to have the authorization or vote of Parliament. I am glad that at last the Government, through one of their members, have come out of the bush into the open, and declared that hereafter they intend to go on the plan that they will purchase, entirely irrespective of whether Parliament has authorized the purchase or not. A little thing! It is the buying of a wharf, and I should think that common honesty would compel the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to stand up and argue that the principle is the same with reference to $3,500 as it is with reference to $75,000. I want the country to know——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent me.

Mr. FOSTER—and I want the members of this House to know it. I have the floor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman refuses to allow me to explain.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the floor. I am perfectly relentless just now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to thank the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member will not give way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to thank him for his extreme courtesy. The hon. gentleman refuses to allow me to explain. I will bear it in mind.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an old rule that when a man smites you on one cheek, you should turn the other; but in parliamentary practice it becomes necessary once in a while to forego that old rule. My hon. friend has time and again refused me a single word in the midst of his explanations, and just for this once I am going to finish what I have to say when I have the chance. Afterwards I will give the hon. gentleman some courtesy. That is just the position the hon. gentleman has taken, and I want the members of the House and the country to know that at last the Liberal Government, through one of their members, have publicly stated to this House and to the country that they do not consider it necessary to have the authorization of Parliament or the vote of Parliament before making purchases.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not make any such statement. The hon. gentleman knows that no money has been paid or can be paid until we take the vote. The Minister simply went there and agreed to purchase this wharf because it was in the public interest that it should be purchased, and the fact that it was necessary to alter it and strengthen it did not amount to a row of pins. The hon. gentleman or any other Minister would do the same thing. It was done in order to get the traffic of last fall on the wharf.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has correctly stated the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I am willing to take his last statement. It is the same as the first.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was satisfied from what was represented to me that it would be a public convenience and in the interests of the Prince Edward Island Railway that we should run this spur down on this wharf. In the conversations with the members of the provincial government, they understood that while we would take the wharf and use it, the purchase could not be concluded until after that on the sanction of Parliament. They never expect a dollar until we obtained an appropriation from Parliament. In the meanwhile, for our own convenience and that of the public we are using the wharf.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The question resolves itself into this: Is the House free to object to this vote?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so. I think that all faith in Governments would be at an end if when this Government makes an arrangement with the local government of Prince Edward Island in reference to a matter of this kind, on which they expend money, this Government is free to depart from it. There is a contract which the House must approve or vote want of confidence in the Administration. A government is not warranted in making expenditures, unless under very exceptional and extraordinary circumstances, without an appropriation, and the fact that this Government said to parties: "You cannot be paid until Parliament votes this money," does not help them at all. It is not a saving clause, so far as this Parliament is concerned. The property was purchased, money was expended on it, and the purchase price must be paid, but it will be paid in opposition to the sound parliamentary principle of getting the authority of Parliament before, instead of after the thing is done. The hon. gentleman can hardly take the position that no harm is done because no money was paid, and, therefore, the House is free. The House is not free. It must carry out the contract made by the head of a department and a member of the Government, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman has inverted the order of procedure. I do not mean to say that there are not cases of exigency where the Government is warranted in incurring expenditure without the authority of Parliament, but there was no such exigency in this case. But I suppose there was an election going on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all. It was agreed to be purchased the previous year from the then premier, Mr. Peters.

Mr. FOSTER. That is still worse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was agreed that we should come down to Parliament and ask for a vote. I thought the vote was in myself. When my colleague came down last year, I took him to the place, and the superintendent ran the railway down the wharf in order that my hon. friend might see whether it was a suitable purchase or not. He agreed that it was a suitable purchase. When the agreement was made, the local government were told expressly: We cannot purchase until Parliament assents. The whole agreement is made subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. If my memory serves me rightly, the spur was built down to the wharf during my time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. It never was there at all in the hon. gentleman's time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman, I assume, does not wish to exaggerate a small matter. The facts are not such as would justify any person in finding the least fault with this transaction. The members of the provincial government thoroughly understood the whole matter, we had no written contract with them but a verbal understanding that we would ask Parliament, and if Parliament gave us the grant we would close the purchase. We are under no obligation further than any Government is to carry out its promise, which in this case was that we would submit a vote to Parliament. That is a thing which has to be done time and time again, particularly in connection with a railway department.

It was perfectly clear that it would be very much in the interests of the public that we should run a spur down there and enable the people to bring their produce to the end of the wharf, and we did that. The provincial government said: We own this wharf, look it over and see if it suits, and if it does, you are at liberty to buy it. The distinct understanding was that the transaction was not a purchase until sanctioned by Parliament and a grant made for that purpose. They were not misled in the slightest degree.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they know they will get their money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They know that if we ask Parliament, under such reasonable circumstances, Parliament will not hesitate to grant the money, but it is open to Parliament to say we will not grant it, and the transaction falls to the ground.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not appreciate the gravity of the case. According to his own statement, the Dominion Government, through its Minister of Railways, makes a contract with the provincial government, but the provincial government know perfectly well that although under that contract they cannot be paid until the money is voted by Parliament, the money must be voted by Parliament, or else the Government would be defeated. At all events the Minister of Railways and Canals would retire from the Government and throw the whole country into confusion unless this vote were carried through.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money was expended on the strengthening of a wharf and preparing it for Intercolonial Railway business?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy does not recollect the amount just at this moment, but it would not be a very large sum. It would be the cost of laying down the rails.

Mr. FOSTER. There is more than that. The hon. Minister of Marine says it was not strong enough and had to be strengthened.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said the rails were underpinned. The whole does not amount to a hill of beans.

Mr. TAYLOR. Beans come high down there.

Mr. FOSTER. We will want the engineer's report on which this was purchased. The hon. Minister of Marine, in his anxiety to help his colleague, rather lets him in deeper by venturing the information that the whole thing had been arranged a year ago, and that he thought a vote for it was in the Estimates that came down last year. Surely there have been elections around there in that space of time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. Mr. Peters came here and talked the matter over.

Mr. FOSTER. More than a year ago the promise was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for this Government, that the provincial government should be helped to the extent of the purchase of this wharf for $3,400. Parliament met, no vote was taken, and Parliament adjourned, the Minister of Railways then went to work and took possession of the wharf, which he had never been authorized to buy and for which he had no appropriation. He spent from $1,000 to $2,000 of public money upon that wharf. He put his rails upon it and took the user of it. He virtually committed himself, without the shadow of a doubt, to payment for it, and yet now he says that there is no harm done because the money has not been paid. Of course it could not be paid until the hon. gentleman got it, for I suppose he was not so pressed in this case as his colleagues were with respect to Mr. Charleson. Mr. Charleson had to be sent out at once, and so they had to steal money from other votes which, in their express wording, were applicable only to other purposes and not to the building of the telegraph line to the Yukon. They furnished Mr. Charleson with $13,000 worth of cheques to put in his pocket to take up into the Yukon. In this case, there is such a hurry to get it all over before the meeting of Parliament, which took place three days afterwards, that they resorted to this act of financial brigandage —nothing short of it; nothing else will express it. The Minister of Railways and Canals, more cautious, or less urgent, because he was dealing with friends of his own, who did not require the cheques in their pockets quite so soon, let it run for a year, puts his hand into the public treasury for a couple of thousand dollars to build up and strengthen his wharf, and then comes down and says: Now, my obedient followers, my loyal henchmen, I want you to step up like little men and vote this money. And the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) is getting ready to justify it.

Mr. WALLACE. He always does.

Mr. FOSTER. Always. And the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) justifies it by saying it is only a little thing, and nodding his head in his superior way, as though he were saying: What fools these men on the other side be for trying to live up to the appropriations of Parliament and the rules that govern the expenditure of money in this country. We want to have the engineer's report and the account of money which was expended up to this time. I shall not ask the hon. gentleman this time to hold back the vote, but only to bring that information for the evening sitting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will try to do so.

Mr. MARTIN. Without entering into the constitutional aspect of the question, I venture to think that it would have been better, if the vote had been included in last year's Estimates. I think the object to be accomplished is a very desirable one. As far back as 1896, the extension of the railway to the wharf at Mount Stewart was advocated by myself, and it was as strongly opposed and ridiculed by our opponents—at least by my opponent in East Queen's. The extension of the railway to the wharf necessitates its purchase by the Government. It was referred to as one of the branch lines to be built in Prince Edward Island. It will afford very necessary accommodation, and I am glad indeed that the Minister of Railways and Canals has taken hold of the matter. I do not know that the case justifies the ex-Minister of Finance in making so much out of it as it is a very necessary work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Martin), if he will allow me, that I did not object to the work.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that perfectly. There is a question at issue, and has been for many years, as to the Dominion Government taking over certain wharfs in Prince Edward Island. I understand that a letter was sent by the Premier of this Government to the Premier of Prince Edward Island, that this Government is ready to take hold of some of these piers at least. I think the preferable way would be to take hold of the question as a whole and finally arranged as to the wharfs the Dominion Government is to take. The place where this money is being spent is a large shipping place, and its business will extend and increase, and this accommodation is very necessary indeed. I trust the item will be allowed to pass.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) did not take exception to the merits of the work. It might be the most meritorious work that the Minister has done for years past, but exception is taken to the way he has done it—first spending money, and then asking the House to vote it. It is said, in extenuation of his conduct, that it is only a little thing; but, if it is condoned by this House in little things, it will not be very long before the Government will take the opportunity of doing the same in large things. We must observe the safeguards that are provided against the improper expenditure of the people's money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have some difficulty in ascertaining how the Minister of Railways and Canals could purchase a wharf, no matter how expedient it might be in the interests of the country, according to the rules which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would have observed. Apparently, the Minister should not even discuss the question of buying a wharf without first having a vote of Parliament. All that occurred in this matter is, that the Minister has discussed the question, and says he will propose a vote in Parliament for the purchase.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, that is the whole story. Anybody transacting business with the Dominion Government ought to know that a vote of Parliament is necessary in these cases. Above all others, members of a provincial government might be expected to know it, because they know something of the principles governing the appropriation of public money. If a Minister was not at liberty to discuss the expediency of purchasing this wharf and the price of it, without getting a vote of Parliament, I do not see how he could buy a wharf at all.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is wide of the mark, and he knows it—he is too sensible a man not to know it. If nothing had been done but what he says, no question would have been raised, unless some were to question the desirability of the purchase itself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What else has been done besides discussing the purchase?

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Railways and Canals has taken personal possession of the property, as if it were bought and paid for, and, more than that, he has spent $1,000 or $2,000 upon it, and has his tracks upon it. He has taken an irreparable step, a step which he cannot retrace, because it would be against his dignity and inconsistent with his place in the Ministry. And the Government could not allow him to do that, even if he were willing. If he has simply discussed the purchase of the wharf and agreed to ask a vote of Parliament, that would be all right. But the action he has taken prevents entirely an open mind with reference to this transaction. The Government and its followers are bound to approve this transaction or repudiate the Government, and that they cannot do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) might be supposed to be making a very good speech on behalf of an Opposition member of the Prince Edward Island legislature.

Mr. FOSTER. What I have said is without any such consideration. I speak as I think it is my duty to speak.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the point he makes might be a strong one from the standpoint of an opponent of the Prince Edward Island Government, who might say: You have given up this property to the possession of the Minister of Railways and Canals without getting anything in return.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That might be a ground for attacking the Government of Prince Edward Island for giving the Minister of Railways and Canals the use of this property without receiving a copper of money, but how the Dominion Government can be complained of in the matter when we have merely taken possession and have not paid anything for the purchase of the property so far, is not clear, and in that respect my hon. friend's criticism is without ground.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose the Government says to this House: You are free to reject this vote or to authorize it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is true.

Mr. FOSTER. He knows the Government have tied the House just as much as if there were manacles around them. Suppose the House would take the view that they would not supplement the bargain, what would happen then? $25,000 of the people's money has gone into that wharf. Does not that make a difference? It does to the extent of the loss of that money, but it does not as to the purchase, and I was discussing the purchase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Cannot my hon. friend separate the purchase from the action of the Government in taking possession? Surely he is not doing himself credit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman ignores the fact that the putting of this spur down upon that wharf is not only an advantage to the Prince Edward Island Railway, but a pub-

lic convenience, and if Parliament did refuse to make this grant, the people and the government of Prince Edward Island would be the very last people to ask us to take up our rails and discontinue the use of that wharf, and my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) will corroborate what I say. It is a matter of mutual benefit to the people and to the Government to have the use of that wharf. My hon. friend is simply carrying to an absurd extreme his idea that we are taking some advantage of the members of Parliament, that we are coming in here and tieing the hands of Parliament. If Parliament is as much hand-tied as he suggests, would they not be hand-tied to an equal extent by any proposition we could lay upon the Table of this House? If we had agreed to buy the wharf, if we had brought in a proposition asking Parliament to authorize us to purchase, would not our friends be manacled to the same extent that they are now? Of course they would. But they are not manacled at all. If they lost confidence in our judgment, when we come to Parliament for authority to purchase, they could refuse that authority just as fully as they can in the present case. I know my hon. friend is very anxious to criticise, I know he is in a hypercritical mood, and he does not seriously regard this matter as open to the criticism that he has made upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. I must make my protest against any such assumption. My hon. friend may be the kind of man who would get up and seriously contend what he does not believe, but I repudiate his assumption that I can do any such thing. As long as I sit in this House I shall follow every illegal action of this Government as far as I can do it, and I am going to protest against it in the interest of good government. Let it be understood that I am not saying one word against what may be the benefit of this, I am in favour of railways increasing their means of doing business. But my hon. friends opposite seem to think they have the whole argument in their favour when a thing is wrongfully done, by saying that it would be beneficial, that it is desirable. The fact that a thing is desirable is no reason why you should go at it in a wrong way. If my hon. friend had sent down a year ago to a provincial government and had said: I will take over your property that is worth $250,000, will you give it to me for $250,000? And they would say: Yes, and he would enter into possession of it, he would go to work and make public improvements upon it, and pay for them with public money, and a year afterwards come down, after he had been using it, and asked us to vote for it, would that be a thing that any Parliament could swallow? Does it make a bit of difference whether it is $250,000 or $3,400? Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend object to this vote?

Mr. FOSTER. Now, hear that childish remark! There never was a more childish word uttered by any man, after I had just stated that I was not opposed to the improvement itself, but I was opposed to the method. He thinks to gain a smart advantage over me by asking me if I am opposed to this vote, so that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can go down to Prince Edward Island and say: Foster and the Liberal-Conservatives opposed this vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They will understand it fully.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will not bandy words with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. No, bandy arguments.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman should not interrupt when he objects to being interrupted himself. The hon. gentleman finds fault with this vote, but he does not dare oppose it. He protests against it. Well, let the vote pass now, and in concurrence he can make a motion against it. The hon. gentleman will remember that old Latin maxim: De minimis non curat prætor.

Mr. FOSTER. Give it to me in English.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought my hon. friend would understand it. The translation of it is this: There are some minds too small to delight in great things, they only delight in small things.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought, Mr. Chairman, there were some cuss words in that Latin phrase, that the Minister himself did not like to use in English. But it appears that the whole purport of it is that gentlemen on the Opposition side have small minds, and cannot grasp large questions.

The PRIME MINISTER. Only some of them.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing that the public should judge.

Mr. SPROULE. The question is not whether this will be a benefit to the people of Prince Edward Island and to the railway, what we object to is the principle of spending public money without the authority of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Railways and Canals says there was no bargain in writing with the local authorities. Whatever arrangement existed, with whom was it made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Attorney General Peters. There was no written contract.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In what year was it made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it was the year before last.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Were the negotiations ended finally with him, or were they carried on with his successor ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The arrangement was made between Mr. Peters who was premier and leader of the provincial government, and myself, but when we were preparing our Estimates last year there was no estimate made to enable us to carry it out. We have been reminded since by the present premier, who has called my attention to the oversight. We intended to ask for the amount last year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At the time that the local government came up—either Mr. Peters or his successor—were there any other proposals ? Is this not part of a general demand made by the Island government in regard to certain expenditures they wish the Federal Government to make in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say to my hon. friend that so far as I am aware this was a transaction by itself. It was not coupled with any other proposal. The arrangement was made directly with the Railway Department and this was the only proposal that was brought to my notice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That may be. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the Island government were making demands upon the Federal Government for certain expenditures in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think for certain expenditures. I know they have made certain claims on divers and sundry occasions, but they are not connected with this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman able to say that this is not a part of the demands made by the Government of Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My recollection very distinctly is that it was not coupled in any shape or form with any other demands.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that the idea of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It has nothing to do with any general claim in any way, shape or form. They merely recommended that this should be done because it was necessary in the interest of that part of the country that a spur should be built down to the wharf for the shipment of grain.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand there was no correspondence about this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say that, but I do not recollect any.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see how important it is, and that is one of the reasons that I rise at all to speak on this item. That is a most unsatisfactory way of conducting public business in connection with this or any other item of public expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry my hon. friend takes that view.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have had repeated instances during this session of abuses of this kind, and it is an important part of this discussion as to how far the Government should pledge themselves in advance of any parliamentary action. The position of the hon. Minister of Railways may be tenable or it may not be. If there was any correspondence we might be entitled to form some judgment as to the nature of the bargain, if a bargain has been made. It is not only unfortunate for the proper discussion of this question by this committee, but for the relationship of the Government and the parties with whom they are dealing that there should be no record kept to which these parties or the Government may appeal. I venture to say that this is a dangerous principle for any department to go upon. Here you are purchasing a wharf, or, in another case, you are undertaking to expend public money in connection with some public work, small or big, and in this case it has actually happened that there is no record of any kind in the matter only the mere statement of the Minister who states things to the best of his recollection from his side of the case. In view of the position the hon. Minister of Finance assumes, it is quite possible that the Government might take an entirely different view of this matter, and I do not know that anything the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has said to-day would prevent the local government taking the position, that they had the good faith of the Government pledged to this proposal. The only chance they took was the chance that the Government majority would not approve of the action of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or his colleagues, and that the vote would be lost. That is the only risk they run with the understanding they have. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals no

doubt told the local authorities that he would make a bona fide effort to induce Parliament to agree to this vote. I fancy that after they obtained the consent of the Governor General to bringing this item down here they merely run some little chance of the vote not being agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is just the same as every vote.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, in reference to any item in the Supply Bill, and nothing but the loss of confidence in the Government would prevent it going through.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We dropped several.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the hon. Minister of Finance say that the Government are free to enter into another arrangement with Prince Edward Island, that there is nothing to prevent them from dropping this item?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not consent to that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister of Finance is making a point that is entirely different from the one I am putting. I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will not push that view any further than I am supposing it to exist, that he is in honour bound to do what is reasonable and fair to get this item through. This brings up the question that the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has raised. It does not matter whether the item is $3,500 or whether it is $35,000, so long as that principle is involved to which the hon. member for York has addressed himself, and that is the violation of the principle that, except in extreme cases of urgency, which are mentioned in the statute, and for which there is a process already provided, all supplies and all expenditures should be controlled by Parliament and that Parliament should be consulted in advance. It should not be assumed from anything the hon. member for York has said that he desires to attack the proposition of making suitable arrangements in connection with the railway service in this or any other locality. All he has done, and I would like to identify myself with him in that, in the strongest possible manner, is to advocate the general principle that where money is required for public purposes, large or small, this Parliament should be consulted in advance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman think that it is improper and incompatible with the position of a Minister, in any department of government, to ascertain from a person who has property to sell, which the Government, in the opinion of the Minister, ought to buy, upon what terms he will be willing to sell it and whether he would hold the property for the Government and to give the assurance that if he could get the authority from Parliament he would take it over.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; I know of many cases where that is done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would it not be paralyzing the arm of administration if that could not be done?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes; I do not think that in anything the hon. member for York has said he has found fault with the principle involved in the last statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals. But in this case the hon. Minister has gone farther.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is as far as it has gone.

Mr. TAYLOR. You went farther; you spent money.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In this case the Government has taken a definite position and public money has been spent in good faith in that direction, so far as the local government are concerned, and there has been action taken in this regard. There is nothing in the English House of Commons where the House shows such appreciation of the position in which the Government may place the Parliament, without the wish of Parliament, though Parliament sustains the Government and sustains them reluctantly, as in regard to this matter of parliamentary appropriation for supplies. I have in my mind a case in which the British Government in the sixties, entered into an arrangement for subsidizing a steamship line which subsequently got into difficulties, but under the contract made outside Parliament, the Government was pledged to guarantee the interest on the bonds. That Government was defeated in the meantime, and the incoming Government, although they contended the contract was improperly and illegally made, still felt bound to show good faith, and though they denounced the whole transaction they voted the money and are paying regularly the interest on the bonds of that bankrupt company down to the present time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is done very frequently.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but it was an abuse in that case, and it was so denounced in Parliament that a similar case, as I believe, has not occurred in England since. If there is not the strongest possible protest made in this Parliament now, this abuse may possibly carry us to very extreme lengths. I join in the request, that later on such correspondence as is in the possession of the department should be brought down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recall any correspondence, but in order to be on the safe side when asked the question, I said it was quite likely I had some reminders from the provincial government on the subject. There was nothing in the way of correspondence which would amount to a written contract. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) thinks that the fact that there was not a written contract is ground for additional criticism, but some of his friends would have made it a gound of complaint if there was a written contract. I admit that what took place was purely a verbal understanding, and if this were a complicated matter it might give rise later to misunderstanding. It is very necessary that these things should be done in a proper way, but you must remember that we are not only a Government administering public affairs, but we are common carriers, operators of a railway, and we have to meet the urgent demands of the public even when Parliament is not in session. It should be, and I believe it has been regarded in the past as being within the general scope of the authority of a Minister and of the Government—in proper cases of which Parliament must always be the judge—that action may be taken in advance of the action of Parliament. I concede that there is a possibility of misconception arising, as to the exact terms of such understandings, if they are not committed to writing. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will remember a case where he made an arrangement for the purchase of a lot of land at Newcastle from the Hon. Peter Mitchell. He says he made that arrangement in the presence of Mr. Pottinger, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has written me several letters on the subject. In the first place, he wrote me that he could not say exactly what price he was to pay, but he was very clear that he made the transaction with Mr. Mitchell to buy the land for a certain amount which he did not remember.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Without a vote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course; there was no vote of Parliament. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) intended to get a vote, but he made the bargain to buy first. He subsequently wrote me a letter to say that his mind was refreshed on the subject, and whilst in the previous letter he could not say what the purchase price was to be, he was then clear that it was $7,000. He stated that he made this square trade and bargain with Mr. Mitchell to buy his land for $7,000. I could not myself see that I was under any obligation to carry that arrangement out, and I was not satisfied that it should be bought in the public interest, and the thing dragged along. Later I had another letter from my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) in which his memory was still more clearly refreshed, and in the latter communication he remembered that he had agreed to buy this piece of land for $10,000, and he pressed upon me to pay Mr. Mitchell the $10,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On receiving this strong representation from my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), I went down to look at the piece of property, and I was compelled to come to the conclusion that the railway did not require the land, and that if it did require it, $1,000 would be a very high price to pay for it. We could not sell it for $1,000 to anyone; we did not need it, and, therefore, notwithstanding the pressure brought on me from all quarters, and while I would like to be as obliging as possible, seeing what occurred when my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) was Minister; I could not decide that it was in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, or of the pubilc, to buy that land. I can very well see, as my hon. friend suggested, that the presence of a written understanding between the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) when he was Minister, and the Hon. Mr. Mitchell, would have removed a great deal of misunderstanding as to what price he bargained for. I mention that to show that in certain matters it is well to have the terms written out. But in this case, we perfectly understand what the arrangement is, and it was all subject to the condition that Parliament should vote this sum.

Mr. McNEILL. Two observations have fallen from members of the Government which strike me as being very remarkable, to say the least. The first was from the hon. Minister of Finance, who said that a case might be made against the local government because they had given over this wharf without having received anything in the way of a money payment in return. He said it might be said against the local government: "You have given the wharf, and you have got nothing for it." The implication there, if it means anything at all, is that a case might be made against the local government, because they had no right to put faith in the pledges of the Dominion Government. That is a statement against which I protest. I protest against the assumption, especially coming from the lips of a Minister of the Crown, that when the Government of the Dominion makes a pledge, that pledge may be broken. That is the last argument that should be made by a Minister of the Crown. But I was still more surprised and very much alarmed at the statement made by the Prime Minister—who, I am sorry, is not present at the present moment in his place—that it was a small thing, and it was only men of small minds who could regard it as anything but a small thing, that the well-established rule that the money of the people shall not be

spent without the consent of the people's representatives, had been violated. When you find the Prime Minister taking a position of that kind in his place on the floor of Parliament, I think we have arrived at an alarming condition of things in this country. We have seen many strange things done by this Government; we have heard many strange expressions from them; but not until now, in the course of this Parliament and the life of this Government, have we heard such an alarming statement as that which fell from the lips of the Prime Minister a few moments ago. I hope the people of this country will take note of it, that we have from the highest authority sitting on the Treasury benches the deliberate statement that it is a small thing to spend the money of the people without the consent of the people's representatives, and to set at defiance a well-established constitutional rule of this country and this Empire.

Mr. HAGGART. The objection taken on this side of the House is, I think, very pertinent, and is unanswerable—that there should be some record of all these proceedings. The hon. gentleman might be justified in entering into a contract if that contract is submitted to Parliament afterwards to receive its sanction; but there is no record of these proceedings, and there is no report of the officer in charge of the railway as to the necessity of acquiring this wharf. If the hon. gentleman has such a report, he ought to bring it down to the House. The hon. gentleman justifies his proceedings by saying that at some time or other I entered into an arrangement with Mr. Peter Mitchell to purchase land at Miramichi. Any arrangement which I made in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, I made on the recommendation of my engineers. I took a memorandum of the proceedings; I had a report to justify me; but the hon. gentleman says he went down there and found that the place was not worth one-seventh of what I had agreed to pay Mr. Mitchell.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You told me latterly it was $10,000 you agreed to pay.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the correspondence? Mr. Mitchell came to me and told me that the Minister of Railways would pay the money at once if I wrote a letter and said that there was an arrangement for the payment of $7,000. It is a small transaction for the hon. gentleman to bring up. He knows the whole effect of it; and he knows what my responsibility was for what took place long after I was a Minister. I never expected that the Minister would bring the matter up in the House. The other day he talked about private correspondence with a gentleman in England being made public; but this is a smaller matter than that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make such a statement as that. He never had any communication with me, I admit; but, not simply on one occasion, but on three different occasions, he gave letters to Mr. Mitchell stating that what he said then was the revised and the re-revised arrangement which he had made with Mr. Mitchell. What did he give these letters for? To be pigeon-holed, and held as private and confidential, never to be breathed about? No, sir; these letters were written for the purpose of enabling Mr. Mitchell to induce me to buy this property from him, and to justify my conduct in buying it before the public and before Parliament, by producing the evidence that my predecessor in office had engaged and promised to take this property from him on these terms. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to say that any such letter was a private letter, and that if I had acted on his statement, I would not have been justified—yes, bound, as a matter of self-defence, and he must have known that that was the purpose for which the letter was given—to bring that letter and use it in Parliament as proof that such an arrangement had been made with the hon. gentleman. Mr. Mitchell stated to me that this arrangement was made in the presence of the manager of the Intercolonial Railway. He (Mr. Haggart) never stated in his letter to me that any engineer was present or that any record was made of the transaction. On the contrary, he said that there was no memorandum or evidence of it, but that the conversation took place in the presence of Mr. Pottinger. I referred to the general manager, and I found that he had not the slightest recollection of any such arrangement or understanding for the purchase of this property. Therefore, of course it was not open to consideration at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand why the Minister of Railways and Canals drags head and shoulders into this discussion a matter which has no relation to what is before the House at all. What are the facts as now stated? It appears that the Hon. Peter Mitchell, a friend and supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, a man who for the last ten years has shown the strongest hostility to the Conservative party, who has run election after election for hon. gentlemen opposite, and has done everything he could to injure and break down the Conservative party, had a piece of land which the engineer of the Intercolonial Railway recommended as a desirable piece of property to purchase in connection with that railway. He was not a political friend of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), but a political opponent of that hon. gentleman, and a political and personal friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. Therefore, my hon. friend was under no obligation whatever to do anything or to strain a point to favour

Mr. Mitchell. But the engineer of the department, having stated that it would be desirable in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway to obtain this piece of property, and having taken the best means he could to ascertain what its value was, he told Mr. Mitchell that he had come to the conclusion that it was desirable to purchase it in the interest of the country; and having gone out of power before that arrangement was completed, he has implemented it at Mr. Mitchell's request by stating, as a matter of business to the Minister of Railways and Canals, that he had contemplated the purchase of that property at a particular price.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That he had agreed to buy it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What had that to do with the question before the committee?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has this to do with it. We are being criticised now, because we made an arrangement to purchase a piece of property contingent upon such purchase being approved by Parliament. We are being criticised now because we made an arrangement to purchase a piece of property provided we got the approval of Parliament. Yet here is a transaction of my predecessor, and which seems not to have been an uncommon thing, and I refer to that in reply to the hon. member for Pictou, to show that similar transactions have taken place before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not see that the cases have any bearing on each other. The contract of which the hon. gentleman speaks was not completed. There was simply a purchase contemplated between the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) and one of his strongest political opponents. That purchase was not completed, and at the request of Mr. Mitchell, my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), as a matter of business and fairness, communicated to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) what he had contemplated doing, if he had remained in power.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume, therefore, that the constitutionality of the transaction depends upon whether the person with whom you are having it is an opponent or friend of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but I am utterly at a loss to understand why the hon. Minister should wish to make it appear that a gentleman to whom he and his friends are deeply indebted for long years of hearty, earnest political support, and who has expended his time, money and help in their service, was trying to impose on the Government and get a much larger price for a piece of property than it was worth. I do not think that Mr. Mitchell will feel deeply indebted to the hon. gentleman for thus bringing his name into this discussion. In my judgment, this conduct is on a par with some other transactions of an equally ungrateful character. I am at a loss to know what the committee is detained about. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said an hour ago that he had no objection to the item passing, on the understanding that the Minister of Railways would furnish later on in the evening any correspondence that bore on the subject. I left the House an hour ago when that proposal was made, and when I came back I would suppose—if I had not known the relations of the parties—that for some purpose or other the hon. Minister of Railways was talking against time. When he travelled away down to Newcastle, and was dragging in his old friends for the purpose of placing them in an unfavourable light before the House, I concluded that he had forgotten he is a member of the Government and desirous of putting through his Estimates, and that an hour ago my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) had offered to allow the item to pass on condition that the hon. gentleman would bring down, later in the evening, the correspondence.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has dragged this matter in for the purpose of making a comparison between the two transactions. There is no comparison, as the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well. I stated the result of the conversation between myself and the manager of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman then met the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, and that gentleman's recollection was not the same as mine. Of course, the transaction then ceased, and the department was no longer bound by it. When the hon. gentleman got a letter from me giving my recollection of the transaction, and when the manager of the Intercolonial Railway said that he did not remember anything of the kind, the Minister was not bound to do anything. Just look at the difference between the two transactions. In the one case the Intercolonial Railway had never entered into possession. There was only an alleged agreement between Mr. Mitchell and myself, and the gentleman who is manager of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. Minister induced Mr. Mitchell to come to me and get from me a letter explaining the transaction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. HAGGART. In order to justify—so I was told—his giving to a political friend a certain amount for a piece of property, which, it is alleged, the Intercolonial Railway wanted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has no authority for saying that I used any influence of the kind. Mr. Mitchell never went to the hon. gentleman at my suggestion or request.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Mitchell told me that he came direct from you to me to get the letter. I went to the hon. Minister myself and had a private interview with him on the subject. I explained to him, as far as my memory went, the whole transaction. He knew perfectly well my ideas on the subject, and then he asked Mr. Mitchell to come to me for the purpose of getting a letter giving my recollection of the conversation that I had with Mr. Pottinger. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Pottinger never recommended it. Mr. Pottinger took a part.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I only tell you what Mr. Pottinger said.

Mr. HAGGART. He took a part of the same property for the Intercolonial Railway and paid for it. Mr. Mitchell said that was part of the same transaction, and that Mr. Pottinger was to have taken the whole of the property. Mr. Pottinger's recollection may be that he did not recommend it to me, but I thought that he did, and under that impression I wrote the letter to the Minister. And the Minister had also a private conversation with me on the subject, for I went in and explained to him, as far as I remembered, the whole transaction. When Mr. Mitchell came to me, he told me that he came at the instance of the Minister, who had said that if he got a letter from me stating what I remembered of the conversation, he would put the amount in the Estimates and pay Mr. Mitchell.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope we are not to be diverted by the discussion of the Mitchell case from the vote before the House. Whether or not Mr. Mitchell is a supporter or opponent of the Government is of no consequence, or whether the price paid him for his land was sufficient or not. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the ex-Minister of Finance have assailed the Minister of Railways because he made an agreement with the Government of Prince Edward Island to purchase a piece of property, necessarily subject to the vote of Parliament. These hon. gentlemen argue that in doing that he tied the hands of the House and took away from Parliament that freedom it ought to have with regard to the appropriations in Supply. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) retorted by citing a similar case in which the late Government agreed to pay Mr. Mitchell for a piece of land, for which they had not asked any appropriation. In that case, it was not merely an offer to purchase, but an absolute purchase, because Mr. Mitchell says that they did purchase this property. What is more, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), to his credit be it said, told his successor that he had purchased the property, and gave Mr. Mitchell a letter to that effect. What does that prove? It proves that in the administration of the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway there may be occasions when it is expedient for a Minister to contract, subject to the vote of Parliament, for a certain piece of property, and that was what the Minister did.

Mr. FOSTER. No one challenges that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend and his colleagues have been challenging that. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) asked a little while ago what was the cause of delay. The cause of delay has been simply that hon. gentlemen opposite have assailed us for purchasing this property, as they say, without a vote of Parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. No, for taking possession of it and spending money on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is another phase of the matter. We find that in this other case a property was purchased. The only question is whether the price has been a fair one. I think it quite fair to say that unless the Minister was at liberty to carry out such transactions the Intercolonial Railway could not be run.

Mr. COCHRANE. As a layman, I am surprised at the stand taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. The argument of the Minister of Finance did not at all touch the point that has been brought before this committee. The question was not whether they have a right to make a bargain, but the question was whether they have a right to enter into the possession of property and spend public money upon property without consulting Parliament. The case cited by the Minister of Finance is not a parallel case at all, for the money was not paid nor was the property occupied. But the Minister of Railways and Canals, in the case now before us, not only negotiated for the purchase of the property but entered into possession and spent public money without asking Parliament for authority. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite seek to draw a red herring across the track; that is in accord with their action in everything else. They think that if they can go back and show that the Tories did what they are doing, they justify themselves completely. In the time I have been in Parliament, I never knew of a transaction like this. The gentlemen are doing away altogether with the responsibility of Parliament. If this is the way our affairs are to be managed, they might as well dismiss the House and run the country without our assistance. I am surprised to see such action on the part of gentlemen, who, during

the eighteen long years when they sat on this side of the House would hardly let us go out to breathe, but they would insist that it must be done by contract. And they hand over thousands of public money to a man to spend in such a way that he himself gets a commission. And because we object to that kind of thing, they say we have small souls. The opinion of the people in the country is that there is a steal in that transaction, and that seems to be the explanation of a good many of the transactions perpetrated by gentlemen in power to-day.

Farran's Point Canal—Enlargement..... $22,000

Mr. HAGGART. How is this to be finished and how much has been expended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The appropriation $325,000 has been spent. It is expected that this $22,000 will complete it. We hope and expect to have it done by 1st July.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) take this opportunity of making a statement, in the light of his present information, as to the time when we may expect to have the fourteen-foot navigation, canal and river, completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would gladly accede to my hon. friend's (Sir Charles Tupper) request, but I think it would be better, if agreeable to him, if I defer a positive statement until I come to the main Estimates. I have a judgment upon the question, but I think I shall have a better and more reliable one on the subject in a week or ten days.

North Channel—Deepening, &c..... $212,000

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. Minister explain how much has been expended and how near this work is to completion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have the fourteen-foot channel, and could use it at any moment now. But it is of a width of 160 feet, and we propose to make it a width of 300 feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the hon. Minister is mistaken. They are working this dry.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is dammed up at either end. But if it were possible for us to use the other canals above and below, we could remove the dam and have the fourteen-foot navigation for a width of 160 feet. But seeing we cannot use the other canals, and as it is cheaper and more expedient to work without letting in the water, the dam is kept standing.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount expended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Up to 1st of May we had paid $400,640. We owe $212,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is required to complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is estimated that the remainder of the work will require $56,000 or $57,000. The cost of the whole work, including land damages, would be about $700,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Of course, it is too late to protest now ; but I protested before this was begun against what I believed to be an expenditure of nearly $700,000 on this work. There was no necessity for this channel. They had a perfectly good channel. We have the right under the Washington treaty, of navigating the American side of the channel ; and with very little or no expenditure, by going round the point, you could utilize the locks at Cardinal. Mr. Rubidge, the engineer-in-chief, recommended the scheme to me again and again, but I refused to spend one cent upon it. I thought the expenditure would be entirely useless. There was a good channel on the American side that we have the right to navigate, we could go from that channel to the mouth of the Cardinal locks. I am aware that the engineer-in-chief recommended the Minister to build this work. I can only enter my protest that there is no necessity for this amount, and I think it is an entirely useless expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend adheres very strongly to the view that the other channel would have been the better channel, but all the engineers of the department are against him, and were against him when he was Minister of the department. They furnished evidence of the fact that it would cost just as much to make the other channel of the depth of fourteen feet as to make this one of that depth ; and the other would have the disadvantage that it would be a very circuitous channel, whereas this is a splendid dead-straight channel right into the canal. All the transportation men were, without exception, in favour of making this channel, as against the other. One would think that when the responsible officers of the department all concurred in the view that this was the proper channel, and when their reports were unquestionably to the effect that this work could be done at an expense not greater than deepening the other channel from nine to fourteen feet, I think the department came to a wise conclusion. My hon. friend has a strong opinion, and is entitled to the enjoyment of it, but it was not in harmony with that of the officers of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend may be perfectly justified in stating that it would take as much money to utilize the other channel as to build the north channel, but I venture to say that if he puts on any unprejudiced engineer to make an examination, he will get no such report as that.

There is no necessity for coming in so close to the point where the water is but nine feet. He could go round it. But if he excavated a channel from the point down, the quantities do not justify the statement which, I have no doubt, has been put in the mouth of the Minister as to the expenditure being as much as for building the north channel. I venture to say that an unprejudiced engineer would report that it would not cost one-fifth, let alone as much as the Minister has said. I do not blame him, because he is taking the report of the engineer-in-chief. He says he has the report of the engineer in his department in favour of the scheme.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So my deputy tells me.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no engineer in his department taking charge of it, unless it is himself. Who is the engineer of his department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Rubidge, the superintending engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Rubidge is the officer of the canals. He always was in favour of it, he recommended it to me, he brought me up to the channel and tried to impress me with the necessity of building it. I thought the deputy who was along with me and Mr. Monroe, who was along with me at the time, rather concurred in my opinion that there was no necessity. The deputy may have altered his opinion since, I am not positive whether he expressed any decided opinion upon it. But I thought it was very plain, as the facts came out, to any one who had an eye at all for such things that there was not the least necessity for building it, as we had a perfectly good channel on the American side, and a very little expenditure on the point for the purpose, taking a straight line towards the mouth of the locks, would meet the purpose without this enormous expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a great difference of opinion with respect to a good many works in connection with the St. Lawrence Canal, but so far as I am aware there was no difference of opinion in the department, and among the officers who had charge of the work, as to the superiority of this route and as to the cost. I had no opinion of my own about it, and would not be expected to have any.

Lachine Canal—
Deepening River St. Pierre..... $8,400

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to drop this.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the position of that work now? We had a spirited discussion over it at a previous time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am inclined to the opinion that what work was done was done very wisely and judiciously, that it was a good scheme. I went over it, and I am sure that so far as the uncultivated mind is capable of forming a judgment, it was a good scheme.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it the Minister's opinion that it was a good thing for the people who wanted the drainage?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say it hurt the people that were going to get the benefit of the drainage.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was expended on it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $160,000 or $170,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no more to be spent on it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be an amount, I think we will have to put it in the supplementaries.

Trent Canal—
W. Quinn, concrete inspector, two-thirds of his wages while laid up..... $153

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This man, while in the Government employ, met with an accident that laid him up for three months. I think it is the custom in the department to allow two-thirds of the wages where a person is laid up from an accident through no fault of his own. It was through some hoisting apparatus.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just want to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the Government to an item which ought to be here, but which is not. I intended to have drawn attention to the subject last night, when the item was going through in reference to the widow of the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. I refer to the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie). He was here for the best part of the session, but he was taken down with typhoid fever, and his medical adviser said that he should be sent home. He was sent home and placed under medical treatment there until the end of the session. When he came to settle up he was docked $150 of his sessional indemnity. I think his full sessional indemnity should be paid. If he had been sick here in Ottawa he would have got it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I could not say a word at this moment, but I am very glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has brought my attention to it.

Chambly Canal—
To purchase double metallic telephone lines $700

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a telephone line which belongs to the Bell Telephone Company. They have changed the route of their main line, abandoning this, and as we will have to construct a telephone line for the purpose of our canal, we have an offer from them to sell for this price. My engineer says it would cost twice or three times that sum—between $1,600 and $1,700—to construct a line.

Mr. POWELL. How long is it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nine miles.

Mr. FOSTER. That is about $80 a mile ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would have to put up a new line if we did not get this. It is really quite an advantage to us to be able to make this arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. They could not have any use for their old line, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are changing their line. They are abandoning this line ; they really have no use for it, because their new line takes a different route. I think that $80 a mile for that line is quite an advantageous price. It is double metallic. I think it is cheap.

Mr. POWELL. Being double metallic does not add very much to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does add this, that you get twice the quantity of wire, which is copper, and copper is not a drug on the market.

Mr. POWELL. Surely it cannot be copper, because that wire would come to more than that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As I tell you, we are getting what the engineer tells me would cost between $1,600 and $1,700 to replace. It is copper wire, and it is in good condition.

Mr. HAGGART. Copper wire is worth more than that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if this Chambly Canal is the canal in reference to which I asked a few questions the other day as to damage being done to farmers' lands and to the destruction of their roadway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember the question the hon. gentleman has reference to.

Mr. TAYLOR. I put another question on the Paper last night in reference to this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to an indenture dated the 8th of December, 1845, being an agreement between the Government of Canada and the owners of the land. This agreement quite contradicts the answer the hon. Minister gave the other day. I would ask him to look into it, to revise his answer, and to be more careful in answering the question I have now submitted, because there is a distinct agreement between the Government and the farmers that the Government will maintain the roadway for all time, in consideration of the farmers giving up the right to their property. I think when my hon. friend reads the agreement made between the Government and these farmers in 1845, he will find that the answers he gave the other day were not correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I read the answers that are given to me. I will, however, call the attention of the proper officer to it.

Cornwall Canal—
To pay balance of amount expended on repairs to recess, platforms and tail bays of new locks, Nos. 15 and 17.. $6,500

Mr. HAGGART. What new locks require repairs ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The platforms of the two locks, Nos. 15 and 17, require to be taken up and rebuilt.

Mr. HAGGART. Why ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have become delapidated, and require to be renewed.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you find out the reason ? New locks like that, only built a couple of years, and which have only been in use a year, could not be out of repair, unless there were surely some reason, such as faulty construction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only explanation that my deputy can give is that the water and the ice got under them and destroyed them, so that, they require to be replaced.

Mr. HAGGART. Bad cement, I suppose—some foreign cement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend must be responsible for the cement.

Mr. HAGGART. While on the subject of the canals, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he did with the quantity of cement that he got from Thorold to be used on the Soulanges Canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not use any more of it

in the works. We have not paid them anything more since the hon. gentleman brought the subject up. It is in statu quo. That is the present position of the question. There was a portion of the cement which was good. It was looked into, and it was found to be as good as could be desired, but there was a portion of it which was defective. It seems to me difficult to understand, because the Thorold people have been making cement for many years. Their cement has gone into some of the best canal work we have. A very large portion of it was used on the Welland Canal by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and other contractors, and the work is standing to-day in first-class condition. There must have been some carelessness in the manufacture of some recently made, because, unquestionably, a portion of it was defective. We have not used that nor paid for it.

Repairs and alterations to the Governor General's car "Victoria"..... $2,500

Mr. POWELL. What does that mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Each new Governor General, when he arrives upon the scene, has his own views in regard to the car. There is an arrangement which has been existing for a great many years, covering the periods of a great many Governors General, under which repairs that they require are made, and the cost of these repairs is added to the previous capital expenditure and interest is charged upon the amount.

Mr. FOSTER. It is treated as an investment?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an investment.

Mr. HAGGART. You charge interest on all these repairs?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That has been the arrangement. It is increasing. Each one has to have his little improvements made, and the present Governor General, Lord Minto, is no exception to the rule in that regard.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not rendered necessary as a cleaning process on account of the Minister of Public Works having had this car for a while jaunting around, is it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never heard that he used this car. I understand that the Governor General is the only one who ever used it.

Mr. BRITTON. Is transportation at the public expense?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all; he has to make his own arrangements; we simply furnish him with a car.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many private cars have we now for the Governor General and for the members of the Government, at the expense of the country?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have only one Governor General and only one Governor General's car. We have a car which is supposed to be more exclusively intended for the use of the Ministers, and we have a car for the Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the "Cumberland"?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was the "Cumberland," but it has now been transferred to the "Montreal." It is a second-hand car which Mr. Harris, during his brief administration, purchased from the Grand Trunk Railway for $4,000 or $4,500. These are the only cars that I know of, which belong to the Government, that are brought up here.

Mr. POWELL. Has the Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway a private car?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but it is usually at Moncton, I believe.

Mr. POWELL. It is a small matter to refer to, and it is only by way of retaliation, that is all, that I speak of it. When the Conservative party was in power there was a tremendous uproar made from one end of the country to the other, as if the constitution itself was shaken, that some improper, or supposed improper use, was made of these cars. I see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is on the alert; his voice resounded through "all Greece to Macedon and Artaxeres' Throne," in denunciation of private cars.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think you can recall an instance where I referred to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. POWELL. I can recall several.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish you would do it, then.

Mr. POWELL. I wish to ask the Minister (Mr. Blair) what are the regulations with respect to these cars. I have no doubt that if there are any regulations they would be violated by Conservatives as much as by Liberals, but inasmuch as it was made a very vital point in the Liberal platform, I would like to know if there are any rules established as to the use of these cars by others than officials. Of course when the Minister of Railways travels he has a right to have any persons with him he sees fit, or when another Minister travels it is recognized by usage also to be the correct thing. But I understand these private cars have lately been handed over to little girls for their transportation, and to their uncles and their cousins and their aunts. I am not

raising a very serious objection, except on the ground of consistency, because I recognize the fact that a great railway cannot be run without granting little privileges of this kind. Private railways see it in their interest to have private cars, and I do not think it would hurt the country very much that the Ministers should have one. It does seem a little inconsistent that the Ministers should use private cars for the accommodation of their friends after denouncing such use before they came into power.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid we are all somewhat inconsistent. My memory is not very retentive on these points, but I can recall the tremendous furore that was raised by our Conservative friends, by reason of the fact that Mr. Brydges had a car during the Mackenzie Government. I think one election was pretty nearly run on the strength of Brydges' car.

Mr. FOSTER. They were a new thing, then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The matter may have been taken up in the same sense by Liberal candidates and newspapers. The arrangement, as far as there is any arrangement, in regard to these cars is that my own official car is under my own direct control, and I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) that I never had any of my family junketing about in it.

Mr. POWELL. I did not refer to you at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never sent it out under these circumstances. I have it when I go myself, and it is not used otherwise. There is a spare car here which Ministers have when they require it, but they have to pay for their transportation; what I mean is there is no expense in connection with it.

Mr. FOSTER. Have to pay what, and to whom?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have to pay for their own transportation unless they can arrange with railway companies to give them free transportation. The Government do not pay for the transportation of the car.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody pays for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The idea I want to convey is, that the use of the car does not involve any charge upon the revenues of the country in any way, and there are no railway charges paid in respect to it. The Deputy Minister has his car which he uses when he requires it, and which I dare say may often be borrowed by Ministers as occasion may arise. I do not know of any rule that is laid down on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) say, as a matter of information, whether or not the Prime Minister has overcome his repugnance to riding in a private car?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To tell the truth I have never seen the Prime Minister on a private car, and I would not like to make any statement in regard to him.

Mr. CLARKE. I presume the same rule prevails with regard to the use of private cars by the present Ministers, as prevailed during the late Conservative Administration. When they are available they are used by hon. gentlemen in the Government who desire to use them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) what he knows about my repugnance to private cars?

Mr. FOSTER. It occurs to me that in the early, and more fresh, and may be a little more innocent stages of this Government's official career, when the right hon. gentleman came from Montreal to Ottawa, shortly after he was Premier, it was heralded all around the country, that he actually rode in a car with other people and did not get on a private car. And the right hon. gentleman when interviewed about it, said: He did not consider himself any better than the common people, and would ride in the same car. I wonder if that same virgin freshness still adheres to my right hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that I was ever interviewed upon that subject, and I do not hold myself responsible for everything that appears in the press. Moreover, I have used a private car when I was acting in an official capacity; otherwise I am a democrat to the hilt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Amount remaining unpaid of sum appropriated by chap. 2 of the Statutes of 1890, in aid of the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, the date for finishing the work named in contract having expired before final completion thereof; this sum being acknowledged as due, notwithstanding that the changes made in the specifications for the work were not legally authorized. $5,300

Mr. FOSTER. I asked that papers be brought down with reference to this, and some were brought down by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and to-day the Minister of Finance gave me a supplementary list. I shall not now ask that this item stand, but I wish it to be understood that I shall have the right to refer to it in the main Estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I might explain, perhaps, that the total subsidy would be $142,400. There have been payments made, one under the authority of the Act of last session for $61,400. There have been paid on account of those subsidies in all $137,100, leaving a balance of $5,300. When the vote was brought in last year it was explained that I had not the necessary report from the engineers to authorize the payment of the full amount, but they have since been obtained and I have in my hand a report dated the 19th of January, 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not included in the papers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As we understand, the engineer had only reported with regard to 20 miles, but it appears we were inaccurate in drawing that inference from his report, because it really covered the whole road, and all required by the department to be done had been done. He sent this report on the 19th of January, showing that it applied to the 25 miles, instead of 20 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend would have a copy of that made and bring it down, so that it may be added to the other papers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will see to that.

Mr. FOSTER. My impression was, that a report was made to Council, on which the Minister was authorized, on the report of his engineer, to allow for certain trestle work for which the contract did not allow; that this was set out in the Order in Council; that the total amount of the subsidy due was subject to this exception, and that last year's vote included the subsidy for all of that work. As the Minister had a supplementary report from the engineer, authorizing certain other structures to be considered as equal, not to the requirements of the contract, but to the practical work, this is a further computation of the subsidy, as due.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The Order in Council was based on a report authorizing certain work which, under the terms of the original contract, could not be permitted. It turned out that that authorization made by Order in Council was not within the legal competency of the Governor in Council, because the date for the completion of the work had expired. Therefore, it becomes necessary to ask for a special appropriation of Parliament to make that good.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom is this payable?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. The railway company made an assignment to Barnes, and Barnes made an assignment of the whole of the subsidies to the Bank of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. In that assignment the bank had a complete right to all the subsidies, unless Barnes paid it $40,000, which seems to have been his indebtedness to the bank.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Forty thousand dollars to bring the road up to the condition required.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not appear, from the papers brought down, that Barnes exercised his option to take up his assignment to the bank.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; the money was all paid to the bank.

Mr. FOSTER. And this amount goes to the bank under that assignment?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Welland Canal—
Remission of arrears of water rental due by village of Merritton, also law costs in connection $2,140 75

Mr. FOSTER. Why is this allowed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A lease was made of certain lands to the town of Merritton in connection with its water supply system, subject to a rental of $400 a year. The town paid that rental for a short period; but the amount appeared to them to be very large, and they protested against it. Ultimately, the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the department, I think in the year 1890, agreed to reduce the rental, and it was reduced from $400 to $80; but there was a considerable amount of arrears at the old rate. I think there was no promise on the part of my predecessor that the rental in arrears would be abated, and proceedings are being taken against the town to recover those arrears. Not long ago a cyclone struck the town, a good deal of property was destroyed, and the tax-paying capabilities of the town were very much impaired. They came to us with an urgent appeal, ad misericordiam, that we should not enforce the judgment against them for the arrears of rent. They are willing to pay the rental of $80, but they ask us to remit the arrears at the higher rate, and we recommend the remission to Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they paid the money?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to do with this money?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the authority of this vote we discharge the judgment. It is a mere matter of book-keeping. I do not know any other way of doing it, except by Act of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I might ask the Minister of Finance, if he consulted his department as to this method of doing away with arrearages. If he has not, I would suggest that he consult with his deputy and the Auditor General on the subject; because it strikes me that this has been done in a different way from what has been done this year. I know that at one time, when arrearages for a large amount were struck off, the matter went before the Public Accounts Committee, the committee reported to the House, and the House authorized the striking off of the arrears.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was that done by Act of Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because it could not be done otherwise. It strikes me, however, that this is not the right way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will look into the matter and see if there is a better way. By doing it in this way, you swell both the revenue and expenditure needlessly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as the appeal to the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, I think that is a matter for the Government. If they wish to have an independent expression on the facts, they might go to the committee; but, when the Government has a fixed view of the case, there would be no occasion of consulting the committee. If they went to the committee, they would escape a certain amount of criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be an advantage.

Mr. HAGGART. I remember the circumstances in regard to this matter perfectly well, and it was my intention to forgive the indebtedness. It is not a remission; it is the wiping out of an indebtedness due by the town of Merritton. They brought in a very strong argument to show that the neghbouring town was getting the water at a great deal less, and it was my intention to have this amount wiped out. But the trouble is the Governor in Council have no power to do it. The Public Accounts Committee recommended it, but have no power to do it. The only possible way is by an Act of Parliament. The wording of this is a little better than the one brought before the House the other day, but it is still wrong, because there is an amount of money that has never been paid to the Government, and you cannot remit it. Could you not have some form of words which would have the effect of wiping it out altogether?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the one hand, you would have to pay out the money and on the other hand to receive it back.

Mr. HAGGART. Who would receive it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Issue a cheque to the Railway Department, and then it would go into the revenue. If you issue a cheque and charge it on the one side and credit the amount among the receipts on the other they would balance.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you would have an abnormal revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, if the amount were a large one.

Mr. SPROULE. How much for law costs and how much for remission of rents?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My impression is something like $140 or $150 for costs. There was an error, we recovered judgment, and of course when we remitted the amount, we remitted the costs.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 129) respecting "The General Trust Corporation of Canada."—(Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 136)—from the Senate—for the relief of Annie Inkson Dowding.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company (Limited).—(Mr. Haley.)

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committe of Supply.

Welland Canal—
Interest to owners of steamer "Lakeside" on balance of sum deposited as security for damages to Lock 1... $143 87

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This vote arises out of a circumstance which may occur frequently, and, I think, it is desirable that some regular procedure should be taken in such a case. The owners of this steamer did certain damage to the canal. According to usage they were required to make a deposit to cover the cost of the repairs. When these repairs were completed it was found that the amount that they had put up was in excess of the

sum expended. The balance of course required to be repaid. The persons who made the deposit had the right to expect that the returned portion should carry interest, and it did really carry interest because it was paid into the bank and they were entitled to get the benefit of it. We are unable, under the existing condition of the law, to add interest to the amount of the refund and are, therefore, compelled to ask for an appropriation.

Mr. SPROULE. What amount are you allowing them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the amount is calculated on the basis of 4 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Then they must have deposited a very large sum over what was necessary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They had quite an amount on deposit, but it was in the hands of the Government for over two years.

Mr. PRIOR. Why?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Beause it took some time to make the repairs, and there was a good deal of dispute as to whether or not the amount of repairs charged against them was properly charged, whether or not we ought to ask them to bear as large a proportion of these repairs, and, therefore, a controversy resulted. Some concessions were made to them ultimately and the amount was settled. The interest we have allowed is only for the period during which we held the money.

Mr. POWELL. I think that is right in principle.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We ought to have some regular machinery.

Mr. POWELL. I was going to bring some other cases to your notice. In election petitions I have had from the office some $4,000 or $5,000 in the hands of the clerk of the election court at one time. In one case it was held for two years and no interest was paid on it. This is a case perfectly on all fours with the one which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has mentioned, and I think there should be some general rule by which interest on such deposits should be paid back to the people who make the deposits.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think the cases are parallel. The money in an election petition is paid into court, and, of course, there is interest allowed on the money paid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not have any reference to election deposits.

Mr. POWELL. No, but until it is paid back, the Government have the use of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had in my mind the present case. The other was not in my mind at all.

Mr. POWELL. I think this is a matter that ought to receive the attention of the Government. Somebody has had the use of the money. The officers of the Dominion Government have had it, for the clerk of the election court may be considered such, for in the case of Valin vs. Langlois the court leaned to regard the election court as a Dominion court, and it is only right that the party who makes a deposit should receive interest on it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. There is interest allowed on money paid into the election court. It may not be paid for the full time. The officers of the court, probably, have not much better banking arrangements than an individual can have, and, therefore, there is always a loss on the fraction of the month or when the money does not stay for some length of time. These are things that you cannot do absolute justice in, but, substantially, there is interest paid on money that is paid into court on election petitions, and I suppose, in a case of this kind, when the money is in the hands of the Government, and presumably used for good purposes, there is no reason why the Government should not pay at least bank interest if they are entitled to pay a portion of the money back to any one.

To pay the Kingston and Montreal Forwarding Company a rebate of tolls on grain that passed through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals in 1891 and 1892, and which was transhipped at Ogdensburg..... $7,321 18

Mr. SPROULE. How does this come—seven years old?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a very considerable amount; the matter is one of importance, and I desire to put the committee in full possession of the facts in reference to it. This vote is to refund the amount which was paid in tolls in 1891 and 1892, by the Kingston and Montreal Forwarding Company, on grain shipped through the Welland Canal, and later through the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal. The rates of toll during these years were, through the Welland Canal, 20 cents, and 15 cents in addition through the St. Lawrence canals. There was an Order in Council passed as far back as 1889, to the following effect:—

Goods shipped to any port west of the St. Lawrence canals, tolls upon which have already been paid for passage through said canals, may be re-shipped from such ports and be passed through the Welland Canal free of tolls in the same way as if they had been shipped through direct in the first instance; and goods eastward,

having paid Welland Canal tolls, may be transhipped at any port on Lake Ontario, and thereafter pass free through the St. Lawrence canals as if they had been shipped through direct in the first instance.

Mr. PRIOR. That is any grain that was shipped through one port went through the other ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Any grain that was shipped from the port of Montreal and passed through the others, was entitled to a refund of the Welland Canal toll to the extent of 18 cents. That being the condition of things at the time that the shipment took place, the Montreal Forwarding Company shipped the quantity of grain, the statement of which I have here, through the Welland Canal. But as there was no port having facilities on the Canadian side, they went over to Ogdensburg and shipped there, and the grain came down later as originally destined for Montreal. But when they asked for their refund the technical question was raised as to whether they were entitled to it under the strict meaning of the Order in Council. I am inclined to think that the point was raised owing to the fact that between the time the grain had come through the Welland Canal and had gone through the other canal, some little time intervened, and a new Order in Council had passed restricting the privilege and the right to a refund to shipments which had been stopped, and had not been transhipped in ports that were wholly Canadian. It was claimed by the Department of Justice that upon the strict interpretation of this Order in Council the company were not entitled to the refund, because the port of Ogdensburg was not strictly a port on Lake Ontario, but was a port on the river. The claim has been made and pressed, and except upon the grounds that the Justice Department puts forward, I do not know any reason why it was not paid. The matter was submitted to me after coming to the department as an unsettled matter. I took a great deal of pains to look into it, and to arrive at a conclusion, and I must say that I felt bound to come to the same conclusion that my predecessor did when he recommended that the amount should be refunded.

Mr. PRIOR. Did your predecessor recommend it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The Minister of Justice had expressed an opinion that in strictness under the Order in Council, they were not entitled to it, but in equity he thought they were, and so we all did. I reported the case to my colleagues in the Council, and they came to the conclusion that it was a very extreme interpretation of this section that had been put forward. The grain came down destined for Montreal, it came to Montreal, and it only tarried at Ogdensburg because we had not at the time any facilities to make a transfer on the Canadian side of the lake.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be possible that this company did not ship the same quantity of grain from Ogdensburg ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That point was gone into very carefully. My predecessor sent the proper officer of the department at Ogdensburg, and he followed up the vessel's record, and followed up the quantity, and he was satisfied that the grain had been reshipped and had gone out by the port of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me very natural that the Minister of Justice should come to the conclusion that he did, because Ogdensburg is a port on the river and not on Lake Ontario, and on the American side. But the Order in Council only provided for the rebate where it was transhipped from a port on Lake Ontario ; therefore, the legal interpretation of the Order in Council would be clearly that they could not get it. It seems strange that this question existed from 1881 to 1892 without being adjusted.

Mr. PRIOR. I presume the matter was brought up several times.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was brought up continuously.

Mr. BRITTON. As I have some business connection with a company at Kingston, not this company, I wish to understand this matter. First, it ought to be made clear that this grain was consigned to that company, and that it was merely transhipped at Ogdensburg because there were no facilities at Kingston to receive it. Secondly, the point should be made clear that it is the same grain that was sent from Ogdensburg later on. These two points being clear, I suppose that in equity they have a claim under what was intended to be the meaning of the Order in Council. Then, the other point is this, whether the department has any knowledge of other claims for payment under similar circumstances. I have inquired, but have not yet ascertained whether the other company at Kingston has any claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would be likely to prefer it before now, if they had.

Mr. BRITTON. If there are any, they will be settled upon the same basis ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the cases are analogous.

Mr. SPROULE. There is more involved here than the settlement of this claim. The Americans have always held that we charged them too much as canal tolls where they shipped to an American port. Now, the Americans might, very naturally, in coming through the Welland Canal, if they tran-

ship grain to Montreal, they might set up the claim for a rebate of the canal tolls which they had paid above what they ought to pay in consideration of their being Americans, because, I understand, that Americans shipping to a port on Lake Ontario and then transhipping to Montreal, are entitled to this rebate. Some time ago, I think, there was an Order in Council passed reducing the tolls from 20 cents to 10 cents a ton. Was it under this new Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The charge was made under the old one of 1889, under which 20 cents was the rate for the Welland and 15 cents for the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Minister remember when the new Order in Council was passed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it was passed in 1892.

Mr. SPROULE. Were any other claims preferred besides this one ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have heard of none.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be that because such a claim as this is paid others may loom up which we know nothing of, and the matter should be well considered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some years have elapsed, and if there were any similar case it would be sure to have been brought to the notice of the department.

With the permission of the House I wish to supplement the information I gave earlier with reference to the Mount Stewart wharf. By reference to the Auditor General's Report, 1897-98, hon. gentlemen will see that the sum of $930.75 was expended in extending the line to that wharf. I have here some letters which have been found since recess and there may be others.

Mr. SPROULE. Better read them and put them in "Hansard."

Mr. TAYLOR. Lay them on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not of sufficient importance, I think, to go on "Hansard," and as they are originals, I shall get copies made and lay them on the Table of the House.

Mr. PRIOR. Is it the policy of the Government to purchase wharfs for public use in other provinces as well as in Prince Edward Island ? I know that in British Columbia the provincial government always does that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) overlooks the fact that this wharf was required in connection with the business of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. PRIOR. I can understand that, but does not the Government own wharfs where there is no railway, in Quebec and Ontario ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think they do, but they are not under my jurisdiction. There are wharfs owned by the Government and the Public Works Department has charge of them.

Mr. PRIOR. Why does not the provincial government attend to that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is on the sea-coast.

Mr. EARLE. If wharfs are required on the Pacific coast for the convenience of settlers, the provincial government have in all cases provided them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The provincial government build them in the maritime provinces too, but there are some built and maintained by the Dominion.

Mr. EARLE. Why do that on the east coast and not on the west coast ? What principle guides the Government in that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there is any rule against the Government building wharfs in British Columbia.

Mr. EARLE. It is simply because we have not asked for them.

Mr. PRIOR. We did not catch on to it before.

Post Office—

Amount required to increase the salary of Mr. A. Bolduc, post office inspector, from $2,000 to $2,200 a year from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1898, Mr. Bolduc having completed ten years' service as inspector $400

Mr. SPROULE. Why does the Prime Minister propose at this late date to increase this salary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. After a certain number of years' service an inspector is entitled, as a matter of right under the Civil Service Act, to an increase of salary. It is not a question of option.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, this inspector's salary should have been increased two years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He did not call attention to it last year, and it was not put in the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Postmaster General give it as his opinion that this officer is entitled of right to the increase or that he becomes eligible for it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he is entitled to it as a matter of right.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the language of the Act is open to that view. It does not depend on any recommendation such as the statutory increase does.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have to vote it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The voting of it is one thing; you might say you have to vote the salary of a judge, which is provided by statute. The salary of a judge is a contract by statute; it is payable out of the consolidated fund.

Mr. FOSTER. So is everything.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The schedule of the Civil Service Act says:

First-class inspector on appointment, $2,200; aften ten years' service, $2,400.

The only condition there for an increase is the length of service. No recommendation is required.

Mr. PRIOR. I call the Postmaster General's attention to the post office in Victoria, B.C. Mr. Noah Shakespeare, the postmaster, has been in that position for a number of years, and the revenue of the post office has increased very materially year after year. The gross revenue is now nearly $53,000 a year, which, as I understand, entitles him to an increase of salary. Mr. Shakespeare is only getting at the present time $2,000 a year, and I think he is entitled to at least $2,400. Would the Postmaster General say what salary the postmaster at Quebec is receiving?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the salaries of the various postmasters, but he will see the scale of remuneration on page 196 of the Civil Service Act. The salary for a revenue of from $20,000 to $40,000 is $2,000. What does the hon. gentleman say the revenue of Victoria is?

Mr. PRIOR. Fifty-two thousand six hundred and twenty dollars. It has been above $40,000 for a number of years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My view of the schedule is, that both the postmasters and inspectors are entitled to these increases—that the only point to determine, as regards the salaries of the postmasters, is the amount of the revenue, and, in regard to the inspectors, the length of service. That is the view I take of the Act.

Mr. PRIOR. If that is the Postmaster General's decision, Mr. Shakespeare is qualified, and has a right to a large increase of salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think he has called the attention of the department to the matter since I have been there.

Mr. PRIOR. I think the Postmaster General will find that he has.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will find, when he looks over the Civil Service Act, that the provision he refers to is not mandatory, but simply gives a man eligible standing, from which he can base a demand for so much salary, and puts the Government in a position to give him that increase, if it pleases. I do not think it is mandatory, but optional, with the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the Department of Justice has advised as I have stated.

Mr. FOSTER. While I was in office, we proceeded constantly on the idea that it was not mandatory, but was an enabling position, from which the postmaster could demand a certain salary, and from which the Government could recommend a vote for it, if they chose. As a matter of fact, I think it was always, or nearly always, done. I know, however, that in one case it was not done for two or three years, although the salary was placed at the requisite figure for other considerations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is an opinion of the Department of Justice. If there is, I will bring it down.

Mr. PRIOR. That being the case, I would like the Postmaster General to remember Mr. Shakespeare's claim, and, if possible, bring down the amount in the supplementary Estimates this year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will do so. If the revenue of the post office entitles Mr. Shakespeare to the salary in the schedule, he should get it, according to the view I have taken; also the postmasters at London, Halifax, and some other places. The Auditor General called my attention to the question some time ago, in the case of another postmaster, whose salary he claimed should be reduced because the revenue had fallen.

Mr. PRIOR. I think Mr. Shakespeare should get the salary, not only for this year and last year, but for the previous years in which the gross revenue was over $40,000.

Amount required to refund to George Yates, postmaster of Oil Springs, on account of cash and stamps stolen from the Oil Springs post office in November, 1893..... $144 27

Mr. FOSTER. What is the practice of the department with reference to cash and stamps stolen from postmasters?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Stamps stolen from postmasters and money received for stamps are the property of the Crown.

Postmasters are alway supposed to have on hand either the stamps they are entrusted with, or the equivalent of money. If the office is where there is a bank, there are certain rules requiring the postmaster to deposit. If the postmaster follows the rules, and a loss occurs, the Crown assumes the loss, though the postmaster is obliged to use ordinary care, such as he would with his own money. Postmasters are agents of the Crown.

Amount required to pay Messrs. O'Connor & Hogg for legal services in connection with claim of department against Estate of Sowden, surety for ex-postmaster of Port Hope..... $160

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for? How much was the department owed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The transaction was this. The postmaster at the village of Millbrook some years ago became a defaulter. Mr. Sowden was one of his sureties. Proceedings were instituted, and he gave a mortgage as security for the amount owing by the postmaster, and this is a bill of the costs incurred by the solicitors for the Crown in obtaining that security. The account was sent to me, and I submitted it to the Department of Justice, and this is the amount at which that department has adjusted it.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was the claim originally?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it was about $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the claim validated?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. I am not finding fault, but I will say that it was allowed to remain in abeyance for a great number of years. I think the default occurred in 1880 or 1882, and the mortgage had not been realized upon; but the matter was brought to my attention, and I put it in the hands of the solicitors of the Department of Justice to recover whatever there was in the security. I rather rebelled at having to deal with an old claim like that, but I found that it was perfectly valid. It is in the hands of the Department of Justice. It is only a few months since the matter came to light at all.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems a large sum for lawyers' fees. Were these costs taxed by the Department of Justice?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were. The account was a good deal larger at first, and this is the amount at which it was adjusted. I have seen the account, and I cannot find any fault with the amount which is certified to by the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these sureties still taken?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are in the case of country post offices; but the system which we adopted two years ago is working very advantageously.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be cases of particular hardship, where a surety may plead properly to be let off; but my own idea is, that if sureties are worth anything, in the case of default on the part of a public officer, the security ought to be rigorously exacted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. To my mind, it ought to require a pretty strong case to justify letting the surety off.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any suit in court over this case?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether the Crown originally sued the postmaster or not.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to say, in connection with that item, that it seems to me to be very liberal pay for little services. So far as we can judge, $160 is liberal pay for searching for a security and taking a mortgage for $2,000 on some property. It appears to be very much on a par with many liberal payments made for law costs by the Crown in connection with legal work done by political friends.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This is a perfectly fair and reasonable allowance. The services were rendered to the late Government and at their request, by Messrs. O'Connor & Hogg, who were the regular agents of the Department of Justice under the preceding Government. The bill was sent in and passed in the regular way by the officials of the department. I do not wish to evade responsibility, quite the contrary, but I wish to say that the responsibility that devolves upon this Government is merely as to the taxed costs due for services rendered to our predecessors.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be quite out of question to expect one lawyer to condemn another lawyer's bill of costs.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If we had not paid these gentlemen, who were employed by the preceding Government, their costs, the hon. member would have a grievance the other way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If we can take the bill of costs as a narrative of what occurred, the solicitors had to go to Port Hope and Millbrook and follow the thing up, and were many days in search of the security before they got satisfied.

Mr. TYRWHITT. How do you propose to fix the salaries of postmasters? Hitherto they received 40 per cent of the gross re-

ceipts, but the reduction in receipts owing to the reduced postage, will reduce their salaries. Is it proposed to increase the percentage?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that the reduction will be permanently much less than it was, and I had not contemplated any change in the salaries for the present, but rather to let the revenues recover, as they will in a reasonable time.

Mr. TYRWHITT. In the meantime, they will receive 40 per cent of the gross receipts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The practice is to readjust the salaries at the end of each fiscal year; and in the ordinary course we would probably proceed next fall to readjust the salaries on the result of the revenues up to the 1st of July. So far as I can see, there is going to be a return to the old volume within probably the time I prophesied when asking Parliament to pass the measure. I think it would be only reasonable not to drop the salaries down, but leave them at their present basis, for in about three years the revenue will have recovered.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the salaries are not to drop below what they are at present?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not as a rule. Of course there will always be cases of reduction for special reasons.

Mr. SPROULE. Twice a year you try to get an approximate estimate of the business. If a postmaster did the $300 of business last year, when the rate of postage was 3 cents, he would only do $200 this year on the same quantity of mail matter, but still you allow the salaries to remain as they were, but there must be a large number of cases where the work has increased, although the revenue has not in consequence of the decreased postage, and in such cases the postmasters would be entitled to more. How do you come to a conclusion as to what advance you will give them?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am only expressing my views with regard to the cases of reductions in the revenue caused by the reduction in postage, and not the cases of increased work without increase of revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. In every case where the gross revenue is no less than last year, there must be greater work—more letters and papers handled.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That does not materially increase the work.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the salaries received by the postmasters in 1898 will be maintained, and that in the event of the revenue falling off in consequence of the decreased postage rate, the loss in his percentage will be made up to the postmaster from some other source?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is substantially what I mean. The salaries of the postmasters are paid by what are called "salary warrants," being deductions from the revenue. I did not contemplate having the salaries scaled down to follow any small reduction in this or that office, as a result of the reduction in postage, but there are always fluctuations in post offices, from special causes. For example, if a village were to lose its trade for some reason, and the reduction in revenue was due, not to the reduced rate of postage, but to other causes, the salary would have to be readjusted. But taking the salaries in the large, it is not intended that they should be reduced to keep pace with the reductions in revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman taken any means of keeping track of the business done so as to see what reduction will be caused in the revenue by the change in the postal rates, and whether the postal business in the aggregate is increasing at a normal or abnormal rate, and how much of that increase is due to the reduced rate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As the reduction has only been in force five months, I would not like to make a statement and be bound by it. The system is hardly in force long enough to offer a sound basis for coming to a conclusion. I will give the hon. gentleman, however, the benefit of what information I have to the present. When the measure went through Parliament, I ventured to predict that the reduction in revenue would not equal $700,000 the first year. I think the reduction for the present year will be at the rate of about $500,000 per year. I think we are carrying now at the rate of 12,000,000 more letters per annum than under the former rate. We are carrying about 10 per cent more letters, judging from the revenue during the five months.

Mr. SPROULE. You have come to that conclusion from the revenue? You have kept no account of the business done otherwise?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is an enumeration taken, but only for part of this spring, and the data are not sufficient to enable us to predict anything more definite. The reduction in revenue for the five months of this year, as compared with the corresponding five months of last year, is about $190,000. Supposing that the reduction this month amounts to $30,000 or $40.000, you would then have a reduction for the six months of about $225,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the increase in expense in that six months?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not say. I do not think I am taking any larger vote than formerly. The annual in-

crease in expenses ought to be something considerable. I am not starving the service in any way that I know of.

Mr. McNEILL. I understand the hon. Postmaster General to say that he did not intend to reduce the salaries of postmasters according to the reduction that might result from the lowering of the rate of postage, but I did not catch what he said regarding the remuneration of postmasters who were found to be doing a good deal more work by reason of the change.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rule of the Post Office is not to base remuneration on the work done. It is based upon the revenue.

Mr. McNEILL. But surely it is based upon the revenue only because the revenue is supposed to afford the readiest and best way of judging of the work done. If the revenue under the 2-cent rate is as great as it was under the 3-cent rate, that would imply that there is a good deal more work being done in the office, and surely the understanding is that after all that it is the amount of work that is done upon which the salary is based. For instance, where postmasters have forwarding work to do, that is taken into consideration, because it involves more work.

Mr. HENDERSON. As I understand the statement of the Postmaster General, the salaries are to continue at the regular percentage, but if that percentage does not yield a salary equal to that under the 3-cent postage, the salary paid during the last year of the 3-cent postage shall be the salary until the revenue rises to what it formerly was.

Mr. McNEILL. But I was pointing out that with a revenue equal to that before the reduction was made in the rate of postage there must be a good deal more work done. What I wanted to understand was whether the postmaster in that case would receive a larger salary than he received before.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) will remember that it has never been the practice in Canada, though I think it is in England, to remunerate postmasters according to the work. In Canada the practice has been to remunerate them out of the revenue received and in proportion to the revenue received. We are speaking now of salaries only. There are special allowances, such as the forwarding allowance, which are classed differently from salaries.

Mr. MOORE. I gather from the discussion that forty per cent of the gross receipts is paid to postmasters. If that is the case, I would like to know how it is that in the town of Magog, the postmaster only gets $600 a year, and the gross receipts, if I recollect correctly, are over $3,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The report for the year ending 30th June, 1898, which I have here, shows the revenue of the post office at Magog to have been $3,184, and the postmaster's salary $800. The scale of remuneration is forty per cent up to $800, and twenty-five per cent between $800 and $10,000.

Mr. MOORE. Is there any change in the percentage as compared with the last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has never been any change; the rate now is the same as it always has been since confederation, and, I am informed, the same since the post office was established in Canada.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to ask another question—respecting losses sustained in post offices through the operations of burglars and thieves. If the postmaster keeps a safe in which he puts his money and postage stamps and a burglar breaks in and steals the money and postage stamps, destroys the safe, does the Government hold itself responsible for the value of the safe?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principle upon which responsibility is based is this: The Government entrusts the postmaster with a certain amount of Government property in the shape of postage stamps. The postmaster, as the agent of the Government, is obliged to have on hand, whenever the inspector appears, either the stamps so entrusted to him or the equivalent in money, unless the post office happens to be situated near a bank, in which case there are certain departmental regulations requiring that the proceeds of these stamps shall be deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. If the postmaster has on hand stamps or the equivalent of stamps and the stamps or the equivalent are stolen through no fault of his, as in the case of burglary, for instance, the loss is the loss of the Crown but not of the postmaster.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Moore) refers to the safe.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not find that the Crown has ever paid for a safe that has been damaged; I never heard of such a case.

Mr. MOORE. In nearly every important town and city in the eastern townships, and, perhaps, in the province of Quebec, within the last few years, the post office has been broken into and the safe blown to pieces, and, so far as I know, no apprehension of the thieves has been made. In many cases the postmaster owns the safe, but I do not know that any of them has ever been remunerated for his loss.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to pronounce an opinion as to the right or wrong in such a matter. Since I have been in the department I have no re-

collection of any claim for damage done to a safe, but no doubt the question has come up. But it is a proper question to consider.

Mr. MOORE. I think it is very hard for a postmaster who is getting a small salary, and who supplies himself with a safe and burglars destroy that safe, that he should get no remuneration.

Mr. PRIOR. I suppose the Postmaster General will say that the same rule applies to assistant postmasters as to postmasters. I see in looking up the Auditor General's Report and the Post Office Report that in Quebec, where the revenue is $2,000 less than in Victoria, B.C., the assistant postmaster gets $1,600, and the assistant postmaster in Victoria only gets $1,400. I presume he is entitled to the same rise in proportion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is only one rule.

Mr. PRIOR. Some time ago I called for a return showing the number of letter carriers employed now in Victoria. That return shows that although there is much more business done there now than used to be, there has been a reduction in the number of letter carriers, permanent and tempor ary, from seventeen to eleven. I know, and my hon. colleague knows that these men consider that they have to work altogether too long hours. They are good men, and they work very often until eleven or twelve o'clock at night. I can understand that when the letter carrier system was first introduced it took them longer to get round than it does after they become au fait in their business. But there is a big difference between seventeen and eleven, and I do not think it is justified. Another thing I know is that there are no extra men. There used to be one man kept on all the time to take the place of any who might fall sick, or be off duty, but there is no such man now, and when one man is away, the remaining men have to do his work, for which, I am informed, they get no extra pay. Then, again, they get no holidays. I believe the entire staff of temporary and permanent carriers have to work from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he has had any report from the inspector stating that the number they have now is insufficient, and that he wants more help. So far as I am given to understand, the head officials in the post office consider they are undermanned altogether. I hope the hon. gentleman will take these things into consideration, and if he finds from reports he has in the office that there are not a sufficient number of men, that he will take steps to set that matter right. I make these explanations now in order that the hon. gentleman may provide for an increased number of men in the supplementary Estimates.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get the information for the supplementaries

Mr. TYRWHITT. I would remind the Postmaster General that in 1891 he professed to be strongly in favour of building a post office at Alliston, in the south riding of Simcoe. I bring this matter to his notice now in order that provision may be made in the supplementary Estimates for carrying out the Postmaster General's wishes at that time, as well as my own at the present time. In the town of Alliston there is a very good building owned by the Bank of Hamilton that could be bought at a very reasonable price, and which would make an admirable post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The purchase of public buildings rests with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). I can only bring the matter to his attention, or whoever may be acting for him.

Mr. BRITTON. For the same reason that the member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) made his statement now, I wish to mention the case of the Kingston post office, and ask the Postmaster General if he would take a note of it. Under the new order of things the Post Office Department is very efficiently managed. I would remind the hon. gentleman that one of the chief employees in the Kingston post office has died, one has resigned, and another has been transferred from that post office to another branch of the service. In no one of these three cases has the vacancy created in that way been filled; yet the business has increased owing to the new rate of postage, and I would like the hon. gentleman to give his attention to it. I do not say that we ought to have, perhaps, a higher class of men there, but if these higher clerks can be relieved to some extent of the minor duties by the appointment of what I understood was to be a distinct class of stampers and sorters, I think the service would be considerably improved.

Mr. ERB. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a class of postmasters who, under the 40 per cent regulation, are, in my opinion, very much underpaid, that is, postmasters in country districts where there is no village. There are several such in my riding, where the post office is held in a farmhouse, necessitating either the farmer or his wife or some member of the family to be at the house during all hours of the day. The post office is an important centre, a great many farmers get their mails there; but since there is no village, no stores, no shops or factories of any kind, most of the farmers, when they mail letters, take them

with them when they go to market or to some adjoining village or town. Consequently, the revenue of this particular class of offices is very small, and the compensation that these postmasters get on the percentage basis is very small. In my riding a postmaster resigned, and I had great difficulty in getting any person in the neighbourhood to take his place, because the pay was so small that nobody wanted to be bothered with it. I hope the hon. Postmaster General will give his attention to offices of this kind. There are a few in my riding, and I daresay there are a few such in various parts of the country.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to ask unnecessary questions of the hon. Postmaster General, nor do I ask questions to irritate him. But this is an important question which has been raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt), in regard to the Government building post offices in different portions of the country. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if there are any regulations, or rules, by which a place has to have a certain number of inhabitants before it is entitled to call upon the Government to build a post office. Magog is a large and growing town and the people are beginning to be anxious to have a post office and custom house built by the Government. If the population is large enough to come within the regulations, if there are such regulations, I would be glad to know it, that I might take measures to have the matter brought before the Government in the regular way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware that any such regulations have been prescribed by the Government. It is a question which arises on different occasions for the Government to consider whether a particular locality has a claim superior to other localities, and to deal with it accordingly. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Moore) had been in Parliament some years ago he would have remembered many discussions on the subject, and, I think, some resolutions were submitted from that side of the House setting forth the views of the Liberal party. I think the general principle of the Liberal party was that public buildings should be erected in places in the order of urgency, or, in other words, that the revenue of the post office and the various other Government offices, customs and inland revenue, should be considered in determining priority as between different localities. This general principle was affirmed in a resolution submitted by the Liberal party some years ago which will be found on the pages of "Hansard," and, I presume, the policy, thus affirmed, will be the policy of the Government to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another subject I have noticed in the press lately, to which I might bring to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General, to see whether he has considered it or not, that is the question of a reduction of the parcel post rates. While there was a substantial reduction on letter postage there was no reduction of postage on parcels sent through the mails, or for sending post office orders outside of the country. I thought I had the paper which was left with some hon. members asking that the hon. Postmaster General's attention should be called to the subject, but I have not got it. From memory I cannot give the countries between which and Canada the money order system is in force. It seems to me that the rates are not as liberal as they might be in that regard. I think Newfoundland is included in the list of countries to which we cannot send a post office order. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if his attention has been drawn to the matter to which I refer, and, if so, if he has given it any consideration.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reference to the foreign post office business, I cannot say what countries are not included, although I know that some countries are not. It may be that Newfoundland is not included, but I will be surprised to hear it.

Mr. SPROULE. I was only speaking from memory

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman may be quite right. As to the rates between Canada and the United States, there are negotiations at present pending between the United States post office department and Canada, with a view to a reduction of the money order rates. I do not know whether a conclusion has been arrived at. I took part in a discussion on the subject, and the conclusions which were tentatively arrived at were to be communicated to the Postmaster General of the United States. Whether he has expressed an opinion I do not know, but the proposal is a reduction in the rates of money orders between Canada and the United States, each country retaining what it collects itself.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to a matter which, I am sure, will receive his careful consideration, because it is a case in which, I think, a very considerable hardship exists. It will be in the recollection of the hon. Postmaster General that sometimes in the early part of the session I drew his attention to a rather peculiar case where money was lost while being transmitted through the mails. It occurred at the village of Campbellville, in the county of Halton, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A mail bag was placed by the courier on the proper hook; the train came along, caught the bag and carried it about one hundred yards, where it seems to have dropped off. The mail carrier fully discharged his duty inasmuch as he placed

the bag where it ought to have been placed, and saw that the train had carried it away. The bag dropped from the hook or from the catcher. It was afterwards supposed to have been picked up by a person who was not honest enough to return it to the post office, but who opened the bag and took out the contents, which consisted, amongst other things, of several registered letters containing sums of money. I forget now the amount, but I do not think it was more than $125.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $125.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the Post Office Department could have traced the responsibility to any mail carrier, or postmaster, that money could have been recovered from themselves or from their sureties. Every effort was made to trace the responsibility. A man was arrested and tried, but the case was dismissed on account of lack of evidence. Every possible means have been taken to find out the guilty party, and it is now admitted that there is no trace of the person who rifled the mail bag, so that every means of recovering the money have been exhausted, and the persons who had mailed these letters are obliged to sustain a loss. I understand it is the intention of the hon. Postmaster General, hereafter, to make provision for a small fee to insure a registered letter. At the time that these men handed in these letters at the post office there was no such provision. The person who mailed these letters took every precaution they could and felt that their money was safely entrusted to the post office, believing that the officials were able to discharge their duty. The officials did discharge their duty as we know. No one is considered in any way responsible for neglect, but yet these men are unable to recover their money. I think this is one of those cases where the Government could fairly step in and remunerate these men for the loss they have sustained. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General to consider the matter fully and see if, under the peculiar circumstances, he cannot place in the supplementary Estimates which he may bring down, a small sum sufficient to indemnify these men for the loss they have sustained.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. Postmaster General in regard to the erection of post offices. He told us that post offices were erected where "urgency demanded or in important centres." I beg to remind him that in the early part of the year, I wrote to the Minister of Public Works asking for the erection of a post office building at Bridgewater. It will be remembered by him perhaps, as well by the Postmaster General, the dire calamity that befell that town by fire the past winter, when the whole business portion was laid in ashes. I need hardly remind the Minister that Bridgewater is an important town, containing, as it does, the workshops of the Nova Scotia Central Railway, and being at the head of navigation, and a town where large lumbering operations are centered, renders it a commercial and trading centre. Therefore, Bridgewater can make out an exceptionally strong claim, and the people of that town will expect a Government building there, and I hope they will not be disappointed. It is also the centre of our friends opposite in that county. But irrespective of that, I think the request would be granted at any time on its merits. Whether or not that should have any influence with the Government, I am not going to say, but still I would advance it as a reason. I know that the Minister of Public Works will have to refer to the Postmaster General for his report on the subject, and when he does, I trust the Postmaster General will consider it carefully and make a favourable report, so that an amount may be placed in the Estimates this year. I bring the matter up at this opportune moment, because were I to allow it to remain over until the further supplementary Estimates are brought down, I would be precluded this year from seeing any sum placed in the Estimates for that very necessary work.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to his explanation with regard to the salaries of postmasters, because I did not quite understand him as to what the policy of his department would be as to the rule which would be enforced for the future. Let me say that the country postmaster is the poorest paid official in the service of the Government, or for that matter in the service of anybody else. In the cities and large towns, particularly those postmasters who get a commission of 25 per cent, they are, I think, overpaid, and the Postmaster General might fairly consider some rearrangement with regard to that. In the case of the ordinary country postmaster who performs his duties for $15 or $20 or as low as $10 a year, and in the case of the postmasters of country villages who get from $100 to $600 a year, they are, to say the least, not overpaid. Suppose a postmaster gets $300 a year, but that under the decreased rate of postage the revenue of his office remains stationary, while that postmaster's duties may increase fifty per cent, what does the Postmaster General propose to do with regard to an increase of salary in such a case? Again, there are many places in farming districts where the business will not increase very much on account of the reduction of postage, because I assume that the increased postage will be largely among business men who write letters in the cities and towns. Now, we will assume that the general postal revenue under the 2-cent arrangement, is as large as under the 3-cent postage, the business hav-

ing generally increased, but nevertheless in two-thirds of the post offices in Canada the business has not increased or decreased but very little. Say that in many post offices, the revenue may have increased a little, but not sufficient to entitle the postmaster under the 2-cent rate, to have the same salary as he had under the 3-cent rate. What does the Postmaster General propose to do about that? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has stated that the increase of letters, which is the principal source of revenue, is about 10 per cent; but the letters mailed would have to increase fifty per cent to bring the revenue up to what it was before the reduction in postage. There is, of course, the other source of revenue arising from the tax on newspapers which was estimated by the Postmaster General at about $60,000, but even that would be a comparatively small sum when we are considering the total revenue of the Post Office Department. If the post office receipts are to be anything near the expenditure, or near what they were last year, there would have to be an increase of 50 per cent in the number of two-cent stamps sold. With regard to the reductions in parcel postage, referred to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), my own opinion is that both the Governments of the past and the present Government have erred in that direction. The Government have assumed the duty of carrying the letters and newspapers of the country; that is their business. But they have gone into the further business of carrying merchandise for the accommodation of the people, and I do not believe they should carry it at less than cost. It is difficult to estimate what it does cost, but it is certain that they are carrying merchandise from other countries to Canada and from one part of Canada to another for one-third or one-fourth of what it costs to do it. That business is increasing year by year. I have no objection to its increasing in a legitimate way, but I do object to the Post Office Department becoming a common carrier of merchandise for the people of the country at one-fourth the cost of carriage, and I think that question should engage the attention of the Postmaster General. If I mistake not, at a previous session the hon. gentleman expressed his opinion in that direction, and I think that he might fairly be asked to ascertain as near as he can what it costs to carry merchandise in this way, and to make those who send it pay the actual cost of carrying it. I think that is a fair proposition.

Mr. CLARKE. Reference has been made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt), the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) to the necessity of increased accommodation in the way of better buildings in their respective towns and cities. I would like to ask the Postmaster General in that connection if his attention has been called to the inadequacy of the post office accommodation in the city of Toronto, and if a movement is not on foot to get a site more centrally situated, on which a modern building could be erected. The present post office building is not in a good locality to admit of taking advantage of the street railway lines. As the hon. Minister knows, the postal business of the city is increasing enormously, and I think every facility should be given to the people who use the post office, and this could best be given by having a more convenient site and a new building. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) referred to the remuneration paid to the letter carriers in Victoria, and to the fact that instructions had been given that they should receive no holidays. When the Post Office Estimates for next year are brought down, I would like the Postmaster General to bring down the instructions given with reference to holidays for letter carriers.

Mr. KAULBACH. When I spoke of the necessity of a building at Bridgewater, I referred simply to a post office; but when I say post office I mean to include custom-house and savings bank. I hope the hon. Minister will be very particular in seeing that this is one of the most important applications.

Mr. OSLER. If the Government are proposing to increase their post office expenditure, and have in view the providing of increased accommodation for the post offices of the Dominion, I do not think they could make a better beginning than by increasing the postal facilities of the city of Toronto. Considering the revenue derived from Toronto, the post office building there is probably the poorest and worst equipped that can be found in this Dominion. I am not one of those who advocate increased expenditure if it can be avoided; but if a general improvement of the post office buildings in the Dominion is going, I think Toronto is entitled to the first consideration of the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the point brought up by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), the facts of the case are, I think, as he has presented them. Unfortunately, there is no provision in the law for meeting such a case. That and similar cases suggested to me the advisability of asking Parliament to consider the condition of affairs, with a view, if possible, of ameliorating them; hence the measure before the House. I may say, if it is any consolation to my hon. friend, that the catching-post, which was erected many years ago near the station in question, happened to have been placed at a very unsuitable point. I looked carefully into the matter some months ago.

and my recollection is, that the officers showed that catching-post was on a curve some little distance from the front of the station, so that if a bag fell from a passing train, instead of being caught, no one at the station would notice its fall. I have since had that remedied. My instructions to the controller were, if possible, to have the post removed and put exactly in front of the platform, so that no such accident as this could happen again. My hon. friend will know whether or not those instructions have been carried out. I believe part of the difficulty was owing to the fact that the train would not stop, and we have had to arrange with the railway company to be a little more accommodating and to slow up at that point. With reference to the remark of my hon. friend from Lunenburg, I understand his point to be now that while he would like to have a post office, he would not be satisfied with a building that would not accommodate the post office, the inland revenue and customs.

Mr. KAULBACH. I must be satisfied with what I can get, but I think that if the hon. Minister would consider the urgency, I would get all I ask.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand in what light I take his wishes. I think his larger proposition was, that the building ought to meet all the requirements of the service, but I understand he is willing to accept anything that is forthcoming.

I do not know that the subject of buildings is quite pertinent to this particular branch of the inquiry, but with reference to the inquiry of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), I thought I had placed that matter plainly before the House; but, although the hon. gentleman has gone, I would say to the committee that his calculation as to the volume of work necessary in order to realize the same revenue is, I think, somewhat incorrect.

Mr. FOSTER. Take 10,000 letters at 3 cents, that is $300 revenue, and you have to take 15,000 at 2 cents to get that revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that, in order to make up the amount of deficiency from 3 to 2 cents, the work would have to be increased 50 per cent. That is quite an error, for, if you take the gross earnings of a post office, you will find that nearly half is derived from other sources than the 3 cents rate. I would not like to venture an opinion altogether binding, but in a rough way I would say that, taking a gross revenue of $4,500,000, nearly $2,000,000 of that would be derived from other sources than the 3-cent letter rate. I think that the 3-cent letter rate would not amount to more than $2,900,000; so that a shrinkage of one-third of that would mean a loss of $900,000. I have over-stated it, because the shrinkage is not so much; so that the shrinkage in revenue from the reduction in the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents does not involve as much as appears on the surface. There is a considerable revenue derived from registration, 5 cents per letter. I think the number of registrations is about 3½ millions per year, and there is a considerable sum derived from drop-letters, from the 2-cent letter rate, from postage upon parcels, and so on. Nevertheless, of course, the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents does involve a substantial reduction in revenue, and I can only repeat that it is only out of revenue that the salaries of postmasters are paid, and the remuneration has heretofore been based on that principle alone—payment out of revenue. Although my hon. friend wants me to pledge the policy of this Government for a long number of years to come, I will not look into the future that far. Suffice it to say, that my intention is to recommend to the Government, after the close of this fiscal year, to deal with the postmasters on the lines I have indicated.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not forget the newspaper postage business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have a note of that. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) regarding the inadequate accommodation in the Toronto office, if his remarks had been limited to the accommodation in the present building, I could quite agree with him, for I have a report from Mr. Bennett, a very efficient officer, to the effect that one could hardly have devised an internal arrangement of that office with less regard to the prosecution of the business of the office, and he has asked me, within the last few days, to, if possible, have an official look into the matter and make a thorough report, with the view of entirely re-arranging the whole inside of the post office at Toronto. I have received his communication within the last few days, and have not had the opportunity of doing anything more than consider it. From my knowledge of the building, I know there is a great deal of force in the criticism, but as to the change of site, that is a very large question.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). With reference to what fell from the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), who represents a county that has always been Conservative, it is very refreshing to hear him ask the Government to put up another building in that county, which was given the benefit of a public building by the late Government.

Mr. FOSTER. If one building is good, two are better.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The place where the hon. gentleman now wants a building put up is where the building already erected should have been put. The

railway ends in that quarter, but the people there did not vote quite right, and so the building was put up by the late Government in the smaller place. Now, however, the hon. gentleman wants a second building in the same county at a place which is Liberal in politics, which, no doubt, would be all right, if there were not other counties with stronger claims. Perhaps we have not properly appreciated this question of public buildings. The whole question is: Does it pay? I have heard a good deal said about the number of people that must be in a place before it can be entitled to a public building, and that, of course, may be a very good criterion. I think, however, there should be a public building in every county in the Dominion. There might be more, if it would pay. Suppose you could get, in a county town, a public building constructed at a cost, say, of $5,000. I venture to say that public buildings could be got in many counties for from $5,000 to $7,000——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It has never been done yet.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That may be because people wanted the buildings too large. The average building in a county where there are no large towns or cities, would not cost more than $7,000 at the outside. The interest on that would be just $210. The postmaster could live there, you could get rent from him, and I will venture to say that that expenditure of $210 per annum on interest would pay the Government, because it would be less than it now pays in the shape of rents for post offices and customs-houses. The question is: Does it pay? Can the Government put up a permanent building in a county on which the annual interest will be less than the amount you have to pay, of necessity, for rents of the two buildings you require? Take the county town of the county I represent. A rental has to be paid for the post office and also for the custom-house. I venture the opinion that any of the Government engineers will say that a building sufficiently large, say for Guysborough, Arichat, and a number of other towns I might name, could be erected at such a cost that the interest would not be as much as the rents the Government is now paying. Then, you would have a better building, better security to the people, better advantages. That is the way to look at it, and in that case each county town would get a fair building that would serve all purposes—custom-house, post office, or any other Government offices required. And you would get them built very cheaply in county towns, much cheaper than in large cities. A substantial building could be built for the sum I have named, and the Government would be in pocket on the transaction. In these poor buildings you have in country towns, the people cannot get good service. There is also constant danger of the mails being robbed; there is not the same security as there would be in a substantial building. If there were a post office building in such places as I have referred to, with the postmaster living in it and paying rent, I believe the Government would be in pocket as a result of the transaction.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am sorry that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) should place himself in the unfortunate position of misrepresenting facts. He stated that the Nova Scotia Central Railway terminates in Bridgewater, it terminates in the town of Lunenburg, and being correct I challenge contradiction. I state further that the trade of Lunenburg is very large and exceeds that of Bridgewater by a very considerable amount. Our trade is very largely in fish, and that represents a large amount of capital. Still, the trade of Bridgewater is large also. The geography of the hon. member for Guysborough is very deficient. He happened to be in the county of Lunenburg some short time ago and ought to know whereof he spoke. But I think he is inclined to be somewhat adverse to the people of Bridgewater in opposing this application I am making for the building referred to. Bridgewater is, as I said before, an important town, and one where nearly all the roads of the county centre, besides being at the head of navigation concentrates trade. Any person seeing the amount of trade done in that town would come to the conclusion that the Minister of Public Works should not hesitate one moment in granting the request I have made for a public building. And the Postmaster General, I feel sure, if he were there, would have no hesitation in reporting favourably for the construction of that work.

Mr. CARGILL. I desire to bring before the Postmaster General the question of the salary paid to the country postmasters. We have had a number of gentlemen to-night representing towns and cities whose postmasters, I think, are pretty fairly paid. At least I feel satisfied that if one of these positions became vacant and an advertisement were put in the papers asking for applications, many would propose to take it and even to work at reduced salaries. In country places where stage routes are established, it is not much inconvenience to establish a country post office along the route. This is a geat convenience, especially to the farmers. It is a serious inconvenience to the farmer who may be appointed postmaster to open up a private house and establish an office, an inconvenience for which he is but lightly remunerated with his allowance of $5 or $10 as postmaster. There are postmasters in my constituency who are giving their services to accommodate the public in the locality and who are receiving only $10 per annum for their services. Now, the

Postmaster General, from what I know of him, is very generous and charitably disposed, and does not want to impose injustice upon any class of the community. I think he feels that postmasters in towns and cities are pretty well paid. But it might be prudent on the part of the department to consider the propriety of reducing these salaries and increasing the salaries of country postmasters. I leave the matter in the hands of the Postmaster General, feeling sure he will give it his consideration and deal out even-handed justice to all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I concur in what has fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from East Bruce (Mr. Cargill). I am sure the people generally admire and appreciate the magnificent manner in which the Postmaster General has handled the Post Office Department the three years during which he has been at its head. At the same time, I earnestly hope that the salaries, fees or commissions paid to postmasters will receive his early attention. I believe that the reduction in the postal rate was appreciated, but I believe also that many postmasters are serving the country at much less than they should be asked to accept. I know one case of a widow who is the postmistress for her locality. She has a grown-up daughter whom she must keep at home to assist in the duties of the post office, although the daughter could earn $10 a month if she went out to service. And yet the commissions this woman receives amount to only about $50 a year. If a person could be got to take the office, she would resign to-morrow, but nobody can be found who will accept it. I know a postmaster who received $12 a year and who resigned, and I had the greatest difficulty in getting a person to take the office to save it from being closed up. These rates of remuneration should be increased. Whether you take from the salaries of those in the cities or from the general revenue, something should be done. I pressed this question upon the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. I dare say they were charitably disposed—I have no right to say they were not—and would have been glad to increase the allowance of these people, but I presume they felt that under the circumstances they could not afford it. Whoever is in power, I think it is time this question should be taken up.

As to the construction of public buildings a resolution was introduced in this House, I think, by the present Minister of Justice, to prevent pedling around the construction of public buildings where it was supposed would do the most good politically. That resolution was endorsed by every member of the House, including Sir John Macdonald who was then leader. It declared for a principle on which public buildings should be erected, and that was that public buildings of the kind my hon. friend from Lunenburg spoke of should be erected only when the public revenue warranted it and that when public buildings were to be built they must be built in those places showing the largest amount of revenue first.

I do not know what the revenue of the post office is in my hon. friend's riding. But there are three or four towns in my riding where I should be rejoiced to see public buildings erected, but there is not one in the riding. The receipts of this office are about $4,000 a year, and I would be glad if the Government could see their way clear to erect a post office. But since I voted for this resolution and the principle there laid down, I do not want to knock at the door of the Minister of Public Works and urge him to depart from that principle. I hope that the Government will observe it in the future, and that they will only erect public buildings at places where the revenue will warrant it. Of course, there may be exceptional cases where that principle should be departed from, but there should be very strong grounds for doing so. I hope the Postmaster General will consider the case of the country postmasters, and the moment that the revenue of the Post Office Department will permit, I hope he will recast the whole system and give the country postmasters some increase. There is no class of men in the public service to-day that are so miserably paid as the country postmasters. We surely can afford to give them some little increase over what they are getting now. Ask a man to conduct a post office the whole year round for $12, to make up the returns and to keep the office open all the time! It is a miserable, scanty pittance to offer anybody, and I think the Postmaster General should give this matter his serious attention.

Mr. GILLIES. I endorse every word that has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill), and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), with respect to the miserable salaries now paid to country postmasters. I do not find any particular fault with the present Postmaster General in the respect, because he is but following in the footsteps of his predecessors. If he reflects for a moment on the miserable pittance that is being paid to his officers, the country postmasters, all over the Dominion, he will agree that some change is desirable in the public interest. I have several cases in my mind in my own constituency, and I believe similar cases exist all over the country. Fancy a daily mail arriving and being despatched by a person in the community, waiting upon the public, delivering letters, receiving them and stamping them, giving his time day and night, and with all the responsibility of a public officer resting upon him, and all for the pittance of $10 a year. I will mention two cases in my own county, the facts concerning which the Postmaster

General will find to be as I state if he takes the pains to inquire. There is a post office at River Bourgeois, in my own county, the postmaster of which is named Sampson. His predecessor resigned because the amount paid him, $50 a year, was too small. There are, I believe, 1,500 or 2,000 mails arriving at and despatched from the office yearly. Sometimes the mail arrives in the middle of the night. The man must get up, take delivery of the mails and despatch them by the stage driver. He has to furnish a building at his own expense, and gives his time exclusively to the management of that post office. I have only to cite the case to show its absurdity.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He gets $80 a year, and some other items, making $100. That is 100 per cent more than the hon. gentleman mentioned.

Mr. GILLIES. Perhaps he does now. The forwarding allowance is included in that, I suppose ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Commissions on money orders and salary together, make over $100.

Mr. GILLIES. Even then his remuneration is far too small. He has to keep a building specially for that service, and gives his whole time to the business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The gross revenue of the office is $200, and he gets one-half of it.

Mr. GILLIES. I am citing the case to show the Postmaster General how absurd it is, because if that post office were situated in a town or city, he would be getting $700 or $800 a year. The other case is the post office at Grand River, kept by Mr. Murchison. Mails arrive there daily, and are despatched daily. He receives a salary of between $30 and $40. At that post office there are some 800 mails made up every year, received and despatched. His house is taken up for the post office, and no rent is allowed him, and this is most unfair if not unjust. These are only two instances out of many I can cite all over the county, and the same state of things exists all over the country. I quite agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) in his views respecting public buildings. I am strongly of the opinion that there should be one in every county. I do not mean that an extravagant building should be erected, but a building that would cost $4,000 or $5,000 in these counties would be amply sufficient to accommodate the post office, the customs-house, the office of the tide-waiter and the post office savings bank. I may say that, in this respect, the shire town of my county, Arichat, is sadly neglected. A site was bought for a public building in 1884, for which $1,000 was paid. An amount of $10,000 was put in the Estimates for a building, but the vote lapsed, and nothing was done. In that town the post office receipts are between $800 and $900. It is the shire town of the county and deserves consideration. The custom-house is there, for which the Government pays $60 or $70 a year rent. The post office savings bank is there, and the deposits in that bank amount to between $200,000 and $300,000. They are very large. The savings bank is located in the room in the house of the savings bank-keeper, for which no rent is paid, and this is most unfair and a positive reflection upon the Government. The tide-waiter has his office in another building ; the custom-house officer has his office in another building. A building could be constructed for from $4,000 to $5,000 which would give the Government the security necessary for the protection of its property, and the public would be largely convenienced, because the several different officers, namely, the collector of customs, the postmaster, the tide-waiter and the keeper of the savings bank, would be under one roof. The Government would not be put under a larger outlay than they are at present. The amount they pay now in rental for different buildings would more than suffice to pay the interest on the money that would be expended in erecting a public building in that town, besides the great public convenience that would be afforded. I therefore impress upon the hon. Postmaster General, and upon the Government that, as they have the site in the town already paid for, they should turn their attention to this matter and construct a public building at Arichat without delay. The small post office they have now is under the control of the post office authorities. It was put up some years ago, but it is in a tumble-down state. I hope the hon. Postmaster General will take hold of the question, and that proper accommodation will be provided for that town.

Mr. McALISTER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with what has been said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) in regard to the small and insufficient salaries paid to country postmasters. I know in my own county postmasters who have to receive a daily mail, have to keep their offices open for the convenience of the people, mailing and receiving letters during the whole day, receiving only $15, $20 and $24 per year. They have to attend to their offices every day to attend to the mail matter that passes through their offices. When you look at the amount they receive per day, it seems smaller than when the yearly pay is mentioned. A postmaster receiving $12 a year gets a little over 3 cents a day, and $24 will be only 6 cents a day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the revenue ?

Mr. McALISTER. It is not altogether the revenue that should be looked at. The postmaster has to keep his office open for

persons coming to mail letters or to get letters no matter what the revenue from the office is. I think the salaries are insufficient, and I am satisfied that an increased grant to the postmasters would meet with the approval of Parliament and of the country. These country postmasters are the poorest paid officials in the Dominion, and I think that this matter should be taken into consideration. As has been said by the hon. member for Richmond, the present Government agreed to pay the salaries paid by the late Government, but still it is not too late to mend, and I think the time has arrived when the Postmaster General should give this matter his serious consideration and endeavour to pay the country postmasters larger salaries than they receive at the present time. I must also say that the mail carriers in the country receive small salaries. True, they are engaged by competition, but when they know that the grant for carrying the mails is to be cut down they will take it at a much lower figure than will pay them, or that they otherwise would take it for. I think that when the large mail carriers are not interfered with, when the remuneration to these is increased from time to time rather than decreased, the country mail carriers, instead of being cut down, should be granted an increase.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. McAlister), who has just spoken, has referred to country postmasters, and if I understood the hon. Postmaster General correctly a few moments ago, he stated that salaries were based on the percentage of the revenue of the post office. Am I correct in that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, except the minimum salary of $10.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. Postmaster General to say that the salary was based on a percentage of 40 per cent. up to $800 and 25 per cent above that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Up to $10,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find that the present Government have changed the arrangement that prevailed under the late Government, because I represented many cases to the late Deputy Postmaster General, Lieut.-Col. White. The system that the late Government adopted was two-fold ; in the first place, salary was based on the revenue, but in addition to that there was a test provided by a numeration made twice a year. if the business upon enumeration showed itself to be larger than upon the basis of the percentage of revenue, the salary was based upon the enumeration. A post office might receive a great many more letters than were sent away, so that if the Postmaster General is running the post office business simply on the revenue basis, he is doing an injustice to postmasters in many places.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) need not make any mistake upon the subject. I stated in the most unqualified way that I have not in the minutest degree varied the system or remuneration. There is an enumeration each year, but I think that the general object of the enumeration is rather to see that the revenue is not in excess. I do not think that there is much fear that the returns from revenue do not fairly represent the ral revenue. This enumeration is always taken into consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the revenue is not altogether the real basis, because, when I spoke to the Deputy Postmaster General, I pointed out cases where the numeration was more than the revenue, and the salary was regulated accordingly. The present Postmaster General is doing a greater injustice to the country postmasters, because he not only expects them to do their work for $20 or $30 or $40 a year, but he prevents them from exercising their franchise. If they vote, or if they attend a political meeting, their heads are cut off. In my county nearly every postmaster's head has been taken off because he attended a political meeting, or because he voted in favour of the Conservative candidate, many of them drawing small salaries. It seems to be a rule with the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). that in addition to expecting these postmasters to do their work for a miserable few dollars a year, he expects them to sell themselves out body and bones to the Liberals. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) eulogized the Postmaster General for his efficient management of the Post Office Department. Let me tell him that in the country districts the Postmaster General has closed up many small and useful post offices in order to make a good showing in his revenue. I know a case where ninety families have to travel eight or ten miles to get their mails, simply because the former postmaster was a Tory and the Government dismissed him and have not appointed another in his place. In South Lake the post office was removed from the centre of the settlement away to the west, where it only accommodates two or three families now, and all the rest have to come eight miles to Gananoque to get their mail. Again, in order to make a better showing in his revenue, the Postmaster General in many country districts gives a mail service only twice a week, where formerly there was a daily mail. Ellisville had a daily mail, but is now cut down to twice a week. That is the same all over the country. No wonder the post office finances are better, but the country districts are suffering for it. That is the experience in my county and I hear the same complaints all over. But the serious charge

against the Government is, that while they pay these postmasters only a miserable salary, they will put them out of office if they dare to show any sympathy for Conservatives.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish these remarks to pass without some comment. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) appears to have had a very unfortunate experience.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is true.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can tell the House that I doubt if any post office was closed, or any mail service reduced in frequency, for any reason other than the proper working of the Post Office Department. I doubt if in any case any post office was ever closed under my administration, or any reduction made in the frequency of the service, except upon the proper report of the regular official of the department that it was in the interest of the public service. It is inaccurate to say that there was any reduction of service except it was warranted from a post office standpoint, and that alone. Generally the trend has been in a more liberal direction and not in a narrowing direction such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) speaks of. There is more mileage of mail carried to-day than ever in Canada before.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly; taking in the Yukon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Leaving out the Yukon. I think I am perfectly safe in saying that there are a million miles per annum of mail service to-day more than there were when this Government took office three years ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And there are more post offices too. There were a few closed, but they were closed because they were useless. There were more opened and opened because they promised to be more useful to the public from a post office standpoint. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will take my statement, but I give it to the committee as a frank and fair statement of the policy I was governed by, namely, a strict regard to the betterment of the postal service of Canada.

Mr. GANONG. I was pleased to hear the Postmaster General state that he held to the same policy as he did before the elections in 1896, namely, that new post office buildings will be furnished according to the urgency of the case, taking into account the revenues received therefrom. Since 1896 there have been appropriations made for post offices, notably those in the counties so ably represented by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), and by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). That gave us a slight suspicion that it was urgency of a political nature, rather than of revenue which shapes the policy of the Government. If the revenue of the post office in Shelburne county which I think is about $1,367, warranted a public building, the revenue of the St. Andrew's post office in the county of Charlotte, being $2,251 a year, certainly warranted a post office also. The town of St. Andrew's is one of the most popular summer resorts along the seaboard, and although the postmaster there endeavours to keep the post office creditably, the building is badly adapted for the purpose. It is no credit to the Dominion to have visitors from the United States finding such poor postal accommodation in that town. I agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that a judicious expenditure of public money could be made, and perhaps a saving to the public be effected, if the claims of some of these smaller towns were considered. The postal revenue of the town of St. George in my county is about the same as the revenue of the town in Shelburne which got a post office, and I submit with confidence the claims of the town of St. Andrew's and the town of St. George in the county of Charlotte to the attention of the Minister.

Mr. MOORE. It is so unusual and so refreshing to see both sides of the House discuss a question in which we all agree, that we feel reluctant to pass from this to another question over which there may perhaps be some wrangling. It is ridiculous to pay postmasters $12 a year, and expect them to do the work and incur the responsibilities connected with their positions. In the Oliver post office, a short distance from the town in which I live, the postmaster draws a salary of, I think, $12 a year. The late postmaster held the office for a great many years and having died he was succeeded by his son-in-law. They were both very strong Liberals, but they did the work for less money than they should receive, and to my mind a good staunch Liberal ought to have about as much pay for doing work as a good strong Conservative. Although this postmaster at Oliver is a political enemy of mine, I would be glad to see him get a sufficient salary to compensate him for the work he has to do. He has to sit up until 10 o'clock at night, change the mails twice a day, and he is doing that year in and year out for $12 a year. Now, as to another matter. The revenue of the Magog post office is between $3,000 and $4,000 a year, and this I think entitles it to consideration from the Government, and ought to be sufficient to induce them to establish a post office and custom-house in the town of Magog.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Postmaster General made any changes for the better lately in the postal service in the Rainy River district, particularly in the direction of the Seine River. The service there has been a

very inadequate one, and I think it is so still. I happened to be in that section last summer, and at Fort Frances, while I was in the office of the Hudson Bay Company, one of Uncle Sam's subjects came in and brought a packet of letters, and received another packet of letters. Walking down the street to another small place of business, I saw the same man come in and do the same. I asked why that was done, and I found that the business men of Fort Frances clubbed together to pay a man to bring in the mail from Kouchiching, United States, just opposite to Fort Frances, which mail comes over the American mail route, and to gather the letters and take them out by the same route. They have to do that in order to get business accommodation. Then, at Mine Centre which is an important mining town 30 or 40 miles above Fort Frances, with numbers of working properties and a large mining population around it, there being at this season of the year anywhere from 400 to 500 to 1,000 men at work, the only way they can get any satisfactory accommodation is to assess themselves a certain amount of money, and send a man to Fort Frances to carry the mail. For so important a point, which is being largely developed, it seems to me that it is not the sort of accommodation which is sufficient for the needs of the people. In the winter season these people get one mail a week from Rat Portage. Last year in the summer season they got two mails a week by the river boats; but, I suppose nine-tenths of their mail matter comes by way of Tower or Harding, by the United States mail route. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he made any amelioration in the service of late.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. During last winter Fort Frances received service from two directions—from Rat Portage over the ice, and from the railway across the country by separate stage. I cannot remember the frequency; perhaps my hon. friend knows.

Mr. FOSTER. Once a week from Rat Portage and once a week from the other.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In winter Fort Frances is a somewhat inaccessible place, and there is scarcely any one living between there and the line of railway except lumbermen. Last winter some 300 or 400 people were engaged in lumbering in that district, and it paid some persons to run a stage, and some other person established a hotel or stopping place along the route. It is a long route, running 80 or 90 miles through an uninhabited country. With regard to the summer service, my hon. friend says that last year it was twice a week. Perhaps that is correct. At all events, this year I have been trying to improve it. There are two lines of steamers running between Rat Portage and Fort Frances. They do not, I believe, go above Fort Frances.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a daily line of steamers between Fort Frances and Mine Centre.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One of the lines of steamers is owned by Captain Lewis, the other by the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company. The latter recently put on a pair of fast running steamers; and so anxious was I to improve the mail service that I undertook to make an arrangement with this company, who, I believe, expect their two steamers to make three trips a week; and besides these they have a couple of smaller steamers, freighters, which they expect will make a couple of trips a week.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the "Keenora" herself makes three trips a week.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, it is the "Keenora" making three trips, and the other making two, that is, five trips a week. When I saw the manager, he would not make any stipulation further than three trips a week. I had a conversation with him, and had hoped, owing to his vessel being the swifter, to give him the service. I expected to put the mail service on that line, commencing last Monday. But my hon. friend has had enough experience in the public service to know that however well one's intentions are, and however much he may be serving a locality, the locality itself acquires an interest in and a sympathy with existing concerns which sometimes prevents an improvement in the service, and that is just what is happening in this particular case. I found that the friends of Captain Lewis thought it was not fair to take the service from his boat, which had carried it on when there were no others. I have sent an officer up to see if an arrangement can be made to have the boats run on different days, and to have four services a week at least—two by Captain Lewis's boat, and two or three by the other. On Wednesday of this week I instructed an officer in Toronto to see Mr. Henderson, the inspector at Toronto, and despatch him at once to Rat Portage to try and make this arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Four services a week to Fort Frances would give a very good service. What about that to Mine Centre?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot speak as to that; it has not been brought to my attention, but I will look into it.

Mr. McALISTER. May I ask the Postmaster General on what basis the postmasters are paid? I find that in the province of New Brunswick the gross receipts are $39,438, and the salaries paid amount to only $19,889. I presume they are paid on the same basis in the different provinces?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All salaries are paid on the same principle, whether in New Brunswick or in any other province. The minimum fees are paid where the post office performs a comparatively nominal service and where the revenue is very trifling. If the revenue exceeds a certain sum so that 40 per cent upon it would give more than the minimum, the salary is based on the percentage ; but when the gross revenue is such that 40 per cent would not come to more than the minimum, then the fixed salary is paid.

Mr. McALISTER. Are the receipts not sufficient to increase the salaries of the non-accounting postmasters without any loss of revenue ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend will see that the cost of the maintenance of an office is not wholly the salary of the postmaster. In many of these small offices the cost of the service far exceeds the revenue, to say nothing of the salary. You could not bulk all the revenues and then distribute the salaries ; that would not be a just arrangement. Of course, it is a great advantage to the people to have post offices here and there ; and if we put post offices within a mile or so of each other in remote districts, they serve only a few families. I think I am safe in saying that there is a county in the province of Nova Scotia in which there are nearly 200 post offices. I would not venture to say how much the average revenue is, but it must be comparatively small ; and, if you multiply post offices to suit the convenience of the people —and I am not saying you are not to do it —if you are going to put up post offices every two or three miles you cannot have a very liberal salary for each officer. My hon. friends will have to choose between a few officers with large salaries, and a great many officers with trifling salaries. The multiplication of small offices in the rural districts is a great convenience to those districts, being the next thing to a house to house delivery.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to a number of cases of hardship in my riding. The hon. gentleman will remember that, on the advent of this Government to power, a large cancellation of contracts took place, and, in their anxiety to secure contracts, a number of carriers took them much below their value, and now wish to be relieved. A case of peculiar hardship is one concerning which I have had some correspondence with the Postmaster General. I refer to the case of Thomas Farley, who carries the mail between Lisle and Black Bank, a distance of 14 miles, for 50 cents a trip. I wrote the department, asking that he might be relieved from his contract. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General to make a note of that particular case, and see if he cannot allow this man to throw up his contract. There are a number of other cases of this sort, but the particular one I have mentioned is very pressing owing to the poverty of the contractor.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman mentions having communicated with the department. His correspondence did not reach me, but no doubt was received and dealt with officially.

Mr. TYRWHITT. It was early in the winter—about January.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A great deal of correspondence that may be directed to the head of the department, if it is purely of a business character, finds its way to the staff, and that, no doubt, has been the destination of my hon. friend's correspondence. As to relieving the contractor of his contract, I am not aware of any provision in the law that admits of that, whether it be a contract to carry mails or perform any other public service.

Mr. TYRWHITT. If the hon. Minister would allow me, I can give him a precedent, and that is the case of the courier who used to pass my own gate, and who was relieved of his contract. His name was Henry Stone, and the hon. gentleman may remember that he relieved him of his contract, and afterwards gave it to John Cook without tender, I believe.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is in error. He was not relieved of his contract in the sense of being relieved of a non-paying contract, but the contract was cancelled in his hands for a different reason altogether—because it had been awarded to him without compliance with the law, and I did not regard it as a proper contract. It was not to relieve him of a non-paying contract, but to put it up to tender.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I only know that, after he got the contract, he was most anxious to get rid of it, because it did not pay, and the next thing I knew was, the contract has been changed and put in other hands.

Mr. BELL (Addington). Is there not a clause in the contract by which, on three months' notice, the contractor may be relieved ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It depends on the contract itself.

Amount required to recoup the North-west Mounted Police for assistance to destitute half-breeds during the years 1897-98 and 1898-99..... $800

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been an arrangement for the past ten years or more under which the officers of the Mounted Police have general instructions, in cases of very great neces-

sity, to offer small amounts of relief and the Department of the Interior has generally had a vote from which it could recoup the Mounted Police vote for these expenditures. Accounts have been received from the Controller of the North-west Mounted Police for $576.77, from the 1st June, 1898, to 30th April, 1899. Part of this vote will be used to pay these accounts, the balance will be available in case of other accounts coming in within the time. The expenditure generally runs about $500. but it has run a little over that this year.

Amount required to pay balance of expenses of commission in Crow's Nest Pass Railway inquiry $600

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the accounts came in from the commissioners, it was found they had charged fees for Sunday as for other days. The department, acting under my instructions, took off the charges made for Sundays. The commissioners refused to accept my view of the case and proposed to have an action against the Government. I referred the matter to the Department of Justice. I do not know whether the department gave a formal opinion, but they intimated that we should have to pay it. This is why I take this appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they work on Sunday ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know that they held sittings ; but, of course, they were out, and, no doubt, in some of the time over which the difference arose, they were travelling. They claimed that under the ordinary rule, they were entitled to get so much a day for all the time they were occupied. I took the view that Sundays should be excepted.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you not hold to that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would have done so, but the Department of Justice was not disposed to stand by me.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole amount spent on this commission ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the information now, but I will give it to the hon. gentleman within a few minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) is anxious to say a few words on this subject, if there is no item for this commission in the main Estimates, I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) will be allowed to take it up on some other item ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, on any of my Estimates.

Amount required to provide for the expenses and salaries connected with the commission appointed to inquire into half-breed claims in the North-west Territories, out of which payment may be made to J. A. Coté as half-breed commissioner, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $1,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I covered all the information about this last night in discussing the half-breed commission.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rate of pay of the commission ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Coté is given $5 a day in addition to his salary. Of course, that cannot be paid without a vote of Parliament ; he gets his expenses also.

North-west Mounted Police—
Required to complete the service of the year $50,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is a further vote for the North-west Mounted Police under item 74.

The PRIME MINISTER. Item 74 is for the force in the Yukon, while the present item, No. 72, is for the force in the North-west Territories. Our reason for asking an additional appropriation is this : In 1896-97 we expended for the Mounted Police $526,162.05, a decrease of $6,852.12, as compared with the previous year. But this was only the work of our prentice hands. The following year, we spent $369,638.88, a saving of $156,523 as compared with the previous year. But it was evident that we had undertaken too much. In 1896, when we took office, the force was 750 men. In 1897 we made provision to reduce the force to 500 men. But we could not reduce the force as speedily as we intended. Last year, it varied from 700 to 550. It now stands at 550. The reason why we could not reduce the force——

Mr. FOSTER. In the North-west, you mean ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes—this is quite apart from the Yukon. We have 200 men in the Yukon. That force is under the control of the Department of the Interior. I speak only of the force in the North-west Territories. Our intention was to reduce the number from 750 to 500. It is now 550. We are about to draw fifty men from the force to send to the Yukon to replace men who are going out of the service ; the force will then be reduced to 500 men.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been expended this year ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We took an estimate for $353,750, and we find we are short $50,000. We could not reduce the force as speedily as we intended, because we had

to send 20 men to patrol the Crow's Nest Pass Railway during its construction. Then we had to keep a reserve of trained men, the very best men of the force, to send to the Yukon. Then we had to organize a patrol in the north in consequence of the travel which is now taking that direction by the Edmonton route. At the present time we have in that region 60 men under the command of Superintendent Griesbach, which are distributed as follows :—Fort Saskatchewan, 30; Edmonton, 6; South Edmonton, 1; St. Albert, 1; Innisfail, 1; Red Deer, 1; Beaver Lake, 1; Westaskiwin, 1; Rivière qui Barre, 1; Lac Ste. Anne, 1; Athabaska Landing, 1; Lesser Slave Lake, 3; Peace River Landing, 4; Fort Smith, 2; special patrols, 6. All these places are very far advanced in the north and west. At Peace River, Fort Smith, Lesser Slave Lake and Athabaska Landing, we keep the men there all the year round. Apart from that we have six men patrolling all the time up and down the rivers in summer and winter. in summer to prevent bush fires especially, because careless travellers set fires, and we have men to look after the camps, and see that the fires are extinguished. They also give protection to travellers and maintain the peace. As I have said, we have been obliged to keep more men than we intended, and the reduction of the force has taken place more slowly than we expected. We are short, as I have said, in our accounts this year by $50,000, made up as follows :—For the pay of the men, $16,000; subsistence, forage, fuel and light, $7,000; transport and freight charges, $15,000; general stores and clothing, $12,000.

Mr. PRIOR. Does the right hon. gentleman find that the 550 men are sufficient for the efficient service in the North-west?

The PRIME MINISTER. They give a very efficient service indeed in the North-west. Of course, we always hear complaints from the settlers who want more men, especially to guard against prairie fires and as a protection against cattle thieves, particularly on the American boundary. But the complaints have become less and less because, as the settlers increase in number, they look more after their own protection. In the fall we always have complaints that more men are required, but we find that keeping a man here and there is enough, because when he discovers a fire he calls on the settlers and they act themselves. The country is gradually settling up, and we believe the force can be gradually diminished.

Mr. FOSTER. What do these six men do in Edmonton?

The PRIME MINISTER. I presume they perform the ordinary duties of the force, policing and patrolling in all directions. They do not do police work for the town. I think no such work is required.

Mr. FOSTER. There are none now in the confines of Manitoba?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman mentioned that he proposed to reduce the force. Several years ago, as a result of a discussion in the House, the late Government determined to bring the force down to 750. It was then over 1,000 men in strength. But my hon. friend has been unable to reduce it as rapidly as he expected, and I think he has done wisely in not reducing it more rapidly. There is a pressure among all the settlements to have one or more mounted police, but I think the Government is wise in depending upon the settlers, as they increase in number to look after their own constable and police business. The extension of the country north will require for some time to be looked after by mounted police. But I wanted to ask my hon. friend if he thinks that the morale and texture of the force is as good as it was two years ago? We were very proud of the force then; does he believe it is as good, or is it not a fact that by drafting out picked men from the different stations and sending them to the Yukon, he has broken to a large extent the splendid morale and discipline of the force which were its chief characteristics up to that time. I have heard experienced men declare that it is so, and I think that impression obtains in the North-west.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I do not think so. If my hon. friend will look at the report of the North-west Mounted Police for this year he will come to the conclusion that the force has not deteriorated. I am free to say, however, that we are bound to give it a little more attention. We have decided to restore the old school that we had at Regina, and keep more men in training at Regina than we had before. By keeping, say 50 trained, drilled and carefully instructed men at Regina, there is no reason to doubt that we will maintain the force in its full efficiency.

Mr. FOSTER. How many were drafted out for the Yukon?

The PRIME MINISTER. 200.

North-west Mounted Police—
Required to complete the service of the year $385,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the hon. Minister to give us a full explanation of the whole business.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The appropriation voted in 1898 was $346,250. The supplementary Estimates asked for now of $385,000 cover two Governor General's warrants. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has no doubt read the

indemnity clause in Resolution No. 79 of the Supply Bill. The sum which is referred to there as having been paid to the Mounted Police officers for the purposes of the force is $144,077.19. That makes up a total of $875,327.19.

Mr. FOSTER. That only makes $790,000. Does $200,000 cover the Governor General's warrants?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. This item we are asking for is $385,000. That covers the Governor General's warrants. The Governor General's warrants are included in this $385,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It includes the two warrants, but do the two warrants make up the $385,000?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, they do not.

Mr. FOSTER. How much are they?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One is $150,000, and the other is $175,000. The two of them together make $325,000. This vote is $385,000. The appropriation by this last year's vote from the revenue and this vote will make $875,327.19. The expenditure which has been accounted for through the Controller of the Mounted Police up to the present time, is $731,010.98, divided as follows:—

Pay of force	$130,512 16
Subsistence, forage, dog-feed, fuel and light	181,363 22
Clothing, general stores, horses, dogs, ammunition, hospital expenses, stationery, &c.	64,942 96
Guides, billeting and travelling expenses	10,647 32
Transportation and freight charges	233,014 67
Contingencies	6,313 64
Buildings	104,217 01
Total	$731,010 98

That leaves a balance of the total amount of $875,327 which I mentioned as being expended under last year's vote, and the money expended from the revenue of $144,316.21. The amount is made up and estimated for the balance of the expenditure this year as follows:—

Pay of force	$50,000 00
Subsistence, forage, dog-feed, fuel and light	25,000 00
Clothing, general stores, horses, dogs, &c.	14,316 21
Transport, freight charges	30,000 00
Buildings	25,000 00
Total	$144,316 21

The charge for subsistence is heavy. It includes subsistence of all the officials in the Yukon. Transport and freight charges amount to $233,000. These cover the transportation of supplies and material for nearly all the requirements of the different services, except militia. The cost of public buildings, $104,000, includes some 26 different buildings. The buildings at most of these places are considerable in extent. At Dawson, Selkirk and Tagish quite extensive barracks are constructed. There is also a very good post constructed on the Dalton trail, not far from the provisional boundary line. There is also a very good building at the Stikine River, where there are three men. We have quite a large post at Tagish, and quite an extensive barrack.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the buildings at Dawson and Selkirk permanent?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What have they cost?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was wrong in saying that we had a building of any extent at Selkirk. I had in my mind the militia buildings, which, of course, were not paid for by the police. We have a small building at Selkirk.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the expenditure of $230,000 during this current year for buildings represent any permanent value?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The barracks at Dawson are permanent. There was a small barracks constructed in former years but it has been largly increased. About $60,000 will be the cost of the barracks at Dawson, and it will not require to be changed except we might want to increase it, which I do not think will be necessary for years to come. It will accommodate 150 men.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distribution of the 200 men?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are, altogether, thirteen officers, including the doctors, 208 non-commissioned officers and constables, thirty-eight special constables and dog-drivers, making altogether 259. The number of dog-drivers was necessarily large on account of the police handling the mail.

Mr. FOSTER. To what department has the cost of the mail service been charged?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has all been paid out of this, and none of it charged to the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. And all the officials in the Yukon are fed out of supplies charged to the Mounted Police.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At present.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely it is the intention to distribute these charges amongst the departments to which they belong?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, after the 1st of July. It is pretty difficult to tell what the proportion of the rations

would cost, but I suppose an estimate can be worked out.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the police practically done all the mail service ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not correct in saying that the police have done all the mail carrying. Shortly before the ice formed at the beginning of the winter season, I undertook, with the Postmaster General, that we would provide for the carrying of 700 pounds of mail once a fortnight each way from Dawson to Lake Bennett. I watched the matter very closely, and Major Wood, a very good officer, stationed at Tagish reported that that arrangement was carried out upon all occasions when the trail was passable, but there was a considerable period during which parts of the lake opened and were not capable of being travelled upon. I am giving my attention to having a cut-off by land at these points where the ice cannot be relied upon, so that next winter we hope to have a permanent service without delays. The expense of that work was paid out of the police fund.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Minister of the Interior made the arrangement with the Postmaster General, did he not make an arrangement by which the Post Office Department was to pay him the cost of the carriage of the mail ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at that time. It was discussed between myself and the Postmaster General, but there was great difficulty in arriving at what it was going to cost.

Mr. FOSTER. It was incumbent upon the Post Office Department to provide for that mail service, and that department should make an estimate of what it would cost, and pay that amount to the Mounted Police. Or, the Minister could have said : Having my mounted police on the ground, I will do the service for you at a percentage less than that. I trust that the accounts will be so distributed that the Post Office Department will bear its fair share of the cost.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) misunderstands the arrangement. It is not proposed to load the service of one department on to another, but it is not necessary to have two departments asking for the vote. There may possibly be an apportionment of the cost between the two departments, but is it immaterial whether the money is voted to one department or the other. It is a matter of book-keeping, afterwards to distribute the charge. Mr. White informed me that when the North-west was being opened up, the system adopted was to take a vote of about $400,000 a year under the heading "North-west Territories," and that was applied to all services, and there was, I think, no apportionment between the departments concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a vote for general service but for Mounted Police, and the cost is charged to the police, thus relieving the Post Office Department of very great expense. If there is no apportionment it will introduce utter confusion into the services of the Government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was no confusion in the case of opening up Manitoba and the North-west Terrritories.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether the expense was apportioned there or not, nor does the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know it from the information of Mr. White.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply stating a very plain principle, that if the Post Office Department gets its mail carried by the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of the Interior should charge the Post Office Department what he thinks is fair ; and a basis to get at what would be a fair amount would be what the Postmaster General would have to pay for the service, tempered by the fact that the Minister of the Interior had his men on the ground and could afford to do it at a percentage less. I do not suppose my hon. friend got the postal revenue, did he ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He is too generous altogether. In his own business I know he would not do that ; if he had to take the cost, he would get all the revenue ; but he is so generous to the Post Office Department that he is willing to do a very important work for it and charge it up against the Mounted Police. I would certainly press on my hon. friend and the Government the necessity of making some fair apportionment of the cost of the service to the Post Office Department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there can be any dispute about the correctness of the principle the hon. gentleman speaks of, that when one department performs a service for another, it should make a proper charge to that department. I think in this case the Post Office Department should be charged with what the service costs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We intend to take an account of that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give my hon. friend the distribution of the force, which includes officers, men and dog-drivers : at Skagway, 2 ; at the summit of Chilkoot Pass, 3 ; at the summit of White Pass, 10 ; at Lake Lindermann, 3 ; at Lake Bennett, 7 ; at Log Cabin, 4 ; at Cariboo Crossing, 3. All these except Cariboo Crossing are in British Columbia. At the request of the provincial authorities, we withdrew all our men from British

Columbia except those whom we deemed to be necessary to protect our own customs officers, and to see that they were in a position to meet any emergency that might arise.

Mr. FOSTER. And those you have mentioned are those that are necessary to be kept ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. All these are not in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Skagway is not in British Columbia.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may be in British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, it may be. The two men who are there are simply depot men to look after supplies. There are at Tagish, 64; at McClintock River, 3; at White Horse Rapids, 3; at the head of Lake Labarge, 3; at the foot of Lake Labarge, 4; at McClintock, a post on the river, 5; at Big Salmon, 4; at Little Salmon, 6; at Tantalus, 5; at Five Fingers, 5; at Atlin, B.C., 1; at Selkirk, 5; at Ogilvy, 4; at Hutchikoo, 4; at Stewart River, 5; at Half-way Post, 4; at Selwyn, 4; at Indian River, 5; at Grand Forks, 7; at Dawson, 63; at Fort Constantine, 4; at Dominion Creek, 5; at the post office on the Dalton trail, 9; on the Stikine River and at Glenora, 5; making altogether 259.

Mr. FOSTER. Tagish and Dawson are your two main points ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. Tagish is the depot point for the southern part of the territory. Major White is at Tagish, and is in command of the southern half of the territory, under Col. Steele, who is the chief commander of the territory.

Mr. FOSTER. At which of these places have you built barracks ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have barracks at all of these places. At some places the barracks are very small. The buildings are log buildings, but are substantial, and will serve every purpose for a considerable number of years. They are intended, as far as possible, to be permanent stopping-places on the line of communication. They were intended for that purpose when put up, and they are carefully and substantially built. It is expected that we shall be able to utilize some of them in connection with the telegraph line and some in connection with the permanent mail route to be established hereafter. A few of them are off the line, but most of them are on the line, and will be capable of being used.

Mr. PRIOR. Were they erected by the men themselves, or did you hire labour ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were mostly erected by the men, though, of course, from time to time, some little assistance was hired.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister know the number of militia in the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I only know that the order was made for 250. Whether that is the exact number there or not, I cannot say. One hundred are at Dawson, and the others are in barracks at Selkirk. The 100 men at Dawson were sent there by the Militia Department at my request to assist and practically furnish a reserve for the police.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I come to the conclusion that in the year there has been close on $1,700,000 or $1,800,000 spent in the Yukon for police and militia. I imagine that the 250 men sent in by the Minister of the Interior and kept there will cost fully as much per man and probably more. The cost of the 200 men amounts to a little over $4,000 per man—$4,375. These men have cost us each $4,375, and the militia no doubt have cost us more than that, say about $5,000 apiece. With such an expenditure, the Government is bound to give us the very best reasons for having incurred it. Were those men necessary or were they not ? Every man that was unnecessary has cost the taxpayer about $5,000. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us generally what service these men have had to perform, particularly with reference to what they had to do in the way of maintaining law and order ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The House is no doubt familiar with the general class of work that has been done by the Mounted Police in the North-west Territories. Their duties in the Yukon district have been pretty much the same. It has been their duty to do the ordinary police constable work and to keep the country, as far as possible, under police control. In addition to that they have been engaged to some extent in handling the mails. They have had a considerable portion of their spare time, when they had any, occupied in the putting up of their buildings and establishing quarters for themselves, which would be of a more or less permanent character. It is difficult for me to give the members of the committee an accurate idea of what the police force is in the Yukon, because in order to do that I would have to give the detailed routine of the force at each point.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be about the same at all the points.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. From a pretty constant supervision of the work, I do not think that any men in the

Dominion, during the same length of time, have been working as hard or constantly and subjected to as arduous toil as the Mounted Police in that district. A large portion of their time has been taken up in patrolling, in the forwarding and handling of their supplies, and in transporting supplies for other departments of the Government, keeping the line of communication open, and handling everything that required to be handled for the Government. It became evident, in the very beginning, that a great many things which, under ordinary circumstances, would not be done by the police, would be very efficiently done by that organization and in fact could only be efficiently done by it. For instance, when we have sent in officials from time to time, we have practically put them in charge of the police at one end of the trip and the police have seen them through. That has occupied a considerable portion of their time at different periods, and it is only in that way that we could keep open communication and have our men forwarded from one place to another as required. I think that the members of the committee will fully recognize the fact that 250 men, scattered over a district of 600 miles, where travel was usually extremely difficult, arduous and dangerous, and when that route at Skagway was encumbered by men of lawless character, travelling in such a way that they had to be under the supervision of the police, had a very great responsibility resting on them, and the fact that law and order has been maintained in that district is the greatest tribute to the efficiency of the force we have ever had since it was organized. It is the universal testimony that there never has been a mining camp where such a rush took place, in which order was maintained as well as it has been in the Yukon territory. The class of men that went in there were, it has been said, a good class of people, a law-abiding population. I would not like to say that they were not, but I have no hesitation in saying that they were, with few exceptions, almost the same class of people that were at Skagway in the early days of that town, when it was impossible for a man to go out after dark without danger to his life. Hundreds of such people had gone up to our North-west Territories. Of course a great many people who went in there were very fine, respectable people, and no doubt the sentiment of the majority was in favour of a proper maintenance of law and order, but it does not follow, by any means, that if there had not been a properly organized force and a sufficient force to protect the officers of law and back them in case of trouble, law and order would not have been maintained with anything like the same efficiency. It must be borne in mind that while we might justly rely on the loyalty and devotion of our police officers, yet there were times when some anxiety might be felt in case the sympathy of the mob would be with the law breakers. Our officers told us that once or twice they did have great apprehension in regard to what would result in case there were any difficulties. However, that period has passed. But I venture to say that in that mining camp at Dawson, when there were from 25,000 to 30,000 people when there were, undoubtedly, a very large number of those people of the most lawless class—for it is a notorious fact that a large number of lawless men did make it their business to go to Dawson City and spread themselves over the Klondike district generally—it is beyond all doubt that the position of the men at Dawson who stood responsible for the maintenance of law and order, was a very arduous position and such a position that it could not be said that there were too many men there for the purpose. The question of sending the militia may be discussed separately. There were other considerations in the mind of the Government in sending the militia, and I do not speak of that subject just now. But I venture to say that, as my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) says, in discussing the question of the police in the North-west Territories, there were difficulties, when, out of 750 men, 250 were drafted away. And there are practically no difficulties about law and order in the North-west. The country is just as civilized and as safe as the city of Ottawa, and more so, for there is less difficulty, so far as the administration of justice and the prevention of crime are concerned. There is practically no danger of any kind, for there are railways and telegraphs everywhere, so that, if trouble occurred, say at Calgary, a regiment of soldiers could be landed there in forty-eight hours without any difficulty whatever. There is no danger throughout that territory, except of a possible outbreak among the Indians, which, I am happy to say, is not at all probable. But, if trouble did occur, there would be no difficulty in getting a force there at any time. Considering all the facts, I think it will be at once evident that we have not, so far as the police force is concerned, sent too many men into the Yukon district. The committee must consider the vast territory, the absolute impossibility of quick communication, of sending men where they may be wanted. At first, we could not even send men, because there were not sufficient supplies available. The men would starve to death on the way in. Now we have a very considerable quantity of supplies, supplies for about a year, and these are stored at differents posts, so that supplies will be on hand if we desire to send a body of 15 or 20 men to one place or another. If we had not such an organization, we should not feel safe. But now, knowing that the organization of the police is so good, we feel almost absolutely safe, because we feel that we can

cope with almost any difficulty that can occur.

I might give one illustration of the difficulty of the situation, without which difficulty the administration of that part of the country would be comparatively simple. Two miners, going down the Hootalinqua River, were shot at by some Indians. One was killed and the other badly wounded; I have forgotten whether the second one died or not. It became necessary to send out a party to hunt the Indians down. The nearest police post had to be communicated with. It was about 40 miles from where the murder took place. That trip of 40 miles was over territory so difficult of travel that a man could only make 10 miles a day, except by the most tremendous efforts, carrying such supplies as would be necessary to keep himself from starving. When the post had been communicated with, they had to send out a party strong enough to cope with any difficulties they might meet, and to take the malefactors, even if resistance were offered. Not only had they to carry supplies with them, but they had to carry full equipment. They had to be as fully equipped as any party that we send out to make a survey in a distant part of the North-west Territories. The men must carry their own subsistence, and be prepared for any kind of weather. This is a vastly different thing from sending men here and there in a country where they can stop at different places over night and get provisions. We must send out a party capable of travelling without assistance, and able to move quickly enough to catch the criminals. This body of men did arrest the criminals, who were subsequently tried and convicted at Dawson City. In other cases also criminals have been promptly apprehended. I say, Mr. Speaker, with some degree of pride, that, in the first place, I do not think it could be shown that there ever was a case of population going into such a country, where the difficulties of communication and of performing these various services were so great. Moreover, I do not believe there ever was a case in which a large and miscellaneous population went into a mining district, and in which so little crime took place during the last eighteen or twenty months, during which that population was there. My information of what took place in Australia, where the very best organization was in existence, where they had a thoroughly organized mounted police force under first-class officers, is, that there was a very much larger amount of crime. It was no unusual thing for the Government convoys to be held up and robbed, and there was a considerable degree of lawlessness, notwithstanding the stringent efforts made to put it down. We have had nothing of that kind. We have established such a state of affairs that the men who, starting for the Canadian Yukon, from Skagway by the White Pass or the Chilkoot Pass, have said that, when they got to the Canadian line, they could pack up their revolvers and rifles, because they would not want them any more. This is the state of affairs we established, and that exists there now.

I venture to say that the statement I have seen in print that it was the name of the Canadian law, simply the name, that brought about that result, should commend itself to the common sense of any member of this committee. The name of the Canadian law had a great deal to do with it. It secured for every mounted policeman on that trail practically the power of ten men; for, when a mounted policeman went to a man and said: Do so and so, he did it. A policeman did not need ten or fifteen men with him to direct the people as to what they were to do. They understand that that one man represented the Canadian law, and they carried out his instructions. But, if we had not had the men to give the instructions, to say what would require to be done, and to say that it had to be done, as a matter of course, everything would have been in a disorganized and lawless state. I want to bear testimony, apart from political considerations, to the men upon that force. I have said that I did not know of any body of men in Canada who were subject to such arduous toil as these men were. They did everything for the people on that trail. They took the people in, fed them, housed them, and took care of them in every way. If a report came in that a man was on the trail, used up, starving or sick, a policeman or two—generally, a party of two—would be sent out and the man would be brought in, and housed, and fed, and cared for. That has been taking place all the time upon that trail up to the time when the ice went out this spring, and travel, except by boat, has practically ceased. Now, the amount of work which these men have had to do has been enormous. I think the members of the committee ought to recognize the fact that they have had cast upon them an enormous amount of work. The question whether the country should provide a force of men to do that work, or whether the country should have left the people to starve, and if they got sick, to let them stay sick, and to die—that is a question of policy; but I have no hesitation in saying, for my own part, that I think the policy was a proper one, under the very unusual circumstances that existed.

Mr. FOSTER. Could my hon. friend state generally, from the records of the Mounted Police, the classes of crime, and number of apprehensions, and the like of that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The record for serious crime is very trifling indeed. Of criminal and other cases tried in the Yukon from the 1st of December, 1897, to the 30th of November, 1898, there were

600 altogether. I can give the hon. gentleman an idea of the nature of the offences by running over a few: Larceny, non-payment of wages, dog stealing, drunkenness, arson, theft, damage to property, assault, creating public disturbance, stealing gold dust, giving liquor to Indians, indecent behaviour, drunk and disorderly—that is the way they run.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of these cases occurred in Dawson?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were all tried at Dawson, except five that were tried at Tagish. Six were tried by the officer on the Dalton trail, one was for evading the customs officer, and five for horse stealing. The hon. gentleman will find the particulars in the appendix of the Mounted Police report.

Mr. FOSTER. The supplies that were bought for the Mounted Police, the whole of the subsistence, amounts to over $200,000. Were all these supplies bought by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All the supplies for the Mounted Police, with scarcely any exception, are purchased by public advertisement. I do not think that during this last year any supplies have been purchased otherwise than by public tender, except in one case. There were a few tons of stuff that had to be sent in in a hurry. The order was sent to Superintendent Curry, at Vancouver, by telegraph, to purchase them. I think they amounted altogether to abount $20,000. He went around to the different persons and procured tenders, and purchased the stuff hurriedly, and shipped it. But supplies generally are purchased by tender. But I will say further, in order not to mislead the hon. gentleman, that during the previous year we purchased a considerable quantity of supplies at Victoria and Vancouver without tender. When I say a considerable quantity, I do not mean any considerable proportion of the whole amount. But we did that in order to ship them quickly, that we might get them in before the difficulty occurred concerning the transportation. But the quantities were comparatively small. During this year we have purchased altogether by tender except in the one case which I have mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. How have the supplies generally gone in?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We let contracts to the transportation companies that go by the upper Yukon. I may say just here that some attacks were made upon the Government because we had let contracts for police supplies to an American company. Now, I want to say to the committee, I maintain that at the time it was the proper thing for me to do. There were two companies in the business last spring when it was necessary for me to make arrangements for supplies for this present year. Of course, the stuff was purchased and shipped as early as possible in the spring. There were two companies, the North American Transportation Company and the Alaska Commercial Company, that had been doing business there for some years. They had steamboats upon the river, they had warehouses, they understood the river, and they knew perfectly well what they could do and how they could do it. There was nobody else in the business; of all the companies that were offering to do the business, there was absolutely no other company that was at all in the same position as these two companies, and could guarantee, without any great danger of failure, that the contract would be carried out and the stuff would be delivered. Of course, it was these companies that carried the stuff in former years. The Government had had their supplies sent by the same companies. The North American Transportation Company had taken in all these supplies formerly. I had in my mind the possibility of getting a Canadian company to do it, but after a great deal of consideration I came to the conclusion that I would not be justified, for the sake of giving the work to any particular company, in taking any chances by giving it to a company that might not be able to carry out the contract. We consequently made that contract which I have referred to, the contract was faithfully and loyally carried out, and the goods delivered according to contract. Shortly after that contract had been made, speaking from recollection, and I think after the goods had been shipped, reports came that there was likely to be very low water on the upper Yukon, and I became alarmed for fear that the boats would not get up there until late in the year. I became alarmed for fear that we would be short of supplies, particularly on the upper portion of the river, which is the southern portion of the river, and to make sure that we would have sufficient provisions from year to year, I instructed the controller to purchase an additional quantity of supplies and push them forward early in the season by way of the passes. They were despatched by the lower route and we have them there. The Controller informed me a few days ago that we have now about a year's supplies for 250 men in the Yukon territory. We will send in this year the usual amount of supplies, so that, in case of any difficulty or temporary stoppage we will be prepared to avoid a shortage of supplies.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had a very adequate explanation of the matter by the hon. Minister compared with the time which is at his disposal and the disadvantage under which we are working at this hour in the morning. I do not think that we are in a position to spend very much time on the

criticism of this vote, and, under these circumstances, I think myself that it would be far better if we made up our minds that these are very important votes, that they ought to be thoroughly looked into, and that we should not attempt to rush them through at this hour of the morning. However, that is in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they choose to stay here all night, we will have to stay also. The disadvantage of taking up a most important matter like this late Friday night and Saturday morning, when almost all the members are away and every one is tired, is apparent. I think that when my hon. friend gets this vote through he should adjourn the House. However, if we must go through with it, there are some things we will have to say. I would not detract, in the least, from the efforts which have been put forward and the work which has been performed by the department and the Government in reference to this matter. I would pay just as hearty a tribute as the Minister to the excellent work of the police force which we have had in that territory. I do not think that there are two opinions about that. I do not think any one in this House would for a moment, believe that the Mounted Police have been lazing away their time, but on the contrary, they have done all that men could do in their position, and they have done it generally to the satisfaction of everybody. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) must not take to himself and his administration the total glory of having a comparatively law-abiding and orderly community in that part of the country. Happily, that has been the exceptional condition in Canada; it has been the exceptional condition in the early history of mining in every part of Canada, in British Columbia especially. I think it is not going too far to say that nine-tenths, yes, probably nineteenth-twentieths of that aggregation of men who go into the Yukon, go into that country not with the idea of committing lawless acts, but, on the contrary, with the idea of diligently pursuing their own interest by lawful means. Their object is to get claims, work these claims and make them profitable to themselves. They do not go in there with the idea of looting or getting claims by violence or force; they go in there with the idea of faithfully obeying the laws of the country in which they are to work, and loyally abiding by the laws of the country, so that lawlessness would be the exception, and law and order the rule. If you take into account the circumstances of the Yukon, you will see that the country does not invite to lawlessness; quite the contrary. There is in that country a hard struggle for existence, a hard struggle to win what they go to win in the way of seeking and obtaining gold, which prevents lawlessness rather than contributes to it. Happily, it has always been the history of our country, that our mining population has been the most law-abiding of any of our population, not excepting the older settled portions of the country. The mere fact that there was a comparative immunity from serious crimes in the Yukon is not to be attributed entirely to the immense expenditures which have been made, or to the large number of police and militia in that country, but to the causes which I have mentioned. I know that in the work which was undertaken by the police, taking into account the exigencies and circumstances of the country, that large expenses were impossible to be avoided. It is impossible for us to go into a critical analysis of the accounts at this hour of the morning. We simply have to take general principles and discuss them, that these supplies were got by tender and contract largely, that they were taken in under contract, that the transport companies gave rates as good as could be secured, sometimes under competition and sometimes without competition. All these are things that might be criticised if we had time, but we have not. We just take the general statement of the Minister and the general report of the department. I must say that I do not think the Mounted Police ought be charged with the keep of the Civil Government in any way. I do not think the Mounted Police should be charged with the cost of carrying the mails, and I think it is the bounden duty of the Government to charge a fair share of that cost to the Post Office Department. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will see, that without that utter confusion for all comparative purposes is introduced into the keeping of the public accounts. Before we pass the main vote, the Ministers should come to a satisfactory conclusion amongst themselves and announce to the House what proportion is to go to these different services. Probably the Mounted Police did a great deal more than was necessary in the way of servile work. Charity, of course, is an excellent thing to dispense, and sick men should be taken care of as far as they possibly can be, but it is an open question as to whether men who were travelling in that district did not rely too much upon the Mounted Police, and were not taught sufficiently to rely upon themselves. The tendency would be to impose upon the leaders of the Mounted Police if the impression got abroad that the Mounted Police were there for that purpose. I am one of those who believe that it is better to err on the side of kindness under those circumstances than to take the other extreme. The crimes that have been committed are of the most trivial character, and I think nearly all of it has been committed in the city of Dawson itself. Is there any civil government in Dawson City or is it all Mounted Police and military government?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Before Mr. Ogilvie went out there I gave

him my opinion that it would be well to have Dawson City incorporated as soon as possible, and he agreed with that view which is also the views of the other members of the Government. We did not give him any positive instructions because we thought it better that he should consult with the people up there. Incorporation has not taken place yet, and in one of his letters he thought the people were better satisfied to have their affairs administered by the council of the district, than by a municipal corporation.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, because they get all their civic work done for them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There will have to be incorporation in a very short time.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the Mounted Police do anything in the way of sanitary work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have regular sanitary regulations which they see are carried out, and one of the officers is sanitary inspector. Some time ago a very capable physician, Dr. Good, who formerly practiced in Winnipeg, was appointed Health Inspector by the Yukon Council. I am well acquainted with Dr. Good, and I know he is a very capable man. He had no intention of remaining there when he started, but he was appointed Sanitary Inspector for Dawson, and he went to work vigorously

Mr. FOSTER. I do not feel like discussing the item any further, but of course we will have an item in the main Estimates for the Mounted Police, and then other important points will be taken up.

Amount required to provide for arrears of salary to 30th June, 1899, to be paid to the following employees connected with the Surveys Branch, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act :—

Louis Gauthier	$228 34
John Langlois	625 00
Otto J. Klotz.....	242 77

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have an explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The two first items refer to the cases I mentioned the other day in bringing in a Bill respecting the Department of the Interior. Mr. Gauthier was appointed to take the place of Mr. Dufresne, who had been a computor in the astronomer's office and had died. The Auditor General held that under a clause of the Civil Service Act we could not make a new appointment. We had examined Mr. Gauthier's qualifications for the position. which were of an extremely technical character, and he had been appointed, on the assumption that the rule respecting technical employees enabled us to appoint him, at a salary of $100 a month. Objection was made by the Auditor General to the payment of the increase, and on further examination the objection was sustained ; so that he could only be paid at the rate of $900 a year. The amount we are asking the House to vote is the difference between $900, which he was getting before, and $1,200. Mr. Langlois is a surveyor. He abandoned a permanent position to accept work in the department, on the assurance that his pay for the present would be $75 a month, and that his employment would be continued. His position is the same as the other. He cannot be paid more than $400 a year under the Act, and we are asking a vote for the difference between that and $75 a month from the date of his appointment up to the 30th of June of this year. As to the pament to Mr. Klotz, it is an old claim, which, after some examination, I decided to recommend for payment. It represents certain extra services and expenses in determining the longitude of Montreal.

To provide for the payment of a gratuity equal to one year's salary to the widow of J. A. Cadenhead, late surveyor in the Yukon $1,095

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The circumstances of this case are very exceptional. Mr. Cadenhead was sent by the department to the Yukon territory to make a survey. He was a perfectly satisfactory officer, the report of his work being very good. While coming back, down the Klondike River, he accidentally broke through a thin crust of ice under which there was a large crevice and went into the water. He was apparently so much fatigued by a long and arduous trip that he had not sufficient strength to get out ; and when he was found he was frozen stiff, with his hands on the ice. But he had evidently taken the trouble to take the surveyor's notes and plans. which he had in his pocket when the accident occurred, and when he apparently realized that he had no chance of getting on the ice, and had thrown them a considerable distance from him, so that they could be got. Therefore, the department had the result of the work that had cost him his life. If he had finished his work and returned, he would have been entitled to charge the department the cost of his return, which would be about $500, and I thought it was fair that his widow should receive the equivalent of a year's salary.

Miscellaneous printing $5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This is the explanation given me by the Queen's Printer of this item :

The miscellaneous printing for the House of Commons has been increasing in volume. During the current year a large number of dairy farm reports were ordered by the House, and had to be charged to this account. The cost also of the Auditor General's Report has increased since the repeal of the Order in Council limiting to 500 the number of copies of reports to be supplied to departments. The report is a very bulky one, and 1,500 copies extra make a

considerable difference. Besides, there is an annual increment in the number of pages at the rate of about 100 pages.

In further explanation, I would observe that the vote for miscellaneous printing was for 1891, and for some years previously, $30,000 ; but finding that that amount was not spent only $25,000 was asked, at which point it has remained for a number of years. During the last three or four years, however, the expenditure has exceeded the amount voted, and the object of the present request is to cover the extra expenditure of the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there any reason why the departments should have more than 500 Auditor General's Reports distributed amongst them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know the particular circumstances which brought about this change, or whether the Order in Council was repealed by this or the preceding Government.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not repealead by us. I do not see why the departments needed so many of the books unless to send them around amongst political friends. When we have established a system of purchase of these reports, outside of what the members get, it seems to me that 500 is more than the departments can require.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will look into the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the hon. gentleman will do so. These are costly books, and I do not see what departmental reason can be assigned for a distribution of more than 500.

To pay the legal representatives of the late A. M. Montpetit in full of claim for translation of Report on Liquor Traffic, including interest..... $581 10

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the Department of the Secretary of State and the following explanation has been given to me :—

This is a claim extending back to the year 1893, when Mr. Montpetit was engaged to translate the report and evidence of the Royal Liquor Prohibition Commission.

About a year after this work was undertaken the Government of the day decided to discontinue it. Mr. Montpetit was paid for the work he had actually done, but in addition thereto made several large demands for what he termed a violation of contract, which were not entertained. He also claimed to be paid for the translation calculated according to the number of pages in French instead of in English, as he had been paid. In October of last year an arrangement was come to with his legal representatives (Mr. Montpetit having died in the meantime) to allow this enumeration, together with the sum of $35.25 for an index, in full of all demands. The difference between the French and English pages come to $527, which with $35.25 makes $562.25. To this amount has been added $18.85 interest accrued since the date of settlement (28th October, 1898), making $581.10, for which a vote is here asked.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very peculiar vote. The claim dates back to 1893, and it was thoroughly well understood then that it would not be admitted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, this claim has been pending.

Mr. FOSTER. I know, but refused.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but pressed all the time.

Grant towards relief of distress caused by a hurricane in the West Indies.. $25,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Last year there was a disastrous hurricane in the West Indies, which caused a considerable loss of life and very great damage to property, and an appeal was made to the Empire for funds. A fund was started by the Lord Mayor of London, and a sum of £37,000 had been collected when Canada took action and contributed a sum of £5,000. After consultation with the Colonial Office as to the form in which it might be most advantageous to use, $15,000 was given to the government of the Windward Islands, and $10,000 to the Government of the Barbadoes. In both cases the money was sent to the Colonial Governments through the Bank of Montreal and the Colonial Bank, both banks lending their assistance without any charge.

International Commission at Washington. $14,000

Mr. FOSTER. This item will provoke some discussion, and as we have done a good deal of work to-day, I think we ought to adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is early yet, and it is desirable that we should get through with the supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. These supplementaries might just as well have been down a month or so after the beginning of the session, and not kept until a few days before the close of the fiscal year, and then rushed through out of all reason.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). We have never lost but one half day during the whole session.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there has been a year in the parliamentary history of the country in which Government business was so far behind and so deplorably managed as this year. Look at the supplementary Estimates for the current year. Not brought down until nearly three months of the session are over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was more convenient to bring them down towards the end of the fiscal year, so that they may be all brought down at the same time. and no need to bring in further supplementaries. There has not been a Government day, since this session opened, when there

was not ample Government business to be done, and very often we have delayed business to suit the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps on one or two occasions in which arrangements were made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The discussion on common-place items which has gone on has never been equalled in the history of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not propose that Estimates shall go through without proper explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have no objection to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the objection to item 93, "International Commission at Washington"?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to do all the talking. An international commission has some aspects that may call for some discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a small item which was left over at the instance of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), for the payment of Mr. Mungovan. The question was put whether this gentleman had been constantly employed during the period covered by the vote. Dr. Dawson, the Queen's Printer, has furnished me with a memorandum which shows that this gentleman was absent for a few days on leave, and these days, of course, would be deducted from his pay. Whether this item is passed as it is or not he would not receive the whole amount. We can either take this item as it stands or reduce it by the number of days of his absence.

Mr. FOSTER. There was another point and that was why it became necessary to make an exception to the law to employ Mr. Mungovan when there are hundreds of young men and women who had passed the examination and were available.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only answer is, that, as I am informed, this gentleman had been employed from time to time in similar service and was competent to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. In what work was he employed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The same work, I am told.

Mr. FOSTER. What was he doing—any technical work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was employed as extra clerk, during the session chiefly, I believe, in the Printing Bureau, addressing and distributing documents.

Mr. BENNETT. Was he not absent during the West Huron fight also?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The statement only shows that he was absent for eleven days.

Mr. BENNETT. That was during the Brockville election. I think he was in West Huron also.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only speak of the days when he was absent.

Mr. FOSTER. If the law is carried out, of course he can only be paid for the days on which he worked. It looks as if the Government were breaking the Civil Service law in order to keep a man at a base of operations from which he can travel out into the different constituencies when calls are made. I think my hon. friend, even without a pair of double magnifying spectacles, can read that between the lines.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we have done a good day's work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will have all day to-morrow to rest, while we have to work.

Mr. TAYLOR. If hon. gentlemen opposite had gone down and got a meal with the idea that they are going to force through this item to-night, I can tell them that they are making a mistake. We have done a good day's work, and have pushed through items with very little discussion that ought to have been more discussed. There were some upon which I wished to have something to say myself, but refrained from speaking because the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) said the Government were anxious to get these Estimates through, and said we should push through as many as possible. We have done that until one o'clock, and now the Prime Minister should accede to the request of the Opposition and let us finish these up in the early part of the week.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let this item through——

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) wants to provoke a fight he will get it. There are as many members of the Opposition here as there are on the Government side. I do not purpose that this item is going through without a division, not only in the committee, but in the House; for this Mr. Mungovan is simply employed in violation of the Civil Service Act, and sent out to the country to electioneer wherever the Government may need him.

Mr. McGREGOR. A very handy fellow.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is well that the country should know that. He was not the only one. In West Huron, the inspector of clothing, McCormick, who came from Goderich, and was employed in the department here, though paid by this Government, was canvassing from house to house during that election. In this way the Government, who were entrusted by the public with the management of their affairs, are spending public money. They are paid $7,000 a year each to manage the business of the country; are they going to steal the money of the country to pay men to do election work for them? If that is what they are doing, the people of the country want to know it. Mr. Mungovan is not a civil servant, but there is a special vote here to pay him to go through the country electioneering. I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the motion is put, I desire to say that I happened to be passing along the streets here in Ottawa in company with two other members of the House, when this Mungovan came up and applied some very disreputable epithets to one of these gentlemen. I believe this was because of the dispute which had arisen over the payment of this account. Personally, I think it is to be regretted that Mungovan or anybody else should be employed as he and McCormick are, to go to any part of the country where they may be sent for electioneering purposes. I for one protest against this payment.

Motion to strike out item negatived: yeas, 9; nays, 29.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, you purpose to put the item through. The proposition by the Minister of Finance is to reduce the amount by eleven days.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection. As I said, the money would not be paid for the time the man was absent. I move to reduce the item by the amount of pay for eleven days, which would leave the item $136.50.

Motion agreed to.

Customs—
Additional amount required for salaries and contingencies..... $16,518 68

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend asked me, whether the officers had been paid. The information given me by the accountant of the department is, that the amount due for salaries in British Columbia, for the month of June, is $5,000; contingent expenses for May and June $7,500; living expenses, $5,000; officers in the passes, from the 1st of February, 1899, to the 1st of June, 1899, $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is meant by living expenses? Is it a per diem allowance?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are allowed $60 a month. There was another item my hon. friend asked about, the $9,000 extra taken for printing and stationery. That account stands as follows:—Paid for printing for May and June, 1898, $3,610. That is, we had not estimates enough for the previous year, and the account for May and June of 1898 had to be paid out of this year's account. Printing for this year, $16,054; stationery for nine months, $3,687; law costs, $1,570, largely in connection with the sugar case, part of which, I suppose. will come back to us from the sugar refining company; instruments for gauging, $482; flags, $72; sundries, $1,000. The total is $26,477.87. Then, we have the printing account for the three months of April, May and June, estimated at about $5,000; stationery, $1,000; making a total of $32,477. We could do with less, but there may be some odd things that may be required.

Mr. FOSTER. Make the vote $8,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have no objection; we can get through with $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman give us some information about that Montreal case of Fitzgibbon, Schafetlin & Co.?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In that case the defence has been put in, and the issues have been fixed by the Court of Demurrer, and Thursday next is fixed for discovery in Montreal. The case is being pressed. We have had already several motions on the preliminary issues.

Mr. PRIOR. This additional amount required for maintenance of and repairs to revenue cruisers, $10,000—does that include revenue cruisers all over the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was discussed the other night.

Mr. PRIOR. Has the hon. gentleman given any more consideration to the request made by my colleague and myself for the last couple of years in regard to providing another steamer for British Columbia waters, so that the "Quadra" can be kept more for looking after smugglers? A smaller vessel could do the other work. This matter has been brought before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Customs year after year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This matter has been before us; in fact, there was a vote by the old Government, and it was dropped, and considered again. But the marine preventive service has cost a good deal, and I hesitate to ask for any more. It has been increased; we have been very active on the Atlantic in this matter.

Militia and Defence $274,290

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to this militia item my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), have a number of accounts which they have gone into, and they wish to bring up the question of prices and tenders, and the like of that. This is a subject which will take a considerable amount of time, and I think that it had better be left over.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I would suggest to my hon. friend that the plan agreed upon between the hon. leader of the Opposition and the right hon. leader of the Government be carried out, that on the main Estimates this can be gone into thoroughly or on the large vote of $250,000 for the Yukon contingent.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they can discuss it on that. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) let us have the items of information in connection with this item of miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses, amounting to $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I promised to give the hon. gentleman some information in regard to this item of $10,000, which is a supplementary vote to the vote of $15,000 for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses. I have a statement here of the exact expenditures to date, which is as follows :—

	Paid to Date.	Required Supplementarily.
Reconnaissance	$3,668	$1,000
Compensation for injuries	2,398	1,375
Printing and stationery	5,390	6,068
Advertising	1,351	212
Legal expenses	878	1,196
Telegraphing	303	50
Sundry	985	15
	$14,973	$9,916

That makes a total estimated expenditure of $24,889. Now, I pointed out the other day, to the committee that about $5,000 of this money was required to pay expenditures incurred prior to the 30th of June, 1898. I was not exactly correct in that because the exact amount is as follows :—Reconnaissance, $1,000 ; printing and stationery, $1,800 ; injuries, &c., $1,575, making a total of $4,455, as the amount which was actually expended prir to or at the 30th of June, 1898. The item of compensation for injuries, as I pointed out on that occasion, is the result of the very large number of battalions, almost the whole of the militia, which have been called out during the last two years. There is a large number of casualties in connection with horses, as any one familiar with these matters will understand.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any change in the regulations in reference to these claims ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. None whatever. The extra expenditure for printing and stationery is caused by the printing of 500 copies of the regulations and orders $1,000, 1,200 copies of the militia list, quarterly, instead of semi-annually, $400, additional printing and stationery required by the present General including daily orders, $600, making an addition of $2,000 to the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the idea of printing the list more frequently than previously?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For the better information of the forces. There are a great many changes going on now and it is considered advisable in the interest of the militia that the publication of the militia list should take place quarterly instead of semi-annually.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Are the regulations distributed gratuitously or are they sold ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sorry to say that the sale is very small. We had the hope of liquidating the expense by advertising. But we find that very few people have taken hold of the advertising. The legal expenses have increased owing to the expropriation of the Rockliffe Range. The expenses in connection with that amount to something like $1,200. Our legal expenses ordinarily are small. So that the $1,200, the $4,500 of the previous year, and the $2,000 for extra printing will pretty nearly cover the increase of $10,000 I am asking.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend tell me in what position the commander of the 8th Hussars, New Brunswick, is ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend will not press that question, but will allow me to discuss the matter with him privately, when he and I will be quite satisfied with the condition which I shall be able to inform him that the matter is in.

Mr. FOSTER. With that presentment of the case I will withdraw my question.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns may we know the programme for Tuesday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose we will have to finish these supplementary Estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 26th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COST OF PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount has been expended to date on account of the Prohibition plebiscite?
2. What amount is estimated to be yet due?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. The amount expended to June 23, 1899, on account of the Prohibition plebiscite is $192,541.61. 2. It is estimated that $1,000 will cover the payments yet to be made.

MONTREAL POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. QUINN (by Mr. Dugas) asked:

Has any person been named to the vacant office of postmaster of Montreal? If not, why not?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No person has been appointed yet to the vacant office of postmaster at Montreal. As I have already stated, before making the appointment, the Government would order an investigation into the office and would have to go into the report.

I. C. R.—REINSTATEMENT OF EUGENE BLANCHETTE, OF FRASERVILLE.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Dugas) asked:

1. Whether Mr. Eugène Blanchette, of Fraserville, in the province of Quebec, was dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway?
2. Has he been reinstated by the Liberal Government?
3. Why?
4. Upon whose recommendation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. Eugène Blanchette was dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway on the 14th of February, 1879. 2. He was re-employed as section foreman on the 8th of March, 1897. 3. To replace a man who left the service. 4. He was recommended by the late Mr. Pouliot, M.P.

BRITISH COLUMBIA ANTI-CHINESE AND JAPANESE LEGISLATION.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Is the Government aware that fourteen statutes, viz., chapters 39, 44, 46, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 89 passed by the local legislature of British Columbia on the 27th February last and received by the hon. the Secretary of State on the 27th April last, contain a clause prohibiting the employment of Chinese and Japanese in connection with the undertakings referred to in said statutes?
2. What is the policy of the Government in regard to the disallowance or otherwise of said Acts?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government is aware that a number of statutes of British Columbia passed in the present year, contain clauses prohibiting the employment of Chinese and Japanese. These statutes are now under the consideration of the Department of Justice, but no report has yet been made.

I. C. R.—TENDERS FOR GREEN SAND CASTINGS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Have tenders been called this year for green sand castings for the Intercolonial Railway, eastern division?
2. If so, whose tender was the lowest, and who got the contract?
3. What is the price per ton, and what amount of scrap are the contractors taking from the Government, and at what price per ton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, tenders were called for this year for green sand castings for the Intercolonial Railway, eastern division. 2. Wm. P. McNeil & Co.'s tender was the lowest, and they were awarded the contract. 3. The price is $24 per ton of 2,000 pounds, the contractors taking an equal amount of scrap at $16 per ton of 2,000 pounds.

CLAIMS FOR GENERAL SERVICE MEDALS.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. Davin) asked:

1. What progress has been made by the Medals Claims Commission in deciding who are to receive the Canadian general service medal?
2. How many claims for medals and clasps have been received up to 23rd of June, 1899, and of these what number have been favourably decided upon?
3. How is it proposed to distribute the said medals and clasps, and at what date is the distribution thereof likely to take place?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. 11,078 applications for medals and clasps have been received. 4,291 have been passed upon by the Medals Claim Board, for approval. Decision in 152 cases has been reserved by the board, pending receipt of additional particulars. All applications, with the exception of 441 received during the last few days, have been investigated, classified and recorded for consideration by the board. 2. Answered by No. 1 above. 3. The question of how and when the distribution shall take place has not yet been decided.

WHARFS AND PIERS CONSTRUCTED IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. How many wharfs and piers have been constructed at public expense in the province of Ontario since 1867, and what amount was expended in the construction, repair and maintenance from 1867 to the present date ?

2. How many in the province of Quebec during the said period, and what was the cost of their construction, maintenance and repairs to date ?

3. How many in each of the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and the aggregate amount expended in each of these provinces during that period in the construction, maintenance and repairs of these wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The question asked by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies), is somewhat comprehensive and it would be difficult to answer it in detail. It would be very much better that it should go into the form of a notice if the hon. gentleman has an opportunity of moving it. For the present I could not furnish him with the answer.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he will accept notice of motion in the words in which the present question is asked ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid it is not in the power of any hon. member of this House to accept notice of motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) has no opportunity, in the course of business, of moving I will consider his question later, but at the present I really could not give him the information.

FISHING BOUNTIES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

On the Order being called for :

Return showing : 1. All persons who have received fishing bounties in Prince Edward Island since 1st January, 1898, on their sworn application, made on the regular forms of the Department of Fisheries, and the amount paid to each showing whether for vessel, boat or ordinary hand.

2. The names, if any, of those who received bounties other than after making oath in regular form.—(Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Stand.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). It has stood twice already. If the Government could see its way to bring that down at an early day —it is an important return—it might facilitate business.

THE TARIFF—DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, &c.

Mr. DAVIN (West Assiniboia) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, faith has not been kept with the farmers of the west, since duties have not been reduced on agricultural implements and have been increased on the cheaper cottons, and that the quarter per cent preference on goods of English manufacture has, in the case of many staples of which all the people are consumers, been rendered delusive by raising the duty above that levied under the tariff of 1894-95.

He said : I rise, Mr. Speaker, to oppose a motion that must commend itself to every member of this House—that must commend itself certainly to every member of this House whose memory is charged with the events of the last five or six years, and whose political conscience is awake. You, Sir, will remember, that for some years before that 23rd of June which has become a red-letter day in the calendar of the Liberal party ; that the leaders of that party in this House, following in the wake of Conservative members, supported an agitation for tariff reform, and after the great convention in Ottawa in 1893, throughout the country, themselves agitated in favour of tariff reform—going, indeed, further and advocating tariff revolution. And, especially my right hon. friend the Prime Minister ; he, in various parts of the country, in fact throughout the country from Halifax to Vancouver——

Mr. PRIOR. Halifax to Victoria.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the right hon. gentleman speak in Victoria ?

Mr. PRIOR. He did, and it is further than from Halifax to Vancouver.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, from Halifax to Victoria, the right hon. gentleman made his chief claim for support, on his determination if he got into power, to relieve those persons whom he himself contended were greatly oppressed by the tariff which was in existence at that time. Now, the right hon. gentleman used no mistakable language ; in unmistakable phrase he described the tariff of that time as slavery, in the same sense as slavery in the Southern States was slavery. My hon. friend the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), whom I see in the House, was present at the meeting in Winnipeg in September, 1894, when the right hon. gentleman, in eloquent, in strong, in almost exaggerated language, described the condition of the farmers in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, as that of slavery. And, it occurring to the right hon. gentleman that somebody in the audience might smile at that, as an exaggerated figure of speech—smile at it as I see an hon. member from one of the lower provinces smiling at it now—the right hon. gentleman harked back on the statement and said: Slavery; yes, slavery in the same sense as southern slavery was slavery. The right hon. the Prime Minister came west, and a few days afterwards, at Moosomin, accompanied by the present Minister of Agriculture, he also spoke on a platform there. The question of relieving the North-west farmer in regard to the tariff on

agricultural implements came up, and in the presence of the right hon. the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture pledged the Liberal leaders, that if they came into power—I am sorry that the right hon. the Prime Minister is about to leave the House, because I was going to make an appeal to him.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will be back immediately.

Mr. McMULLEN: He will read it in "Hansard" afterwards.

Mr. DAVIN. Ah, no; I will have to make a special appeal to him on this occasion. The right hon. gentleman was present at Moosomin when the present Minister of Agriculture spoke as follows:—

As a farmer he was not satisfied with the reduction which had been made in the agricultural implement duty, because the United States Congress had made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that.

That is: to give reciprocity in agricultural implements.

Last year the farmers of western Canada imported $120,000 worth of American implements, on which they paid $40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combine, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own markets, showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. Massey-Harris got protection; why should not the farmers?

Now, I ask you, what could any farmer around Moosomin, who happened to be present on that interesting occasion, what could he and his friends think as to what the policy of the Liberal Government would be. I may say here, that the public opinion of Ontario, the public opinion of all Canada, is greatly influenced by the opinion of the farmers of the North-west Territories, because the eyes of the farmers, especially of Ontario, are on these territories, for the reason that their brothers and their sons have settled there and they are in constant correspondence. Then, if the farmers in the North-west Territories feel that any wrong is done them by any Government, it hurts that Government all over Canada, because of the reason I have stated. I want to read to the House the resolution which was passed in 1893 at that great Ottawa convention, when the Liberal party formulated its policy, and that resolution, if I remember aright, was moved by my right hon. friend. It will not, I think, occur to the House that I am taking up its time unnecessarily in reading this resolution, when I recall to it, that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made his Budget speech, in which he gave what was to be considered as the reform tariff of the Liberal leaders, he actually quoted this very resolution as though he wanted to emphasize his belief that the Liberal Government was bound by this resolution.

Mr. MONTAGUE. One of their ten commandments.

Mr. DAVIN. One of the ten commandments, not so brief, but equally binding. It was the first resolution, and it is as follows:—

That the customs tariff of the country should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but on the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused a great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle in our countrys progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing justice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted so as to make free or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the electors of Canada gave their verdict in favour of this policy, thus formally and solemnly, as you, Sir, remember; for you were part of that great conclave—this policy again and again propounded in a most solemn manner by the right hon. Prime Minister, but never implemented by him when power is placed in his hands. These promises make what an

old writer calls "reverend history" to-day. It may be that the leader of the House would like to forget the many promises he made when he was courting the electorate of Canada, just as some fickle lover would like to forget the vows he made and poured into the ear of the girl he had left betrayed. But, Sir, it need not be supposed that the poor girl forgets. She remembers, and she might address to the Prime Minister some such lines as these:

Say that the lips once breathless
May quicken if they would;
Say that the soul is deathless,
Dream that the gods are good;
Say March may wed September,
And time divorce regret:
But not that you'll remember,
And not that I'll forget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that I would make a special appeal to the Prime Minister in this matter; because, Sir, I have reason now to know, not merely as an inference from events, that his—shall I say without offence?—falsification of promises is systematic, but I have actual testimony to which the right hon. gentleman will be sure to pay some attention, because I have in my hand a eulogy of my right hon. friend from one of the most gifted members of this House, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau). It is a sonnet, in which it is intended to embalm in fourteen immortal lines all the good qualities of the man whom my hon. friend naturally regards as the great statesman of the day, and the first thing for which the hon. member for Temiscouata eulogizes the leader of the Government is this: "Il n'a rien affronté"—he has faced nothing; he will not come up to the scratch; he will not come to the fight; that is really what it means. Why, Sir, that is what we say; and here a distinguished supporter of my right hon. friend in lines, each of which is intended to glitter on the stretched forefinger of all time forever, tells us that the Prime Minister will not face anything, and he has not faced anything. It is quite true, he afterwards tells us of some other good qualities which I hope we shall see in operation. But it is a remarkable thing that in a sonnet by a gifted member of this House, a close friend of the Premier's, the writer commences by telling us that the Prime Minister has faced nothing up to the present. All I can say is that when next the hon. member for Temiscouata writes a sonnet, say after next session, I hope he will be able to tell us that the Prime Minister has faced something.

Now, Sir, I have proved that the promises that were made to the people of Canada, especially to the people of the North-west have not been fulfilled. But, Sir, what did we see here this session? We saw a remarkable thing, and it is time the attention of the public and the attention of Parliament should be drawn to it. We saw the Finance Minister come forward and make his financial statement, which showed this House what everybody of any foresight knew all along. I do not know whether my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is here; but if he is, he will remember that a few years ago, in the Rideau Club, after some speeches, amongst which was a speech from my right hon. friend, I told him that it was palpable to me that what the Government intended to do was to draw itself right on to the base of the old Conservative Government. And that is exactly what has been done; because what happened when the Minister of Finance sat down? My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) got up and made a speech full of vigour, as he always does, full of analysis, as all his speeches are; but, in concluding his speech, he congratulated the Finance Minister on his position, and accepted it as a perfectly satisfactory position—accepted his standing on the old Conservative base. And after the hon. gentleman had sat down, a distinguished member on the Government side replied to my hon. friend; and then we had a speech from the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who on two occasions in the course of that speech, endorsed the position of the Minister of Finance—welcomed it. So that the hobnobbing, if I may say it, between the Minister of Finance and the ex-Minister of Finance, and—I will not go so far as to say—the osculations of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. leader of the Opposition—but anyway, the fact of these four gentlemen mutually greeting each other, led one to cry out, "Righteousness and peace have met together, love and joy have kissed each other." At any rate, what has happened has emphasized that now the Government is standing on the old Conservative lines, not only with regard to the tariff, but with regard to other leading questions.

But my hon. friend need not suppose for one moment that the farmers of the North-west Territories and Manitoba will accept the position that this tariff is satisfactory to them. It is, on the contrary, extremely unsatisfactory to them. They feel, not only that it is unjust to them, but that promises have not been kept. They feel that they are the victims of the slavery so eloquently described by the right hon. leader of the House in 1894; they feel that they have trusted, and that their trust has been misplaced. Another man would not put it in that euphemistic form, but would say that they had trusted, and had been betrayed.

This motion goes further. It declares that the reciprocal feature of the tariff, on which so much stress has been laid, is illusory. I have in my hand a pamphlet that I noted in this House before; and, if I refer to it particularly now, it is because it is still being circulated in the North-west

Territories and Manitoba. This is a pamphlet containing speeches by Mr. Fielding, Sir Richard Cartwright and the Hon. William Paterson. I do not see my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) here, and I should like very much to know whether his absence from the House is his silent, and, I fear, impotent, protest against the course taken by his colleagues upon this important question. The hon. gentleman bore with a tariff that actually increased the duties on cotton, that did not lower the duties on agricultural implements, that buttressed up, to use his own language, "the robbers great and the robbers small." He bore it all patiently, although we saw the camel shrinking under the load of ignominy that was crushing him to the earth. But what seems to have broken the camel's back is the iron duties. When these duties were submitted, he fled the House, and he fled for one of two reasons, perhaps both—to utter his silent protest, to go into the wilderness, though I cannot compare him with Achilles sulking in his tent, because he has no myrmidons to follow him, and no black ships to take away, and, whatever terrors formerly circled around his flashing helmet, are now things of the past. But I want, in this connection, to read to the House what the hon. gentleman said in 1894 on the iron duties:

> Nothing would be more objectionable than an attempt to tie the hands of Parliament for a period of ten years.

Of course, this is the very thing that is being done.

> For myself, I utterly refuse to be bound by it, and I say so expressly, for the benefit of these manufacturers, that I for one will utterly refuse to be bound by any such proposition. I do not recognize the authority of this Parliament to tie the hands of our successors by any definite term of years.

Sometimes we see the Opposition papers speaking of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce as the big policeman of Ontario, in regard to expenditure. Well, the big policeman has put on the upper shelf in the lumber room his dark lanthorn, he has burnt his baton, he is as conveniently blind, with regard to expenditure, as if he had suffered the fate of John Milton, but we thought that there was one spot in the political world where he might stand erect, and that was the iron duties in the tariff. When he spoke in 1894, he thought he was a power, he thought that if the Liberal party came into office, he certainly would be Finance Minister, and so he did not say: "We, the Liberal party," but "I want to tell those manufacturers that they need not depend on me;" and I fear that one of the reasons why the hon. gentleman was left, not altogether out in the cold, not actually in the street, but in the porch, badly planked, so that from the winds of public opprobrium he is not wholly sheltered—one of the reasons was because, from the very first, it was intended to take the course that had been taken, and finally to stand upon the old Conservative basis.

Now, I will do what some people in the country have more than once taken me to task for doing. I will compliment my right hon. friend who leads the House. I have sometimes got into a scrape for doing this, but I must compliment him on the clever way he took to break the shock to the public mind. I have my own opinion about it from an ethical point of view, but there can be no question as to its effectiveness—allowing first one session to pass, and then another, and then another, allowing four sessions to roll away, and then at last the Minister of Finance took his ground squarely on the Conservative basis. Of course, we know that the public mind is so constituted that it will only resent strongly something it greatly disapproves of—well, about twelve months. Public opinion gets indifferent after about twelve months, but so great was the somersault contemplated by my right hon. friend, that he did not trust himself to merely twelve months, but broke the thing gradually; and what even then was done? Why, within a few months of the Minister of Finance appearing here as a Tory financier, we had the Postmaster General, with his ursine grace, speaking at a dinner to the Prime Minister of Ontario, and saying: "We have carried out our pledges, we have reformed the tariff, and, if anybody is not satisfied, I tell him that there is a worse tariff than a high tariff, and that is an uncertain tariff. You will have to be content with that, and make the best of it." Well, the Minister of the Interior, our own Manitoba and North-west representative in the Cabinet, took as daring a course, although he was not quite so rough and impolite as the Postmaster General. This is what he said at Perth:

> The tariff question in Canada is settled. It is, I venture to say, a dead issue. There will be changes, but as an issue between the parties it is dead. We have already succeeded in solving the difficulty, and our opponents, if in power, would not alter it, because they are satisfied and we are satisfied.

Why, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said he was satisfied, and the leader of the Opposition said he was satisfied.

The PRIME MINISTER. You had better sit down, then.

Mr. DAVIN. No, for I represent the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, who, to a man, resent the way they have been betrayed. They have been betrayed by this Government; they have been betrayed and humbugged by the Minister of the Interior. I do not want to say anything offensive. I could not possibly say anything offensive

in the presence, and certainly still less in the absence, of any one.

And, now, with what we know to have been the history of tariff changes since the 23rd June, 1896, what language would characterize this speech of the Minister of the Interior at Perth? Suppose we were to say it was a timid speech? Suppose we were to say that the Minister of the Interior had a brow of unblushing effrontery, could it be said that we were slandering him? Why, people might think we were very mealy-mouthed indeed. But I want to show something else, he said in regard to this. The Minister of the Interior, when speaking at the Hardy banquet said, that they had settled the tariff question, just as he said at Perth. But I want to read the exact words of the Minister of the Interior, as I find them reported in the "Weekly Globe," of Wednesday, November 16th, 1898—language of the most extraordinary nature, when you consider that the Liberal party had denounced the manufacturers as robbers great and robbers small; that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was the financial critic when the Liberals were on this side of the House used to describe them as having their hands deep in the pockets of the people; that a gentleman who is now a judge—I do not know whether his elevation to the bench was to salve his disappointment for not being made a Minister of the Crown, or whether it was to silence the indignant thunder that he might pour out behind hon. gentlemen because of their course in regard to the tariff—described the farmers as bled white by the manufacturers. Now, listen to what the representative in the Cabinet of the North-west and Manitoba says on the subject:

> We have, therefore, succeeded in bringing about a revision of the tariff which has afforded much-needed relief——

To whom—to the farmer? To the labourer? To the shopkeeper or the tradesman? Let me read it again:

> We have, therefore, succeeded in bringing about a revision of the tariff which has afforded much-needed relief to the manufacturers of this country.

Why, Sir, it is almost incredible. If I had not the words in the "Globe" here, if I could not give you the date, if I were not ready to pass it to the hands of any one who wishes to see it, it might well be said to be incredible.

They have succeeded in affording "much needed relief," not to the farmers of the North-west Territories who were suffering from bondage like the slaves in the Southern States, not to the people generally who were being bled white by the manufacturers, but to "the manufacturers of this country." Now, Sir, in this pamphlet I have here a statement given by the Minister of Finance in his financial statement in 1898 in which he sought to show that some advantages had been given to the people. And he states at page 14, that cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, were brought in under the old tariff of 30 per cent, and then he goes on very fairly to show that they are brought in under the present tariff at 35 per cent. So the Government that were to carry out the resolution I have read, pledging it to do away with a system of tariff that had destroyed the country from every point of view, that Government puts 5 per cent additional on cotton fabrics coming into this country.

Under the preferential tariff, after the 30th June, 1898, this is reduced to 30§ per cent, still five-eighths of one per cent, so far as English goods go above the old tariff, and when the preferential tariff came into full effect from the 1st of July last, the reduction would be to 26¼ per cent, or 3¾ per cent lower than the old tariff. But the old tariff was a wall around the robbers great and robbers small; it was a bastion and buttress behind which these men fattened and grew to be millionaires. And this wall is lowered by taking off a few bricks, lowered by taking off a coping stone here and a coping stone there; but when the people of the country seek to pass their goods over it thus lowered, they seem to be but pigmies so high does it rise; so nearly equal is it to the old tariff that had been so strongly denounced. In the same way curtains, trimmed or untrimmed, were 30 per cent under the old tariff and 35 per cent under the new, but also reduced so far as concerns goods coming in from England.

Now, I will turn to the speech of the Minister of Customs and take the list that he gives. And the figures are correct, but it was one of the most extraordinary and audacious things in the world to put it before the people with a view to convincing them that some promises had been kept. I take what I have taken before and I take them not because I am able to compare the incidence of taxation in the light of another year's experience and in the light of a full preferential tariff:

	Present Tariff.
	p.c.
Springs and axles	35
Wire nails	30
Cut tacks	25
Wood screws	35
Iron or steel nuts and washers, strap-hinges and bolts	42½
Locks, butts and hinges, n.e.s.	30
Cutlery	30
Files and rasps	30
Adzes	30
Cleavers	30
Hatchets	30
Saws	30
Shovels and spades	35
Cotton fabrics, white	35

Let us look a little closer at cottons.

	Old Tariff.	Present Tariff.
	p.c.	p.c.
Cotton fabrics, unbleached.....	22½	25
Cotton fabrics, coloured.....	30	35
Damask of linen	25	30
Table-cloths	30	30
Towels	25	30
Cotton quilts, coloured	30	30
Curtains	30	35
Carpets	30	30
Wool fabrics	30	35
Tweeds, flannels, blankets of all wool	32½	35

When this was first brought to my attention, I took the Trade and Navigation Returns, up to the 30th of June, 1897, and I saw that the columns placing before the people the rates under the so-called preferential tariff were quite illusory. But I grant that a change took place on the 1st of July, 1897, and on the 1st of July last, and instead of having 12½ per cent, there was 25 per cent. I wanted to see what the result was since then, and I found that the figures, as given me by this return, were not of such a character as would enable me to make a precise comparison.

Mr. McMULLEN. They did not prove what you wanted. That is what the trouble was.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I could not get them. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; I will hand over the figures to my hon. friend, if he wishes, such as they are. The impression left on me by looking over the only figures I could get, namely, the figures supplied by the Trade and Commerce Department——

Mr. McMULLEN. Between the old tariff and the new, did you make an allowance for the deduction of 12½ per cent and 25 per cent?

Mr. DAVIN. No, I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Because that would not suit your views.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it suits my purpose admirably, and I will go back to that. Just take cuffs—35 per cent under the present tariff. The calculation was made that under the reciprocal tariff they would be only 26¼ per cent. Is that satisfactory to the hon. gentleman? Will my hon. friend say that 26¼ per cent is carrying out free trade?

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the old tariff?

Mr. DAVIN. The old tariff was 38 per cent, as given by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now it is 28 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. It is 35 per cent. Now, I will run that to the ground. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), surely, with a memory in his brains, unless he has been hypnotized, either by disappointment or by delayed ambition—with the memory in his brains of what he used to say, on this side of the House, of a tariff of 30 per cent, surely he will not contend that 26¼ per cent is a free trade or a revenue tariff. If he will, I will be glad to hear him say it, because he will be received from one end to the other of this country with mockery; and if I should have time to go down to North Wellington, he dare not go back to his constituents and contend that a tariff of 26¼ per cent is a redemption of the promises that were made.

Mr. BENNETT. He is being gerrymandered.

Mr. DAVIN. Gerrymandered or otherwise, I venture to say there are sufficient independent farmers in North Wellington to hoist him higher than Haman—I speak politically—if he takes the position that he takes up here. I say politically, Mr. Speaker, because there is no man breathing the vital air that the literal realization of that suggestion would shock so much, and to whom it would give such enduring pain as to myself. Now, then, take carpets. My hon. friend is a self-made man, and I honour him for it. But he can recall the time when he emerged from one small house into another, and when the laying down of the carpet was an important thing—a most important thing, that is, in the social progress of aspiring manhood. Now, would he like to know what carpets were under the old tariff? Carpets were 30 per cent; under the new tariff they are 35 per cent, and if they come from England, 26¼ per cent. But how many carpets that are used by the farmers and by the tradesmen of Wellington come from England? I venture to say, all the carpets, even in the mansion of my hon. friend, do not come from England. Probably all his come from Turkey. He will find, if he looks at the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the great majority of the moderate-priced carpets come from the United States; therefore, this preferential tariff is altogether illusory. I see the hon. gentleman is quiescent, and I will assume, not that he is satisfied, but that he is silenced.

Now, I am going to take some items in which the people of the North-west are very much interested. Take springs and axles. We get of these from the United States 8,393 cwt., and only 1,984 cwt. from Great Britain; that is to say, according to the last Trade and Navigation Returns, we got of these articles from the United States $23,194 worth, and under the reciprocal tariff, $4,280 from Great Britain. Then, take harrows—under the reciprocal tariff we get none whatever. Then, take cultivators; out of $14,152 worth of cultivators, only $100 worth came in under the reciprocal tariff. What is the good of placing

it there, unless in view of an election? When my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was making that speech last year, I thought perhaps an election was imminent, and that there would not be time to inform the farmers how completely illusory his reciprocal columns were, and under those circumstances I could understand him making that speech; but when, so to speak, we can take the Minister and bring him up before the agricultural tribunal, the forum of the agricultural opinion of this country, and when we can show that his reciprocal columns are illusive, why, it was the greatest mistake in the world to send out that pamphlet, which is a clear demonstration of how completely the people have been—well, disappointed. My hon. friend here (Mr. Bennett) says "humbugged"; and he assures me that you have decided that "humbugged" is a parliamentary phrase. Well, I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to see that you dissent from that opinion, because I was going to raise a point of order and to contend myself that nobody could use, in a Chamber like this, the word "humbugged"; and as you know, Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to keep up the tone of debate in this Chamber, I am very glad to find that you do not agree that "humbugged" is parliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Who says, Carried. Is it one of the timbers in the bottle-necked steamship that is creaking? Well now, Sir, I come to drills: out of $53,806, none came in under the reciprocal tariff. Out of the total amount of drills, the North-west Territories and Manitoba took $45,600. And yet, forsooth, you have the reciprocal tariff held before them here, although, as a fact, not a single dollar's worth comes in under reciprocal tariff. Do hon. gentlemen suppose, for one moment, that the million farmers in Canada, in the North-west and in Manitoba, count for nothing in political dynamics? When the schoolmaster has been abroad, is it to be supposed that those men, devoted to an employment that is more useful to the people of Canada and more useful to any country, where it exists, than any other, will not, when the time comes, make an indignant protest against the way they have been treated by my hon. friends opposite? Of pronged forks, 58,098 dozens, worth $12,419, brought in, 50 came in under the reciprocal tariff. Of hoes, 13,354, worth $2,166, only 232 came in under the reciprocal tariff, costing $85. Out of 1,973 horse rakes, worth $31,578, none came in under the reciprocal tariff. Out of that number of 1,973, the farmers of the North-west Territories and Manitoba, those gentlemen for whom I speak here to-day, took 1,009, costing $15,600. Of the 8,822 ploughs, costing $159,718, how many came in under the reciprocal tariff, under the reciprocal tariff that was to do so much, in regard to which the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was so eloquent? The hon. gentleman is always eloquent, but he sang in a dithyrambic tone of the reciprocal tariff; he was inspired more than usually when he talked about the effect of the reciprocal tariff, and the hon. Minster of Customs (Mr. Paterson), resonant as his eloquence always is, was louder than ever when he talked about what the reciprocal tariff would do. Farmers of Canada, farmers of the North-west Territories, farmers of Manitoba, hear what the reciprocal tariff has done for you in regard to ploughs! Out of 8,822 ploughs, costing $159,718, seven actually came in under the reciprocal tariff, costing $109. It is splendid. Mr. Speaker, I wish that some of those members of the Reform party, whose young days were devoted to the muses, would become vocal again and sing us the song of the reciprocal plough. If we could only get a sonnet on the reciprocal plough, or the reciprocal hoe, or some other reciprocal entity, it would be edifying, at least. Take adzes, cleavers, hatchets, &c., which the farmer is deeply interested in, and I see the perspicuous orb of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) fixed upon me; I want to ask his opinion, because I think he knows all about these things. Of these articles $37,662 worth came in. How many of these actually came in under the reciprocal tariff? Five hundred and sixty-five dollars' worth.

Mr. WOOD. I suppose that, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knew anything about it, he would know that, if there were a 50 per cent preference in favour of England, these articles could not be made in England and brought into this country?

Mr. DAVIN. Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood)? I wonder that the party whips do not go and garrote him. If that be true, what are you to think of the honesty of the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Finance? I thank thee for that word. There is a Daniel come to judgment.

Mr. WOOD. You know that you are talking nonsense.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, we have axes.

Mr. BENNETT. To grind?

Mr. DAVIN. These are not axes to grind, although they might be in the view of hon. gentlemen opposite. These are axes to be used by the honest farmers of Canada, who have homesteads to clear. The reciprocal tariff is held out: Look what the reciprocal tariff will do for you! It will give you axes, if you will go and get them from England, 3½ per cent lower than you did pay for them, although we have put them up a little under the general tariff. The honest Canadian farmer hears this, and having heard my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, in those stentorian and resonant periods that I always liked to hear when he was opposing

me in Haldimand, goes before the farmer and says: Look what you are getting out of this reciprocal tariff! See what these farmers who went across the Atlantic to Birmingham to buy their axes got. Here is the result. Out of $36,711 worth of axes, $8 worth came in under the reciprocal tariff. It must have been a glorious sight to see them bringing these axes in. There must have been half a township of farmers groaning under the weight of this $8 worth of axes that they brought in under the reciprocal tariff. I have only touched the fringe of the great achievement of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think I would be able to cross swords with the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau, and fight him, because, I think, after having $8 worth of axes brought in, I will not say that my hon. friend has not faced anything. Eight dollars worth of axes brought in under the reciprocal tariff? I hope the hon. member for Temiscouata will indulge in another sonnet; in fact, I hope that he will write one sonnet on the reciprocal tariff and a sonnet on each item, showing its worth and recording its triumph. Of saws, $81,111 came in, and how much under the reciprocal tariff? $3,613 worth. You remember, Mr. Speaker, in the days when you used to devote your leisure to the study of Shakespeare that Prince Hal and his friends searched the pockets of Falstaff to find bills to any amount for sack and only a twopenny worth of bread. Prince Hal cries out: What an unconscionable amount of sack to twopenny worth of bread. We can reverse this and mers of Canada generally, and so small a say: What an unconscionable amount of goods brought in under a tariff as high as the old, or higher, and paid through the nose for by the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and by the farmers of Canada generally, and so small a quantity under the reciprocal tariff. Take files and rasps. All the farmers need files and rasps. Out of $73,241 worth, only $9,214 came in under the reciprocal tariff, and as to "tools generally," out of $377,724 worth, only $45,548 worth came in under the reciprocal tariff. And then buggies. It is really laughable to see the little flag of reciprocal tariff raised over buggies. The successful farmer or the son of a successful farmer who has money and who wants to buy a swell buggy, may think he will get it cheaper now on account of the reciprocal tariff. Well, that class do not seem to have brought over a great number, because of $27,382 worth of buggies, only $322 worth was brought in under the reciprocal tariff. I suppose that would pay for two buggies—or probably for one buggy imported for some first-class English swell who could not ride in anything that had not springs made at Sheffield, and that had not been finished up at Manchester.

An hon. MEMBER. Or the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, that would be very proper. He is a farmer, Sir, that I love to contemplate, because he is always so exquisite and so beautifully veneered, that I would take him for a Bond Street swell rather than a farmer who is occupied in seeding down the land. Out of $924 worth of cutters, none came in under the reciprocal tariff. As to wagons; all farmers, not merely the genteel farmer, not merely the kid-gloved farmer, but all farmers are interested in wagons, and wagons to the value of $79,084 were imported, and only $30 came in under the reciprocal tariff. That is something for the hon. members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to meditate upon. I see my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) dreaming on this subject, and I rather think, when I see a sort of expiring gleam over his face, that he may come to my help in this matter, and strike a blow for that agricultural class in Manitoba which he is fain to suppose he is representing. Now, then, we have carriages, and out of $16,112 worth of carriages, how much came in under the reciprocal tariff? None. We imported of "finished parts of buggies," $21,446 worth and none came in under reciprocal tariff. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I promised that when I get through with that, I would turn to cuffs. I could not get my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) to go through this book for me; I suppose he has found it very unpleasant to consult the Trade and Navigation Returns from time to time, but I, who have always delighted in the light literature of blue-books, I find no trouble in devoting a little time to them, and so I turn to cuffs, and here is what I learn. Cuffs, cotton, linen, xyolite or celluloid; we imported of these 10,159 pairs, valued at $2,254, and under the reciprocal tariff 7,921 pairs came in, value $1,676, and paying a duty of $513. Under the reciprocal tariff, cuffs to the value of $1,676 worth, the kind of cuffs that are used by the people, paid $513 in duty, or going well beyond 30 per cent. We see there that this reciprocal tariff is completely illusory. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to read this motion in order to show what its bearing is:

That in the opinion of this House, faith has not been kept with the farmers of the west, since duties have not been reduced on agricultural implements and have been increased on the cheaper cottons,——

I have proved that the promise was made by the Liberal party to reduce the duty on agricultural implements and I have proved that that was not done. I have proved that instead of a reduction being made on cotton that the duty on cottons has been increased.

——and that the quarter per cent preference on goods of English manufacture has, in the case of many staples of which all the people are consumers, been rendered delusive by raising the duty above that levied under the tariff of 1894-5.

Mr. Speaker, I will grant you, that had that 25 per cent reduction been made on the old tariff, I think it would have been a boon, but what I assert in the resolution, and what I have shown in my speech is, that when the Government took it into its head to bring in the preferential tariff, for fear they should hurt the manufacturers, before the preferential tariff was brought into play the old duty was raised. I have shown that from the figures of the Minister of Finance himself, and I have shown it from the figures of the Minister of Customs. The third proposition I lay down in the resolution, I have proved as thoroughly as a mathematician might prove a proposition in Euclid. I have demonstrated what I undertook to demonstrate, and, therefore, I say here, that no honest man in this House can refuse to vote for this motion which I now move, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (King's, P.E.I.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has made a direct appeal to me, it is only fair that I should give him an answer, and in a very few words I think I shall be able to show him that he himself has given me the very best reply I could make to such a motion as this. This motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) comes very much like mustard after dinner; the dinner is over now, the guests have left the table, and there is no use for the condiments of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) had been in earnest about this motion, it seems to me (as it must seem to everybody else) that the proper time for him to have moved such a resolution was when we had the Budget debate before us, and when the Minister of Finance stated, that in the opinion of the Government, though we had not done yet everything we intended to do with the reform of the tariff, still it was of paramount importance that there should be something like stability in the tariff, and that for this year, at all events, the Government would do nothing more.

If my memory serves me rightly—and I think it serves me perfectly well in this instance—and if it were not out of order to refer to a past debate, I think I remember some words uttered by my hon. friend, in which he rather took the view that we had acted wisely in not reforming the tariff this year—that, in fact, we were protectionists, as he was; and I think he paid us a compliment on that score. I do not know that I appreciated the compliment, though, if he repents it now, I shall not find fault with him. At any rate, if he did not do so, some of those associated with him stated that, in regard to the tariff, we had borrowed their clothes, and become protectionists, and, therefore, there was no necessity for having a further reform in the tariff.

My hon. friend, because this is a question of political economy, discussed it with political quotations. He has found a rival poet in this House. Now, the poet speaks of things nearest to his heart. I have a young friend in this House who is attached to me, not only politically, but personally, and who, in a moment of poetic fancy, such as my hon. friend has experienced, has dedicated a poem to myself. As I say, every one who indulges in poetic effusions, speaks of things nearest to his heart, and I remember a poem written by an older poet than the hon. member for Temiscouata, and dedicated to his night-shirt—which, of course, was the thing nearest to the poet's heart. And, as my hon. friend, in a moment of poetic fancy, dedicated one of his poems to his night-shirt, perhaps that is the reason he complains in his motion that cottons are not cheap enough. That is the best answer I can give to my hon. friend on that subject. But my hon. friend also gave his version of the poem of my hon. friend from Temiscouata. Now, I do not dispute the scholarship of my hon. friend. He gave us to-day an English quotation, and I have heard from him quotations not only in English and French, but in Greek, Latin and German. My hon. friend undertook to translate the poem of my hon. friend from Temiscouata. Perhaps, Sir, I may, without any pedantry, claim to understand the French language at least as well as he does, and I may tell him that the word "affronter," which he finds in the poem of the hon. member for Temiscouata, has more than one meaning.

Mr. DAVIN. But not as here.

The PRIME MINISTER. The word "affronter" does not mean simply to face an enemy, but it means "to deceive;" and, when the writer of the poem says, "Il n'a rien affronté," the translation was obvious—"He has been guilty of no deception." Therefore, my hon. friend has the answer in the poem itself, when he says that faith has not been kept with the people of the west; for the hon. member for Temiscouata tells him that he is all wrong—that the leader of the Government has never deceived anybody, or made any false promises. Now, Sir, that is all my answer to my hon. friend on this occasion. There is no need of going into this question to-day; it has been threshed out again and again. If my hon. friend is in earnest, he should have moved his motion at the proper time; and now, that the proper time is past, there is nothing to do but to vote it down.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I was rather amused at the address of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) this afternoon. I have had the privilege of sitting in this House with my hon. friend for a number of years, and I can honestly say that if there is any man in

this House who has an unenviable record on questions of trade, of speaking one way and voting another, it is my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia. He has given us many evidences of his capability of being one thing one day and another thing another. I was looking up his record recently in regard to the many votes he has given in this House. I notice that in 1891 he voted against taking the duty off binder twine, and almost immediately afterwards, on April 7, 1892, in the Regina "Leader," his own organ, he published a long and pointed article on the very heavy duty on binder twine to which the farmers of the west were subjected, amounting to some $400,000 more than their binder twine was really worth. I suppose he came to realize that the farmers of the west were not very well pleased with his vote against taking the duty off, and that is why he took a turn in the other direction. Then, the present Government took the duty off binder twine, and my hon. friend does not give them any credit—he does not say a word about that. He simply declares that the duty should be taken off agricultural machinery of every kind. My hon. friend has a record on that subject, too. When hon. gentlemen opposite were induced to reduce the duty on reapers and binders from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, my hon. friend landed them in his paper and on the floor of Parliament for the manner in which they had acceded to the demands and necessities of the farmers of the North-west, and said they had gone as far as any Government could be expected to go in face of the revenue necessities of the country. Then, when the Minister of Public Works of Manitoba had a seat in this House, he moved to take the duty off binder twine again, and on that occasion my hon. friend did not find it convenient to be in the House. To use a very common or vulgar phrase, he crept under the barn on that occasion also.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the date?

Mr. McMULLEN. If my hon. friend will turn up "Hansard" on every occasion on which he acted so inconsistently, he will find them by the dozen.

Mr. DAVIN. Give us the "Hansard."

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will turn up "Hansard" of the session of 1893, he will find that a motion was moved by the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) that binding twine be put on the free list; and how did he vote then? In April, 1892, he had, through the Regina "Leader," expressed his sympathies with the farmers of the North-west because they were subjected to the payment of duty on binding twine; and in the session of 1893, when the hon. Postmaster General moved to make it free, the hon. gentleman did vote that time, but he voted against the motion. My hon. friend has given us several quotations from the new and the old tariffs in the endeavour to show that, in many instances, the new tariff was higher than the old. But he never gives any credit for the preferential rate, and I find it a common practice for hon. gentlemen opposite, on the platform, when trying to show that the present duties are equal to or in excess of the old duties, to make no allowance at all for the preferential tariff, and that course appears to be followed by their newspapers, particularly the "Mail and Empire."

Then, my hon. friend says that the Government promised us free trade as it is in England. Surely, being a man of extensive knowledge and experience, he must know that England did not jump into free trade at once, just as a man gets out of one suit of clothes into another. He must know that it took a long period of years before England reached the position in free trade which she enjoys to-day. In 1842 she adopted free trade as a principle; in 1844 she abolished the duties on wool and raw material; in 1845 she abolished the duties on some four hundred articles; in 1853 she abolished the duties on 123 articles; in 1860 she lowered the duties on butter and cheese; in 1861 she lowered the duty on paper; in 1866 she reduced the duty on timber; in 1870 she lowered the duty on sugar, and in 1873 she abolished it; and in 1880 she abolished the duty on malt. So that, from the time she first adopted free trade as a principle, in 1842, down to the time when she reached the condition she now enjoys, thirty-eight years elapsed during all of which she was continually making reductions. I contend that Canada has made as great progress in the direction of free trade from 1896 to the present as England did during the first two or three years of her tariff. Surely hon. gentlemen did not expect Canada would have jumped into free trade all at once. No doubt, we would like to see her position financially such as that we could adopt free trade. But she is not in that position to-day, and hon. gentlemen opposite are largely responsible. Were our financial condition to-day such that we could go the length England has gone, we would be very glad indeed.

My hon. friend has taunted the Government with not having implemented its promises as regards taking off the duties on agricultural implements. But he must admit that very considerable reductions have been made. He must admit that the duty has been taken off barbed wire. Also that very considerable and desirable reductions have been made on agricultural implements, such as hoes, spades, shovels, &c. The duty has also been taken off wind-mills, to which, surely, my hon. friend will not object. Our hon. friends opposite have produced one live specimen of a wind-mill, and I trust

they will not produce any more. My hon. friend does not appear disposed to give the Government credit at all for anything, but asserts that they have broken all their promises. I contend that, on the contrary, they have gone a very creditable way in implementing those promises by making many reductions, which no doubt will be followed by more. I am quite sure that the Government will make further reductions just as soon as the financial position of the country will enable them to do so. They have cut down expenditure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, they have, and I hope they will go on in that direction. I know very well that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not feel comfortable over there, but would much prefer to be supporting the Government. No doubt, he looks longingly back to those happy days when he feasted at the public crib. We all well remember that when my hon. friend had not a great deal to do, the late Government sent him away to British Columbia as secretary to the commission appointed to inquire into the propriety of allowing Chinese to come into Canada. He was sent out as secretary, along with the late lamented Mr. Chapleau, who, I think, was commissioner. I do not know what happened the hon. gentleman. Whether it was due to the salubrious, bracing air of the mountains, or the sleepiness produced by the heavier air of the Pacific coast, but he certainly became absolutely oblivious when he got there, so that he was not capable of telling a Chinaman from an African or a Hottentot, and some one else had to take his place. He drew, however, something over $3,000 for his services. Of course, we can understand his anxiety to have a repetition of that experience.

An hon. MEMBER. What was the matter with him ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I could not say, and the report does not state what was the matter, but certainly something must have happened. No doubt, the hon. gentleman would like to go back on another Chinese commission, or something of that kind. He knows perfectly well that when he was supporting the Government he received very desirable patronage, which no doubt he appreciated, and no doubt many of the votes he gave in this House, some of which were contrary to his expressed opinion, were given out of gratitude for the advantages and privileges which he enjoyed.

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether it is in order for an hon. member to say that another hon. member has given a vote because of advantages he has received from the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My personal opinion would be that it would not be in order to impute any motive to any hon. member, and I think it would be just as well not to do so in the future.

Mr. McNEILL. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. gentleman ought not to withdraw a statement of that kind, which no doubt he made hastily, without due consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not impute any motive to my hon. friend at all, I was only reciting certain facts in history. I was only telling the House what his experiences in the past were.

Mr. WALLACE. In further reference to the point of order, let me say that the hon. member for North Wellington did impute motives. He said——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. member for North Wellington was not well understood, but he has just told us that he did not impute any motives, and you must accept his statement.

Mr. WALLACE. He made a statement——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE—that the hon. member for West Assiniboia gave votes in opposition to his speeches.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. So long as the hon. member says that by his statement he does not wish to impute motives, as I understand, he is within the rules. Perhaps we have not understood him perfectly well, and we must accept the statement he is making.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sure Mr. Speaker will hear what I have to say. I only want to have this point clearly understood. If I say that what an hon. member in this House states is untrue, I understand that I am not out of order, even though I do not mean to say : You are a liar.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think there is any point of order in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) says. If I understand well the situation it is this : The hon. member for North Wellington has been charged with imputing motives to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Now, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) denies that. For my own part, I was inclined to believe that he did impute a motive and should withdraw his expression, but he has declared that he has been misunderstood and did not intend to impute motives. Then we must accept his statement. That is the way I understand the rule.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to understand whether, Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. McMULLEN. I have only to say that I——

Mr. McNEILL. For future occasions, I wish to understand the ruling that has been given. The hon. member for North Wellington said—the expressions he made use of was—that no doubt the hon. member for West Assiniboia was influenced in his vote by the fact that he had received certain benefits from the Government of which he was a supporter. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, your ruling is that such a statement as that is in order, if the hon. member who makes it says that he does not intend to impute motives ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule I am applying is, that if we understand an hon. member to impute motives or say something which would be irregular, and if he declares that what we understood him to say was not what he intended to say, we must accept his statement.

Mr. McNEILL. And the hon. member is not to alter his statement ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I was pointing out the course the hon. member (Mr. Davin) had taken in this House in discharging his duties to the country—and his services, in some cases, were such as to be appreciated, I presume—and I was going to show also what the Government had done for Manitoba and the North-west. The hon. gentleman has tried to make out that nothing has been done by the present Government, since they came into power three years ago to carry out the pledges they made ; to reduce the burdens resting on the people of Manitoba. We all know, and the hon. member (Mr. Davin) himself will not deny, that many improvements were made in the tariff which were of benefit to the people of the North-west.

Mr. DAVIN. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman venture to deny that the present Government took the duty off barbed wire ?

Mr. DAVIN. The old Government had brought it down to 12½ per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. But will the hon. gentleman deny that the present Government took the duty off barbed wire ?

Mr. DAVIN. But the real good was done by the previous Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman insists that the Government has done nothing to redeem its pledges. I have heard the leader of the Opposition, over and over again, declare that the Government had not fulfilled one pledge they made to the people, and that statement is repeated from time to time, not only in this House, but in the press. And it is repeated notwithstanding that we have pointed out many promises of the Government which have been fulfilled. Of course, the Government cannot fulfil every pledge in a year, or in two years, or in three. But my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) knows, and will, no doubt, admit it, that Manitoba and the North-west Territories were burdened by a very oppressive tariff of railway rates. He himself has complained on behalf of that people, the people have often complained for themselves. This Government, when they made a bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, arranged to secure a reduction of those rates under which the people of Manitoba and the North-west had suffered for so many years. And what was the result ? We know that a gentleman in this House stated, after a careful investigation, that the advantages reaped by the people under this reduction would be worth $600,000 a year to them. That was a very desirable reduction and it was a carrying out of the promise made by the First Minister.

Mr. PRIOR. What did they pay for it ?

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government gave a certain amount for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. If my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) will take the whole amount given for the construction of that road, he will find that the reduction in what the people will have to pay in goods going in and out will more than cover the whole amount of interest on the sum given. And we not only secured reductions over the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as my hon. friend knows, but we have secured very desirable concessions over the Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

Mr. PRIOR. Is that any reason why you should give them two millions more than we offered ?

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend will admit this—and if he does not, it is true, nevertheless—that when the Government of which he was a member made their bargain for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, there was no stipulation for a reduction of freights and no stipulation that the Crow's Nest Pass road should be utilized not only by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but also by any other company that desired running powers over it on equitable terms. These concessions were secured under the arrangements made by the present Government, concessions which will be of advantage to the people of the North-west for all time. Moreover, my hon. friend from West Assiniboia has given the Government no credit for the reduction on coal oil. The hon. gentleman used to cry loud and long against the duty on that commodity. I do not know that he ever voted against it, because it never suited his party to vote that way. And not only has this Government reduced the duty, but it has increased the facilities given to bring coal oil into Manitoba and the North-west, an advantage

which is even greater than the reduction of duty. Coal oil now can be brought in in tank cars, which could not be done before. Every facility is offered to provide the people of Manitoba and the North-west with this commodity at the lowest price. And my hon. friend knows perfectly well that binders are now admitted into Manitoba and the North-west at 20 per cent. And that is a very low tariff after all. How many other commodities of the same kind are admitted at less than 20 per cent? I contend the rate is very low indeed. The people of Manitoba cannot expect that they alone are to be the cherished children of the entire Dominion. I believe the Government and the Dominion are willing to do everything they can for the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Our sympathies are with them in their struggles to make progress and to become prosperous, and we earnestly hope that every facility will be given to them, consistent with the necessary revenue that the country must gather for the purpose of meeting the demands on the Dominion treasury. But as I said before, when the Government came into power they found that they had to provide for meeting an enormous expenditure, we had an enormous debt, and the interest has got to be provided to pay on that debt. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that, they stand up and find fault with the Government when they have made reductions in expenditure, and again when the Government bring in propositions to reduce the expenditure by reducing the number of civil servants, by dismissing men from the Intercolonial Railway where they are not necessary, and to reduce the expenditure in other directions, immediately a unanimous yell is raised on that side of the House that this is being done for political purposes, that these men are being beheaded because they belong to the Conservative party. Now, that is not fair. When this Government proceed to make reforms, hon. gentlemen opposite charge that they are animated by pure political spleen. But I believe the Government have made commendable advances in the direction of implementing the promises that they made, especially if we take into consideration the difficulties that they have had to face, the enormous troubles that they have had to contend with in bringing about a reform of the condition of things after the extravagant manner in which they were handled the last 17 or 18 years. It was no ordinary undertaking that the Government assumed, and I say they have made commendable advances in the direction of carrying out the promises that they made, and they are going on to implement the others just as soon as they possibly can. We promised that we would abolish the gerrymander, and we intend to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consent to the passage of a Bill that will do away with that infamous Act, an Act the equal of which never disgraced the statute-books of this Dominion. We hope that Act will be abolished, we promised the country that we would do it, and I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will feel it their duty to lend us their countenance and assistance in doing away with an Act that certainly was never put on the statute-book with a desire to mete out justice and equity to the electors of this Dominion. Now, when my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) gets up and recites all the broken promises that he claims stand at the door of the Government, I earnestly hope he will have manliness enough to confess that a very considerable number of those promises have been already fulfilled, and not to try to make the people believe that nothing has been done at all in the interests of those people of whom he claims to be the sole champion in this House. I confess that I greatly pity the settlers of the North-west if their interests, their progress and their advancement are solely dependent upon the efforts of the hon. gentleman. When he supported the Conservative Government he never appeared to accomplish very much. Sometimes he appeared to stand in very bad favour with the Government that occupied the Treasury benches, but there was one thing that I will give him credit for, and that is that however much he kicked, however much he reared in opposition to what he thought was wrong, when it came to a vote he was nearly always found on the right side, or else he was under the barn. Now that he is relieved from the necessity of following a Government, I hope that when he takes up a resolution of this kind again, and attempts to point out where the Government have been lax in fulfilling their promises, he will give them credit for what they have done. But I am quite sure, notwithstanding his loud tones in condemnation of the Government, that when he gets home and addresses the people of the North-west, and when they realize the advantages they have gained by the legislation that has been passed by this Government and the improved condition of things they now enjoy under this Government, they will accept those advantages as a pledge of the good intentions of the Government concerning them, and what they may hope for in the future, and that they will go on and bestow their confidence and support on a Government that have done so much in so short a time for the people of this whole country.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I do not intend to deal with this question at any length, as it has been threshed out time and again in this House already. But the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) thinks that he must bring this motion up annually. I think that every year he brings up some such motion as this, to-day it is with reference to implements. But I do not think that anybody, especially in the North-west, is inclined to take the hon. member

seriously. Nobody does that. As a matter of fact people know that for the last 15 years he has been bringing up these motions for the sole purpose of getting his name into the papers. Why, Sir, just take up the Order paper, and you see what his motions are for. A few weeks ago the grain dealers met at Winnipeg and passed a set of resolutions, a copy of which was sent to every member from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. But we find the member for West Assiniboia, who poses as the farmers' friend, simply put his name to the back of the set of resolutions and handed it in to the Clerk and had it appear on the Order paper as coming from him, to show what he had done for the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west. That explains his whole method of action. Then, again, he introduced a Bill some time ago with reference to pensions for the North-west Mounted Police. He wanted to get a pension for every man of the police force who had served 10 years. Did ever anybody hear of such an extravagant thing? But it served his purpose, because he sent copies of the Bill to every police force post in the North-west and got it stuck on the walls, as I am informed, in order to show the Mounted Police how hard he tried to get a pension for them. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman occupies the same position, he fills the same role in this House that the clown does to a circus, or the end-man to a minstrel troupe. That is about the size of it. This thing has been going on from year to year, but the people of the North-west Territories understand the hon. gentleman. They have come to understand all these things, because he has been shown up time and again in this House, they know his record in the past of moving motions in this House and then voting against them.

Now, he tried to say something about the tariff. I do not intend at this time to go into that subject for the reason, as I said before, that the question has already been pretty wll threshed out. He read from the Trade and Navigation Returns and tried to show that a great many articles which would have been lower under the preferential tariff did not come into the country at all, and, therefore, they had no claim to the reduction. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there were half a million dollars worth of any commodity imported and consumed in this country, and that only $10 worth of that commodity was imported from Great Britain, I claim that the people get the advantage of the reduction on that half million dollars worth, because it is the reduced tariff that regulates the whole amount. For the same reason, if the manufacturers and wholesale men of this country understand that goods can be imported into this country for a certain figure, they have got to reduce their prices to meet that figure, or they will not carry the country's trade. People are going to buy where they can buy cheapest, and if they can buy and import goods from Great Britain at 25 per cent less duty than from anywhere else, they are going to buy from Great Britain.

I have here a statement which I wish to place on "Hansard," showing the old tariff rate, the present general tariff rate and the present preferential tariff rate on manufactures of cotton:

—	Old Tariff.	Present general rate.	Preferential rate.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Duck, gray	22½	22½	16⅔
Duck, white	25	22½	16⅔
Embroideries, white	30	25	18¾
Gray unbleached cotton fabrics	22½	25	18¾
White or unbleached cotton fabrics	25	25	18¾
Fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p.	30	35	26¼
Jeans, coutilles and sateens, imported by corset and dress-stay makers for use in their own factories	25	20	15
Handkerchiefs	30	35	26¼
Batts, batting and sheet wadding, not bleached, dyed or coloured	22½	25	18¾
Knitting yarn, hosiery yarn or other cotton yarn, not bleached, dyed or coloured.	25	25	18¾
Wadding, batting, bleached, dyed or coloured	22½	25	18¾
Knitting yarn, hosiery yarn, &c., dyed or coloured	25	25	18¾
Cotton warps, n.e.s.	25	25	18¾
Warps on beams	25	25	18¾
Seamless bags	20	20	15

Seamless bags are articles that, I think, my hon. friend from West Assiniboia will admit the people of the North-west and of his own constituency, use to a great extent.

Sheets	32½	30	22½
Shirts of cotton—			
Costing more than $3 per dozen....$1 per dozen and	25	35	26¼
Costing not more than $3 dozen	35	35	26¼
Sewing thread on spools	25	25	18¾
Sewing cotton thread in hanks, 3 and 6 cord	12½	15	11¼
Crochet cotton thread on spools, in tubes, or in balls.	25	25	18¾
All other cotton thread, n.e.s.	25	25	18¾
Bed quilts of cotton, white	25	30	22½
Bed quilts of cotton, col'rd	30	30	22½
Clothing	33⅓	35	26¼
Blouses and shirt-waists—			
Costing more than $3 per dozen....$1 per dozen and	25	35	26¼
Costing not more than $3 per dozen	35	35	26¼
Damask, &c., of cotton, n.o.p.	25	30	22½

	Old Tariff.	Present general rate.	Preferential rate.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Cotton bags, made up by the use of the needle, n.o.p....	32½	35	26¼
Hosiery, n.e.s.....	35	35	26¼
Lamp-wicks	25	25	18¾
Shawls	25	30	22½
Socks and stockings..... 10c. per dozen pairs and	35	35	26¼
Tape, not dyed or coloured..	25	25	18¾
Tape, dyed or coloured.....	30	35	26¼
Towels	25	30	22½
Undershirts and drawers— Woven	35	35	26¼
Made by the seamstress....	32½	35	26¼
Uncoloured cotton fabrics, bleached, viz.: Scrims and window scrims, cambric cloths, muslin apron checks, brilliants, cords, piqués, diapers, lenos, mosquito nettings, Swiss, jaconet and cambric muslins, and plain, striped or checked lawns..	25	25	18¾
Velvets, velveteens and plush fabrics, n.e.s.....	30	30	22½
Other articles made by the seamstress from cotton fabrics, n.o.p.....	32½	35	26¼

That is the whole list of cotton goods, and I venture to believe that no one can honestly say, taking the preferential rate into consideration, that great reductions have not been made in this tariff in the interest of the consumers. I procured this list from the Customs Department, and, I suppose, it is correct. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. member for West Assiniboia to the fact that his own leader, in 1897, in this House, did not take the same view of the tariff that the hon. member now takes because he appeared to be very much put out about it. He was afraid that all the industries of the country were going to ruin. I have the statement here, and I would like to read to the hon. member, for his benefit, what his leader said. I suppose that he recognizes the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) as his leader, although, from his record in the North-west Territories, when he was holding meetings up there, one might be suspicious of the fact, because, when an hon. gentleman who is as closely connected as the hon. member for West Assiniboia is with a political party, holds scores of meetings without mentioning the name of his leader, it makes an outsider consider that there is something suspicious, that there is a nigger in the fence. Still, in the meantime, the hon. member for Cape Breton is recognized as his leader, and this is what the hon. gentleman said in 1897:

The result is that this tariff goes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while hon. members gloat, vindictively gloat, over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal "Gazette," where one manufacturer after another declared that those industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

Sir Charles's notion was that these results were to flow from the working of the preferential tariff. He proceeded:

I feel that, so far from rejoicing at it from a party stand-point, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada, and upon its great industries. Still I unhesitatingly say that from a party point of view the hon. gentlemen are doing their own work; they are showing the people of this country that no reliance can be placed upon the most solemn declarations that they make, either in the House or out of it; they are showing the people of this country that, having obtained power, which was all they wished for, they are now prepared to abuse that power at the cost of the sacrifice of the industries of Canada.

That is what the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) said when this tariff was introduced, and now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) tries to make the people believe that nothing has been done for the farmers of this country. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has pointed to the fact that binder twine and barbed wire have been placed on the free list; and the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) interjected: What good has that done? I am sure the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will not agree with him that no good has been accomplished by that, because the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has always announced himself in favour of putting binder twine on the free list. He was in favour of it, according to his speeches in this House, even though, when it came to a vote, he was found opposing it. Now, with reference to the good effect on the farmers of the country which this preferential tariff has, I will read to the House a statement made by Messrs. Stobart Sons & Co., of Winnipeg, large wholesale dry goods dealers, who are good, strong Conservatives and political friends of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). They take several small bills of goods, and they show what duty the people would have to pay under the old tariff, and what they have to pay now under the preferential rate. They had an invoice of goods dated February 2nd, 1897, covering woollen cloths valued at $39, on which the old rate of duty would be $14.25, and under the new tariff the duty would be only $10.24. Still, the hon. member (Mr. Davin) says that nothing has been done by this Government for the

REVISED EDITION.

farmers. This large firm in Winnipeg had another invoice, dated February 15th, 1897, for blankets valued at $2,020, and under the old tariff the duty would be $832.35, but the same consignment to-day would only have to pay a duty of $530.25 under the preferential rate. Here, in a small consignment of $2,000 worth of blankets, the duty is $300 less under the preferential tariff, and that sum is saved to the farmers. Still, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) says that nothing is done by this Government in the way of reduction of duties. Then, this Winnipeg firm takes the value in duty on a single blanket, and they quote a seven-pound planket as being worth $1.50, which is supplied by the Canadian manufacturer. Under the old rate of duty during the Conservative Government, the duty on that single blanket would be 72½ cents, but under the new tariff of the Liberal Government the amount of duty collected on that one blanket would be only 39½ cents; and any one purchasing that blanket under the new tariff would save 34 cents, as compared with what he would have to pay under the old tariff. Is not that a considerable reduction on an article used by every one. Then again, on March 16th, 1897, an importation was made by this same Winnipeg firm of calicoes and prints, valued at $81, and it would pay duty under the old tariff of $24.30, but under the present tariff the duty was only $21.26. Then again, in an invoice for cotton cloth, on February 17th, 1897, the value of the goods was $28, and under the old tariff the duty would be $9.10, but under the new tariff it is only $7.35. On a small consignment like that there is a large reduction of duty, which the farmer gets the benefit of. That is the statement by Stobart Sons & Co., a reliable firm in the city of Winnipeg, who, as I have said, are political friends of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because it is well known they are strong supporters of the Conservative party. Anyway, whether they are Liberals or Conservatives, they would not make a statement that was not true, and I have given you their statement. But the hon. member (Mr. Davin) may say that these goods are not coming into the country. Whether they do or not, that lower rate of duty under the new tariff regulates the price, not only of the goods that are brought in from the United States, but of similar goods manufactured in Canada. If the American manufacturers want to trade in this country, they have to sell their goods as cheaply as the Canadian merchants can lay them down from Great Britain. If the Americans do not reduce their prices, they cannot get the trade of Canada, and they know that, and in consequence they have reduced their prices. That is the reason such a large amount of American goods have been imported into Canada in the face of the preferential rate. The Americans have been obliged to reduce their prices, and the consumers are getting the benefit of it from one end of Canada to the other. In the same way the Canadian manufacturers have had to reduce their prices, or, if they did not, the merchants would go to England and get their goods there. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that only about 1,000 yards of imported cotton has been brought into the North-west Territories this year, and that is because we are using home manufactured goods. If our people could import them cheaper than they could buy them at home, it stands to reason they would do so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Would the hon. gentleman again give the figures for a single blanket?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. The selling price of a seven-pound medium gray blanket is $1.50; the market is supplied by the Canadian manufacturer—I have sold numbers of them myself, and I know something about them. Under the old rate of duty on this class of goods the amount collectable on the one blanket would be 72½ cents, but under the new tariff the amount collectable is 39½ cents. That fact alone goes to show that a great deal has been done for the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) brings up this motion year after year, but neither I nor anybody else takes him seriously. It is brought up for the purpose of doing duty in his constituency, and I suppose in the other western constituencies as well. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) brings this motion to a vote or not, he can get his speech printed, and that speech will be circulated all over, and he will be able to get up on a platform and say to the people of the Territories: Look at what I am doing for you. He will say to the North-west Mounted Police: Look at what I have done for you. Did I not introduce a Bill to get you a pension after ten years' service; have you not read the Bill? Well, they may have read the Bill, but all the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) ever did for them was to introduce it. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that these tactics will not do any longer, because the people now understand him, and they are going to judge the hon. gentleman by what he accomplishes in Parliament, and not by what he says. The records will show that, when he was here supporting the Conservative Government, he accomplished nothing, and he has accomplished nothing since. I believe, moreover, that he is a detriment to the people of the Territories, on account of the way he brings these matters up, because, if he did not act in the peculiar way he does, far more would be accomplished for the people up there.

Even if I were not satisfied with the tariff as a whole, I would be prepared to support this Government for all the other legislation they have introduced, and I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia should take that into consideration; for the tariff is not the only issue in this great country of ours. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), mentioned the fact that the late Government was prepared to enter into some agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and said they were going to get the work done cheaper than the present Government. How were they going to do that? They were going to give away $5,000 a mile of the people's money without getting one cent in return. They were going to tie up the people of the North-west; they were going to hand over to the Canadian Pacific Railway another pass in the Rocky Mountains, and allow them to stand over it with a club and prevent any one else from using it. This Government did give more; they gave $11,000 a mile, but they got in return more than five times what would pay the interest on all that was given. They got reductions on freight rates on all commodities going into the North-west, and on all grain going out. That means a saving of $800,000 every year to the people of Manitoba and the North-west, whereas the whole interest on what was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will not amount to over $100,000 a year. Besides, no monopoly is granted, for we have running powers over that line, and over all branches that may be built from it for all time to come. That shows that it was a good bargain; and if the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) thinks the matter over, he will not again make such a statement as he has made to-day. Now, I do not propose to take up any more time, because, no doubt, the hon. member for West Assiniboia will have a few more poetical quotations to give us. There is one, however, which I would advise him to study; it is from Burns:

> Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as ithers see us;
> It wad frae mony a blunder free us,
> And foolish notion.

If the hon. gentleman could see himself as the people of the west see him, he would make fewer speeches, and parade himself less before the House than he has been in the habit of doing during the last ten years.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I have a few words to say in regard to my right hon. friend's construction of the French language, as he might not be here when this question comes up again. I do not at all question—it would be absurd for me to do so—the right hon. gentleman's standing as a scholar and a man of culture; but I think he will agree with me that though a man who acquires a language cannot hope to speak that language as idiomatically, or to understand its delicate "nuances" of phraseology as well as a man to the manor born, yet in regard to the grammar of that language, the man who acquires it, especially if he has been fortunate enough to have had some training in linguistic studies, need not veil his opinion on a question of grammar before any man, no matter how eminent or eloquent he may be in that language or any other.

The PRIME MINISTER. You must give way to the dictionary, though.

Mr. DAVIN. I will give way to the dictionary; but now I will appeal to my hon. friend. I say that he cannot translate that line into English as he did; it cannot be done correctly. I quite understand that in certain connections the past participle of the verb "affronter" means "deceived," but the right hon. gentleman cannot make the word mean it without placing the man who has written the sonnet, and who, I am told, is a master of expression, in an entirely false position. Let me read it, and there is not a man here, whether he knows French or not, who will not easily understand whether I am right or not: "Il n'a rien affronté." If that is intended to mean what the Prime Minister says it does, that the Prime Minister has deceived nobody, then it does not say it. If the writer of the sonnet meant to use the words in the sense of "deceive," the translation would be: "He has deceived nothing." I am quite ready, of course, to acknowledge that it may seem like a piece of temerity on my part to question the accuracy of my right hon. friend's translation. But I have Littré and other dictionaries here, and I say it is not grammatical if it means what my right hon. friend says it was intended to mean. I am quite ready to submit the question to any competent arbiter, and to submit to any fine that may be necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the course that has been taken by the right hon. gentleman and by other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House proves that I have made an unanswerable case against the Governement on behalf of the people of the North-west and Manitoba; because the Prime Minister, who is the mouthpiece of the pledges made by this present Government, says in reply two things. He says I should have brought this motion up before the Finance Minister brought on his Budget. What he means by that, if he means anything, is this, that if I had brought it up before the Finance Minister brought on his Budget, he, having it called to his attention how he had made those promises and had failed to perform them, would have spoken to the Finance Minister, and the Finance Minister, when

he made his statement, would have given redress. Does the right hon. gentleman forget that last session I brought this motion forward, and brought it forward long before the Budget was brought down? And who on that occasion moved the adjournment of the debate, for the purpose of choking off an expression of opinion by this House? No less a person than the Finance Minister himself. So that that reply on the part of my right hon. friend is entirely out of court. When I brought this question forward on March 30th, 1898, I went more fully into the matter than I have done to-day. I proved to the handle the promises and expectations of the farmers of the North-west; and when the Minister of Finance moved the adjournment and I insisted on a division, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Earle, Mr. Gillett, Mr. LaRivière, Mr. McNeill, Mr. Pope, Mr. Quinn, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Roche, Mr. Sproule, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Wallace, and others voted with me; while Mr. Fielding, the Finance Minister, voted against me. So that that answer of my right hon. friend is not a good one. Then, my right hon. friend passed on to act on the advice of the attorney to the barrister when he had a bad case; not literally, because the right hon. gentleman is too gracious a person to abuse the other side; but he tried to raise side issues, and I must say somewhat frivolous issues.

My hon. friend referred to some productions of mine when I was not so much engrossed in politics as I have been for many years, and when I sometimes fell into the sin of perpetrating verses. I believe that since the cares of state have been on my shoulders, if I may use such a phrase, I have not erred in that way, and, therefore, am not open to the criticism that even if a member of Parliament makes bad verses, he is not bound to publish them. My hon. friend referred to one or two sins of mine of that kind, committed before I became a member of Parliament, and in order to make a case against me, something extraneous to the issue has always to be dragged in, whether my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who will do it politely, has to do it, or whether the dogs from the kennels of the party have to be set on me. My right hon. friend raises, in tones that a rhetorical Orpheus might envy, the side issues, and then, after him we hear the bay and the bark of the following, who do not belong to as high a plane of culture as himself. What is the meaning of that? The meaning is that they have no answer, that there is no defence, and, therefore, they seek to divert the attention of the people from the main question to something that has no bearing at all upon it. When I bring this motion on from year to year, as I intend to do until I succeed, I am met with this sort of retort, or else I am overloaded with abuse for having ventured to bring it forward. I say here now, and I challenge contradiction, in the face of the strident and unfounded utterances to the contrary in my regard that have come from hon. gentlemen of the calibre of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that during the tenure of office of the late Government, by the independent course I took in this House I accomplished more, as "Hansard" and the statute-book will show, for the North-west Territories than was ever accomplished by any private member.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. We had the bark a short time ago, and now we have the bray. That is my reply to the hon. member for North Wellington. With reference to the irrelevant matter which was brought in, I have nothing to say. For instance, he said that I got some advantages from the late Government, Sir. you have only to look to the Auditor General's Report for four or five years before 1895, and you will see that in consequence of the independent course I took in this House, the Conservative Government boycotted a newspaper with which I was supposed to be connected, and gave all the patronage to the Grits, both advertising and printing.

Mr. McMULLEN. You had sold the paper then.

Mr. DAVIN. The paper was sold in 1895, and I say that from 1891 to 1895, the hon. gentleman will find that five-eighths, nay, nineteenth-twentieths of the printing and advertising were given to the Grit paper, and the paper in which I was supposed to have an interest was boycotted. During the time the late Government was in power, and I made that statement when Sir John Thompson was here and he endorsed it, I never, from the time I became a member of Parliament—and I believe I could say before that—uttered a word to any Minister on any subject in which I was personally interested. Therefore, at this time of the day, when it is known throughout the length and breadth of the land, what manner of politician I have been—whether as a member of Parliament or not—to rise here and suggest that I ever did anything from personal motives is uncalled for and simply playing into my hands.

The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that I was secretary to two commissions. I was secretary to the Canadian Pacific Railway commission, and what are the facts about that? I am glad to see my hon. friend the member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) here. When I was appointed secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway commission, my first intimation was from the Secretary of State, and I went and saw the hon. gentleman who is now leading the Opposition and I told him I wanted to give up the appointment. Sir John Macdonald was then on his way across the Atlantic, and my hon. leader here said to me: Sir John

Macdonald wishes to have you on that commission, and he is now away, so do not take a course that may displease him. I wanted to give the appointment up, because I did not think it would be of any financial advantage to me. It took me away from Toronto and broke up an arrangement I had formed, and destroyed, for the time being, my professional connection. I was assured by my right hon. friend, the late Sir John Macdonald, that the commission would not last beyond the long vacation. I said there were two reasons which disposed me against accepting it. In the first place, I could not take it if it went beyond the long vacation, and, in the second place, I could make more out of my time than that commission would give me. Sir John Macdonald assured me that it would not go beyond the long vacation. Then a great man, who is a professor, and plays an important part in the literature of this country, came out in one of the papers, "The Telegram," I think, and said, speaking of that commission, that Judge Clarke was a partisan very much under the influence of Sir John Macdonald, that Mr. Miall was an employee of the Government, and Mr. Keefer was a creature of the Government, but that so long as Mr. Davin was secretary of the commission, there was a guarantee to the public that nothing crooked would be done; and for that reason, though I desired to leave the commission at the end of the long vacation, and when the late Mr. James Beattie wrote me letter after letter, which I can produce, urging me to come back to my duties in Toronto, I had to remain with the commission as the result of my resignation would have been to give colour to the statements made by the "Globe." A more thorough inquiry, an inquiry more completely without fear or favour, than that, at the head of which was Judge Clarke, never was made.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 152, Letter M of the Senate) respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

MONTREAL ISLAND BELT LINE RAILWAY.

On the Order being called for the House to resolve itself into commitee on Bill (No. 112) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Lemieux.)

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At the request of the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, I ask that this Bill be allowed to stand until Wednesday night.

Mr. BERGERON. Why?

An hon. MEMBER. Explain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The members of the Harbour Board are here and they find that some of the provisions of this Bill interfere with the properties under their control, and they wish to have it left over until Wednesday night in order that they may look into it. I think that is a reasonable request and one that might be granted, under the circumstances, without opposition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have seen two members of the Harbour Board and I know what—I can hardly call them objections—but what the statements are that they make. They pretend that the Belt Line Company should not build any part of this line on the harbour property, unless permission be granted. Of course we have no objection to that, as we have no right to infringe on any of the Crown's properties without the permission of the Crown.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) desire to go on with the Bill?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not object to the Bill standing over.

CIVIL SERVICE—ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 38) respecting the attachment of salaries of public officers and employees of the Government.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

Mr. JOHN H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I must say I have great sympathy with the object of the Bill. I have a very high opinion of the civil service of Canada. It is as independent and efficient as any that can be found on the face of the globe. As a general rule the members of the civil service pay their debts. But there are some exceptions to the rule; and it is to provide for these exceptions that this Bill is introduced. What power has the tailor or the grocer or the landlady to enforce payment of bills against a civil servant debtor? Of course they can sue and get judgment and issue execution: but the debtor has no lands against which the judgment will attach, there is no goods upon which execution can be levied. Hence the employee of the Government is in a position to laugh at the process of the court. Is that the only remedy? No, there is another. The merchant can make an affidavit that he has a judgment and cannot enforce it. He may cause to be issued a judgment summons calling upon the man to show cause why he should not appear and be examined, touching his means of paying his debts. The defendant pays no attention to

the judgment summons, and the order goes as a matter of course, for him to be examined. At the next court he appears, and tells the best story he can—the number of relations he has to support, what he has to pay out of his salary, and so on. The judge makes an order against him probably for a payment of $5 a month. At the end of the first month, the $5 is not paid. What then is to be done? Another summons is taken out calling upon the debtor to show cause why he should not be committed to jail for not paying as ordered. On the strength of this last process, the merchant gets his first instalment. You can easily see that this is very unsatisfactory. It actually costs more to collect the debt than it is worth. So one can easily understand how the merchant, the boarding-house keeper and the tailor are very anxious to have a law enacted to give them greater power in the collection of their debts. They cannot see any valid reason why the civil servant should be placed in a better position than the employee of a railway company. If the employee of a railway company owes a bill, you can garnishee the amount by serving a process on some officer of the company. They naturally wonder and ask why the civil servant should be placed in a better position than the employees of the railway. Is it because he has a poorer salary? That reason does not obtain, because he gets not a poorer but a better salary. His emolument is a generous one. If any man wants to know how generous, let him walk out from Sparks Street in the direction of Stewarton, and look at the beautiful houses erected in that direction. A great proportion of these houses belong to members of the service. And how have they got them? They have saved out of their salaries—honourably saved, enough to provide themselves with these beautiful—and in some cases, magnificent residences. The civil servant, in respect of his salary, gains at both ends. He gets $50 increase yearly, or did until recently, and that as a matter of course, whether efficient or otherwise, he got it by lapse of time. He gains at the other end because of the greater purchasing power of his money. Each year he can buy more groceries and more clothes for $50 than he did the preceding year. Therefore, there is no valid reason why members of the service should not be made amenable to the law to the same extent as persons in the employ of the railway companies. Now, an objection has been raised to this Bill. The moment you give power to garnishee the civil servants' salary, what will be the result? A man sometimes goes into the service who had, perhaps, already been in debt, and he comes here as to a city of refuge. There is no blame to him for that, but the moment you give power to garnishee for the debt, that moment you place him in the hands of his old creditors. They would have power to take away all his salary, and so render it virtually impossible for him to continue in the service. Now, that is not an objection to the principle of the Bill. Besides a provision may be made that this Bill shall not apply to any debts contracted by the civil servant prior to the time when he became a member of the service.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am willing to accept that suggestion.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Then, another objection is raised, viz., that too much labour and responsibility will be thrown upon the head of the departments. Now, it is no reason why a merchant should not have his rights because it may entail a burden upon the head of a department. More than that, if you look at the matter closely you will see that there is really little extra trouble entailed. The moment the head of the department receives the process from the court attaching the salary of the employee, it is only necessary for the head of the department to write a letter to the clerk of the court whence the summons issued, stating the amount of salary and how much of that salary is accruing due at the end of the month. Then, when the order is made under the seal of the court and that order is lodged with the head of the department, at the end of the month he simply charges up the amount of the judgment against this man's salary, and pays him the balance. That is a simple process. Of course, some complications may arise where the department may require to employ an attorney. For instance, if a man voluntarily attempts to assign his salary before the end of the month, and a notice of that assignment is served upon the department, I can imagine that the department may be obliged to employ some one to safeguard its interests In all cases provision should be made in this Bill by which the whole costs should fall upon the civil servant and not upon the department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, from these considerations I do not see that any valid objections can be urged against this measure. We are not treading upon ground that has not been trodden before. Other provinces have set us the example. In the great province of Ontario we find a law authorizing the salaries of its civil servants to be garnisheed. It is the same in other provinces. We are only asked to follow in the footsteps of precedents well established—laws satisfactorily in operation. There can be no reason why this Bill should not pass, and why the members of the civil service should not be placed exactly upon the same footing as other men in the community, and be compelled to pay their honest debts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman promoting this Bill to the interpretation he puts upon the word "salary." I may be

wrong, but I do not understand that any garnishee laws of any of the provinces enable the creditor to garnishee anything but a salary or wage. An attempt is made here to extend that—whether it is desirable or not, is a matter for the committee to consider. I think he ought to be satisfied to embrace the salary simply, and not to include other items such as fees, or allowances, or other moneys than salaries or wages. I do not know what it is intended to cover by that, but you are getting into all kinds of difficulties by enabling fees to be garnisheed. I do not see how it can be done. I do not believe it can be done. I believe it is a great blot in the Bill. I believe it is a mistake, and I think the hon. gentleman will achieve his object, if the committee are with him in the principle of the Bill, by leaving the word "salary" to embrace salary and wages, and leaving out the words "allowances, moneys, emoluments or fees." By introducing those words into it, you encumber the Bill with many difficulties that you will find it almost impossible to overcome. I do not see what good you are going to do. Your object is to attach the salary of civil service employees. That may be a good object or it may be a bad one, it may be capable of achievement or it may not, we will discuss that as the Bill goes on. But I think the hon. gentleman will be well advised if he limits the Bill to what he really desires to achieve, enabling the court to attach the salary or wage of the man, and not emoluments or fees. Something else than salary or wages is not a thing that can be attached, and we should not attempt to do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. When a judge is called upon to decide as to the percentage to deduct from a man's annual income, call it salary or call it allowance, in deducting that amount the judge should be in a position to know the amount of the man's income, and whether it is all salary or whether it is called allowances. Now, I give my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries an example. We know that there are a number of civil servants in the departments drawing extra allowances for supposed extra services; and why should not these men pay a certain percentage of that extra allowance given them annually, as well as a certain percentage of the salary towards paying their honest debts? Take, for instance, any of the Deputy Ministers, take the Clerk of the Supreme Court, take the Clerk of the Exchequer Court, take any civil servant; I say that any money that that official receives as a civil servant, in the discharge of his duty, whether it is called salary or whether it is called allowance, no mattter what it is called, the whole sum should be part of the amount he has to pay in the satisfaction of his honest debts, so long as it is a fixed annuity. There may possibly be a case in which a clerk is allowed a certain amount for the performance of some specific duty. For instance, a clerk in the Marine and Fisheries Department might be required to get up a return, and the hon. Minister might be willing to allow him something for it. I do not say that that amount should be included, but where there is a fixed sum received as a regular annual allowance by a civil servant from year to year, which is not called salary, and which is not put down in the civil service report as salary, it should be taken into consideration when you are going to take the power to make him pay his honest debts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) does not grasp the objection I took. You are attempting to put civil servants on the same level as any other citizen who owes a debt to another citizen. You are going further than that, in my opinion. Speaking under correction, my recollection is that, when I was in active practice, you were only allowed to garnishee the debt due and nothing more than the debt. If you were allowed to attach the salary or the wages, that covers everything. I was not very much in favour of this Bill when it was introduced last year; I am not very much in favour of it now. I think the hon. gentleman is getting into deep water. I think that if a small fee is payable to a man it is not a matter that should be garnisheed. Where you give a gratuity to a man it should not be garnisheed. The judges of the land are civil servants, and the hon. gentleman is taking power from this Parliament to attach the salaries of the judges.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER. That is what we want.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An hon. gentleman says that is what he wants, but there are a great many considerations to be weighed before we grant that this is the right thing to do.

Mr. POWELL. That is what the public want.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not quite sure about that. The judges of the land are appointed to discharge certain important judicial functions.

Mr. FOSTER. Why should not a judge pay his debts?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not saying that he should not pay his debts. I never argued that; I think he should pay his debts, but it does not follow that an allowance given to a man to live upon should be taken from him in order to pay his debts, and he be de-

prived, perhaps, of what the country has a right to expect from him.

Mr. FOSTER. That debt may be another man's living.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That may be, and if we are satisfied that it is desirable that a judge or any other man occupying a position of that kind, should be subjected to have his salary attached and taken from him, well and good, but I think it is just as well that we should not do anything of the kind. I do not think it is desirable that judges of the land should practically have their salaries attached to pay a debt that any man may claim as due from him.

Mr. FOSTER. In the question of attachment, would not the debt have to be proved first ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, of course the court would have to give judgment. I suggested to the hon. gentleman, when he introduced his Bill last year, that instead of introducing a Bill that would more or less encroach upon the principle that the local legislatures should declare what the practice should be, he should content himself with the simple declaration that the salaries of officers of the Government should be liable to attachment as well as those of others. He might leave it to the different provinces to apply it as they choose. Instead of that, the hon. gentleman comes in to usurp the powers of the local legislature by declaring what machinery shall be adopted to recover a debt. I do not want to give an off-hand opinion ; I do not know whether this is constitutional or not, but I have my doubts upon it. It is infringing upon the prerogatives of the local legislatures.

Mr. POWELL. It is a civil procedure.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I do not know whether we have power to pass such legislation ; my own judgment is that it would be well to confine the word "salary" to salary or wage, which covers everything, leaving the emoluments, fees, moneys and allowances to stand by themselves, because, I think, you will give rise to an immense deal of complication by introducing in this Bill that which I do not think is present in any provincial legislation. Can the hon. gentleman produce a provincial Bill showing that fees are attachable ?

Mr. THOS. FORTIN (Laval). Mr. Chairman, I happen to know something about this Bill, in favour of which I have expressed myself a good many times. It has always been to me a matter of surprise that a law of this kind was not passed at the very first opportunity. I was astonished that the first Bill presented two or three years ago, was not even discussed in committee, and I was even still more surprised last year when I heard some of the ablest and oldest members of the House, even some hon. members of the Cabinet, opposing a measure of this kind. Of course, I attribute this astonishment of mine to my being a new and inexperienced member, having new and simple ideas ! I believed, in my simple notion of things, that public officers, such as judges, postmasters, customs officers, who received large salaries, who by their own position ought to be an object lesson and to give an example such, for instance, as the judges, should come under the general rule of the ordinary common law applicable to every man ! In my innocence, I even went further. I believe a man occupying the position of a judge—and I see that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) makes an especial exception in favour of the judges—occupying the position of a judge, who has to administer the law, who can, in many cases, send a man to jail for stealing a loaf of bread for his children or his wife, should be only too proud to be able to tell other people that he was subject to the ordinary laws. If any one—I do not think it is possible—but if any gentleman occupying such a high position should so far forget to pay his legitimate debts, I think the law should be made applicable to him as well as to other people. Last year when the discussion of this Bill in committee was in progress, an hon. member asked whether the Bill was to be applicable to the judges. I happened to be speaking at the time. I did not, of course, answer the question, because it was far away from my mind that anybody should suggest that a judge should neglect to pay his legitimate debts, but I said, and I still believe, that if there could be found in the whole country one judge who will not pay his legitimate debts, we should have a special law applicable to him, if that object could not be secured by a law of this kind. Of course I understand that I am inexperienced in matters of this kind, and that my ideas may be new, but nevertheless I am strongly convinced that this Bill is a good one, and should be passed at once. The principle of the Bill is not attacked ; that is a point in favour of the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). Now, what are the objections ? Last year the Bill as it came before the House contained only one clause, which was equivalent to a consent on the part of the Dominion Parliament that the sums voted to be paid as salaries to public officers and employees, should be attached in the hands of the Government as any other garnishee. The objection was made last year, that the Bill was incomplete, was too short, was too simple, but this year we are met with the objection that the Bill is too complicated. Last year it was said that the Bill contained no machinery as to how the

attachment should be made, and this year we are met with this objection: Why, there are too many provisions; you deal with the procedure, and that belongs to the provinces. My opinion is not in accord with these objections, and I beg to differ from what has been said with reference to the procedure. As to the question of what is seizable or what is not seizable, or what proportion is seizable and what proportion is not seizable, I admit that that is within the jurisdiction of the provinces, because it is comprised within the constitutional Act under the head of "property and civil rights." I have looked carefully into the British North America Act and I cannot find a single provision which would make the subject of attachment itself, come under the authority of this Parliament. But, Mr. Chairman, although the provinces may make laws to declare what proportion of the salary of a public officer or a public servant shall be seizable, it does not follow that it can be attached. And why? For the simple reason that the Dominion Government is not amenable before the courts, because the Crown cannot be sued except with its own consent. In the case of a petition of right, for instance, there is a statute which enables an ordinary subject to bring in a petition of right, and the first thing to be done is to obtain the fiat of the Attorney General; the consent of the Crown. This Bill says in effect: We, the Parliament of Canada, declare that in future the Crown consents to be attached.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) permit me a moment. What seems to me to be inconsistent and peculiar is, that you give the right to the creditor of the civil servant to attach the salary, though it is not proposed, nor does the law now permit, the civil servant to sue for that salary himself. He has to obtain a fiat for a petition; so that you really give his creditor a greater right over that salary than you allow the civil servant under the law as it now stands.

Mr. FORTIN. I do not consider that to be a very weighty objection. We cannot suppose a civil servant remaining as such and being obliged to sue the Government for his salary. That is an hypothesis that I do not think ever will take place. But let us suppose such an emergency, and what would happen?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Suppose he were dismissed he would not hesitate to sue them.

Mr. FORTIN. He might sue then, but he would come under the ordinary rule of having to ask for the consent of the Crown. There are probably ten or fifteen thousand public employees drawing salaries from the Dominion Government all over the country. The Bill is dealing with them, and an exceptional case of one out of ten thousand would not, I think, be a very strong argument against this Bill. As I was about to say: what the Bill gives is the consent of the Crown to be attached. The attachment is obtained; that is to say, it is an order of the court, by which the garnishee as well as the defendant are summoned to appear; the defendant to show cause why his salary should not be attached, and the garnishee to declare what he may owe, or what may be due by him in the future, to the defendant. It is because the attachment is a suit that up to the present time it has been found impossible to attach the salary of a public officer, when such salary is derived from the Dominion Government.

Mr. POWELL. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) passes from that, I would like to ask him a question in respect to the matter suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). You are working on the supposition that you are going to make the Crown a party, which is essential, there is no doubt about that; and as the Minister suggested, this Act contains no machinery by which you can make the Crown a party. The local legislature cannot make the Crown a party. The requirements of the law are not fully complied with in this legislation. Even though it passes, I do not think it would operate at all.

Mr. FORTIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) has apparently not read the whole Bill. The machinery is well defined in sections 3, 4, 5 and following.

Mr. POWELL. Let me put an instance. We will say that the Crown disputes the claim that you are attaching, and says that there is no debt due, or says that the employee has been guilty of laches or misconducted himself in his office, so that really the Crown does not feel like paying him anything. How can you proceed in that case?

Mr. FORTIN. There is no law which prevents the Crown from bringing in an attachment.

Mr. POWELL. If my hon. friend is a practising lawyer, and I presume he is—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. POWELL—then he must know he has to make the Crown a party in some way, and there is no provision in this Bill for making the Crown a party.

Mr. FORTIN. I do not know whther the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) is a practising lawyer or not, but judging from what he says I doubt very much that he is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FORTIN. It is very clear under sections 2, 3 and 4.

Mr. POWELL. Where is the authority to make the Government a party ?

Mr. FORTIN. I will show you. Subsection 3 says :

A copy of the writ or attachment shall be served at the office of the head or deputy-head of the department in which the public officer is employed, or from which he receives his salary.

Mr. POWELL. Does that make the Crown a party ?

Mr. FORTIN. Allow me to proceed for a moment. I do not know how in the other provinces one is made a party to a suit, but in the province of Quebec and in most civilized countries, a party is made a party to a suit by being served with a copy of the summons.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That does not apply to the Crown.

Mr. FORTIN. Of course it will apply to the Crown.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. FORTIN. Why ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. Before you could make the Crown a party you would have to have a fiat, and get a petition of right.

Mr. FORTIN. Exactly, if this Bill is not passed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must see that that Bill does not make the Crown a party, because one of the Crown officers is served. Suppose I were to be served with a summons issued against the hon. gentleman, would that make me a party simply because it was served on me ?

Mr. FORTIN. According to our ideas of law and procedure in the province of Quebec, a person might be made a party to a suit against whom nothing was claimed. For instance, I ask for the cancellation of a deed of sale made by my debtor to a third party ; I can take my conclusions against the debtor as to the cancellation of the deed, and make the third party merely what we call a "mis en cause"—a party to the suit merely to annul the deed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That does not apply to the Crown in Quebec, any more than in any other province.

Mr. FORTIN. Because no action can be taken against the Crown without the Crown's consent ; but, if this Bill passes, it provides for the consent of the Crown.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not expressed.

Mr. FORTIN. I think it is, in section 2. If the Parliament of Canada lays down the rule that the Crown can be attached exactly as a third party will it not be a party to the suit ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not under that clause.

Mr. FORTIN. Under that clause and the following, which provides how the writ is to be served—in the hands of the Minister or the Deputy Minister. Then, another clause provides what shall be the duty of the Minister. Now, suppose this would not make the Crown a party to the suit, what law is there in force which will prevent the Crown intervening in such a suit and contesting it ? What harm can result from this ? The writ is served in the hands of the Minister or the Deputy Minister. He reports what is due, or that nothing is due. Then, if the suing creditor wants to go further, if he wants to say that that declaration is not in accordance with the facts, then, he will have to apply for a petition of right. It seems to me there can be no question on this point. The object of the Bill is merely to give the consent of the Crown, because, if such consent were not necessary, we would not want the Bill at all. If the members of the civil service were not paid by the Government, their salaries could be attached.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The mere fact of a Bill passing does not necessarily imply that proper provisions are in it.

Mr. FORTIN. There may be difference of opinion as to the merits of the Bill ; but, so far as I can judge, the Bill meets all the requirements of the case. I may say that this Bill is framed in a very large degree on a statute passed in the province of Quebec in 1875. Though that Bill has been in existence for twenty-four years, not a single defect has been pointed out in it by the judges.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman, if the practice under that Bill is to make the Crown a party in the process ?

Mr. FORTIN. Yes, a party by garnishment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman remember whether there is an express provision in the Bill for that purpose ; or is there any general provision in the legislation of Quebec which would be applicable to a Bill of this kind, not requiring the naming of the Crown, where the Crown is interested ?

Mr. FORTIN. The statute passed in 1875 only deals with the employees of the province of Quebec. The procedure in ordinary cases, is the ordinary procedure in matters of petition of right. There is a local statute embodied in our Code of Civil Pro-

cedure in regard to the local government, and there is a federal statute in regard to the Federal Government. With regard to subsection "c," I think it should stand as it is. There might possibly be struck out the word "fees." The Bill deals with public officers and employees of the Government, There are public officers who are not employees of the Government, who are not in receipt of a salary from the Government. For instance, the judges are not employees of the Government, or civil servants, but they are public officers; and they cannot be said to draw a salary, at least not according to our understanding of the word in French. A judge does not receive a salary; he receives an emolument.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A judge receives a salary, does he not?

Mr. FORTIN. Not according to the meaning of the word in French. He receives an emolument or a "traitement," or an "honoraire d'office"; but he does not earn a salary. There can be, however, no difficulty, because call it what you will, whether a salary, emolument, fee, allowance or wages, the object of the Bill is clear. It only applies to persons receiving an annual or monthly allowance from the Government. It does not apply, for instance, to the member of this House or the Senate, or any person receiving a special fee for any particular service rendered to the Crown, but only to those who receive a monthly allowance, salary or fee, or whatever you choose to call it. I do not think that on this point any serious objection can be taken.

I repeat what I have said. I am still under the impression that this Bill is a good one, and should be passed at once. I have studied it very carefully and compared it with our own statute of the province of Quebec, which has been in force for twenty-four years, and given uniform satisfaction. I have listened to the many objections against this Bill and do not find one good one. The reason advanced last year was that it will embarrass the Government. That is a great mistake. That assumes that there are so many public officers who do not pay their debts, that each department will be flooded with attachments, but to make any such assumption is unjust to the civil service, who, as a rule, pay their legitimate debts. There are exceptions, and this Bill is intended to meet those exceptional cases, but, as a matter of principle, whether there are exceptions or not, does it stand to reason that the best paid men in the whole country are to constitute a privileged class? I do not know really to what particular school I may belong, whether the English or the French school, but I belong to that school which takes as its basis the principle of equality before the law. I want to see everybody equal before the law, to be judge, crier or bailiff. I am scandalized when I enter a court-house and see the judge presiding, personifying justice, and enjoying a salary or emolument of some $5,000 or $6,000 or $7,000 a year, and who, if he chooses to refuse payment of any just claim, cannot be forced to pay it. Just in front of him sits the clerk of the court, who receives $1,000 a year, and a portion of whose salary you can attach. Then, there is the crier, receiving $500 or $600, and if he does not pay you can attach a portion of his salary, but the lord, the almighty lord, personifying the ideal of justice, need only pay if he chooses to do so. I say that is a scandal. I admit that these notions of mine may be very primitive and rude, but I confess that I cannot make up my mind to the conclusion that the law which sanctions this is a good law. I sincerely hope that the members of this committee will put no obstacle in the way of passing this Bill as soon as possible. There may be imperfections in it, no one pretends that it is perfect; but it is a step in the right direction, and I think it will work very well. There will be no such flooding of attachments as is dreaded. The mere knowledge by a civil servant that a portion of his salary may be seized will excite in him, to a certain extent, a certain sense of shame. I would be ashamed, if I were a judge receiving $5,000 or $6,000 a year, to see my salary attached in the hands of the Minister of Justice. The mere existence of such a law will make civil servants more careful. If they go into debt, they will do so knowing that a portion of their salary is liable to seizure, and will take the better care to pay their just and legitimate debts. There may be exceptional cases of misfortune, but the Canadian people are not so exacting as to shut their eyes entirely to exceptional cases. When a man is unable to pay his debts, on account of illness or some other misfortune, his creditors are not usually Shylocks in this country. In fact, they are not sufficiently Shylocks, perhaps, and so far as I am concerned, I intend to support the Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend must be in error in coming to the conclusion that the moneys paid our judges for the work they discharge are not salaries. If he will turn to the statutes which authorize these payments, he will find that the moneys are throughout defined as salaries—the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court, the salaries in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, &c., of the several judges, shall be so and so. All through the statutes, whenever any money is made payable to a judge, it is called a salary.

I am not going to argue very much against this Bill, if the sense of the committee is in its favour, but I submit that it is going further than any legislation has gone yet. I understood the proposition to be that we should extend to the public employees of this Dominion the same liabilities that are applied by the provinces to their employees.

But you do not stop there, and I ask why do you use words which may give rise to a great many difficulties? For instance, the travelling fees of a judge are to be attached, when he travels on circuit. I say that is not right.

The hon. gentleman says there is no argument against this Bill. I submit that there are very strong arguments against it. This principle of attaching the debts of workingmen was first introduced in England in 1854, but has been several times amended by withdrawing salaries from liability or attachment. For instance, take the case of the merchant seamen; so great was the evil arising from the law which enabled creditors to attach the salaries of merchant-seamen that a statute had to be passed by the British Parliament exempting the wages of seamen from attachment, so that their families might have something to live upon and not have the wages go to the one creditor, who manage to serve through some sharp practitioner, the first garnishee process. Not much time elapsed before the evils in the system were found to be so great that a statute had to be passed to remedy them. In 1870, a statute was passed called "The Wages Attachment Abolition Act," providing that the wages of any servant, labourer or workman should not be liable to attachment; and after an experience of many years with regard to the Merchant Seamen's Act and the Labourers and Workmen's Act, the law was again amended, and daily wages were not allowed to be seized by the first person issuing a garnishee process.

The idea of the hon. gentleman may be a very good one, but it will have to be worked out with very great care. And the hon. gentleman is attempting to substitute a provincial court for the Court of Exchequer. He is attempting to empower the provincial court to serve its process beyond the jurisdiction of the province. I ask: Can that be done? The provincial court can issue a writ within the limits of the province, but can it issue a writ outside the province? Perhaps it can. If we constitute a Dominion court, I can easily understand how this power can be given.

Mr. FORTIN. There is the election court.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a Dominion court; and in a case where this very objection was taken that you could not serve a member of Parliament out of the province, it was held that, inasmuch as this was a Dominion court, this Parliament could give it power to serve a writ outside the province. But nobody suggests that these provincial courts are to be made Dominion courts. You are trying here a new experiment, seeking to give to provincial courts power to serve without the province. That is a matter that will have to be decided. I want to ask this committee, if you are going to make a civil servant of the Government liable to a garnishee process the same as every workman, why not simply say in this Bill that his salary or wages shall be liable. Why use too many words?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to say just a few words with regard to the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Hon. members will recall that, when I introduced this Bill last session, it was severely criticised, among its critics being the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). And we got so tangled up in the different opinions of the lawyers that the laymen of the House did not know where they were at. I suggested that we should at least go on with the Bill, and, if there was anything wrong about it, it could be decided in the courts. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that he suggested that I should confine myself to a general declaration. He would probably be surprised to know that I adopted his suggestion last year, and simply made the declaration, removing the barriers and leaving the provincial laws to be applied in the case of the Dominion civil servant. The hon. Minister was strongly opposed to it——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say a word about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman did not assist the Bill, and was one of those who opposed it most strongly. And during the year I sought to have a perfect Bill proposed. I thought about it from month to month, and sought to provide the necessary machinery, seeking the assistance of the best legal talent I could secure, and now the hon. gentleman meets me with the question: Why did you not confine yourself to a simple declaration, without any machinery? It is utterly impossible to know how we are to please these hon. gentlemen. Like my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin), I came to this House with all the enthusiasm of youth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am quite free to make the frank confession. I supposed that, when I got here, I should find a burning desire on the part of everybody to advance liberal legislation; that such a Bill as this, being just what the people of Canada wanted, would at once win the cordial support of all the representatives of the people. It seemed to me to be the most reasonable, the most liberal, proposition that could be placed before this Parliament or before the people of Canada—that all men being born equal, all men should stand equal under the law. And I thought that if I introduced a Bill obviously based on that principle, everybody's hand would be raised for it. It seemed to be an outrage, a thing unfair to the civil service itself, as well as

the general public, that any class should be created an aristocracy in this country, and be allowed to contract debts and then snap their fingers at the law and their creditors. I was immensely pleased with one remark of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), when he pointed out that it would be an injutice to the people to whom the debts were owed, if a Bill like this were not allowed to go. What about the poor people who are giving the credit, who are struggling from day to day to make a living? I am not here to curse the civil servants, I am not here to denounce them in general terms; but I am here to say that they are a portion of the governmental machinery, and, inasmuch as the Government must be, or at least should be, always respectable, and as it is not respectable that any of these men should be indebted all over the country, they should not have more freedom in refusing to pay their debts than other people have. But where I looked for approval, I find myself met with all sorts of objections. After the Bill has been left over for a year, I am told as I was a few moments ago: I believe in the principle of the Bill, but we must give it careful consideration. I would ask hon. members: When are we ever going to accomplish this reform? Am I to be told year after year, as I have been for two years: We quite commend you, Mr. Richardson; your idea is an excellent one; but we must think over it carefully? It reminds me of an incident that occurred during the American War. Mr. Seward, who was a member of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, had occasion to write a letter to some person who had offended him. He wrote a very vicious letter, and went into Mr. Lincoln's office to read it to him. It was in most denunciatory terms, and, when the reading of it was finished, the President said: "It is a capital letter; just the very thing—capital." Seward answered: "I thought it was about the right thing to say to this man, and I will go now and get it rewritten and sent to him." "But," said Lincoln, "surely you don't intend to send such a letter. It is just the thing to write, but I would not think of sending it." This, it would seem, is just the kind of Bill to introduce; but, if we accept the dictum of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and others, we should never pass it or put it in force. I maintain that this is the kind of liberal measure that should go in force. Last year my hon. friend the Prime Minister, as members here will bear me out in saying, said he believed in the principle, and, if it went over for a year, he promised he would support it this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know that he said that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I remember that he distinctly made a promise of that kind. However, I do not want to press that. The Bill should stand on its merits. Let me tell hon. gentlemen what the practice is in the United States. I was talking to-day with a gentleman who is familiar with the way they do things over there, and he tells me, if a letter is sent to the head of a department that a civil servant owes a certain amount of money, that civil servant is sent for, and, if that money is not paid instanter, the civil servant is dismissed. And, if the complaint is repeated, he is dismissed. And if two or three people complain to the head of a department that a man in the employ of the Government is not paying his debts, that man is dismissed at once. Why all this pretended sympathy for the civil servants? If they will not pay their debts, let them have their choice and accept instant dismissal. Surely, hon. gentlemen will not pretend that this country cannot get along without civil servants who will not pay their debts. Let those who will not pay be dismissed and better men put in their places, men who will pay. These are the considerations that would lead me to-night to press forward this Bill. If lawyers differ on the questions involved, let the Bill go upon the statute-book, and let the questions be determined by the highest courts, whether the Bill is a proper one or not. On the general proposition there cannot be two opinions, and I urge very strongly that the Bill pass committee, and go to the third reading.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). I think the best thing to do with this Bill is to refer it to a special committee composed of legal gentlemen of the House. I am just as strongly in favour of the objects sought to be attained as any gentleman who has spoken in favour of this Bill. I want that distinctly understood. But I do not see any use in putting upon the statute-books of this country an Act that is going to be a detriment rather than a benefit to the people in whose interest it is supposed to be framed. I know nothing about the codes of procedure in force in the province of Quebec, but I have no hesitation in saying that so far as the working out of that Bill is concerned in any of the maritime provinces it is perfectly waste paper, it is utterly impossible to work it out. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) spoke of such an Act being in force in the province of Quebec since the 70's. But in Quebec, or any other province, there is no possibility of a constitutional question arising with respect to the attachment of salaries of the officers of the local government, because the local government is supreme in that matter. But the mere fact that no question has arisen under that law in Quebec is no guarantee that such a question will not arise between the provinces and the Dominion with respect to this legislation, because it is just in respect to points of proce-

dure that the jurisdictions clash. Now, let us look at the general philosophy that underlies the exemption of the salary of a public officer from seizure. There has been an opinion expressed by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) that the laws of the country have had in view the constitution of some privileged class. Now, he will pardon me for saying so, but he has not in his reading—and he is not to be blamed for that, because he is not a lawyer—he has not run against any cases that state the principle and reason for the existence of the rule. The rule is laid down as a rule of English law, not for the benefit of the man who gets the salary at all, the rule is not for him, but it is laid down for the benefit of the Crown, and it is part and parcel of the prerogative of the Crown. I am not arguing whether this was a good rule or a bad rule, I expressed my opinion in the beginning that I was decidedly in favour of the ends that were sought to be compassed by this Bill. Now, let us see how the principle works. It applies not only to salaries, but it applies to pensions, and every lawyer in the House from an English-speaking province where the common law of England is in force, will bear me out in stating, for it is elementary law, that a man in receipt of a public salary cannot even by contract under seal assign that salary. The salary is the salary of the Crown, and the law goes so far as to say that even if he is a pensioner he is not allowed to assign his pension, that is the prerogative of the Crown. The salary of a postmaster is given to him by law in order that he shall be above want, and shall be able to devote all his time to the public service, and be as good a servant of the Crown as he possibly can be. Whether that is right or wrong, I am not going to discuss; but this much is certain: I know, and I presume other gentlemen in the House know as well, if not better than myself, hundreds and hundreds of people get fat salaries who do not pay their debts, and the fat salaries are not required for the purposes of fulfilling the duties that the public have placed upon them. Whatever may have been the correctness of the rule at the time it was established the progress of civilization has outgrown the reason of the rule, I am free to admit. Now, I would suggest something in line of what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has suggested, that there should be a simple declaration, together with an enabling power conferred upon the local legislatures to make such procedure as will work out the desired results, and in order that the Bill may be properly drafted to accomplish this, I would suggest that the committee rise, and that a motion be passed—it might be done with the unanimous consent of the House—referring it to a special committee consisting of legal gentlemen, some who are for and others who are against the Bill. Now, I will direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to sub-clause c of section 1, which has escaped his notice. He will find there in the Bill itself a declaration putting upon the word "salary" the meaning that he has placed upon it:

> The word "salary" includes salaries, emoluments, fees, moneys, allowances or wages payable to any public officer, or to any person employed by the Government.

His construction of the following section was correct without that, but in order that there shall be no difference of opinion, the draughtsman of the Bill has expressly defined "salary" and it covers all these cases. In respect to the procedure in the English provinces, there is no question about it, under the garnishee processes in those provinces—I do not speak of the province of Quebec, but for the maritime provinces—any party whose interests are going to be affected by the court must be before the court, and you cannot make the Crown a party unless the statute expressly authorizes the Crown to become a party. This summons is served upon whom? It is simply served upon some servant. There is no direction made as to trying out the main issues, or one of the main issues, as between the Crown and its servant, or whether the debt is due or not due, and in this respect the statute is lamentably deficient in procedure. In the English-speaking provinces we find that garnishee processes are very difficult to work out indeed. Draw the law as carefully as you like, make the provisions as distinct as you like, still the difficulty is felt by the judge, and by litigants who invoke that law. I am in favour of the principle of this Bill because I know several parties who have evaded payment of their debts. If this Bill goes to a special committee of legal gentlemen of the House, and if I happen to be one of them, I shall devote my time enthusiastically to working out a Bill that will be applicable to every province, because there is no use passing an Act that may be perfectly applicable to Quebec and absolutely inapplicable to the circumstances of every other province.

Mr. GILLIES. Without saying whether I am or not in favour of the principle of this Bill, I am certainly opposed to the Bill as it stands at present, although the objects sought to be obtained by the promoter of the Bill are laudable objects. I regard the Bill as it now stands as simply and entirely unworkable. So far as I understand the garnisheeing process in the province of Nova Scotia, every judgment creditor, or every person attempting to enforce garnishee proceedings, must have judgment against a debtor whose moneys he attempts to attach that are in the hands of a third party. Take an officer of the Crown, a judgment obtained against him by a judgment creditor is entered up, and then the judgment creditor attempts to attach the moneys that are in the hands of

the Crown, how can these proceedings be enforced when there is no way provided by the Bill for making the Crown a party to the proceedings. In other words, A obtains a judgment against B. B has funds in the hands of the Crown, which may be designated as C. A attempts to garnishee the moneys in the hands of the Crown. How does he give notice to the Crown? The Crown cannot be made a party to the proceedings without consent, that is, there must be a fiat granted, and there is no consent here provided for on the part of the Crown. The Bill says that a certain officer of the department, in which the civil servant is employed, shall be given notice. That is not making the Crown a party, in any sense whatever and therefore the Bill, as to that, is entirely abortive. I am opposed to it on grounds of public convenience, such as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries pointed out to-night very cogently, in making it applicable to the judges. Hon. gentlemen behind him attempted to make light of that proposition. In that they were entirely astray. The administration of justice might be seriously interfered with if you make this Bill applicable to judges. A judge, before he came to the bench, may have been indebted like any other person. There may be very serious inconvenience arise from the attempt to collect debts by the process attempted by this Bill which might have been incurred before the judge came to the bench, and it would be seriously interfering with the administration of public justice if a judge's salary could be made the subject of lien in the way of a garnishee. If you can attach his salary you can attach his travelling fees, and if you can put a judge in the position that he cannot go from one circuit to another to hold court, you interfere with the administration of justice That may be a reductio ad absurdum, but we have to consider all the possibilities.

Mr. BERGERON. Why does he not pay his debts?

Mr. GILLIES. He has not the money. He may have been heavily in debt before he went on the bench at all, and therefore unable to pay his debts all at once. If a judge is appointed to the bench owing $5,000 of a debt which has been legitimately incurred in the ordinary course of business, or perhaps through unlooked for losses, and if, after he is six months on the bench, his creditor garnishees his salary, serious inconvenience will result. If he can take his salary, he can take his travelling fees, and the administration of justice might be seriously imperilled by the inconvenience the judge would be subjected to thereby. For these reasons, I am entirely opposed to the Bill. I think it is thoroughly unworkable, and would be defeating the object aimed at by the hon. gentleman introducing it. It is an attempt to legislate on behalf of the different provinces, which, I think, is entirely beyond our jurisdiction. The question of civil rights and legal procedure is entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces, and is entirely beyond the powers conferred on us by the British North America Act.

Mr. CHAUVIN. I would like to put a question to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). I am in favour of this Bill, but I would remind the hon. member for Laval that last year the hon. Solicitor General, and the right hon. Prime Minister, said that to render the Bill workable it would be necessary to have the laws of the provinces amended, especially the laws in Quebec, in order to make the salaries of federal employees seizable. I would like to ask the hon. member for Laval if it is not true that two of his friends in the Quebec legislature, Mr. Gouin, in 1897, and Mr. Champagne, the member for Two Mountains, in 1898, submitted a Bill to make provision to render the salaries of federal employees seizable? It is probable that Bill was asked from the legislature at the request of the hon. member for Laval in the interest of the present Bill, because he felt that this Bill would not be practicable in Quebec except there was a provision in the civil code of that province making the salaries of federal employees seizable. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is not true. The Bill introduced into the legislature is not yet passed, and that is a reason why he should not push through the present Bill because it would not be workable unless there is a provision in the Quebec law making the salaries of federal employees seizable.

Mr. FORTIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that the discussion that took place last year, to which he has alluded, in which the hon. Solicitor General took part, was on the Bill as first presented by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). There was in it one provision declaring, in general terms, that all moneys due by the Crown would be seizable. The objection was taken upon this point: Whether it belonged to the provinces to declare what was seizable and what was not, and whether we had the jurisdiction here to declare that salaries should be seizable in toto or in part only. It was only upon that point that the discussion took place, and it was generally admitted, and, I am told, by the hon. Minister of Justice, that it belongs to the province to declare what is seizable and what is not, whether a fifth, or a fourth, or half the salary. This Bill does not touch that point at all. This Bill recognizes that power as belonging to the provinces, when it says:

> In future all moneys and salaries due or accruing * * shall be liable to be seized by way

of attachment in each and every of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada in such proportion as may be determined by the laws in force in such provinces.

Therefore, there can be no question, and I am informed that the hon. Minister of Justice, having carefully examined this Bill, has declared, as I understand, to the hon. member for Lisgar, that there is no constitutional objection to it, as the Bill fully recognizes the jurisdiction of the provinces. The Bill must provide for the machinery. Objection was made as to the procedure. When a subject falls regularly or constitutionally before this Parliament or any class of subjects upon which this Parliament can legislate, it has been held time and again by the Privy Council that all necessary and incidental powers, in order to enforce such laws, although they may be in reference to civil rights or laws of procedure, may be exercised by the Dominion Parliament. That is a general rule which has been decided in many cases. There is another reason here applicable to this particular Bill, and it is this: The Bill, I repeat, is equivalent to a consent on the part of the Crown. Some hon. members object on the ground that the Government cannot be a party, but call it by whatever name you like, there is the necessary machinery in the Bill to put the writ in the hands of the Government and to enable the head of the department to retain the salary and to pay a portion of it, under the direction of the court from which the writ has issued. Whether it is to make the Government a party to the attachment or not, is a mere matter of name and it is no use to discuss the point, because it is of no practical importance whatever. The moment there is a consent that the attachment can go into the hands of the Government, the moment there is the necessary machinery to meet the requirements of that attachment, to send a report that the officer receives so much a month or a year, and then from the moment of the service of the writ of attachment the Deputy Minister will retain the portion which is declared seizable by the laws of the province from which the writ is issued; the moment all that is provided you have the provisions to carry out the law, and it is immaterial whether you say the Government is a party to the suit or not. As regards the procedure in this Bill, there is a particular reason why it falls within the powers that can be exercised by the Dominion Parliament. The Dominion Government has full control and authority over the persons who are employed or paid by it. In passing this law, Parliament says in effect, that a portion of the moneys voted by Parliament, and to be paid by the Government, can be attached. Is it not a legal consequence that Parliament can say under what conditions that portion of the salary can be attached, and how the members of the Cabinet, or the Deputy Ministers are to execute such a law? It may be argued that the Government might consent, but that the Minister or the Deputy Minister could not go from Halifax to Vancouver, or to the Yukon to appear in court to make a declaration as an ordinary garnishee would. That is quite true, and, therefore, the necessary procedure must be provided for by this Bill, and it must be by the consent of the Crown to become a garnishee in such case. It becomes necessary for Parliament to say: Well, then, garnishment will take place in such a way that the public service will not suffer; and this Bill provides exactly how that can be done. The attachment is made by serving a copy of the writ, and then the declaration of the garnishee may be sent by mail.

Mr. BRITTON. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) a question right here. Is it intended that after the writ of attachment is served, the Government has the opportunity of disputing the claim, and, if so, is it to be worked out as a trial of the case against the Government in this particular proceeding? Or, is it intended that on this writ, or whatever you call it, being served, that then, if the Government does not dispute it, the Bill merely provides a way of the Government paying money to the creditor. Or, if the Government disputes it, is the matter to be abandoned?

Mr. FORTIN. In my humble opinion, all the cases that may arise in an ordinary suit by attachment, can arise under this Bill. I do not know of any law which would prevent the Government from disputing the claim. I know of no law which would prevent the Government from saying in answer to the writ of attachment: We owe nothing to such a man.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it optional with the Government as to the payment, or is it mandatory? Does your Bill merely empower the officer to pay it if he chooses or does it compel him?

Mr. FORTIN. It is mandatory as regards all that may be acknowledged to be due to the defendant, or otherwise it would not meet the object of the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Then your Bill fails altogether.

Mr. FORTIN. Why should it not be mandatory? If an ordinary person instead of the Government be the garnishee, is it not mandatory? The third person is ordered by the writ to appear before the court and to declare what he may owe to the defendant. But here, under the machinery of this Bill, the Minister or the Deputy Minister is not bound to appear in person and to that extent we facilitate the process. We must expect that ordinary justice would be done by the Minister or Deputy Minister, and we merely ask them to send a report by mail. It has been suggested that the procedure should be left to the different provinces. Imagine,

Mr. Chairman, what would be the effect of leaving the execution of an attachment of this kind to the procedure in each of the different provinces. There are seven, or we may say eight provinces in the Dominion, and the procedure might be different in each of them. We could well understand the Minister saying in such a case: Are we compelled to follow the statutes of each province; are we compelled to go to the chef lieu of the court to make a declaration in one province, and to send a letter in another province? The very idea of leaving to each province the manner in which this Bill would be carried out, would be the strongest objection against it, and the only way to make it workable is to provide the machinery here, and to make that machinery as simple as possible. It was strongly urged last year that the Government would be obliged to employ an army of officers all through the Dominion; but the present Bill has met that objection, and under section 9, the Governor in Council is authorized to make by-laws and regulations, and to deduct from the salary of the civil servant a certain amount, not exceeding ten per cent, so that all this expense is avoided.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a point to which I wish to direct the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin). He has attempted an argument as to the legality of this parliamentary attempt to usurp the rights of the local Parliaments to legislate on civil procedure. The hon. gentleman starts out in his argument by assuming that there is a subject matter of legislation assigned to this Parliament, and that he is only incidentally providing the machinery for carrying out some legislation which this Parliament determines should be enacted with regard to that subject matter. But, his whole argument is based upon the assumption that we have the jurisdiction in the first instance. I would like to ask him, under what subject matter in the British North America Act does he place it? What has been assigned to this Parliament to legislate on? I can understand that when the subject of insolvency was submitted to this Parliament, we could enact all the machinery—as incidental to the main matter—necessary to carry out our legislation. As incidental to the main subject of our jurisdiction, we have the right to enact all procedure necessary for carrying it out, but where is the subject matter in the first instance here, which would enable you to annex to it the power to legislate on a matter of procedure. You are deliberately starting out to usurp functions which properly exclusively belong to the local legislatures. Unless you can satisfy yourself that there is a subject matter which you can legislate upon in the first instance, and assign to this Parliament as being within its jurisdiction, you have no right to intrench upon the civil procedure at all. The mere getting through this Parliament of a Bill which is unworkable will not do you any good. The hon. gentleman seems to think that if he only gets his Bill through, whether it is workable or not, whether it produces good or evil, he will accomplish all he wants.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? I called on the Minister of Justice four or five times to get his legal opinion of this Bill, as he is the legal authority of this Government, and I got his opinion that there was no constitutional objection to the Bill at all. What more could I do than that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman got a legal opinion from this House last session as well as this session, that there was no constitutional objection at all to civil servants of this Government being amenable to the law of the province; but he must not get away from the point under discussion. That is not the point we are discussing. The point is whether this Parliament has power to enact legislation regarding the method of carrying that out—whether we have the power to enact the procedure that shall be followed—to say when the writ of attachment shall issue, upon whom it shall be served, and when it shall be served. All these matters are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the province. The hon. gentleman says that he is introducing liberal and radical legislation, and that we all ought to support him. I have pointed out that in England similar legislation was passed in 1854, and that Parliament afterwards repealed it—first as regards seamen, and in the second place as regards all workmen and labourers. That is some evidence that those opposing this Bill are not opposed to legislation which is absolutely good in itself, but are opposed to legislation which has proved to be absolutely bad in Great Britain. There is already a procedure by which every civil servant who owes a debt and will not pay it can be compelled to pay it. What is that procedure? He can be brought before the court—in the province of Ontario, at any rate—and can be examined as to what his salary is and how much he owes; and the judge, after hearing the whole case, declares that he shall pay so much per week or so much per month out of his salary, and if he does not pay it, he can be imprisoned. But that is apart from the point I am discussing. I would like to see this Bill referred to a committee of lawyers. I am unable at present to see how it can be worked out, unless through the Court of Exchequer, because you cannot confer upon a provincial court power to use its process outside of the province that gives it life. The jurisdiction of a provincial court in Prince Edward Island is limited to the bounds of the province. You say, let the writ be issued, and send it

up to Ottawa ; but you cannot do that without violating the British North America Act. You are attempting to introduce legislation which as I see it now is absolutely unworkable.

Mr. McNEILL. Did I correctly understand my hon. friend to say that this Bill would enable the travelling allowance of a judge to be attached ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I called the attention of the promoter to the fact that in the very first section that could be done, and I asked him to strike out all the words, except "salary and wages."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am willing to accept that suggestion. With regard to this Bill being referred to a committee of lawyers, the spectacle which we have witnessed to-night, and the spectacle which we witnessed last year, when the Bill was under discussion, must satisfy every member that the most futile thing on earth would be to refer it to a committee of lawyers. There is one way in which we can settle this question. I have it from the Minister of Justice, the fountain of legal authority in the Government, that the Bill is perfectly constitutional. I have had the same opinion from other legal gentlemen, perhaps not so eminent as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Have you his written opinion ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not. He had two or three little objections which I could not help regarding as absurd.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will give them to the hon. member, and let him judge of them for himself. The Minister of Justice said he did not think it was a wise Bill, because a lot of people forced goods on civil servants, and they were compelled to buy more than ordinary people. I think that was absurd ; but he said that so far as he was concerned he took no objection to the constitutionality of the Bill. Then the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), an eminent lawyer from the province of Quebec, says the Bill is all right. In view of legal objections now offered, when lawyers differ in this way, what in the name of common sense can laymen do ? The only logical thing is to pass the Bill, and let its constitutionality be tested in the courts. I am not trying merely to get a Bill on the statute-book. This is a liberal and radical measure which I am anxious to see passed. I am not a lawyer, but if we leave the Bill to a committee of lawyers we cannot hope to get an agreement. Let the Bill go upon the statute-book, let it be challenged if necessary, and then we shall have a decision of the courts whether it is constitutional or not. That is a reasonable proposition, and one that will enable the people of Canada to know whether the salaries of civil servants can be attached or not. If we go on with the Bill, I am willing to accept any reasonable amendment. It can be discussed in this committee as well as in a special committee ; and after my recent experience I have very little faith in special committees. The night is young ; let us go on with the discussion of the Bill, and any reasonable amendments that may be offered will be accepted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the plea which the hon. member makes, that the Bill should be allowed to go on the statute-book, however defective it is, and however incapable it is of doing the work intended, is a very bad plea, and will not be accepted by the House. Such a Bill, if placed on the statute-book, will only lead to costs being incurred, and to difficulty arising between the Government and the civil service, for no good whatever, except to gratify the ambition of the hon. member.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no ambition.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says he has no ambition, and we can accept his statement. I will say to pass the Bill will do no good except to meet his desire on this particular point. Now, I have always understood that it was the duty of the legal department of the Government to be prepared with a statement as to the legality of a Bill and its completeness to perform the purpose for which it was intended, and the duty of some Minister of the Crown to present that statement to Parliament when the Bill was under discussion. Time and again these Bills, promoted by private members have in my experience been discussed at the council board, and the opinion of the Department of Justice has been given in regard to those Bills, and that opinion has always received the greatest possible consideration in the House. Now, in what position are we to-night ? We are a lot of laymen, a number of us, and we have heard legal opinions on this question on the one side and the other. How are we to decide ? This House naturally looks to the Justice Department of the Government as having some authority and as being responsible to the House and the country. But here we have a private member saying : I consulted the Minister of Justice, whose opinion I accept on one point, but whose opinion on other matters is absurd, and consequently I threw it aside. And here we have a colleague of the Minister of Justice—himself a lawyer equally eminent and of much longer practice—declaring that this Bill, which the Minister of Justice declared constitutional, is unconstitutional.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say it was unconstitutional, because I suggested last session, and I am still of that opinion, that in so far as the Bill declares that the salaries of civil servants shall be liable to garnishment or attachment in the provinces, to that extent it is perfectly constitutional.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But this Bill goes further, and the hon. gentleman has specifically declared that going so far as to interfere with the question of civil rights, which belongs to the provinces by the British North America Act, it is unconstitutional. That is directly opposite to the statement of the hon. member for Lisgar, who says that the Minister of Justice has declared that this Bill is constitutional in its entirety. I do not think this Parliament should be without guidance in a matter of this kind. We have seen in the case of Bill after Bill submitted to this House, the Solicitor General standing up and saying, when questioned as to the legality of a certain provision: I am not expressing my opinion. The Solicitor General represents the Department of Justice. the Minister of Justice is not here nor is the Solicitor General, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the only lawyer in the Cabinet present, and he declares the Bill unconstitutional. In the absence of the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Lisgar ought not to press this measure until we get a definite opinion from the Department of Justice, first, as to whether it is constitutional, and next as to whether the machinery provided will be efficient to carry out the purpose the hon. gentleman has in view. What is the use of our going on discussing this measure, and then finding out that the Minister of Justice or his colleague throws it overboard, or, if we should put it on the statute-book, finding out that it is absolutely unworkable. These proceedings are farcical. This House ought to hold the Government responsible for not being prepared, on measures of this kind, to express their opinion, as the authorized committee of this House, as to the constitutional aspect, before we spend hour after hour discussing them.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not this Bill the one that was brought in last year?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly not.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the difference?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is entirely different. This Bill provides machinery for the collection of debts.

Mr. DAVIN. But in principle it is the same?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the promoter of the Bill another question. Did not the Bill last year provide that you could not collect old debts, but only debts accrued from the date of its passage?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, and I have expressed my willingness to consent to an amendment to the same effect.

Mr. McNEILL. Did the Minister of Justice say that the providing of elaborate machinery was constitutional?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I called at the Department of Justice three or four times, and urged them from time to time to consider the Bill, and finally the Minister of Justice told me he had gone over the Bill, and, so far as he was concerned, he could see no constitutional objection to it. He made some little objections, such as I have mentioned, namely, that it might interfere with the administration of the public departments, that servants of the Government occupied such a position that they should not be dragged before the courts to the neglect of their duties. I took no stock in these objections, but was perfectly satisfied with his opinion that he saw nothing unconstitutional in the measure. I am satisfied to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Marine, and beg to move, therefore, that in subsection C of section 1 the words "emolument, fees, moneys, allowances," be struck out.

Mr. DAVIN. On this very point we are in this position. We have just had the statement from the hon. member for Lisgar that the Minister of Justice gave him a certain opinion; we have heard the position taken by the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies), which seems to me to dodge responsibility on the part of the Government, but last year when a Bill, the same in principle, was before the House the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) had no doubt whatever. This is what he said:

> We have no right to declare by Act of Parliament that a man's salary shall be liable to attachment. I would not like to see such a declaration passed by this House. With all respect to the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill and those associated with him, it would not be creditable to us to pass through this House the clause which declares as to who should or what should be liable to attachment. We cannot do it. Then, if it is going to be law, it will be necessary to provide some machinery which is not provided by the Bill, whereby the Queen can be sued. You cannot take one single step in order to enforce a remedy against the Crown unless Her Majesty permits herself to be a party to the action. The Queen can only be sued upon a petition of right, a fiat has to be granted by the Government. Some provision to meet such a case will have to be adopted. I say, with all good feelings towards the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill, that it is not in the shape in which it can be passed, even if we thought the principle one that should be adopted.

That is a manly position taken by the Minister of Railways. But to-night we are in this extraordinary position, that in the discussion of a Bill respecting which a Minister of the Crown, himself a lawyer, and who has been Prime Minister of a province, declares his opinion in that unmistakable manner, we have a Treasury bench deserted save for the presence of one Minister, who spoke on the Bill, and he wobbles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not wobble, but expressed myself exceedingly strongly.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend considers that he spoke exceedingly strongly and definitely, I do not know what his weak moments would be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman could have been in when I spoke.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I was, and I must confess that the spectacle we have to-night is one the most derogatory to Parliament that in my experience——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I spoke in the earlier part of the sitting of the kennel, and I now hear voices from that unclassical quarter. I do not know where that sound came from, but I may say to one or two hon. gentlemen opposite, just by way of warning, that one or two of them in past sessions made to my knowledge a contract with one or two—shall I call them gentlemen ?—to interfere with the independence of this Parliament, and I have treated them with silent mercy, but I give them fair warning that if they are not more careful I will attach an epithet to each one of them that will go down to their graves with them and will make them a laughing-stock in the little rural villages in which they sometimes shine as great members of Parliament.

Mr. McMULLEN. Say that over again.

Mr. DAVIN. I will repeat it, in order that we may see again the beautiful smile that is characteristic of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I repeat that, in my experience as an observer of this Parliament, either as a member or one whose duty forced him to observe it, I have never witnessed a scene so derogatory to its dignity as this—when, with so important a Bill as this before us, we are left, as the hon. member for Haldimand has shown, entirely without guidance. Where, Sir, is the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) ?

Mr. TALBOT. He is going to England to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. That, then, is the reason. The Solicitor General should be here to represent the Minister of Justice and help Parliament with questions of this sort. I think he might time his visits to England better. Is he going to Rome this time ? I well remember that on one occasion he went to Rome as a delegate to the Vatican, and I heard that he displayed great diplomacy, insomuch that if he found that the bar was altogether too mundane an employment, he would be capable of graduating to a high dignity as an ecclesiastical delegate. Well, Sir, I would ask this gentleman (Mr. Talbot), who knows all about it because no information has come from the Treasury bench—is the Solicitor General going to Rome this time ?

Mr. TALBOT. He had left you roaming.

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. DAVIN. That is the question. I asked, where the Solicitor General was, and was told that he was not here, as he was going to England. That meant crossing the Atlantic, and he might go from London to Rome. I ask again the question : Why is it we are without guidance here ? For you might as well look for guidance to a weathercock, whirling in a shifting breeze, as to look for it in the shifting speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Does any one know where he is ? Does any one know whether he thinks this Bill is constitutional or not ? Does any one know whether he wants this Bill to pass or not ? What did we see a short time ago ? We saw the hon. member for Lisgar make a pathetic appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and then from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the gods above, recalling a time when, with the blooming innocence of his ignorance of parliamentary life and trickeries——

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, no ; I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree that the hon. gentleman did not express himself at all as well as that. But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman must not expect that, when I speak obliquely, when I use the historical form, I will give his exact language. If I wish to quote him, I will quote him directly, as I sometimes do, from the Winnipeg "Tribune." But I always do it with fear and trembling, lest it should spoil my style. But we did see the hon. gentleman—and, if my descriptions should fall short in any way of doing justice to the tragic elements in the appeal, surely that is not to be wondered at—we did see him appeal to his past, and to the time when he came in here an enthusiastic young reformer, believing that all he had to do was to bring forward a measure like this, and everybody would hold up his hands, that he would get help from the Ministers of the Crown, that when the Minister of Justice told him the Bill was unconstitutional, he would not find him-

self let and hindered by the Treasury bench. He told us, and he has not withdrawn it, though the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries doubted it, that the Prime Minister told him he would help him this year, or in some future year, with this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What I said was, that the Prime Minister said he was in favour of the principle of the Bill, but there were some details he wished to look into, and, if I would lay it over for another year, he would endeavour to support it.

Mr. DAVIN. And I must say—and I like to come to the help of my western friend—that is my recollection also. But, here again, where is the Prime Minister now, when this important measure is before the House, an important measure supported by a leading Reformer from the west, and by a distinguished lawyer from Montreal, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin)? Why, Sir, as I say, it is a most derogatory situation we find ourselves in—unguided, the Government afraid to take responsibility in the face of a measure like this and to declare, as the Minister of Railways and Canals did last year, that they could not accept the measure, or else to come forward and say to the hon. member for Lisgar: Accept certain modifications, and the measure will be passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. member (Mr. Davin) need not worry about the spectacle of the Government. If I remember the facts, last year the Government divided on the question, some voting for the measure and some against it. Any member of this House should be at liberty to introduce any legislation here he chooses, regardless of the Government. I support the Government on general principles, but I do not propose to run to the Premier, or to any member of the Government, to ask what legislation I shall or shall not introduce, or how I shall vote on this question or on that. Surely to goodness, this is a measure with regard to which every member has his responsibility. If hon. members do not wish to vote for it, they can vote against it. If an hon. member does not think it constitutional, let him vote against it. The Government affords no spectacle in connection with the matter. I suppose they have been attending to matters which they think infinitely more important. When the question was asked, some time ago, whether they intended to introduce such a Bill, I think the Prime Minister replied that the hon. member for Lisgar had already introduced a Bill. Now, we listened with all attention to the words of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). He seemed to make out quite a case; but, when you come to look at it, what is there in it after all? The Government has not taken any responsibility in the matter. The Minister of Railways and Canals has pressed——

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to lay down the doctrine that the Government has no responsibility in regard to legislation of this sort placed on the Public Bills and Orders?

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I apprehend the matter—I may be entirely wrong, but I give my own view—I do not see that the Government have any more responsibility than other memebrs of Parliament in regard to this matter. The hon. member for West Assiniboia is just as much interested that such a Bill as this should become law as is the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Bill stands upon its merits. Why fly off at a tangent and rush into a criticism of the Government, endeavouring to make a point against the Administration? Surely that is not what we are sent here to do. We are sent here, not to seek to put the Government in a hole, but to act upon our own responsibility to our constituents. Let the hon. member for West Assiniboia remember that he will not make himself a name in this country by seeking to get a crack at the Government, as it were, to try to hold up the Government to ridicule. Let him remember that the people have their eyes upon him, and that he will be held responsible for the position that he takes on this Bill, and on other legislation. It will not bring kudos to himself to be able to send out speeches showing that he scarified the Government in this or that connection. To my mind that is the greatest curse of politics at the present time, and one that we should get rid of. I appeal to hon. members to give this measure a fair trial. It is a matter immaterial to me to have my name attached to any Bill that goes upon the statute-book. What honour does it bring to me that a Bill of this kind has been promoted by myself? It is because I believe that an aristocracy is being created in this country, the aristocracy of the civil service, and that they are not placed in the same position as other members of society, that I have undertaken to press this measure. It is because of that conviction that I have introduced this Bill year after year. So far as I am concerned, if it does not pass now, I do not propose ever to introduce it again. I want to have it decided to-night upon its merits. If members think it is of no use, let them vote against it; if they think it is all right, let them vote for it. But I do not allow myself to be deceived by being told that if I will just wait another year it will probably be adopted. Let us settle it here to-night upon its merits.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill is neither a Government measure, nor are the Government supporting it or opposing it. Individual members of the Government may support it, and others may oppose it, as they did last year. It is a matter upon which gentlemen on either side of politics are free to vote just as they like.

Mr. BELCOURT. Representing as I do a constituency in which there are probably a greater number of civil servants than in any other constituency in Canada, I desire to say a few words. I wish to discuss this Bill, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) puts it, on its merits. I am glad of the opportunity which is now afforded me of expressing my opinion of the civil service, as I have done on a previous occasion. Having lived here a good many years, and having had frequent and close relations with them, I am in a position to assert confidently that there is no class of the community which more honourably fulfils its obligations than the civil service, speaking generally. If we attend our division court in Ottawa we see a lesser proportion of civil servants attending on judgment summons, or to be examined after judgment, than almost of any other class. With respect to the constitutionality of the Bill, I desire to point out that by section 2 it is provided that in future all moneys due by the Crown are attachable. Now, as a lawyer, I am of opinion that that provision is unconstitutional. The garnishment of the salaries of the civil servants may not be unconstitutional, but the attachment of moneys due by the Crown to any person is, to my mind, unconstitutional.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have changed that.

Mr. BELCOURT. You have changed section c, but that difficulty will still remain. because you have not changed section 2. Supposing a man having an important contract puts in a claim for extras. A garnishment is taken and served upon the head of the department; the matter comes up in court, in the division court or the superior court in any province; in order to decide the question raised by the attachment, the judge will have to decide as to the liability of the Crown in that contract, involving thereby a question which properly belongs to the Exchequer Court alone. That is why I think this provision of section 2 is unconstitutional. I have listened carefully to the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill, but they have failed to make out a case to show that there was any demand for this Bill; they have not shown any necessity for attaching the salaries of civil servants. The member for Lisgar has told us that this was a liberal and progressive measure. I take issue with him there I do not think it is either liberal or progressive. Let us remember that the tendency in all countries is not to render attachable the salaries of wage-earners, but, on the contrary, to increase the exemptions. At one time wage-earners' salaries were wholly attachable; to-day, in Ontario, practically, you cannot attach the salary. The law provides that you must leave in the hands of all wage-earners the sum of at least $25, and I say that amounts to practical prohibition as to attachment. As a matter of fact, those who practise in the courts of Ontario know that attachment for salary is a practically unknown quantity; it is practically prohibited by the fact that $25 must be left in the hands of the party whenever seizure is made. I say it is neither a liberal nor a progressive measure, for another reason. The tendency in modern days is not to encourage but to discourage the giving of credit. Every day we find our retail merchants giving less and less credit. If you render salaries attachable you are going to stimulate the habit of giving credit, and the very evil which my hon. friend seeks to prevent, that of giving credit to the civil servants, will not be overcome, but, on the contrary, will be fostered. Some hon. gentlemen have compared the case of the Government with that of railway companies and other large corporations. It seems to me that the two cases are not at all parallel. A railway company is engaged in business for profit, whereas the Government is not in that position at all. The Government is in the position of administering the affairs of the country for the good of all. I submit, therefore, that no case has been made out for the Bill. Surely the merchants of Ottawa must be supposed to be as much interested in this matter as the merchants of any other city, but they have not demanded this Bill. they are not, so far as I know, in favour of this Bill. I think we may safely be guided by the opinion which prevails in this city of Ottawa. Again, there is no necessity for it, because we have in the province of Ontario to-day all the necessray machinery for forcing legal debtors to pay their debts. You may bring them up before a judge and examine them, and if the judge thinks they are in a position to pay, he orders them to pay a certain sum of money, and this they must pay upon pain of imprisonment. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) says that there was no such provision in the province of Quebec. I think, however, there is such a provision, but not to the same degree: there is a provision by which you can bring a judgment debtor before a judge and examine him as to his means of paying. If he has committed any fraud, you may have a remedy even in the province of Quebec. So that in the two large provinces, at least, there are ample means at the disposal of all creditors for securing their debts. If this Bill were passed and were found workable it would not afford the people of Ontario and Quebec any remedy which they have

not got to-day. The only procedure which is created by the Bill is the one which speaks of a writ of attachment. In the province of Ontario you can issue a writ only in certain cases. So, not only does this Bill not afford any remedy, but it does not afford any procedure by which that remedy can be carried out in Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. I should like to say a word on the question of the constitutionality of this Bill, if I, as a layman, may venture an opinion upon it. In the first place, I would say that my opinion is in direct contradistinction to the opinion which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) expressed at the last session of Parliament. The argument that has been advanced by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) is incontrovertible, that we have jurisdiction over the wage of the civil servant. We may say that we shall pay the wage of civil servants in any direction we think proper. It is incidental to his employment. We may say that we will pay a portion to his wife, or a portion to his children.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a matter of contract.

Mr. HAGGART. The contract is not binding on the Government in reference to it. You may do it in any manner that you please as was made plain in the Balderson case. But that question does not arise here. It is incident to the hiring of the civil servant and incident to the service that the Government, or the legislature, should have full control or power in reference to the payment of the wages of the civil servant. The Government can do it in any form. The legislature can direct what form may be adopted; it may be that the wage may be paid in the form of a judgment. We are not interfering with the jurisdiction of any of the provinces when we say that a certain form shall be provided before we pay the money out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are declaring in this Bill that there should be an attachment and how and where it shall be served.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of attachment is another thing. As to the manner of procedure it is incidental to the manner in which we may pay wages. We may say that a judgment of the court may be obtained before we pay that, and we may prescribe the form in which the creditor shall have to proceed before we pay the money. All these things, to my mind, are simply directory, they are simply optional upon the Government. The Bill does not provide means enough for bringing action or making the Crown a party to action. It will not be mandatory upon the Government, and that is one fault that I have against the Bill that it does not provide means whereby the Crown shall be sued. We provide means whereby the Crown shall be sued. The Crown itself is a consenting party, but a party has to get their consent. You cannot make a garnishee effectual by legislation, such as is proposed here, against the Crown unless the Crown is a consenting party to the proceedings. The Bill does not provide fully for that, but I think the object of the Bill would be accomplished fully if it were made simply optional with the Crown, so that when a party has judgment against a civil servant, upon it being furnished to a Deputy Minister, or an officer of the Crown, he would have power to pay it. There is another objection to the Bill. I think it is not directory enough. When you interfere with the prerogative of the Crown the Act should be framed in the most direct manner possible so that there can be no doubt possible. I think the object would be accomplished if the Bill were passed and simply filed with the deputy heads of the departments and leave it optional with them. I am not speaking of the principle of the Bill. I am of the same opinion as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that these Bills that have been passed in Great Britain have been found unworkable and that the Crown has found it necessary to alter or revoke them altogether. I am not of the opinion that any sufficient cause has been shown for a Bill of this kind, and I think it is not necessary. I think the Bill is objectionable on many grounds, but what I rose to state was simply the constitutional point to which I have referred. I think there is no doubt as to the power of the legislature to deal with the wages of the civil servants and to say in what manner they shall be paid. It is, an incident to our power, and it does not interfere with the procedure of the court at all. This is a public Bill, and one which the Government should have an opinion upon. They should state what their policy is to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that the case in reference to all public Bills?

Mr. HAGGART. Public Bills cannot become law, or do not always become law, unless they have the support of the advisers of the Crown. The advisers of the Crown have had an opportunity of becoming familiar with the opinion of the members of the House and of the country, and I think it is fully time that the advisers of the Crown should give an opinion upon it.

Mr. McNEILL. In regard to this clause which says that any public officer, or any officer employed by the Government, is included in the Bill, I would like to ask if that covers the case of a contractor?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have stricken out the words in the interpretation clause, and the meaning in the second clause must follow and be limited to salaries and wages.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, it has been made quite evident, by this discussion, that there is a great difference of opinion as to the Bill, whether it would be workable or constitutional or not. I think from the diversity of opinions that have been expressed here to-night it is a question whether this Bill should be allowed to pass. I am not sure as to the wisdom of passing this Bill. We have had, for thirty-two years, since confederation, the law as it stands to-day, and there has not been, so far as I have been aware, one single reason why that law should be revoked. The whole tendency of legislation, not only in this country, but in Great Britain, has been in the direction of further exemption, as was stated by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). This law was repealed in England after a fair trial, and we know that in the local legislatures they are rather increasing the exemptions and providing that men shall have their wage or salary for themselves and their wives and families to a greater extent than before. My opinion is that it is not a good thing to provide too much machinery for the collection of debts. I believe it would be a good thing if a law were passed exempting everything under a certain amount. In Ontario it is limited to $40, but I would go farther than that. In the present Bill it is not proposed to interfere or take cognizance of any debts contracted heretofore.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have promised to introduce that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It does not provide any remedy for debts heretofore contracted. It only makes provision so far as the future is concerned. If the groceryman, the merchant, the tailor, the shoemaker, the blacksmith——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The doctor or the lawyer——

Mr. CAMPBELL—or anybody else in this country chooses to give credit to members of the civil service he knows they are not responsible. He knows that he cannot collect that debt, and therefore he gets cash down, or else he allows it to become a debt of honour with the debtor. I venture to say that most of the civil servants in Ottawa pay cash down for what they get, and if they do not, then the merchant trusts them on their honour, because he knows he has no recourse against them. I have heard of no sound reason why we should now put on the statute-book a law repealing the system which has been in force for thirty-two years. As the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) very justly said, the curse of this country is the credit system. If we could only go back to the cash basis, people could buy goods a great deal cheaper, and it would be an advantage both to the buyer and the seller, because there would be no bad debts at all. As it is to-day, the man who pays 100 cents on the dollar has to pay not only for his own goods, but has to pay for his neighbour who defaults in his payment. Every merchant knows that when he is selling goods he charges a little more to provide for bad debts, and therefore if we make a law providing that these creditors can collect from the civil servants, we are simply extending a system which I believe to be a bad one in principle. Even if this law when passed were workable—and we have heard sound opinions on both sides of the House that it would not be workable—even if it were workable, I am not sure that we would take a step in the right direction to pass it. I am of the opinion that we should hesitate before passing this law, especially in view of the divergent opinions that have been expressed. It is my opinion, and I am strongly of that opinion, that this Parliament should do all it can to do away with the credit system. If we could make all debts uncollectable up to a certain amount, then we would do away with the merchants giving credit, because he would only sell to those who paid cash or to those whom he was sure would pay. I again say that we should consider the matter carefully before passing any such Bill as this.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hardly think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who is the only legal member of the Cabinet present to-night, is treating the House with due consideration. This certainly is a subject of some public importance, and I submit that it is a subject of sufficient importance to call for a definite declaration of policy upon the part of the Administration. The Administration have other duties to perform than their departmental duties, and one of the important duties of an Administration is to guide the legislation of Parliament generally. Before I discuss that point, I wish to disabuse the mind of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) that I was charging him with any petty attempt to perpetuate his name in the annals of Canadian history by putting a Bill upon the statute-book, and while I do that, I cannot help saying to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson), that his awful threat that if we do not pass this Bill now and here he will never bring it up again, will not make this Parliament cease to consider this Bill, or any other Bill introduced by that hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman which deals with a matter of public importance such as this does. I submit that the very strongest case has been made out that this Bill shall be left over, and I say that with a very large amount of friendship to the Bill itself. I submit this to the hon. member for Lisgar: if any member came into this House absolutely uninformed and abso-

lutely unbiassed, depending upon the argument for his judgment and his vote to follow his judgment upon the Bill; I submit that up to this time that member would not know how to vote upon this question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has laughed at referring this Bill to a committee of lawyers, but even lawyers are sometimes useful, and they are useful, it appears to me, in framing a statute that may be workable; or at least more workable than that which happens to be framed by a layman. What I rose to say to the Minister of Marine was that it is the bounden duty of the Government to give us a declaration of the policy upon a Bill of this kind. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) gets up and he says to the members behind him: We have no particular policy on this Bill; you can vote just as you please. That is an easy way to get out of it, but it is not the constitutional practice for a Government to pursue. It is an easy practice to please and not to displease his followers, but it is a practice which is not at all in conformity with the practice of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) ought to know that as well as any other member of this House.

Mr. POWELL. Especially where the royal prerogative is concerned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so. Especially where the royal prerogative is concerned, and especially, too, that a Bill of this kind, if you come to consider it to its limits, may mean an interference with the revenues of Canada. Let me refer to Bourinot upon this very question (pp. 804 and 805), and I think the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) will see there that the point which I took before and which I am repeating now is very clearly taken. Bourinot says:

> Ministers alone can initiate measures of public taxation and expenditure under the constitutional law which gives control of such matters to the Crown and its advisers; while the conventions and understandings of the constitution——

And these, I submit, are quite as strong as the laws of the constitution.

> ——have gradually entrusted them also with the direction and supervision of every matter which demands legislative enactment. In the ordinary nature of things, no measure introduced by a private member can become law unless the Ministry gives facilities for its passage. If the House should press on their attention a particular measure, they must be prepared to give it consideration and to assume full ministerial responsibility for its passage or its rejection.

Now, I submit, in view of that statement in an authority which is recognized by this House, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) ought either be prepared to say what is the policy of the Government on this Bill, or he should advise his friend behind him to let this stand until the Government of Canada, on a matter of this importance, is prepared to give its policy to Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) that even in this House or in the Imperial Parliament, in the case of any and every Bill introduced by any and every private member, that the Government is bound to announce a policy one way or the other. I have seen, time and again, in the Imperial Parliament, members of the Government divided upon Bills which were not Government Bills, and I have seen in this House, time and again, some members of the Government vote for a Bill and some vote against it, it not being a Government measure. It was not a Government Bill; the Government were not responsible for it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not when the policy of the Government was asked.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Opposition would always ask the Government to adopt a policy pro or con; but the Government may not have a policy on the question, one way or the other.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They ought to have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some of them will be in favour of the Bill, and some of them opposed to it. The Government may say: It is not a Government measure, and our supporters are free to vote for the Bill or not, as they please. That is the position we occupy with reference to this Bill; I am opposed to the Bill; I stated that last year, and I state it now. I think it is an unworkable, unjust and unfair Bill, and to some extent I think it is unconstitutional. But some of my colleagues think differently. That may well be. It does not follow that the Government are bound to be unanimous on every Bill, or every resolution, which is produced by a private member. You have often seen the Government differ on temperance resolutions and on fifty other resolutions brought into this House. They are not bound to unite on a measure, unless it is a part of the Government policy, on which they can be challenged.

Mr. TISDALE. These constitutional questions, which must frequently arise under our federated form of government are very difficult questions. With regard to the constitutionality of this Bill, I do not think it is necessary for us to settle that question or to be seriously troubled about it, because I think we ought to be pretty well able to agree upon a decision without reference to its constitutionality, more particularly after hearing the views of the promoter, who, no doubt, is sincere in his desire to get the Bill passed. If we cannot get some further

light from him on the subject, I do not think we have light enough at present to justify us in passing the Bill. The one remark of his that would influence me against it is, that we should pass the Bill, and then leave the courts to decide whether it is law or not. That is one principle of legislation, whether public or private, which I have found most mischievous, and lawyers particularly know the evil of it, for two reasons: First, it costs so much to find out whether a doubtful Bill is law; and secondly, what sort of a standing would a legislature have that passes laws which it is doubtful about? We are here not only to pass laws, but a great deal of our time is occupied, and one of our most important duties is, in trying to remedy legislation that is not plain, so as to make it plain. The hon. gentleman, therefore, comes with a very weak case. He has to admit that, under all the circumstances, it is extremely doubtful whether the Bill is constitutional; and, even if it were constitutional, it is very doubtful whether it would be workable. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman as to that: I think it is quite plain that it is unworkable, and that it cannot accomplish what he desires. I go strongly with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). Even if the Bill were constitutional and were effective, there is no case calling for it. I agree with the hon. member for Ottawa that the trend of legislation is not to create machinery, unless it is absolutely called for, which can be used for founding credit. This, I think, is the fourth Parliament in which this kind of legislation has been introduced, and it has always failed to pass, and each year it grows less. With regard to the province of Ontario, as the hon. member for Ottawa says, there is ample machinery at present in the hands of the courts; and it is a poor argument to say that we should force this legislation in the province of Quebec, if its own legislature will not provide a remedy. We all agree that it is entirely within the competence of the province to legislate on this subject, whereas there is a difference of opinion as to the competence of this Parliament to do so. At all events, we should not interfere until we are quite sure that the law we are asked to pass is within our jurisdiction, more especially as it is the undoubted right and duty of the province to deal with the subject. As the Minister of Railways said last year, if this Bill passed, it would compel every spending department of this Government to inaugurate a set of books in order to keep track of the attachments that might be issued. Now, in my opinion, there is nothing so dangerous, or that brings the action of the legislature so much into contempt as to pass ineffective laws—laws that cannot be enforced. The beauty of our system—and it is something no man ought to forget—is that, when we pass laws, whether in great things or small, the people accept them, and know that the officials behind them will compel their observance; and, in my opinion, it is our first duty to be careful not to pass any legislation which is in danger of failing. In justice to the civil service, I think no case has been made out to show that in equity and fairness there has been such a crying grievance as to justify us in laying a strong hand upon them in order to compel them to pay their honest debts in this way. I have never heard of a case. Even granting that the machinery could be made effective, if there had been a notorious grievance on the subject, there might be some plea for the legislation; but there is not. I do not know why the hon. gentleman—and I say it in no unfair spirit of criticism—is so anxious to have this legislation passed, because he is not in the centre where there are many civil servants. He may advocate the measure in a theoretical sense, but I do not think he has shown any practical necessity for it. The legislature of Ontario had to take a retrograde step to protect the wages of workingmen in that province from being garnisheed, the argument being urged that they needed their wage, and that the need of their wives and families ought to be considered. The same argument will apply to the civil servants. I look on this as a measure that will not be of any good to the people the civil servants deal with, and will be used in an unfair and cruel measure towards the civil service. I think, on all these grounds, we have quite enough to reject the Bill, whether constitutional or not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I may tell my hon. friend that I have had resolutions of Boards of Trade and letters from grocery associations and other people from all parts of the country, urging me to go on with this measure. Here is the last I have received:

Montreal, April 17th, 1899.

The Montreal Grocery Association have much pleasure in fully endorsing the Bill you have presented concerning the attachment of the salaries of Government employees, and hope it will become law during the present session.

That is a sample of the many resolutions I have received within the last year or two. The hon. member says he cannot understand what reason I have for introducing a Bill of this kind.

Mr. TISDALE. What evidence?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman said reason. Well, the reason I have for introducing it is the very opposite to what the hon. gentleman has for opposing it. I was able to submit instances last year of very great hardship existing owing to the impossibility of collecting from people who refused to pay their just debts, under the most aggravating

circumstances. I have no desire to mention these instances again, but many hon. members will bear me out when I say that such instances exist by the thousand. There are gentlemen all around me who are willing to give instances, if the hon. member insists. There is the greatest need for a measure of this kind, or I would not urge its passage. I have no special reason for promoting this Bill, except the great injustice which is committed from time to time under the present law. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say it is not constitutional or not workable, but there are lawyers all around me, just as eminent as he is, who entertain a different opinion.

Mr. TISDALE. I said nothing about its constitutionality.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman did not think it is workable or necessary. I do not wish to be discourteous, and I am much younger than the hon. gentleman, but I have sat in this Parliament three or four sessions, and my experience is that I have never yet known that hon. gentleman to raise his voice in favour of any liberal measure or any measure of benefit to the country. I wish to say now, as the last word I shall have to say of the measure, that my sole object is to attain the best end than can be desired. If hon. gentlemen do not care to vote for the Bill, let them vote against it, but let us at least have a vote. When lawyers differ, laymen should make up their minds to vote, on their own judgment, as they think proper.

Mr. COCHRANE. There are other members just as anxious to discharge their duties as the hon. gentleman is, but in what position are we placed? We have gentlemen of the legal profession disagreeing as to what effect the Bill would have and as to its constitutionality. If we are all anxious to have this Bill become effective, what would be the best way to proceed? Would it be on the lines indicated by the promoter of the Bill, who says: I am going to kick; I must have a division to-night or I will not have anything more to do with it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. The position I took was that inasmuch as I had brought the Bill up for three sessions and we had now fully discussed it during nearly three hours, we ought to decide whether to pass it or not: and if you do not choose to pass it, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to waste my time with it again.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the Bill lies so near to your heart and has lain so near to it so long, why do you want to abandon it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. There will be no object in going on with it further.

Mr. COCHRANE. There would be all the object in the world in having it dealt with in an intelligent way, and it appears to me the most intelligent way would be to refer it to a committee of legal gentlemen, and they might associate with them a man of common sense. But we ought to have an opinion that would be conclusive. I do not agree with the hon. Minister of Marine. I like his smiles and all that sort of thing, but we have a Department of Justice, and I should think that that department was created just to deal with such cases as this on which legal gentlemen differ. I am at a loss to know how I should record my vote if called on, but if I had an authoritative opinion of the Department of Justice, although I do not agree with the policy of the Government, I would feel compelled to decide in this matter according to the opinion of that department regarding the constitutionality of the Bill. We have here a question which should be settled by the Department of Justice, and the better way, I think, would be to refer the Bill to a committee of legal gentlemen, who would be able to come to some conclusion on the various law points raised.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There appears to be a general disposition to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and it would be, perhaps, as well for the committee to rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. I would then have an opportunity of discussing the measure with the Minister of Justice and will not fail to do so. I would, therefore, move, with my hon. friend's consent, that the committee rise and report progress. That will be the best way to attain something definite. That will not kill the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have already seen the Department of Justice. I do not wish to be fractious in this matter at all, but I have sat here every Monday night, since the session began, for the purpose of promoting this Bill, and I think we ought to have a vote now and be done with it.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I think a proper course would be for this committee to appoint a sub-committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This committee cannot do it. We must rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. The House can then refer it to a special committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the committee rises the Bill will not be heard of again.

Mr. POWELL. I do not think the hon. member for Lisgar should take this course. A great many of us are deeply interested in this measure. I speak with perfect candour when I say that I am very anxious that by some Bill we should compass the end sought to be attained. I do not see any use forcing the Bill to a division. There is a very simple procedure indicated by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). For two decades it has been the custom of the Govern-

ment to embody in their railway subsidy contracts the provision that the Government shall, out of any moneys coming to the contractor, pay the workmen. Now, that has worked most admirably, and why not apply it in the case of civil servants? A judgment may be entered up against the debtor and a certified copy of such judgment may be filed with the department, for which the debtor has performed services. Then unless the debtor can satisfy the department that he has settled the judgment, let the amount be deducted from what is coming to him and paid over to the judgment creditor. That has been done in the case of railway contractors for the past twenty years, and if applied to the cases sought to be covered by this Bill it will accomplish everything aimed at, and there can be then no question of constitutionality. As a matter of law, I think that section is perfectly constitutional. I may say that the Department of Justice in its different branches thinks differently, for last year the Solicitor General on a perfectly similar matter with respect to the franchise, laid it down as an incontrovertible principle of constitutional law that this Parliament could not hand over any subject of its jurisdiction to a local legislature. I differ from him, and I see most hon. members do. I would advise the hon. gentleman not to force it to a division.

Motion to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again agreed to—yeas, 26; nays, 17.

Committee rose and reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like if the Minister would consent to have the next order advanced one stage. It may be that when we meet again under this order, the Bill may take up the whole night, and all the legislation after it will be blocked. It will not take a minute to advance this one a stage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All right.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the number of clerks in the inside and outside service connected with the Post Office Department, including city post offices, who have not received their statutory increases since 1st July, 1896, and showing the bulk sum accruing to the department thereby.—(Mr. Hodgins, by Mr. Gillies.)

Return showing the number of first-class and second-class clerks in the inside and outside Civil Service who have had their statutory increases granted them since 1st July, 1896, and the number of increases in each case.—(Mr. Hodgins, by Mr. Gillies.)

Return showing the amount of salaries and travelling expenses paid to the superintendent of the railway mail service and his staff since the organization of the branch, up to 1st May, 1899.—(Mr. Hodgins, by Mr. Gillies.)

Copy of the report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the construction of the Wellington Street and Grand Trunk bridges across the Lachine Canal at Montreal.—(Mr. McInerney, by Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.)

Copy of the final estimate or settlement of section number three (3) of the Lachine Canal enlargement of 1875-1880 in detail.—(Mr. McInerney, by Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.)

Copies of the evidence of Collingwood Schreiber, E. H. Parent, G. F. Desbarats, L. G. Papineau, taken before the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the construction of the Wellington Street and Grand Trunk bridges across the Lachine Canal at Montreal.—(Mr. McInerney, by Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.)

Copies of all exhibits contained in the proceedings of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the construction of the Wellington Street and Grand Trunk bridges across the Lachine Canal at Montreal not embraced in the "Lachine Canal Inquiry" before the Public Accounts Committee, nor in the Supreme Court case of St. Louis, appellant, and Her Majesty the Queen, respondent.—(Mr. McInerney, by Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.)

Copies of the plans and profiles of the substructures of the highway and railroad bridges across the Lachine Canal at Wellington Street, Montreal, the dimensions to be in figures, also isometrical projections of the pivot and rest piers (abutments), showing the figured dimensions and elevations of the several parts, including turntable, circular girder, wheels and machinery.—(Mr. Inerney, by Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.)

Copies of all papers, documents, letters and correspondence between the Government or any of its members and Dr. J. A. Duchesne, veterinary surgeon, of Chicoutimi, in connection with the work of inspecting the cattle for tuberculosis in the county of Chicoutimi, since June, 1896, and with the appointment of Dr. Hall for the said work.—(Mr. Casgrain, by Mr. LaRivière.)

1. Copies of all papers, documents, correspondence, letters, &c., in connection with the appointment of Dr. Hall, veterinary surgeon, of Quebec, for the purpose of inspecting cattle for the discovery of tuberculosis at Hébertville or elsewhere in the county of Chicoutimi.
2. In connection with any part of said work done by his brother.
3. Statement of the number of herds which he or his brother examined.
4. Statement of the sums of money paid for such inspection, travelling expenses, carters, aids or assistants.
5. Statement of any sum or sums paid to David Ouellet, of Hébertville, in connection with said inspections.—(Mr. Casgrain, by Mr. LaRivière.)

Return of the contract with A. Onderdonk, or a copy thereof, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the several awards made by the arbitrators chosen to value the rolling stock, and all letters and telegrams referring to the purchase of said rolling stock from the said Onderdonk; together with any opinion or opinions given by the Justice Department as to the obigations of the Crown to take over the said rolling stock, together with the cheques given in settlement of said rolling stock; and all other papers and documents relating to the purchase of said rolling stock.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copy of any correspondence from the Montreal Board of Trade, or any other board of trade in

the Dominion, requesting insolvency legislation.—(Mr. Bergeron, by Mr. LaRivière.)

Copies of all petitions or communications addressed to the Government or any member thereof within the last two years, by or on behalf of any board of trade or other public body, asking for insolvency legislation.—(Mr. Quinn, by Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all correspondence had with the Department of Railways and Canals, or with any member of the Government, in connection with the cases of Pierre Michaud and Fred. Belanger, porter and track foreman, respectively, on the Intercolonial Railway at Trois Pistoles, and dismissed therefrom in 1898, and for all petitions and papers in regard thereto.—(Mr. Foster.)

Return showing the names of persons to whom payments were made of allowances or drawbacks on freight charges on the Nova Scotia portion of the Intercolonial Railway from 1st July, 1898, to 31st March, 1899, giving amount and date of payment and date at which overcharge was made.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou.)

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 27th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 162) to incorporate the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hurley.)

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved that the House again resolve itself in Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply I deem it my duty to bring to the attention of this House some of the most serious considerations that could possibly occupy the attention of a free Parliament. I have to ask at the outset the indulgence of the House, because the subject that I propose to address myself to, so far as I have been able to consider it, does not admit of a brief statement, or a brief introduction. Will you, Sir, credit me with this statement, which I make in all sincerity, and it is that I never rose with more reluctance to address the House than I do on this occasion. I am impelled to perform what I consider my duty by the most serious sense of my responsibility as a member of the House of Commons of Canada. I will not say more, Sir, at this moment, because I hope, before I conclude my observations, that the House will agree with me, that whether I am well-advised, or ill-advised, the sincerity of that statement cannot be questioned. A member of this House enjoys privileges, and a member of this House has responsibilities in all the statements that he may make. I want to invoke not so much the privilege as the responsibility in that connection, but, before doing that, as I shall have to animadvert upon private character, as in so far as private character is connected with public affairs and with the affairs of the Government, I want to recall the attention of the House to the fact that attacks on private character under circumstances not so solemn as the circumstances that surround the subject of my speech to-day have been made, and made by members older in parliamentary experience than I am, and by members occupying great positions to-day and positions of responsibility. In the first place I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that, in regard to the privilege which is accorded to a member of this House, this was the statement of Chief Justice Cockburn in the case of Wasson vs. Walter, after centuries' experience in the House of Commons in England, where he made this observation:

> Numerous as are the circumstances in which the conduct and characters of individuals have been called in question in Parliament——

He went on to deal with the statement that had been made in the House of Lords by either a Lord Chancellor, or an ex-Lord Chancellor, where he had stigmatized the remarks and observations of a man outside of the House as scandalous and disgraceful. Then we have in our own House, a record of where a colleague of the present Prime Minister, Mr. Alfred Jones, attacked the characters of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and of a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and where he stigmatized the Chief Justice of that court as a "foul slanderer." That was in 1878. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) also appears on record as having attacked Judge Travis, and the appointment of that judge, and he attacked him by right of his privilege in this House, when he said, speaking of his appointment:

> It was an appointment that under no circumstances should be made. That is the opinion of almost every member of the House, because hon. members have more or less opportunity of judging as to whether he was suitable to the province or not. He may come out of the investigation well, and he may technically escape condemnation, but if any one reads the public press of that part of the country he must come to the conclusion that the administration of justice has been degraded and that, practically, there is no respect for the Bench in Calgary to-day.

That was in the year 1886. The present Minister of Justice, when a member of this

House, from his seat in Parliament deemed it his right to make the following observations when dealing with the rebellion in the North-west Territories :—

I thought I had the names of the parties here who gave me this information, but I find I have not. I was told that the furs were divided between Mr. Bedson, Mr. Hayter Reed and the General who was in command. My information is so direct, so circumstantial, that I have had in my own mind no doubt whatever, with respect to the accuracy of that information, and I should like to know very much what redress has been given, and whether any inquiry has taken place. For it seems to me that a party who could be guilty of such a proceeding is not one worthy of being retained in the public service. I have already given the names of the parties : Mr. Hayter Reed, Mr. Bedson and General Middleton.

That was in the year 1887, and in the same session of Parliament the present Minister of Justice used this language :

I call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that there was a half-breed named Charles Bremner living in the vicinity of Battleford and having in his possession $7,000 worth of furs ; that he was arrested and sent to Regina and afterwards discharged, because there was nothing against him ; that during his absence his furs were taken possession of by the military and that General Middleton, this man Bedson and Hayter Reed divided the furs amongst them. There can be no doubt in the matter. These three parties instead of protecting the property of an innocent man took it and divided it amongst them.

Later on, the Minister of Justice said :

But, when a man goes into his own country and is paid and is liberally paid by the public, for the service he is discharging, and instead of using his authority to protect people and to preserve their property, uses his position, because he thinks the public are not likely to become cognizant of his conduct ; to rob a citizen of his property, especially when the man is a half-breed living beyond the influence of public opinion and reach of public intelligence ; the Government ought not come down to Parliament and propose to increase his salary as is done in this case. I say these men ought to be called to account for their conduct and they ought to be held responsible to the law of the land for what they have done in this matter. I do not think we are discharging our duty to the people of this country when we permit officers to conduct themselves in this way to escape that censure which their conduct richly deserves.

I call particular attention to the last sentence of that observation of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills), in connection with much that I have to say on this occasion.

Then, Sir, I approach the subject with a recollection of the extraordinary inclination the present Administration have shown for commissions of inquiry—commissions to prove, commissions to take down, commissions to search out, commissions to ferret into and to dive underneath, in order to fasten a charge upon some officer, who they are told by a political supporter, has been guilty of the offence of political partisanship ; or to investigate and inquire and thoroughly search into the affairs of some institution, such as the Kingston Penitentiary, the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, the Dorchester Penitentiary, in order that if possibly it could be proved that any officer, high or low, in that institution had been guilty of dereliction of duty he should be immediately discharged from the service, or, at any rate, that the public should become familiar with all the facts connected with the administration of these institutions. I dwell upon that just for a moment to show that inquisitorial spirit with which this Government heralded their advent to office and this inquisitorial spirit which they have continued ; this inquisitorial spirit which they backed up by votes of large sums of money, on the justification that no one could complain if, at the end of these inquisitions, some delinquent was got hold of and made a public example of. There was no man asked to take any particular responsibility in connection with this matter. There was no political supporter of the Government asked to come out in the open and formulate charges. There was no member of Parliament defied to risk or imperil his position, but on the information of the slimmest character so far as Parliament is aware, these commissions were issued and these inquiries were made, with the result, I submit, that there was nothing arising out of them that could at all justify this expensive curiosity of the Government. Now, then, taking a general glance again at matters of public importance, I would recall to your recollection, Mr. Speaker, as an old parliamentarian, what was the experience of the English Parliament in connection with corrupt practices at general elections. How, for instance, in the 15th or 16th year of Her Majesty's reign, the public was alarmed at the evidence in election trials that pointed to a state of general political corruption in certain constituencies ; and how, early in the reign of Her Majesty, legislation was adopted in England whereby the Parliament could delegate to judges of high position, extraordinary powers, powers that had never been delegated before by Parliament, in order that wherever there was a ground for the belief, the ground for a suspicion even, that general corruption had prevailed in the constituency, there should be a tribunal that could probe the whole matter to the bottom, so that as a result of their report to Parliament, Parliament might act, and the action of Parliament, of course, as we know, was represented in certain cases by the disfranchisement of the whole constituency. A good many years later on we copied that legislation. To that legislation I particularly refer to-day, because the motion which I shall put into your hands has direct reference to that wholesome principle and to that practice, which has been of incalculable advantage to the mother country, and since we adopted that legislation, of equal advantage to us. In the statutes of England, for in-

stance, we find that the Act is entitled "to provide for the more effectual inquiring into circumstances of corrupt practices at elections." The sections to which I wish to call the attention of the House are particularly sections 6, 9 and 14. Section 6 provides that the commissioners shall, by all such lawful means as to them appear best, inquire with a view to the discovery of the truth in regard to the existence of general corruption in a constituency. Section 9 provides that for the more effectively prosecuting an inquiry, every one who upon such examination "makes a true discovery, to the best of his knowledge touching all things as to which he is so examined, shall be freed from all penal actions, forfeitures, punishments, disabilities and incapacities, and all criminal prosecutions." I call particular attention to section 9. Then, section 14 provides that the commissioners shall have power to award to any witness a reasonable sum for his travelling expenses and for his maintenance. I call particular attention, also, to section 14.

Now, Sir, in the time of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, Mr. Blake, as Minister of Justice, introduced practically a copy of that old English statute, which forms chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada; and paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of that chapter will show that these important sections have not been lost sight of, but have been re-enacted into the laws of Canada. And, I ask you to note this, that in "Hansard" of 1876, Mr. Blake is reported to have pointed out, in regard to this statute, that in connection with corrupt practices at elections, it is obviously desirable to avail ourselves of the services of the judges of the Supreme Court or the judges of the provincial courts for these purposes; and that the object of giving full powers for the calling of witnesses and for indemnifying witnesses who answer truly, is in order to facilitate the object one has in view in an inquiry of this description—mark these words, Mr. Speaker—to get at the truth, to search to the bottom; and therefore he advocates that a very liberal indemnifying clause should be provided. I need not dilate upon that important feature, for it was the novel feature in England, and it was the novel feature in Canada at that time—the power of indemnifying witnesses; the power of protecting a witness who came forward and practically turned Queen's evidence. Not, mark you, as under another statute to which I shall refer, and under which the Government of the day have pretended to act in the case of the Yukon, to make the evidence of a witness such that it could not be used against him in a subsequent prosecution; but to enable the court and the judges to make him, at the moment when he made an incriminatory statement, entitled to a free pardon, an indemnity, and a protection against all prosecution in the future for the crime with which he was connected, or in regard to which he would give evidence to assist the commission of inquiry.

Then, touching the subject of commissions of inquiry, I would recall to your recollection a statement made long ago in regard to the disposition and the spirit of the House of Commons of England. Pitt said, in 1788, on a motion for an inquiry into the conduct of the Admiralty in England, that whenever a case was made out strong enough to warrant a suspicion of abuse, that deserved either censure or punishment, he should have held it to be the indispensable duty of the House to proceed to an inquiry. And Fox, speaking in the same debate, said it was the constitutional province and undoubted duty of the House to watch over the executive departments; and where they had cause to suspect abuse, to institute an inquiry with a view to censure or punishment.

Then, we have the present Minister of Justice, when a member of this House, in 1891, referring to the case of Lord Torrington, and using these words:

> Take the case of Lord Torrington, in the matter of the rebellion in the Island of Ceylon. A Royal Commission was appointed there, as it was too far away for Parliament to investigate.

Indicating not merely an adherence to the practice laid down by all in England, and followed down to the present day, but pointing out where it was essential and where it was reasonable that, instead of Parliament conducting the inquiry under its particular supervision, it should delegate its great powers and all the powers it possessed to a royal commission. The case mentioned as the case for justification was where the matters to be inquired into were situated afar off.

Another aspect of these commissions in England is adverted to by Todd, in his work on "The Parliamentary Government in England," where he says that commissions of inquiry ought not to be of a partisan character. Then, the late member for North Simcoe, in this House in 1878, referred to this subject. In opposition to a Government that had an immense ministerial majority, referring to the Welland Canal contracts and to the Goderich harbour job, as he described it, the late Mr. McCarthy said—and I quote his language:

> It was idle to pretend that a committee could be obtained in this House whose decision would be viewed as that of an impartial judicial tribunal. It was utterly impossible to suppose such a thing.

And later on in the same speech, he said:

> It was neither fair nor reasonable to ask that charges which were made should and must necessarily be referred to committees. He did not understand there was any rule of that kind.

I would again go to the mother country, and refer you, Sir, to such commissions as I have been able to discover that have been issued in connection with any such matters as immediately pertain to the subject of my speech. I refer first to the Sheffield inquiry, which was of a judicial character. Referring to the Members of Parliament Bill, which had to do with the charges referred to the Parnell Commission, in 1888, the Home Secretary, Mr. Mathews, referred to the Sheffield rattening case, where outrages had been committed at Sheffield and criminal proceedings had proved abortive. The public mind was exercised and accusations were levelled against individuals. A question arose as to whether the trade union was responsible for the outrages. The inquiry provided was a judicial inquiry, and the reference was in the largest possible terms. It was a general inquiry into acts alleged by any one in the world against these trade unions or associations, and it was stated expressly on the floor of the English Parliament that that commission was intended to ascertain, as far as possible, the whole truth about the grievances, outrages and scandals which had moved the public mind. That was in the discussion of the Parnell Bill, and that is in later days. But following up the reference, I find that in a discussion of this Bill, to which Mr. Mathews had alluded in 1888, Mr. Walpole said it was proposed to make the commission of a non-partisan character, the president being the late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Sir John Grey, and the composition of the commission was a most important question, because unless constituted in such a way as to give confidence to those whose interests were concerned, it would be found to produce very little benefit.

Then we come to the Royal Commission of Inquiry in England, in 1888, into the management of the Metropolitan Board of Works. The Secretary of State for the home department informed the House of Commons that that commission would retrospectively include everything from the foundation of the board. Lord Randolph Churchill, who initiated this inquiry and who moved the resolution for it, made some observations that seem to me so relevant to the subject in hand that I ask the particular attention of the House to them. Referring to the extent the Metropolitan are under the management of the Board of Works, he said :

> That a body administering affairs so large is bound to possess, if it is to be efficient, the most entire public confidence which can well be imagined.

When you remember that I am proposing an inquiry into the administration of affairs of such a large territory as the Yukon district, the applicability of these observations will be apparent. Lord Randolph Churchill went on to say :

> That members and officers of the board had been interested in property required for public use, and that parties on the board were practically paid for some of their advice given on the board. That members of the board engaged outside in professional duties and used their personal influence inside the board in favour of the scheme submitted in which they were professionally interested, and that land which had been held by the board was in the hands of a clique which had been guided by interested and personal motives.

Then, he explained, and you will see, Mr. Speaker, the weakness of his position as compared with the strength of mine as I develop it :

> These charges had been mainly made by newspapers.

He took no responsibility, he incurred no risk, from the beginning of his motion to the end of it, and I ask you to contrast his position with that which I propose to take on this occasion. He said :

> These charges had been mainly made by newspapers. He also referred to a statement by another newspaper, that the Board of Works is the most corrupt public body in London, and it was quite notorious among the architects that members of the board had been bribed.

He also referred to a statement made by a member of the board, that the Estate Office was corrupt from top to bottom, and in his speech, he went on to say :

> I can understand that there are some hon. members who will think a parliamentary committee preferable to a Royal Commission. I think that a parliamentary committee has many advantages, but there is this disadvantage about such a committee—that owing to its composition and to the character of the House of Commons, a parliamentary committee cannot prevent itself from being more or less of a party character. I think that it would be most dangerous to the interests involved in connection with the Metropolitan Board of Works, and most dangerous to London government, if the House of Commons gave a shadow of encouragement to the introduction of party spirit into this matter. * * * I think that from every point of view, if the House comes to the conclusion that an inquiry ought to be held into these matters, a Royal Commission composed of eminent men beyond all possibility of being suspected of any party would be a preferable body before a parliamentary committee.

And having made his motion, in his own language, the Speaker suggested a better form, and this motion, on the suggestion of the Speaker, carried :

> That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire and report upon the Metropolitan Board of Works and into the irregularities which are alleged to have taken place in connection therewith, and to assure Her Majesty that this House will concur in empowering such commission to take evidence on oath, to compel attendance of witnesses, and to call for all necessary records, documents, &c.

And later on, the Government acceded to the reasonableness of the view that in an inquiry of such an important character, the country should pay the expenses of procuring the attendance of the witnesses.

Coming again to Canada, I call your attention to the language of the Royal Commission that was granted in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is the part of that commission to which I refer :

> The questions which have arisen have become the subject of discussion, both in and out of Parliament, touching the propriety of and responsibility for large expenditures connected with this work. That allegations have been made as to divers irregularities and extravagances, neglects and other derelictions of duty on the part of officers and others employed on the said work, and that sundry irregularities and improprieties have taken place in the obtaining of contracts for portions of the said work, and in the performance of the same.

Sir John Macdonald, in "Hansard" of 1881, speaking on the Address, and referring to this commission, said :

> It was announced in the House, press and country that there had been gross improprieties —this had been made the battle-ground of both parties. There were charges and counter-charges of misconduct of official subordinates, and even insinuations, as well as assertions, with regard to members of the Government. It is absurd to suppose that a committee of the House could by any possibility satisfactorily examine into matters of that kind. It would be a farce, a most perfunctory inquiry, if made here, in Ottawa, dragging witnesses from British Columbia and the Georgian Bay for the purpose of a full inquiry. The only consequence of this inquiry will be this : if the commissioners will carry out their commission honestly and impartially, they will inquire into all the proceedings connected with the railway. They will report without fear, favour or affection, what they consider has been wrong, what extravagant, what well done—what parties are liable to censure, who are worthy of praise. I can only say this—and, if my word be doubted, we can prove to the House—that not one single word of instruction, not a single word of insinuation, not one hint has been given to the commissioners, or any of them, as to the manner in which they should perform their duty.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before those commissioners were called, the Minister of Public Works, the late Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, and his successor in office on the Conservative side, and public men of all descriptions and party proclivities, and the commission was of the character that Sir John Macdonald said he intended it should be. Then coming more directly to the difficulties, the charges, the grievances in the gold fields, coming more directly to the case in hand, where, evidently, from the terms of the commission, the Government of the day had nothing to fear, where they stood as independent as any man in the community could stand, I find in the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Council of Victoria, Australia, in 1854-55, the following Minute of the Executive of the Lieutenant Governor, authorizing a Board of Inquiry, dated 30th of October, 1854, in which the following paragraphs appear, and I read them in full :—

> 3. Has the conduct of the officers generally in camp at Ballarat, either during the execution of their duty, or at other times, been such as to inspire respect and confidence amongst the population in general ?
>
> 4. Charges of corruption having been publicly advanced against officers of the Ballarat Camp, it will be the duty of the board——

And again, for the purposes of comparison later on, I ask your particular attention to the language of these instructions to this commission :

> ——it will be the duty of the board narrowly to search for and inquire whether there is any foundation for such serious accusations, and they will specify the individuals, if any, who they believe to be guilty.

That, on its face, is reasonable, and just what it should have been. It was a board of inquiry. All these commissions, all these investigations, short of the indictment, short of having the criminal in the box on his defence, are of an inquisitorial nature. That is shown by the instructions that I have quoted in the Australian case. The object is to relieve the public mind. Where there is suspicion, right or wrong, over the length and breadth of the land, that there is something wrong in the state of Denmark, the officer who goes to inquire into that, should not sit as a judge and ask for an indictment, should not sit as a judge and ask that all the terms of the indictment should be technically drawn up, ask for the prisoner to be produced in advance, and to be charged with the indictment, ask for the counsel, and ask for all the formalities that properly surround any man really on trial, either for life or in regard to offences where, if guilty, he may be sent to prison. They are the preliminary steps, and are used by the Government in order to see whether some one should not be brought to the bar. They are used for the purpose of ascertaining whether some one should not be given notice that he is to be formally charged by indictment, by the finding of the grand jury in all these various particulars. Is that an extreme view ? Let me take the next case under my hand. The Government of the day —I quarrel not with them—appreciated the objects of these royal commissions in a case in which I have asked for the papers, and where the papers have come down. They were vague charges, so far as the papers disclose. They were exceedingly vague charges in connection with the Crown Timber Agency out in New Westminster, B.C. It is only in the year 1898, I think, that this Government was called upon to deal with these general charges in regard to the Crown Timber Agency of the province of British Columbia, under the administration of

the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), being in an unsatisfactory condition. Let us see what happened. Mr. Archer Martin, then barrister in British Columbia, now a judge of the Supreme Court, was appointed to inquire into the Crown Timber Office at New Westminster—Sessional Papers, No. 112, reference 115. The papers have been brought down this session. I do not think, speaking subject to correction, that I will omit any important fact, when I make the following statement in regard to this commission of inquiry.

A complaint was made on December 5, 1892, by a settler that the firm of Genelle Bros. had men cutting timber on his place, and that he had protested to the Crown timber agent in vain. Further complaints were made in 1893, and in September, 1896, the settler complains that the timber inspector pays no attention to his appeals, and, when he visits the district becomes the guest of Genelle. That is the substance of the information, as I take it; I am willing to be corrected on that. I am willing, for the purpose of my argument, to be considered to have passed lightly over some other complaints. But it is enough for my purpose to say that seems to be the gravamen of the charge of the settler, and in the papers brought down that seems to be the substance of the complaints that led to the commission. But let the charges be more serious, let the assertion be more serious, imagine what you will, on February 2nd, 1897, a minute of Council approves of a memorandum from the Minister of the Interior, who states he has received such information in regard to the affairs of the Crown timber agent in British Columbia as would appear in his judgment to require to be investigated immediately. The commission is accordingly issued, authorizing Mr. Martin to inquire into and report upon the affairs of the Crown timber agent in British Columbia. That is dated February 2nd, 1897. I ask the members of this House who are good enough to follow me, to note that that commission is under the same statute, is of the same character and of the same description as the commission that was issued to Mr. Ogilvie in connection with the Yukon. On the issue of the commission, the Crown timber agent is accordingly suspended. The Department of the Interior proceeds to forward papers and returns received from licensees of timber berths to the commissioner, as it is thought that he might want to seek to examine them.

I do not question the propriety of this; I ask you to bear it in mind in the case of the commission that was issued to the Yukon. On February 27th, 1897, the commissioner writes to the secretary of the Interior that he finds that it may be necessary to hold sessions in other parts of the province, in order that the whole affairs of the agency may be thoroughly investigated, which is, I understand, the object of the commission. He goes on to discuss the belief that the returns of the licensees are inaccurate, and says:

> I presume you intend to leave me a free hand to sift the matter to the bottom.

Again I do not blame the Government, for the purposes of my argument. The Deputy Minister, on March 15, 1897, wires:

> Investigation to be as thorough as possible.

The memorandum of the Deputy Minister of the 6th of March, 1897, to the Minister contains the following:—

> No definite charge is made against Mr. Higginson.

Mr. Higginson was the Crown timber agent. I ask the members of the House again to note this carefully: "This investigation was to be as thorough as possible." On March 4th, 1897, the assistant secretary of the department writes to the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company, requesting that his officers at New Westminster will afford all necessary information to Mr. Martin, as it is desirable to check the telegraph account of the Crown timber agent. On the 11th of March, 1897, a detailed statement of the contingent expenditure of the New Westminster office from June, 1895, to December, 1896, was transmitted to the commissioner. On the 20th March, 1897, the commissioner writes that, under the circumstances, he does not think that he should search for further evidence against this official, but that he should utilize that which crops up in investigating other matters. That which "crops up"—I ask you again to observe this language of the commissioner. He adds:

> I issued subpœnas for the principal witnesses, examination of whom would take all next week. This will clear up all the evidence in this part of the country, but it may be necessary for me to go up to, say Kamloops and that vicinity, for a few days. I think that it would be cheaper and more satisfactory for me to go there, where I might pick up other evidence,——

"Pick up," I ask hon. members again to remember that—

> ——than to bring uncertain witnesses a long distance at considerable expense.
>
> This commission sat at New Westminster from the 19th to the 29th March, and examined 23 witnesses. It became evident that the condition of things up country would require to be investigated, particularly in regard to lumbering operations in the vicinity of Shuswap Lakes, and that it would be less expensive and more expeditious for the commissioner to go to the witnesses than for witnesses to come to the commissioner. I decided to hold sittings at Donald, Notch Hill and Kamloops, where the Golden Lumber Company and the Columbia River Lumber Company were examined.

Now, we have had discussed in this House what I might call the Spinks Commission,

and you will observe at page 386 of the Votes and Proceedings of this House the resolution that was voted down. I do not intend to refer to a past debate, but I am sure it is doing no violence to the rules of the House to refer to the facts, still fresh in the recollection of hon. gentlemen, as to how that commission was set on foot—the fact that counsel were supplied to the parties who failed to make specific charges and supplied at the expense of this country to prosecute the charges against the judge; subpœnas were issued and every attempt was made, and yet that commission proved abortive. But I call attention to the fact—and I would like to transgress the rules of the House just for one moment—that the justification at the hands of the Solicitor General amounted to this, that, in any event, a great public service had been done by the result of that commission, because the suspicions that existed in the community had been removed, and, therefore, the fountain of justice was again considered to run pure. So, practically, that commission issued against the judge, one of the highest officers of state. In that case suspicions were thought sufficient ground for a commission, and the Government paid all expenses of conducting the prosecution.

Then, coming down to the case in hand, I find this in the Department of the Interior report for 1898, page XIV. Referring to the question of charges that had been made from time to time against certain Government officials in the territory, of improper acts in the discharge of their duties, attention is called to that portion of Mr. Walsh's report of the 15th of August, above referred to, dealing with this particular matter. And in view of what Mr. Ogilvie has reported, I ask again particular attention to that statement in regard to Mr. Walsh's statement to the Department of the Interior:

> While there would appear to be no doubt from this report as to the groundlessness of the accusations that have been made, I may say it was, nevertheless, considered desirable, both in justice to the public and to the officials themselves, to have a thorough investigation, and thus afford an opportunity to persons who have complaints to make to substantiate the same by proper evidence.

I repeat that—

> It was considered desirable, both in justice to the public and to the officials themselves, to have a thorough investigation, and thus afford an opportunity to persons who have complaints to make to substantiate the same by proper evidence.

I will call your atention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that careful pains seem to have been taken not only that there should not be a thorough investigation, mark you, but that there should be "no opportunity to persons who have complaints to make to substantiate the same by proper evidence," though the Deputy Minister in the innocence of his heart, was led to make that official report. What gave rise to the Ogilvie Commission, so-called? The petitioners, the Miners' committee, standing with nothing but their own resources at their backs—men who had gone out to brave all the difficulties and trials of that country, its climate, its condition—they, and they reasonably ask, on making certain charges in regard to the delinquency of officials and the corruption which they charge to prevail in the Yukon district, for a commission of inquiry. But they were sufficiently well advised to ask, that in connection with the inquiry, there should be those very things, that, to the mind of English legislators, to the mind of Hon. Edward Blake were so essential in a matter of this kind; and that that is where you run a tilt against corruption of that character, where you dare to attack corruption in communities, and it is believed to be corruption widespread, corruption systematic—you could not hope to proceed without these provisions that enabled the commission of inquiry not merely to pay the expenses but to protect the men who, on coming into the box in order to expose the corruption, would have to confess their own venality and their own crime. So these men ask that provision be made for the expenses of witnesses and the protection of witnesses, and these are features in the resolution of the miners to which I have referred, and these are features which are conspicuously absent from the commission that issued. Let us look, for instance, to see how this came up. I have here the report of Mr. Ogilvie, and all through it, from start to finish, you find among other noteworthy things in it that the men who wanted to expose to the light of day the exact state of things were hindered by the fact that they could not bring men at their own cost and charges from the creeks miles and miles away to live in Dawson at their own expense during the pleasure of this commission, that they could not induce these men to come in without the protection that the Legislature of Great Britain and the Legislature of Canada has seen fit, in cases of this character, to throw around the witnesses. For these reasons, the commission became wholly unsatisfactory. This is what Mr. Ogilvie found. The notices that were given did not indicate—as they could not indicate—that there would be protection for witnesses or allowances for witnesses; consequently, you will see all through this answers of this character: "We cannot secure immunity for our witnesses," said Mr. George, for instance, page 77, "we cannot compel them to answer."

In the stenographic report of the evidence submitted by Mr. Ogilvie, one of the parties, at the outset of the inquiry, wanted to know if there was any safety accorded to witnesses if they appeared. The commissioner referred to the provision of chap.

33 of our statutes. I need not quote it; it is the well-known provision that where witnesses answer candidly, such evidence as they give on the stand cannot be used against them. The House will recollect the difference between that provision and the one in the Corrupt Practices Act and the one in the English Act, where there is power to pardon a witness on the spot, not merely to protect him from having used against him the confession he has made, but to enable him to go free. Under the Act to which the commissioner referred a witness might be indicted on the strength of having made a statement, and, while he was protected from having the evidence used at the trial, he knew that he incurred responsibility for his action, while under these other Acts he could be relieved of responsibility immediately. There was no power to grant pardon to a witness who had made a clean breast of the case, and which, as Mr. Blake said, is a most desirable and necessary provision where the purpose is to ferret out crime. The miners' memorial is dated August 25th, 1898. The notice respecting this commission was not issued until the 25th of January, 1899, notwithstanding that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) told us that a special messenger was detailed to take this commission in to Mr. Ogilvie. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is not in his seat, but probably he could account for the delay. All through the history of this sad case you will observe, Mr. Speaker, that what was required, if there was a desire to probe to the bottom and ferret out the facts, was expedition. Everything was gained by the delinquents by the lapse of time. Some of them, no matter what this Parliament may do, before anything reasonable can be done, will be able to plead the statute of limitations, which is incorporated with many of these crimes in the Criminal Code. If they are able to say that two years have elapsed since they stole money, since they took bribes, since they committed gross frauds upon this Government and this country in the acquisition of claims, dredging leases and so on, they will be able to laugh at the law. So, we will find that everything that has occurred, from start to finish, even that which occurred in this House not so long ago, has been the very thing that any criminal connected with this transaction would have desired. The notice respecting this commission is dated on the 25th January, 1899. It does not indicate, because it could not truthfully indicate, that there was any protection for witnesses, or that there was any indemnity for them, and so the men who might otherwise have been induced to come from the creeks and from their mining locations to Dawson City to give evidence in connection with, say, a $10 or a $25 bribe, or with some nefarious conduct,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

knew they must abandon their work, come down to Dawson, live in this expensive place and pay the whole cost themselves without any remuneration whatever. At the outset there was apparently a desire on the part of the Government that everything should be done so quickly that the report should be here by the meeting of Parliament. By reference to "Hansard" we find evidence of it in the letter accompanying the petition. Ordinarily Parliament meets in February; this commission, notice of which was given in January, 1899, was supposed to be concluded in time for the pending session. No provision as to the expenses was made. I received a communication dated Dawson, the 27th February, which is as follows:—

Dawson, Yukon Territory, 27th Feb., 1899.

The Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Sir,—We believe you are vitally interested in the correct government of this country.

We beg to inclose a copy of our letter of above date to Sir Wilfrid Laurier protesting against the character of the inquiry into the conduct of the officials now being held in Dawson. We also inclose a copy of the "Klondike Nugget" newspaper, which gives a substantial, correct account of the first two days' sitting, and expresses the feeling of the miners and the criticisms which are current.

The confidence of the miners in the sincerity of the Government in this matter and desire for their fair treatment generally is considerably shaken. They demand, at any price, a pure and capable administration.

We, therefore, place the facts before you, in the hope that your influence will be used towards arriving at this end. You will doubtless see—if a complete report of the first two days' sitting if the commission is available to you—that the questions asked by the commissioner were not searching, and his utterances exposed the nature of his sympathies. The newspaper inclosed will inform you how this ruling of February 23rd surprised us at a time when it was confidently expected that a complete exposé would be made of grave misdemeanours occurring up to the present time.

We would point out to you that Mr. Ogilvie's ruling exempts from investigation all official acts since he has been at the head of affairs. Also, that by official invitation of a proclamation by Mr. Ogilvie a large number of vital charges had been made in writing and placed in his hands, and many more were in preparation, which are now ruled out of court by his lamentable decision.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) GEORGE T. C. ARMSTRONG,
DONALD MacGREGOR,
PERCY McDOUGALL,
ARNOLD F. GEORGE.

This is a document which, I may say, has been treated with a great deal of contempt by the Government. When I asked, very late indeed, perhaps twice, whether any answer had been sent to this communication, I was told that none had been sent. First, I will read the communication to the Government:

Dawson, Yukon Territory, 27th Feb., 1899.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, M.P.

Sir,—Our memorial, dated 25th August, 1898, desired on behalf of the miners of this country a searching and impartial investigation into the conduct of the officials of this territory.

It appears that the interpretation which Mr. Ogilvie's legal advisers place on the commission framed in response to that memorial limits the inquiry to the actions of the officials prior to the 25th August, 1898 (the date of our memorial), six months ago. We cannot believe this interpretation is in accordance with the spirit in which the commission was framed, falling so far short of what we, your memorialists, desire, and so hopelessly inadequate to the needs of the situation.

We would also call to your notice that Mr. Ogilvie informs us he has no instructions with regard to expenses, and cannot even provide maintenance for penniless witnesses compelled to come in from remote creeks.

We desire to point out that such an inquiry can be productive of no good, adds to the dissatisfaction of the people, and has already become a by-word amongst the miners.

We took part in the first two days of the commission, and conclusively proved one, the least of our charges when a decision was called for by the attorney for the officials regarding the illegality of evidence of misconduct subsequent to the 25th August, 1898. The decision was given that such evidence was inadmissible.

We, therefore, immediately withdrew from such an unsatisfactory and inefficient inquiry.

Furthermore, we strongly object to the principle of a departmental inquiry—the head of a department inquiring into the acts of his subordinates, for which he is responsible.

We would beg for the immediate appointment of a parliamentary commission, with power to inquire into matter occurring up to the date of the sitting, and with proper provision for expenses, of at least three members, acting under the instructions of a parliamentary committee.

Your obedient servants,

(Sgd.) GEORGE T. C. ARMSTRONG,
DONALD MacGREGOR,
PERCY McDOUGALL.

Now, I asked a question in regard to whether this had been received and I was told it had, and on the 15th of May I asked :

Has any reply been sent to the communication of the 27th of February, 1899, from the committee of the miners of the Yukon River, received by the hon. Minister of the Interior on the 1st of May, 1899 ?

The Minister in reply said, "No." Now then, have these men reasonable ground for being dissatisfied with the rulings and with the conduct of that commission. Their position and mine are totally different. They asked for a parliamentary inquiry, and to the best of their knowledge they limit their charges. My charges, which I shall put in your hands, Mr. Speaker, are of a far more extensive character, but, nevertheless, under no circumstances can reasonable men deem that the action of the Government in regard to such charges as these men fulminated, could have the confidence of the country. Who was Mr. Ogilvie ? Let us recall the constitution of this committee. I cannot recall a bolder thing ever done in the history of Canada, or bolder conduct following it up, than the Minister of the Interior was guilty of. You will remember, Sir, how satirical he was in his official capacity, when as a member of this Parliament I ventured to ask about the relationship of various officers to him, and the relationship of various officers one with another. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) told us he had not time to go into genealogical theories or facts. I shall show you, Sir, without much difficulty, that if he understood the responsibilities of his position, or cared for them, that was a very important question for him, and that the country, in coming to a conclusion with reference to an inquiry by Mr. Ogilvie, who was a subordinate of the Government, into the conduct of other subordinates, might have good reason to believe that the uncle of the Minister of the Interior by marriage, was not the proper man to inquire into charges that came so near the nephew's door. I say it was a gross scandal, I say it was one of the worst scandals that has ever been known, to put such a man into such a delicate position, and the fact that Mr. Ogilvie would act under the circumstances indicated his entire unfitness for that position. The report of the commission that is now before us shows his unfitness. I will demonstrate to the letter before I get through that he was absolutely unfit and absolutely unqualified. The report of the evidence, the stenographic notes taken before Mr. Ogilvie, all show his unfitness, his desire to shield, and show at the outset, his misconception of his duties as a commissioner, show, too, that it made him lose his head, so that he thought he was a judge of assize, and show that before any man could receive information on pubilc questions, that man, forsooth, was to be served with a notice to give him an opportunity to be present and to stand his trial. All through this business, the whole affair will show that it was honeycombed with these relatives. In the first place, the nephew censures his uncle at the outset. Mr. Ogilvie had already had to submit, as the Minister of the Interior shows, to a censure at the hands of his nephew, the Minister of the Interior. The Minister had censured him for his indiscreet connection and his indiscreet letters with reference to a company that was to operate in the Yukon. That was a rap over the knuckles for Mr. Ogilvie at the start. So, we have this relationship between the Minister of the Interior and Mr. Ogilvie, who was the judge of the Minister of the Interior. We have another double running relationship, as the evidence is considered later on. We have the Walsh and Walsh combination : the James Morrow Walsh, the Louis Walsh, and the Phil. Walsh combination : all figure prominently in this arrangement—and the relations between Major Walsh and the Minister of the Interior were, perhaps, even closer than the relations between Mr. Ogilvie and the Minister of the Interior. We

have the Willison and Willison combination also. On one occasion the Minister of the Interior was able to officially state that Mr. Willison, of the Yukon, was not a brother of Mr. Willison, editor of the "Globe." On another occasion when asked if Mr. Willison, of the Yukon, was not a cousin of the editor of the "Globe," he said he did not know anything about the relationship, and he seemed surprised when I reminded him that he knew enough to say that the Mr. Willison of the Yukon was not a brother of the Mr. Willison of the "Globe." However, they are, no doubt, related, and the "Globe" thinks that this attempt to inquire into Yukon matters is born of malice and political spite. Then, we have the combination of Landerkin and Landerkin, a member of this House who has his son sent out there. I would say nothing about it except that in the very evidence that comes up before this commission, there is a private and confidential note from one of the Minister of the Interior's officers, asking Mr. Fawcett to say a good word for Mr. Landerkin in his official report. I would remind the committee and the Minister of the Interior, that where a responsible Minister has not only his own family connections under him, but where he is surrounded by family connections in the administration, the public, right or wrong, is suspicious, and, at any rate, frankness is due from the Minister of the Interior. Sir, I have an absolute right to know from the Minister of the Interior what relation, what connection by marriage or otherwise, Mr. Ogilvie, appointed his judge, is to him. Here was a man asked to perform the most difficult and delicate duties, without any training or qualifications that could be suggested; a man who had spent his life in the wilds, a good surveyor, and, if you like, an honest man, but a man without training. He could not move a step until Mr. Clement arrived. He sat waiting for the arrival of that gentleman who was not named in the commission, in order that he might discharge the duties that the Governor General had imposed on him. But, Sir, let us see how delicate Mr. Ogilvie's position was, and how pertinent my inquiry was as to his relationship to the Minister of the Interior. I challenged, in that question, the jurisdiction of Mr. Ogilvie. There is no doubt that the Minister of the Interior was involved in that inquiry. There is no doubt whatever, that the evidence in that inquiry came dangerously near his door: there is no doubt at any rate, putting the evidence aside, that there were possibilities of it coming straight to his door. He was responsible for the whole administration of the territories, and this officer of his, who was trying other officers, knew in his heart, if he had the intelligence of an ordinary man, that if he brought in a verdict or report that showed that Wade was corrupt, that showed that McGregor was corrupt, that showed that Norwood was corrupt,

that showed that Walsh was corrupt, that showed that the whole box and dice of them were corrupt, incompetent, and unfit to discharge their duties; he was giving a sentence of political death to the Minister of the Interior, and he knew that if he reported in that direction, his nephew by marriage would have to leave the Government, if he had a sense of manliness or responsibility about him. I submit that that is not an extreme position. What are the rules? Why, in states of the Union men are disqualified from sitting as judges where the connection exists either by blood or marriage. Take an authority on that subject out of the American and English Encyclopedia, where it is stated:

> Disqualification has, however, commonly been imposed by statute where the judge is related by blood or marriage.

That is in accordance with the ideas of some of the states of the Union. But let us go to the English authorities and see the delicacy that properly exists—see the rules laid down in regard to all matters of a judicial character. In the Queen vs. Rand, Law Reports, 1 Queen's Bench, page 230, Mr. Justice Blackburn said:

> Wherever there is a real likelihood that the judge would, from kindred or any other cause, have a bias in favour of one of the parties, it would be very wrong in him to act; and we are not to be understood to say that where there is a real bias of this sort this court would not interfere.

And in the Queen vs. the Justice of Great Yarmouth, 8 Queen's Bench Division, page 525, Mr. Justice Field said:

> The administration of justice ought not only to be pure in itself, and capable of being demonstrated to be so, but nothing should be done by those who are administering it to throw on it a substantial doubt. It is not enough that the conclusion arrived at was right, and that it has been arrived at on right principles, for every person having a personal interest in any litigation, or having a direct or indirect motive for desiring a particular decision to be come to, should abstain from putting himself in such a position as that, unconsciously to himself, a bias adverse to the due administration of justice might take possession of his mind.

Again, in the same report Mr. Justice Smith said, referring to the Rand case:

> This is the point: "Wherever there is a likelihood that the judge, whether from kindred or any other cause, would have a bias in favour of one of the parties, it would be very wrong of him to act." That is the rule; where there is a real likelihood, from kindred or any other cause, that he may have a bias in favour of one of the parties, he ought not to act.

These are the rules that guard and guide the judges of England, that guard and guide the judges of the land, and I do not believe there is a judge in any of the provinces who, if he had been connected with the

Minister of the Interior by marriage or by blood, would have for a moment accepted an invitation to sit on that commission; and I am certain that I shall never hear, on any evidence to the contrary, that there is one in all the land who would have so far forgotten his duty to the community and his respect for himself as to have accepted that position. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, these relationships become of tremendous importance to any one who follows the history of this case, as I intend to give it; because we have not only the relations and connections of the character I have mentioned, but we have the whole system of Government practically conducted by private correspondence between the relatives. There are letters from the Minister of the Interior to his uncle, not brought down to Parliament. There are letters between those two that I have asked for, that the Minister of the Interior has admitted related to this commission; but he has said that private matters were so interspersed with other matters in them that he could not lay them on the Table—since this man accepted the position of a judge, corresponding with him in regard to this very commission. I would like to see the man, whether a Minister of the Crown or any other, who under such circumstances would correspond with a judge of a Superior Court of this country with regard to the judicial duties he was performing on the bench, and who would be permitted to say on the floor of this House that that correspondence was private and could not be produced. We have private correspondence between connections by blood and connections by marriage; and we have, as Mr. Ogilvie has had to report to this House, this private correspondence, some of it forced out of the witnesses on the stand before him.

Now, to make good my statement—because in my opinion it is a very serious one—in regard to this mixing up of private correspondence, I take the Minister of the Interior's own statement during this session. On May 29, 1899, I asked him:

1. Has any official or unofficial or other communication been received by the Government from Mr. Ogilvie respecting the commission of inquiry?

2. If so, what is its purport?

3. Will the hon. the Minister of the Interior lay upon the Table of the House that portion of the private letter from Mr. Ogilvie referring to the subject to which the Minister alluded on 15th May, 1899, in the House of Commons?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. The report has been received. 3. Inasmuch as the remarks in reference to the subject are intermingled with references of an unofficial and private character, it is not considered proper to lay a copy of them upon the Table of the House.

On another occasion the Minister of the Interior deemed it proper to base an argument upon a communication from the commissioner, saying:

I have had a preliminary note from Mr. Ogilvie saying that the report would be forwarded in a short time, and then I will lay it on the Table, and the House will know as much about it as I.

I asked for the production of that, and the hon. gentleman brought down a return; and on page 48 of the return, in which he brought what he considered he ought to bring, and refused to bring down what he thought he ought not to bring, he remarks that this is a private note from Mr. Ogilvie, and, therefore, he does not bring it down. So, again, the Minister on April 4, 1899, read a telegram which he had sent to Mr. Ogilvie in answer to a private letter:

You have an absolutely free hand in regard to the officials. Do what is necessary to put the service on an effective footing.

I asked for the letter to which that telegram was a reply. That letter is private; it will not be brought down. And as we go through, we shall see the difficulties that beset any one in my position or any one who is anxious, from a public point of view, to probe this matter to the bottom by reason of this correspondence being considered as private. Let us for a moment consider that telegram itself. What absolute buncombe it is: "You have an absolutely free hand in regard to the officials." That telegram was sent after the constitution of a government in the Yukon. Mr. Ogilvie had not then and has not now an absolutely free hand in regard to the officials. The statutes of the land control him in respect to every wish he may have in regard to any reform there; and I will show you what class of men surround Mr. Ogilvie if he desired to do right, if he came to deal with an official or to perform any executive act. He is not the arbitrary despot that Major Walsh was; he is not controlled by the Minister of the Interior in that regard; but there is a statute and there is a council, which shows how empty that telegram is. With regard to this commission, I have said that the petition was dated the 25th of August, and that the commission was issued on the 17th of October, 1898; and now I call your attention to the fact that the inquiry opened on the 6th of February, and what happened? Here is a commission ordering Mr. Ogilvie to conduct an inquiry and to report. Mr. Ogilvie opens the court and explains the delay, outside of the difficulty in mail transmission, to be due to the fact that he could not go on without the attendance of Mr. Clement, as legal adviser. On page 7 of the report, this is what I find:

The commissioner said that nearly half a year had elapsed since the 25th of August, the date on which the petition of the miners' committee had been forwarded to Ottawa; that the commission had been issued from Ottawa on the 7th of

October ; that the commission had been delayed by reason of the delay of the mail and the non-arrival of the legal adviser.

Mr. Clement may be considered a very essential man as a legal adviser, but the Governor General never authorized him to act in this matter, though the evidence shows that he practically took charge of it. Not a thing could come up, hardly a matter of discretion could be determined without reference to Mr. Clement. The ideas in that locality are somewhat crude. The ideas of Mr. Ogilvie were as odd as those of Judge Dugas. Judge Dugas so lightly considered the responsibility of his judicial position that he did not hesitate to confer with Mr. Ogilvie, and practically, as the evidence shows, Mr. Clement was the legal adviser of the judge as well as the legal adviser of Mr. Ogilvie. Let us see how this Mr. Clement interfered. I shall give a few instances to show how this gentleman, who was unknown to the commission, who had no authority under it, who was supposed, I believe, by some members of this House to be there, as a nautical adviser sits in an admiralty court—let me give a few instances to show what authority he assumed and was conceded. In the case of a nautical adviser, what he says he says to the judge, and the judge, on his own responsibility, uses or not what he says, but Mr. Clement assumed a different position altogether, and as he figures considerably in matters concerning which I have to make serious charges, I will refer particularly to page 76 of the evidence, where it will appear that Mr. Clement had the audacity, in the case of a commission holding open court, to browbeat and to bully one of the petitioners who appeared before it. When Mr. McDougall, who had no lawyer to advise him, as was given these men in British Columbia, who made charges against Judge Spinks, was endeavouring to press his charges, Mr. Clement, who was as much a stranger to that commission as any man in this House, interfered in the most arbitrary and uncalled-for manner. Mr. Armstrong and Mr. McDougall were both explaining their case and were both struck with amazement on being told that this commission was limited, and that the moment any evidence was offered of anything that took place after the 25th of August, 1898, the court's ears would be stopped. Mr. Armstrong said :

> We withdraw from the commission on account of the limitation.

To this the commissioner replied :

> You have incurred the responsibility of making statements which you refuse to substantiate.

Mr. McDougall retorted :

> No, we don't ; but I submit this is not a proper commission of inquiry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

Then, let us see how this gentleman, who was not known to the commission, who was vested with no authority whatever, chose to interfere. He said :

> You are talking nonsense.

Again, on page 34 of the evidence, we find Mr. Clement again interfering. Mr. Clement was there to keep out, as the record shows, all the evidence he possibly could. Mr. Tabor, counsel, speaking as to what questions would be inquired into, said :

> That is, charges laid down prior to the date of the commission and of the letter of the 25th of August.

Here Mr. Clement interposed with his own ruling :

> The charges contained in that letter ; nothing subsequent.

That was the ruling given by Mr. Clement, and on page 73—I am only making a few references here and there to show the unfair and improper and uncalled-for interference of this gentleman—we find Dr. Bourke putting this question to the commissioner :

> Am I to understand that we have no appeal to the judge for his ruling in this matter ?

Dr. Bourke was then discussing whether they were bound by Mr. Ogilvie's decision. Here is the reply of the commissioner :

> That is what the legal adviser says.

Thereupon Dr. Bourke asked :

> If we apply to the judge for a mandamus, would you hold to his decision on the point ?

The commissioner replied :

> I don't think I would be compelled to.

Mr. Clement again gave his decision, and said authoritatively : "No."

You will, therefore, Mr. Speaker, see the position which Mr. Clement assumed, with the connivance of the commission. Here you have the miners' committee—not one of them trained in the law—granted a commission, and Mr. Clement, under the guise of being a legal adviser to the commissioner, comes into court and takes the case out of Mr. Ogilvie's hands, and assuming an authority for which he had not the slightest warrant, tells these men at one time that they are talking nonsense, and again lays down the law as to what the ruling will be.

I shall not take time by going further into the evidence to show the arrogant and dictatorial position which this Mr. Clement assumed, but compare the commission empowering Mr. Archer Martin to inquire into charges against the Crown Timber Agent in New Westminster with the present case. Mr. Ogilvie shows all through the evidence that he considered his was a commission of assize, and not a commission of inquiry—that serious indictments were preferred and

that the men implicated would have to be present, that the charges would have to be submitted to these men, that they should have opportunity to defend themselves, and counsel were heard and the greatest formality observed at different parts of the inquiry. But later on, he lost that spirit and took another course, and attempted to go beyond the 25th of August to oblige Mr. Fawcett, an officer of the Government, and invented some system, contrary to Mr. Clement's idea of what could be done under the commission. They sat informally and took solemn declarations, where they could get the witnesses to solemnly declare after giving their evidence, but at the start these gentlemen proceeded as though sitting in assize and not on a commission of inquiry. I would refer you to pages 8, 9, 12, 14, 33, 34, 50, 213 and 258 of the evidence, where it will be seen that any one daring to open his voice in this court—as Mr. Ogilvie thought it was, with his legal adviser beside him—would have to formulate the charge on which he wished to be heard and notify the parties accused. But see the difference compared with the Archer Martin commission. In this case the commissioner, Mr. Martin, wrote to the secretary of the Department of the Interior:

> Kindly give me all the information you can from the department, so that I may follow it up. Get me permission to get all the telegrams out of the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraph office from 1895 to 1898, so that I may check them all over. Give me authority to ransack this district and then go up to the other district. Put money at my disposal to summon all the witnesses. I infer that the desire of the Minister is that I shall probe this matter to the bottom.

But in the case of the Ogilvie commission Mr. Ogilvie thus interpreted his duties: Specify your charges, notify the parties in any way implicated, and an opportunity being given them to go into court, we will proceed to try the case. Although I have been appointed a commissioner by the Governor General in Council to inquire into this matter, I propose to constitute myself a judge of assize, and as Mr. Clement, an officer in the service of the Government and a man of legal training, is associated with me, I will pronounce the rulings, but they will be those dictated to me by Mr. Clement, and I will not follow the law, but will depart from my duty to allow Mr Clement to take charge when all these matters come up. He may browbeat the witnesses as much as he pleases, tell them they are talking nonsense, and lay down what rulings the court will give.

We find at page 8 that the laws of evidence were to apply. The laws of evidence! Look into that commission issued to inquire into the Crown Timber Agency in New Westminster, and see how much he was guided by the laws of evidence. You find the correspondence between the commissioner and the department, and the material on which he went, and the copies of documents which he used for the purposes of the commission of inquiry. And I say he proceeded in the proper spirit. The desire was there to find something wrong. Now, the very opposite method is adopted here. Is it a violent assumption, then, to say that the desire was to find nothing wrong, and that Mr. Ogilvie appreciated that fact? Compare the treatment of others with the treatment of this man Pulford, of whom something was said before. Pulford was sent to jail for conduct that Mr. Ogilvie had ruled, with the assistance of the legal advisers, justified such treatment. Charges were to be put in specified form, notice to be given, and all that kind of thing. They directed Pulford to answer, and, because they had an idea that this man was an agent of some Conservative Association—that never existed—in the city of Ottawa, Mr. Ogilvie resorted to the old Star Chamber method of torturing the witness, ordering him to tell all he knew, regardless of any charge, regardless of any one being summoned, and, when he did not answer satisfactorily, sent him to durance vile, and made him suffer for not giving general information, such as he was said to possess. However, it turned out that this young man knew practically nothing, and was not authorized by any one to take any particular position. But, wherever any one attempts to fasten a charge upon an official, or give evidence in regard to any conditions that obtained there, he is held down to the rules of evidence, and to specific charges, and to the important consideration as to whether the parties accused, directly or indirectly, had been given opportunity to attend. So, conditions are made. For instance, as shown at page 10 of the evidence, as to what facilities will be given to those coming before the commission for searching the records. It will be seen that Mr. Armstrong asked, if the records of the Gold Commissioner's office would be open to them, and the answer was in the affirmative, but on the condition that they would state what area they wished to investigate. That will be seen to be contrary to the spirit of the Martin commission, contrary to the spirit of all these commissions of inquiry. They were to name at their own hazard the particular area or location they wished to examine; otherwise, they were not permitted to look at these records. Why, Mr. Speaker, the proper consideration of his duties would have shown Mr. Ogilvie that these men were to be considered as assistants, not as prosecutors, not as men preferring indictments—though they had named some charges—but himself as one who was to inquire, and these others as men who were to assist him. But he proceeds in an entirely different spirit. Having laid down these strict, stern rules,

which pertain to the courts of justice, Mr. Ogilvie shows again his unfitness for the position by allowing one person, Captain Starnes—a very good man, no doubt—to walk into the box, and, without being sworn, to give information concerning a matter in regard to which sworn evidence was given. Page 41 shows the style in which Mr. Ogilvie himself conducted this examination. I ask particular attention to this. We all know what Jeffreys did of old time in England, in his treatment of those who came into court. Perhaps Mr. Ogilvie is not quite his rival, but I do not think that any will contend that his language was such as to encourage any one to come before him or to assist him in carrying on the inquiry. After Mr. McDougall and Mr. Armstrong have reasonably, and in calm and in moderate language, discussed this question of jurisdiction, discussed it almost as if they had been trained in the law, after Mr. Clement tells Mr. McDougall that he is talking nonsense, this is the language that Mr. Ogilvie dared to use—I quote from page 76 :

The Commissioner.—You should have some respect for yourself, Mr. McDougall, if you have none for other people. Your opinion does not rule in this country, I am glad to say. It would be better if you would restrain yourself. You come into the Government offices and insult people who are quite as intelligent and respectable as you are, Mr. McDougall. I should like you to have some degree of propriety before this commission.

I would recall the language of Jeffreys to the mind of the lawyers in this House.

Mr. McDougall.—The point has been raised in court, sir.

The Commissioner.—Express yourself in proper terms, or I will listen no more to your remarks.

Mr. McDougall.—I am quite prepared to take the consequences.

The Commissioner.—I will give you a lesson in civility unless you conduct yourself in a proper manner.

Mr. McDougall.—I am prepared to have any lesson in civility.

The Commissioner.—After this restrain yourself when you are addressing any person. If you have any charge to make against the purport of the commission, do so in a proper manner.

Now, there is no one who will defend the spirit shown by that language. And, if any one will refer to pages 75 and 76, preceding this outburst on the part of Mr. Ogilvie, he will not find the slightest provocation for the exhibition of temper and the insolence of which Mr. Ogilvie was guilty. Then again, I would call your attention—as illustrating the fitness of Mr. Ogilvie to this position—to page 68. During the examination. Bolton, one of the officers in the service was being examined, and this is the manner in which Mr. Ogilvie attempted to meet Mr. McDougall, who was examining him. The commissioner was clearly wrong:

Q. But you swore, in answering me, that you never heard there was such a thing as trafficking in passes ?—A. I don't think I did.

Q. But you swore to me that you never heard so ?—A. I don't think I did.

Q. Can the evidence be looked up to see if he stated that he never heard there was trafficking in passes ?

Mr. Bolton.—I had knowledge of hearing of such a thing.

Mr. Tabor.——

He is counsel for Mr. Bolton.

——How many times have witnesses to be asked questions over and over again ? There are rules laid down by the highest authorities ; that rule should apply here. There are two gentlemen examining at the same time, and asking the same thing over and over again.

The Commissioner.—I notice some questions are asked over and over again.

Mr. McDougall.—It is a curious state of things, according to law, if a person who has sworn one thing, and I rise to ask if he has sworn whether that was positive or not ; I should like the evidence locked up.

Stenographer referring to notes found the question referred to was : " Did you ever hear of any traffic in passes ?"—Answer " No, sir."

So, Mr. McDougall was right ; but, instead of getting the sympathy of the court in a line of cross-examination which was reasonable and proper, the very thing to be desired by the court, he has cold water thrown on his efforts. Again, at page 201, we find an example of the weakness of this commissioner. I do not know whether his legal adviser was with him or not. The witness was Mr. Woodworth, who is a counsel there, and they were trying to get from Mr. Woodworth information he had received as a solicitor. Mr. Woodworth said :

Mr. Woodworth.—I cannot bring anything to mind as a solicitor, in which I have. If I had, I would be very glad to answer, because my feelings have been outraged in the way in which things have been done ; it is an awkward situation for me.

The Commissioner.—It is an awkward situation for me ; the public may not understand this ; if I don't force you to tell what you know, they will think I am in the swim as much as the rest. I will take the matter into consideration and advise you on it.

Now, I say for a man who is put in this position, is it not preposterous that he should care one brass farthing what the public thinks ? This man had a legal adviser beside him, but he had not the moral courage, he had not the stamina, or the experience—I do not say he was dishonest, but his whole training shows, and that answer is absolute evidence, that he was not fit to perform his duties properly and impartially. Then on page 246 we have a ruling. Now, here is a most extraordinary thing. Just where your interest is excited, and you suppose now that you are going to get something important, the commissioner shuts the whole thing up and there happens a blank, and he actually stops the stenographer. I will

have something to say about Judge Maguire; and I regretted very much, when speaking on a former occasion in this House, that I had occasion to refer to him directly, because in the paper I read his name was incidentally mentioned. But this evidence shows an extraordinary condition of affairs in regard to Judge Maguire and Judge Dugas. They are advising most improperly—the Solicitor General will agree with me, any lawyer in this House will agree with me—most improperly advising gold commissioners privately as to what they ought to do in a hypothetical or in an actual case, cases that may come before them in a judicial capacity, and at the same time the evidence shows these gentlemen are going to the Gold Commissioner for mining claims. This commission, this very evidence, brings out what I never knew before, that Judge Maguire was the private counsel of Mr. Fawcett, and Mr. Fawcett, as Gold Commissioner, was giving Judge Maguire mining locations. While I am attacking this commission as a commission that ought never to have been organized, because the man was not the proper man for it, there is in it, for any one who will read the evidence, cause for the most serious alarm, and there is proof of the most nefarious conduct, conduct so nefarious on the part of officials right and left, that if I wanted a vindication for the suspicions I have expressed already on the floor of this House, there it is in the Ogilvie commission. But I say this is far short of what an inquiry ought to be. Listen to this evidence on page 246:

Mr. Fawcett.—I have here the opinion of Judge Maguire, under which I acted in subsequent cases. That is Judge Maguire's decision in a similar case, in which the purchaser was recognized, although the claim was cancelled.

There is Judge Maguire's decision in a similar case. It is not in court, this decision is an opinion from the judge of the Superior Court:

By Dr. Bourke:

Q. What claim did McDonald get?—A. 16B on Dominion.

Q. But that refers to another claim on Dominion?—A. Yes; that is a case which I submitted to Judge Maguire. I have here the præcipes, which I submitted to Judge Maguire, in regard to claim 160 below on Dominion, and that is the judge's reply.

My contention is that if the judge had never been interested in mining claims, it would have been wrong for him to give opinions to this official. Let any man in this House attempt to get an opinion from a judge in the province of Ontario, and I can anticipate the answer he would get. But what would he think if an official opinion was given to you by a judge making application for claims later on?

Q. This refers to Murphy. How was Murphy connected with McDonald?—A. That is a similar decision. I was giving you my authority for doing things of that sort.

Q. The judge did that in the case of Murphy, and you—was Mr. McDonald's case one of an innocent purchaser?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it included in your list of re-locations?—A. No, it came up subsequently.

Q. That seems to be a solitary case.—A. Well, yes, it was the case referred to. I submitted this to Judge Maguire for his opinion, so that I might in future be guided by it. It was the only case that came, up to this time.

Q. You would not call that to apply to a case where the man had not paid for the claim at all?—A. I don't know anything about paying for the claim; that has nothing to do with the case at all.

Q. That had nothing to do with the case at all?

The Commissioner.—Stenographers will not need to take that down. We are not going to take notice of these statements.

Coming down to the very core of the most fearful scandal, getting right into it, the judge asked to inquire into this matter, saying: "Stenographers will not need to take that down." However, take Mr. Ogilvie's own opinion of what this inquiry was. He had a little contempt for it himself. On page 186, he says:

The Commissioner.—No one here can explain why it was done.

Dr. Bourke.—I can explain why it was done; so can Mr. Fawcett.

The Commissioner.—It is only a one-sided investigation; some of the people are here, and some are in Ottawa.

This is the great Ogilvie inquiry, stigmatized by the commissioner as only a one-sided investigation. Naturally he imagined—and you will see him cutting off the evidence right through—that it was his duty to put a stop to evidence implicating John Brown or Tom Smith if they were not in court. Take the case of Major Walsh; if anything came up against him, Major Walsh was not present. If anything came up against Mr. Wade, Mr. Wade had not arrived. If anything came up against any other officer—wait, these men are either out of the country or they are returning. So he understood, or misunderstood, his duties. Then if you read pages 12, 15, 72, 74, 75, 76, you will wonder, as I did, who raised this question about the 25th of August, about this limitation, put off until they got the miners out of the way, until the Miners' committee had withdrawn, and then overlooked because Mr. Fawcett wanted to come to Ottawa, and then they circumvented the difficulty by saying that the witnesses would have given statements that were not on oath. But that was not until these men who had asked for the inquiry were practically bowled out of court by being told that wherever there was any evidence that related to an act before the 25th of August, 1898, there was no jurisdiction in the commission, the commission should not hear it. I ask the Minister of the Interior, who, I suppose, will have something to say in this matter, when I was asked

personally in December, 1898, to send the information that I had in my possession to Mr. Ogilvie, whether he believed at that time that he had limited this matter to the 25th of August, 1898, and if he had that idea, or if that was the opinion of the Government, why it was that in the correspondence that took place between his deputy and myself, there was no intimation of this kind? But Mr. Ogilvie, before a man had raised a question as to the 25th of August, this limitation that turned out of court the real active men in the inquiry, and left in court Mr. Fawcett to conduct this informal inquiry to suit himself, Mr. Ogilvie says more than once in these references that I have given, that this question has been raised. Who raised it? It was not raised before him, it was raised, as he tells the court, when they talked about application for a mandamus to Judge Dugas, and you will find in the evidence that he had been consulting with Judge Dugas.

With whom else had he consulted? He had his legal adviser, and he had the free run of the judge, and the judge was interested in mining claims, as I will show, just as well as Judge Maguire. There was this little ring, and this advice that they could cut and nip this inquiry in the bud. Then, we come to the report itself. I am endeavouring to speak within the bounds of moderation and fairness, in this matter, but, I confess, the condition of affairs that confronts me is appalling to my mind. What I say I endeavour to support by reference either to the facts or to information, and the House and the public can form their own opinion. I say that no man can carefully read the evidence, and read Mr. Ogilvie's report, as I have read it, without coming to the conclusion that Mr. Ogilvie has wholly proved his unfitness for the position of weighing evidence, that he has not appreciated even what crime consists of and matters, which are criminal, he passes over as matters about which there is no dispute. Take a case which is referred to on page 7 of his report, which has been in circulation in the House for some time:

> The first day was devoted to investigation of charges of corruption against officials in the Gold Commissioner's office for having accepted bribes for admission into the office.——

Mr. FOSTER. That is what he told us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER:

> ——The result was that a door-keeper named Villeneuve, who was employed as a special constable in the North-west Mounted Police service, and who had been for some time a dog-driver, had accepted money for admitting people out of their turn into the office. No one else was implicated in any way except that some of the evidence showed that clerks had received pay from outsiders for attending to work done before and after office hours. This was so usual an occurrence that it was readily admitted, no one attempted to deny it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

There is this extraordinary statement. This was a crime of the most serious character; this general custom of taking money before and after office hours was an offence against the provisions of the Criminal Code, but it was such a usual occurrence that no one attempted to deny it, and it forms a most important part of the evidence against the whole administration in the Yukon, that everything was so arranged and there was so much confusion that we find these clerks taking this money before and after office hours, while the whole grievance was that you could not get your work done in office hours.

Mr. FOSTER. Why should you?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why should you, the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) pertinently asks. The point is that matters were so arranged that, according to the evidence, as stated by Mr. Ogilvie, it was a simple thing to take pay for work after office hours. The bribe was there, and whether the bribe was there or not, the criminal offence was there. This man Villeneuve that Mr. Ogilvie so lightly speaks of, was, according to the evidence, an illiterate man. He could neither read nor write. He was put into a position in Mr. Fawcett's office, without Mr. Fawcett saying aye or no, or anything about it. He was a poor, uneducated man, who was used for the purpose of working the pass system there. He took bribes. This man went into the box and perjured himself before Mr. Ogilvie, by swearing that he had not done what Mr. Ogilvie says he did do. Mr. Ogilvie passes over the perjury, passes over the scandal of his appointment, and the extraordinary conditions connected with Villeneuve and with Mr. Fawcett that I propose to refer to in connection with this matter so lightly mentioned by Mr. Ogilvie. At page 41 is the evidence that Mr. Villeneuve could not read, and in another place it is shown that this man who was posted there to pass men into the office was engaged as a dog-driver. His accomplishments fitted him for that position. That he was employed as special constable in the Mounted Police, does not appear, so far as I have been able to pursue this report, that he was a dog-driver appears on page 43 of the evidence, and that he was employed as a janitor without the Gold Commissioner's authority; and not under the Gold Commissioner's control appears on page 56 of the evidence. He was placed in Mr. Fawcett's office. I have no reason to say more against Mr. Fawcett, according to my information, than that his weakness all through was pitiable and deplorable. He was afraid, not only of the whisper of Major Walsh, but of his shadow. He hardly dared call his soul his own. Even a woman, who would whisper in his ear any direction, when she came to get a privilege, through the order of Major Walsh, was able to get it, according to the evidence, which

goes to show that Major Walsh had sent her. They broke the rules and regulations, and Mr. Fawcett seems to have been simply terrorized by Major Walsh all through this unfortunate business. There is evidence that the officers under the Gold Commissioner appointed to attend to the public and the man appointed to guide and regulate the entrance of the public were not placed there by the Gold Commissioner, that they did not act under instructions from him, and that he knew nothing of thier duties. At page 56 of this evidence, you will find that Villeneuve, this man was convicted of being paid in connection with these passes, according to the report of Mr. Ogilvie, was one of the appointees of Major Walsh, and was under Major Walsh's instructions. Mr. Fawcett did not know that passes were issued. As is stated in this evidence at page 57, and Villeneuve was told to accept passes from men passing in and out of Mr. Fawcett's office. That appears on page 59. This man, of whom Mr. Fawcett knew nothing, had to do with what are called the regulations as to the admission of miners to Mr. Fawcett's office, which appears by the evidence at pages 31 and 45. There are references in this report to these passes that are extraordinary. Mr. Fawcett says that there was no pass system. That is in his evidence at page 59.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the pass system?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This pass system appears, from the explanations on pages I have mentioned, to have been a rule framed for the purpose of regulating the turns of men to go in or out of the office. That is the official explanation, but the charge, a large part of which will be corroborated in this evidence, is that it was simply a plan for fleecing the public. It is simply an excuse for bribery. A man named McGill was able to play a very sharp trick, owing to the illiteracy of Villeneuve. He found out that Villeneuve could not read or write. He made a pass out on a bit of paper, like that which was used, and he sold it to a poor miner, getting $10 for it—a most dishonourable trick. That man handed this forged piece of paper to Villeneuve, and passed on. Mr. Fawcett says: I knew nothing of the pass system, because there was no pass system. Villeneuve is convicted of having accepted money for admitting people out of their turn into the office, but poor Villeneuve, I do not think has been properly looked after or defended. He was working under Hurdman, as he says. He was told to take these papers, and on one or two occasions, of course, he took the money instead of the passes. However, Fawcett says there was no pass system, but, mark you, Mr. Fawcett admits at the same time that Villeneuve was told to accept passes from Hurdman and Bolton, two of his clerks. If my recollection serves me right, this gentleman, Hurdman, who exercised so high functions under Mr. Fawcett, Hurdman who was delegated with all the powers of the Governor General of Canada in Council as well as the powers of the Minister of the Interior, was a $2-a-day man. That was the amount we had to pay for an officer to discharge these high duties. Fawcett admits that Villeneuve was told to accept passes from Hurdman and Bolton, and I do not know how poor Villeneuve could tell when the pass was from one or the other, McGill found out he could not, because he sold one that was neither from Hurdman nor Bolton. Let us see about the pass system. It is a most extraordinary business, and while Mr. Ogilvie in the innocence of his heart refers to it in the light manner I have mentioned, the charge was that all this was an organized system of corruption, and not merely did McGill make money out of it, but that men in the service of the Government made the money that induced them to stay there for $2 a day, which as every one knows would not keep them in Dawson City. Bolton, one of the officers, says about the pass system, at page 63:

Q. Do you know whether other clerks gave passes for admission into the office?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who would be supposed to give passes?—A. I do not know, I am sure; it was done by different boys in the office. There were lines leading up to the different wickets. If there were five or six men in front of a wicket before dinner or before four o'clock they would give them passes to come into the office after dinner or next morning.

Q. There were three wickets at which clerks were permitted to give passes?—A. Yes; the clerks gave passes to men at their separate windows.

Let us hear what poor Villeneuve, who was the only victim according to the judgment of the court; let us hear what he says. At page 39:

Q. You used your own authority in the matter of letting people into the office—never had any instructions from Mr. Fawcett except to say you had nothing to do with the door?—A. Yes.

Q. Why didn't you follow Mr. Fawcett's instructions not to take passes?—A. Well, when the man outside presented me with a little piece of paper, and said: "This man is correct, let him in," I had to take it.

Again, at page 31, he deposes:

Q. Did you ever take a pass from any of the miners at the door?—A. Yes; I used to take them from the special constable at the door.

Q. Did you ever receive in your own hands a pass from any of the miners to get in?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever receive passes from miners to get into the office?—A. Well, that I can't say; I don't remember.

Q. Did you frequently receive passes?—A. I received passes sometimes.

Q. Did you receive a large number of passes every day?—A. Pretty nearly every day when I was at the door.

Q. Were all these passes the same, or were they different?—A. All different; there were some

passes I did not look at. As soon as I saw anything like passes I put them in my pocket.

Q. Did you do anything with them after ?—A. Yes, I burned them.

Q. Why, because there was no stamp on it ? At first you only receive passes with the office stamp on ?—A. Yes.

Q. But do passes on which the office stamp was have a signature on them ?—A. Yes.

Q. Are they similar to the passes shown ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did they all have the office stamp on them ? —A. No ; they had to be stamped ; they were stamped after hours. Some people were left in the office and wanted to get a pass from Mr. Hurdman to get in after dinner or to get in the next morning—because people that were waiting so long at the door, I think it nothing but right for them to have the right to have the first show when to come in again.

Q. Were these passes good for over dinner and over night ?—A. Well, the passes were supposed to be good for one day ; some passes came in behind every day.

Q. You refused some passes ?—A. No, sir ; at the beginning I did ; I was told not to refuse a pass.

Q. Who told you not to refuse a pass ?—A. I was told that from the clerks in the office.

Q. Which clerk ?—A. Mr. Hurdman.

Q. Did you receive any instructions from Mr. Fawcett about acceptation or the rejection of passes ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did they tell you to let any man in who came with a pass ?—A. Yes.

Q. Who told you that ?—A. Mr. Hurdman.

Take the evidence of Frank Gibson, another clerk, as to the pass system, of which the Gold Commissioner knew nothing. Gibson was in the office from the latter end of July until the 16th of October, and at page 44 he gives his evidence, as follows :—

Q. Had you any instructions as to the admission of miners into the office ?—A. No, sir ; they had to take their turn. Lists were gotten out and allowed them in in the right order.

Q. There were several systems during the summer ; one system replaced another?—A. Yes, sir ; one or two.

Q. There were numbers given ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Before that there was indiscriminate getting into the office ?—A. Well, I couldn't say.

Q. Who gave the numbers ?—A. That I couldn't recall ; perhaps Mr. Bolton, I think he was the principal clerk.

Q. You don't mean that Mr. Bolton gave passes ? Any pass given from Villeneuve to Bolton ?—A. I believe so.

Q. You know that Villeneuve had a good deal to do with the regulations connected with the admission of miners to the office ?—A. Yes, as far as I understood.

Q. He was more connected with it than the policeman ?—A. Yes, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. He practically had in his hand the regulation of miners to the office ?—A. Yes, as far as I know.

This poor illiterate wretch who was proved to have been guilty of being bribed right and left, he had, according to Gibson, the regulating of miners into the office. Can it be doubted that there were not men behind him. At page 45, Gibson continues :

Q. You beckoned me through the crowd and obtained permission for me when the door opened after the dinner hour ?—A. I did that on my own responsibility.

Q. Why did you mildly remonstrate with me for not giving money to the door-keeper ?—A. I don't know that I remonstrated ; I might have asked you why you didn't ask him to have a drink or something of that kind.

At page 51 you will find that these officers were allowed to regulate the passes in the manner the evidence has already shown, because Mr. Hurdman deposes :

Q. Did you have any definite instructions from Mr. Fawcett about the admission of people in or out of turn ?—A. No, none at all.

There you have the office presided over by Mr. Fawcett, but you have Major Walsh putting in charge a man who is permitted and enabled to manipulate and manage an affair of this kind, and to make money out of it. I refer hon. gentlemen to pages 107, 108 and 123 of the evidence if they wish proof of this. I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to an extraordinary stop in the examination on this point. The commissioner passes it over lightly, and as I have said, he seems to have forgotten that the evidence which he passes over so lightly, and as to matters which were well known to have occurred, happens to constitute a crime under the Criminal Code. On page 114 there is an extraordinary stop in the testimony which was leading up to an important fact, and a fact which I propose to charge. E. D. Bolton is being examined and he admits a peculiar thing. I make the statement now, that another private letter seems to have arrived which we have not had brought down to the House. Bolton states that the officers were told by Mr. Deville in a letter, that they could not take up claims. I make that statement here, so that it may be corrected if it is wrong ; in view of the announcement by the Minister of the Interior that there were no instructions outside the conversations he had with Wade, and the Order in Council that was passed touching the taking up of claims by officials. Bolton deposes at page 114 :

My letter from Mr. Deville stated that I would not be allowed to record claims.

That letter has not been laid on the Table, and in case I forget it, I want it to be observed that one of the most curious things in the history of this whole business is, not merely the private correspondence, but the keeping away from this House at this late period of the session, the kind of information that this evidence shows did exist, and is in existence and which would be most material. I refer to minutes of Council in the time of Major Walsh, and I have not seen one of them laid on the Table of the House. But listen to this, in the middle of Mr. Bolton's evidence, at page 114 :

Q. Now, there are a great many charges. This is a question not relevant. There are a great

many charges of officials having acquired interests. Have you any objections now to stating whether you obtained any interests in such a way as that ?—A. No, sir, I never acquired any in that connection.

Q. Directly or indirectly ?—A. If I did, I didn't know it.

Q. Did you or did you not ?—A. No ; I have not any interests in Dominion Creek.

Mark you, this is the line of answers that this witness gave :

Q. You have none at all on Dominion Creek ?—A. Not in that way ; none in any other way as far as—

Now, what was this commissioner there for? To allow an officer before him to stop there ? You will find him interrupting the men who preferred these charges ; you will find him confining them and limiting them ; you will find him asking questions right and left, by way of cross-examining on the part of the defendant ; but you will not find him assisting to find out anything. But I will do Mr. Fawcett the justice to say that he did fasten upon Major Walsh very effectively, so far as an inquiry of this kind could do it, in the absence of Major Walsh, a charge that was attempted to be put on his own shoulders. Again, there is an important reference on page 53, by one of these clerks, as an excuse for all the irregularities and troubles, the crime and confusion that was permitted to exist in these offices. The charge of parties, intelligent men, who owned interests there, was, that the system was such that corruption was the easiest thing in the world, that men were able to charge for this, that, and every other item, because the system lent itself to such opportunities. Mr. Tabor, who is defending, sees the importance of defending the witness against something that was brought up, and he asks :

Q. You were very busy ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The books you kept no one else knows anything about but yourself ?—A. I don't think any one else could make head or tail of them—the rush was so great, I had too much work to do ; when I got the data that is in them it was rather a disconnected affair, and I have never had time to get on the creeks and make them continuous.

Q. Therefore in your press of business you paid little attention to what was going on in the office ?—A. I couldn't.

Now, I refer again to Mr. Ogilvie's report, on page 8—and I think it is a matter for comment that, in regard to a serious charge, this is what he says, and this is all he says :

A charge was brought by the people of the "Nugget" against Mr. Fawcett for having improperly issued a permit to prospect to Mrs. Emma Koch.

The evidence shows that Mr. Fawcett misunderstood this woman, who didn't at the time she applied for the permit use very good English. The act of granting the permit was, we will admit, improper, but there was nothing to show that Mr. Fawcett in any way benefited by it, or any of his friends, Mrs. Koch being an utter stranger to him.

I say that any man who has a head on his shoulders and is not biased, sitting down and reading the evidence in regard to that permit to Mrs. Koch, will say that Mr. Ogilvie, as he shows himself in that sentence, was absolutely biased, was not a man who should have been entrusted with this inquiry, and was endeavouring to shield, not only the people immediately connected with that matter, but Major Walsh, who was connected with it in the most disgraceful manner ; and even Mr. Fawcett does not come out of it very well. I will give you references to show that Mr. Fawcett first denied the charge, and afterwards admitted it ; and, when he admitted it, he drove back the responsibility on to the shoulders of Major Walsh. It lets a flood of light into the system that prevailed under Major Walsh, and shows the manner of man he was, the things he dared to do, the influence of this woman upon him, the manipulation he practised, and the most arbitrary conduct on his part. It shows the fear and terror which Mr. Fawcett had of Major Walsh. Now, I will come to the evidence. Take, first, the charge and the direct negative given by Mr. Fawcett. Then, when he found himself in such a position that a direct negative would not do, he comes finally to the man who is responsible ; but the name of that man is not mentioned by Mr. Ogilvie, nor is a suggestion made that there was anything improper on the part of Major Walsh in this matter. Charge No. 2, submitted by E. C. Allan, found at page 78, reads as follows :—

That at the time pending the issuance of permits to prospect, as appeared in his own notice of 11th July, 1898, at 10 a.m., he did wilfully deviate from his said notice and issue a permit to Mrs. Koch." (Referring to Mr. Fawcett.)

The Commissioner.—There is a case, too, on the list against Mr. Fawcett in connection with Mrs. Koch, are you ready to go on with that case, Mr. Fawcett ?

Mr. Fawcett.—I do not remember the lady. Is Mr. Allan in court ?

The Commissioner.—I don't see him.

Mr. Fawcett.—To this charge I give the direct negative.

Later on, you will find that he remembered the lady, and that he did not give the negative. Mr. George, who makes the charge, says :

You will support your direct negative by sworn testimony ?

Mr. Fawcett.—The charge is true, inasmuch as I deviated from the said notice ; for at the time this permit was given no arrangement had been made by the council with reference to issuing permits, and no notice had ever been made public or passed.

Now, I am going into this matter, for it is very important—one of the most important matters that has come up in the inquiry. The Minister of the Interior will remember the case of Nelson & Donald, and he will not be able to reconcile the evidence of Ma-

jor Walsh in that trial with the evidence of Mr. Fawcett in this case as to who was responsible for the closing of Dominion Creek. We have Mr. Fawcett here putting the whole of that responsibility on Major Walsh, and we have Major Walsh, in the case of Nelson & Donald, saying that Mr. Fawcett had acted, and that he concurred in the action which Mr. Fawcett had taken. As I have a very long task ahead of me, the shortest way is to stick to the very evidence. This is Mr. Fawcett's own statement:

The facts of the matter are these: From the beginning there was a difference between myself and the commissioner in reference to the closing of Dominion Creek hills and benches. People had been permitted by myself to prospect these hills and have their applications at the office, nothing preventing them from renewing their certificates except that the returns of survey had not yet come in, and these returns would aid in identifying these hills to show where they were.

Before going on, I may say that I have no doubt, and I submit it to the lawyers of this House who have followed the regulations in this matter, that Mr. Fawcett was correct—that there was no authority to close these creeks, that the regulations contemplated nothing of the kind. If that view be correct, it lends itself to the imputation of corrupt motives on the part of Major Walsh; and of corrupt motives and corrupt conduct on his part I have not the slightest doubt, after reading the evidence. Mr. Fawcett goes on:

Pending that, everything that was necessary to be done had been done with reference to persons prospecting receiving their claims, so that on that account I had objected to this notice, or this so-called legislation if you wish, stating that Dominion Creek hill and benches were closed and readily objected to that on the ground which I have stated, because had they been closed it would have prevented those whom I had permitted to prospect from having their claims put on record, and thrown their claims open with the rest, so that after going on and prospecting with my permission they would have no protection whatever; probably many of them would lose their claims.

Mark you, he did not know this lady, nevertheless, the whole thing came out when she was here in court to give evidence. Mr. Fawcett then went on to say:

So that this lady came to me on the 7th of May (I think some time then), one morning after I had had information about the closing of these hills, and she says, "Major Walsh says I have to have a permit to prospect on Dominion hills, creeks and benches." Well, I told her I knew about no permits; I had heard nothing about any permits. About an hour after, Major Walsh came to me and said: "I think we will issue permits for Dominion Creek, hills and benches." That was the first intimation I had of any permits being issued. "All right," I said. Of course, I came to the conclusion that they concluded I was about right, and to prevent a hasty stampede they had accordingly decided to give a permit to any one who came.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

About an hour later Major Walsh's cook comes back,——

That is the lady I have mentioned.

——and says, "Major Walsh says I have to have a permit." I was very busy at the time, and unthinkingly wrote on a piece of paper: "This will permit the bearer to prospect any section of ground on Dominion hills and benches,"——

This is the way in which the business was conducted. The public were notified that not a soul could get in there, but a whisper from Major Walsh's cook was all that was required for her to obtain a permit of this character.

——and, as near as I can remember, shortly after she came to get a permit for her husband or some other friend. I told her to bring me a written order from Major Walsh——

He would give Major Walsh's cook a permit, but when it came to giving his friends a permit, he said:

——saying that a permit should be granted. I had had time to think the matter over a little. Major Walsh came down a few minutes later, and he said: "Did you give Mrs. Koch a permit?" I replied: "She came and told me you said she was to have a permit." He says: "I will have to get it from her; we will have to appoint a time for the issuing of these permits, and there will have to be public notice given."

Do you suppose that he got it from her? She not only kept the permit, but, as the record shows, the remonstrance on the part of Major Walsh was exceedingly weak, and she followed the permit by a claim. She got all that she wanted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is not the evidence. Read a little further on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will come to that, and am only too glad to be corrected.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I notice that just two lines below the evidence is directly to the contrary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. By Mr. Fawcett?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, the cook got nothing on her permit.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better leave me alone—not that I complain of the interruption—but if he is a friend of Mr. Fawcett, he had better refrain from interrupting, because Mr. Fawcett admits that he was mistaken when he said in his evidence that she got nothing on her permit. I shall read the few lines to which the hon. gentleman refers:

So he departed and I expected, as he and Mrs. Koch seemed to be particular friends (I think she cooked for him), I thought she would get the permit from him. The end of it was that Mrs. Koch got nothing on her permit; she got no claim; she has received no claim yet on account

of that permit. That is the full explanation of the matter.

The hon. Minister of the Interior would not have made that interruption, because, later on, Mr. Fawcett admits that he was entirely mistaken, and that she did get a claim recorded on that permit. Bear in mind, that the cook of Major Walsh got this permit, for there were cooks and Indians and brothers of Major Walsh, who all figure in this matter of taking claims. This was his friend the cook, but he had more friends than the cook. There was a Mr. Charbonneau, and there are Indians and there are brothers who were benefited, and I charge the Major with having been interested with the brothers, but whether that be so or not, we have this fact, that these people whom he took up, of whom he was the ruler, were manipulating claims and manipulating the officers, whisperings in the ear, such as this cook resorted to, with Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Fawcett thought she got no claim, that she took nothing by this, but she knew a little better than that, and he admits that she did, and that she showed him that she did get a claim.

Let us glance at this cook's evidence on pages 128 and 129, for it is rather interesting. Mrs. Koch, being duly sworn, testified as follows :—

At this time I could hardly talk. I heard in my restaurant that Dominion would be thrown open, and it would be a good thing to stake. Everybody had the fever at the time, so I got it too. I made up my mind to go and try and get a claim on Dominion. On the morning of the 28th of June, word was sent me very early in the morning by Dr. Arabella Merrill. I shall not go out without a permit. It needs a permit. Do I have to tell who sent the news ? It was from the Indian of Major Walsh, Ambrose Serett ; he heard the Major talking in the tent over it, so I went to the office and asked where the Gold Commissioner was. This is the gentleman (pointing to Mr. Fawcett).

Q. Mr. Fawcett, you mean ?—A. Yes. I went and asked him for a permit to stake on Dominion. Mr. Fawcett didn't answer me straight. I asked him again, and he asked me who told me. I said (whispering) "A friend." And he could not understand, and all the gentlemen around were laughing over me, and I went and whispered to Mr. Fawcett : "Somebody, the gentleman told me you don't need any permit." I came home and I said it was too good news, it must be something. Dr. Merrill was there and the rest. I said, please to go to the Major and ask him ; we want to go out and stake ; ask for a permit. He would let us go out for nothing, being only two women. ;—

Dr. Arabella Merrill evidently was a woman.

—would tell us true, so Dr. Merrill went and asked if it needs a permit. He said, "yes, I will go and instruct the Gold Commissioner." That is all I can remember. He went down and came up again, and said, "yes, it needs a permit." The doctor came and said it needed a permit, and I went there again. I told the Gold Commissioner I needed a permit. I got a permit, and was staying in the building. Major Walsh's brother, Philip, came in, and I said, "Mr. Philip, see what I have got." He opened it ; he said, "where did you get it from," I told him I went to the Gold Commissioner and he gave it to me. He said, "you are very lucky, I wish I coud get it." He went up to his brother. A short time after that I went to the Major ; still in the building. I asked him for a second permit for my friend from the Gold Commissioner. I thought everybody got a permit ; I thought, I am ahead, because a woman can run quicker than a man ; I asked him—I don't remember correct what the Gold Commissioner answered me, but I remember, "no." I saw then that the Major was coming down the steps, every muscle in his face twitching. Went into the office and called Dr. Merrill from the window, where she was getting a miner's license. Thought she will get a permit, too. He called her up. He said, "tell me, doctor, you have a permit?" She tells him, "I don't get a permit My friend, Mrs. Emma Koch, got permit." He said, "heavens! this is a mistake. One permit will throw open the whole of Dominion." And Dr. Merrill came down and we were both very down-hearted, because I threw my restaurant over and sold everything I had. I don't know what to do. I was thinking I don't want to make trouble for any official. If it is wrong I will offer the permit back. So I got a letter written to the Major if it is wrong or any trouble, he will please take back his permit, but if it is possible and he can help a poor woman along, he shall let me have a permit, but if it makes any trouble to send for it by 8 o'clock. If not, I will go to Dominion and stake, and then after I stake I will fight for it. So I went over on Dominion and staked. I came home very sick. At the time there were not many ladies up the creek. My ! I was sick. I did pick nuggets off of the ground. I saw pretty nuggets and lots of gold. Now, I thinks I am rich. I don't know what to do to record, because I don't know the law. I don't know anything whatever, so I came home, and after a day or two's rest, I heard stories all around that dozens of ladies went to the Major and the Gold Commissioner, and made it hot for him, for every lady wanted to stake on Dominion. Every lady I showed the permit to told Major Walsh and wanted to stake on Dominion. I went to the Gold Commissioner to record a claim. He said he would not. I told him he has to. He said not. He didn't want to record it. Told me he would not do it for his best friend. I went to the Major and made it just as hard for him. He told me permit was open for Dominion. Told him I staked and I wanted my claim. I went from one to the other and did not get it.

Q. But didn't you get it recorded after ?—A. Yes, I got it recorded.

Q. The claim ?—A. Yes.

Q. That is all you have to say ?—A. Because the Major told me permit was open on Dominion.

Q. Do you remember when your application was accepted ?—A. On the 11th.

So, the hon. gentleman will see what I mean. Mr. Fawcett's statement will appear later on. At page 129, Mr. Fawcett examines the witness :

Q. After you came from Dominion, do you remember Major Walsh came to my office to see if I would record ?—A. No, you are mistaken. I went to Major Walsh and begged him if he can do anything for my case ; I wanted a claim. Said "No, no." I said I will fight. He said he is ready to fight. Then later I was crying and

he felt sorry. He said he would come down and talk to you in the office, and he sent me down He came down then.

Q. That is right, but was your application taken at the office ; do you remember who took your application on the 11th ?—A. Where everybody has to go in line I went too.

Q. You got the claim some time after that ?—A. A long time after that.

Q. After they had all been investigated ?—A. Yes, sir, I think I was the last one to get a claim.

Referring to this same page, Mr. Fawcett calls Mr. Craig and examines him :

Q. Do you remember anything about this lady coming for a permit to me ?—A. I don't recognize her, but I remember such a case as she speaks of, distinctly.

Q. You remember something about it ?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember Major Walsh coming to me that morning after the lady came for the permit ?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you recollect what he said ?—A. He said he thought the most simple solution of the difficulty would be to issue permits for a specific time for parties to prospect—something to that effect.

Q. Do you recollect her coming a second time?—A. She came for a permit the second time, and, I believe, got one.

Q. Do you remember her conversation on that occasion ?—A. I don't know that I noticed it particularly. I was working at the time at an adjoining desk. I recollect she spoke low.

Q. Do you remember of her asking for a friend ?—A. I remember of her asking for a friend, but I thought that was at a later date.

Q. That was your impression ?—A. The application for the friend was refused ; whether her own was or not, I don't know.

By the Commissioner :

Q. You don't know of any understanding between Mr. Fawcett and Mrs. Koch about this permit, why it was given ?—A. Not unless it was given on Major Walsh's suggestion.

Q. Have you any reason to know it was given on his suggestion ?—A. I know Major Walsh came to the office to see Mr. Fawcett shortly before this lady came back the second time.

Then comes the correction of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was not aware, and to which I referred :

(The Commissioner addressing Mr. Fawcett) :

Q. You made a statement the other day, Mr. Fawcett, to the effect that Mrs. Koch got nothing by this permit ?—A. Yes, I was under the impression that her claim was not recorded. She tells me it is. I know I had her application ; that is why I was under that impression.

So, then, as at page 130, he says :

Q. You were mistaken in making that statement ?—A. Yes.

Q. She is on record ?—A. She likely is.

Q. This record would verify her statement ?—A. I have not looked at that.

(Addressing Mrs. Koch.)

Q. Have you your certificate with you ? Have you the papers for your claim ?—A. Yes.

Mr. Fawcett.—That was my impression. I had the application and thought it had not been put on file yet, with the rest, and my impression was she had not recorded the claim. I know she didn't receive record until after they were all investigated by Mr. Cautley. Mrs. Koch here shows her certificate showing that she had recorded (29th August)?—A. After Mr. Cautley went up to Dominion and made the investigation of the stakes, I put it down.

There is further testimony as to how the public were treated in regard to this matter, showing most extraordinary conduct on the part of the authorities. From the quotations to which I have referred, it would look like an honest and explicable transaction ; but there was a most extraordinary course attempted. Mr. Fawcett placed the whole matter upon Major Walsh ; and Major Walsh in the care of Nelson and Donnelly, as I recollect it, put it upon Fawcett. But the truth was that, contrary to the law and contrary to the regulations, Major Walsh or Mr. Fawcett, or both—one puts it upon the other and the other puts it upon the one—undertook to make a ukase or order that, for a certain time, all the claims on a valuable creek should be withdrawn from the public, either for staking or for application. Then, certain persons got wind of it, before any one else, that this embargo was off and that the creek was open. And out they rushed—people like the cooks and the employees, and some policemen, if I recollect rightly—but I will refresh my recollection of that by referring to the page—and Indians in the employ of Major Walsh, interested with Major Walsh's brothers, Louis, who was away, and Philip, who was with him—and engaged under written agreements, too—and directly representing, as I believe, Major Walsh as well. And when the advertisements are being prepared there is carelessness in the office, and so on, and the result is that this woman, this ignorant woman, and others in the ring are able to get an advantage over the general public. If these facts are true—and I am referring now mainly to this evidence—no greater scandal could have occurred in the administration of the Yukon. Now, the pages to which I refer I intend to give, but, if the House would indulge me by calling it six o'clock——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) can give us some idea how long he expects to speak ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have so long a speech to make that, if my voice will permit, I am satisfied I shall speak longer than most hon. gentlemen will care to listen. I am performing what I believe to be a duty. When I began I was suffering from a bad bronchial attack. I would ask the Prime Minister to permit me, at a reasonable hour to-night to move the adjournment myself and finish my speech

to-morrow. I will undertake to do all I can to discard any irrelevant material, and to speak as long as my voice will permit to-night.

BUBONIC PLAGUE.

Mr. PRIOR. With the consent of the House, I would draw the attention of the Government to a matter of the greatest moment, not only to the Pacific coast, but to the whole of Canada. I refer to the subject of a statement appearing in the morning's paper, in a special telegram from Honolulu via San Francisco. It is a subject to which, I think, we may ask the immediate and earnest attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). The subject is the bubonic plague, and the telegram reads as follows :—

The bubonic plague has come half way across the Pacific Ocean. The Nippon Maru arrived here early this morning and was put in quarantine by the board of health on the report of bacteriologists that a death occurred three days before the vessel arrived here was due to the bubonic plague. The Nippon Maru had a death on board among the Chinese passengers from Hong Kong shortly before reaching Nagasaki, May 26. The Japanese health authorities decided that the suspicion of the death being due to the plague was so strong as to warrant putting the vessel in quarantine and cremating the body. The vessel was in quarantine until June 3. It then proceeded to Yokohama, leaving there for this port June 8. Three days before arriving here there was another death among the Chinese. The ship's surgeon diagnosed the cause of death as uræmic convulsions, but considered the symptoms as suspicious enough to warrant flying the yellow flag when the steamer neared this port and of preserving the body for examination here. No communication between the shore and the vessel is allowed and the health officers who boarded her have gone into quarantine themselves.

This seems to be a most serious matter, because everybody who knows anything about the bubonic plague knows that it is one of the very worst plagues that can be brought into the country. I only draw this to the attention of the Government to ask them whether they are looking after the quarantine in British Columbia, and seeing that every facility is given to the officer in charge there to look after the ships and to order the strictest quarantine to be taken in regard to this matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I can assure the hon. gentleman that every precaution will be taken that can possibly be taken. The Director General of Public Health, Dr. Montizambert, has already had his attention drawn to the bubonic plague, and has given instructions to the officers at the different ports to look out for it.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On page 88 of the evidence, I find this extract from the evidence of Mr. Fawcett :

Q. When was that privilege stopped on the hill-sides ?—A. The 30th of May.

Q. What led to it ?—A. A resolution by Major Walsh and his council.

Q. How was that council constituted ?—A. The commissioner was the council himself ; but there were other members of the administration whom he invited in for consultation. He sometimes sent written requests that we should call upon him. On this occasion there were present Messrs. Wade, Bliss, McGregor, myself and Mr. Pattullo, who acted as secretary for whatever was done.

Then on page 89 the following appears, speaking of the order that was posted up :—

Q. Did you issue it ?—A. Well, on one occasion Mr. Pattullo came with a notice asking me to sign it ; it was in relation to closing the hill-sides ; but I objected on the ground that I considered there was no basis for the hill-sides being closed ; I still maintained my objection to what had been done in council as Gold Commissioner, and I refused to sign the notice.

From my point of view Mr. Fawcett was then acting with due regard to the law of the land.

Mr. Walsh sent and summoned me before him, and he gave me a very strong reprimand. As near as I can remember, he said : "Mr. Fawcett, I want you to understand that it is impertinent on your part to question anything that has been decided in council, and when I sent that notice for you to sign, I want you to sign it." On the spur of the moment I signed this notice without reading it.

Q. Were you not simple in not reading it ?—A. Yes ; I was simple. I acknowledge this.

Q. Don't you think you should have kept a copy for your own protection ?—A. I never thought of the thing at all.

Q. Don't you think you should have made a copy of it before you let it go ?—A. Well, I never thought anything would arise out of it. I didn't think any blame or weight would be attached to me. I had no idea there was to be any change in what Major Walsh seemed to be so resolute in passing.

That has reference to what has gone before, this extraordinary exercise of arbitrary authority on the part of Major Walsh in closing this creek, then his equally extraordinary interference in opening it for his cooks and those who happened to be in his good graces.

I had no idea there was to be any change in what Major Walsh seemed to be so resolute in passing. When I signed that I thought I was carrying out what was passed in council.

These words "in council" are misleading. There was no council. These officers who were called in were nothing more than tools of Major Walsh. They were his subordin-

ates ; they were officers of very inferior position ; they were under his authority and subject to his order and they were, this gathering, this motley gathering, called the council. Then this evidence goes on to say :

Q. What was in this notice ?—A. It stated that on and after 11th July that permits to prospect bench claims on Dominion Creek would be granted—for prospecting and staking, and I think there was something that applications would be accepted if approved of by the mining inspector.

Referring to page 90, the commissioner asked :

Q. It is necessary to procure a copy of that notice. Would you procure a copy of it, Mr. Fawcett ? That notice, you say, was posted about the 30th of June ?—A. Yes, I think it was posted about that time.

Q. Was the intention of that notice carried out? —A. No, it was not carried out, for this reason : I was under the impression that these people who had been permitted by me to take their claims and practically recorded them,——

Mr. FOSTER. It must mean stake claims.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It means stake, I suppose, but I am reading the exact report.

——to take their claims and practically record them would make a great noise if they were deprived of their claims there, and on issuing this notice, which I think was about the 6th of July, or about then, I saw that the whole responsibility seemed to rest upon my shoulders, the notice being over my name, and to relieve the responsibility from myself I wrote a letter to Major Walsh. A copy of that letter I have with me, which I will put in evidence.

The commission then adjourned for lunch.

NOTICE.

The notice recently issued regarding permits to be given on 11th July, 1898, is hereby cancelled and the following substituted therefor :—

HILL AND BENCH CLAIMS

On Dominion Creek are now open for location and prospecting by all free miners.

Those claims shown in the appended sketch, with one exception, will be open only to those who made application for them prior to the completion of the survey, which application was filed at the office of the Gold Commissioner.

Dated at Dawson, Yukon District, this 8th day of July, A.D. 1898.

By order,
THOMAS FAWCETT,
Gold Commissioner.

Dawson, 7th July, 1898.

Hon. J. Morrow Walsh,
Commissioner for the District of the Yukon,
Dawson.

Sir,—Having considered, from different standpoints, the proposed method of opening the hill and bench claims adjoining that portion of Dominion Creek between Upper Discovery and 120 Below, through the issue of permits, thus giving those who have but recently arrived, and others who have never prospected, an equal chance of acquiring a claim with those who during the winter and early spring staked their claims with my permission, spent in some cases a considerable amount in packing over their supplies, also weeks of hard labour prospecting, and who, on appearing at the office to record their claims had their applications noted, and were informed that they would be permitted to record as soon as the returns of the survey were so far completed that the position of the ground staked by them could be exactly determined in relation to the adjoining creek claims. Some of those persons complain very strongly, and I think with good reason, and with both law and equity on their side, that if they are deprived of the claims which they consider theirs by the right of staking and prospecting, through the permit system, they having to take their places in line with those who have been watching an opportunity of acquiring the benefit from their labours by making the journey more speedily than they are able to make it from Dawson, that they intend to carry the issue to Ottawa, and that they have had the assurance of their counsel that their case is a good one. I think myself that if the proposed plan is carried out it will work great mischief before the last is heard of it. I further think that on constitutional grounds it will be conceded that when the creek or hill claims are thrown open for location and recording, and other permit than the miner's license granted them under the mining regulations is not required, to allow them to stake and prospect on any ground where they are not prevented by the mining regulations. Even now I am of the opinion that it would be advisable to protect the claim of those whose applications were accepted at the office, allow them to record without further staking, or give them ample time to redate their stakes, and proclaim the balance of the hill-side open for prospecting and recording. It would be an easy matter to have the proclamation posted at this office, and at the post office, about the time announced for issuing the permits, and there could be no complaint that the people had not received due notice of the opening, the proclamating taking the place and answering the same purpose as the permits.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
THOMAS FAWCETT,
Gold Commissioner.

Turning to page 92, and continuing the evidence of Mr. Fawcett, he says :

(Taking the second notice) : The words "The notice recently issued regarding permits to be given on the 11th July is hereby cancelled" refers to the first notice ; as far as I remember I put no date on it myself ; the typewriter put a date on the notice. Of course what I had in my mind was that this notice would not be printed and would not be published on the date on which the permits would be given, and after, when people came for permits they would be confronted with the notice ; that is what I had in my mind, but it happened otherwise.

Q. What was the date of the issuance ?—A. Dated "Dawson, 8th July. By order, Thomas Fawcett, Gold Commissioner."

Later on :

Q. You didn't date it at all ?—A. I didn't date it at all.

Q. And the executive part of it you left to others ?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, under that notice, had you any knowledge of any one taking advantage of the terms of it ?—A. Well, at least, I heard some one saying people were starting for Dominion.

That is on Dominion Creek.

Q. Any before this was published ?—A. The night of the 8th.

Q. Was that published on the 8th ?

I call your attention to this particularly, Mr. Speaker :

A. It was published on the morning of the 9th.

Q. Well, then, were they starting on the night of the 8th ?—A. So it was reported ; people were on the trail, and over there already, thinking it would open on the 11th.

Q. Did you have any knowledge of any one ?—A. I have no knowledge.

Q. You didn't instruct any one ?—A. None, and no none in connecction with the office started.

Q. You gave no advice ?—A. No.

Q. Didn't suggest to any one to take advantage ?—A. No ; there were two men working on my party who started about 2 o'clock on the 9th.

"Two men working on my party." I suppose that means working under his direction, officers in his employment. I do not know ; the commissioner does not seem to have pressed to have that explained. I merely offer the idea that comes to my mind, and leave it to the consideration of the House.

Q. How did the public come to the knowledge that notices were to be up before that time ?—A. I don't know.

Q. That is all you know of the history of the case ?—A. As far as I can remember. I know that Mr. Swineheart was in on the afternoon of the 8th July ; saw Major Walsh and had a conversation with him when I was upstairs. I think it——

Turning to page 93—

——could be ascertained from him that the notice was published by Major Walsh's instructions, and arrangements made by him and not by me.

Some hon. gentleman may not have followed this evidence quite as closely as I have, and I would ask the House, Mr. Speaker, to recollect the entourage of Major Walsh, who had got in on the Dominion Creek—these cooks and others in his employ—and I would call attention to the fact of the advantage obtained by those who are very close to Major Walsh, in connection with Mr. Fawcett's evidence.

Q. Do you remember your attention being called to the fact that notice was given to throw the claims open at the moment it was posted up? —A. That was my understanding ; that the moment the notice was posted up the claims were thrown open, but I didn't expect it would be posted up before the 11th. I understood as soon as these notices were posted up these claims were thrown open and not before, and as this was to take place if the permits it should not have been posted before the 11th,——

I ask that that be marked.

——that was my understanding ; that it was posted up before the 11th was a matter over which I had no control and no knowledge.

Q. When did you learn it was posted up before the 11th ?—A. I saw one of the police——

I mention here, because the evidence bears it out later on, that this was one of the men acting under Major Walsh directly.

——I saw one of the police carrying a bundle down on Saturday morning and posting them up ; that was on the morning of the 9th, at 9 o'clock.

Q. On the morning of the 9th these notices were posted up for the first time ?—A. One at the office for the first time.

Q. And your expectations were that they would not be posted up until the 11th ?—A. That was my intention and my expectation.

Mr. Galpin.—I would like to explain the position I took ; if you had been here last summer, sir, there was about three or four thousand men all hot on this very question. They appointed a committee to make an investigation, as they had heard several rumours about the throwing open of these claims. I was on that committee and am here to-day to carry out a promise I made to them that I would look into the matter to the best of my ability and find out why the muddle arose. Mr. Fawcett, how long would it take for a man to go and stake a claim on Dominion and come back to Dawson and make application ?

Mr. Fawcett.—That would depend upon the ability of the man ; the shortest time I think would be twelve hours.

By the Commissioner :

Q. What would an average time be ?—A. It would be hard to make it in one day ; if they were not strong it would take two.

Q. Do you think it possible to go out and come back in twelve hours ?—A. I think not ; I think twenty-four hours would be the shortest time.

Q. By twelve hours, you mean one trip ?—A. Yes.

Q. Going out and coming back you think would be about twenty-four hours ?—A. I think at least. Monday morning was the first time they appeared at the office to record.

Q. Leaving Friday ?—A. Leaving Saturday ; of course the office wasn't open on Sunday ; they might have been ready for anything I know.

By Mr. Galpin :

Q. This previous notice, a copy of which is not here, was sent, I believe, all over the country ? It was sent to Stewart River and I know of people who came down from Stewart River to get a permit. They got here just as this notice appeared saying that no permit was required. Now, Mr. Fawcett tells us that that was dated 8th July. I think the paper says so. That was on Friday. They were not printed, I believe, until Saturday. On the 8th, on Friday, I suppose Mr. Swineheart had them, and what was to prevent Mr. Swineheart from sending out a number of people on Friday when he had the manuscript in hand. Could Mr. Fawcett tell us if one of the council did send out anybody, giving them information that these were thrown open ?—A. I don't know ; I don't know if Captain Bliss was on that council.

I call attention again to this description of the gentlemen whom Mr. Walsh called in on this occasion, as "the council."

Q. You don't know whether Captain Bliss gave that information to anybody ?—A. No.

Q. Was Captain Bliss on the council ?—A. Yes.

Mr. Galpin.—I think I should have mentioned that. I bought a claim on Dominion from a person, a man who has since left the country. He said that he was given information by Captain Bliss, and says others as well knew of it, and

he met people going back ; this was before the notice was put up.

The Commissioner.—That is only a statement; we can't take it as evidence.

The commissioner says :

That is only a statement ; we cannot take it as evidence.

And good man as the commissioner was, he did not ask on any occasion that I can find that any one should be put in a position to make that statement on oath, or, as in the case of Pulford, to send him to jail for not giving him full information on that subject. I will not go fully into the evidence except to show that if Mr. Fawcett is to be believed in regard to all this illegal conduct of closing Dominion Creek, he protested. The act was done by Major Walsh, and in regard to the opening of this creek, it shows that these gentlemen whom Major Walsh calls a "council," had a meeting, that they issued notices to open the creek, that people in close connection with Major Walsh got this information, that they staked and afterwards recorded claims in advance of any other people. On this subject I will have something to say later on, wholly and apart from the evidence before that commission. I do not profess to have made a thorough examination of the evidence taken by Mr. Ogilvie, but I am giving a large part of it that seemed to me to be of importance. With the exception of the reference that I will make to this commission in another connection, my point has been to show three things in regard to it. First of all, that the man who was appointed ought never to have been appointed, that he did not appreciate the position in which he was placed, that he was there to inquire and probe into these matters, and not to put men on their trial and to conduct a criminal trial or a quasi criminal trial with all the necessary precaution that surrounds the accused, when he is properly put on his trial ; and, thirdly, that notwithstanding the manner in which that commission was constituted, there appeared the most extraordinary revelations—and we have got but just a peep into the condition of affairs that existed during Major Walsh's time. One more reference to the evidence taken before this commission, and I will leave it for a moment. At page 94, after the commissioner said "that is only a statement," Mr. Galpin said :

Mr. Galpin.—Applications were received on July 13th. That would give little time to go and come back even though they knew on the 9th. The application for the claim I have was received on the 14th.

Mr. Tabor, who was acting for the commissioner as counsel, said :

Mr. Tabor.—You say this was given as an exhibit to Major Walsh and it should have been returned to you ?

Mr. Fawcett.—Not necessarily ; it was made by Major Walsh's instructions for him.

Q. You just simply sent it to him for his approval ?—A. It was his order, practically.

Q. He had control of it after that ?—A. Yes.

Again, showing the authority that was exercised by Major Walsh, who locally was responsible for so much of the misconduct and maladministration that occurred, but who, after all, can very well fall back upon the gentlemen whom I see opposite on the Treasury benches, who, recklessly, regardless of every principle that ought to have influenced them in their organization of the government of this territory, disregarded their duty, and in the most reckless manner clothed improper parties with authority, and who, for all their maladministration and for all their wrong-doing, must be and remain wholly responsible. I wish to refer now to some observations that have been made in connection with the constitution of this commission, to prove my statement that it could not satisfy the public mind of the country, and that it could not satisfy the intelligent critic in any part of the Empire. I shall quote from the "National Review" of May, 1899. I do not quarrel with that "Review," but I will say that, on the whole, their observations under the heading of "Greater Britain" have been unduly favourable, in my judgment, to the Canadian Administration of the day. It may be that, like the London "Times," their cue is to support whenever possible the existing Administration, and so this leading magazine in England has been exceedingly kind in its criticism of the Canadian Government. It has eulogized the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), for instance, and that is going a long way, if the "National Review" only knew all we know in regard to his administration. The "National Review" has, in fact, eulogized the Government as a whole, but in its description of events that took place here this session, I will quote a few lines from that magazine of 1889, where it says :

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper very rightly maintained his demand for a judicial inquiry, and was ultimately defeated by 101 votes to 48, confidence being confirmed in the Ogilvie investigation. From the point of view of the British invester this decision is regrettable. Commissioner Ogilvie is an upright and honourable man, but he is not strong enough, nor does he occupy a sufficiently independent position to conduct the searching inquiry the occasion demands.

Mr. Speaker, I have made no attack, and I desire to make no attack upon Mr. Ogilvie personally ; but I think that crisp sentence in the "National Review" expresses, perhaps more happily than I in the heat of debate may have expressed, my criticism in regard to Mr. Ogilvie. I do not withdraw in the slightest degree my animadversion upon what I regard as his cruel and harsh remarks to men untrained in law, to men who were not given the advantage of counsel such as in the Spinks investigation the Government gave to the complainants, when

they were endeavouring to remonstrate in proper language, and temperate language, against the view which the commissioner took of his limited jurisdiction, which particularly controlled the complainants and the petitioners who put on foot this investigation at the outset. In a paper published by gentlemen who support the Administration, and quoted by the Winnipeg "Daily Tribune," which I believe is edited, owned and controlled by a gentleman supporting the Administration, I find further evidence; and I ask the attention of the House to these quotations in order that I may not be considered as taking an extreme view in the criticism that I have made on this investigation. I ask the attention of the House to what was said by Mr. A. R. Lee, who was summoned before the commission. The Edmonton "Bulletin" published and the Winnipeg "Tribune" copied the following:—

A. R. Lee, formerly of Edmonton, writes from Dawson under date of March 7, stating, in regard to the commission of investigation: "I had the pleasure of waiting upon the court on the opening day in answer to a subpœna which turned out, however, to have been served on the wrong man, consequently, as I had waked 60 miles to attend court, it was of interest to know who would compensate me for the loss of time and out of pocket expenses incidental to my journey to town. Mr. Ogilvie said he had no authority to pay witnesses their expenses even. Now what is the use of "posters" setting forth Mr. Ogilvie's invitation to men who know of any malfeasance connected with Government officials to come forward and make their complaints known? In the first place, most people are under the impression that the investigation is only a trap whereby the Government can ascertain what claims have been procured illegally, and through collusion with Government employees in order to deprive present owners of their property. I never heard of such a general feeling of insecurity to property, as prevails in this unfortunate territory, and can scarcely realize that it is part of the British Empire. When this objection does not apply, is it reasonable to expect men to walk 50 or 100 miles, lose their employment (if they are working for wages or their time if working for themselves) expenses all the time they are kept in town, and receive no compensation whatever for all this, in order to get the privilege of telling Mr. Ogilvie that they were forced to pay some one at the post office $2 before they could obtain a letter, or $5 or $10 to the doorkeeper of the Gold Commissioner's office in order to gain admission to that holy of holies?

And I myself have conversed with gentlemen whose word I have no reason to doubt, who were, I believe, English gentlemen in the truest sense of the word, who told me of the necessity to bribe, and to pay these fees over and above official salaries, but yet who, when I asked them: "Will you give me your names and the right to use your names, and the day and date when you did these things?" answered: "Why should I, with my claims? I hold my property under the Government of Canada. The regulations surrounding my rights are made by Order in Council. There are, however, so many cases in which I must appeal to the discretion of the Gold Commissioner, or later on possibly to the discretion and judgment of the Minister of the Interior; and do you suppose that I am going to go to the expense of a hundred dollars or so to come down to Dawson, to leave my claim and the representation of my claim, at my own cost and charges, in order to show that I had to buy a Government official for $20, $30, or $50, and to go back at my own cost and charges? It is not for me to cleanse the Augean stable. No duty rests on me to do this thing at great cost and charges." And can you expect poor men, who through this robbery and extortion have been unable to obtain claims, at their own cost and charges to wait on the time and pleasure of a Royal Commission constituted as Mr. Ogilvie's commission was constituted, and without the advantages which I referred to to-day, and which I must mention again, that obtained where this House and this country have said they wanted a full and thorough investigation as to whether corrupt practices prevailed in any constituency, and to obtain which Mr. Blake said you must require that the inquiring authority will pardon those who come forward and make a clean breast, and also provide that the expenses of the witnesses shall be defrayed by the Crown? Then the Winnipeg "Daily Tribune," which, as I say, is edited by a member supporting this Government, assists me further in showing that my impressions, as indicated by the stand I am taking in this matter, are not wholly characterized by political bias. On April 17, 1899, that paper said:

As it is the best of Liberal doctrine to let the fullest light into all charges that may be made, it may be assumed that honest Liberals will hold up both hands for the most searching inquiry at the right time.

Again, in the same article:

Nobody doubts Mr. Ogilvie's honesty and integrity, but few will say that he possesses the qualifications necessary to conduct a searching inquiry into the mess which returning Klondikers seem to be unanimous in declaring existed there.

So again, in the same paper, the date of which I have not under my hand, because it is an extract from the "Tribune" appearing in another paper, it is said:

The people of Canada are satisfied that all is not right in the Yukon; we doubt if there is an honest man in the Yukon who is not scandalized by what has occurred, and may still be occurring there.

Then, further down:

The Government has infinitely less to fear from the fullest investigation and exposure than it has from any attempt to prevent or burk the most complete inquiry. It is very plausible to cry that no specific charges have been laid. This is not true, but even if it had been it does not help the case. Wrongs have been committed.

And so on. One more reference to the Liberal press. This is to the Victoria "Times," a paper published in the city of Victoria, in the province from which I come, and where perhaps we are brought more directly into contact with the injury that is done to Canada, not merely to its good name but to its business interests, by the conditions which have existed, and which, though in a less degree, I think I shall be able to show—at any rate, prima facie—exist to this very day. This paper, the Victoria "Times," a Liberal paper, and an ardent supporter of the Government, said as follows :—

In the opinion of the "Times" the course which the Government should take is quite clear. All charges should be thoroughly investigated, and by a commission having the confidence of the country. The Government and not the Opposition must take the lead in prosecuting such an investigation. If officials have done wrong they should be exposed and punished, it matters not what their politics, or by whom appointed. Now that direct charges have been formulated on the floor of Parliament by a prominent member of the House, nothing short of an exhaustive inquiry by a non-partisan commission will properly meet the situation. The investigation by Mr. Ogilvie may be good enough in its way, his findings may be absolutely fair and just, and cover the whole ground ; but partisan politicians, who think more of making a point against the Government than of reforming abuses, will not accept them as final. An investigation that does not silence criticism has failed in its object.

Now, I have a stronger appeal to make to the Government—no, I am speaking to-day to Parliament. I am arraigning the Government, let there be no misunderstanding on this head. The position I am taking, I take with full premeditation. The Government ask the confidence of this House. They ask us to resolve ourselves into a committee to vote supplies, so that they may expend those supplies in carrying on the Government of Her Majesty ; and with the information that has come to me, and in the position I am warranted in taking, I believe the proper time is now to ask, not the Government, but to ask the free Parliament of free Canada to consider whether the time has not come for the thorough investigation demanded not only by these miners in the city of Dawson, but by the press of England and the press of Canada generally, even by Liberal organs such as I have quoted to-day, when, not being coerced by the party whip or lash, they said, on the spur of the moment, that such an investigation of a non-partisan character was absolutely essential to silence all criticism, or, in other words, to show that if wrongs have been committed in Canada, the day had not yet come when the Canadian people could not rise to the occasion, and, after a full and fearless investigation, punish all who were guilty of these wrongs, whether they occupy a position high or low in the service of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

And so, before the full brunt of all this evidence was felt, before the damning evidence came out, even before Mr. Ogilvie, what was the position that the hon. Minister of the Interior himself assumed ? When he wrote to me, as he did through his deputy, asking that I should state charges, he never warned me that I would be abused and vilified for hitting below the belt if I spoke my own mind thoroughly. He never told me, when asking me, to give such information as had come to my ears, that if I dared to name a man who was pointed at by the finger of scorn of the people who had expended their money and risked their lives in the Yukon, my name would be held up to scorn and contempt. No, he told his deputy to write and ask me to forward to Mr. Ogilvie, or through the Department of the Interior, all such information as I had heard of or had collected in the province of British Columbia. He asked me, knowing that I had never been in Dawson, to send all the hearsay evidence I could to his officer, to his wife's uncle, in order that it should be investigated. He never told me to remember that though he wrote in December, they would not inquire into such things as could be proved by evidence to have had any connection with any events later than the 25th August, 1898, but in December, 1898, he asked me to disclose to him and his department, and through him to Mr. Ogilvie, everything that I had heard in connection with the maladministration of the Yukon. Well, because I took a different view, because I appreciated the state of affairs differently from him, what was my punishment, so far as he could administer it, so far as the men behind him could administer it ? It was this. When I came here, and from my place in this House undertook to give the information that I had heard, declining to send it to his wife's uncle, I was told that I had made—what was it ? A disgraceful speech, a shocking speech——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And an hon. member, whose son is affected in some respects, says "hear, hear." There are several members probably who would join in the "hear, hear," for that same reason. Was it fair, was it manly, to ask a man to sit down and send, over his hand and signature, any information that he possessed, in order that it might be investigated, and then, when that man, as a member of the Parliament of Canada, chose to rise in his place in Parliament and state the information he had received, to brand him with having made a shocking speech, with having hit below the belt, with having referred to names inside this House in such a way that he would not dare to do outside this House ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), the father of one of the young men in the service, says "hear, hear." These are the men who would shout you down when you ask to be shown some spirit of fair-play. Would it have been more manly for me to write a private letter to the Minister of the Interior, at his invitation, reflecting upon Major Walsh and Mr. Wade and the different officers, than to come out here in the open, in the Parliament of my country, and make the statements that he had asked me to make to him in a private letter?

At any rate, let me refer to the letter of the 2nd December. What was his request? His deputy wrote to me that the Minister appreciated the difficulty of getting information as to any specific acts of wrong-doing, and asked if I were in possession of—and I quote now the exact words:

> Any information whatever showing or relating to any specific acts of malfeasance of office on the part of any officer during the past two years.

That was the invitation extended to me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Down to December.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Down to the 2nd December, 1898. There was no limit; it would have seemed extraordinary if there had been. That covered hearsay evidence, and it did not limit the information to acts committed previous to August 25th. A fair answer to that, had I been willing to adopt the plan the Minister suggested of sending this up to Mr. Ogilvie, the officer of his department, would have been to state all I knew about Major Walsh. Would it not? Is there a man can say no to that? If there had been immorality and drunkenness in connection with Major Walsh, and I had heard of it, and if that immorality and that drunkenness affected the public in their dealings with Major Walsh, if I had accepted that invitation, would I not have been, as a man of honour, bound to state such information? I do not presume that any one would suppose that I had been in Dawson or that I had any direct testimony. Everything the hon. Minister asked me for was, on its face, hearsay and in the nature of hearsay evidence. I did what I had a perfect right to do. I declined to put into his possession any information that had come into my hands; and if he says that his commissioner was right in ruling out everything connected with anything after the 25th of August, 1898, my discretion was very well exercised. According to the plan these gentlemen adopted, it would have remained locked up in the possession of the Minister of the Interior. I replied on the 10th of December, disapproving of the Ogilvie Commission, and prefering "a perfectly independent Royal Commission." I have referred to the matter of my treatment when I said here what I was asked to say in a letter to the Minister of the Interior, which would have been published by sending it to Mr. Ogilvie, according to the way in which that letter was framed. And here I want to ask your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the conditions which confront us. If the Government propose to follow the policy outlined in the Ogilvie commission, and to sit in their offices, supported by a majority that has heretofore followed them through most difficult passes and around most difficult curves, and to defy every man in this House or out of it to come forward, and at his own cost and charges bring witnesses from Australia, bring witnesses from England, bring them from the different parts of the Dominion of Canada—itself half a continent—in order to support a charge that he dares to make regarding the delinquency of an official, then, of course, carte blanche is given to the officials in the Yukon, even at this day, to rob and plunder at their own sweet will. Let us see whether there are not some responsibilities that ought to prevent the Government of this country taking that position. We are dealing, mark you, with a territory under the particular charge of the Administration of the day. We are not dealing with Manitoba, we are not dealing with any of the old provinces, where the administration of criminal justice and the prosecution of criminals is in the sole charge and under the sole direction of the local authorities. We are dealing with a case where the responsibility for the suppression of crime and the punishment of criminals devolves primarily on the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches in this House. And in connection with this matter of prosecuting charges under similar circumstances in England, we know now that, if the suspicion of a crime arises in any part of the United Kingdom, you will have the hearty co-operation and support and the support of the exchequer under the direction of able prosecutors, and you can ferret out the crime where it exists and punish the criminals who committed it. In an interesting article in the "Law Magazine," 1864-65, vol. 18, this whole qusetion is discussed. I would ask the attention of the House to a very short reference to the subject, which becomes now primarily important, for we are dealing with a portion of the Dominion of Canada which is as much under the direction, in these matters, of the Attorney General of Canada as is London under the direction of the Attorney General of England. In this very able article, it is said::

> And, depend upon it, that while, as we have been told by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, the existing system of private prosecution too frequently operates as a direct encouragement to crime, the greatest discouragement that could influence and deter the mind of willing and un-

scrupulous offenders would be the knowledge that there was an official sentinel of the state whose peculiar duty it was to keep a vigilant eye on all that relates to the public and domestic security, and who would with all the unbounded resources of the position track out the criminal and bring him speedily and surely to justice.

Now, some hon. gentlemen may say to me: You are travelling far afield. I do not think so. The day has come when the spirit of that article is appreciated——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does that apply to Winnipeg?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman what applies to Winnipeg. I was just coming to that. Manitoba is not and was not like the North-west Territories. In Manitoba the responsibility for the administration of criminal justice is local; in the North-west Territories it is federal. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) has reminded me of this point. In the province of Manitoba, notwithstanding that the responsibility for the administration of the criminal law was local, we have a noted case where the Federal authorities intervened owing to the financial difficulties of the local administration.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does that take cognizance of the case the hon. gentleman established in the Public Accounts Committee the other day, the case of an official who drew his salary and did not do any work?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. A case of robbery.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it will facilitate business very much if hon. members who desire to make an interruption ask the permission of the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member to explain, if what he has just said applies to the case he established the other day in the Public Accounts Committee, of the officer in the Inland Revenue Department who drew his salary and did not work? And will the hon. gentleman tell us who that officer is?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that, later on, if I have time, I will show that there is a man in the Yukon who is a son of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin), who has just interrupted me. And there is some private correspondence where it is said: We hope you will say something good about young Landerkin; it would please his father. The hon. gentleman called my attention to Winnipeg——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, to the case you established.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) has some maudlin idea——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Maudlin? Does the hon. gentleman talk about maudlin?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, maudlin.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) should be ashamed of himself to be so fresh.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) will be good enough, if he wishes to make an interruption in the debate, to ask permission of the hon. gentleman who has the floor. If the hon. gentleman who has the floor allows it, he may interrupt.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am amazed at my own moderation when the hon. gentleman dares to interrupt me.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are in the same state you were in the other night.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Coming to the province of Manitoba, to which my hon. friend had directed my attention, where the responsibility for the administration of criminal justice was local, let us see what was done. We had before this House the evidence in regard to a matter where, if strict rules and procedure precedents had been observed, no prosecutions would have been ventured on by any self-respecting Attorney General in the province of Manitoba without the orders and directions of the House of Commons. In England the rule is, under similar legislation to ours, that, when offences are committed against the laws for the protection of the House of Commons, those prosecutions are conducted under the order and direction of the House of Commons of England. But in the case in point, it was supposed that there had been a violation of the laws for the protection of elections to this House; and the present Minister of the Interior, when the Conservative party were in power at Ottawa, after the general election of 1896, undertook to go to great expense, to employ detectives to ferret out information, not at his own expense, but at the expense of the Dominion treasury, relying, as he did, on being able to induce the incoming Prime Minister of a Liberal Administration to father the Bill and put it on the federal treasury. In regard to that, we had the evidence of Mr. Howell, who, acting either for the Minister of the Interior privately, as he first did, or for the Minister of the Interior when he was Attorney General of Manitoba, as some of his evidence suggests, or as the private prosecutor for the Dominion treasury, as some of his other evidence suggests —we have his evidence that from the 26th of June, 1896, and perhaps an earlier date, he began to gather evidence from all sources in order to prove that men in Manitoba had been guilty of offences against the Act in

relation to the election of members to the Federal Parliament. He testified that Mr. Sifton told him to employ detectives to get evidence, to send them all over the country; that he gathered evidence, and, after some five months of gathering evidence all over the province of Manitoba, he was told to go on and prosecute. He further testified in the prosecution that, where there is a suspicion of crime, it is usual to get detectives to work up the case." He had done it under Mr. Sifton's instructions before, and, to use his own language again, he said: "When we get a suspicion in the province of Manitoba, we start." He was gathering information all along during the autumn, gathering it from all sources, and some time in July, and again he said: "It would be a gradual collection of hints until I got the evidence." There is a case in Manitoba, as I have explained, that was primarily under the charge and administration of the Attorney General of Manitoba. His excuse was, as it will appear later on, that they had not the money to tackle such a formidable case as a suspicion that there had been a stuffing of ballots and illegal conduct at a Dominion election. The hon. gentleman got the co-operation of gentlemen opposite, got the money out of the people of Canada, to carry out this work, which resulted in some 23 prosecutions, and the conviction of a man who was a self-confessed scoundrel in the box.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go further back than the result from Manitoba, I remember when the Prime Minister, drawing from his reading and great learning, gave us in this House a reference to that interesting work of Parkman, the book of Wolfe and Montcalm. The Prime Minister, perhaps, has forgotten the time when he drew from his recollection and referred to those unhappy days in the Empire of France, when, just such things were occurring that undermined that empire away out here in Canada, as I, in my heart, believe have been occurring in this part of fair Canada to-day, the Yukon territory. The hon. gentleman referred then to the robbery and the corruption that weakened the hands of Montcalm, to these scoundrels Bigot, Péan and others. To that stage in the history of our country I refer in this connection because, whatever may be said about the Government of France in those days, when they were dealing with that condition of affairs away across the sea, and far away from the central government, they did not hesitate, even in the times so long ago, to do in the case of Quebec just what the Minister of the Interior was able to induce the Government in 1896 to do in the case of Manitoba, employ detectives to ferret out the delinquents, in order to bring them to justice. For it would appear that, however bad and corrupt those local governors had been, and those local officers had been, they were not afraid in Paris that the detectives would bring the crime any nearer to Paris than Quebec was.

And consequently we have, for instance, Major Walsh, of whom I have much to say before I finish my observations—we have heard from him his denial. I am not going to say that I would ask this Parliament to believe that Major Walsh, or any of those poor men who were under him, were absolutely guilty. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I must press my case hard, I must press it strong, for the case at present is only for an inquiry. My case is based on information that convinces me, in the absence of a thorough inquiry, of the guilt of these men. But that does not mean that I would pass my verdict on them now once and for all. I am attempting to prevail upon this House in order that such an inquiry, such an investigation, as is sanctioned by the mother land, by the practice of the mother of all Parliaments, that has been sanctioned by our own Parliament, to fasten upon the guilty the crimes of which they have been guilty. But in all this let it be understood that if I happen to use an expression to the contrary effect, I do not mean it. I do not ask that these men should be prejudged, but I am pressing earnestly to-day for an inquiry, I must say, in the absence of hearing the other side, but they should be heard, if I can have my wish, not only on the preliminary inquiry, but they must be heard in the criminal courts of the country, no matter what the result of the preliminary inquiry may be. Let it not be considered for a moment that I am prejudging the case of these men. I am speaking of the evidence before me, I am showing what it points to, I am charging home guilt on a prima facie statement, I am charging home guilt without the other side being heard, I am charging home guilt without these men having what they are entitled to, a trial before a British jury, and British fair-play. But I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have got to make such an overwhelming case, I believe I have to press this case so strongly, that I have not the ghost of a chance of even a preliminary inquiry, unless I make that case as strong as it possibly can be made.

Now, we have Major Walsh heard on the floor of this House by a letter, where, while he does not deny, in so many words, the charges that were made against him, he challenges proof. Well, no lawyer would have been surprised at that, suppose him to be guilty; that would be the first thing he would do, if he were indicted for some of the crimes that I believe, on the evidence I will submit to you, he has been guilty of.

Again, with that guarding sentence, subject to what he would prove on the trial, I believe I am in possession of information in regard to this man and others that if it were in the possession of the public prosecutor in England these men would be treated as men who had to stand their trial and

must be brought to the bar. But this is not an unusual circumstance. In the case of Bigot, when he was berated for maladministration, Vaudreuil wrote to the Colonial Minister :

I cannot conceal from you, Monseigneur, how deeply M. Bigot feels the suspicions expressed in your letters to him. He does not deserve them, I am sure. He is full of zeal for the service of the King ; but as he is rich, or passes as such, and as he has merit, the ill-disposed are jealous, and insinuate that he has prospered at the expense of His Majesty. I am certain that it is not true, and that nobody is a better citizen than he, or has the King's interest more at heart.—p. 31.

That was the defence of Bigot, but when these charges had been followed up, Bigot was tried and found guilty in Paris, and how did the Government get the evidence ? They did not sit back in their seats and challenge men to take any particular risk or responsibility ; they did not do as Mr. Ogilvie has done, ask for specific charges to be made by men untrained to all the difficulties and intricacies of legal channels. They sent detectives away from Paris in these old days on the long journey to Quebec to ferret this thing to the very bottom and to obtain information, if information could be obtained, wherewith the Government authorities in Paris could enforce the law and punish those who had been guilty in the performance of the high responsibility and trust reposed in them. As Parkman goes on to say :

One Quærdisien-Tremais was sent from Bordeaux as an agent of Government to make investigation. He played the part of detective, wormed himself into the secrets of the confederates, and after six months of patient inquisition traced out four distinct combinations for public plunder. Explicit orders were now given to Bigot, who, seeing no other escape, Broke with Cadet, and made him disgorge two millions of stolen money. The Commissary-General and his partners became so terrified that they afterwards gave up nearly seven millions more. Stormy events followed, and the culprits found shelter for a time amid the tumults of war. Peculation did not cease, but a day of reckoning was at hand.

There is an instance of what might be done by a Government which is desirous of following up all delinquents and punishing those guilty of crime. But the difficulties in this case are enormous. To men informed at all in connection with the history of Canada and of the situation of the Yukon, the position we are occupying in Ottawa to-day, no argument would be needed. As I have already mentioned every month's delay in following these men is a shield to the criminals, if the criminals there be. Time is running, and time is everything to the guilty, if there were those guilty of a breach of trust. Time is everything to the host of offences under the Criminal Code on the part of public officers. Speaking generally two years is the limitation for the prosecution of an offence under that Act. You have officers sent out, appointed in 1896 ; you have officers sent out in 1897, the bulk of them in 1897 ; you have the robbery, the peculation and the conspiracy to rob and everything else charged in 1898. We are running on and now we are away into 1899, and the cry that goes up everywhere is not to condemn men unheard but to take some action when there is reason for suspicion, to follow the lines that you follow, not as in Manitoba, but as they would be followed in England, and as, with your federal jurisdiction you are bound to follow in the Yukon Territory. Witnesses of crime, men who have been robbed, men who have been victimized, men who have been deprived of their rights came from every part of the world to this extraordinary and unique locality, and now they are scattered and gone. The man who takes my position in this House takes some risks, and I am free to acknowledge that. The witness is here to-day and is away to-morrow. The witness that meets me on the coast and unbosoms himself to me of the wrongs that have been practiced upon him, who upbraids your country, who asks me whether there is no redress and who makes an appeal to you, so that you feel that you should take some responsibility in regard to the matter, have disappeared after you have taken that responsibility. You may have taken the responsibility and made charges on his statement, and when the time comes you find that you have reckoned without your host. He may have died ; he may be out of reach, and being of the class of the mining population, you cannot count upon being able to trace him at the required time. Take the kaleidoscopic changes of officials. Was there ever anything like it ? The conditions of the country may be extraordinary, but look at the condition which confronts you. You have Major Walsh in charge practically from May till August ; you have Judge Maguire from some time in February till August ; you have other officers, and suddenly they are out of the country. They have gone. Naming these two or three represents the condition of many. You have your $2 and your $1.50 officers, you have your cooks at about the same price, but they do not remain. Many of these men would be valuable witnesses, but they are all of transitory spirits, here to-day and away to-morrow. More serious than all, Mr. Speaker, in a case of this kind, when you are pressing it on the attention of a House where there is a vast majority subordinate to the Treasury benches, I recognize the fact that the authorities are involved. I would not have brought this matter solemnly to the attention of the House if it were only to get the head of the son of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), or if it were to obtain the scalp of the cousin of some other hon. member of this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Perhaps of your own brother-in-law in Winnipeg.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Or of my own brother-in-law. These are not the men against whom I fulminate. The men against whom I bring the brunt of my charge sit opposite to me. The men who are on trial in this matter, so far as they can be on trial, are the men on the Treasury benches, but the men sitting behind them, of course, want the strongest possible case to be made out before they would withdraw their allegiance from them. These are a few of the difficulties in proving this case, and a few of Mr. Ogilvie's difficulties, an officer appointed by these gentlemen, censured at one time by one of these hon. Ministers, connected by the closest ties with one of these hon. Ministers. Think of his position in conducting a formal investigation. After all said and done, think of the position of the miner, of the man who owns a claim in the Klondike, when he goes into court and dares to beard these men, dares to charge that rascality was rampant in the Gold Commissioner's office, dares to charge that the pet and appointee, the creature of the hon. Minister of the Interior, was himself corrupt and immoral. Think of the risk these men run. They know that the title they hold their lands by is under the regulations framed by these gentlemen on the Treasury benches; they know that the discretionary power is vast, even in the local officers whom they might attempt to upbraid. Take the Gold Commissioner's powers, take the various powers that ultimately are exercised by the Minister of the Interior, who—to the disgrace of this Parliament, whether under a Conservative or Liberal regime—has the extraordinary authority which he ventured to exercise in the case of Nelson and Donnelly. Think, then, of the difficulties that surround the man who would venture, in the city of Dawson, to bring these men to the bar of public opinion, to challenge the uprightness of their conduct or to charge them with malfeasances or something even more serious. Need I argue as to the condition of these men who would bring such charges. Conditions may be imposed upon them by these very officials, the time for the representation of a claim may be lengthened; the time for leave of absence may be shortened; there are a hundred ways in which these men could be ground down by Orders in Council and regulations under them. There is the question of royalty. They are on their knees in that district to the Government of the day in regard to what some of them consider an extreme exaction. All these men are in search of gold, all of them are looking after worldly gain, and are not they to reckon with the risk and hazard they would encounter if they dare to come into court (though it be conducted by Mr. Ogilvie or by a judicial commission) and give testimony that would reflect on the men who hold in the hollow of their hands so much of their fortune. Take the case of Nelson and Donnelly. A word or two about that case to show the position that these gentlemen on the Treasury benches hold when any man dares to bring to their doors this responsibility for all the maladministration and scandals that have occurred in that district. In the case of Nelson and Donnelly, in reference to "34 below Upper Discovery on Dominion Creek," according to the return brought down, the question arose whether this had been recorded under two different descriptions. The inquiry began on June 23rd before Mr. Fawcett, the Gold Commissioner, assisted, if you please, by Judge Maguire, the judge of the court before whom either of those parties, if aggrieved in their legal rights, have an absolute right to appear. Yet this judge was ordered as an assessor into this court, contrary to all law, contrary to all statutes, and asked to sit in an informal proceeding and in a proceeding that was conducted illegally from beginning to end. Mr. Wade appeared, if you please, for Alexander McDonald and R. Morrison. This was in June and in the March before Mr. Wade had handed over the richest real estate property it is possible to conceive, to Mr. A. McDonald and Mr. R. Morrison. The Land Registrar, the officer who held four or five positions, had handed over, as Mr. Fawcett himself says—although Mr. Fawcett's name was used—Mr. Wade had handed over the water front in March or April to Mr. Alex. McDonald, and he appeared in this case for Mr. McDonald and Mr. Morrison; and Mrs. Lucille Elliott then appeared on the scene. The inquiry began on June 23rd. She purchased a quarter interest on the 5th of July, 1898, after the inquiry had commenced, and funny things happened. The side into which she purchased the quarter interest went through the whole gamut of these proceedings and came out triumphant. Major Walsh was the witness who assisted her, and though he was examined before Mr. Fawcett, forsooth, his testimony was contrary to the testimony I read to-day in regard to the closing of Dominion Creek, and Mr. Fawcett did not contradict him. Mr. Fawcett contradicted him in 1899, but in 1898 he sat and listened to evidence being given on behalf of "Mrs." or "Miss Lucille Elliott" by Major Walsh. She purchased a quarter interest on the 5th of July, 1898, after the inquiry commenced. The contestation began between one Nelson and Lucille Elliott as against McDonald and Morrison. There was a nice contest in view of the information to come. Taking the information to be correct (and for the moment I assume it to be correct, though forming no final conclusion), you have a scandal connected with the whole outfit, through all the improper influence of Lu-

cille Elliott on the one side, the improper influence of this A. McDonald and Morrison on the other, and you have them in this case coming into collision. There is no evidence to show that Lucille Elliott was a purchaser for value, without notice, of a quarter interest. One Donnelly was in actual possession of the claim. The Gold Commissioner knew of the claim; Nelson knew of it. It was shown that the commissioner had neglected the regulations requiring the recording of the claim within the specified period. There was no dispute about that from beginning to end. No dispute was lodged, no case was brought into court when the Crown, through Mr. Fawcett, began this investigation, but something moved the powers, and Mr. Fawcett calling in Judge Maguire as an assessor—as Mr. Ogilvie called in Mr. Clement—proceeded to investigate. To show the extraordinary influence of the powers that be in the Yukon district—the reason that, to my mind, that hundreds of mouths are shut in that district, that if they had a suspicion that fair-play would be shown to them on the part of the powers that be, would be open—I proceed to refer to this. Regulations made by Major Walsh without authority of law, without authority of this Parliament, without any authority under the sun, were agreed upon as covering the case. No one dared to resist them. Major Walsh made regulations, and Major Walsh had no more right to make regulations in regard to the holding of mining titles there than the page who sits at your feet, Mr. Speaker. He was powerful enough not only to close Dominion Creek when he liked, and to open it when he liked, but to make regulations when he liked, and all had to bow to the regulations of Major Walsh.

Mr. DAVIN. He modified the law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He modified the law, he changed the law, he repealed the law, he was a law unto himself. Walsh came to testify in this case, and he said that upon his arrival the Gold Commissioner told him of having closed a portion of Dominion Creek, in which he acquiesced. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am in the judgment of the House as to how far this can be credited. I have referred to the evidence of Mr. Fawcett to-day, and unless I am altogether astray in my geography, you cannot believe both Mr. Fawcett and Major Walsh, but nevertheless this was the evidence given to Mr. Fawcett, sitting in this extraordinary inquiry. At the conclusion of the inquiry, Judge Maguire, if you please, paid by this Parliament, commissioned by this Parliament as a judge, independent of the Executive, having no relations with the Department of Justice, having no relations with the Gold Commissioner in the Yukon territory, no right to advise him in one way or another; an impertinence for the Gold Commissioner to come to him, and an equal impertinence for him to come to the Gold Commissioner—nevertheless, Judge Maguire, who sat through this extraordinary inquiry, gave an opinion to the Gold Commissioner, which Mr. Fawcett said coincided with his own; and from this there was an appeal to the Minister of the Interior on the 31st of January, 1899. Remember, Mr. Speaker, my point is the vast powers rightly or wrongly exercised by the Minister of the Interior, and I ask you, then, to realize the difficulties that you would have, if you were prosecuting the charges and asking men to come from their claims on the different creeks around Dawson to give evidence that would reflect on the ability, and character, and integrity of the Minister of the Interior, or any of his satraps or appointees. Here was an appeal in regard to a valuable property. That it was valuable, there can be no doubt. The Minister of the Interior appreciated that, when he came to give his decision. He stated in his decision, according to the papers brought down to this House, that it was a case in which the Gold Commissioner had "inadvertently issued certificates to different parties for the same ground." Affidavits having been used in the investigation before the Gold Commissioner, and objected to as not being evidence, the Minister of the Interior ruled that these affidavits could be properly read in evidence, and that they were prima facie evidence of the staking of a claim on a certain day. To the members of the bar in the province of British Columbia, I think, that would be a delightful ruling, and would save an awful lot of trouble, if it were accepted under very similar regulations that exist there. I have not myself been able to find that the rules of evidence have been changed in the slightest particular by the mining regulations. Nevertheless, we will take the opinion of the Minister. Admitting that he was right, there was question of evidence on which the claim was allowed, and he ruled that it was good. He goes on to say:

> I do not think that the Crown would under all the circumstances be justified in insisting upon a doubtful and technical right, to overrule its officers.

Now, you have this awkward position. You have Lucille Elliott, on one side; and you have Aleck Macdonald, a big man, a favoured man, not only as to the waterfront, but, as I will show you, strongly favoured with regard to this oppressive royalty, the richest man, or one of the richest men, in the Klondike—you have this great mining king on the other side. The decision has to be given for one or the other. Now, we will see how the Minister of the Interior worked out the conclusion. He proceeded to confirm the decison of the Gold Commissioner, and held that the plaintiffs—that was, Lucille Elliott, or those connected with her—

were entitled to the claim in question; and he directed—this great Minister, this man clothed with these huge powers, this man whose influence overshadows the Yukon—directed that a renewal certificate for claim 34, below Upper Discovery, on Dominion Creek, be issued to the plaintiffs, and that the certificate issued for claim 17 to Mr. Donnelly—that is, the party through whom Aleck Macdonald claimed—be cancelled in the books of the Gold Commissioner. That was pretty hard on Aleck Macdonald. Now, let us see how Aleck Macdonald's troubles are assuaged. After this, the Minister refers to the plaintiffs' faulty and careless proceedings—that is, the parties through whom Lucille Elliott claims—in consequence of which Donnelly—that is, the party through whom Aleck Macdonald and Morrison claimed—had gone to trouble and expense. Here we come to the great chancellor, the man exercising all the powers of common law and chancery law, and all the powers in the kingdom. Because he considers that the costs which this unsuccessful litigant, this great mining king, has been put to in prosecuting the appeal, must be very heavy; just as we saw in the case of the mining royalties, when the costs against Aleck Macdonald were big and the royalties were heavy, they had to mete out to him an easy rule which would enable him to pay by instalments later on, rather than exact from him the payment at once; so, in this case, the Minister proceeds:

> In view of the facts I direct that the defendants——

That is, Aleck Macdonald.

> ——have a lien upon the claim——

That is, the claim of Lucille Elliott and others.

> ——for $8,000 for their time, labour and costs, the said sum to be paid within six months from Jan. 1st, 1899, and that the Gold Commissioner hold in his hands the renewal certificate for the claim until this sum is paid to him for the defendants. All structures and improvements upon the claim shall be left unimpaired, and shall become the property of the plaintiffs upon taking possession, which they may do forthwith.

There is the power, if you like. That is not the order of an impartial judicial tribunal. That is the order of the great Napoleon of the West; and am I rash and unreasonable, when I say that it takes a man of some stern stuff, whatever race he may belong to, away out in the Yukon, to challenge the character of that Minister, and to challenge the character of the man whom that Minister has particularly favoured. I say the difficulties are so great that he would not be a coward, when, in pursuit of gold, he hesitated before he ran a tilt with the Minister of the Interior. I hold in my hand a series of regulations, or a large number of sections. I shall not, under the circumstances, cite them all; but I hold in my hand a reference to the mining regulations, touching, for instance, this representation of claims, by which you must appeal to the discretion of the Gold Commissioner in regard to some of your dearest rights. For the purpose of my argument, I think I will content myself with referring to the case of Nelson & Donnelly; for, if the Minister is justified in exercising these extraordinary and autocratic powers to which I have referred, no reference I could make to the particular clauses in the regulations would strengthen my case. There are other difficulties. There are great difficulties on the part of men pressing this inquiry against a Government that is not sympathetic, against a Government that is on the defensive, against a Government that holds you at arm's length, and whose Minister of the Interior tells you: You table your specific charges, if you dare, and I will make you rue the day you tabled them. There are difficulties in the way, and I appreciate them all. And these men in the Yukon, no doubt, appreciated them, perhaps, more than I do. They may think that this Napoleon and the Government of the day have some strength, which we in this House know they do not possess, whatever their majority may be. There is a sense of fairness in this House, whether the majority be Liberal or Conservative, in which I have confidence. We may be partisan blind at times, but I believe in the inherent sense of fair play that dominates this body, and I also believe that if the men in the Yukon, who know what has been going on, appreciated the sense of fair play in the Parliament, there is not one Minister on the Treasury benches who could inspire the slightest terror in any one man of them. At any rate, there is not the slightest terror inspired by any one of these Ministers in me.

Let me give an illustration of the further difficulties in dragging to the light the wrong that seem to me to have been committed, in unearthing the irregularities and crimes that I believe to have been committed. I want to show the extraordinary secrecy with which the Government of the day has surrounded this Yukon territory. I want to show you how, step by step, they have endeavoured to prevent any man from letting the light of day into the history of their administration of the Yukon, from its very inception down to the present. Take page 85 of the evidence, and we find the commissioner referring to minutes of council. He says:

> Mr. Fawcett is here and the clerks are here, and the minutes of the council are here, which can be examined.

What minutes of council have been produced before this House? What minutes of council has the Minister brought down here, from the time his officers went up in February, 1888, down to the present? Not a line, though, as will appear later on, there were positive instructions in the commission

to Major Walsh to keep this Government advised of every step he took and everything he did. If Major Walsh had done so, the difficulties of any man who suspected wrongdoing would be in a large part removed.

Take the Order in Council of the 17th of August, 1897. The commissioner, Major Walsh, was ordered, as follows :—

> To make a full report to the Minister by each mail of all matters affecting his office and the administration of the various departments of the Government under his control.

Is there a Minister on the Treasury benches who would say to me now that Major Walsh ever did anything of the kind ? There is not one man of them who will pretend that Major Walsh made a full report to the Minister by each mail of all matters affecting his office and the administration of the various departments of the Government under his control. But there were dragged out of Mr. Fawcett—and I use the word advisedly—before that commission, reports or letters of Major Walsh with regard to public matters and the administration of the various departments of the Government under his control, marked " confidential." That is the order of the day under this regime—and in this respect Major Walsh was a mild sinner in comparison with the Treasury benches—private correspondence, private letters, private records, every attempt to conceal these important matters from the public. He had his example, he has his vindication in the practice adopted by the Government of the day in the city of Ottawa, and so we did not get the full reports. We will find how many he made in this career of his for a year. For a year, do I say ? Some Ministers have said officially that his carrer was for an indeterminate period. However, we will come to that later on. The Minister of the Interior said officially that Major Walsh made eight reports, of which six were laid on the Table of this House. I think the hon. Minister erred. I have been a pretty diligent student this session of returns laid on the Table, and I can find none. Possibly the Minister referred to a return in reply to an address of the Senate, dated 17th March, 1898, for there are six reports in that return. The first of these letters is dated " Skagway, October 24th, 1897." The second is dated " Commissioner's Office, Bennett, October 31st, 1897." The third is dated " Bennett, October 31st, 1897." The fourth is dated " Commissioner's Office, Bennett, October 31st, 1897." The fifth is dated " Tagish, November 31st, 1897." The sixth is not dated, but is called a supplementary report. And at page 3922 of " Hansard," we are told that the two other reports will be brought down to complete the eight. They have not been brought down, and I would not advise any member of this House, if he is at all inquisitive, to take the trouble of looking up the information contained in the reports laid on the Table. But if he wants to find out anything interesting, if he wants to find out how the Yukon is governed, he can get a peep or two by reading the evidence that Mr. Fawcett gave before Mr. Ogilvie—I may say the evidence that Mr. Fawcett was compelled to bring out. He can learn, for the first time, he will not learn it from the reports before this Parliament, that certain mock minutes were now and then adopted. Minutes of council ! A nice council that was ! You have heard of the men who composed it—the clerks of Mr. Walsh, none of them with any other authority or status than that of a clerk or inspector. One was a livery stable keeper, the captain of the whaler was not there, but there was an accountant, and these various gentlemen were brought in to constitute a council. We did not constitute them a council. There was no legislation to do so. There was a council, forsooth, something like those minutes. We have not seen these minutes, but they accidentally rolled out in the evidence of Mr. Fawcett. The iniquity of the practice of this private correspondence in regard to public business is illustrated further on. You will remember that in this House the Minister of the Interior told us that Major Walsh came home in pursuance of a letter which he had written the Minister saying that he intended to come as soon as he possibly could. I asked for that letter. There have been very few letters from our commissioner, and the few we have amount to nothing. They give the temperature for a large period of time—three or four months how cold or how warm it was, and all about the discomfort of the gentlemen who accompanied the commissioner and the Indians and all that, up as far as Lake Bennett and Tagish and so on. But as regards administration or policy, there is a blank. I asked for the information on which the Minister of the Interior made that statement, and in the return he brought down in reply, I find simply the statement : " This is a private letter from Major Walsh." Then again, the Minister stated that before Major Walsh started down to Dawson City, in the spring of 1897, he wrote to the Minister and said he did not wish to remain in Dawson any longer than he could help, and would like his successor to be sent in as soon as possible, and the Minister said that shortly after getting this letter he cabled to Mr. Ogilvie. All the correspondence outside of that is absolutely private.

So, again, there is not the light of day. Compare with this for a moment, and only for a moment, the treatment that Mr. Peters got. Mr. Peters happened to be connected in business with me in July of last year. And before he was connected with me he sent a cipher message to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). I suppose he had some object in putting his message in cipher. He apparently did not think it was to be a public document. What that message was no man knows to this day. But, in the desperation of the

moment, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries permitted his colleagues to do a thing for which no explanation has been given, a thing that I cannot pass by without remarking upon it. He permitted his colleagues to drag this into debate. And, worse than that, when the papers were moved for, he permitted his colleague to fix up the return, to pass it through the hands of the Governor in Council and lay it on the Table of the House in such form that it should not appear in the return at what time this cipher message came from Mr. Peters, whether it was when he was a partner of mine or before he became my partner. I have asked ad nauseam in this House, as hon. members will recollect, to have the return corrected. I was told cavalierly once that the Minister of the Interior had written a note to the Clerk of the House about it. I pointed out that that would not go into the return, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite—I do not know what has induced them to take such a course—have not taken one step to have that rectified; but correspondence that, I suppose, Peters thought was private, though no reason was given why he or any one else should have thought it private, has been put before the House as though it were with a partner of mine about a liquor permit. I would take this occasion to say that I suppose that Mr. Peters, who is as strong a Liberal as any who sit on the Treasury benches, who differs from me in toto cœlo in politics, is as indignant—at least, I hope so—about the use made of his name as I am. But I say, without fear of contradiction by any living man, that I had no more to do with that correspondence, it was no more my business, I had no more knowledge of it, than any man on the Treasury bench. Mr. Peters happened to have referred the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to me, and he used my cipher. But I never saw his telegram, he never put it in my hand, and I never heard of it until it was dragged in in this manner. I would not have referred to this except to make the point, as I do, that hon. gentlemen opposite are ready, when they think they can wound an opponent, to bring down a cipher telegram, and all the correspondence surrounding it. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is ready to print at the public expense all the private correspondence he can find in the pigeon-holes of his predecessor in order to wound an opponent; but, forsooth, in the case of the government of the Yukon, there are uncles, there are sons, there are brothers of members of Parliament, are the correspondence in regard to the goings-on, in regard to what is transpiring there, will be so mixed up, as the Minister of the Interior said on one occasion, with private correspondence that the records cannot be produced to Parliament. This system of private correspondence, as will be seen, affords, whether it is intended to or not, a cloak which is the greatest shelter that fraud and rascality can find. Fraud and rascality cannot flourish in the open. Public officers cannot and dare not do wrong as they might do under the cloak of secrecy, when the details of everything they do and everything they resolve is put upon the official record, and is open to be inspected by Parliament. Let us see some of this official correspondence. In this examination Mr. Fawcett produces a letter marked "private"—improperly marked "private," no privacy about it. It was written by an officer of old standing and one, so far as I know, of reputable character, Mr. Deville, in the Department of the Interior. But, following the lines and practice of his Minister of concealing everything that can possibly be concealed, he writes a letter on the public duties of Mr. Fawcett, and marks it "private"—dares to mark it "private"; dares to put it in the category, the shameful category I have been referring to. I refer to page 207 of the evidence. This letter is dated 26th July, 1897:

> Unless you are very wrong, and I do not think that possible, you may be sure that Mr. Sifton and Mr. Smart will stand by you.

I must concur in that statement. And the last sentence of this letter—and I ask the attention of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin)—is this:

> When you write to us, do not forget to put in a few words about Landerkin. I will communicate them to his father and he will be pleased.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he say anything about the Winnipeg matter?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, he does not seem to have thought it so important as the hon. member for South Grey does. He has a mind and the hon. gentleman has something else.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has not much of a mind or he would not take up the time of the House in this way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At page 210 we see, speaking of this Mr. McDonald, who had great favour allowed him:

> Q. I would like to know if McDonald got an extension of time——
>
> Mr. Tabor.—I object, Mr. Commissioner, to the question. I would like to have the letter produced.
>
> Dr. Bourke.—I want the letter produced. Did he write to you?
>
> Mr. Fawcett.—He sent a letter to me. I think this is something that he wrote Mr. Fawcett (looking for the letter) I fail to find the letter and it is my impression that they did write to me at this time. I have not a copy of it.

And later on:

> Q. You know of this letter from Mr. Walsh to you, and you know that Alex. McDonald got

time. I suppose there is no other case like this ?—A. No, not that I know of.

Q. No other case of extension ?—A. I don't know ; this is the only case that came under my notice.

This, if you please, is in regard to the "mining king," who got an indulgence under which they were not to collect his royalty as promptly as they collected the royalty of a poor man. They come down on him easily, by instalments. Then, Dr. Bourke said—and, by the way, this is the man whom Mr. Ogilvie goes out of his way to abuse, a man who seems to have known a thing or two :

Dr. Bourke.—I want this to go on record, and ask that this letter in which Major Walsh hurriedly referred to McDonald's difficulties to meet his engagements. I want the Government to know McDonald's position as a practical speculator ; a man who holds Government royalty to speculate with while a poor man who cannot pay for his sluice-boxes is locked up.

The Commissioner.—The Government knows that months ago.

I suppose the Minister of the Interior will not contradict that.

Dr. Bourke.—The public want to know.

The Commissioner.—The Government have been asked if there is any way to fix the amount of royalty due by Alex. McDonald.

Mr. Fawcett.—I asked Mr. Dougherty the same thing.

The Commissioner.—We can collect it ; it is a simple matter if you know the amount.

A terrible difficulty occurred in the case of Macdonald and the papers had to come to Ottawa. Of course, when all the papers were shovelled off to Ottawa no one could act until the Ottawa Government had acted, and Macdonald, of course, got delay. But as Mr. Fawcett honestly says, he does not know any other man that could work that little racket. Now, let us see what the letter is that Mr. Fawcett could not find. It is found on page 211 :

(Confidential.)

Dawson City, N.W.T., 20th July, 1898.

Alexander McDonald, Esq.,
Dawson City, N.W.T.

Dear Sir,—I have just received your letter of to-day with regard to the royalty and the manner in which it affects your interests if collected at once.

I do not think it is exaggeration to say that he was the most successful man in the Klondike. They say that his mules are coming along the trails in extraordinary number.

I fully realize the value of all your mining interests and of the work you have devoted to their development, and also appreciate the fact that besides expending large sums of money in this way, you have also reinvested largely in this territory, instead of simply removing the gold from the mines and sending it outside.

I believe from what you say, and from what I have learned from other sources, that to insist on the payment of the royalty on your total output at once might be embarrassing to you.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

I am sure the Canadian Government recognize the value of your services in developing the country. I would not care to do anything which might seriously interfere with you.

I do not see anything unreasonable in your proposition to pay one-half of the royalty in September next and the other half in May, 1899. I will write the Gold Commissioner instructing him that you are to have the time mentioned in which to make your payments.

I am yours truly,
J. M. WALSH,
Commissioner of the Yukon.

Why did he mark that letter confidential ? There is no reason I can conceive of other than the reasons that exist for those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches marking all their correspondence confidential, when they dare. The Blair letter to Roche is a sample ; but there are hundreds of them, as we shall see before this discussion is finished. But there is another confidential letter. Mr. Walsh had read over, no doubt, the Order in Council of His Excellency to make a full report to the Minister by each mail of all matters affecting his office and the administration of the various departments of government under his control. Good, easy man. Why, he said, looking to the practice of Ottawa, that does not apply to anything, I will mark it confidential. So, on the 22nd of July, 1898, he writes to Thomas Fawcett, Esq., Gold Commissioner, at Dawson, a confidential letter ; and if there can be anything more cowardly than for a superior officer as he was to write to his subordinate a letter of instruction, a letter of advice, and mark it confidential, I would like any hon. gentleman to suggest it. The first letter might be corrupt, it might be anything, but the second letter is of the most cowardly possible character, and may possibly be based on corruption, too, at any rate, it suggests suspicion, and when we come to read it, we will see what its purport is :

(Confidential.)

Commissioner's Office,
Dawson, 22nd July, 1898.

Thomas Fawcett, Esq.,
Gold Commissioner, Dawson.

Dear Sir,—I inclose a copy of a letter I am forwarding to Mr. Alexander McDonald, in reply to a communication from him applying for an extension of time for the payment of royalties due him this season. You will please be guided in accordance therewith, and give the necessary instructions to the inspectors of mines.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. M. WALSH,
Commissioner, Yukon District.

In other words, I, Mr. Walsh, tell you confidentially to violate the rules and orders, and regulations of the Governor in Council, and your instructions, I tell you confidentially, disobey me at your peril. And Mr. Fawcett writes an open letter, acknowledging these instructions, and then, forced as he is by the suspicion, when the charges of favouritism are made against him—because, poor man, he could not quote it to the pub-

lic in whose authority he was doing it—then he writes the confidential letter. It is his justification, he is impaled on a charge, and his answer is: I did it on Mr. Walsh's instructions. Where is your authority? Here it is, it is the confidential letter.

Now, I want to show, Mr. Speaker, how serious a thing this system is, if you have been able to follow me in the illustration I have been giving. When the Government of India was undertaken at long range from home, what was the great guarantee of honesty on the one hand, and what was the proof of dishonesty in the minds of able men, notably in the minds of exceedingly able men? The check against dishonesty was publicity and the minute record of every official act; the proof of dishonesty and a dishonest purpose was the obliteration of the record, and the resort to private correspondence for the conduct of public business. In the impeachment of Hastings by Burke, he has something to say of the advantages of a government of writing and a government of record, and the advantages of a system which, as he says, makes every transaction in the service and every expenditure a matter of record. He adverts to the unfortunate conduct of Hastings, and charges him with having destroyed that system:

He has destroyed it by making a fatal, mischievous distinction between public and private correspondence, whereas the company has made none. He has said: "There are thousands of occasions in which it is not proper to divulge your private correspondence, but there is no occasion in which it is not necessary to communicate your correspondence to those who are above you." These are the distinctions he has thought proper to make. The next way—without entering into all the ways in which he has attempted to evade this regulation—is, by appointing spies and under-agents, who shall carry on the real state business, while there are public and ostensible agents who are not in the secret. And the correspondence of those private agents he has stopped and secreted, and there remains nothing but the shell and husk of a dry official correspondence, which neither means anything nor was intended to mean anything.

Could anything be more appropriate? But he goes on and says:

This is the way in which he has defeated this excellent institution.

That was the institution where a record of everything was published, where a record of every transaction was committed to paper.

But he has taken a mode of doing it by delegating out of his own hands the whole powers of the company, which he was bound to execute, into hands where they were not bound to record their deliberation, where they were not bound to accord their assent or dissent unless they chose it, and where, as in a gulf, a most important part, as we shall prove, of the company's transactions has been buried.

Now, for a moment, let me refer to Todd, to show how far this Government in general, and in this case in particular, has departed from the sound, the wholesome and the honest rule of government. Todd lays down, after reviewing the cases and the practice in England, the following:—

All public transactions of state are necessarily official; and that no public officer would be justified in withholding from official record any document emanating from himself in his official capacity in relation to public affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to prepare the way for the serious step I propose to take, a step that I take after deliberation, after careful thought, impelled by a sense of duty, and invited by the challenge of the hon. Minister of the Interior. That hon. gentleman used this language across the floor of this House:

I challenge the member for Pictou or any other man in this House, to lay upon the Table of the House the charges that he has to make, and declare his ability to substantiate them by evidence, and he will get his investigation, and I will be able to convince the hon. gentleman who makes that charge that discretion on his part would have been the better part of valour.

I propose, therefore, in compliance with that challenge to move:

That the condition of things in the Yukon district in the North-west Territories was satisfactory, prior to the time when the present Minister of the Interior became responsible therefor.

That it appears by Minute of Council, approved by His Excellency on the 1st June, 1895, that in the year 1897, the Honourable Thomas White, then Minister of the Interior, authorized the organization of an expedition having for its object the exploration of that region of the North-west Territories of Canada, which is drained by the Yukon River.

That the explorers found that in proximity to the boundary line there existed extensive and valuable placer gold mines, which even then as many as three hundred miners were at work.

That the number of persons engaged in mining in the locality mentioned steadily increased year by year since the date of Mr. Ogilvie's survey, and it was estimated that in June, 1895, not less than one thousand men were so employed. "The number it is certain will be," the said Minute of 1895 stated, "greatly augmented during the current season, for reports of the mineral wealth of the region have become widespread reports which the geological observations of Dr. Dawson would indicate to be well founded. Incident to this mineral development there must follow a corresponding growth in the volume of business of all descriptions, particularly the importation of dutiable goods and the occupation of tracts of the public lands for mining purposes which, according to the mining regulations are subject to the payment of certain prescribed dues and charges."

That for the purpose of ascertaining officially and authoritatively the condition of affairs to which the correspondence referred to in the next preceding paragraph relates, the hon. the President of the Privy Council, during the spring of 1894, despatched Inspector Charles Constantine, of the North-west Mounted Police Force, accompanied by Sergeant Brown, to Fort Cudahy and the mining camps in its vicinity.

A copy of the report made by Mr. Constantine on his return dated 10th October, 1894, estab-

lishes the substantial accuracy of the representations already referred to. Mr. Constantine left Sergeant Brown at Cudahy for the winter and that officer made reports to his superior officer at regular intervals, the result of which was to keep the North-west Mounted Police Department well informed as to the condition of the settlement, and to fortify still further the demand for organized government.

The facts recited established in 1895, first, that the time had arrived when it became the duty of the Government of Canada to make more efficient provisions for the maintenance of order, the enforcement of the laws and the administration of justice in the Yukon country, especially in that section of it in which placer mining for gold was being prosecuted upon such an extensive scale, situated near the boundary separating the North-west Territories from the possessions of the United States of Alaska.

The Minister accordingly recommended in 1895, with the concurrence of the hon. the President of the Council, that a detachment of twenty members of the Mounted Police Force, including officers, should be detailed at as early a day as possible for service in that portion of the North-west Territories; the officer in command, in addition to the magisterial and other duties he might be required to perform by virtue of his office, and under instructions from the Department of Mounted Police, to represent, where necessary, and until other arrangements could be made, all the departments of the Government having interests in that region.

That it appears by a Minute of Council approved by His Excellency on the 15th May, 1896, that by authority of His Excellency the Governor General a detachment of twenty members of the North-west Mounted Police was in June, 1895, detailed for service in the Yukon district, the officer in command in addition to his magisterial and other duties to represent where necessary and until other arrangements could be made, all the departments of the Government having interests in that region, particularly the Customs, Inland Revenue and Interior.

A surveyor was sent into the district for the purpose of laying out building lots and mining claims and generally of performing such duties as might be entrusted to him from time to time.

The Government of Canada was at this time keenly alive to the importance of that section of the country and was kept continuously and thoroughly informed of the condition and progress of its business and other affairs as stated by the said Minute.

That Mr. Ogilvie, the present commissioner for the said district, on coming out of the said district in the fall of 1897 stated in a public lecture at Victoria, B.C.:

"Many miners have expressed to me their gratification at the way in which law and order are administered in Canada. They seem particularly pleased with the fact that a man's just rights do not depend upon his personal popularity, that his tender to his claim is not based on the number of times he treats when near the saloon, nor yet upon the quantity of whisky he drinks, or any kindred merit, but simply and purely on his just and legal rights whether or not all in the country are his friends, or all his enemies.

"I came a good deal in contact with these men during my work about the creeks, settled many of the disputes arising between them, adjusted many differences and everywhere and every time they had the highest respect for the law. Never but once was anything unkind or uncomplimentary said about what was done, and in that case the offender soon after offered a most ample apology. I think I can safely assert that, taken as a whole, there is no more lawlessness and disorder in the minds of the miners of that district than there is in the minds of the citizens of our most highly civilized communities in this favoured land."

That it appears by the ninth report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, dated 3rd June, 1898, Appendix No. 2e, that the following correspondence took place in 1896 between the Prime Minister of Canada and one the Honourable Clifford Sifton, not then a member of this House, but a resident of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba:—

(Exhibit Y.)

(Confidential.)

Winnipeg, July 17, 1896.

Honourable Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Laurier,—The result of the late elections in some of the constituencies in Manitoba indicated to me that a fraud of some kind had been perpetrated in the interest of the Government candidates. I at once placed skilled detectives at work, and have now in my possession conclusive evidence of an organized system of tampering with ballots which constitutes the most colossal crime aginst honest elections which I have ever had any knowledge of. I now know that two constituencies were secured by means of these practices. I think it can be proved eventually that others were secured in the same way. I am also in a position to say that there are strong indications that the same practices prevailed in Ontario. As I have said above, detectives are now at work, and my purpose is to promptly but secretly push the inquiry and secure evidence upon which to convict the guilty parties.

It is also important that no means be left untried to unearth these frauds in the province of Ontario and punish every one guilty of complicity. The bearer will explain the matter somewhat in detail.

The expense of such an investigation here is altogether beyond the financial competency of my department, although I have assumed the responsibility of inaugurating the work and carrying it on so far, from my conviciton of its far-reaching importance. I now think, after careful consideration, that it is the plain duty of your Government to furnish the necessary funds for the service in order to carry on this work here, and to take the matter in hand in Ontario yourselves. I therefore request that the expense of conducting these inquiries and prosecutions should be borne by the Federal Government. The money will be fully accounted for in detail by me as the officer having charge of the administration of justice in this province. I have spent a considerable portion of my time since the elections in connection with this matter, and I cannot conceive of any more urgent public duty resting upon you as Premier of the Dominion than to leave no stone unturned to expose these frauds and punish the perpetrators. You must be aware that representative Government and vote by ballot are simply a farce if such practices are permitted. In view of what I know I am almost surprised that any Liberal was returned in a close constituency.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the necessity of an immediate and favourable reply.

Yours faithfully,

CLIFFORD SIFTON.

(Exhibit Z.)

24th July, 1896.

The Hon. Clifford Sifton, Winnipeg, Man.

I feel confident that you will unearth the most odious conspiracy which has taken place for many long years, and we will most willingly furnish the necessary funds for the service in order to carry on the work in which you are engaged.

WILFRID LAURIER.

That Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, a member of the Privy Council of Canada, and a member of this House, having stated from his place in Parliament that he is credibly informed and believes that with the same co-operation (and through the supervision of the Department of Justice) as was given by the Government of Canada to the said the Hon. Clifford Sifton, as indicated by the said correspondence hereinbefore referred to, and the evidence contained in the report of the said committee, he can establish before a commission comprised of eminent judges and clothed with powers as hereinafter suggested, the following facts and charges :—

That the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, has been guilty of scandalous neglect, delay and mismanagement in the administration of his department in the Yukon district.

That Mr. W. Ogilvie, an officer of the Department of the Interior, who had been engaged in that region since 1895, reported in 1896 to the Department of the Interior the richness of the gold deposits ; advised that department that a great development was expected, and that a great rush was likely to be made to the Klondike. He further reported that gold had been found in quantities ; that Bonanza Creek was rich in gold ; that the excitement was intense ; that it was certain that millions would be taken out of the district in the next four years. He reported that the traffic in liquor would have to be taken hold of and regulated without delay ; that legal machinery was absolutely necessary for the trial of cases of contract, collection of debts, and generally the judicial interests of the country ; that there had been several applications for land in the vicinity of the mouth of the Klondike, and that Inspector Constantine had selected a reserve for Government purposes at the confluence of that stream with the Yukon, 40 acres in extent, and that he (Mr. Ogilvie) recommended also that a court of record be established.

That the reports of Mr. Ogilvie upon the subjects and district aforesaid were dated, and received at the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, respectively, as follows :—

His report of the 6th September, 1896, was received 19th October, 1896 ; his report of 18th August, 1896, was received at Ottawa on the 22nd October, 1896 ; his report of 6th November, 1896, on the 16th February, 1897 ; his report of 9th December, 1896, on the 27th February, 1897 ; his report of 11th January, 1897, on the 16th March, 1897 ; his report of 23rd January, 1897, on the 15th March, 1897. (See statement of the hon. the Minister of the Interior—" Hansard," 1898, vol. 1, page 974).

That on the 11th February, 1897, the Surveyor General, Mr. Deville, formally and by report in writing communicated the information contained in the said official documents which had then arrived at Ottawa as aforesaid to the deputy head of the Department of the Interior.

That the Surveyor General of Canada reported (see report dated 1st February, 1898) to the deputy head of the department as follows :—

" The first news of the Klondike gold mines was communicated by Mr. Ogilvie in his letter of the 6th September, 1896, which was received on the 20th October, 1896. This letter, as well as those which followed, contained full particulars of the discoveries and of the extraordinary richness of the ground. They were all published in the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1896 ; they were also embodied in a pamphlet compiled in this office and entitled ' Information respecting the Yukon district.' The manuscript of this pamphlet was handed over to the printers on the 8th June, 1897. It contained the report of Mr. Ogilvie's exploration in 1887, notes on the history of the district, means of access, &c., collected from various sources, views from Mr. Ogilvie's photographs, and five maps compiled and photo-lithographed in this office. The pamphlet remains to this day the most complete and reliable source of information available. It has been reproduced in full or in part by several publishers, and extracts from it form the bulk of many recent Klondike publications. Notwithstanding the wide circulation of these reports, and although the news was given to the press and published all over the country in the fall and winter of 1896, they did not attract much attention from the public. The present excitement dates from the arrival of the steamer " Portland," at Seattle in the end of July, 1897, with the first contingent of successful miners."

And again : " Mr. Ogilvie was informed accordingly by letter, dated 24th July, 1896, and instructed to return to Ottawa for the winter. This letter did not reach him until the 11th September, 1896. * * * In one respect this was a fortunate circumstance ; his presence on the ground during the winter of 1896-97 was of great service to the whole population, and helped to prevent conflicts in the newly-discovered goldfields. He was able to make a survey of all the lands applied for at or near Dawson. He marked out for the applicant, Mr. Joseph Leduc, a part of the town-site into lots, surveyed nearly 200 claims on Bonanza and Eldorado creeks, settled quietly and without trouble nearly all, if not all, the disputes on those creeks, and there were many, and, perhaps most important of all, educated the miners fairly well in the requirements of the mining law."

That in the aforesaid lecture at Victoria, in the fall of 1897, Mr. Ogilvie said :

" In conclusion, let me say that we have in the far north land a vast region comprising from 90,000 to 100,000 square miles of untold possibilities.

" Rich deposits we know exist in it, and for aught we know many more equally rich may yet be found. We know now that there is sufficient to supply a population of a hundred thousand people, and I look forward to seeing that number of people in that country within the next ten years.

" It is a vast inheritance ; let us use it as becomes Canadians, intelligently, liberally and in the way best to advance our country, Canada. Let us use it as becomes the offspring of the Mother of Nations."

That notwithstanding the foregoing facts, the hon. the Minister of the Interior informed the House of Commons in 1898 that he had nothing but the vaguest and most indefinite information until the 1st October, 1897, when he met Mr. Ogilvie aforesaid at Vancouver, B.C. (" Hansard," 1898, vol 1, p. 582.)

That at all events on the 16th February, 1898, at the latest, the said Minister expected and had reason to expect that possibly 40,000 or 50,000 people would reach Dawson in the summer and fall of that year. (" Hansard," Vol. 1, 1898, p. 624 to 626.)

That the Deputy Minister of the Interior in his annual report, 1898, states :

"The great rush which was anticipated as a consequence of the gold discoveries on the Klondike River made it imperative to carry out Messrs. Ogilvie's and Constantine's recommendations."

That no action having been taken on Mr. Ogilvie's reports or that of the Surveyor General aforesaid the latter called the attention of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the Yukon Territory had been neglected, and wrote to the Minister on the 5th March, 1897, as follows :—

"A perusal of Mr. Ogilvie's report leaves the impression that if prompt steps are not taken for placing the land and mining business of the district under official management, it will soon be in an undesirable condition."

That Mr. Fawcett, the Gold Commissioner, reported under date 19th January, 1898, a rush and overcrowding of his office. (Interior report for 1897, p. 93) as follows :—

"The stampede to record claims still keeps up on the office. Our certificate number has now reached 50 per day. We have used the foolscap paper I brought in with me for keeping records on and have used the last of the stock to-day. There is none to be had in town and we will have to use the thin paper such as I am writing on. The office falls in for a great deal of blame because the people cannot get in to record as fast as they want to.....

"We have nearly protests enough to keep us engaged for a full month doing nothing else but investigating these matters."

That in May or June of 1898, about 30,000 to 35,000 persons had actually arrived at Dawson.

That the Deputy Minister of the Interior (returning to the year 1897), reported in 1898, moreover, that "in view of the rapid development," and especially of the large influx of miners, "it was deemed necessary for the proper enforcement of law and order as well as for the successful management of the Government interests in that district, that the officer representing the Government of Canada should be appointed as chief executive officers of the Government with full authority over all officials of the various departments of the Government as well as the North-west Mounted Police stationed there."

That notwithstanding Parliament was not prorogued in 1897 until the 29th day of June, no parliamentary provision was made for supplies, nor was special legislation proposed or obtained for preliminary or permanent organization in the Yukon district.

That on the 12th August, 1897, the present Minister of the Interior caused the following telegram to be sent to Inspector Harper of the North-west Mounted Police at Victoria, B.C. :—

"Department of the Interior,
"Ottawa, 12th August, 1897.

"Inspector Harper,
"North-west Mounted Police,
"Victoria, B.C.

"Advise Fawcett that Major Walsh has been appointed Commissioner for the Dominion Government for Yukon territory. He will have complete authority over all matters as representing the Government. Expects to leave in about three weeks. This will not affect Fawcett's position except that Walsh will be placed in full charge of all officials, including police.

"CLIFFORD SIFTON."

That statements in the telegram aforesaid were untrue and misleading and tended to further confusion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

That on the 17th August, 1897, His Excellency the then Governor General was advised to approve of an Order in Council in the words and figures following :—

Extract of a Report of the Committee of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 17th August, 1897.

On a memorandum dated 11th August, 1897, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting that for the proper enforcement of law and order as well as for the successful management of the Government's interest in the Yukon Territory, he is of opinion that it is necessary that an officer representing the Government of Canada should be appointed who shall be the chief executive officer of the Government in that district; and that the chief executive officer should be vested with the fullest authority over all the officials of the various departments of the Government, and should have power to remove, suspend or supersede any official except the judge of the Supreme Court pending the action of the Minister under whose department such official is employed.

That he should also be placed in full command of the North-west Mounted Police Force, and the officers of the force should receive their instructions from him. In order to maintain proper discipline he should be empowered to remove, suspend or supersede any member of the Mounted Police Force whose conduct, in his opinion, would warrant such action.

The Minister further submits that the chief executive officer appointed herein should also have power to vary, alter or amend any mining regulations issued under authority of Your Excellency in Council governing the granting of mining claims, where such change may, in his opinion, be necessary in the public interest.

The Minister states he should make a full report to him, the Minister, by each mail upon all matters affecting his office and the administration of the various departments of the Government in the territory under his control.

The Minister, therefore, recommends that John M. Walsh, of the town of Brockville, province of Ontario, be appointed Chief Executive Officer of the Government in the Yukon Territory, and that he shall be known as the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory ; and further that he be vested with the authority as hereinbefore contained. And that his appointment shall take effect from and after the 15th day of August, 1897, and that he shall receive a salary at the rate of $5,000 per annum.

The Committee submit the above recommendations for Your Excellency's approval.

(Signed) JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

To the Honourable
The Minister of the Interior.

That His Excellency the then Governor General was further advised to sign under his hand and to cause the Great Seal of Canada to be affixed to a commission in the words and figures following, that is to say :

"(Signed) ABERDEEN.

"CANADA.

"Victoria by the Grace of God, of the United Empire of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c., &c.

"To John M. Walsh of the Town of Brockville, in the Province of Ontario, in our Dominion of Canada, Esquire,

"Greeting :

"Know you that reposing trust and confidence in your loyalty, integrity and ability we have

constituted and appointed and we do hereby constitute and appoint you the said John M. Walsh to be the Chief Executive Officer of the Government of Canada in the Yukon district with the title of Commissioner of the Yukon District.

"To have, hold, exercise and enjoy the said office of Commissioner of the Yukon district unto you the said John M. Walsh and for the purposes aforesaid, we do confer upon you the necessary and requisite power and authority in the following matters, that is to say :—

"1. To remove, suspend or supersede any official or officer of our Government of Canada (except the judge of our Supreme Court of the North-west Territories), pending the action thereon of the Minister of the department in which such official or officer is employed or acting.

"2. To vary, alter or amend any mining regulations issued under the authority of our Governor General in Council governing the granting of mining claims where such change may in the opinion of our said commissioner be necessary or expedient in the public interest.

"And we do also empower you, our said commissioner to have and exercise full command of the North-west Mounted Police who may be stationed or quartered in said district. And we do order and direct that the officers and men shall receive their instructions from you, and shall obey any lawful orders which may be issued by you, our said commissioner. And to that end that proper and necessary discipline may be enforced. We do authorize and empower you to remove, suspend or supersede any member of the said North-west Mounted Police stationed or quartered in said district whose actions or conduct would in the opinion of you, our said commissioner, warrant such action on your part.

"And we do further order and direct that you shall send by each and every mail a full report in writing to our Minister of the Interior upon all matters and things affecting your said office and upon and concerning the administration of the various departments or branches of our Government of Canada under your supervision or control in said district, and with all and every the powers, rights, authority privileges, profits, emoluments and advantages unto the said officer of right and by law appertaining during pleasure."

"In testimony whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent and the great seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed, witness our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and councillor the Right Honourable Sir John Campbell Hamilton Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen, Viscount Formartine, Baron Haddo, Methlic, Tarves and Kellie, in the Peerage of Scotland, Viscount Gordon of Aberdeen, County of Aberdeen, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Baronet of Nova Scotia, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, &c., &c., Governor General of Canada.

"At our Government House, in our city of Ottawa, this seventeenth day of August, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven and in the sixty first year of our reign.

"By command,

(Signed) "R. W. SCOTT,

"Secretary of State."

That His Excellency the then Governor General of Canada was again advised on the 26th day of August, 1897, to approve of the following Order in Council :—

"Extract from a report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council approved by His Excellency on the 26th August, 1897.

"On a memorandum, dated 23rd August, 1897, from the Minister of the Interior, recommending that the name James Morrow Walsh be substituted for that of "John M. Walsh" in the Order in Council of the 17th instant appointing a chief executive officer of the Government in the Yukon Territory.

"The committee submit the same for Your Excellency's approval.

"(Sgd.), H. G. LaMOTHE,

"Asst. Clerk of the Privy Council."

His Excellency's advisers further advise the then Governor General to issue a further and other commission under the hand of His Excellency the Governor General and sealed with the great seal, addressed to James Morrow Walsh in the words and figures following :—

"CANADA,

"Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c., &c., &c.

"To James Morrow Walsh of the Town of Brockville, in the province of Ontario, in our Dominion of Canada, Esquire.

Greeting :

"Know you that reposing trust and confidence in your loyalty, integrity and ability we have constituted and appointed and we do hereby constitute and appoint you the said James Morrow Walsh to be chief executive officer of the Government of Canada in the Yukon district with the title of commissioner of the Yukon district.

"To have hold, exercise and enjoy the said office of commissioner of the Yukon district unto you the said James Morrow Walsh and for the purpose aforesaid we do confer upon you the necessary and requisite power and authority in the following matters, that is to say :—

"1. To remove, suspend or supersede any official or officer of our Government of Canada (except the judge of our Supreme Court of the North-west Territories) pending the action thereon of the Minister of the department in which such official or officer is employed or acting.

"2. To vary, alter or amend any mining regulations issued under the authority of our Governor General in Council governing the granting of mining claims when such change may in the opinion of you our said commissioner be necessary or expedient in the public interest.

"And we do also empower you, our said commissioner, to have and exercise full command of the North-west Mounted Police who may be stationed or quartered in said district, and we do order and direct that the officers and men shall receive their instructions from you, and shall obey any lawful orders which may be issued by you, our said commissioner.

"And to the end that proper and necessary discipline may be enforced, we do authorize and empower you to move, suspend, supersede any member of the said North-west Mounted Police stationed or quartered in said district whose actions or conduct would in the opinion of you, our said commissioner, warrant such action on your part.

"And we do further order and direct that you shall send by each and every mail a full report in writing to our Minister of the Interior upon all matters and things affecting your said office and upon and concerning the administration of the various departments or branches of our Government of Canada under your supervision or control

in said district, and with all and every the powers, rights, authority, privileges, profits, emoluments and advantages unto the said office of right and by law appertaining during pleasure.

"In testimony whereof we have caused these our Letters to be made Patent and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed.

"Witness: Our right trusty and right well-beloved Cousin and Councillor the Right Honourable Sir John Campbell Hamilton Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen, Viscount Formartine, Baron Haddo, Methlic, Tarves and Kellie in the Peerage of Scotland, Viscount Gordon of Aberdeen, County of Aberdeen, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Baronet of Nova Scotia, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and St. George, &c., &c., Governor General of Canada.

"At our Government House in our City of Ottawa, this seventeenth day of August in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, and in the sixty-first year of Our Reign.

"By command,
(Signed) "R. W. SCOTT,
"Secretary of State."

That no authority, statutory or otherwise, exists for the advice so tendered as aforesaid to His Excellency.

That the said commissions were and are wholly void and contrary to law.

That neither the instructions to His Excellency, the Imperial or Canadian statutory or other authority warranted such appointment of the said James Morrow Walsh, as aforesaid, or the conferring of the powers upon him as aforesaid.

That the record of the said James Morrow Walsh in the public service when superintendent of mounted police in the North-west Territories, and the evidence taken before a Board of Inquiry respecting his conduct while in office was of such a character as should have prevented his reappointment to a position of trust and responsibility in the Government service.

That subsequently the said James Morrow Walsh published the following in the said district:—

"YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT OF
"CANADA.

"Under the powers vested in me by my commission as chief executive officer of the Government of Canada in the Yukon District, North-west Territories, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 7th day of August, 1897, for the purpose of providing a suitable tribunal for the hearing and decision of disputes with regard to title in placer mining properties:

"I hereby amend the regulations governing placer mining in the Provisional District of the Yukon, North-west Territories (approved by Order in Council of January, 1898) by adding thereto the following sections:—

"The Gold Commissioner and the Mining Inspectors for the District of the Yukon shall each have power to hear and determine all disputes with regard to mining property arising within the Yukon District, subject to appeal by either of the parties, as follows:—

(a.) In case the appeal shall be from the decision of either of the mining inspectors it shall be heard by the Gold Commissioner of the Yukon District.

"(b.) In case of an appeal from the decision of the Gold Commissioner, it shall be heard by the Minister of the Interior of Canada.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

"(c.) There shall be an appeal to the Minister of the Interior, not only from the decisions by the Gold Commissioner on cases originally tried by him, but also on cases decided by him on appeal from decisions of either of the mining inspectors.

"42. No particular forms of procedure shall be necessary, but the matter complained of must be properly expressed in writing, and a copy of the complaint served on the opposite party not less than seven days before the hearing of the matters contained in said complaint.

"43. The complaint may, by leave of the Gold Commissioner or either of the said mining inspectors, be amended at any time before or during proceedings in connection with the trial thereof.

"44. The complainant shall, at the time of filing his complaint, deposit therewith a bond fee of $20, which shall be returned to him when the complaint proves to have been well founded, but not otherwise, except for special cause and then only by direction of the Gold Commissioner or either of said mining inspectors.

"45. In all cases of appeal the appellant shall, at the time of lodging his appeal, deposit at the office of the Gold Commissioner, a bond fee of $20, which shall be returned to the said appellant if his appeal proves to be well founded, but not otherwise, except for special cause, and then only by direction of the person hearing the said appeal and rendering decision thereon.

"46. The appeal must be in writing, and must be filed at the office of the Gold Commissioner not more than twenty days after the decision appealed from has been communicated in writing to all the parties interested, and must state the ground upon which said decision is appealed from. Time shall not run against said appeal and the lodging thereof until said decision has been communicated in writing to all the parties interested, as aforesaid.

"47. If the Gold Commissioner or either of said inspectors decides that it is necessary to a proper decision of the matters in issue to have an investigation on the ground, or in the cases of disputed boundaries or measurements to employ a Dominion surveyor to measure or survey the land in question, the expense of the inspection or remeasurement or resurvey, as the case may be, shall be borne by the litigants, who shall pay into the hands of the person hearing such dispute in equal parts such sum as he may think sufficient for the same before it takes place; otherwise, it shall not proceed, and the party who refuses to pay such sum shall be adjudged in default. The person hearing and deciding each such dispute shall subsequently determine in what proportion the said expense shall be borne by the parties respectively, and the surplusage, if any, shall then be returned to the parties, as he may order.

"48. All bond fees adjudged as forfeited and all payments retained under the last preceding section shall as soon as decision has been rendered, and all entry and other moneys shall, as soon as they have been received under any of the foregoing sections, be paid by the recipient to the credit of the Receiver General in the same manner as other moneys received by him on account of Dominion lands.

"49. For the purpose of enabling said Gold Commissioner and mining inspectors to properly dispose of every case brought before them under these regulations and compelling the attendance of witnesses where necessary, I hereby confer upon said Gold Commissioner and said inspectors all the power of a justice of the peace, with reference to the issue of summons requiring the attendance of witnesses, and also with reference to the issue of such warrants as may be necessary

to compel the attendance of witnesses who disobey any such summons.

"Given under my hand and seal of office this 2nd day of July, 1898.

(Seal.) (Signed) "J. M. WALSH,
"Commissioner Yukon District."

That on the 30th March, 1899, His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to approve of an Order in Council rescinding "the aforesaid regulations issued by Major Walsh."

That though Major Walsh was appointed as aforesaid Chief Executive Officer or Commissioner of the Yukon District on the 17th August, 1897, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that his appointment was for no specified time ("Hansard," 1898, page 470) he had nevertheless made it a condition of his acceptance that he should not depart for the Yukon until the 15th September. (Mr. Sifton, vol. 1, "Hansard," 1898, page 582.

That Major Walsh did not leave Ottawa until the 23rd September, 1897, reaching Winnipeg on September 27th. (Return to Senate, No. 38 B, 17th March, 1898.)

That the said officer only arrived at Lake Bennett on the 3rd March, 1898, and did not reach Dawson City until the 21st May, 1898.

That Mr. Walsh was also given a commission as senior officer of the North-west Mounted Police, and a commission as a police magistrate. (Vol. 1, "Hansard," 1898, page 1777.

That the Honourable the Minister of Justice has officially stated:

"Major Walsh went up into that country in connection with the mounted police for the purpose of maintaining law and order, not for the purpose of organizing an independent Government there, but for the purpose of carrying on the executive government with which His Excellency the Governor General is entrusted, under the advice of his Ministers here, and we fully admit our responsibility for the manner in which that duty will be discharged."

That in reply to a formal inquiry in the House of Commons, the present Honourable Minister of the Interior stated on March 4th, 1898, that instructions were given to Major Walsh in addition to the commission and that they were verbal and general in their character. (Vol. 1, "Hansard," 1898, page 1777.)

That notwithstanding this official statement in 1898, in reply to a formal inquiry in the House of Commons the present Honourable Minister of the Interior stated from his place in this House on May 17th, 1899 ("Hansard, 1899, page 3365): "No instructions were given to Major Walsh, Commissioner for the Yukon District, when he went there, except what are contained in the commission."

That Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as already stated, informed the House of Commons in 1898 that the appointment of Major Walsh was for no specified time. ("Hansard," 1898, page 479.)

That the Secretary of State in 1898 announced in another place officially that "he, Major Walsh, was to remain there (in the Yukon) until order was restored to that country." (Senate Debates, 1898, page 201.

That in 1899 the Minister of the Interior used the following language in the House of Commons:—

"In pursuance of the understanding with Major Walsh that I should appoint his successor as soon as possible." ("Hansard," 1899, page 852.)

That the Deputy Minister of the Interior in his annual Report for 1898, says that Major Walsh "was compelled through personal reasons to ask to be relieved of the duties of this office and his resignation was accordingly accepted."

(Page XIII., Report of the Department of the Interior, 1898.)

That nothwithstanding the foregoing, in a letter to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, Major Walsh wrote in 1899, and the Minister read to this House, as follows:—

"I engaged with the Government as you know to go to the Yukon for a year only, although my commission did not state so."

("Hansard," 1899, page 905.)

That the Honourable Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, explained from his place in this House that he did not appoint a lawyer as Gold Commissioner, because Mr. Ogilvie recommended a surveyor. ("Hansard," 1899, page 856).

That on being requested to produce the said recommendation the said Honourable Minister produced the following extract from a report of Mr. Ogilvie, dated June 10th, 1896:

"I would respectfully call the attention of the department to the fact the services of a surveyor are very urgent in here and will be for some years to come, and I would suggest that one be appointed to look after and take charge of all the land interests of the district. He would find plenty to do and any work outside of departmental which he might be asked to do (and there is much of it and will be more in the way of engineering), would go materially to pay his salary which would of course in here have to be liberal."

That while the said recommendation was dated June 10th, 1896, the Order in Council appointing Mr. Fawcett is dated the 21st May, 1897.

That while the recommendation was for the appointment of a surveyor as land agent the appointment of Mr. Fawcett was as land agent and gold commissioner.

That the said the Honourable Clifford Sifton, as Minister of the Interior advised His Excellency to grant authority to the said Fawcett to act for the Minister of the Interior in matters relating to the administration of the district and that certain assistants of the said Fawcett, viz., Elnworth, Doran, Bolton and Gibbon should be authorized to act in his place during his absence, and His Excellency was moved by his advisers to approve of an Order in Council accordingly on the said 21st May, 1897.

That Thomas Fawcett, Esquire, Dominion Topographical Surveyor, so selected to represent the Department of the Interior in the gold district as gold commissioner, surveyor and land agent, did not leave Ottawa until the 1st May, 1897, when he left with a staff of two surveyors and four men, and he did not arrive at Dawson until 15th June, 1897.

That by Order in Council 21st July, 1898, the said Order in Council of 21st May, 1897, was rescinded.

That by Order in Council, dated 5th July, 1898 the said Thomas Fawcett was appointed gold commissioner for the Yukon Territory, his appointment to date from 1st July, 1898.

That on the 7th October, 1898, the said last mentioned Order in Council was rescinded, and one Gordon Hunter, barrister, said to be, by the Order in Council, of Vancouver, B.C., but in reality a resident of Victoria, B.C., was appointed gold commissioner in his stead.

That Mr. Hunter declined the appointment, and on the 26th October, 1898, Edmund C. Senkler, of Nelson, B.C., was appointed to the said position by Order in Council.

That the Deputy Minister of the Interior reported (Annual Report of the Interior Department, 1898):

"It was further felt that in order to facilitate

the administration of justice both civil and criminal in the Klondike district, one of the members of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories should have his domicile in close proximity to the various centres of population that have recently sprung up in that region, and with this in view Mr. Justice Maguire, of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, has been transferred to Dawson City, vested with the fullest authority as regards any legal or criminal matters that may be brought before him."

The Honourable Mr. Justice Maguire did not reach Dawson till the 26th day of February, 1898, and he left there on the 16th August in in the same year. ("Hansard," 1899, page 4185.)

That the Deputy Minister of the Interior also reported (1898, Annual Report), the appointment of "two inspectors, Mr. J. B. McGregor, of Brandon, Man., and H. H. Norwood, of Berwick, N.S. The duties of these inspectors will consist chiefly of inspecting mining locations and reporting thereon to the gold commissioner, with a view specially of supervising the collection of dues and the settlement of conflicting claims."

That the H. H. Norwood, aforesaid was also appointed inspector of supplies ("Hansard," Vol. 2, 1898. page 7120), and he was a naturalized citizen of the United States, and the uncertificated master of a whaler or small sailing vessel.

That the said J. D. McGregor, and H. H. Norwood were appointed on the 4th July, 1897; the said McGregor did not reach Dawson until 26th February, 1898, and the said Norwood did not reach Dawson until the 28th March, 1898. ("Hansard," 1899, page 3184.)

That the said J. D. McGregor was a livery stable keeper. That the said J. D. McGregor and H. H. Norwood were both incompetent for the proper discharge of the duties aforesaid.

That Mr. F. C. Wade was appointed Crown Prosecutor, Clerk of the Court, and Registrar, and acting Dominion Lands Agent for the district of Yukon on the 26th day of August, 1897, and subsequently legal adviser of the executive council, but did not arrive at Dawson until the 26th day of February, 1898. ("Hansard," 1899, page 3184), or about March 20th, 1898. ("Hansard," 1898, page 1879.)

That the Honourable the Minister of the Interior has informed the House of Commons that his "batch of Grit officials got to Dawson in February, 1898." ("Hansard," 1899, page 885.)

That the Government of Canada, appointed on the recommendation of the Honourable Clifford Sifton certain officials who were incapable, incompetent, inefficient and corrupt, to positions requiring experience. technical knowledge and integrity of character.

That the Honourable Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior has been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon in the North-west Territories.

That as appears by a Return (83), 3rd Session, 8th Parliament, 61 Victoria, 1898 (Canada), the following parties applied for and obtained leases of good placer mining or gold dredging areas in the Yukon district:—

A. E. Philp, said to be of Brandon, for a lease on Bonanza Creek.

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on S. Fork (Stewart).

G. Philp, said to be of London, for lease on B. Salmon.

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Indian River or Creek.

J. A. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Teslin River or Creek.

A. D. Cameron, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Stewart's River or Creek.

That Mr. A. E. Philp and Mr. A. D. Cameron, aforesaid were partners in business with the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, when that gentleman became Minister of the Interior, and all were members of the firm of Sifton, Philp, and Cameron of Brandon.

That by the said Return, it further appears that W. J. Lindsay, said to be of Ottawa, P. C. Mitchell, said to be of Brandon, and W. L. Parish, said to be of Ottawa, applied for dredging leases in the Yukon, whereas these gentlemen were residents of Brandon who first learned of these applications by a letter from A. E. Philp, aforesaid advising them that these leases had been granted in their names and inclosing a power of attorney from each of them in favour of said Philp, to enable him to dispose of them.

That in the list contained in the said Return are the names and addresses of the following purporting to be applicants for dredging leases:—

F. Burnett, Vancouver.
F. Burnett, Colborne.
J. G. Burnett, Edmonton.
F. Burnett, Colborne.
Frank Burnett, Brandon.

Whereas F. Burnett was never in Colborne in his life, but said Philp came from that place.

That the said Philp, heretofore a partner of the said Minister, represented in writing that he was engaged in a dredging venture in the Yukon, and in endeavouring to induce another to join him, represented in writing that Mr. Sifton, the said Minister, and Major Walsh, were also interested with him, but their names could not appear as he wrote "for obvious reasons."

That the Honourable Clifford Sifton gave to the said Philp a permit or authority signed by him contrary to law, which was offered for sale by the said Philp, for a large amount of money.

That chapter 54 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, section 7, provides as follows:—

"No person employed in or under the Department of the Interior shall purchase any Dominion Lands, except under the authority of the Governor in Council, or shall locate military or bounty land warrants or land scrip or act as agent, of any other person in such behalf.

And the word land "by the provisions of the said Act includes mining claims."

That chapter 51, section 31, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the "Territories Real Property Act," provides as follows:—

"No registrar, deputy registrar, or clerk in any land titles office under this Act shall directly or indirectly act as the agent of any person investing money and taking securities in real estate within his registration district, nor shall such registrar, deputy registrar or clerk advise for any fee or reward or otherwise upon titles of land, nor practice as a conveyancer, nor shall he carry on or transact within the registry office, any business or occupation whatever, other than his duties as such registrar or land clerk. The expression "land" by the provisions of the said Act means, among other things, mines, minerals, &c."

That on repeal of chapter 51 aforesaid and the enactment of the Land Titles Act, 1894, it was provided by section 31 thereof as follows:—

"Neither the inspector of land titles offices, nor any registrars, deputy registrars, or clerk in any land titles office shall directly or indirectly act as the agent of any person investing money and taking securities on land within any regulation district, nor shall the inspector of land titles

office, nor any registrar, deputy registrar or clerk advise for any fee or reward or otherwise, upon titles to land, nor practice as a conveyancer, nor shall he carry on or transact within the lands titles office any business or occupation whatever, other than his duties as such inspector, registrar, deputy registrar, or clerk."

The word land is defined by said Act to include mines, minerals, &c., &c., &c.

That the Minister of the Interior, the Honourable Clifford Sifton, gave his express sanction and approval to Mr. Wade, hereinbefore mentioned, holding and becoming financially interested in Dominion lands or mining claims in the said Yukon District, and the said Wade did, with the said Minister's express consent and approval, hold and was financially interested in such property, contrary to the provisions of the statutes in such cases made and provided.

That unsanitary conditions have unnecessarily prevailed in the district.

That there have been gross abuse in connection with liquor permits.

That in Dawson City, containing at a moderate estimate, some 25,000 of a population, there was not, on the 1st April, 1899, a single road, bridge or drain, nothing that might be termed a public work in any form. In Dawson City there was neither pavement, roadway, drain or ditch, no water supply nor lighting, and the matter of the disposal of refuse had up to that date been one of individual responsibility only.

This condition of affairs resulted in an epidemic of typhoid fever in 1896.

That official favouritism and partiality has been shown and extended to the representatives and interests of the North American Trading Company of Chicago and Seattle, in the Yukon district.

That Major Walsh did not send by each and every mail a full report in writing to the Minister of the Interior, as comanded by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, or as required by the Order in Council purporting to appoint him to his office as aforesaid.

That Major Walsh, while acting as Commissioner and Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Government, wilfully adopted and countenanced a system in the Yukon Territory tending to inspire a reasonable distrust of the justice and good faith of the Dominion of Canada.

That Major Walsh, acting as Commissioner and Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Government in the Yukon Territory, in sundry instances acted in a manner repugnant to the honour and policy of the Dominion of Canada, and contrary to the principles of constitutional and parliamentary government, and thereby brought the Canadian Government and the Queen's authority and name into contempt and caused injury to the Queen's subjects and others domiciled within Her Majesty's dominions.

That Major Walsh, while acting as Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Government in the Yukon, was guilty of the crime of misbehaviour in office.

That Major Walsh was guilty of doing acts directly contrary to the design of his office as Chief Executive Officer of the Dominion Government.

That in September, 1897, Major Walsh employed six Indians from Fort William Mission Band, upon an engagement to send them home in October, 1898, at the expense of the Government of Canada. That Philip Walsh, a brother of the said Major Walsh, and employed by the Government, was in charge of the said Indians (Return to Senate, 17th March, 1898, No. 38B). That these Indians located and recorded mining claims for and on behalf of Major Walsh. On the return of the Indians these claims were transferred to Lewis Walsh, another brother of Major Walsh; and Lewis Walsh and Philip Walsh, aforesaid, left Fort William on or about 10th May, 1899, to look after the said claims.

That the following correspondence deals with certain and clear and well-known provisions of the Canadian Parliament:

"Department of the Interior,
"Ottawa, 23rd June, 1898.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Minister of the Interior to request your advice upon the following question:

"By section 92 of the North-west Territories Act, 49 Victoria, Chap. 50, no intoxicating liquor is permitted to be imported or brought into the North-west Territories from any province of Canada, or elsewhere, except by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant-Governor.

"On the 13th June, instant, an Act was passed declaring that the Yukon District should no longer form part of the North-west Territories. The Administrator of the Territories had, however, on the advice of his Executive Council, issued a number of permits under section 92 of 49 Victoria, Chap. 50, expressly authorizing the persons to whom they were issued to take liquor into what is known as the Yukon District; and the question now submitted for your consideration and advice is, as to whether or not such permits authorized the holders thereof to take liquor into the Yukon District after the 13th day of June instant.

"I have the honour to be, sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"(Signed) JOHN R. HALL,
"Secretary.

"The Honourable the Minister of Justice,
"Ottawa."

"Ottawa, 27th June, 1898.
"Department of Justice,

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd instant, in which you ask for an opinion as to whether permits authorizing the importation of intoxicants into the Yukon District issued by the Administrator of the North-west Territories under section 92 of the North-west Territories Act before the 13th instant, upon which date the Act of last session providing for the government of the Yukon District became law, continue in force so as to authorize the holders of them to take liquor into that district after the 13th June.

In reply, I beg to state that the Act of last session referred to, the Yukon Territory Act, contains a section providing that, subject to the provisions of the Act the laws relating to civil and criminal matters as the same existed in the Territories at the time of the passing of the Act, shall be and remain in force in the Yukon Territory in so far as the same are applicable thereto until amended or repealed by the Parliament of Canada, or by any law or ordinance of the Governor in Council, or the Commissioner in Council made under the provisions of the Act. Under this section the prohibitory provisions of the North-west Territories Act are still in force in the Yukon District, in so far as the same is applicable, and I am to state that the Minister of Justice is of opinion that, such being the case, any order or regulation validly made thereunder also continue in force so far as it may be applicable. Of this nature are the permits referred to, and the Minister is of opinion that they are of the same force now as if the Act of last session had not been passed.

"The Minister is of opinion also that these permits continue in force by virtue of the provisions of section 7, paragraph 50 of the Interpretation Act, to the effect that whenever any Act is repealed wholly or in part and other provisions are substituted, all the by-laws, orders, regulations rules and ordinances made under the repealed Act shall continue good and valid in so far as they are not inconsistent with the substituted Act, enactment or provision until they are annulled or others made in their stead. The Act of last session effected the repeal of the Territories Act so far as the latter Act vested executive and administrative powers over the Yukon Territory in the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, but in accordance with the rule of interpretation laid down by paragraph 50, above referred to, such repeal did not affect the validity of any orders, regulations, &c., made under the repealed Act, and the permits in question, therefore, remain good and valid by virtue of that paragraph until they are annulled under the provisions of the law as it now stands.

"I have the honour to be, sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"(Signed) A. POWER,

"Acting Deputy Minister of Justice."

That notwithstanding the foregoing, and that it is provided by section 138 of the Criminal Code, 1892, that every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who, without lawful excuse, disobeys any Act of the Parliament of Canada, or of any legislature in Canada, by wilfully doing any Act which it forbids, or omitting to do any act which it requires to be done, unless some penalty or other mode of punishment is imposed as provided by law; Major Walsh, aforesaid, did, on March 5th, 1898, issue an order to the Superintendent of the North-west Mounted Police in the Yukon, forbidding him to recognize "permits for the importation of liquor into the Yukon District, unless issued by the Department of the Interior or Inspector Wood."

That Major Walsh subsequently advised representatives of the gambling and liquor saloons that the Governor of the North-west Territories had no jurisdiction, and that local magistrates and North-west Mounted Police would be instructed not to entertain charges laid for infraction of North-west Territories ordinances or regulations (which were then in force), and that any one could retail liquors subject only to this restriction that none should be sold on Sunday.

That Major Walsh subsequently permitted one Lucille Elliott to keep open on the Sabbath a stand for the sale of cigars and light drinks, and the said Lucille Elliott sold spirituous liquors by virtue of this order, and in contravention of outstanding and unrepealed ordinances and regulations.

That Major Walsh illegally interfered with liquors imported under liquor permits which had been issued according to law, and when applications were made to the Honourable Mr. Justice Maguire for injunctions to prevent such illegal conduct, Mr. F. C. Wade, the Crown Prosecutor, falsely represented to the court that the Act respecting the Yukon which had not reached Dawson, provided for the cancellation of such permits, and so succeeded in obtaining an adjournment of such cases and in frustrating the enforcement of the laws of the North-west Territories.

That Major Walsh illegally assumed authority to permit spirituous liquors to be brought into the Yukon district, and illegally and vindictively exercised his authority in seizing or holding spirituous liquors which came into the Yukon under legal permits.

That application to the Minister of the Interior and political influence became and was necessary in order to secure respect for permits issued under the law, and a Liberal lawyer was enabled to charge a large sum to secure the good offices of the Minister in consequence of irregular and illegal conduct under his administration.

That while acting as the chief executive officer of the Canadian Government, Major Walsh carried on in the Yukon a liaison with one known as Lucille Elliott, who was permitted to enjoy privileges, advantages and favours from the local authorities in the said district.

That while acting as the chief executive officer of the Government, Major Walsh was guilty of intemperate and immoral acts, which involved him in irregular and improper conduct in the discharge of his public duties, and brought contempt upon Canada.

That the regulations were not regularly enforced, but certain of them (as for instance, those relating to the royalties on mines and mining claims), were allowed by Major Walsh to be violated, and claims were allowed by him to be staked and recorded at 500 feet in length in lieu of 250 feet in length, as prescribed by the regulations.

That Major Walsh illegally exempted individuals from the law and regulations respecting the payment of royalties.

That the Crown Prosecutor, F. C. Wade, declined to act in the enforcement of the laws, ordinances and regulations of the North-west Territories.

That Mr. Wade actively practised his profession of the law in the said district while holding the official positions aforesaid, and appeared before the court of the district, the Gold Commissioner and other officials as the paid advocate of private parties having business transactions with the various departments of the Government.

That the Gold Commissioner's legal adviser accepted retainers and fees from persons contesting claims before the Commissioner.

That the acting Dominion Lands Agent, Registrar, Clerk of the Court, Crown Prosecutor, has accepted retainers, fees or remuneration to procure or for procuring, or attempting or promising to procure, grants or title or possession of Dominion lands and mining claims.

That an officer of the Government was guilty of blackmailing persons engaged in the sale of spirituous liquors, and keeping of gambling saloons.

That Mr. Wade, while holding the position of registrar of lands, clerk of the court and Crown attorney was financially and personally interested in the disposal of lands known as the Water Front.

That officials in the employment of the Canadian Government in the Yukon Territory have been guilty, directly and indirectly, of accepting and agreeing to accept offers, proposals, gifts, promises, compensation and consideration for their assistance and influence for and in the performance of work and in the procuring of mining claims, mining interests, land interests and information from public offices and public records, contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

That officials in the employment of the Canadian Government in the Yukon Territory have been guilty of directly and indirectly accepting or receiving gifts, compensation and considerations for assisting or favouring certain individuals in

the transaction of business with the Government, contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

That officials in the employment of the Canadian Government in the Yukon District have been guilty of fraud and breaches of trust affecting the public, contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

That the official records in the Government offices of the Yukon District were kept secret and inspection thereof was not allowed, which practice led to, among other consequences, what has become to be known as a system of "grafting," and to other abuses so that, for instance, after application for a record of a mining claim, if the property were found by or through officials in the mining office to be of value it was staked and recorded in a name other than that of the first applicant, but in a name of some one who represented the interest of an official, and to a system known as the "side door," whereby officials were permitted to and did exact private fees for official work, and official information, and it became and was difficult to secure the performance of work during office hours.

That this "side door" system prevailed at the post office, and involved abuse and wrong-doing on the part of officials and employees of the Government.

That a system of bribery among Government officials was rendered necessary by the inability otherwise to procure them to perform their duties.

That blackmailing by officials of persons applying to record claims has prevailed.

That unfair and fraudulent use has been made by officials of knowledge acquired in the discharge of their duties.

That timber inspectors or officials engaged in the inspection and protection of the Government timber lands and interests in the Yukon District have become interested financially in the said timber interests and have secured sums of money over and above their official fees in connection with the performance of their duties, contrary to the provisions of the statute in this behalf made and provided.

That Arthur Young Wilson, of Dawson City, in the Yukon District of the North-west Territories of Canada, prospector, is a resident of Dawson City, in the Yukon District of the North-west Territories, and is a citizen of the Dominion of Canada and a British subject, having been born of Canadian parents at the town of Simcoe in the county of Norfolk, in the year 1858.

That the said Wilson went into the Yukon country in the fall of 1897, arriving at Dawson City on or about the 9th day of December, 1897, and became engaged there in the occupation of a prospector.

That on or about the 12th day of June, 1898, he saw T. S. McFarlain, Crown Timber Agent for the North-west Territories at Dawson City at that time and applied to him for a timber berth one mile square and being situated on the west side of the Yukon River, opposite Dawson City, and he assured Wilson that he could have the same on paying the necessary Government license therefor and royalty on the timber cut therefrom and the said Crown Timber Agent instructed him to go and stake out the berth wanted, and how to go about it.

The said Wilson, acting in accordance with the instruction of the said Crown timber agent and under his directions did forthwith thereafter take a man with him and measure off a square mile on the said west bank of the Yukon River, according to the following measurement and description :—Commencing on the west bank of the Yukon River directly opposite to the Yukon Mining Exchange in Dawson City, thence north along said west bank of the Yukon River one mile, thence west one mile, thence south parallel to the west bank of the said Yukon River one mile, thence east to the place of beginning, and such measurement was completed on or about the 15th day of July, 1898, and the necessary notices posted up thereon.

That on or about the 16th day of July, 1898, the said Wilson put in a formal application to the said Crown Timber Agent, T. S. McFarlain, for the license and right to cut the timber from the berth described in the next preceding paragraph thereof, and paid to such timber agent, the government license fee, $250, and received therefor the receipt of the said timber agent, which receipt is as follows :—

"Dawson, June 16th, 1898.

"Received from Mr. Alf. Wilson the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars, being deposit for timber berth applied for.

"(Signed T. S. McFARLAIN,
"Crown Timber Agent."

That the Crown Timber Agent at the time of accepting the said license fee explained to Wilson that he might begin cutting the timber when he chose, but he would also be subject to the payment of the government price (or royalty) per cord for wood or per thousand feet for timber, for all wood or timber cut or caused to be cut thereon and taken therefrom, to which Wilson agreed.

That a few days after Wilson obtained the license hereinbefore mentioned, one J. W. Willison came to Dawson City and assumed the duties and office of Crown Timber Agent and he refused to recognize Wilson's grant or license upon the alleged ground that the berth for which the same was given was to be reserved for the use of the citizens of Dawson City, and was not to be sold to any persons, and notwithstanding the utmost protests from Wilson he was not allowed to cut the timber thereon and sell the same, and he lost much valuable time in consequence thereof, and suffered great loss and damage financially.

That after taking all steps which seemed necessary to enable Wilson to secure his rights respecting the said timber berth, and finding the same ineffectual, Wilson applied for the repayment of the $250 which he had paid therefor, and on or about the 24th day of August, 1898, the same was returned to Wilson by the said T. S. McFarlain.

When returning the said money to Wilson the said T. S. McFarlain told Wilson that "it is a shame that Willison would not allow you to have the timber, and that Willison had no right to go back on anything that I had done and I promised you the berth and it was wrong to take it away from you."

The timber on the berth hereinbefore described was afterwards sold by the Crown Timber Agent J. W. Willison to the Messrs. Bartlett Bros., of Dawson City, for the price or sum of 75 cents per cord, and the purchasers caused to be cut thereon and sold therefrom over 1,000 cords of wood, at a clear profit of at least $5 per cord.

That the said Wilson had three men hired in addition to himself for the purpose of cutting the timber on the said berth and by reason of the wrongs suffered by Wilson the time of the men so hired by him was lost to him and Wilson lost at least 53 days' work which, at the rate of wages obtaining at that time in Dawson City, $10 per day, makes up for the four, whose time was lost, the sum of $2,080.

That there were upwards of 1,000 cords actually cut by the subsequent licensees or purchasers, Messrs. Bartlett Bros.

That, as appears by the Departmental Report for 1898, page xiii. :

"THE YUKON TERRITORY.

"Pursuant to the provisions of the Act assented to by Parliament on the 13th June, 1898, intituled "An Act to provide for the government of the Yukon Territory" (61 Victoria, Chap. 6), an Order in Council was passed on the 7th July last, authorizing the employment and defining the duties of the various chief executive officers and clerks whom it was deemed necessary to appoint, in order to properly carry on the work connected with the administration of the Territory."

This Act provided, among other things, for the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer and for the constitution of a Council to aid the said officer in the administration of the said district.

That by this Act it was also provided that the existing laws should remain in force in the said District until altered by the authority constituted by the said Act.

That Major Walsh left the Yukon District on the 4th August, 1898.

That Mr. William Ogilvie was appointed Chief Executive Officer under the provisions of said Act, but did not leave Ottawa for Dawson until the 4th August, 1898, and did not reach Dawson until long afterwards.

That Mr. Justice Maguire left Dawson on the 16th August, 1898, and his successor was not appointed until 7th October, 1898, and did not reach Dawson until long afterwards.

That Samuel Benfield Steele, Superintendent of the Mounted Police, was appointed a member of the Yukon Executive Council on the 7th July, 1898.

That Joseph Edward Girouard was appointed registrar of lands and a member of the Yukon Executive Council on the 7th July, 1898, by Order in Council.

That Joseph Edward Girouard, while registrar of lands and a member of the Executive Council in said district practised and practices his profession as a member of the bar and solicitor, &c., during office hours, and became and is financially interested in mining claims in said district, while holding the aforesaid position.

That the following is an extract from a report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 17th October, 1898 :

"P. C. No. 2432. Interior.

"That Mr. William H. P. Clement, barrister at law, Toronto, be appointed legal adviser to the Council of the Yukon Territory, vice Mr. F. C. Wade, resigned. Mr. Clement's salary to be at the rate of $2,500 a year ; and his appointment to date from 7th October, 1898. Mr. Clement shall not be permitted to accept retainers, or to act as counsel, attorney or solicitor in any action, suit, matter or transaction involving the title to a mining claim or mining property.

"That under the authority of section 5 of the Act of the Parliament of Canada, assented to on the 13th June, 1898, intituled, 'An Act to provide for the government of the Yukon Territory,' Mr. Clement be appointed a member of the Council to aid the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory in the administration of that district, vice Mr. Wade, resigned.

"(Signed) JOHN J. McGEE,

"Clerk of the Privy Council.

"To the Honourable the Minister of the Interior."

That Mr. W. H. P. Clement is a member of a law firm which practices before the Gold Commissioner and acts professionally in matters within the purview of said Council.

That Mr. Justice Dugas was appointed a judge for the Yukon Judicial District on the 7th October, 1898, and became a member of said Council by virtue of his office.

That the said Mr. Justice Dugas, while a judge for the Yukon Judicial District, and while a member of the Executive Council thereof, became, was and is pecuniarily interested in mining claims in said district.

That confidential information has been illegally revealed by officials in the office of the present Gold Commissioner who has been obliged to dismiss an official for the offence.

That gross and scandalous abuses have occurred in the Department of Customs in the Yukon District, United States vessels having been admitted to the Canadian registry in the said district upon fraudulent undervaluation, as in the case of the steamer "John C. Barr," which was worth at least $60,000, but was allowed to be passed at the customs at a valuation of $10,000.

That the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis H. Davies, appointed to the office of inspector of steamboats one Russell who had been previously dismissed from the said service of the Government on account of improper conduct, and detailed said officer to Dawson to act as steamboat inspector

That the laws respecting the certificates of masters and mates have not been properly enforced in the Yukon District, but uncertificated officers, and officers disqualified have been permitted to act as officers upon Canadian registered vessels, contrary to law, to the detriment of Canadian mariners holding certificates under Canadian laws.

That the Honourable the Postmaster General was guilty of gross neglect in the administration of the Post Office Department and from the year 1896 to 1899 did not provide a reasonably efficient postal service to and from the Yukon Territory, but, on the contrary, appointed insufficient, inefficient and corrupt officials and provided such inadequate and unsuitable accommodation and postal arrangements that a large community consisting of the inhabitants of Dawson, N.W.T., suffered distress, inconvenience and pecuniary losses.

That F. Harper was postmaster of Dawson City and gave the exclusive right of delivery of letters in Dawson to a company known as the Yukon Mail and Express Delivery Company.

That upon a personal visit by the special correspondent of the London "Times" newspaper, and after inquiry it was found necessary by that responsible person to report through the "Times" to the business people of the world :

"It is deplorable to have to admit, but it is idle to ignore the fact that the administration of the Klondike district and the relations which exist between the representatives of the Government and the public leave almost everything to be desired. The population remains, on the whole, orderly and law-abiding, but it is in an open and emphatically expressed anticipation of changes which, to give satisfaction, must include within their operation both the system and the personnel. To put the position as plainly as is daily and hourly stated on the mining fields and in the streets of Dawson, there is a widely prevalent conviction not only that the laws are bad, but that the officers through whom they are administered are corrupt. It is hard on innocent and upright individuals whose ad-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

ministrative duties may be performed with scrupulous integrity to be associated in the sweeping charge which is made against the whole official body, but there is no disguising the universal dissatisfaction, and innocent and guilty stand at present together. It is impossible to talk for five minutes on business with any one on the mines or in the streets without some allusion occurring to the subject, and it is a painful experience for Englishmen proud of the purity of the British system of government to be compelled to listen to the plain-spoken comments of Americans and foreigners.

"Apart from the graver charges, there is much dissatisfaction with imperfections of organization, which are ascribed to inaptitude and inattention to business on the part of the responsible officers. That there are, as yet, no roads, no trustworthy mail arrangements, no sanitary organization of any kind, and no clear distribution of streets and town lots in a town of nearly 20,000 inhabitants are conditions which are held to be wholly unnecessary in view of the amount of the revenue derived from the mines and the fact that the town is now two years old. There can be no question that in these respects "gold fever" has had the effect of diverting energy and attention from all but mining interests. The unsanitary condition of Dawson, situated as the town is upon a swamp, and devoid of the most elementary provisions for cleanliness and health, is a standing menace to the community. Typhoid is permanently in the town; the death-rate is abnormally high; and there are as yet no signs of any measures to be taken to avert the danger of a serious outbreak of epidemic. That mining districts cannot be surveyed, that claims in many instances cannot be recorded, that necessary information with regard to districts already staked is not open to the public are facts which have come to be regarded by the public as so many purposely designed channels for individual bribery. A half or a quarter interest is frequently quoted as the price at which good claims can be recorded, and scarcely a day passes in which some fresh story does not become current of the number of dollars which it has cost to obtain letters from a nominally unsorted mail or to make good an entrance on business into one of the public offices."

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency to desire that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to give immediate orders to his Attorney General that the most effectual means be taken for discovering the facts in any way relating to the above charges, and that His Excellency will also be graciously pleased to order the issue of a royal commission to two or more judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Superior Courts of any province of Canada, granting and conferring the fullest possible powers for a complete effectual and exhaustive inquiry with a view to the discovery of the truth of the statements and charges aforesaid, and to this end that His Excellency be advised that in the opinion of this House such a commission should be clothed by a special Act containing similar provisions, powers, jurisdiction, discretion and authority as are conferred by the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 10, being "An Act respecting inquiries as to corrupt practices at Elections of members of the House of Commons."

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as this is part of my speech, that I propose to move, at a later stage, that resolution, and I want to add to the language that it contains, the following statement:—

I am prepared, moreover, to place my services gratuitously at the disposal of the Attorney General for Canada to assist the commission of inquiry in probing this matter to the bottom, whether those services be required at Ottawa, Dawson City or both.

In addition to whatever responsibility attaches to the action I have taken in this matter, I am prepared, if the commission is granted on the terms suggested, to abide by the result and to consider that by failure to substantiate the charges made I will have forfeited my right to sit in Parliament or to hold any office in the gift of the Crown.

I make that statement after the most careful consideration I can give to it in order to convince Parliament and convince the country of my sincerity. While I am taking advantage, undoubtedly, of my privilege as a member of the House of Commons to bring straight to the front and in the light of the information I believe to be based on fact, and while I could not, nor could any man in Canada, unless he were a millionaire, undertake that responsibility outside of the privilege of this House, and summon from the north, the south, the east and the west, all the witnesses and prepare the case as it should be prepared, in order to show a court of law his right and his authority for making statements, I must, to satisfy public opinion of my sincerity, go a great length. I consider I have the right to exercise the privilege a member of the House of Commons possesses to make these statements without incurring any greater responsibility than the laws of Parliament contemplate or impose. But I waive all that, and in this Parliament, in the face of the country—my native country—I am prepared practically for all the pains and penalties, in the discretion of Parliament. I am prepared for more than that; I am prepared, that great good might come out of this investigation, as great good will come out of it, and great benefit to Canada, to incur the risk I have mentioned—no small risk to a man even of ordinary ambition, that is to be considered that he has, by failure, after taking an important step of this character, disentitled himself to the confidence of his fellow countrymen in any public matter, and disentitled also to the confidence of the representative of the sovereign in connection with any matter of political preferment or within the gift of the Crown. According to the understanding which, I think, was reached, informally, today, I now move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has stated that he is not in very good health, and I have consented to agree to an adjournment, but it must be on the understanding that we shall sit later to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year 1898.—(Mr. Fielding.)

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 28th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 53) to authorize the Bank of Nova Scotia to issue sterling notes for circulation in the Island of Jamaica.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax.)

DISMISSALS FROM MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. QUINN (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

What are the names, religions and nationalities of all persons dismissed from Montreal Post Office since June, 1896?

What are the names, religions and nationalities of persons appointed to Montreal Post Office since June, 1896?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). That question had better take the form of a motion.

YUKON—CONSTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. FOSTER (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. What was the date of the Order in Council authorizing the construction of a Government telegraph line into the Yukon?
2. What amount of money has been expended to date on this work?
3. From what moneys voted by Parliament have these expenditures been paid?
4. Have the supplies so far purchased for this work been purchased by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have been furnished by the department with an answer, but it is not as complete as I would like to have it, and I will ask the question to stand.

VALUATION OF BINDERS, &c., FOR DUTY.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

What are the values and bases of valuations fixed by the Department of Customs on the importation of binders, mowers and horse-rakes from the United States, for the purpose of collection of duty thereon?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou).

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The valuation of mowers, binders and horse-rakes from the United States has been fixed for the purposes of customs duty, upon a basis which takes into account the prices of these articles for home consumption in the country of export and the terms and conditions of sale there.

PROPOSED CANADIAN NAVAL RESERVE.

Mr. BRITTON asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps towards the formation of a naval reserve, or a naval brigade, or a marine militia of any kind in Canada, whether in connection with the present militia force or otherwise?
2. If so, when are such steps to be taken?
3. Where, and under whose direction are the first corps to be organized?
4. Has there been any correspondence with the Imperial Government, or the Imperial Naval or Military authorities on this subject? If so, what has been the tenor of such correspondence?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The whole question of the formation of a naval reserve or brigade in Canada has been for some time under the consideration of the Government. No definite conclusions have yet been reached, nor is it thought possible that any scheme can be submitted to Parliament this session. There has not been any correspondence with the Imperial Government, and the only correspondence with the naval and military authorities on the subject is confidential.

MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAYS ON THE GRENVILLE CANAL.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Did the Government of Canada in the year 1845 enter into a written contract with the farmers whose lands are crossed by the Grenville Canal, that upon the condition of the said farmers surrendering their rights to private bridges and accept a single bridge crossing at Lock No. 3, the Government would guarantee good roadways on both banks of the canal for the use of said farmers to and from their farms?
2. Did the Government allow the engineers in charge of the improvements now being made on the Grenville Canal to stake off the farmers' roadway, and did the Government allow the contractors, Messrs. Pigott & Inglis to excavate away the farmers' roadway on both banks of the canal and to place the material so excavated right alongside the cut, completely blocking the farmers' roadway for seven months in 1898 and for six months of the present year, without first providing a roadway for the farmers?
3. Did the Government engineers in charge of the improvements now being made on the Grenville Canal know that the farmers' roadway was destroyed and blocked for seven months in 1898 and for six months of the present year? Did said

engineers notify the Government of the fact? Did the Government send down a Mr. Pope as commissioner to try and compromise with one of the farmers who controlled the situation? Was the Government notified by telegram that Mr. Pope threatened that the Government would put the farmers in jail if they pulled a rotary derrick off the farmers' roadway that completely blocked them from their spring's work?

4. Did the Government receive a petition signed by all the farmers who were deprived of their roadway in the spring of 1897? Was said petition a petition in equity setting forth all the facts of the case and pointing out the amount of damage these farmers had suffered in consequence of being deprived of their roadway by the Government?

5. Did the Government relieve itself of the responsibility to provide a roadway at all times on both banks of the Grenville Canal for those farmers whose lands are leased for said canal according to said agreement entered into by the Government of Canada on the 8th day of December, 1845? If the Government has not relieved itself of this solemn compact, why does not the Government settle with these farmers for damages and annoyances caused by them being deprived of their roadway for seven months in 1898, and for six months of the present year?

6. Did the Government send Mr. Pope for the second and third time as commissioner to settle with Mr. Weldon for road damages, who was never deprived of a roadway to his farm, and left unpaid all those farmers who for seven months in the year 1898 and for six months of the present year and who at the present moment have no roadway on either bank of the canal fit for traffic?

7. Were the Government notified that the contractors making the improvements on the Grenville Canal caused the farmers who suffered a loss by being deprived of a roadway by compelling them to sign off a claim for damages before they or their teams were allowed employment by the public works carried on by the Government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The Government did undertake by written document to maintain a good road for the use of the farmers. 2. The Government in making the improvements to the canal, did have staked off a part of the roadway and allowed the contractors to excavate a part of the roadway on the bank of the canal, but endeavoured to compel the contractors under the terms of their contract to provide a roadway for the farmers. 3. The engineers of the Government were aware that the road was blocked by the contractors and called upon them to provide a sufficient road for general traffic, and they contended they had provided amply sufficient accommodation for the traffic. Mr. Pope was sent down to value the land taken by the Government for a raceway and at the same time at the request of the contractors, with the consent of the department, valued some damages for the contractors done to one Weldon, for which they paid. The Government so far as is known, was not notified by telegram that Mr. Pope threatened to jail the farmers if they disturbed the contractors' derrick. 4. The Government did receive a notice from the farmers that the road was blocked and each making a claim for damages. 5. The Government have not relieved themselves from any legal liability, but it is not aware that any damage has been suffered, but if any damage was suffered, the contractors under their contract, engaged to settle them, and for this reason, the Government has taken no action in the matter. 6. The Government on more than one occasion made an endeavour to effect a settlement with Mr. Weldon for land for raceway, and sending Mr. Pope for the purpose and on behalf of the contractors. The agent of the Government endeavoured to settle with Mr. Weldon for various damages, and came to some understanding or agreement with him, the Government paying for the land for the raceway and the contractors for the damages. So far as is known, no sum has been paid other farmers for any damage. 7. The Government were notified by Dr. Christie and the farmers that the contractors were compelling the farmers to sign off a claim for damages before they or their teams were allowed employment by the contractors, but we have no other information.

THE CROWN vs. THE BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton) asked:

Has an action been recently begun by the Government against the British American Bank Note Company, and if so, when?

2. What is the nature and amount of the claim involved in the action; when did it originate, and over what period does it extend?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Yes, an information against the British American Bank Note Company was filed in the Exchequer Court of Canada on the 18th of May, 1899, and served upon the defendant company on the 20th May, 1899. 2. Under the terms of the several contracts entered into, it was provided that all the stamps should be printed from engraved steel plates, but the defendant company without the consent or knowledge of Her Majesty's officers, as the Crown charges, supplied during the continuance of the contract, a large quantity of stamps which were not printed from engraved steel plates but were printed from stone by the process called lithographing. The stamps printed by the process of lithography are not worth as much as engraved stamps by 60 per cent, but are inferior in workmanship and are very easily imitated and counterfeited; and the Government claim from the defendant company as damages for breach of contract the sum of $300,000. The defendant company, as a defence to the information, set up, first, a general denial; and second, substantially, that the work required to be done under the contract, was done under the supervision of an officer of the Government of Canada; that the stamps were supplied subject to the revision and approval of the

Minister of Inland Revenue for the time being, and that the stamps were accepted by the said Minister under the said contract.

SETTLEMENT PRIVILEGES IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to a reply he made to a question which I put to him on the 10th of May, and to ask him if he has formulated any plan for giving to the sons of farmers and others in Ontario the same privileges as have been given to the Doukhobors and Galicians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to my hon. friend, I have to say that I have not been able to give the matter such attention as would enable me to formulate a plan. The answer I gave to the question expressed my view and my intention in the matter, and the intentions of my colleagues. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is quite impossible for me to devote much time to a matter of that kind in the midst of the work of the session. I hope, however, after the session is over to get the matter into such shape that our intentions can be carried out.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—TELEGRAPH LINE TO THE YUKON.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a few words on a question of privilege. I have in my hand a file of the Victoria "Daily Times," of the 22nd of June, which contains an article headed:

Useless Obstruction—Another All-night Sitting of the Dominion House of Commons—Col. Prior Objects to an all-Canadian Line to Dawson—Fighting against the Interests of the Province of British Columbia.

The article then goes on to say:

(Special to the "Times.")—Ottawa, Ont., June 22.—Col. Prior was the means of starting a field day in the House yesterday over the Government's action in rushing through the telegraph line from British Columbia to Dawson City, and the adjournment was only reached at 6.35 this morning.

Col. Prior and some others of the Opposition side talked in favour of the Northern Commercial Company, because one Roche, of the British House of Commons, seems to have made the friendship of Prior while visiting Canada.

Hon. A. G. Blair did not hesitate to tell Col. Prior that his friend, whom he was supporting against the best interests of the country, and particularly of British Columbia, was no gentleman. Roche not only so far forgot himself as to publish a private letter, but he tried to do what was equally as bad while in Ottawa.

All this did not prevent Col. Prior, who was ably assisted by Mr. Earle and Sir Hibbert Tupper, the latter of whom sat out the debate to play the part of "copperhead" and do all that lay in his power, along with his colleague and the man who wants to lead the Tories in British Columbia, to defeat a measure which is calculated to assist the province in every way.

The scheme of Prior, Earle and Tupper meant a cable to Seattle.

Sir Louis Davies told Col. Prior what he was doing, and how he was abusing the confidence of the people who elected him.

Premier Laurier pointed out that he would have no cable scheme such as Prior was fighting for, but insisted on what the Government was doing, an all-Canadian line. The Premier showed that Tagish and Lake Bennett were now connected by telegraph, and the line would be continued on to Dawson. From Bennett a spur was built to Atlin. All this would be done this season, and next year the line would be continued from Bennett to Quesnelle, to connect with the British Columbia telegraph system. In this way Canada would not only have an all-Canadian route, but places along the way, largely in British Columbia would be benefited. The Northern Commercial Company never did a turn until such time as the Government commenced work.

If Col. Prior had his way, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier truly said, the Government should not have given any telegraph connection between Dawson and British Columbia, but should have waited until such time as his friend and client, Roche, wanted to act.

Last year Senator Macdonald (British Columbia) was put up to denounce the railway connection between British Columbia and the Yukon, and now we have Prior, Earle and Tupper sitting all night and fighting by all kinds of obstructions and otherwise, a grant of $25,000 to commence operations of building a telegraph line from British Columbia to the Yukon country. The item, however, was passed, as the Government determined to put it through.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that this is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end. I am not very much surprised at seeing it in that paper, knowing the source from which it emanated.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has risen to make a personal explanation, he must not attack anybody, even outside of the House. Of course, if he wishes to go further, the hon. gentleman must make a motion.

Mr. PRIOR. I will move a motion after I get through, Mr. Speaker. I say I am not surprised at that article, as every few weeks there has been something of the same kind put in this paper in reference to myself and my colleagues. I wish to state, as will be seen by reference to "Hansard," that neither I nor any of my colleagues have at any time resisted this scheme for a telegraph line to Dawson. I only wished, when I brought forward that motion and the papers connected with it, to show what I considered the unfair and deceitful dealings of the Government with the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, the company I was talking about; and when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) attacked me about my conduct in sitting all night, I defied him to find one word in "Hansard" that I had uttered against the scheme. I was not against the scheme; I was anxious to see an

all-Canadian line; and the company I was talking about offered to build an all-Canadian line instead of a line by Skagway, through American or disputed territory. This article says that the scheme I supported meant a cable to Seattle. So far as I know, Seattle as a terminus of the telegraph line was never mentioned in this House; it never entered my brain to have a telegraph line from Seattle to Dawson. The charter of the Northern Commercial Company was for a line from Vancouver to Dawson. It certainly went through American territory, or rather, I will say, presumed American territory, because the territory is in dispute; but the company offered to build the line which the Government are building now. I never, by word of mouth or in any other way, offered any opposition to that line being built; but I did object to the Government building it without offering some compensation to the company or giving the company a chance to build it. The company could build it as quickly as the Government. But any one who looks at "Hansard" will find that I never said a single word against the scheme. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion negatived.

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That the Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before continuing the line of observations which I was addressing to the House when it adjourned last night, I would like to refer to a suggestion which has been made to me that possibly I had overlooked chapter 33 of 52 Victoria when referring to the difference in the powers given to Mr. Ogilvie and the powers granted under the Corrupt Practices at Elections Act, in regard to the pardoning of witnesses. I did not overlook that Act, because Mr. Ogilvie sets out in his report the section from it in full, and refers to it. But since the matter has been mentioned, I would compare section 3 of chapter 33 of 52 Victoria with section 9 of chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes in order to make clear the point to which I referred yesterday. Now, having mentioned the resolution which I propose to put into your hands, and the responsibility that I am prepared to take in regard to this matter, I proceed now, as briefly as the subject will permit, to give some additional reasons not contained in that long resolution, which I purposely made as full as possible, why the positions taken in that resolution should commend themselves to this Parliament. One may note that the charge of gross neglect, incapacity, &c., at the outset of that resolution is due largely to the extraordinary delay on the part of the Government in filling the position of Minister of the Interior. I will not here refer to the negotiations, arrangements and manipulations that were going on until late in the fall before the way was made clear to the Treasury benches for the present Minister of the Interior, but I would refer to the fact that attention was drawn, in the most marked manner, to the vacancy in that important portfolio. On September 8th, 1896, the leader of the Opposition formally called the attention of the Government to the delay in appointing the Minister of the Interior. On September 10th, the Prime Minister replied that public reasons required delay, and again on the 23rd September my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) repeated the inquiry, and the Prime Minister said, to use his own words: "The department must remain in abeyance yet." And on that occasion the leader of the Opposition referred to the importance of the department, especially at that moment. Again, the hon. member for York said that he objected to granting the $1,000,000, then being asked in the Committee of Supply, when there was no Minister to explain the policy, and he insisted that the delay was damaging to the public interest. Again, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) called attention to the interests of the vast North-west and the necessity of having a Minister to represent them.

The point touched by the resolution, that though the Minister of the Interior, when he finally did settle down into office, was aware of the enormous influx of population that was going into the Klondike region, and had been aware of it long before, nevertheless he took no active steps or measures at all, though pressed continuously to do so by his subordinates, is shown by the minutes of Council, based on a report of his own, dated 28th February, 1898. In that report he says:

> It is apparently beyond any question that what is known as the Yukon District will be occupied by a large number of people during the coming season.

But to make that point stronger, I shall refer to his observations in this House on the 16th February, 1898, when he said:

> There are at present thousands of people on their way, and thousands more who are making their preparations to go to this district. What will be the condition of affairs if 40,000 or 50,000 people should struggle through these mountains and find themselves at the end of the summer 40 or 50 miles down in the northern part of the district.

Again, he said:

> We have to consider that, no matter what warnings are addressed to the people, no matter what this Government or the United States Government may do or attempt to do, immense numbers of people will find their way into that territory. What will be the condition of affairs

if it should happen that 40,000 or 50,000 should be there in the fall.

In the same speech, he referred to a statement in the New York "Herald" to the effect that a quarter of a million gold-seekers would go from Seattle alone this year. And again, he said, "that 7,000 had sailed in the last eight days," and he referred to "what is known as the movement to the Klondike district. Again, he said:

> We are told, too, that the transportation agencies in Europe are booking tens of thousands of people for the Pacific coast and that the immediate object of these people is to procure transportation to the Klondike district.

Again, he said:

> Everything points to the fact that the greatest rush that has been seen for many years on this continent will take place during the next few months towards the Klondike district.

What steps did the hon. gentleman take to prepare for that rush? What organization did he contrive to prepare for it? Will one of his officers tell us? This comes out in the private correspondence, produced before the Ogilvie commission, as can be found on page 207. And, remember, as I read this extract from Mr. Deville's letter, what is stated in the motion that I have referred to and to which the Minister of the Interior himself referred this session, where the Surveyor General pressed him to take this matter up and pointed to him the danger arising from the delay that had already occurred, and that, if my recollection serves me right, was about the month of March.

On the 28th July, 1897, there was the following letter from Mr. Deville, in which he tells Mr. Fawcett:

> Since you left, I have continued to urge action upon all of Mr. Ogilvie's recommendations, and I am glad to say that the Council have at last taken up the matter in earnest, so much so that some decisions are rather unexpected.

Then follows on that page the things that were done as pertaining to the organization of a proper staff. It was in March, 1898, that Mr. Deville again had to call the attention of his Minister to the neglect that had occurred with regard to this region, to which the Minister himself admitted there was a great and unexpected rush. When the hon. Minister finally set to work, when he began to mean business, when he began to issue instructions, he certainly went with a rush. He became the Napoleon of the west in earnest, and as a despotic Minister, or an incapable or an impetuous Minister, wildly rushing here and there, he ignored the Governor General of the day, he ignored all forms of procedure, he ignored our parliamentary system and the rules of parliamentary government. All those points are touched upon in the motion and they are important. They transcend, of course, the other evidences of extraordinary haste in connection with the confusion of names and the confusion of addresses of some of the most important officers whom the Minister sent out. Although the Minister of the Interior had been a close friend and intimate with Major Walsh for some fifteen years, although the Minister and Major Walsh had been thrown together previously to this, the hon. gentleman forgot the name of Major Walsh, so that the Order in Council and the illegal commission which His Excellency was induced to sign appointed the wrong man. Afterwards other officers of some importance were given their wrong addresses, and all these things had to be corrected; and then, without any justification and in disparagement of the high office of His Excellency the Governor General of that day, this Minister, forsooth, without authority of any kind, wired to his officers, or one of them—and the telegram is set out in my motion in full—that he had appointed Mr. Walsh, on the 12th August, to the high position, which afterwards, if you please, His Excellency was induced to formally confer. But, whereas on the 12th August John M. Walsh was appointed by the Minister of the Interior, the Governor General did not know until the 17th August, that it was the intention or wish of his advisers that John M. Walsh should be appointed. And then the commision under the Great Seal followed to John M. Walsh, with the extraordinary powers, extraordinary and illegal powers, to which I have already referred. And then he waked up, did this Minister, in a hurry, this Minister, who seemed to have had no time for constitutional considerations, no time even to obtain the correct names of and addresses of the men upon whom he intended to confer large powers—he waked up, to find that there was no John M. Walsh, though he had been appointed by His Excellency himself; there was no such person as the one mentioned in the commission issued under the Great Seal. But the commission to John M. Walsh was not rescinded, it was not cancelled, it was not revoked. But His Excellency is asked to appoint James M. Walsh, and His Excellency does appoint James M. Walsh, who succeeds John M. Walsh. And so, we have outstanding the two commissions, the one to John and the other to James. And, if any student of parliamentary practice or constitutional law is curious enough to follow this matter up, he will find that the law relating to issue of proclamations was disregarded in a most extraordinary manner. In the first place, with these duplicate commissions, with the powers given therein, or purporting to be given therein, we are brought face to face with the fact that there is no authority whatever on the part of this Government, or on the part of the Governor General, to confer these powers or to issue these commissions, either the one to John or the one

to James. This, of course, is important in more senses than one. I cite this evidence to show that everything was allowed to get into such a state of confusion that the constitution was trampled upon, and all these powers, all these questions of jurisdictions and authority, were ignored, or were completely unknown or unappreciated by the advisers of His Excellency. In this House, the Minister has told us that the commission to Major Walsh was issued under the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 19, section 1, as amended by 56 Victoria, chapter 14. Further inquiries brought out the fact that the only Order in Council issued under these statutes was the Order in Council of September, 1893. Therefore, it will be found that no Order in Council has ever yet been approved by any Governor General in Canada under the provisions of these statutes which would permit him to issue the commission under the Great Seal to other persons than are mentioned in the Royal Instructions; and no such officer as Major Walsh, as a chief executive officer, anywhere is mentioned in the Royal Instructions. The Queen's prerogative in that regard cannot be exercised by the Governor General without statutory authority. And the statutory authority in this case, in which the Minister of the Interior is under the impression that he has justification, has never been acted upon, for the Order of September, 1893, only fixes fees, and does not extend the list of the officers to whom these commissions under the Great Seal may issue. Then again, as to the gazetting; paragraph 2, chap. 14 of 56 Victoria requires the publication of the notice of these appointments in the "Gazette," the list of the commissions to be laid on the Table within fifteen days after the commencement of the next session. Waiving the point as to the right of His Excellency the Governor General to issue a commission under the Great Seal to either James or John, the only compliance with the provision was in the case of John. This did not exist in the case of James, in whose case we have simply the notice erratum of August 28th, 1897, respecting James Morrow Walsh. No list was laid on the Table of parties to whom commissions were issued. Parliament met on February 23rd, and it was not until March 4th that the commission was laid on the Table. So, these important provisions of Parliament—and none will deny their importance, none will deny the great solemnity attached, under our constitution, to an action in respect of these things—were entirely overlooked or ignored. But we have had, in this whole matter, such a system of arbitrary government, such a series of illegal acts on the part of the advisers of His Excellency, that I believe there is no parallel in the history of this country for the state of things that followed. These gentlemen, one and all of them—for they are all involved in this—had got into a hurry, and the rush had bewildered them. Let me briefly refer to constitutional points that require no elaboration. The powers of the sovereign, under our constitution, are limited. To use the old expression, "The sovereign cannot touch a blade of grass or take an ear of corn without the authority of the law." But what do these gentlemen care for rules that prescribe the powers of the sovereign? What do these gentlemen care for constitutional safeguards in regard to parliamentary government and the limitation of legislation by Order in Council? They ignore, in these cases, all these important principles, so that one is obliged to turn to the Privy Council decisions, and read again, as I do, from the case of Cameron & Kyte as to the powers of the Governor. I have referred to the sovereign authority. But, wide as these powers may be, in the case of the Governor, it is laid down as follows:—

> But if the Governor be an officer merely with a limited authority from the Crown, his assumption of an act of sovereign power, out of the limits of the authority so given to him, would be purely void. * * * No authority or dictum has been cited before us to show that a Governor can be considered as having a delegation of the whole royal power in any colony, as between him and the subject, when it is not expressly given by his commission.

You have two sources, and two only, for the authority of the Governor General in Canada in regard to the royal prerogative. One source would be considered his instruction, and the other source the statutes of this country. I have dealt with the statutes. Now, turning to Lefroy and to Clement, whose name has been mentioned in another connection, we find this question of prerogative powers, and limitations of it by instructions, dealt with. The five classes who may be appointed, outside of special legislation, by commissions under the Great Seal, are as follows:—(1) members of the Privy Council, (2) Senators, (3) Speakers of the Senate, (4) Judges, (5) Deputy Governors General. Under none of these heads would come the case of a chief executive officer for the Yukon territory. Nor can it be said that under any statute comes the case of the chief executive officer of the Yukon territory. Parliament met, Parliament sat, and Parliament was prorogued during this time. But these gentlemen, good, easy Ministers, as they were, caring nothing either for the question of the prerogative or the responsibility of the Queen's representative, cared less for Parliament. We could have given them the power, we could have given them the powers that were obtained aforetime by limited acts in regard to a country that was about to be organized and about to be governed like the old Northwest Territories. But they had an easier and shorter road than all that. It means bother to come down to Parliament and ask

for parliamentary authority ; so, in this case as, unhappily, in many others, these gentlemen simply did as they pleased, and from that day to this they have not taken the trouble to come down and ask for an act of indemnity, and plead the exigency of the case, and lay before Parliament the state of affairs, and to say that, owing, first of all, to their unpardonable neglect in appointing a Minister of the Interior, and then owing to is incapacity, and to his allowing the state of affairs to become so confused, and the rush of people to become so great, they had to do all these things. They did them with good intentions, and, therefore, as under constitutional rules, they could ask the House to give them an Act of indemnity. But that has become a matter of form ; they feel safe in relying on a parliamentary majority, and with that they do not think it is worth the bother and trouble to pass Acts of that kind. As to the executive authority, let me do, as the Prime Minister once said this side of the House proposed to do, remind the House of the A B C of parliamentary government. Todd says :

The executive has a limited power of legislation by Order in Council, and rules framed by the Department of State, but only where the exercise of such power has been authorized or sanctioned by Parliament. It is a fundamental law of the English constitution that the sovereign can neither alter, add to, nor dispense with any existing law of the realm. The ancient prerogative of the Crown in legislating by Order in Council has been subjected to the control of Parliament, and is now mainly exercised as a deputed and not as a prerogative at all.

That is the case of the sovereign, but as I pointed out, no Governor General and no Government of any British colony stands even in that position. Therefore, you nave these high principles trampled on, and the spectacle of a Governor General of Canada, not only induced to trench upon the royal prerogative improperly and illegally, but you have the spectacle of a Governor General under his commission, and his responsible advisers asking him to sign an Order in Council deputing to Major Walsh, of whom I shall have much to say before I sit down, powers that this Parliament never deputed to a Governor General in Council, legislative authorities given to this man without the slightest sanction of Parliament, directly or indirectly—that is the condition of affairs, and enough to turn this man's head, as it did. The Governor General, sitting in Ottawa with his Council, were limited in regard to what they might do ; Major Walsh, under the Great Seal, away in the Yukon, was an absolute despot, and he exercised his powers in the most despotic manner. Cared he for the legislation of this Parliament ? Not a bit. Whether it related to the North-west Territories, or whether it related to matters in the Yukon, he would look to his commission and to his Order in Council, and plead, as he did, according to newspaper reports, and certainly as his acts show, that he was governed by no law ; he was, as I said before, practically and verily, a law unto himself. Now, as to executive officers, Charles on Powers of Executive Officers, says this :

Officers are employed by the state to put into actual execution the laws or some portion of the laws of their country.

But in this case this gentleman was put in that position, and clothed ostensibly with authority to repeal laws or to make laws, and he did so, or attempted to do so ; and yet the Minister of Justice, in another place, stated in regard to Major Walsh all that I have been contending for, but contrary to the expressed authority to which I refer, for he said :

Major Walsh goes there, and he goes there to act under the law and in accordance with the law ; we could not protect him if we instructed him to violate the law.

They did instruct him to violate the law, he violated the law ; will he be protected ? Have these gentlemen new light on the subject, and do they think that they are compelled to act in that particular ? I refer to this question of ministerial responsibility in regard to all this action, in my motion ; I will refer to Votes and Proceedings, page 362, to support the position I take, that for all of these acts, at this time and under the circumstances to which I refer, the Government of the day stand responsible to Parliament and responsible to the country. Is this subject an important one to which I have referred for the last few minutes ? I venture to believe it is as important to-day as it was in the case of India when the trial of Warren Hastings took place, and these questions were examined and inquired into. Warren Hastings was charged with exercising arbitrary power, and his plea was ignorance, his plea was that he was not a lawyer. I would ask the House to remember that when Burke impeached him for high crimes and misdemeanours, he said :

He impeached him as a British Governor answering to a British tribunal, not as a subahdar, as a Pacha of three tails. He considered it monstrous that an English Governor, tried as a British subject, should be heard to declare that he governed upon the principle of arbitrary power.

When dealing with Hastings's plea, that he assumed sovereignty, he said :

Whether or not such power or powers of that nature were delegated to me by any provisions or any Act of Parliament, he confessed himself too little of a lawyer to pronounce.

That was the condition of things. Burke disposed of the plea of ignorance by saying that if that were admitted, no one but a lawyer would be eligible for high office. In regard to arbitrary power, Burke says :

He have arbitrary powers ! My Lords, the East India Company have not arbitrary powers to give him ; the King has no arbitrary power to give him ; your Lordships have not ; nor the

Commons; nor the whole legislature. We have no arbitrary power to give, because arbitrary power is a thing which neither any man can hold nor any man can give away.

Again, in his speech on that occasion, and dealing with this subject, he said:

Those who give and those who receive arbitrary power are alike criminal, and there is no man but is bound to resist it to the best of his power, wherever it shall show its face to the world. Nothing but absolute impotence can justify men in not resisting it to the best of their power.

Again, on page 93, he says:

In short, follow him where you will; let him have eastern or western laws; you find everywhere arbitrary power and peculation of governors proscribed and horribly punished—more so than I would ever wish to punish any human creature. If this then is the case, as I hope and trust it will be proved to your Lordships—that there is law in these countries, that there is no delegation of power which exempts a Governor from the law—then, I say, at any rate a British Governor is to answer for his conduct, and cannot be justified by wicked examples and bad practices.

The applicability of that language to the case under consideration, is apt; it condemns the Government, the advisers of the Governor General, and it condemns the man who acted under their illegal authority, in consequence of this attempt to clothe Major Walsh with these powers that the Government themselves did not possess, and dared not exercise. Who was Major Walsh? What was his record? How did he serve the country, and how did he leave the service of the country? That is an interesting question at the outset to consider, in view of the facts which have come out in this extraordinary investigation conducted by Mr. Ogilvie. Go to the North-west Territories and ask about the record of Major Walsh when he was Superintendent of the Mounted Police. I do not wish, nor is it necessary for me, to attempt to detract from the reputation that he got there for courage. I do not wish to detract, if I could, from the reputation that he got for having done the state some service when affairs were in a disorganized condition, when he showed British courage to Indians, and, notably, in the case of Sitting Bull, though I could give versions from that part of the country that do not altogether accord to Major Walsh the credit that has been given to him down in this part of the country. But, when this man, who served his country for some years, from early in the seventies down to 1883, was permitted to retire from the service without one kindly word being said about him in this Parliament, and this Parliament is not lacking in generosity to its servants, when no vote was brought down in regard to the gratuity to this officer, but when it was in an amount paid out of a lump sum, and this man was permitted silently to retire into private life, it was impossible not to ask why this was so, and it was impossible not to learn that he retired under a cloud. Knowing this, believing this, remembering all this, I attempted, before making this speech, to acquire official information and official facts. I approached the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and asked him for permission to see the records in regard to the charges that were made, charges that were notorious and that were referred to by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite on the floor of this House, charges in regard to the disappearance of supplies and stores under the charge and responsibility of Major Walsh when he was in the Mounted Police. With his usual courtesy, the right hon. Prime Minister gave me authority to have access to these files. On coming in contact with the officer to whom he had referred me, I discovered that these files had been burned. I discovered also that a board of inquiry, presided over by the present head of the Manitoba penitentiary, Col. Irving, I think, had met, and that this board had considered the condition of things. I gained some information, not very explicit, but sufficient to confirm my impression that it was Sir John Macdonald's condemnation of Major Walsh's conduct in the matter by permitting him to retire, the other alternative being to further prosecute the matter and hold the Major responsible, for the shortage in the supplies under his command, a shortage of supplies that the late Hon. M. C. Cameron, afterwards appointed by the Treasury benches Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, referred to on the floor of this House. It was at this time that Sir John Macdonald used the facetious remark to the effect that the mice were said to have got at the supplies, some of which supplies were nails and spikes, and that it was a fact that the mice in that part of the country had suffered from indigestion for a long period afterwards. Major Walsh was appointed by the Conservatives. He left under the Conservative regime, and that he did not leave altogether in a happy frame of mind was indicated by the fact that he joined the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. But to come back to the subject with which I was dealing I asked, as these papers were burned, that the Controller of the Mounted Police should record the official conversation I had with him under the direction of the right hon. Prime Minister, that he should submit that record to the right hon. Prime Minister and ask the Prime Minister to allow him to let me have that official record for the purpose of using it in this House, but to my amazement I am left without it; I am denied the privilege, in fact, the right. Here you have the disappearance of the record; here you have no official paper in Ottawa concerning a most important feature of this very case, and I asked that the information

that was given to me by the officer of the Government, with the sanction of the right hon. Prime Minister, should be put in the shape of an official memorandum, and that I should be permitted to say that this official statement was the recollection of the officer thoroughly familiar with the whole transaction. All of that is denied me, and, consequently, I can but refer, in the way I have, to the general knowledge in the country, and which is borne out by a Liberal paper of the 1st September, 1898. I would prefer to have read the official memorandum if I had been permitted to read it to the House, but I am forced to have reference to a statement published by the Regina "Leader" of September 1st, 1898, a paper in sympathy with this Administration. No one doubts that statement, because the paper says so. It proceeds:

Major Walsh, when he arrived in the Klondike, seems to have imagined that he was again empowered to deal as a man is justified in dealing in a "Sitting Bull" emergency—that is, to be a law unto himself, and follow or disregard any rule, regulation, precept or statute as his instinct leads him to think will be best at the moment. About the first thing Major Walsh undertook to do in the Klondike was to issue liquor permits at $2 a gallon—a thing which he had as much right and authority to do as the editor of the "Witness." * * * In view of the circumstances—and we say it as an admirer and supporter of the Minister and the Government under which Major Walsh held his appointment not one whit less warm than the "Witness"—we fully coincide with Mr. Haultain in the belief that it is fortunate for the country that Major Walsh's power as Yukon Commissioner has ceased, and that such a man could not leave the district too soon.

I may say, as I proceeded to read, I thought that was the issue of the paper containing a reference to the shortage of supplies. Later on, I may be able to give the House that particular reference made openly in the press, charging Major Walsh with responsibility in that regard. Further, in connection with the Major's assumption of authority, and his illegal action I refer to Mr. Bulyea's report. I shall not read it; it was brought down and is of public record in the North-west legislature. But Major Walsh, in his report attached to the departmental report for 1898, at page 323, informed the hon. Minister as follows:—

I have written you previously that I should not recognize the authority of the North-west Territories Government in this district.

The Regina "Leader," of August 5th, 1898, contains the report of the speech by Mr. Haultain that everything at Dawson was in disorder. Referring to Mr. Bulyea, he says he went in to prohibit or regulate the sale of liquor. He associated himself with the Superintendent of the North-west Mounted Police and another federal officer. That was a superintendent other than Major Walsh. A retail license was fixed at $2,000: there was to be certain accommodation for boarders, sale on Sunday was prohibited and gambling in bars forbidden. Mr. Haultain said that Major Walsh undertook to openly urge and support and encourage breaches of the law which was as much a law of the Yukon as it was of the North-west Territories; and that if his conduct in this particular could be taken as an indication of his ordinary attitude Major Walsh could not leave the country too soon. So said Mr. Haultain. I need not further deal with this subject because my motion sets out very fully the reference as to the opinion of the Department of Justice being sought about the subject as to whether the laws of that country did not prevail in a portion of the Territories to which they were especially applicable. It is inconceivable how such a question should be submitted.

I again call attention to the carelessness of the Government in respect to the organization of this country, and to the lack of proper checks upon the officers appointed. We have a provision in the statutes requiring all officers who have to do with the revenue to give bonds. I asked the other day how many officers had given bonds in the Yukon territory, where so many officers are under a cloud of suspicion—and unfortunately those who have done no wrong have to suffer from being included in any general language concerning the others—and the Minister gave me the names of certain officials in the customs and three in the post office. On one occasion he said in Supply, as I thought, that no officers in his service had given bonds, but "Hansard" having reported him in the other sense that there were no officers who had not complied with the statutes, I ventured to write to the Minister of the Interior some days ago to know if he were correctly reported, and to that letter I have had no reply. I have been unable to elicit in the House, and he apparently has been unable to give me the names of any officers appointed by him who have complied with this statute concerning public officers and the 5th section thereof. Let us see what class of officers in the old times and before the advent of these gentlemen to office, did give these bonds. You will find in the returns of 1897-98 that sheriffs, land registrars in the North-west, agents of Dominion Lands, several of them, the sheriff of another district, even the acting agent of Dominion Lands, all gave bonds; and in 1898 Dominion Land agents and sheriffs in the North-west Territories outside of the Yukon, registrars of titles, and so on, all gave bonds. When I asked the Minister of the Interior formally what officers appointed in the Yukon since February, 1897, gave bonds under the provisions of that Act, he gave me only the names of certain officials in the customs and three in the post office. Then we have an interesting return in regard to these public officers. The point has been made with great force in the case of Indian officials to which I have referred,

where officers were appointed with salaries wholly inadequate in that country; salaries which were good in England but wretchedly small in India, and that suggested to the great critic of the Government, that in that fact itself there was suspicion that officers could not be expected to withstand the temptation surrounding them when their salaries were so small. I understand that the Government urge this contention against that view: When you speak of small salaries do you know that the Government provide board and living allowances for these officers, and in consideration of that is it fair to say that these salaries are too small. On that I have been unable to get definite information this session. I have tried with a pertinacity that may have been annoying to the Minister of the Interior. The information he has brought down may be sufficient, and it may be my stupidity that will not enable me to be satisfied, but let me say to the House that on this important question the only authority I can find for granting quarters and rations to officers is furnished to me at my request by the Auditor General. I went to the Auditor General and asked him if he knew of any authority for supplying rations, and so on, and what do you suppose the date of that authority is? It is the 7th July, 1898. But look at the officers that were appointed to the service as shown by the return, and look at their salaries. It would be tedious to refer to this matter in detail, but I ask you to recollect these extraordinarily small salaries paid to officers who were invested with extraordinary great powers. I have mentioned the delegating of the powers of the Governor General in Council to Major Walsh, but these powers were delegated to Mr. Fawcett and to three clerks under Mr. Fawcett, and let us see how these clerks were paid. This return shows the names of timber agents, paid $60 a month: two or three cooks $60 a month; deputy registrar, $60 a month; clerks in the Gold Commissioner's office, who rightly or wrongly are involved in the evidence in regard to the purchase and sale of passes and privileges as doing work before hours and after hours; these officers received $2 a day. Assistant cooks got $60 a month; janitors, like Villeneuve, got $60 a month; surveyors, $3 a day; surveyors' assistants, $1.50 a day, and the housekeeper for the judge, $60 a month. There may be authority by Order in Council from the man who absolutely ignores Parliament, but none has been produced for paying some of these allowances. The other day I had a conversation across the floor with the Solicitor General with regard to judges, and although the House is not formally supplied with information on that score, nevertheless we have judges who are appointed without provision for their board and their allowance. There is a correspondence (not brought down) that took place after these officers were appointed in regard to their allowance. But what authority was there to pay Judge Maguire over and above his salary. I shall pass that point by referring to some interesting names. I find Philip Walsh as a timber agent, and Philip Walsh, as the evidence shows was a pretty active speculator, and I have charged in my motion Philip Walsh in connection with a very serious matter. I find E. McKeown a secret service officer. Did any one in this Parliament ever know that since Parliament ceased to vote supplies for secret service, there was a secret service in the country.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Customs has one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) reminds me that the Minister of Customs has a little fund for that purpose, but he got that fund openly and above-board. The funds that were supplied in a matter of that kind were supplied by the free vote of Parliament; but, in the case of Mr. McKeown, what services did this secret officer perform? Who was he? If my recollection is right, he was something of a prizefighter; he was practically ruined in the general elections in Manitoba; and I believe he was not far from trying his fisticuffs with Major Walsh before they got through their secret services and their government of the Yukon territory; and he has disappeared from the service. But we now found another name—W. H. Lynch, Dominion ranger, $20 a month and $620.70 expenses. Now, according to tolerably good knowledge and certain notorious facts in regard to when he went there and when he came back, his ranging was from the eastern townships to the Yukon and back. What he did besides write a report, and, I believe, a supplementary report as well, neither of which has been brought down to the House, will perhaps be explained. But in regard to these officers, I have only this in addition to say. Mr. Philip Walsh, Crown timber agent, was a brother of Major Walsh. He left the service on August 31, 1898. Mr. Willison, a cousin of the editor of the "Globe," was Crown timber agent. William Wright, employed in the Crown Timber Office at Dawson, is also a relative of the editor of the "Globe." But there is an interesting name here to which I wish to refer. Some attention would be paid to his evidence, I fancy, for he is given a position of great responsibility and trust. R. C. Miller was appointed mining recorder and Crown timber inspector at Tagish, Yukon territory, on the 1st of March, 1899, at a salary of $1,500 per annum. Now, my information may be considered as coming from one who is a little biassed in matters of this kind. What do we think of Mr. R. C. Miller, who has the confidence of the Government to such an extent? Before he was appointed he went to the Yukon territory, and he formed an impression such as

I have formed, in regard to the prevalence of corruption under Government management in that country, and he wrote to the press not long before he was appointed :

Since I have reached Dawson I have almost been forced to a like conclusion, and have no hesitation in declaring that if they do not take strong and speedy steps to end the orgie that is in progress here, they will not only have become partners in the dirt themselves, but shall have permitted the continuance of a system which must result in a very great financial and moral injury to the Dominion.

I shall not read all of his letter, though it would bear it ; time will not permit me.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the date ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This was some time in the fall of 1898. It appears in the press of the 15th of October, 1898. Mr. Miller was the editor of the Pembroke "Observer," a Liberal paper, and he wrote these letters to that paper, one of which, I am told, was so bad that the Liberals of the place would not have it published. But in this letter, which is bad enough, in all conscience, he says :

I have seen enough to convince myself that it is worse even than the mind of an honest man can conceive. That the mining laws are being set aside on a colossal scale is beyond all question, and that barefaced bribery is the rule of the day is equally certain.

Now he has been rewarded by the Minister of the Interior with an office at Tagish. How much, I wonder, is he given besides $1,500 a year ? Board and allowance ? At any rate, this is witness No. 1. Now, in my resolution I impeach the Minister of the Interior straight for having issued an illegal permit to an old partner of his, and for having violated the laws of this country. The defence has not been suggested, that he violated the law in many other particulars ; I hope no such defence or answer is to come. But I defy any member of the Government to give authority in the laws of this country for this document which the Minister of the Interior undoubtedly gave to this man, who tried to sell his great privilege, whether he succeeded or not :

Ottawa, 13th May, 1898.

To the Officers and Officials in the Yukon Territory.

This introduces Mr. Philp, who has a permit to enter the Yukon district with such provisions as he may see fit to take with him, without regard to the usual regulations.

(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Every customs officer, every Mounted Police officer, every inland officer included in that direction ; and every officer who would disobey that injunction, would do so at the awful peril of offending the Napoleon of the present Administration. What was done with it ? Here is a letter which was addressed to Mr. W. H. Bunting of the "Mail and Empire," Toronto :

October 4th, 1898.

W. H. Bunting, Esq.,
"Mail and Empire," Toronto.

Dear Sir,—When in Victoria, B.C., in June last, a gentleman introduced himself to me, and in substance said he had a permit to take a large quantity of liquor into the Yukon district, and wanted to know if I knew a certain distiller. I replied in the affirmative, and wished to see before taking hold of the deal in any way, the bona fide nature of the transaction. A telegram was sent at my suggestion to Victoria, where the original order or permit was held ; an answer came back, which I saw, stating that the original, signed by Clifford Sifton, could be forwarded by next steamer if necessary. The party in whose favour the permit was was Mr. Philp, partner of Clifford Sifton, of Brandon. I asked who was interested in the matter beside the party who offered it to me ; he said that Philp was to receive $5,000 in cash when order or permit was handed over, and one-third of the profits at the end of the deal. I then would have nothing to do with it ; did not think seriously of having anything to do with it at any time.

It is fair to say all that I know in defence of this high-handed, illegal transaction, that is, that at that time Mr. Philp was not a partner of the Minister of the Interior ; that Mr. Philp, having sent a wire at the same time to the Minister of the Interior to know whether this covered liquor, was told that it did not cover liquor. But these people, or any person dealing with Mr. Philp, had simply the language of that to go upon ; and the official to whom that might be presented by any one entering the Yukon territory, had simply that document to go on. I charge that document to have been an illegal document. I charge that the Minister of the Interior, with daring to violate the laws of this country, and to violate them in connection with his former partner, a man who undoubtedly made an improper use of this document, from any point of view. Though my desire is to give to the House as fully as possible the sources of information on which I am taking this important step, I cannot venture to read all that is in my possession. At this stage, when I am asking for a commission, and undertaking all the responsibility that can attach to any hon. gentleman in this House in such a position, I think it would serve no good purpose for me to give even the names of the parties who are willing that I should give them. But, in order to satisfy the House that there is in my possession material that should force—not the Government ; I make no appeal to the Government in this matter, let that be understood—but force the House, a majority of this Parliament, to see that the reasonable request of my motion is complied with, and that a proper commission is constituted which will enable these matters to be probed to the bottom, and far more satisfactorily than under the Government commission that was issued, was possible or has happened.

I have in my hand a statement from a Liberal, a man who tells me at any rate that

he is a Liberal, and a respectable man. I shall not, for the moment, give his name, though I have permission to do so. He says:

That he was compelled to pay women $1 or $2 to go in a side door of the post office for his mail. Police would not allow men to go in. This was the door from which men came out after having gone in. Police took money to let the public into the mining recorder's office. Kennedy went in by the Mackenzie River and Yukon route in 1897 and left in September, 1898. He got two letters while there, dated the 11th and 12th of April, and received those about the 1st July of that year.

Another young man who was in a bank, writes on the 29th May, 1899, and I ask the attention of the House to this particularly, because there is a formal charge in my motion in connection with the same subject, although this is not the case mentioned:

I have just returned from the Yukon, where I have been for the last two years. I was one of the many unlucky ones. We had one good chance of making a little stake. Mr. McLaughlin, at one time timber agent, gave us a grant of a mile of timber land near Dawson. We had our money up, $250, when a new timber agent arrived, who took the grant from us. He said the Government did not intend to grant any timber berths within three miles of Dawson—yet in less than ten days he had given the same berth to Messrs. Bartlett Bros. They (Bartlett Bros.) sold the timber to other parties for $10,000. We would have this much or more out of it.

Couple that with the Wilson case, for exactly the same thing happened to Wilson. He had paid his $250 to McLaughlin, he had his receipt, he had his promise of a berth, when suddenly the same timber agent said to him that all this was to be reserved from the public. The agent gave back the $250, and Wilson did not get the berth, but Bartlett Bros. later on got it.

I would refer to the interview already published of A. C. Anderson, of Toronto, in the "Mail and Empire," of April 10th, 1899, and I refer to it for this reason, that Anderson has written to me stating that that interview is based on facts, and he can testify to it. He wrote me on March 30th, 1899, from Dawson, as follows:—

The laws, administration and conduct of the officials here are a disgrace to Canada. The recent Royal Commission was a farce from the start to the finish.

Then remember that while I am free to admit, and I certainly hope from the bottom of my heart that there is some improvement in the Yukon at present, while I believe that Mr. Ogilvie himself is an honourable and conscientious man, I am satisfied—and the reasons are recited in my motion—that he is not surrounded by upright, independent and honest men, that the council which was constituted controls Mr. Ogilvie, rather than he the council. Take the case of Mr. Sinclair, whom I gladly exempt with other names I will exempt from the sweeping charges I have made.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have named the men that I have evidence against, and other names will appear as I go on, but I do not wish it to be said that at any time I desired to charge against those officers in general any single thing direct or indirect. Where I have heard the name, I mention it, and where I know nothing of the conduct of the men I do not wish to include them. But I say that the difficulty that confronts us now is this, that because there has been no spirit shown by the Government to ferret out the criminal that might exist and still be carrying on his nefarious schemes at the Yukon, you are putting a premium on the men there to continue to do wrong. I say, in my motion, that there are men who are violating there the laws of the country at present, and I have named them.

Take the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) who sits in this House. I believe that he made some observations on the subject. I am informed that Mr. Oliver, a good friend and supporter of his, publicly stated that after the return of the hon. member for New Westminster from the Yukon, he said that he could not have believed that such a damnable wholesale system of corruption existed had he not gone there. Now, I am told that the hon. gentleman did not lead this House to think that that was his opinion. Mr. Oliver may have, therefore, referred to him improperly, but Mr. Frank Burnett, another Liberal in Vancouver, was so shocked when he heard that the hon. member for Westminster had since expressed different views, that he wrote to the Liberal paper in the province of British Columbia on April 21st, in which letter he says:

It would now be in order, I think, to ask Mr. Morrison what he meant when he informed another member of the House, immediately on his return from Dawson, "that half the iniquities had not been told."

A gentleman writing me from England, after the discussion took place in this House, under date of 11th April, 1899, said:

I think, however your salutary protest is bound to cleanse the Augean stables, and promote a healthier atmosphere for the future. It must have needed a good deal of cotton-wool to stop the ears of many, as those stories of corruption were notorious, and I, thousands of miles away from the Klondike, had no doubt of their truth after seeing, as I did, so many people from Dawson City.

Mr. Freeze, a respectable citizen of the county represented by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Robinson) in the province of New Brunswick, writes to me, in answer to my own letter, as I had been given his name as one of those who had come from Dawson:

Doaktown, May 11th, 1899.

Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 9th instant to hand re Yukon officials. Was prospecting on Henderson

Creek last June, found the whole valley and its branches claimed, as appeared by the notices on trees and stakes as far as I went—probably 15 miles or so—and only saw two men working or representing claims in the whole distance.

Found what I thought might pay on a certain branch of the creek, which was also claimed. I then went to Dawson, knowing that according to the mining law claims could not be held in that way. Upon inquiry at the recording office, was told in an insulting, peevish manner that "all the claims on Henderson Creek were recorded last fall."

I explained that the claims I was most interested in were those on a branch coming in two miles above the forks of the stream on the south side, and observed by the notices posted that they were not claimed until April and May, 1898.

"What is the name of the gulch?" was the question, in a Scotch accent and same peevish way. I replied that I had no means of knowing whether it was named or not, but if he showed me a map I could point it out to him. "Oh, we got no map," was the reply. I drew from my pocket a list of the claimants' names, with the numbers of their claims, taken from the trees on the ground, and, handing that to him, asked if those men whose names he saw there had recorded claims on Henderson Creek or its branches, and he refused pointedly to give any such information.

That is my experience at the Dawson recording office. The question arises, what is the office kept for, and, if it is a public office, was I not entitled to the information sought, and does it not give good cause to suspect that there was money made there by refusing information, as stated above?

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL FREEZE.

Then Captain John Cotes—I did not intend giving his name but have given it—is referred to by reputable men as one who went into the Yukon with Mr. Wade. And Wade told him he had his tracks covered. I am also informed that a man named Dan Stewart, of Vancouver, formerly of Brandon, had got a post on the White Pass, in connection with, I believe, the customs, at a very small salary, and my information is that this man took $20,000 into Dawson within a month or two of his appointment on the pass. He got his post on the pass through the Minister of the Interior. I am also told that Isaac Burpee, jun., wrote a letter to J. M. O'Brien, of the Vancouver "World" in the summer of 1898. This paper, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, is an open defender of the Government in regard to the maladminstration of the Yukon, so I am going to use simply this statement. I am credibly informed that this letter was written, my information being a man who says he saw it, and whose evidence would certainly be taken in court until it was shown that he was not worthy of belief. And in that letter, Isaac Burpee, jun., writes that the officials were undoubtedly corrupt, that Lucille's influence with Major Walsh was great and notorious; that a lemonade stand (with whisky inside) under her control, was permitted to be open on Sunday; that she practically kept a land office, and that she had been traced to Walsh's tent on different nights. Then, another witness, whose name cannot at present be given, but whom I believe to be a credible witness, and who will be forthcoming at the proper time, staked his claim, and was without doubt entitled to have it recorded, but when he went to the office for that purpose was told that an objection had been filed. A name was given, but he never could find any one who answered to it. He waited several weeks in a vain effort to get his papers. He happened to be going up the river with Colonel ———, and told him about his difficulty. On their return to Dawson the Colonel offered to get the claim recorded for the modest sum of $100. He at first objected to pay anything, but finding his efforts fruitless, he at last, to save further loss of time, paid the price asked, and received an envelope containing a slip of paper which he passed in to the recorder, when instructions were at once given to have his papers made out. When I say "the Colonel," I do not know the name of the person referred to. I do not wish it to be understood that I refer to any one in this House. A strong Liberal writes from Dawson to a correspondent in Manitoba, but as the statements are general, I will pass this letter by. In the main, it is in accord with the statements I have already made. In the London "Standard" of April 8th, there is a letter published by a lady as from her son:

> But I have no doubt you have read in the papers of the corruption of officialdom here in Dawson—how a man would prospect a piece of ground, come in and record it, and would be refused on some trivial grounds. Then the clerks would immediately send some friend out to stake the ground in return for a half interest. I never was ashamed of the British flag until I came up here; but the rottenness and corruption of the Canadian Government, as represented in this section of Canada, makes me feel indignant to think that it is a part of British soil.

Now, some of this information was corroborated by the Minister of the Interior. But the other day he pleaded ignorance of the facts. So, even according to the hon. gentleman himself, there is something to be inquired into. My informant told me that Joseph Clark, of Toronto Junction, was employed as Assistant Gold Commissioner during Mr. Fawcett's time, and he was a deserter from the Mounted Police at Fort Macleod. My informant was in Dawson for about two years, up to the end of December, 1898, and he is also authority for the statement that it was well-known that Lucille Elliott had what was called a strong pull with the leading officials, and that $10 and $15 tips were paid to get into the Government offices. Now, in the public press there are very strong statements over names and addresses of those who were responsible for those statements. I refer, for instance, to the Kincardine "Review" of Thursday, 18th May, 1899, where Angus A.

Mackenzie, who is spoken of as a son of the late John Mackenzie, makes statements charging the officials with corrupt conduct. I shall not trouble the House with that, as it has been published. A man who was in the Yukon and well known to me, now in Atlin, writes—this will be heard, I hope, in connection with the evidence I referred to yesterday:

Major Walsh was instrumental in closing Dominion Creek until a certain date to locaters, and on the morning of that date the record office was to issue permits to those who desired to locate claims on the creek. Two days before that date the officials started men for the creek, and A. P. Hughes, of London, Eng., tells me that Major Walsh secretly told two English ladies, by name Mrs. Edgecombe and Mrs. Arthur, to go at once to Dominion Creek and locate claims, as they were not going to issue permits. The following day the miners found there were to be no permits issued, and the result was that when they finally arrived on the ground, very few got claims.

It was impossible to record a good piece of property until Mr. Fawcett and his subordinates found they couldn't handle it to their immediate advantage. To my knowledge, the clerk in the office had as much as forty interests in placer claims procured by recording property to the men that suited them, and Fawcett knew perfectly well what was going on every day under his very eyes in the office. * * * My later experience in July was a smooth talk to Fawcett and $50 to one of the clerks, and I got my transfers, records, &c., in four hours.

The proprietors of games of chance (and all gambling is illegal) were forced to pay Mr. Wade the sum of $500 each (for, as he said, a subscription for a hospital) or close down.

Then, the Sherbrooke "Gazette" of April 7th 1899, has some specific statements in regard to the corruption in that country, sent by A. S. F. Rankin, his letter being dated February 24th, 1899. I shall not trouble the House with these documents, as they have already been published, further than to give the reference to the names and dates. Then, in the "Ontario Gleaner" appears a letter from H. C. Eyers, from Dawson City, dated January 14th, 1899, and to much the same effect. Then, in the Ottawa "Citizen" of April 8th, 1899, appears an interview with one F. N. May, formerly of Ottawa, but now of Dawson. In the "Daily Sun" of New Westminster, March 29th, 1899, there are very serious statements of fact. At the end of a long period of allegations in regard to a lady official, a Mrs. Miner, and the extraordinary favour granted to her in regard to the claims she recorded, the observation is made, speaking of Mr. Hurdmen, who is involved in this:

He is invited to observe that a clerk in a subordinate office, on October 5th, during the incumbency of himself, Mr. William Ogilvie, as Yukon Commissioner, did in some manner acquire a piece of ground in size contrary to the laws then in operation or in existence at this time.

This is addressed to Mr. Ogilvie:

We ask him to take notice that at the date of recording, October 5th, by Gold Commissioner's, Thomas Fawcett's, rulings there were two whole claims and a fraction in the ground recorded by Hurdman for a fellow employee. That this was in direct violation of the orders from Fawcett to his subordinate.

I refer also to the statements of an Ontario man whose name I have and whose permission I have to give his name; but for reasons mentioned, and considering the undertaking I have made myself in regard to these charges, I refrain at present from giving his name. The date is November 1st, 1898. This is the conclusion of the letter. The writer is a man very well known to Sir Mackenzie Bowell:

So you have the timber inspectors, if a poor devil brings a few logs to Dawson, he wants to know how much there is in it for him—and all the others is the same.

I would refer also to an interview with one H. T. Monk. I have the paper, but I have not the date; however, it has been published, and I refer to it as corroborating the statements that I have made in general. The letter is written September the 20th, to a friend in Ottawa, by Mr. H. T. Monk, a young Englishman in the Klondike. Then, take an article in the "Wide World" magazine of May, 1899, where there are the name and address of a lady who went up to Dawson after her husband. This lady was Mrs. Lillian Agnes Oliver, of Chicago, and her letter appears on page 53 of the magazine of May, 1899. I think I am correct in saying that her mission was to relieve her husband, who was there ill, and this is what she writes:

Dawson, July 13th.

Three letters reached me to-day, and though I have been here a week I have not been able to get my mail. Post office only opens a few hours a day, and there are hundreds waiting outside. Ladies are being let in by a side door; but the mail men are slow in sorting, and one has to wait ten days or two weeks ere a mail can be distributed, after arriving. The brutal way these men at the post office speak to the people would cause a lynching on the American side. They treat the men like dogs. Everything is grabbed here, people having to pay for everything. The miners are holding a meeting to protest against the way they are being treated. If a man stakes a claim he must first take a license, for which he pays $10; or to record a claim, $15. That is, if they let him have it. If work is not done within the year he loses it, and also his right to take up another claim in that district. On recording a claim they will not give an answer to a man for sometimes six weeks. In the meantime, they send out a "grafter" to investigate, and if the "find" is likely to turn out rich, the unfortunate prospector loses it. Their answer is: "I am sorry, but that claim was staked before"; and the poor man, not being allowed to see the books at the recorder's office, cannot protect himself. These claims are being sold "under the rose" to some one that will give an interest in them to parties in power. This is no secret in the Klondike, and, therefore, no place for the poor man.

Now then, a book was brought out this year by Charles Scribner's Sons, an eminent firm in New York, and it is called "In the Klondike." This book is in the library of Parliament, and is written by Mr. Frederick Palmer, a gentleman who has already published in two reviews, statements that I propose to read to this House. I made inquiry of Scribner's Sons, because, being a reputable firm, their reply would be credible as to who this Mr. Palmer was, and the Scribners write, on May 12th, 1899, that Mr. Palmer is the author of a book of note on the Greco-Turkish war, and is a journalist of recognized ability. He was sent by the New York "World," as special correspondent to the Phillipines. He gives in this book the substance of what he saw in Dawson. Substantially the same article appeared in a current number of the "Forum" of June 18th, 1899. The New York "Nation" calls his work in the Klondike a lively and truthful picture of life in the Klondike. I would refer to page 202 of this article, under the heading of "The Government of Canada's policy in the Yukon province—Gold Commissioner's Office," and so on. This is what Mr. Palmer writes:

Major J. M. Walsh, who was chosen commissioner, did not go to Dawson in the autumn of 1897. His corps of civil officials preceded him, while he remained behind in camp on the Lewes Lakes, with a considerable force of police, in order to escort to Dawson the United States relief expedition.

Among the foremost charges of maladministration made against the civil officials was the one in connection with the water front, data of which were given to me by several leading men. The Canadian law provides that the main street of a new town shall be at all points a certain distance from the bank of the river. In order not to have a crooked main street, the men who staked the town-site of Dawson agreed to follow this measurement, from the greatest indentation of the bank, in a straight line. Those who bought lots on the main street supposed that they were securing river frontage, which is invaluable. The spring of 1898, however, saw a long row of buildings, whose back-doors were towards the river, and which faced the original row. The officials had leased the water front to an individual for a nominal sum in the name of the Government. The sub-lessees said, with a shrug of their shoulders, that they did not care to say to whom they paid their heavy rents, and that they were satisfied as long as they were left undisturbed.

Captain Constantine, who had been transferred from the charge of the police at Forty-Miles to the same position at Dawson, was an old-fashioned executive. His departure in the summer of 1898 was agreeable to him as well as to the other officials, because he was alone among uncongenial company. He understood the miners, and they knew that, though gruff, he was honest and incorruptible. Even the lawless ones admitted this much; for in no community is simple integrity, enforced by a strong will, better appreciated than in a mining camp. Had he been retained as administrator of the whole district, with the power to choose his own assistance, Dawson would have been a phenomenally well governed settlement from the start, and the development of the great wealth of the region would have been less retarded. Instead of men who had spent their lives among pioneers, the Dominion Government sent, as the reward for party service, men whose experience was limited to local politics at home. With hundreds of experts to choose from in British Columbia, an ex-captain of a whaler and an ex-livery stable-keeper were made inspectors to collect the royalty of 10 per cent on an output of eleven millions of gold.

Considering the expense of recording a claim, the owners of claims and the prospectors had at least the right to expect from the Gold Commissioner's office reasonable attention to duty. To have posted in a public place a detailed map of the district, with all claims and the names of their owners recorded, would have required little labour and no expense; but it would have ruined the business of the clerks in furnishing information. Considering the number of policemen with idle hands, mail received in the summer might have been sorted with despatch and distributed at different windows under different heads. But a delay of two or three days, and the prospect of waiting in line for several hours before one could even ask if there was a letter for him, were strong incentives to miners who wished to hurry back to their claims, to put a few dollars into an itching palm, and in return to receive immediate attention at the side door of the post office.

Unfortunately, the arrival of Major Walsh in Dawson in the spring was not productive of the reforms which an oppressed population had hoped for. The acts of the officials, except that of a representative of the North-west Territories in placing a tax of $2,000 each on saloons and gambling-halls, seemed to meet with the favour of the commissioner. He maintained that the territorial government was infringing on the special powers granted to him by the Dominion Government; and he issued an order that any one who chose might sell liquor without any form of license.

The buildings on the water front stood in the way of even a primitive system of sewerage. Simple sanitary rules were not promulgated, much less enforced. Absolutely no precautions were taken against the epidemic of fever, which was responsible for so many deaths. Private beneficence built the two hospitals, and it now maintains them and carries on all charitable undertakings. Whatever has been done in the way of improvements has been paid for by public subscriptions. The full measure of the Government's public spirit was the construction of the barracks and stockade for the police on the Government reserve. Had some of the money collected from the claim-owners and the prospectors been expended in constructing trails and on a system of sanitation, there would have been less ground for complaint.

That is sufficient reference to that book. Then, there is Dr. H. A. Bonnar's opinion, published in the Winnipeg "Telegram" of October 22nd, 1898. Mr. Bonnar, of Chesley, Ont., is well known, and is said to be in this paper a strong Liberal in politics, and at the last general Dominion elections was Liberal candidate for North Bruce. My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill), who sits here, happily, for that riding, will know Dr. Bonnar. I will only read a short paragraph of what Dr. Bonnar says in this interview, speaking of Major Walsh:

Taken as a whole, he was in every way unfitted for the position he occupied, and it was

a fortunate thing for the country, as well as for the Government, that he resigned from the office he should never have been appointed to fulfil.

Later, there is a passage speaking of the unsanitary condition of the city. He said :

Speaking of the sanitary condition of the city, he stated the city had been built in a swamp without drainage of any kind or other provisions for the protection of health. The consequence is a great deal of sickness, and the hospital staff is kept busy all the time. He left Dawson City on September 22.

So that, he was there during the whole time of Major Walsh's regime. Published in the Shawville "Equity," there is a letter from David R. Macfarlane. He is, I am informed, a prominent Liberal from Pontiac county. He went into the Yukon country and wrote back as follows. At the end of his letter there is a passage, it is short, but, coming from a Liberal source, it may have more effect with the majority in this House than if it had not come from another source. I will read it :

I have been a pretty strong Liberal all my life, but unless they improve the way in which they have been administering here, I am afraid I will not be with them next election. Nearly every Government official here is corrupt, and are open for any kind of a deal or steal which they can make anything at. About 70 per cent of the miners are Americans, and our laws are so administered as to make me almost ashamed to acknowledge being a Canadian.

Mr. Ogilvie's son is an important witness, as I am informed. I have had no conversation with him nor do I know him. He is a graduate of Kingston Military College, and in Vancouver, on his way out this spring, he met another graduate of the Kingston Military College, a young gentleman esteemed by every one who knows him, George A. Walkem, son of Mr. Richard Walkem, of Kingston. Both of these young men graduated from the Kingston Military College. Mr. Ogilvie represents a syndicate in Montreal, and he told Mr. Walkem, in that conversation, that he had a considerable feeling of disgust at the way things were even then being done under the regime of his own father. He did not blame his father, but I am informed that Mr. Ogilvie said that his father was powerless, because he was only one of the council, in reference to much of the maladministration now going on in the Yukon. He corroborated these facts in connection with Major Walsh during his career, and he was there during the time that Major Walsh was in that place. Mr. Frank Swan, of Longbridge, sent to the Birmingham "Gazette," a letter from Messrs. Edward and John Whitehouse, formerly of Northfield, England, and now in Dawson, as follows :—

The bribery and corruption which has been going on among the officers equals anything that has happened on the American side. If you wanted to record a claim you could not do so unless you had a $5 or $10 bill to grease the palm of the officer. I had heard lots of people say that this is the first time they have felt it a disgrace to be under the British flag. Besides the police, who do good work, the Laurier Government have sent a lot of Canadian regulars, 165 men, at the cost of $250,000 ; they have nothing at all to do, and cost twice as much to keep as they would in eastern Canada. There is a commission of inquiry going on now into the charges of bribery and corruption among the officials ; but it is a complete farce, as no evidence is taken on oath,——

As to the evidence not being taken on oath, Mr. Ogilvie explains that that was in connection with the difficulty when they came to deal with Mr. Fawcett's request that charges against him regardless of the limitation of time and of jurisdiction should be investigated. Where they could get solemn declarations after the witnesses gave their evidence they were got. That was in case the witnesses were willing :

——and no charges will be heard which were not filed before August 25th last. Most of the charges against the officials have been filed since last October, so you see what a farce the commission is.

I cannot refrain, in support of this inquiry, from reminding this House that, before there was anything like a controversy between the Government and this side of the House as to what should be done, Liberal papers from one end of Canada to the other, said there should be an inquiry before an impartial commission. Take, not only the Liberal papers, but the statements of prominent Liberals. Mr. Martin, Attorney General of British Columbia, out on the coast, meeting these people as I have met them, coming and going, is on record as saying :

The fact that the most bitter protests come from British subjects is significant, and it is very difficult to believe that bribery and corruption of officials has not been rampant.

That is the statement of a gentleman who is in sympathy with the Liberal party and who is a leading Liberal. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) will know how true a party organ the Kingston "Whig" is. Mr. Gardiner wrote to that paper on April 11th, 1899, as follows :—

It is nothing but a system of boodling from beginning to end that prevails in the Klondike. The Government, as the district was so far away, gave the officials too much power, and they have used it despotically. There is no service of the Government there which is not corrupt.

Then the paper edited by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), the "Globe," a strong Liberal organ, contained the following statement from a correspondent in the Yukon :

Every official is looking out for his own interests only, and if a miner without influence wants to find out anything he has to grease somebody's dirty paw. One cannot even see the mining records to find out what claims are or are not recorded without bribery and corruption.

Then, I have referred to the Pembroke "Observer." I have referred to the letter which I was informed was written by Isaac Burpee to J. M. O'Brien, of the Vancouver "World." I was told that by a gentleman who said that he saw the letter. The "World" corroborates that statement, for before it was opposing me for pressing for an inquiry; this is what it said:

> From letters received from reputable gentlemen at Dawson we have the declaration that more than one of the Dominion officials feathered their private nests pretty well while paid to look after the interests of the public.

When I spoke of Mr. Gardiner I referred to the Rev. D. Gardiner, Methodist minister, who has been seven months in the Yukon. Of course, that would give more importance to the statement he made. In the Edmonton "Bulletin," this statement is made:

> As a matter of fact, Canadians and Liberals are as little pleased with the administration of the Yukon as Yankees or Conservatives.

Mr. Andrew McRae, a strong Liberal of Guelph, is quoted in the "Mail and Empire," of April 17th, 1899. I shall not read his statement, but I refer to it, and I refer also, to the Rev. Dr. Steele, of Grahamsville, as referred to in the same issue and in the same line.

Now, we come to this question of the water front, which has been so much discussed. I think that the commission taken with the public reports that are before us and some other information, show the necessity of probing this matter in the most thorough manner before an absolutely impartial tribunal. The Act respecting Dominion lands, 1894, chapter 26, section 3, provides:

> The Governor in Council may authorize the sale or lease of any lands vested in Her Majesty which are not required for public purposes, and for the sale or lease of which there is no other provision in the law.

My charge is, outside of the language of my motion altogether, but connected with that, in regard to the water front, that Mr. Wade corruptly—and my motion covers that, so that I take the responsibility of saying that he corruptly disposed of it. I go further, and say, most illegally. He had no more authority to deal with the water front, or to pretend to lease it, than I had. There was, of course, no formal lease, but there was correspondence, and this piece of property was undoubtedly illegally disposed of by him; I charge, corruptly, and it is fair that I should mention some reasons for that. We have several official reports on the matter, and they do not agree. We have the report of Major Walsh; we have Mr. Wade's interview; we have the position of the Minister of the Interior, and we have Mr. Fawcett's account under oath, and none of them agree. Mr. Wade's interview may have been improperly reported, and I attach no importance to it; but we have Major Walsh's report, contrary to Mr. Fawcett's sworn testimony, and we have the position of the Minister of the Interior, contrary to all. At page 323 of the Report of the Department of the Interior, 1898, Major Walsh reports: That Mr. Wade and Mr. Fawcett, representing the Dominion Government, leased this property. Major Walsh says that tenders had been made to Messrs. Wade and Fawcett. According to Major Walsh, these two gentlemen were the gentlemen responsible. They called for tenders, and, acting for the Government, they closed this whole bargain. If that statement were correct, it would show that the law was violated, because no authority was ever given to the Governor in Council that would enable these gentlemen to close the bargain and put Messrs. Macdonald and Morrison into possession. This session I questioned the Minister of the Interior, and what did he say? I asked:

> Under what statutory authority, if any, were Messrs. Morrison & McDonald put in or allowed to take possession of or enjoy the control of the land known as the water front in Dawson?

The Minister replied:

> Under section 4, chap. 22, R.S.C., the Minister of the Interior has control of all Crown lands except those under the control of other departments mentioned in this section.

There was nothing erroneous in that statement, but this part of the reply was erroneous:

> The public lands in the Yukon territory are under his control, and Mr. Thomas Fawcett was authorized by the Governor in Council to act for the Minister of the Interior in matters relating to the administration of the Yukon territory.

The Governor in Council had no such authority to delegate to Mr. Fawcett powers that had been delegated by this Parliament to the Minister of the Interior, and, therefore, it was wholly illegal. Now, mark this portion of the answer, because a good deal will turn on it. Major Walsh says that Wade and Fawcett did this; the Minister (Mr. Sifton) says that he was authorized to dispose of these lands, and that the Governor in Council delegated the power which Parliament gave him, to Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Fawcett is put in the breach. The Minister further answers:

> The question whether Mr. Fawcett's action regarding the water front was within his power had never been formally determined. The Government has taken no action respecting the leases referred to.

This is a very significant fear, or hesitancy, or whatever you like to call it, in the position of the Minister of the Interior. Mr. Fawcett says he has power given him by the Governor in Council, and the Minister says the Government took no action in regard to the matter. This confirms my contention as to the law, that there cannot be

governmental action in connection with the transaction described. When Mr. Fawcett is in the box, and this thing is pressed upon him, he, evidently knowing the scandalous conduct of Mr. Wade in reference to it, unloads the whole responsibility on Mr. Wade. Before coming to that, I will refer to the interview in the Klondike paper that is said to have taken place with Mr. Wade:

When application was made for the lease by Wm. Bourke on March 24th he was informed by Fawcett and Wade that it could not be leased for more than one month at a time. Two days afterwards, when Alex. McDonald makes an offer which is endorsed by Mr. Fawcett (according to the reporter as Mr. Wade's account) as very good, and recommends it to Mr. Wade's consideration.

Wade, therefore, puts it upon Mr. Fawcett.

On the 28th of March Messrs. Morrison & McDonald made, according to this statement of Mr. Wade, an offer of so much, and then the leases were given.

We will take up the evidence, and see what Mr. Fawcett thinks of sharing the responsibility in this matter. Before I read the evidence, let me summarize. Mr. Fawcett simply says that he was a machine. It happened that the Order in Council referred to him, but Mr. Wade did the whole thing, and Mr. Fawcett knew nothing about it. Mr. Fawcett says that Mr. Wade told him to sign, because under the Order in Council he was the person to sign, and he did what Wade told him. I read from Mr. Fawcett's evidence, pages 220, 221, 223 and 229:

Mr. Wade, as Dominion Lands agent, attended to all the terms of this letter, and for the Minister I signed it.

Q. What authority had you to act?—A. I had authority to act for the Minister of the Interior.

Q. Who decided the question of giving this to McDonald?—A. Mr. Wade; and, of course, I approved of this myself.

Q. Did you know McDonald & Morrison were the highest bidders?—A. I did, as far as I know, It was represented to me that they were.

Q. Who represented that to you?—A. The land agent.

Q. Then you took no part except signing the lease?—A. Practically signing the lease.

Q. Were they ever removed at all?—A. Farther back to allow 60 feet.

Q. You never thought you had a right to object to his course?—A. No; of course there were some things I wouldn't have done.

Q. You gave a lease of that bank, with the people on it, to Morrison & McDonald?—A. I authorized it in so far as to put my name to the lease to make it a legal document.

Q. I don't understand you?—A. I put my name on the lease to make it a legal document. It was prepared by Mr. Wade as the Dominion Lands agent, and I was the representative of the Minister here.

Q. Did the fact of you representing the Minister entitle you to sign leases?—A. I had that authority.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, there never was a lease at all. Here is Mr. Fawcett's statement, trying to disassociate himself from the transaction altogether, and he said he simply signed his name to the lease because he had authority, as representing the Minister. There never was a lease, but still it gives you an idea of what Mr. Fawcett thought of that transaction, and how unpleasant it was for him to be considered as sharing any responsibility in the matter. Compare what I have read of this evidence with the sworn testimony of Alex. McFarlane, given at page 225. He deposes:

Q. Had you anything to do with the water front at that time?—A. No, nothing more than I tried to get a location on the water front. I asked Mr. Fawcett about it. It was pretty well on in the fall. I wanted to build on the water front. He refused. He said it was against his wish to have the water front taken up in that way. There were a large number of buildings there and he would have to have them removed; he thought it would be inflicting a great hardship on them, and he would not let me have it. I didn't get it. I spoke to him several times on the subject.

Mr. Fawcett, so far as I can find, does not contradict the statement of McFarlane. He was opposed to any lease at all, but afterwards, without knowing why except that the land agent, Mr. Wade, told him, he signed the leases and he seems to be ashamed of it, and the Minister of the Interior is also ashamed of the transaction, because he says the Government has taken no action respecting the leases referred to. I now refer to where Mr. George is being examined, on page 227; but before I read this evidence, I wish to say that it confirms a statement that a member sitting in this Parliament made to me personally, that Major Walsh informed him that Mr. Wade got $10,000 for giving this lease to McDonald and Morrison. Now, I want to read some sworn testimony from Mr. George in regard to a conversation which he said he had with Mr. Wade:

I remember one question distinctly: "Mr. Wade, what part of this money did you get of this water front?" He said: "I got no share of it." I waited a while and repeated the question again: "Is there any of this money coming to you?" He replied (by the way, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that this was a public interview; it was for the press; I had my note-book and pencil in my hand at the time). He replied, none, unless a certain fee he had received from Mr. Alexander McDonald could be considered in that light of a division of the profits. I got him to make me a statement of what that fee consisted. He said he had immediately after his decision which gave Morrison & McDonald the water front, he had been retained by Alex. McDonald for his attorney for one year, and had been been given a handsome bonus as a retainer fee. I asked him what the amount of the retainer fee was, but he didn't tell me; I asked him if it was $10,000,——

This is the sum that Major Walsh told a member of this House that Wade did get out of the water front—

——and while he didn't say (I don't recollect whether he said yes or no) he left the impression on my mind that that amount was the retainer fee.

The Commissioner.—The amount can be ascertained.

Mr. George.—I am not arguing the case, I am merely giving facts. I asked him if he had done any services for that beyond giving the water front lease to these gentlemen; his reply to this I am not quite positive of, but to the best of my recollection, he said as yet he had not rendered any services. I think that is all.

Dr. Bourke.—All I want is what people know; I have no questions to ask you.

The Commissioner.—Did you ask him particularly if this was a retainer, or whether it was for services to extend over a period of time?

Mr. Tabor.—Presumably——

Mr. George.—I looked at it and laughed, and said Mr. Wade's explanation would be satisfactory to a number of people; by the way, I never published that interview.

The Commissioner.—I just wanted to know that point, if it was for special services, or a year's services.

Mr. George.—That's all I know; he claimed it for a retainer fee for one year's services.

Q. The amount he didn't state?—A. My impression was that it was $10,000, and that the space of time between the retainer fee was given Mr. Wade and he awarded the water front lease to Morrison & McDonald was within a few days of one another.

Now, can it be said that a matter of this kind, with this fact appearing on the surface, is not of itself a matter that should be probed to the bottom by a most impartial commission?

I said yesterday that I unfortunately had to refer to Judge Maguire as well as to some of the other officials, from the evidence that comes out at this very inquiry before Mr. Ogilvie. Permit me to turn to page 249 of the evidence, where you find the letter of Judge Maguire appearing apparently for the first time, and where it is shown that he has been advising Mr. Fawcett, for he writes a legal opinion, and Mr. Fawcett says he acted on his advice. On this page you will find his letter "re placer claim 160 below o: Dominion." On page 251 you will find the following evidence:—

By Dr. Bourke:

Q. I want to ask Mr. Fawcett: on one or two occasions you gave an extension of time, and Judge Maguire, as it appears from correspondence in the office, got an extension on a number of claims?—A. Yes, sir.

Here is the officer taking this advice, which no judge should have given to him or to anyone else; and here is the officer exercising his discretion in a most extraordinary manner in favour of the judge; for every one who is at all familiar with these matters knows that an extension of time under these regulations is not a matter of course, but a matter of discretion, and the exercise of that discretion is a matter of very great importance and requires great care. The evidence in regard to the extensions continues:

Q. How many?—A. I think four.

Q. I should like to ask you the reason you had for extending that privilege to Mr. Maguire?—A. Judge Maguire said by letter that he was going out of the country on Government business——

That shows that he was going home—going to leave the country entirely—

——and asked for an extension until he returned or other arrangements were made, which was granted; the privilege didn't extend one year.

Q. There was no work done?—A. I don't know. It was newly located; I think the claims had just recently been clear.

Q. Would the same answer apply to Mr. Wade?

There is no doubt that Mr. Wade, with the express sanction and permission of the Minister of the Interior, was allowed to violate the law of this country, and here comes the iniquity of the whole thing. Here is this legal adviser, this officer holding three or four different positions, dragging Mr. Fawcett through this deal, as in the case of the water-front business, out of which he profited largely and corruptly, and compelling Mr. Fawcett to exercise his discretion in his favour in all these matters. After reading all this evidence, it requires no argument to show how wise was the law which prohibited an officer from placing himself in a position to influence his brother officers for his own advantage. The evidence goes on:

Q. Would the same answer apply to Mr. Wade?—A. Yes, the same answer applies to Mr. Wade; he applied for quite a number of claims; those claims that he acquired himself I granted him an extension on, but those that he got through other persons I did not—he represented them. He said he was going out on Government business.

Q. Did he say Government business?—A. Yes, I knew he was Dominion Lands agent.

Q. Did he mention it?—A. He did not need to; he was a Government official.

Q. So that every Government official that went away went on Government business. He said it was Government business that took him away?—A. I don't know whether he mentioned it in his letter or not.

Q. As to Mr. McGregor?—A. He was called away.

Q. I admit that?—A. He applied on the evening that he left.

Then, a little further on:

Q. You spoke of a company; what company? What reason have you to use the word "company"?—A. Well, when a group of claims is brought in like that I generally suppose that more than one person is interested; I suppose there is a partnership arrangement of some sort.

Q. That may be, but I take it in the case of an official it didn't matter how many claims he had, he was entitled to representation to them?—A. It did matter; in the case of an official I only laid over those he acquired himself.

Referring to the system that existed there, he said that in some cases he would require the man's own name, and in others he would require another party's name, and this leave of absence was granted always to an official where the claim was in his own name and declined where it was not.

Q. Any official if he wanted to go out for any reason he was allowed representation on these claims ?—A. That's all.

Q. You told me there was no exception to that practically on which you refused ?—A. I don't think any one went out for himself.

On page 253 of the evidence, I find the following :——

Dr. Bourke.—That was not Chief Maguire's reason why he left the district ; I can't understand how he went out on public business.

The Commissioner.—Can you prove it was not his reason ?

A fair indication, I think, of a little bias on the part of the commissioner to ask this gentleman, whose name is mentioned in the evidence, why he suggests such a thing as that.

Can you prove it was not his reason ?

Dr. Bourke.—He told me he did not intend coming back.

Mr. Tabor.—Judge Maguire is still judge of the territorial court ?

Dr. Bourke.—We will put that to one side. Even if he went out on Government business, is it necessary that the Government official, because he is a public servant, is not expected to represent his claims ? I will put it like that ?

Mr. Fawcett.—I am not going to argue this question.

When he is pressed by a very proper question, in cross-examination, that is Mr. Fawcett's reply.

Mr. Fawcett.—I am not going to argue this question. All claims that were laid over——

Q. They were not asked to represent them as ordinary citizens ?—A. They were laid over for one year.

Q. Because they were Government officials ? (No answer).

Time will not permit me to go into the favouritism shown to Mr. McDonald, but I think I referred sufficiently to that yesterday. With regard to the gross, cruel neglect, so far as the sanitary condition of Dawson was concerned, I need simply refer to the statement in my resolution, for my formal charge largely follows the language of the Government officials. In this connection, you will find that Faith Fenton, who was correspondent for the Toronto "Globe," and who figured as one of the Government officials, described on April 26th, 1899, the frightful neglect of all sanitary precautions in Dawson City, the prevalence of fever and all that kind of thing.

With regard to the scandal which I charge in the administration of the post office, I want to read a succinct statement from Mr. W. E. Dawson, formerly mayor of Charlottetown, in a letter of the 16th May, 1899, to myself. He writes as follows :—

I have P. C. or letters from my son regularly, and to quote from one or two of them, on the 11th December, he writes :

"The first mail this winter, in fact the only one since 1st October, got here a few days ago and was delivered on the 19th, bringing me letters all the way from April 16th to October 2nd."

On the 8th February, he writes :

"Yours of the 20th and 28th November just received, the first and only letters I have from you since yours of October 1st. I understand that this mail came right through from Skagway and that there are hundreds of bags of mails lying between here and there. There is no reason in the world why we could not have a mail every week, as the trip over the ice from Skagway can now be made easily in twenty days. It looks as though the Government wanted to make this country harder to live in than it really is. In fact they are killing this country, and it may have a very bad effect on the whole of Canada, as there are men here from all over the world, and they, not knowing anything different, think the whole Dominion rotten, and run by a rotten Government. It is no use one trying to uphold one's country here, and even if you could, you have not the heart."

He writes, 17th March :

"Mail arrived here at least two weeks ago and is not open yet. I got the following after several calls at P. O. daily, when it was open, as they close up a day to sort and open the next, Sept. 24th, Oct. 19th, 16th, 30th, Nov. 4th, 6th, 13th, Dec. 4th, 26th, so you see I am not getting more than about half my letters, and on asking the clerk when the whole of the mail would be opened, his answer was 'some time next week.' I asked how much more they had to open, and he said 200 or 300 registered letters. This made me hot, and I told him if this office was on the outside, things would be different, but supposed that while we were in Siberia all that could be done was to wait. There is no excuse for this sort of thing, as they have a larger staff than Charlottetown."

On the 21st inst. I received a letter from my son, dated 11th December, in which he said :

"The only mail since 1st October got here a few days ago, delivered on the 9th, bringing me letters of August 7th, September 4th, 11th 18th, October 2nd, and April 16th."

Some reference was made to my having had a detective in Dawson City. There is, of course, no truth in that, but what gave rise to any such statement was possibly the fact that I had a partner there. However, when I undertook to make the charges I did on a recent occasion, the mail service was so vile that I had no communication of any kind whatever from my partner, Mr. Smith, who went to Dawson some time last fall. And therefore, while I have no doubt whatever that he would not hesitate to write me anything interesting, it was impossible, when I made that speech, for me to say anything on his authority. In April, for instance, I was informed by letter from my partner, and this is apropos of the present statement :

I have just received a long letter from Smith, dated March 4th, in which he says : "I have just this morning received yours of the 31st January, and yesterday got a letter from you dated October 1st."

Showing the absence of any statement received by me from Mr. Smith whatever. I would refer also to a letter from Prof. J. W. Good, published in the Winnipeg "Tribune," and dated February 12th, 1899, in which he says :

I got my second letter from Winnipeg yesterday. The first arrived in October, so it was a long wait. Newspapers, of course, hang fire at Skagway. The company which agreed to bring in the mail were somehow unable to do the work, and so the police have had to do the whole work; and so too much has been thrown on so limited a force.

Then, the "Market Guide," of Chatham, Ont., refers to a statement of Mr. Hale, the son of Mr. Hale of that place, and who is now in Dawson. Then, the Toronto "Globe" of April 22nd, 1899, has this statement from Faith Fenton:

The splendid dog teams, with their laden sleds, came in day by day, bringing in mail of September, October, January and February—a jumbled heap—but welcome as the first May flowers will be in the Yukon.

With regard to the scandalous neglect of the Government, I have charged three departments—the Department of the Interior, the Post Office Department, and, I regret to say, the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I can hardly conceive of greater carelessness and more reprehensible conduct, in so far as irregularities are concerned, than the course taken by the hon. Minister of Marine in connection with a man dismissed by the Governor General in my time. The law provides for the Minister of Marine appointing an inspector of steamboats in a very summary manner, for these out-of-the-way places, but so far as the return brought down shows, this Yukon country, with all its development of steamers and all these ships going in and so on, has been neglected to this very day.

The inspector for British Columbia, without being given any powers, authority or jurisdiction whatever, was appointed for the Yukon district, was actually told—in fact, he suggested—that he should take a run up to Dawson. And he did take a run up to Dawson and there he collected fees that he had no authority whatever to collect, and inspected and reported a certain number of steamers and then returned. So that, practically, those laws which are equally important with others, have been largely a dead letter. But the scandal behind this is the man who was given the authority. What was his record? I asked for a return and I shall give briefly the facts taken from the return now before the House. In the first place, there was the Act of 1898, assented to on June 13th, 1898. Section 4 refers to the appointment of inspectors. Subsection 4 of section 5 provides that, in the North-west Territories, the Minister may assign the duties of such inspector to the inspector of boilers and machinery, or such other person as he temporarily employs. There was no pretense of going through that form, but an officer was sent up in the careless manner I have mentioned. Russell was the name of the man sent. He was appointed inspector of steamboats on the 3rd of December, 1896, for the province of British Columbia.

In 1897, he was notified that, as an officer of the Government, he could not engage in outside work, and to confine himself strictly to the duties of his office. That was in addition to what the law provides, with which law he was supposed to be conversant. Complaints were made in 1888 that he was not obeying these instructions. He replied that he had given friendly advice to private parties, but had made no charge for his advice. He was then charged with having demanded a fee of $500 from Mr. Rithet, a well-known man in Victoria, for his work on the "Etta White." Later on, he applied to be permitted to act as inspector for a private company, and he was told that he could not so act. Complaints were renewed in 1889, charging Russell with taking bribes; and in January, 1890, Capt. Devereux was appointed a commissioner to investigate the charges. I think that Capt. Devereux and two other officers, Mr. Smith, and the chairman of the board, endeavoured to retain Mr. Russell in the service, but the evidence was of the character I shall mention, and the Governor General disagreed with these gentlemen and considered—and I think there is no question that the decision was right and proper in the public interest—that this officer was not the man for a position of trust. After the investigation was over, Russell admitted, in writing, that writing being on file, having taken $100 from Mr. Rithet. You will remember his denial in the first place. But he afterwards admitted having received $100, but denied that he had charged $500. He admitted that on the 4th of June, 1887, he received $20, and on the 4th of May $25, from parties for drawing specifications for boilers. These were the boilers it was his duty to inspect. Mr. Russell thought that he ought to receive $500 for his services in connection with the boilers being built by the Albion Iron Works. After some discussion, he accepted $150. Shortly afterward, when a steamer was being built at the Albion Iron Works, Russell said that the boilers would not be passed because Mr. Rithet had not treated him right in the other case. Mr. John Henderson stated that he had paid Russell $100 for the supervision of a boiler. Russell made no charge, the amount being voluntary. The captain on the Navigation Pacific Company testified that he knew that Russell was paid some small sum. Accordingly, Russell was dismissed. It was shown that he had been untruthful in the statement of the case to his department. He was convicted, therefore, of falsehood, as well as of violating his instructions and of taking money, which he called fees, but which others would call bribes, which made it impossible for him to be independent, taking these moneys from the owners of boilers, machinery, &c., on the plea of drawing specifications, which machinery he afterwards had to inspect as a supposed independent officer working for the Government. On the 24th of June, 1890, it was reported that Russell had neglected

to deliver the records of his office and was using his office as a bedroom. He disappeared, finally, from the service. Evidently some pressure was brought to bear upon the department, for, on the 4th of February, 1898, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries writes Mr. Russell that he had read the papers in this matter—the papers brought down and from which I am giving the statements I am now making—and said :

> While I think you are to blame in having accepted work outside of your office business, after receiving notice that you would be expected not to accept outside work, I at present see no reason to conclude that the sin was serious enough to prevented you being appointed, other things being equal.

Now, if you have regard to the solemn oath an officer has to take before he is appointed to this office, if you have regard to the temptations that surround an officer with such work to do, surely, when an officer has been dismissed for violating his oath of office and taking money under the circumstances contrary to his oath and contrary to his express instructions, as well as contrary to the law of the land, it is not an extraordinary thing to say that he had forfeited his right to reinstatement of that kind. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the view that such a man was quite eligible for reappointment. I challenge that view. On the 13th of April, 1898, Russell was appointed steamboat inspector for British Columbia, the very district in which he had violated his trust and his oath. Apparently, he was appointed on the recommendation of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) and Senator Templeman, because in this return appear two letters dated immediately after his appointment, one to each of these gentlemen, telling them that he had been appointed. Sixteen vessels are reported on August 21st, 1898, by Russell at Dawson, in which months he issues certificates of inspection. Mark you, vessels had been on the Yukon, vessels had been on the Hootalinqua and on the Lewes in 1897 ; and, so far as we can learn from any public record or from this return, no officer was sent up to perform these important duties which are contemplated to be performed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In August, he issued these certificates of inspection, every one of them illegal, not one worth the paper it is written on. I make such a statement, and I venture to say the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself will not contradict it. On the 15th of June, the chairman of steamboats reports that there were no reports received from Russell while at Dawson City. The reason of his going to Dawson is suggested in a letter of June 25th, 1898, from Vancouver, in which the chairman of the board says : I understand there are a number of vessels on the Yukon, but whether it will warrant his going there or not, he did not know. His reply is that he should go to the Yukon if there are vessels on that route. During this session another thing with regard to this officer cropped up. In "Hansard" of this session, page 3159, will be found the statement by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that complaints were made to him of Russell's personal habits ; and again at page 4856 he says : I had my attention called to Russell's conduct by some hon. gentleman, that Russell was in the habit of drinking. This is the officer sent up to perform this important duty.

I quoted from Parkman's "Montcalm and Wolfe," because I remembered a passage once quoted from the same work by the right hon. Prime Minister. The sad state of affairs in Quebec during the last days of the French régime, were, I regret to say, very similar to the condition of affairs in the Yukon, if one-half of what we have been informed be true. The right hon. gentleman smiles, but if he believes even the evidence I have referred to taken before their own official, Mr. Ogilvie, if he believes one-half the evidence I have referred to, much that cannot be disputed, is this quotation from Parkman not applicable to that far-off part of our country ? Speaking of the days of Montcalm, Parkman writes :

> Canada was the prey of official jackals—true lion's providers—since they helped to prepare a way for the imperial beast, who, roused at last from his lethargy, was gathering his strength to seize her for his own. Honesty could not be expected from a body of men clothed with arbitrary and ill-defined powers, ruling with absolute sway an unfortunate people who had no voice in their own destinies, and answerable only to an apathetic master 3,000 miles away.

I would sincerely hope that there is no analogy, and that the language is not fairly applicable to the condition of things in the Yukon. But nevertheless, until the information that I have frankly brought to the knowledge of this House, is removed or explained away, and the impression founded thereon removed from the public mind, as it alone can be by a thoroughly impartial and judicial tribunal, a tribunal clothed with powers that Mr. Ogilvie has never pretended to have, and does not possess, powers that are required now to be given by special legislation as in other cases of corruption this legislature itself agreed should be given to tribunals investigating matters of that kind, the public will inevitably be reminded of the condition of affairs under the French régime as described by Parkman. If a commission of that character were granted, I would willingly sink into a position of obscurity, into a position of contempt, into any position that this House or the people of this country would place me, so long as by the fact of a thoroughly fair, judicial and impartial tribunal, the good name of Canada was upheld, and the reputation of Canada, which never aforetime deserved the odium that has been cast upon it, was restored. Whether hon. gentlemen on the Treasury

benches will use their influence and their power to prevent this inquiry, I do not know. I have said several times that the time had come, and come it has, I believe, in the minds of most people in this country and of a great many people in the mother land, when Parliament should take this thing up. The responsibility is on Parliament. I say seriously, Mr. Speaker, that I do charge the Government with gross neglect and incapacity, followed by a carnival of corruption in the Yukon; but bad as all the crimes may have been in that district, it will be a national scandal and a national shame for this Parliament to refuse a judicial commission of inquiry upon the fair and reasonable terms covered by my motion which I have put in your hands, and the statement of which I have already read, and wish to be considered responsible for as therein stated.

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

After Recess.

MONTREAL ISLAND BELT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. MORRISON moved:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill (No. 112), respecting the Montreal Island Belt Railway Company.—(Mr. Lemieux.)

Mr. MONET moved, in amendment:

That the order be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, to consider the objections of the harbour commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), who has charge of this Bill, is unavoidably absent to-night, and he requested me to see that the Bill went through the usual course. In addition to that, I happen to have followed this matter in the Railway Committee, and I think that, certainly, it is incumbent on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monet) who has moved that the Bill be referred back, to state upon what grounds the Bill should be referred back.

Mr. MONET. Mr. Speaker, I made this motion on behalf of the harbour commissioners of Montreal, or, rather, on behalf of their lawyers who represent them here. This Bill, as it reads now, gives the company the right to divide its undertaking into sections, which shall be designated and known as:

(a) Section 1: that part of the main line extending from a point in Hochelaga ward in the city of Montreal northerly to Rivière des Prairies in the parish of Pointe aux Trembles, a distance of about 13 miles, and including all branches therefrom.

(b) Section 2: that part of the main line extending from the southern limit of the city of Montreal westerly to St. Anne and thence northeasterly to the northerly end of section 1.

Subsection "c"—and this is the one I want to draw the attention of the House to particularly—is as follows:—

(c) The Montreal section: consisting of that portion of the railway of the company extending across the city of Montreal, as located and defined on the company's franchise from the city of Montreal, passed before O. Marin, notary, on the 13th day of March, 1895, together with a connecting line from a point at or near Montcalm Avenue to the point in Hochelaga ward mentioned in paragraph (a) of this section, and consisting also of all terminal lands (and works thereon), branch lines, sidings and spurs, constructed, purchased or otherwise acquired by the company in connection with its railway across the said city of Montreal.

The section refers to rights granted under a certain notorial deed passed before O. Marin, notary, in March, 1895. I will read an extract from this notorial deed, which gives the company the right to pass, construct and operate their railway, as follows:—

Commencing at the point at or near the western end of St. Gabriel levee; thence easterly on and along said levee and along the river front to and across the Lachine Canal, &c.

Owing to this notorial deed, the company would have the right to build and construct their elevated railway, not only in the city of Montreal, which is the business of the city council of Montreal, but they would be granted the right to build their elevated railway along the river front, and especially along St. Gabriel levee. I am told that the St. Gabriel levee belongs to the harbour commissioners, or, rather, they are trustees of the property, which belongs to the Crown. If this Bill carries, as it reads now, I understand that the company will have the right to expropriate that property without paying any indemnity to the harbour commissioners. Such a thing is never done, but it will be done in this case, if the Bill passes in its present form. It was practically understood, if not explicitly, at least implicitly, between the harbour commissioners and the company, or the agent of the company who represented the company before the Railway Committee, that there would be an agreement between the company and harbour commissioners, in order that certain rights might be preserved in favour of the harbour commissioners, these rights consisting in a certain control that the commissioners would keep as to locating the line of the company, so that there would not be too great an encroachment on their property when the work is proceeded with. The commissioners see that such an agreement is not incorporated in the Bill, and they have some very important objections to make to the Bill, as it now reads. I think this question is of importance enough to grant the motion that is made.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot understand the ground that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monet) takes now on this Bill, because in the Railway Committee, when we had that question up, and I asked if that point was provided for, I think he was one of the parties who stated that the harbour commissioners were perfectly satisfied with the Bill. It was understood that everything was arranged satisfactorily.

Mr. MONET. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is quite mistaken. I was in the committee, but I did not hear a single word of objection made by the hon. gentleman. I never said the commissioners were satisfied. On the contrary, the commissioners never noticed that such a change was made in the charter asked for this year.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was stated, on behalf of the commissioners, that it was perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is unusual for me to support a reference back to the committee of any Bill of this description, but I think, in view of the statement, which I have heard for the first time, of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monet), it would be better to refer this Bill back The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is, no doubt, mistaken as to the gentleman who answered, but I did raise the question, and he, no doubt, heard that somebody did answer that the harbour commissioners were satisfied with the Bill as it was. The reason I, as chairman, did not ask for any further information or perhaps take any interest in looking into the question was that the solicitor of the city of Montreal was present on behalf of the city, and I supposed that he was also looking after the Bill in the interest of the harbour commissioners. However, Mr. Speaker, what I want to point out is this, that if I am not mistaken, this property is the property of the Dominion of Canada, and if through oversight or any other reason so important a point as this has been overlooked, the harbour commissioners, who I understand are merely the trustees of this property in the interest of the Dominion, are responsible. Therefore, under the circumstances I think it would be better if the House would agree to refer this Bill back to the committee until we hear what objections have been raised. I must also add that the Board of Harbour Commissioners, in view of the notice given and the publicity given to the discussion of this Bill from time to time, were very careless in not having found it convenient to give us their objections before now. However, under the circumstances I would feel it my duty to support the reference back.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my hon. friend before he sits down if he has satisfied himself that it does affect the property of the Crown ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not; but I doubt very much if even a gentleman of legal training could satisfy himself at once, from the reading of a document such as that, whether it did or not. I did not think so when the Bill was going through the committee, but I would not like to take the responsibility as a member of this House of saying that it did not. Nor do I see that any harm could come from further consideration, considering the importance of the point that has been raised.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I am not going to offer any objection to the motion to refer this Bill back to the committee; but I would like to make an observation or two on the subject, because I am rather under the impression that some gentlemen are misapprehending the effect of this Bill. I followed the Bill somewhat closely when it was going through the committee, and I formed the opinion that so far as the Montreal Board of Harbour Commissioners were concerned, there was no interest which they represented that was prejudicially affected by the Bill, nor would this Bill take away any of their rights. There was no person present on the occasion representing the board, but it was, I think, very generally understood that they were not opposing it. But even though that had not been understood, I would have felt satisfied in my own mind that this Bill did not prejudicially affect them. Hon. members must always have in mind that there is a principle which governs legislation that is applicable to the present case, namely, that unless the Crown is, not merely referred to by implication, but distinctly and explicitly mentioned in legislation, Crown rights are not interfered with ; and there is certainly nothing on the face of this Bill, and nothing that would arise from it by implication, which would injuriously affect the rights of the Crown. That is at all events the view I entertain, and I would have thought the Bill might go as it is ; for, if it was contemplated by this company, as a portion of the undertaking, to erect an elevated railway along the front of the river, they would have to get permission and authority from the owners of the property for that purpose. If any portion of the line crossed private or other property, they, the company, would be obliged to indemnify the owners for the property they were taking. I do not think the mere fact that a company is incorporated to build a railway from A to B enables the company to traverse the property from A to B and lay down their tracks in entire disregard of the rights of the owners of the property which they may cross. I take it as simply an authority from Parliament that such a railway may be constructed, but subject to all the conditions that usually apply, one of which is that the company must under the

law procure the right to cross property and pay the compensation fixed by the law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Can they confiscate the Crown property?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is no authority here, in my view, to take the Crown property; and if there was a right to the railway to cross property belonging in the Crown, unless it were distinctly stated that that right could be exercised without compensation, I do not think the statute would carry it. I think the Bill would have to be very clear and explicit in order to convey such a meaning. However, I have no objection to the Bill going back to the committee. I am sure it is the desire of all parties concerned —I think it is the wish of the company themselves, though I have not conferred with them—not to have any right conferred by this Bill which is not in accord with the views they had when they started to promote the undertaking. My hon. friend, the Chairman of the committee, suggests that the committee might take up the Bill to-morrow morning. It need not occupy a great deal of time, and the Bill, if taken up to-morrow morning, should be disposed of and come back to this House without very much delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has said that he has no objection to the Bill being referred back; but he has made a very strong speech to show that it is entirely unnecessary to refer it back, and that the grounds on which it is proposed to refer it back have no real existence. Considering the difficulty there was in the Railway Committee to get the parties all to agree on the Bill as it now stands, I think there ought to be some absolute necessity or some solid ground for referring it back after it has reached its present stage, and the Minister of Railways and Canals has quite convinced me by his speech that it would be a great mistake to refer it back, because there is really nothing to refer it back for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite willing that it should not go back, and I am quite willing that it should.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself I have always opposed referring Bills back to the committee, except on very strongest grounds, and I submit that my hon. friend has not advanced any ground for the motion he has made. I have failed to catch what his reason is for wishing to have this Bill referred back, except simply that he wants it referred back. As a member of the committee I feel certain that every opportunity was given to the harbour commissioners of Montreal and to every person who could possibly be interested in this Bill, to appear before the committee. But they did not appear. It was adjourned, I think, more than once, and still they did not appear. Besides, it must be known to members of the House that this Bill has been several times before that committee. It was amended in 1896, and none of the harbour commissioners appeared; therefore, we are safe in assuming that the harbour commissioners at that time had no objection to the Bill. Last session it was also amended, and none of the harbour commissioners appeared. It was up again this year and none of them appeared. After being fully considered by the committee, it came down here; and we are asked in the most cavalier way to have it sent back. Now, the gentlemen who are interested in the Bill, and who took pains to appear at the various meetings of the committee prepared to answer any question that might be raised, anticipated, for reasons best known to themselves, that there would be objections to the Bill. I understand that the objection, if there is any, is in respect to the word "franchise" occurring in the Bill. The reason for the use of that word is this. By subsection 2 of section 3 of the former Act, the company was authorized to build a subway across the city of Montreal, along the river front, on such location as the city of Montreal defines. In 1895 the city council of Montreal defined its location, and a contract defining the same is termed a "franchise," and is referred to in the Bill as such. That is what the word franchise means, and if the gentlemen who now wish to have the Bill referred back to committee admit that is their objection, I am advised by Mr. Lemieux, who has charge of the Bill, that the promoters are willing to elide from section 1 the words from "Montreal" down to the word "together." This objection being removed, there will be no necessity to refer back the Bill. If there is any other objection, I would like to know what it is. Speaking for myself, I shall, on general principles, oppose the sending back of a Bill under these circumstances. I believe it is a bad precedent, and I believe that those who ask to have a Bill sent back to the committee, should give very good reasons for their request. This Bill in no way, expressly or by implication, affects any rights of the harbour commissioners of Montreal, and if it did, I do not think there would be any objection to sending it back.

Mr. WOOD. I had an interview with the Montreal harbour engineer on Friday last, and he told me they did not know a solitary thing in reference to this matter until he came up here anxious to see in what shape the Bill was. The president of the Montreal harbour commission was here yesterday, and he also stated that he knew nothing of what this Bill contained, and therefore they wished to have their rights preserved. They do not want to interfere

with the road if it does not interfere with the harbour commissioners, and therefore in order to have the rights of the harbour commissioners considered it is desirable to have it referred back to the committee. The chief engineer of the Montreal harbour and the president of the harbour board know more about the necessities of the Montreal harbour than a gentleman living so far from the city of Montreal as my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) does. I am in favour of the Bill being sent back to the committee, so that the harbour commissioners can present their case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have listened very carefully to the argument of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), and I cannot see that he has advanced any reason why the Bill should not be referred back, except on general principles.

Mr. MORRISON. The onus is not on me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is true, but we have the right to ask what possible harm can be done by sending it back. The House will certainly be just as wise when the Bill comes back as they are at the present time. Although it is a good plan to adhere to general principles and to practice, at the same time if there is a possibility of any one's rights being invaded, or if there is a possibility of the best interests of the public not being served by the Bill in its present form, it is clearly the duty of the House to send the Bill back for reconsideration by the committee.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On behalf of the city of Montreal and as representing the city of Montreal on the harbour board, I fully endorse what has been said by the mover of this motion (Mr. Monet). There is no doubt that the Bill as printed and first presented was not what it is to-day. That is to say, it was reprinted as proposed to be amended in the Railway Committee, and that, I presume, misled the harbour commissioners, and is probably the reason why they did not before this advance their objections against it. As the Bill stands now, there is no doubt that the harbour commissioners' rights will be infringed upon unless they are protected by some amendments to it. The amendment that was suggested to the promoters of the Bill was not accepted by them, but I think if a reference is made to the committee we can come to some understanding. The Bill as it stands, surely should not be passed, because the rights of the harbour commissioners of Montreal would be infringed upon by it. More than that, the rights of the city of Montreal itself are concerned. There is a reference made in the Bill to an agreement made between the city of Montreal and the company. By that agreement, which is referred to as before Marin, notary, the works contemplated were to be commenced on the 1st of July, 1896, but none of that work has been commenced yet. According to the Bill, this agreement is ratified in a very indefinite way, and is supposed to be yet binding between the company and the parties interested. I have no doubt that the committee will arrange in some satisfactory way that the rights of the Crown, as represented by the harbour commissioners, should not be sacrificed, and I think the House should consent to refer the Bill back for reconsideration by the committee to-morrow morning. As a member of the harbour commission and as a representative of the city of Montreal, I may say that we have no objection to the Bill if it is amended properly, and if the rights of the Montreal harbour commission are properly protected.

Mr. BERGERON. No reason has been given to the House why the unusual course should be adopted of referring this Bill back to the committee. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Préfontaine) speaks of the rights of the harbour commissioners, and the rights of the city of Montreal, but the Bill was considered at two sittings of the committee, and Mr. Ethier, the city attorney of Montreal, spoke on the two occasions, and declared himself perfectly satisfied with the Bill as passed by the committee.

Mr. MONET. He declared himself satisfied provided it were amended.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all, Mr. Speaker. At the first meeting of that committee Mr. Ethier moved an amendment, but he accepted afterwards the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), and declared himself perfectly satisfied with that amendment. At the second sitting of that committee, Mr. Ethier was present and he could move any amendment he thought proper, but he did not do so, and he again stated that the Bill satisfied him. As far as the Montreal Street Railway is concerned, Mr. Archer, the partner of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) was present at the two meetings. He spoke at the first one and accepted the amendment, and at the second never said a word, showing that he accepted the Bill as passed by the committee.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is not the harbour commission.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend is not defending the harbour commissioners, but the Montreal Street Railway.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I beg your pardon, I deny that.

Mr. BERGERON. The harbour commissioners were notified, as well as the whole public, that that Bill was coming before the committee, but they paid no attention and the reason is very simple. This Bill does not change in the slightest degree the charter

of the Belt Line Railway Company, which was accepted by the harbour commissioners in 1894. There is not one word in this Bill changing the position of the Montreal Belt Line Company, so far as the harbour commissioners are concerned. These objections are futile. The Montreal harbour commissioners have been told, since the Bill was passed in committee, that it contains an infringement on their rights, but that is not true, and if the Bill be sent back to the committee, it cannot be changed in that respect. At the last meeting of the committee, on Monday, my hon. friend the chairman of that committee, on behalf of some of the harbour commissioners, asked that the Bill might be postponed until this evening, so that the harbour commissioners might have time to examine it—which they should have done before—and made some suggestions to-night, but these harbour commissioners have gone home.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have not.

Mr. BERGERON. I know they have.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Look up in the gallery.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, they went away, but may have come back. I do not see any of them here any way. I was told the other day that the promoter of the Bill, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) stated in the House that the members of the harbour commission, after listening to him, were perfectly well satisfied, and no doubt they were, because there is not a word in this Bill changing the charter which was first passed by Parliament. It would be unjust to send this Bill back without reason to the committee. It has already been postponed once, and we are asked to follow an unusual course when advised not to pass the Bill to-night. As a rule any Bill sanctioned by one of the committees of this House is accepted by this House, unless for some very grave reason, because the committees represent the House, and we have confidence in their action.

Mr. TISDALE. I would like to ask the hon. member for Maisonneuve if he is a member of the Montreal harbour commission.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. Is he interested at all in the Montreal Street Railway?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not a cent.

Mr. TISDALE. Then, the hon. gentleman speaks as a member of the harbour commission?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On behalf of the harbour board and as a representative of the city of Montreal.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand that the harbour board, as such, had no representative at the meeting of the committee.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It had not.

Mr. TISDALE. We must remember that the harbour commission are trustees for the harbour of Montreal and that Montreal harbour is a subject in which the whole Dominion is interested. Therefore, when the Montreal harbour commission prefer this request to us, we should pause before refusing it. As trustees they occupy a different position from that occupied by disputing interests, not of a public nature, and, therefore, it would be a rather serious thing not to allow a board that represents the maritime interests of the Dominion to be heard in the committee on this Bill. Were it not for that fact, I would not for one moment consider the question of referring it back to the committee, especially when it has been so fully discussed in that committee.

Motion, that the Bill be referred back to the committee, agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 151) rspecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's motion in amendment thereto.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has to leave to-morrow for England on business before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and he has two or three Bills which he is most anxious to dispose of before leaving. As the hour is very far advanced, and it will be impossible to complete this debate this evening, I have to propose that the debate be not now proceeded with, but that it be adjourned until to-morrow, so as to allow the hon. Solicitor General to go on with these Bills.

Mr. McGREGOR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 91) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the amendments?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The amendment to section 40 of the Bill is to provide that, when a vessel is seized, certain security should be given in

reference to the seizure. Section 40, with the changes made, is as follows :—

40. Every seizure and detention made under this Act shall be at the risk, cost and charges of the owner or master of the vessel, or the owner of the goods seized,—

(a) Until the amount of all sums due and penalties incurred, and of all costs and charges incurred in the seizure and detention, and of the costs of any conviction obtained for the infringement of any provision of this Act, or of any by-law in force under this Act, has been paid in full ; or—

(b) In the case mentioned in paragraph (c) of subsection 1 of section 38 of this Act, until the injury done has been repaired by the master or crew, or on their behalf, and all the damages, costs and charges mentioned in subsection 2 of the said section 38 have been satisfied ; or—

(c) In any case, until sufficient security, either personal or otherwise, has been given for—

(i) Payment of the amount mentioned in paragraph (a) of this section ; or—

(ii) Payment for such amount for the repair of the injury referred to in paragraph (b) of this section and for damages, costs and charges, as may be awarded in any suit therefor brought against the owner or master of the vessel.

That is for the purpose of protecting the owner of the vessel against any seizure that may be made. The amendment was made at the instance of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are two earlier amendments to sections 19 and 38.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The first of these amendments has practically no effect. It simply refers to returns they are obliged to make to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The amendment to section 38 involves the addition of a clause giving a preferential lien on vessels for the amount of damage done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Government agree to these amendments ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, they are not amendments of any importance.

Amendments agreed to.

JURISDICTION OF EXCHEQUER COURT AS TO RAILWAY DEBTS.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 159) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved :

That section 1 be amended by inserting the words "before or after" after the word "receiver" in the 18th line.

He said : I propose this amendment, so as to give jurisdiction to appoint a receiver before the maturity of the bond, as well as after.

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

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 155) further to amend the Post Office Act. He said : Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains three provisions. Section 1 proposes to add to section 9 of the general Post Office Act a clause entitling the Postmaster General to provide for late mailable matter being despatched, on the payment of an additional fee, to be fixed by the Postmaster General, and also to add a clause to that same section 9, entitling the department to establish a system of indemnity for the loss of registered mail matter, such indemnity in no case to exceed $25 for any one registered piece. Section 2 provides for striking out of the section of the Act passed in 1894 the words "to their subscribers." The object is to allow papers that are called sample copies, mailed by publishers, to contain within them the same things that may be inclosed in newspapers sent from the office of publication to the regular subscribers. At present the publishers are allowed to inclose in papers notices informing subscribers that their subscriptions are about to run out, and asking them to renew, and also envelopes to contain the reply, with the subscription money. By same accident, that privilege was limited to papers, sent to subscribers, and not extended to sample copies. It is customary for newspaper publishers, from time to time, to issue sample copies, which are not, therefore, within the meaning of the section, as it is to-day, not being sent to subscribers. It is proposed to strike out the words "subscribers." This has been asked by some of the publishers. Section 3 of the Bill proposes to allow the promotion of a railway mail clerk to be made from any clerk in the railway mail service. At present, superintendents must be chosen from mail clerks who have been practically running on the cars. This removes that restriction, and allows the choice to be made from those who may have been ten years in the railway mail service ; part of the ten years on the cars, and part in other branches.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This provision would seem to do away with the principle of promotion after a lengthened term of service, and it would enable the authorities to overlook the regular promotion that ten years in the railway mail service now gives, and allow parties to be brought in who had not that amount of experience in the railway mail service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The present statute states that except, in Bri-

tish Columbia, no person shall be eligible to be appointed superintendent unless he has served ten years at least as a railway mail clerk. That means has actually been engaged running on the cars for ten years.

Mr. BERGERON. Why change it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Because there are men who may not have served ten years running on the cars, but have been in the railway mail service. which also embraces service in the office of the superintendent. There are superintendents in Ottawa and London and Toronto, and other railway centres. Each has a staff of clerks, and it might be advisable to choose from that staff. I assure the hon. gentleman that there is no person in view at all. This has been recommended by the head of the service as a necessary amendment to the Act.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a very large number of persons in the North-west Territories and Manitoba interested in this legislation, and I do not think that the reason given by the Postmaster General should commend itself to the House, because it is perfectly clear that an injustice will be done to the railway mail clerks. The Postmaster General tells us that his object is to enlarge the sphere of choice for promotion. Hitherto the promotion has been confined to the railway mail clerks running on the railway mail trains, and now the Postmaster General wants to enlarge the field whence competition will come, and he necessarily does an injustice to a body of men who really are, I believe, the most deserving civil servants we have in the post office employ.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the very last object of the Bill. It may be that a railway mail clerk has shown himself specially deserving, and for that reason he may have been taken off the road and brought into the superintendent's office. The whole policy of the Government in the railway mail service is to reward merit. If you get a deserving man who served five or six years as railway mail clerk, and you promote him to the superintendent's office, it may be that he would be the fittest man to succeed the superintendent himself. This Bill is really to reward merit. I repeat there is no person in view. The controller recommended this amendment as the result of his observation, and when he drafted the original clause. (because it was he who drafted it), he would not have limited it to those actually engaged on the mail cars if it had occurred to him.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the Postmaster General would accomplish what he aims at by defining that any time spent in the office would count the same as if it were spent on the train.

Mr. MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is what the Bill does.

Mr. SPROULE. No. The Bill would allow the Postmaster General to make a selection from amongst those who perhaps had served no time on the train.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am perfectly sure no man would be appointed to the inside railway mail service who had not practical training in running on the mail cars. It is a special technical branch of the service, and it cannot possibly happen that the controller would recommend any one as superintendent who had not practical experience as a railway mail clerk.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, why do you not so provide in the law ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will consider that in commitee.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. ELLIS. Perhaps the Postmaster General would explain why he adopts the idea of giving any special privilege for late mail matter. It appears to me that there should be an equal privilege, without a special fee, to all the people in the country, with regard to mailing matter at the last possible moment. I can conceive, as one result of this, that there might be a tendency on the part of post offices, particularly city post offices, to close the mails earlier, and not to be as expeditious in the despatch of the mails, if there were a fee charged upon letters that came in late—not for the purpose of collecting the fee, for I do not think that would influence postmasters very much, but in order to expedite the work, without much regard to public utility. But probably the Postmaster General can say something on the question which does not strike my mind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hardly think any postmaster would deliberately alter the carrying on of the work of his office, in order to tax the public. But there has to be some hour for closing the mails fixed, for there is a good deal of work for the staff in the office to perform after the receipt of the mail matter before it can leave the office for the train ; and each office must be the judge of the time for closing, because so much time is required in the case of a heavy mail, and a different time for a lighter mail. So there has to be some regular hour, so many minutes before the departure of the courier to the station, to enable the indoor staff to make up the mail. But in order to meet the case of accidents, or of persons who are most anxious to despatch matter at the latest possible moment, it is proposed to establish a system of

having an officer or a staff wherever it is deemed practicable, to take to the train such mail matter as is posted at the very last moment; and for that extra expense to which the department will be put a fee will be imposed. I think the fee will probably be a cent on small matter, such as letters, and there may be large packages also; that is why the Bill says "fee or fees," for it may be considered advisable in the working of the measure to have a larger fee than a cent for matter which would be more expensive to handle. I think the system works well in England; for it is nothing original with me, but simply the adaptation to our conditions here of a system that has been tried and found to be a public convenience in great centres in the old country.

Mr. HENDERSON. In country towns and villages it is a common practice, after the mail is made up by the postmaster, for the mail courier to take letters that may be brought into the office or handed to him and convey them to the railway station. I would like to know if the proposal now made by the Postmaster General would in any way interfere with the mail courier doing that without an extra stamp being put on?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. The stamp would only be required where the carrying of the letters to the station after the hour for closing the mails would put the department to any additional expense. I fancy that this will not have application except in the large centres. It is not proposed for the sake of making money, but simply to add to the convenience of the public.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the Postmaster General if he has matured any plan of applying this new method in the centres of population? Will it be possible under it to mail late letters at all the branch offices, or in the letter boxes, or will it be confined to the central office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to go into the details as far as my hon. friend desires. We will no doubt commence at the main post office, and probably develop the system from there as experience warrants. It may be possible to extend it to branch offices. The adaptation of the electric system in the collection of letters may yet produce a revolution in the mail service in large centres like Toronto, or wherever the automobile system may be adopted. I am in hopes that we may be able before long to adopt that system, in some places at all events, where the climate will admit of the operation of automobile cars. I have been thinking that over, but have developed nothing on the subject to offer to the House at present.

Mr. CLARKE. What will the fee be?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill says a "fee or fees." In cities like Toronto, for instance, it might be possible to despatch small mail matter within five minutes of the departure of the train by bicycle. In the case of letters and other small matter the fee will probably be a cent. In the case of more bulky matter, which could not be so carried, it might be necessary to have a larger fee.

Mr. BENNETT. Section "v," while commendable, may lead to difficulties. As I understand, in case of a person inclosing say, $25 in a letter, the department guarantees that if the contents are abstracted or tampered with, it will make good the amount. That being the case, it would seem to me that difficulties may arise. Assuming that a person wished to be dishonest, and passed over a letter to the postmaster, had it registered, and afterwards made a complaint that the letter had contained $25 but that when it reached its destination the amount had been abstracted, the issue would then be between the post office and the claimant as to whether the amount should be made good. In that case, would the Postmaster General explain what would be the procedure? Would it be necessary for the claimant to institute an action, or would the amount be paid forthwith by the department? It seems to me that the provision would result in putting a premium on dishonesty, and lead to considerable litigation between claimants and the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the working out of the scheme regulations may have to be established. The section proides for regulations. It may be thought advisable that one of the regulations should be that if a claim is intended to be made for the contents of a letter said to contain such an amount, the said amount may be endorsed upon the registered letter, and then the receiver shall open it in the presence of the postmaster delivering the letter. In the case of express companies, for example, they have a system of tying the letter up in a certain way, and putting their own seal on it in different places, which practically renders it impossible to be broken open without detection. We will endeavour to surround the system with safeguards so as to prevent fraud. In some countries the delivery of the letter is supposed to discharge any liability, whether there be anything of value in the package or not. In England, I think they insure practically all registered matter, the premium of insurance being part of a regular registration fee, and no proof of loss is required. If they cannot deliver the package, they assume that it contained the amount, to insure against the loss of which the fee is paid, just as in the case of a life insurance policy the premium is taken as a test of the amount insured.

Mr. BENNETT. The regulation suggested might result in this fraud being practised.

A letter, when received at its destination and opened by the postmaster, may not contain any money at all, and the person who sent the letter might give evidence that a certain amount had been inclosed, although when received it contained nothing, and the result would be that the department would be forced to make the payment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT. Would not that be placing a premium on dishonesty, for a man might inclose a piece of brown paper in the envelope to make the package appear bulky, and then give evidence that he had inclosed money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There will be nothing to prevent the same precautions being adopted at the beginning which are adopted at the end, namely, to require the sender to inclose the money in the presence of the postmaster who would then seal the envelope. Then, if the letter is registered, and the contents should be missing, we could have proof of the contents.

Mr. DAVIN. The fee will be graded, I suppose ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but the fee is not yet fixed. We will endeavour to make it as small as possible, so as to save the department from loss.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, there would be the evidence of the remitter as against the evidence of the postmaster, and what would be the result in that case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a question of fact.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the hon. gentleman made up his mind as to what the minimum fee will be ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not in a position to discuss the rate at present. The registration fee to-day of five cents is pretty high. Discussing the matter with the accountant, we thought that the minimum fee, say, for an amount of $5, might be one or two cents for the insurance, and then, perhaps, increase the fee one cent for every extra $5 up to $25, or something like that.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. All the amendments in this Act are excellent, and, to my mind, in harmony with the present progressive administration of the department. I think that the fee idea which, I presume, is adopted from the English plan, should apply in the large cities and towns and be confined to the central post office and the post offices adjacent to the railway stations, but what I would like to know is whether this would apply to packages as well as to letters. I would also ask what is meant by striking out the words "to their subscribers," as provided in the second clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reply to the first question, the clause is large enough to make it applicable to all mailable matter. The words "mailable matter" in the Post Office Act includes everything that can pass by mail. The Bill says "mailable matter" in the third line of subsection u, but at the beginning it would, perhaps, be prudent to apply it simply to letters only, and then, later on, make it apply to all mail-matter as rapidly as we can develop the system. With regard to the second question, as to what is the meaning of the provision to strike out the words "to their subscribers," there is a provision in the Act, chapter 54, of the statutes of 1894, imposing a penalty for inclosing anything in a newspaper except accounts and receipts of newspaper publishers, printed circulars inviting subscriptions, and the printed envelopes addressed by such publishers to their subscribers. These may be inclosed in newspapers sent by the publisher to their subscribers, and it is proposed to strike out the words "to their subscribers," so as to enable newspaper publishers to inclose circulars in sample copies of their paper, inviting subscription, and sent to parties who are not subscribers.

Mr. CLARKE. Referring again to subsection u, I would suggest that if this late letter posting is to be of practical value to people in large centres of population, it ought not to be confined to letters posted in the general post office, but should be made applicable to certain branch offices that might be named as soon as the law is to be put in force. I hope that when this law is put in operation, it will apply to branch offices in different sections of large cities, such as Toronto, so that late letters may be mailed at these branches.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite admit that the extension of the system as suggested would be in the public interest, and the hon. gentleman may be sure that I will remember his suggestion and endeavour to carry it into force, but, of course, I must go slowly and with a reasonable degree of caution.

Mr. HENDERSON. With reference to the registration clause, I draw the attention of the Postmaster General to this point, that there may be some difficulty in the case of inclosures in parcels other than money. For example, suppose a person should mail a gold ring in a registered letter, alleging that it is worth $25, when it may be spurious and not worth 5 cents. Now, who is to be the judge of the value ? The postmaster may see the inclosure, but may be unable to determine the value. If the article is lost, the party may recover $25 for a thing that is not worth $1. How would he get over a difficulty of that kind ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If a person incloses a thing alleged to be worth $25, and pays the insurance fee on $25, and if

it is abstracted en route, that is one of the ordinary incidents against which the insurance would apply. That is a different case from that suggested by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), of no inclosure at all. But, if the article is inclosed, whatever fraud is committed, is committed, we will say, by the post office officials, because the letter is in the custody of the post office from the beginning. But, considering how few articles are lost in the mail, then, applying the doctrine of chances, it would not pay a person to pay the insurance fee on $25 on the chance of some useless article not reaching its destination.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that this mailing of late letters will only apply to large cities or towns, and not to small towns or villages ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not possible at present to say how far the system will extend. It should be extended to every place where it will add materially to the public convenience. But in most small places no advantage will be gained over the present system. In each of these places there is a courier, whose duty it is to carry the mail to the station, whether the letters are inclosed in a bag or delivered to him by hand. That courier probably starts at the latest possible moment to catch the outgoing train. I do not see how we could add to the public convenience by adopting this system in such a place. But in the large centres the quantity of mail matter is so large that the hour for closing is fixed a considerable time ahead of the time for the leaving of the train. That is necessary to afford time to make up the mail. But this does not apply in the smaller centres, because the few late letters are carried by the courier, as part of his contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I had in mind particularly such a case as this. Mails are closed at a certain time in the evening, but they might be closed a great deal later and still catch the train. In such a case, this late system would be a great convenience. In most small places the mail closes at eight or nine o'clock.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Do you mean the post office building.

Mr. SPROULE. They close at eight or nine o'clock, but they might close much later and still catch the train. In such a case, this new system would be relatively as great a convenience as in a city.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The inspector fixes the time for the closing of the mail. There is no fixed time for the postmasters closing their offices ; they are supposed to keep them open for a reasonable hour at night. I doubt if it would be practicable to have the postmaster keep his general office open to a later hour in order to handle the few late letters that would come in.

Mr. SPROULE. But the late letters could be dropped in the box after the post office is closed, and, if the carrying of such letters to the train could be secured by means of putting on a special stamp, it would be a convenience to the public.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Wherever it is practicable to apply the system in the public interest, it will be applied. There are different conditions in each office, so that no general rule can be adopted for the whole country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it would be well for the Postmaster General, either in this Bill or by regulation, to define the post offices to which this late-letter system is to apply. The postmaster in a small place of one or two thousand people might have no conveniences to carry out the system, yet might leave himself open to dismissal or censure for not doing so. It would be well that every postmaster should understand distinctly his duty in this respect.

Mr. BRITTON. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) say that, where there are already good facilities for getting letters to the train just before it leaves, this will not be interfered with. I notice there is great difference in the time at which post offices in different places close for the despatch of mail matter. In some of the towns of Ontario, for instance, you cannot have a letter despatched unless it is dropped in at eight or nine o'clock in the evening, while others despatch letters received up to midnight. The latter is the case, for instance, in the city of Kingston, where I live. This would cover the great bulk of the letters ; it would be very rare indeed to have one posted later than that. But, as I understand, the Postmaster General simply takes power to give facilities where they do not now exist, and provides for the charging of a small fee for the service. This seems to me a capital thing to have in the Post Office Act, and such rules could easily be made as would be necessary to carry it out. As to the other point, the insuring of registered mail matter, I am satisfied that the post office will make a little something out of that, because comparatively few of the registered letters go astray, and comparatively little of the large sums sent by mail are abstracted. Though we hear occasionally of a loss, when you consider the large amount sent, that loss must represent a very small proportion of the whole. And, when an opportunity is given to the sender to insure, no doubt many will take advantage of it, so that it will be a source of revenue to the Post Office Department. I believe both these reforms are in the right direction.

Mr. DAVIN. I think there is not the danger that my hon. friend behind me anticipates in regard to late letters. I would ask the Postmaster General whether in England there are not boxes specially for late letters, so that letters can be dropped in and the clerks, when the limited period has arrived for late letters, can go there and take them out. Am I wrong in that impression ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there are a number of receiving stations throughout the city of London where late letters are posted and stamped with a peculiar stamp.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. It is not a particular stamp.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I know there are a number of late letter-boxes in various parts of the city.

Mr. MOORE. This section gives power to the Postmaster General, not only to fix a fee for late mailable matter, but also to make regulations with respect to the despatch of late mailable matter. He undoubtedly has been made aware that difficulties often arise between postmasters and patrons of the post office regarding the issuing of post office orders and the mailing of registered letters. In many of the post offices in railway towns the mail has to be despatched at a certain specified time, and if a person wants a post office order, and the postmaster has not time to make it out and make up his mail in time to be despatched, it often occasions annoyance and ill-feeling. I think it would be well to make regulations that would exempt postmasters from issuing post office orders and registering letters for a certain length of time before the mail is despatched. Possibly such regulations have been made, but if not, it would be well to make such regulations and avoid the difficulty that has been occasioned in that way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I fancy there is sufficient power at present to have such regulations made as the hon. gentleman refers to for the guidance of postmasters. If not, I will take his suggestion into consideration.

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to that section, I think the Postmaster General will admit that the committee has been very kind in allowing this Bill to scamper through, and that the last clause should be postponed. If that clause were passed an injustice would be done to the railway mail clerks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made a suggestion that I am prepared to give effect to. He thought that, perhaps, the controller might recommend some person as superintendent, or some person might be selected as superintendent who had not been actually a mail clerk at all. Now, to guard against any such contingency, I would be quite willing to have this section limited in such a way that the superintendent must be chosen from those who have been in the railway mail service, not for ten years, but that they should have served at least one-half of such period as railway mail clerks. That will get over the danger that the hon. gentleman anticipates.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I think that would still be an injustice to these men. There can be no danger that in so large and intelligent a body of men a superintendent could not be found. But if there was any danger to the efficiency of the service, I would at once yield to the Minister. But I cannot see any reason whatever for making this change. I certainly will move against it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). On the third reading.

Mr. DAVIN. No, we will vote against it now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understands the working of the system, otherwise he would not make this proposal. I would like to satisfy him upon its merits, because both he and I have the same object. Now, in the railway mail service we take, for example, the city of Ottawa. In this city the railway mail service consists of the railway mail clerks, the superintendent's office, and the staff in his office. The staff in his office have served more or less as railway mail clerks, they are probably the men best versed in the workings of the local service.

Mr. DAVIN. How many form the staff in the office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps four or five. In the city of Toronto there are, perhaps, half a dozen. Now, those positions in the inside service become prizes for mail clerks. There are many mail clerks who become incapacitated to run on the trains. It is a severe service, and it becomes necessary sometimes to transfer from the outside to the inside men who become physically unable, but are perfectly competent to manage and organize and maintain discipline. It will be a misfortune, it will be unfair, if a mail clerk who, because of his merits is promoted or transferred from the cars to the inside service should be excluded from the chance of being superintendent, because he has not

served the actual ten years on the cars. I am sure my hon. friend does not want to do that injustice to those in the inside service.

Mr. DAVIN. How many are in the inside service in Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps six, I think, mail clerks.

Mr. DAVIN. How many railway mail clerks in the Toronto division ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I mentioned forty-one. Now, I am willing to guard against the accident of a man becoming superintendent who has not had actual practical experience on the cars. But I do not think that we ought to shut out of the chance of promotion to the superintendency those who have been mail clerks, and who have been transferred to the inside service, either because they have been selected for their special merit to be inside, or because of accident, or the breaking down of their health, they are unable to work on the cars. I am willing to meet the criticism of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) by putting in some limitation so that the superintendent should have been at least five years on the cars, the balance of the period having been put in railway mail service elsewhere.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Postmaster General's defence of the clause is more commendable than the ill-considered clauses we have already passed. I think he has justified the insertion of this clause by the amendment which he is prepared to accept, providing that clerks in an office shall have been at least five years on the road as railway mail clerks.

Mr. DAVIN. You have forty-one who are active mail clerks, and the Postmaster General holds that it is necessary, for the efficiency of the post office service, that he should turn away, say in Toronto, from the forty-one mail clerks, and go to those ininside.

Mr. ELLIS. Oh, no ; that is not it.

Mr. DAVIN. I know he can take them from the 41, but there is the bare fact that he has 41 outside men who have hitherto had this prize to look forward to. As he said himself, it is a distressing service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said a severe service.

Mr. DAVIN. A severe service. Well, severity distresses. It is a severe service in Manitoba and the North-west where you have cold nights in winter, and you are diminishing the chances of promotion of the railway mail clerks who are now actively employed in the railway mail service. I think the committee will come to the conclusion that it is unjust to take a course of this kind.

Mr. ELLIS. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has quite a logical mind. It would appear to me to be perfectly plain. These men engaged in inside work are usually persons who have filled the positions of railway mail clerks, and it would be somewhat unfair to say that they should not have the chance of promotion simply because they have been taken inside. I think every man in the railway mail service should be allowed to look forward to the chance of promotion in the railway mail service. When the hon. Postmaster General has made the provision that men shall serve five years on the train he has made a liberal provision in respect to these men.

Mr. DAVIN. The clause to which this amendment refers, is as follows :—

> Except in British Columbia, no person shall be eligible to be appointed such superintendent unless he has served at least ten years as a railway mail clerk.

Under that clause not one of these six men in the inside service, who had not served for ten years, would be eligible, and what the hon. Minister wants to do now, at the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), is to say, or, at least, what it comes to, is this :

> Except in British Columbia, no person shall be eligible to be appointed as superintendent unless he has served at least five years as a railway mail clerk.

Mr. ELLIS. That is it ; that is not so very bad.

Mr. DAVIN. If he is going to do it in that way, then, any of the railway mail clerks who have been five years in the service might be made a superintendent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The clause will then read as follows :—

> Except in British Columbia, no person shall be eligible to be appointed such superintendent unless he has served at least ten years in the railway mail service, at least one-half of which period shall have been passed as a railway mail clerk.

That means ten years in the railway mail service, one-half of which must be served as a railway mail clerk.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if the gentlemen who have been selected already to act as superintendents have had ten years' experience in the railway mail service ? Has any difficulty been experienced in selecting from the men who have served ten years as railway mail clerks and have these gentlemen been qualified in that way to act as superintendents ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would say to the committee that there always have been superintendents in the service, and I have not displaced any superintendents except where there has been an abo-

lition of centres. I have never had occasion to see whether the present superintendents have served ten years or not as I have taken them as I found them. I have only made one appointment of a superintendent, and that was in the case of Mr. Plumb in the Ottawa division. I think that is the only appointment I have had to do with as superintendent. Mr. Plumb was appointed superintendent on my recommendation on the 1st of July, 1897. He was appointed mail clerk on the 23rd May, 1882, so that he had been fifteen years in the railway mail service.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if Mr. McLeod was more than ten years on the road ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What division is he in ?

Mr. CLARKE. Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not recollect the case of Mr. McLeod. I simply appointed those that the controller selected. I do not know all the mail clerks. The controller is an old officer in the department; he organized the branch, and every recommendation he made I acted upon. I do not consider myself competent to sit in judgment upon him, because his branch is a most responsible one; he is responsible to me, and, of course, I to Parliament for the choice made.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. Minister say what set of circumstances are before his mind that suggests this reform ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), to begin with, that I have no object whatever in view except to make the measure a good one in the public service. First of all, if he has any suspicion that any person is in question, let me disabuse his mind of that. It is not the case. The controller called my attention to this provision of the Act. He thinks it is not advisable to shut out from promotion to the office of superintendent those of the staff in the railway mail service who are in the inside. He wants to be able to draw from the active mail clerks, for superintendents or deputy superintendents, the most efficient men in the service. If, to-day, he wished to transfer to the inside service a railway mail clerk, who had been only eight or nine years acting as a railway mail clerk, he would for ever make it impossible for that man to be a superintendent. That is not a desirable state of affairs. It would render him ineligible for promotion should a vacancy occur, and this Bill simply enlarges the class from which superintendents may be chosen, yet will limit it to those who are engaged in the practical working of the railway mail service, and, when I have changed the time, to at least, five years, my hon. friend should be satisfied.

Mr. DAVIN. On whose suggestion is the promotion to be made ? The hon. Minister gets advice from somebody. Who advises him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The controller.

Mr. DAVIN. Are those who are in the office constantly in contact with the controller ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not in his office. A superintendent is a man under him; the controller is over all. He does not come in contact with the men in the office except he might do so in Ottawa. He is stationed in Ottawa, while the superintendents and staffs are in the cities and railway centres of Canada. He may not see them any more frequently than he sees the railway mail clerks.

Mr. BENNETT. When a man accepts an office at the present time under what is known as a railway mail superintendent, he accepts it with the full knowledge of what his duties will be. That is to say, that his duties will be of a clerical character appertaining exclusively to inside work. The position of railway mail clerk is one of the greatest danger, and rarely a serious accidents takes place that a mail clerk is not found among the killed or injured. In addition to that, there is great danger to the health of these clerks, for while working in a heated car in winter with their coats off, as is necessary for the despatch of their work, the door has to be opened every few minutes, so that the clerk is liable to catch cold, and the experience is, I think, that few of those clerks live to an old age. These clerks know now, that after they have been ten years in the service they may attain to the better position of a railway mail superintendent, but under the proposed system in the Bill, a clerk in the inside office who has not undergone the risk, may get that promotion. There is a Mr. Croker, in the Toronto division, under Mr. McLeod. I know him personally, and to my knowledge he has been more than ten years in the Toronto postal division. Now, the Postmaster General might appoint Mr. Croker to the position of superintendent if even he served five years on the cars, notwithstanding that he has been for years discharging the quiet work of the inside duties of the office. There are clerks in the Toronto division who, I assume from their age, have been running on the road for over twenty-five years, taking all risks to their life and health, and yet, if this clause goes into force the controller might recommend a man who has only served five years on the road. It seems to me that this clause is unfair to the men who have been running for a good number of years on the road. The best proof that there is no necessity for the amendment is that when the present service was organized every gentleman chosen as superintendent

was taken from the clerks who had been running on the trains. It was pointed out by the hon. member (Mr. Davin) that the controller, in moving about the country will necessarily come in contact with the clerks in the different divisional offices, and he will probably make acquaintances in these offices when he would not in all probability meet the clerks running on the railway. The result might be that the controller would select men in the offices and not men who had been exclusively engaged in the railway mail service. Considering the risk to the health and life of these mail clerks, I do not think that their only hope of promotion should be removed by this Bill.

Mr. MOORE. The point taken by the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is quite forcible, but it occurs to me that what the country requires is, that a man should have experience enough on the road to make an efficient officer. If ten years' service is liable to imperil the man's health, it would be better to take him off the road after five years than to keep him on the road until his health is ruined. Five years is long enough for a man to inform himself of all the details of the work in the division to which he is appointed ; and, consequently, I think the proposition in the Bill is a reasonable one.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE. The Postmaster General promised last session, I think, that he would give consideration to the question of insuring the lives of railway mail clerks. As my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out, these officers have particularly arduous duties to perform and they are obliged to work in a part of the train where if an accident occurs, they are specially liable to be injured. Has the Postmaster General made any progress in working out a scheme for giving to the families of the mail clerks some security in the way of insuring the lives of these officers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think I promised to bring down any scheme of that kind. I recognize the special risk that this class of officers run, but, perhaps, it is a risk that they have to take. When there are accidents they have their claims against the railway company, if the railway company is responsible for the accident, and I know that in many instances the railway companies have been found responsible. For example, very recently an accident happened between Toronto and Ottawa, in which one railway mail clerk was killed and another seriously injured, and I have been told that the injured clerk received a considerable sum of money from the railway company. Since taking office I have had to deal with a number of cases where there was no recourse against the railway, and the House has been good enough to adopt several proposals providing compassionate allowances. As long as Parliament is willing to proceed in that way, and until some other scheme is adopted, that, perhaps, is the best insurance that the mail clerks can have. I do not know that Parliament is prepared to assume a legal responsibility for the mail clerks, that would be simply relieving railway companies of their liability. The country ought not be liable for the railway companies if the railway companies, which are primarily liable, must give compensation.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask the Postmaster General whether he has considered the matter which I brought before him in previous sessions, with regard to giving to the mail clerks in Manitoba and the North-west Territories an extra allowance to meet the increased cost of living in Manitoba and the Territories as compared with other parts of Canada, and of which extra allowance these officials have been deprived. I wish the hon. gentleman would consider that.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 137) further to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters. He said : When I introduced the Bill, I explained its object and purport. It is a declaratory Act to remove a doubt as to the meaning of the law prohibiting the depositing of ballast in public streams of less than 12 fathoms in depth. The question was raised, whether the law would interfere with the discretion of port wardens, within the limits of a public harbour, to order ballast to be deposited in a certain place. The Bill contains a proviso declaring that the Act does not interfere with the provisions of the Harbour-masters' Act in that regard. That is the only alteration made.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the Ottawa River is to-day full of new sawdust, floating down the stream and destroying the river, as it has been doing for years, notwithstanding that there is a law on the statute-book prohibiting it. I would like the Minister to explain to the House why he permits the law to be flagrantly violated right under his eyes every day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman should not put it in that way—why I permit the law to be violated under my eyes. It is not my special province to attend to it. The law makes any person who deposits sawdust in the river, liable to a penalty, and anybody can sue for it.

Mr. WALLACE. Have not the Government given permission ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, that has all expired. The Government gave no permission. Parliament extended the exemption to the Ottawa River up to the 1st of June last. I may say, in fairness to some of the gentlemen who are still depositing sawdust, that an experiment was made last year for the purpose of utilizing this sawdust; and I am informed by those engaged in the experiment, that it has proved eminently successful, and they are now actually constructing, on the foundation of the old Booth mill, which was burned some years ago, a large mill for the purpose of consuming the sawdust. A very large amount of money is being expended in the construction of the mill, and a large amount will be expended in its operation. I have a letter from Mr. Booth, making that statement, which I shall be glad to bring down, when we go into Supply. He hopes that the sawdust not only will not be dumped in the river, but will be used in a most lucrative way by those engaged in the enterprise.

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose there was no such establishment, as there is not to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, they are liable for the penalties to anybody who chooses to prosecute them.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 29th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TIME FOR POSTING PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. SCRIVER moved:

That the time for posting private Bills under rule 60 be reduced from one week to three days for the remainder of the session, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 8th report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. WALLACE.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 166) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 165) to incorporate the Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 164)—from the Senate—respecting Loan Companies.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Bill (No. 163)—from the Senate—further to amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to some typographical errors in the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of the 28th June, 1899, where the resolution that was moved by me is printed. On page 530, about the 17th line from the top, "1899" should be "1896." On the same page, about the 18th line, where the name of the Hon. Clifford Sifton is printed, "not a member of this House" should be "not then a member of this House." On page 540, about the middle of the page, the words "representing in writing" should be "represented in writing." On page 541, about the 18th line "gross abuses" should be "gross abuse." On page 543, 13th line, the word "enforced" is used instead of "imposed." On page 547, "Harpsr" is printed for "Harper" in the middle of the page.

Mr. BERGERON. I am informed that the French copy is a great deal worse. The translation is badly done, and the name of Mr. Walsh appears in two or three places where another name was used, making the thing perfectly incomprehensible. If corrections are to be made, the French translation should also be revised.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Clerk of the House has taken a note of the corrections, and will see that the motion as printed is made to agree with the manuscript, and that the French translation is revised.

CONSTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT YUKON TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. FOSTER (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. What was the date of the Order in Council authorizing the construction of a Government telegraph line into the Yukon?
2. What amount of money has been expended to date on this work?
3. From what moneys voted by Parliament have these expenditures been paid?
4. Have the supplies so far purchased for this work been purchased by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I beg to reply: 1. 13th March,

1899. 2. The sum of $15,000 was advanced to Mr. J. B. Charleson upon his departure for the Yukon, to be accounted for by him with properly certified vouchers. In the discussion of the subject a few days ago, I stated, on the authority of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, who was in attendance at the time, that the amount of this advance was $13,000. The deputy has since informed me that in his statement to me, speaking from memory, he confused this advance with one that had been made to another official. The correct amount is $15,000. In that amount was included the sum of $2,500 specially chargeable to telegraph lines in British Columbia. As soon as Mr. Charleson's accounts come in and all the bills rendered for supplies are examined and certified to by him and the apportionment made, we will be able to say how much of the advance made is applicable to the telegraph construction. 3. The above advance has been drawn as follows:—$10,000 from the appropriation for "surveys," for which a vote of $25,000 was granted at the last session of Parliament; $2,500 from the appropriation for "Dredging, B.C.," for which a vote of $15,000 was also granted for the current fiscal year; and $2,500 from the appropriation for "Telegraphs in B. C.," for which there is a vote of $12,000. 4. Quotations for the wire were asked for from two firms in eastern Canada: Messrs. Lewis Bros. & Co., of Montreal, and Mr. W. G. Charleson, of Ottawa. The quotation of Mr. W. G. Charleson, of Ottawa, was the lowest and the contract was awarded to him. The other supplies were obtained by Mr. Charleson, superintendent of works, without tender.

CHANGES IN LIGHTING PARLIAMENTARY CLOCK.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Dugas) asked:

1. Has the light in the tower of the Parliament buildings been changed?
2. Since when, and why?
3. What advantage has been gained?
4. By whom has the new light been furnished?
5. What amount was saved per night, if any?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I beg to reply: 1. There has been a change in the lighting of the dials of the clock. 2. Recently; to try a new system. 3. Better light at one-fifth the cost. 4. The Ottawa Electric Company supplied the light under the old system and under the new. 5. The dials were previously lighted by four 50 candle power lamps each, making sixteen 50 c.p. lamps in all, at a cost of $100 per annum. They are now lighted by one 40 c.p. lamp each or four 40 c.p. lamps in all, at $20 per annum for the whole. The economy is effected by a change of system.

ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Have any petitions been received by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, or any other member of the Government, protesting against or in favour of the latest reduction in docking rates at the Esquimalt dry dock?
2. If so, when were they received, and who are the signers of the same?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). No such petitions have as yet been received. But we have a telegram from a Mr. Shaw stating that a monster petition was being signed and would be forwarded. Written protests against the reduction of rates at the Esquimalt graving dock have been received from the following:—E. P. Davis, dated 3rd June, 1899; Hon. F. Peters, on behalf of Mrs. Bullen & Co., dated 12th June, 1899; Victoria Board of Trade, dated 14th June, 1899; Vancouver Board of Trade, dated 15th June, 1899.

EXTENSION OF LOBSTER FISHING SEASON.

Mr. McLELLAN (by Mr. Gibson) asked:

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries determined upon any extension of the lobster fishing season for Prince Edward Island?
2. If so, in what localities will such extension apply this year?
3. What will be the limit of such extension?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I beg to reply: 1. Yes, to report to Council favourably. 2. To those localities defined by the report of the Lobster Commission between West Point and Carleton Head in Northumberland Straits. 3. Up to and including the 31st day of July.

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Has the Government awarded the contract for the erection of the drill hall in Vancouver, B.C.?
2. If so, to whom, and at what price?
3. Does the contract awarded, if any, include all the work required to complete the building in accordance with the plans and specifications as approved by the Minister of Militia and Defence?
4. How many tenders were received for the work, from whom received, and at what figures?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The contract has not been awarded. It is not expedient, before the signing of a contract, to give the information that is asked for.

DRY DOCKS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I beg to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution, which His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter thereof, recommends to the House :—

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend chap. 17 of 45 Vic., 1882, entitled : "An Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them," by providing, in lieu of section 1 of said Act, that if any incorporated company approved by the Governor in Council as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with Her Majesty to construct a dry dock for the reception and repairing of vessels, at a place, and according to a plan and specification providing for all proper and necessary equipment, machinery and plant, such plan and specification to be approved by the Governor in Council on a report by the Minister of Public Works as sufficient for the requirements of the public at such place, and to be completed within a time to be limited by such agreement, then, provided the company performs the work according to such agreement and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose department the work shall be done ; the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, of a subsidy not exceeding two per centum per annum on the cost of the work, during twenty years from the time of its completion and acceptance by the said Minister : provided, that such subsidy shall not exceed $20,000 per annum, and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said Minister ; and the subsidy shall not be payable for any portion of the said twenty years during which the dock shall not be in complete repair and working order ; and that it is expedient to further provide that if any incorporated company approved by the Governor in Council as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with Her Majesty to enlarge and extend any existing dock for the reception and repairing of vessels according to a plan and specification approved by the Governor in Council on a report of the Minister of Public Works as sufficient for the requirements of the public where the said existing dock is located, and to be completed within a time limited by such agreement, then, provided the company performs the work according to such agreement and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose department the work shall be done, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, of a subsidy not exceeding two per centum per annum on the cost of the work during twenty years from the time of its acceptance by the said Minister : provided that such subsidy shall not exceed $10,000, and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work incident to such enlargement and extension as estimated by the said Minister, nor shall such subsidy be payable for any portion of the said twenty years during which the dock shall not be in complete repair and working order.

Mr. FIELDING.

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply and the amendment of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper thereto.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The somewhat premature breakdown of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), after speaking only nine hours upon this motion, made it necessary for me to arrange that I should not proceed to reply until this afternoon. According to rumour, the hon. gentleman spent between three and six months in preparing his motion and the oration to which he treated this House during the last two days of its sittings. And I should have thought that the hon. gentleman would see fit, at an early period of his remarks, to place in some intelligible form before the House grounds upon which he is asking that this proceeding be taken. However, after speaking seven hours and a half upon other, and largely irrelevant, subjects, the hon. gentleman condescended to state, in some degree, the evidence upon which he intended to rely as grounds for the proceeding which he was asking the House to take. The House will at once perceive that, as these references were read rapidly, it was most difficult, in fact quite impossible for me to appreciate their significance, so that I was compelled to leave over my remarks upon the subject until to-day, in order that I might have an opportunity of looking at a report of the hon. gentleman's speech and judging of the significance of that which he has laid before the House.

It was a matter of common knowledge for some time before the present session of Parliament began, that the hon. gentleman had charged himself with the duty of leading an attack upon the Administration in connection with the affairs of the Yukon district. He made that attack ; and the circumstances of that attack and the manner in which it was made are within the memory and the knowledge of the House. I replied to the hon. gentleman at that time. I went somewhat fully into the history of the administration of the district, and I think I showed, to the satisfaction of the House and to the satisfaction of the country, that there had been no neglect and no mismanagement, so far as the Government itself was concerned. And I stated then, fully and fairly, what the position of the Government was. I pointed out that the government of the Yukon had been organized as early as possible last summer, and that officers who had been sent there, had since been in charge, and that, so far as known, no serious complaint, nothing that could be called a complaint, had

been made in regard to the administration of affairs since Mr. Ogilvie and his coadjutors took charge. And it is, therefore,—and I desire to call the attention of the House somewhat closely to the fact—in reality, in regard to the administration from the spring of 1898, when Major Walsh left—some time in the month of June—to the month of September, when Mr. Ogilvie took charge, that these questions altogether arise. The hon. gentleman seems to have realized, in the address he formerly delivered on this question, that it was necessary for him to make some strong statements in order that he might justify the position he took. And he did make a number of very strong statements. I went into those statements and analysed them carefully, with all the information that was at my disposal or at the disposal of the officers of the department. I showed how foundationless, how groundless, they were. I showed that, in every case in which a specific statement of fact had been made, where the means of investigation were at my disposal, the statement was untrue; and I concluded my remarks by saying that I did not think that a speech had ever been made in this Parliament that contained so many untrue statements as that made by the hon. gentleman. It is worthy of remark that, up to this moment, no gentleman on the other side of the House has seen fit to controvert my remarks in that respect. But the hon. gentleman has learned caution since his effort. It was expected, I think, by the members of the House that he would be more specific, when he came to deal with the question again. But the hon. gentleman is not more specific: he is very much less specific. If anybody will take the trouble to read the motion—I suppose we must call it a motion—which has been placed before the House, a document which takes, I think, one hour and fifteen minutes, by the standard time, to read, I think he will see that the greatest possible care has been taken, in nearly every possible case, to avoid anything in the nature of a specific statement, to avoid giving anything that would enable anybody to understand what the statement was intended to refer to. And let me point out to my hon. friend, and to the House—not so much, I may say, to my hon. friend as to the House—that in one special case, where the hon. gentleman undertook to charge me with impropriety, to say that a lawyer in Victoria had applied to me by letter, or by telegram, for the purpose of getting a liquor permit, and had obtained it by letter, or telegram, and had charged a large sum therefor, I denied that statement, I denied it point-blank upon the spot, and I deny it now, for there is not a solitary word of truth in it. Now, in that case, what does the hon. gentleman do? In this very resolution is a clause intended to convey to the public the impression that he is reiterating that charge. I will read that clause in a little while—I cannot find it at the moment. I would not take the trouble to refer to it, if it were not for the fact that it shows the principle upon which this resolution has been framed. The clause in the resolution to which I refer says that a Liberal lawyer was enabled, by reason of political influence to charge a sum of money—for what? Was it to get a permit, as the hon. gentleman said, when he charged me before? No, but to get the recognition of a permit that had been issued by the Government of the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman had made a specific charge against me, which charge I had denied. Now, the hon. gentleman was called upon to do one of two things, either to stand to his guns, to repeat his charge and try to prove it, or to accept my denial. But he does not do either. I explained that there was not a shadow of truth in the charge; I pointed out to the House just what had been done. I desired to put the House in the fullest possession of the facts. I explained that I had had correspondence by telegraph with Mr. Archer Martin, that Mr. Martin had telegraphed to me, asking me to issue authority to recognize a permit that had been issued by the Government of the North-west Territories. I was advised by the Minister of Justice that the permit was a legal permit and ought to be recognized, so I telegraphed Mr. Martin in reply to that effect. If the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had telegraphed me in the same way, he would have had the same answer; if the holder of the permit, or any one else, had telegraphed me to the same effect, he would have had the same answer. I had the opinion of the Department of Justice that the permit was good and legal, and I simply acted on that. And that simple and proper transaction, which I explained to this House fully and completely, the hon. gentleman has drawn his clause in this resolution to cover with the object of making it appear that he is reiterating the statement which he made here before, and which he is utterly incapable of substantiating. That will give the House a slight idea of the honesty of purpose with which the various clauses of these resolutions have been drawn, and of the hon. gentleman's idea of fairness in political debate, and of his anxiety, which he declared to us at such wearisome length during the last two days, that everything should be done fairly, and properly, and honourably for the sake of the good name of Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman does not stop there. He goes on in the same way all through those resolutions, and we find that wherever there is any danger that the resolution might convey an idea of what the specific charge was, it is put in such language that no possible information upon the subject can

be gathered. Now listen. The hon. gentleman charged me that a lawyer in Victoria had got $500 for telegraphing or writing to get a permit, which I denied. Now this is what he says :

> That application to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and political influence became and was necessary in order to secure respect for permits issued under the law, and a Liberal lawyer was enabled to charge a large sum to secure the good offices of the Minister in consequences of irregular and illegal conduct under his administration.

He has drawn it in such a way that the facts, the perfectly proper facts which I laid before this House, may support a charge which he intends that the public shall understand as a reiteration of the charge from which he has backed down because he knows he cannot prove it. Then we find a statement that an officer of the Government was guilty of a certain thing. An officer of the Government—no name, no particular. We find the statement that officials of the Government have been guilty of fraud. Did ever anybody hear of a charge being brought against an official in that way, or a Government being asked to indict publicly the official administration of a whole district upon the statement that officials of the Government have been guilty of fraud ?

But before dealing with those phases of the question, I desire to take up that particular phase which is personal to myself and personal to other members of the Government. For some reason which I have not yet been able to fathom, it has fallen to my lot, since I have been a member of this Government, to be subjected to a peculiarly virulent and constant stream of abuse. I have no knowledge of the reason. I have no complaint to make of it, if it suits the gentlemen who are politically associated with him on the other side of the House. But I am satisfied that it does not affect the reputation which I enjoy amongst my own friends. Rather the contrary, Mr. Speaker, would any friends that I might possess be influenced to stand more firmly by me when unreasoning abuse and vilification are directed against me. Well, amongst the gentlemen who seem to have conceived—I do not know what it might be called, an unusual amount of venom and bitterness against me—is this hon. gentleman who represents Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in this House. I need not call to the attention of the members of the House the fact that this hon. gentleman seems to have been delegated to make an attempt upon every possible occasion and in every possible way to lead the House of Commons and the people of Canada to suppose that there is something radically wrong, vicious and defective about my public conduct. I am bound to say that during the last few days he has transferred his attention considerably to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), but until that time I think I was easily the first in the hon. gentleman's consideration.

Now, every one who was in this House when the hon. gentleman spoke of this question upon the Address, will remember the manner in which he spoke, the style of his utterance, and the insinuations that he conveyed from beginning to end of his remarks. Everything that it was possible for him to do without making a specific and definite statement, to convey the impression, to lead the public to believe that I was personally corrupt and personally involved in improper transactions in the administration of this district, he did. Not only has the hon. gentleman done that, but the press which supports my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House, have been extremely liberal in insinuations of improper, dishonest and corrupt conduct on my part. Therefore, it becomes a matter of some interest to the House of Commons, the majority of whom are responsible for my political conduct, now to appreciate the position which these gentlemen take at the culmination of their efforts upon this subject. The hon. gentleman, as I said, has spent six months in preparing himself. He has placed in your hands a resolution which, as I said, took an hour and fifteen minutes to read, and in that resolution, Mr. Speaker, he has not dared to make one single charge of personal dishonesty or corruption against me or any member of the Government. That is the position to which the hon. gentleman has brought himself by the proceeding which he has taken. Now, Sir, that of itself would not be discreditable to the hon. gentleman if he were prepared to take a manly position in connection with it, and I do not see why a manly opponent should not take such a position. Sir, in the few years I have been in political life, I have never charged an opponent of mine with corruption ; I have never, upon a public platform or in the legislature where I last sat, or here—I have never charged in my life a political opponent with corruption or with dishonest conduct, and I do not think my political career has been any less successful on that account. It would not be any discredit to the hon. gentleman to say : I do not believe in your administration, I think your administration has been incapable, I think your officials are corrupt ; but let us fight it out on that basis as gentlemen should. But the hon. gentleman has not done that, he has taken an entirely different position ; and I propose to show, I think to the satisfaction of this House, that when the hon. gentleman stood here and undertook to risk his position as a public man, he will not have very much of a position to risk by the time I have finished. What does he say in the first place ? He starts in by saying that the Minister of the Interior has been guilty of scandalous neglect, delay and mismanagement. Now, I want the members of the House of Com-

mons to pause for a moment and think of a gentleman who has been Minister of Justice for Canada, proposing to refer to a commission of judges the charge that a Minister of the Crown has been guilty of delay and mismanagement in connection with the Yukon. Members of the House of Commons of the least experience will know that the highest functions of a House of Parliament is to decide whether a Minister has been guilty of delay or mismanagement. Since when, Mr. Speaker, was the conduct of a Minister of the Crown, was the question as to whether a Minister was to remain in office or not, was the question whether his administration was effective or not to be settled by a commission of judges? If in any sense I have been guilty of neglect I will answer for my conduct to the House of Commons; I will answer for my administration of the Yukon, and I will place that administration beside the administration of these hon. gentlemen, beside their mismanagement of the North-west Territories, which became a byword all through that country. This hon. gentleman says that I have been guilty of partiality and favouritism. What are partiality and favouritism? If I have been guilty of partiality and favouritism in the discharge of my office, if in the exercise of the powers conferred upon me by law, he means that when I wanted to appoint somebody to office, that I was partial to my friends, the Liberals as against the Conservatives, if that is what the hon. gentleman means, it is true; there is no question about that. But that is not a misdemeanour: that is a question of policy. I imagine I see a commission of judges sitting upon the question as to whether a Minister has been guilty of partiality or favouritism. That would be rather a new departure in the proceedings of constitutional government. Let me say that every member of this House, who has any experience in connection with matters of this kind, knows that you could not get a respectable judge in Canada to accept a commission of that kind, or for one instant to undertake an investigation into a question of administration which is in conflict between the members of the Opposition and the Government. What does the hon. gentleman do? He says the Minister of the Interior has been guilty of favouritism and corruption. I will read it:

That the Hon. Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, has been guilty of favouritism and partiality——

Not corruption; he did not say corruption. He was careful not to say it.

——in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon in the North-west Territories.

Now, what follows? He does not say "in proof of that" he cites the following, but he cites the following in order that it may be taken as proof of it:—

That as appears by a Return (83), 3rd Session, 8th Parliament, 61 Victoria, 1898 (Canada), the following parties applied for and obtained leases of gold placer mining or gold dredging areas in the Yukon district:—

A. E. Philp, said to be of Brandon, for a lease on Bonanza Creek.

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on S. Fork (Stewart).

G. Philp, said to be of London, for lease on B. Salmon.

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Indian River or Creek.

J. A. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Teslin River or Creek.

A. D. Cameron, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Stewart's River or Creek.

That Mr. A. E. Philp and Mr. A. D. Cameron, aforesaid, were partners in business with the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, when that gentleman became Minister of the Interior, and all were members of the firm of Sifton, Philp & Cameron, of Brandon.

These gentlemen were partners of mine until I became Minister of the Interior, not "when," but a short time before that partnership was dissolved:

That by the said return, it further appears that W. J. Lindsay, said to be of Ottawa, P. C. Mitchell, said to be of Brandon, and W. L. Parish, said to be of Ottawa, applied for dredging leases in the Yukon, whereas these gentlemen were residents of Brandon who first learned of these applications by a letter from A. E. Philp, aforesaid, advising them that these leases had been granted in their names and inclosing a power of attorney from each of them in favour of said Philp, to enable him to dispose of them.

That in the list contained in the said return are the names and addresses of the following purporting to be applicants for dredging leases:—

F. Burnett, Vancouver.
F. Burnett, Colborne.
J. G. Burnett, Edmonton.
F. Burnett, Colborne.
Frank Burnett, Brandon.

Whereas F. Burnett was never in Colborne in his life, but said Philp came from that place.

These are two remarkable statements to appear in a state document. These are all the allegations that refer to this particular matter. The hon. gentleman says that I was guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of my department, and he cites as a reason, that certain gentlemen, who were formerly partners of mine, have procured certain dredging leases as shown by this return. Now, I desire to point out that, if the facts, as stated, were correct, it would not be proof of either partiality or favouritism. The regulations, which are published regarding the mining affairs of Canada, give to every citizen of Canada the same right, and I have no power on earth, justly or properly, in administering my department, nor have the officers in that department any right or power to refuse Mr. Philp, or Mr. Cameron, or anybody else, his just rights under these regulations. If these gentlemen file applications in my department, and under these regulations they are dealt with by the chief clerk of the department, they are entitled to what they are

assigned by that clerk, and neither I nor anybody else has a right to deprive them of that. It would be rather a peculiar doctrine that, because a man had been my partner, he would not be entitled to the same rights as any other citizen in connection with the affairs of the Government of Canada. But while this is abundantly clear it is not at all necessary for us to settle that point in connection with this particular transaction. I have in my hands Return No. 83, which the hon. gentleman cites in this resolution, the product of three months of assiduous and careful labour by the hon. gentleman; I have in my hand this return which the hon. gentleman cites as proof of the statement which he makes. Would you believe it that the hon. gentleman cannot read a return when it is brought down to the House of Commons? What does the return show? The return shows that Mr. Philp, and all these gentlemen who are named never got any leases of any kind whatever. One would expect, that, when the hon. gentleman takes three months to prepare a motion and moves for returns, and when returns are brought down and laid on the Table of the House, that he could read them. A boy ten years old would not have made the blunder that the hon. gentleman has made. Here it is—a lease on Bonanza Creek to A. E. Philp. Here at the top of the return are the names of the persons who have applied for leases to dredge the localities, and so forth. The various columns are all worked out so that anybody could see—"name of applicant," "address," "river or creek," "number of miles leased," "rent paid," "assigned." Here we have:

Name of applicant, A. E. Philp; address, Brandon; river or creek, Bonanza; No. of miles, leased, none.

Every one of these gentlemen is in the same position. On page 10:

Philp, A. E., address, Ottawa; river or creek, South Fork, Stewart; number of miles leased, none; rent paid, none.

The clerk of the Mining Branch informs me that Mr. Philp was staying in Ottawa at the time, and he wrote his letter from the Russell House, Ottawa. The clerk got the letter here and took his name down as belonging to Ottawa, and so, that is the fraud, that is the corruption, that is the rascality on the part of the department, which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) refers to. The fact that a man came here and wrote a letter of application from the Russell House, and that the clerk of the Mining Branch entered his address as Ottawa, is cited here as a fraud by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). So, we see that in this case, Mr. Philp got no lease and paid no rent. Again, on page 16 of the return:

Name of applicant, G. Philp,——

That should be A. E. Philp.

Name of applicant, A. E. Philp; address, ——; river or creek, Big Salmon; number of miles leased, none; rent paid, none.

Name of applicant, A. E. Philp; address, Ottawa; river or creek, Indian; number of miles leased, none; rent paid, none.

F. A. Philp,——

It is printed here "F. A.," but it should be "E. A."

Name of applicant, E. A. Philp; address, Ottawa; river or creek, Teslin; number of miles leased, none; rent paid, none.

Again, on page 17:

Name of applicant, A. D. Cameron; address, Ottawa; river or creek, Stewart; number of miles leased, none; rent paid, none.

That is a proof of gross favouritism and partiality, according to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). While I am on this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement to the House, just briefly, because it may be a matter of some interest to some of my hon. friends. I am aware of the fact that some of my hon. friends have, perhaps, thought that I was a little lacking in personal attention to matters connected with the Mining Branch, when applications were made to me. I want to say this to them. It has been my invariable rule since I took charge of that department, to exercise no discretion whatever in connection with mining applications of an individual character. When an application comes in for a mining concession of any kind, it goes to Mr. Ryley, the chief clerk of the branch, and it never comes to me unless it is a case in which Mr. Ryley has to ask for instructions, cannot deal with it under the regulations, or in which there is some confusion or some doubt concerning which he thinks he ought to have the direction of the Minister. If it is a matter for which there is no regulation, then it is brought before me in order that I may consider whether special action should be taken in regard to it or not. Now, Sir, as to these applications for dredging and mining concessions in the Yukon which are referred to by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), the fact is, that I absolutely knew nothing of any one of them, that I absolutely had nothing whatever to do with them. I framed the regulations after consultation with Mr. Ryley, and then I said to Mr. Ryley: Now, I do not want to know the name of a single man making application for a lease; I want you to take these papers and deal with them according to the regulations, each on its merit, and according to their priority as each man is entitled to them under the regulations. I am perfectly aware of the fact that such a course prevented me from giving any of my friends any particular favours, or leaning the scale one way or the other in their favour. I was satisfied to take that position, and I am satisfied that every mem-

ber of this House—and there are many of them—who have come to my office and consulted me about mining matters, will remember that the course I have adopted on every occasion has been to refer them to the regulations, or to the clerk of the department who had charge of that work.

Now, Sir, I have taken the trouble upon this particular point to procure from the chief clerk of the Mining Branch a statement which I will lay upon the Table of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This gentleman is not an officer appointed by me; although I do not know that he would be any the worse if he were, but he is not. He was appointed by the late Government, and he is an excellent, praiseworthy and competent officer, so far as I am aware, and I have had a very large amount of business in connection with that branch, which has brought me closely in contact with him. I took the statements of which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had made, sent them to Mr. Ryley, and asked him what he had to say in regard to them, because if there were any partiality or favouritism in connection with the transaction it would be the clerks of the department who are guilty and not me. This is the reply which Mr. Ryley made:

Department of the Interior,
Ottawa, June 28th, 1899.

Memorandum.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, in the course of his speech, stated that the Hon. Clifford Sifton had been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon in the North-west Territories.

With reference to this assertion, I may say that favouritism and partiality in connection with the leasing for dredging purposes of portions of rivers and creeks in the Yukon territory could not have been shown without my knowledge, as all applications passed through my hands and were dealt with personally by me. So soon as regulations for the disposal of leases to dredge for minerals in the beds of rivers were promulgated, I personally asked the Minister of the Interior whether he desired that each application should be submitted to him for his instructions. In reply he instructed me that all the applications should be dealt with strictly in accordance with the provisions of the regulations in that behalf, and according to their priority of date of filing in the department, and that none of the applications need be submitted to him. These instructions were fully carried out, and the first applicant, irrespective of who he was, obtained a lease of the stretch of river applied for, provided he paid the rental within a given period. I may add that the Minister never saw the list of the applications filed in the department until I handed him the return for Parliament, which has been numbered 83.

Sir Charles further stated that it appeared by the reurn 83 that the following parties applied for and obtained leases of good placer mining or gold dredging areas in the Yukon district:—

I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that it would be just as reasonable to suppose that the Minister of the Ontario Government who has charge of the registry offices in that province knew who were the registered owners of land in a remote county of Ontario; as to suppose me to have a personal knowledge of the persons who have mining connections through my department; quite as reasonable. There must be thousands of leases. I brought down a return here at the beginning of the session of Parliament, which, I think, embraced eight or ten thousand names, and it takes a whole staff of clerks to handle it, and the very idea of a Minister having any personal knowledge of them is simply absurd on its face. Mr. Ryley goes on to say:

1. "A. E. Philp, said to be of Brandon, for a lease on Bonanza Creek." Mr. Philp applied for a lease of a portion of this creek, but it was not granted, as will be seen by referring to page 4 of the said return.

2. "A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on South Fork of Stewart River." Mr. Philp was in Ottawa at the time the application was made. No lease was issued in favour of Mr. Philp, as will be seen by referring to page 10 of the said return.

3. "G. Philp, said to be of London, for lease on Big Salmon." No lease was issued in favour to Mr. G. Philp, as will be seen by referring to page 16 of the said return.

The hon. gentleman seems to have neglected to refer to the return—

4. "A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Dominion River or Creek." Mr. Philp did not receive a lease, as will be seen by referring to page 17 of the return.

5. "J. A. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Teslin River or Creek." This should be "F. A. Philp," who applied for a lease on Teslin River, but no lease was issued, as will be seen by referring to page 18 of the said return.

6. "A. D. Cameron, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Stewart River or Creek." No lease was issued in favour of Mr. Cameron, as will be seen by referring to page 17 of the said return.

7. "That by the said return it further appears that W. J. Lindsay, said to be of Ottawa, P. C. Mitchell, said to be of Brandon, and W. L. Parish, said to be of Ottawa, applied for dredging leases in the Yukon, whereas these gentlemen were residents of Brandon who first learned of these applications by a letter from A. E. Philp, aforesaid, advising them that these leases had been granted in their names and inclosing a power of attorney from each of them in favour of said Philp to enable him to dispose of them." The name of Mr. W. J. Lindsay appears on page 4 of the return as an applicant for a lease of a portion of Stewart River, but no lease was issued in his favour.

Mr. P. C. Mitchell obtained a lease, as will be seen by referring to page 4 of the return.

Mr. W. L. Parish received a lease of 10 miles of the Hcotalinqua, which will be seen by referring to page 3 of the return.

Sir Charles further stated "that in the list contained in the said return are the names and addresses of the following, purporting to be ap-

plicants for dredging leases :—Frank Burnett, Vancouver ; F. Burnett, Colborne ; J. G. Burnett, Edmonton ; F. Burnett, Colborne ; F. Burnett, Brandon ; whereas Frank Burnett was never in Colborne in his life, but said Philp comes from that place."

It appears that Mr. Philp was acting as Mr. Burnett's attorney.

The applications from Mr. Burnett headed Colborne were forwarded to this department by Mr. Philp when he was on a visit to that place, and as the letters were headed "Colborne," the return gave that place as his address.

That seems to be a very natural and ordinary transaction. There does not seem to be any reason why that should be made the subject of a motion in Parliament.

The applications referred to appear on pages 4, 5, 10 and 14. J. G. Burnett lives at Edmonton, and his application was not filed in this department by Mr. Philp.

(Sgd.) G. U. RYLEY,
Chief Clerk, Timber and Mines Branch.

Now, I have given the statement of a man who has something to lose. This gentleman is a permanent officer of the department. His career for life would be ruined, absolutely ruined, if a word of that statement could be shown to be false. And that statement, let the House understand, is not volunteered by Mr. Ryley at all. It is a statement which I asked him to make, which as head of this department I required him to make. I am charged by a gentleman on the floor of this House with partiality in connection with a certain branch. I send the applications which came in in connection with that work to this gentleman, who is the head of that branch. I want to know whether any one under him has been guilty of favouritism, and I demand that he shall make a report to me for presentation to Parliament in connection with that matter, and this is that report. The hon. gentleman will not, I think, take much comfort out of that portion of his resolution. Neither do I think the hon. gentleman himself will now conclude that it is necessary to have that assertion referred to a commission of judges to decide.

What further does he do ? I said that I could respect a manly opponent, and I can. I have been in quite a few political contests, some of a rather warm character, and I have never respected a man any the less because he has been a good fighter. But I can see no object whatever in a gentleman insinuating what he cannot prove, making statements which are calculated to leave on the minds of persons who read them, an impression that is not justified by those statements. It is easy, as the hon. gentleman knows, as any lawyer knows, to draw a statement which the casual reader will think is an assertion which is no assertion. Let me give the hon. gentleman a sample of that. The hon. gentleman says, in his resolution, on page 6036 of "Hansard" :

That the said Philp, hereinbefore a partner of the said Minister, represented in writing that he was engaged in a dredging venture in the Yukon, and in endeavouring to induce another to join him, represented in writing that Mr. Sifton, the said Minister, and Major Walsh, were also interested with him, but their names could not appear as he wrote "for obvious reasons."

Now, what is the statement here ? Is the statement that I was interested in that venture ? Does the hon. gentleman take the responsibility of charging me with being interested in that transaction ? No, he does not do anything of the kind. He is afraid to do it ; he dare not do it. Let the hon. gentleman make that charge, and it will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in fifteen minutes. But he wants to refer to a commission of judges—what ? The question of whether or not another man said I was interested. And when we get before the commission of judges, and I say : "I am here to be tried, I am charged with an offence," the hon. gentleman says : "Oh, no ; I did not charge you with an offence, all I have got to prove is that this man said so." Now, Sir, I want the hon. gentleman. I want his friends, to consider for a few minutes whether they think this is the kind of proceeding that the Parliament of Canada ought to be treated with. I told the hon. gentleman what I would do. He said in grandiloquent language that he would read the challenge I made, and that he would take it up. He did not read the challenge and he did not take it up—neither the one nor the other. What did he do ? He read part of the challenge. He left out the part that gave the point to it. On page 6022 of "Hansard" the hon. gentleman refers to the remarks I made on the Address. I closed my remarks by saying this—and hon. gentlemen who were in the House will remember it :

I ought not to sit down without referring to the fact that throughout the speech of the hon. gentleman there has been a continuous trend of suggestions that there was some improper or corrupt connection between myself or some members of the Government with the Klondike district. I want to say that I challenge the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, I challenge the members of his party in this House, I challenge the members of his party outside this House, I challenge the press of his party, to produce their private detectives, to come here upon their responsibility and press their charge. I challenge the member for Pictou or any man in this House, to lay upon the Table of the House the charges he has to make, and declare his ability to substantiate them by evidence, and he will get his investigation, and I will be able to convince the hon. gentleman who makes that charge that discretion on his part would have been the better part of valour.

Now, Sir, what does the hon. gentleman do ? He starts to read my challenge. My challenge was in reference to the charge of personal dishonesty or corruption. I challenged him to make such a charge. He said he would take up the challenge. I leave

the House to say whether he has taken it up or not. There is not the shadow of a charge of personal corruption in the resolution he has moved; and I think that this Government, so far as a question of personal wrongdoing is concerned, needs no better vindication than the fact that the hon. gentleman, after six long months, has been compelled to place on the Table of this House a resolution which is carefully drawn to avoid in the slightest degree any responsibility for the statement that any member of this House has been corrupt or dishonest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the personal matters in relation to this motion may be considered as disposed of; and when the hon. gentleman gets ready to take up my challenge and to make any personal charge against me, he will not require to make a nine hours' speech to get an investigation. He will just require long enough to read his charge and it will be followed by a motion for an investigation. But it will have to be a charge. It will have to be something different from what he has given here. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to write out a statement that somebody else said something about me. He will have to make a charge; he will have to make a definite and positive statement.

I desire to deal somewhat briefly—and I can relieve the anxiety of the House by saying that my remarks are not to be very much extended—with the general question of whether we have been guilty of neglect or delay in connection with the administration of this district. I dealt with that question fully in the debate on the Address, and I think I then succeeded in convincing the House that the charge laid at our door was not justified by the facts, but wholly unwarranted. I want no better evidence that the House was fairly well convinced of the justice of my position in connection with this matter than the fact that throughout the continuance of all that debate, as it went on, after the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), who held the hon. member's brief in his absence, was through, practically the whole case was abandoned by our hon. friends opposite. Certainly, no attempt was made to controvert the position I had taken in connection with the general course of our administration in that district.

Let me briefly put before the House the proceedings that I took. The hon. gentleman went at such length into the details that the House might well be excused for being confused by his lengthy address. If I have any fault to find in connection with this discussion by hon. gentlemen opposite, it is this, that they persisted in discussing this matter as though the administration of the Klondike district had been undertaken under the most usual and ordinary circumstances, in which the same rules could be applied and everything done as though that district were only a few yards away. But we cannot deal with it in that way. I have already pointed out that my attention was first called to the necessities of that district in March, 1897. I was sworn into office in November, 1896, and it was not until after the 1st January that I had practically got down to work. In March of that year, my attention was called to the necessities of the Klondike district. Immediately I took the question up, and decided that some officers of the Government had to be sent there. My hon. friend harps upon the fact that no appointment was made until the 21st May. If he had been studying the Yukon affairs for five or six months now, as he has been pretty steadily, he ought to know that the 21st May would be about the earliest date any of our officers could be despatched, because only then would the rivers be open and people able to get in. We despatched these gentlemen just as soon as it was possible for them to get in. They were sent at the time which the Surveyor General, with all his knowledge of that country, considered the earliest time practicable to send them. No political appointments were made, but the officers of the department were sent, men well recommended for that purpose. When the excitement took place later on, special measures were resorted to. Major Walsh and his officers were appointed, and everybody knows that at the time Major Walsh was appointed, it was a matter of general remark that we had made the very best possible selection for the position. The Government were generally complimented for having selected the man generally regarded as the best qualified to fill the position. I showed before, in discussing the matter, that the men sent out for the purpose of assisting Major Walsh in his administration had been selected on account of their special aptitude and ability for the work, and I explained in detail every particular appointment, and showed conclusively, I think, that every appointment was made carefully, under circumstances which fully justified it. There were difficulties and delays. These difficulties and delays were inseparable from the circumstances of the case. I need not detail all the mishaps and difficulties that took place in our dealings with that far-distant district, from which it was almost impossible to get information, and regarding which calculations turned out differently from what we expected, and all that sort of thing, but every possible effort was made to overtake the work that had to be done. Then, in the last session of Parliament, only a few months after Major Walsh and his party had been sent out, and before they got into Dawson City, I had an Act passed for the purpose of constituting the government of the district. A few days after the beginning of the session, that Act was assented to, and a few days later Mr. Ogilvie was here, his appointment as commissioner

was recommended, his staff was selected, and he was instructed to go to Dawson City and take charge of its administration. I cannot understand how it could have been possible for the Government to have acted any more promptly than we did. I even cabled Mr. Ogilvie to return at once from England in order that he might not be delayed in going to the Yukon district. He did not get away until about the 4th August, and he was appointed on the 4th July. Himself and his officers took a certain amount of time in making preparations. Special things they required at the last minute, which they could not get without delay, which nobody could have known they wanted but themselves, and which were required in connection with the various matters expected to arise. Mr. Ogilvie and his party went forward as fast as possible and took charge of the administration, and there has not been the scintilla of a suggestion that since they took charge of the administration of Dawson City in September of last year—having gone up as rapidly as possible after the Act of Parliament was passed—the government of that district has not been properly and rightly carried on. What, then, in the name of common sense, is all this hullabaloo about? That is a question which must occur to every hon. member of this House. When you come to think of it, all these suggestions for a commission, for an inquiry, for an investigation—they refer to what? Why, to that little period of time between the 20th of June last year, when Major Walsh got in there, and the time Major Walsh came out, towards the fall. That particular little period of time is the period to which these charges and insinuations refer, and in regard to which it is demanded that this investigation shall take place. Of course, it is intended that the investigation shall cover everything and be for all time, but there is not the slightest shadow of what any reasonable man could accept as a reason for coming to the conclusion that anything which has taken place since Mr. Ogilvie took charge is the subject of criticism demanding an inquiry. The hon. gentleman himself said yesterday, whatever his opinion may be worth—and I do not know that it adds anything to Mr. Ogilvie's reputation—that Mr. Ogilvie was an honest man. He even admitted that Mr. Senkler was an honest man. I think that these gentleman would enjoy the reputation of being honest men even if the hon. gentleman thought differently. They are honest men, and well known to be of irreproachable character, particularly Mr. Ogilvie, who is recognized by the people in general as an honest and incorruptible public servant. He is in charge of and responsible for the administration of that district. Mr. Senkler, a son of Judge Senkler, whose father is one of the most respectable and honourable gentlemen in Ontario, whose reputation has come to him by heredity, if I may say so, was appointed Gold Commissioner. He is a man whose reputation is without spot or blemish. He is in charge of the entire business of recording gold claims in that district; and there is not a suggestion that all he does is not correctly, and regularly, and righteously carried on. So, Mr. Speaker, what we are called upon to issue this commission to investigate is the question, whether something wrong was or was not done during the few months last summer, before Mr. Ogilvie took charge of the government. Let it be well understood that there is no impeachment of the government in that district, as it exists at the present time; it is in regard to what took place a year ago, at a time when, under the peculiar circumstances existing, it was, humanly speaking, impossible to have a regular administration of the government.

Now, what is our position in regard to these charges? These statements were first made in definite form by the miners' committee. It has been stated in this House that we wasted months after that complaint before we took the proper means to have the investigation proceeded with. It has been shown, in answer to that, that we did not take months, that we hardly took days. We received that petition, and acted upon it, and I think that, within a week of the time we received it, the commission was issued and despatched to Vancouver, and by a special messenger, and directions were given to forward it to Dawson City. It would have been impossible for the Government to act more promptly than it did.

Complaint is made that the commission should not have been issued to Mr. Ogilvie, because Mr. Ogilvie, it appears, is unfortunate enough to be related to me. Before I deal with that phase of the question, or with Mr. Ogilvie's fitness for the work, or his actions in carrying on the investigation, let me point out this to the House—that, when we issued that commission in the fall of last year, we practically had before us everything that we have now. The labours of this hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in searching from one end of the country to the other, from Dawson City to Halifax, for the purpose of getting evidence to impeach the officers of the Yukon district, have substantially failed to bring out a single thing which was not charged by the miners' memorial, received by us last fall. I took the trouble to go through the printed report of what the hon. gentleman was pleased to style his evidence yesterday, and the evidence which, with such a flourish of trumpets, he had placed upon "Hansard," is nothing but a rehash of the same things charged last fall in the newspapers, the same things which he charged here on the Address, the same things which, when suffi-

ciently specific to be dealt with, were promptly refuted and shown to be untrue. Therefore, I say, what we have before us at this moment is practically what we had before us when the commission was issued, is practically what Mr. Ogilvie was charged by the commission to investigate. I do not think there is a single thing which the hon. gentleman has referred to, in connection with the officers of the Yukon district, as being improper or corrupt, which was not covered by the commission issued to Mr. Ogilvie. Now, I desire to make that point clear, for it is a point that would be likely to be obscured by the hon. gentleman's much speaking, He speaks for several hours at a time; and if members of the House are called out from time to time, while he is speaking, they may naturally suppose that in their absence he has brought forward something new. I can assure hon. gentlemen that, so far as I have been able to examine—I am speaking generally—substantially the charges which the hon. gentleman has made are the charges which the miners' committee made, and which they could have established under the commission issued to them, if they had felt disposed and had had the evidence at their command.

Now, the miners' committee say that they are not properly met by the Prime Minister in issuing the commission, because the commission was limited to receiving proof of facts alleged to exist prior to the 25th of August. When that is stated, it leaves upon the mind an impression that there is something in it; it leaves upon the mind the impression that the commission should not have been limited, but unlimited, as to time. But just consider the matter for a moment. The miners' committee were in Dawson City during the whole period when this alleged corruption took place. There were 25,000 people around them. According to the hon. gentleman and his friends, these people were all being defrauded every day, every hour, by officials of the Government. This was going on, according to these gentlemen, all summer, from the time Major Walsh got in until he left; and, so bad did it become, that this miners' committee, on the 25th of August, forwarded to the Government a memorial, asking for an investigation. An investigation of what? An investigation of what had not happened? An investigation of what was going to happen? One would imagine that they were asking for an investigation of what had happened. And, if these gentlemen did not know of a single fact to substantiate the charges which they made in their petition, charges referring to what had happened before the 25th of August, their statement was false, and they were falsely charging the officials, without facts to back their statements. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if I ever heard of a more barefaced attempt to get out of a difficult position than that of which the gentlemen composing this miners' committee have been guilty. They sent down the most unqualified charges—vague and general, it is true, but most unqualified in their character—in regard to the officials of the district. They signed the statement, and dated it the 25th of August. And, when the commission goes up there, they say: We have no facts of what existed before the 25th of August; our statement was false. But we consider that you are treating us in an outrageous way, because you have not sent a commission to investigate something that might happen after we petitioned you. I do not think I ever heard of a more ridiculous or barefaced attempt to get away from a position already taken; I cannot conceive of a more complete admission on the part of the committee that they had not the first fact upon which to base the charges that they made against our officers.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that before a popular assembly, before gentlemen who may not take the trouble to follow everything in connection with a technical matter of that kind, a man might get away with such a proposition. But, Sir, I think I see my hon. friend going before a judge with such a proposition as that. I think I see a man coming up, a criminal lawyer, a Crown prosecutor, coming up before a court and making a proposition of that kind, that he could not prove the indictment, or that he could prove something that happened after the indictment was drawn against the prisoner. That is precisely the position the gentlemen who composed that committee have taken, and that is the position which this hon. gentleman says is the right position, and which he endorses on the floor of this House. Now, I am not prejudging the matter in any shape or form, I am not taking the position of deciding at this moment whether these officials were corrupt or not; I am simply pointing out that our officials in that district have got the benefit of the most complete possible admission on the part of the gentlemen who charged them with corruption, that they had no facts whatever on which to base it.

Now, it is said that we should not have sent the commission to Mr. Ogilvie because Mr. Ogilvie was related to me by marriage. Mr. Ogilvie is a man whom I never saw until I became a member of this Government. I never saw Mr. Ogilvie in my life until he came back from the Yukon district, a year after I became a member of the Government. I met him in a hotel at Vancouver when I was on my way to Skagway, and I had to be introduced to him by a gentleman who knew us both. It is true that Mr. Ogilvie married Mrs. Sifton's aunt; I never saw the aunt. But these genealogical facts are sufficient, it seems, to blast for ever the reputation of Mr. Ogilvie. Now, let us for a moment be serious in dealing with this question. The hon. member for Picton is

very serious. The hon. member for Pictou, as might be expected from a member of the distinguished family to which he belongs, is filled with holy zeal for the purity of the public service, and he is very serious upon this question. Now, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Ogilvie was brought into the public service and kept in the public service by hon. gentlemen opposite, for long years remained there, and earned an honourable and distinguished reputation in the Dominion of Canada as a public servant. He earned that reputation by his own efforts, he had no assistance from the hon. gentlemen. They did not do anything for him except to pigeon-hole his reports, and keep them from the knowledge of the public. He is under no compliment to them. He attained such a reputation that when he was appointed to the position of Commissioner of the Yukon district, it was the universal opinion of the people of Canada that he was the best possible man, the most honest, reliable and incorruptible man, that could be selected for that purpose. Everybody had the same opinion, Liberal and Conservative, the "Mail" as well as the "Globe," and that was the position that was taken all the way through. It was admitted that he was a fit man to take charge of the great interests of this country in the Klondike district, to exercise the great power and authority that are conferred on a gentleman who occupies the position of commissioner of the Government in that district. Now, if he was fit for that great and responsible position—and mind you, Mr. Speaker, a man in that position has greater discretionary power than any member of this Government, he has more individual power given to him, and necessarily so. He is not constantly subjected to the advice and to the control which comes from a council the members of which are mutually responsible to each other. He must be given a large amount of arbitrary authority, he is a man who is given tremendous authority, and necessarily so. Now, he was reputed to be fit for that position when he was appointed. When did he become unreliable? When did he become incompetent? That is a question which is pertinent to the issue. If he was fit for that great and important position then surely he was fit to find out whether the officials of the district, the subordinate officers were properly acting in the discharge of their duties. I cannot conceive of any man who would be better fitted for that position; I think he would be very much better fitted to take charge of such an inquiry as he has conducted than any judge who knew nothing about the people, who knew nothing about mining claims, who knew nothing practically about the Gold Commissioner's office, and who would inevitably be puzzled to death in order to form any conclusion whatever in regard to matters that came before him. Every practical man in this House will agree that it is not necessary a man should be a lawyer, or that he should be a judge in order to form a common-sense opinion about matters in that country.

Well, we appointed Mr. Ogilvie. I am not going to defend Mr. Ogilvie's reputation; Mr. Ogilvie's reputation stands alone, it does not need any defence. We sent a commission to him authorizing him to look into these matters, and so far as we are able to understand from the papers that are before us, he has looked into them as thoroughly and as carefully as it is possible for him to do. He has not shown any disposition whatever to shut out evidence. The hon. gentleman who makes this motion said that it was placing Mr. Ogilvie in a very awkward position. Why? Because, forsooth, the investigation might reflect on me and might cause me to resign. The hon. gentleman did not explain how. I cannot understand why, if an officer whom he appointed and sent out to the Yukon district, proves faithless to his trust, that is any reason for the Minister resigning. The hon. gentleman seems to think so; he said so. He said that if Mr. Ogilvie found—and this is the gravamen of the charge of appointing Mr. Ogilvie—that Mr. Ogilvie who, having married my wife's aunt several years ago, must be very friendly to me and be very much concerned about my political future, and if he found out anything that was likely to injure me, he would have no regard whatever for his oath of office, or for his duty as commissioner, but he would at once burk that evidence and prevent it from coming out. That is the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. And to give point to that he says that there was danger that something was coming out which might affect my political future and force me to resign.

Then he goes on to say that if it was proven that these officials were corrupt, then the Minister of the Interior, if he had any respect for himself at all, would proceed to resign. Well, I do not think so; I do not think that is the constitutional law, or the constitutional practice. But I will give the hon. gentleman an authority on the subject. I do not believe many members of the House will accept it as an important authority, but I believe the hon. gentleman himself will; it is the authority of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, which he will find on page 3035 of the "Hansard," of 1895. It was in connection with the Government's Curran bridge. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will remember it. But he did not resign when that $200,000 was stolen down at Montreal. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? He says that if the officials of the Minister of the Interior were found to be dishonest, if I appointed three or four men and sent them to the Yukon district and they turned out after they got there to be a little too human, and unable to withstand the temptation offered by the gold fields, it would be my duty to resign.

Now, what did the Minister do in a similar case where a couple of hundred thousand dollars were stolen, not in the Yukon district where communication was impossible, where I could not tell what was going on, where I had not any check upon the men, and had not any means in the world of knowing what they were doing or how they were conducting their business, but down in Montreal, right under the noses of the members of the Government?

This is what the hon. gentleman says, the present hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), having taken part in the debate:

> Take the criticism of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and the evidence given by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in regard to those details. What do they relate to? They relate to fraud, to trickery, to deception, to stuffed pay-lists, to all kinds of false pretenses; and if the case stood there, that the Government, knowing of that, had done nothing, the case would be grave indeed against this Government or any Government. But what information, I ask again, has any hon. gentleman in this House on which to base a case against the Government? Do they pretend that they make one solitary elector in any part of Canada believe that under a Liberal Government, or under a Conservative Government, under the present Government of thirteen or fifteen men, you could guarantee the people of this country against fraud and iniquity on the part of men employed by the Government? * * *
>
> And, if the Government were to fall on that ground, if the Minister were to lose his standing——

Not even his position, but his standing.

> ——on that ground, what would be the position of Minister after Minister in the Imperial Government? How about the Ministers who are responsible for the construction of ships that, after having been built, are almost as speedily condemned? How about the Ministers responsible for supplying the army with bayonets that will not stand the slightest use? How about Ministers whose departments have been investigated time and time again in reference to other matters, and who have sheltered themselves, and sheltered themselves properly, behind the advice of experts?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just desire to say a word or two upon that point to show that the attack which the hon. gentleman makes upon the character of Mr. Ogilvie as a commissioner is perfectly absurd, and that nobody knows that it is absurd better than he does himself. Mr. Ogilvie had authority to investigate all things which occurred in regard to those matters up to the 25th of August, 1898. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the charge of the miners' committee was made on the 25th of August, and if it were true, if it were believed to be true, if it were supposed to be true, it referred to matters which had happened before the 25th of August. The letter which the hon. gentleman quoted last night as being written by Frederick Palmer, referred to matters that had happened before the 25th of August. The diatribes that appeared in the press throughout Canada, in one form or another, were all in regard to matters that happened before the 25th of August, and the hon. gentleman has practically added nothing new to the indictments, so that Mr. Ogilvie had authority substantially to investigate every charge that we knew of as having been made, or that we know of now, against our officers in that country. I do not say that, perhaps, some of the men who have made statements, might not have been referring to something that happened between 25th of August and some time in September, when Mr. Ogilvie got there, but there is no specification of a fact which we can get at. Mr. Ogilvie has held his investigation and his report is here partially. He has sent in his report as to the matters which he had, up to that time, investigated, and which he had received evidence upon. We have had this report before us for a few days. It was copied at once and sent to the printer. We have had it only a couple of days, because it could not be satisfactorily examined until it was printed. I would ask every hon. member of this House to read that report and the evidence, and I venture to say that there is not a fair-minded man upon either side of this House who will not say that Mr. Ogilvie has fairly and honestly tried to discharge his duty, who will not say that he has manifested, all the way through, a desire to get at the facts and disclose the facts as far as possible. Did he try to shut out evidence? Did he try to bully witnesses and keep them from bringing in evidence? Did he discourage charges? Mr. Ogilvie begged and implored the public to come in and make charges against the officials. They came in; they came in by committee and by counsel, and they came in themselves personally. However, they came, in whatever guise, or whatever kind of a charge they were desirous of making, Mr. Ogilvie was ready and willing to hear them and to hear them to the fullest possible extent. The evidence that was taken by that commission will make a lawyer laugh. If the hon. gentleman had a commission of judges, do you suppose that men would be allowed to give evidence such as was given there? I do not mean that the judges would not ask leading questions; I do not mean that the judges would not pursue an inquisitorial policy; not at all, but evidence is given there, statements are made there that no commission, inquisitorial or otherwise, would ever have allowed to be printed as part of the evidence—statements of the merest hearsay, street corner talk are put in there, and men are allowed to make their statements almost in any way that they see fit. Mr. Ogilvie was determined that the investigation would be thorough, and he was not going to allow any lawyer to dictate to him in regard to technicalities or the rules of evidence. We

have the evidence before us, although the commission is not yet completed, and we have not the complete report. There were three or four gentlemen connected with the service, whose actions had been called in question, who were not present and who, therefore, could not be tried when the evidence, which we have, was taken and sent down. Mr. Wade, Mr. McGregor, Mr. Norwood, and, I think, another man by the name of Bliss, although, whether there was any charge made against him or not I am not sure, went back into that country in winter, over the ice, but they did not get in there until the evidence which we have was sent out. A telegraphic report, that I have seen in the press, states that these four men went before the commission, that charges were made against some of them, that Mr. Ogilvie had completely exonerated the whole of them, that, particularly, Mr. Ogilvie had investigated the water front transaction, which the hon. gentleman referred to, at such length yesterday, and the day before, and that he found that there was nothing corrupt or improper in connection with it. But I am not in a position to say that this is absolutely so. It is a newspaper report, and there may be some delay in connection with the official report, as they have to copy the evidence and get the report ready, but I presume——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Where is that evidence?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not received it yet. It has not reached here yet, but I expect that it will reach here in a few days. The information which we have, which comes from outside sources, is to the effect that the investigation of the charges against these gentlemen, made before the commission, has resulted in the entire exoneration of all of them.

I wish to say to the House what the position of the Government, in connection with these charges, is. The position is this: So soon as charges were made against our officers, we sent a commission to Mr. Ogilvie—the only man who was in a position to investigate them, because at that time we could not have sent a judge in over the ice—to make an examination. We had complete confidence in Mr. Ogilvie's integrity and in his desire to make a thorough and complete investigation. He has made an investigation; we have not yet received his full report; but what we say in regard to it is, that when we get the remainder of Mr. Ogilvie's report, we will give this whole subject, and the evidence that is contained it it, our fullest and most careful consideration. We will give every fact, every alleged fact, that is brought before the Government and brought before Parliament, our fullest and most careful consideration. And if there is the least ground for finding that there should be any further or more complete investigation, we will provide that that further and more complete investigation shall take place. But in order that there shall be a complete and full investigation, we do not deem it desirable and we do not deem it proper that the question of the administration of this Government, the political responsibility of this Government, shall be taken from the House of Commons of Canada and sent to a commission of judges to try. Sir, that is the position which the Government takes in regard to this inquiry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I may be pardoned, Mr. Speaker—while not prejudging the case at all—I may be pardoned for referring to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is surely very reckless, when in the most unguarded and most unqualified language, he charges Mr. Wade with corruption in the transaction regarding the water front. When the report—not the official report—but the report in the press which the hon. gentleman no doubt is familiar with—is that this matter has now been investigated by Mr. Ogilvie, that everybody connected with the transaction has been put on oath, and that everybody connected with the transaction has sworn there was no corruption and no impropriety in connection with the matter; surely it would be sufficient, under those circumstances, for the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to make a much milder statement in regard to his belief respecting that transaction, and surely it would be sufficient for him to wait until the official report gets here in order that we may know whether there is any foundation for the idea that a further investigation ought to be held.

I shall refer for one moment to a transaction which the hon. gentleman spoke about. I am not going to analyse the evidence taken before Mr. Ogilvie, but I shall say here, that you can take a book of evidence of that kind and by taking little extracts from it here and there, you can make it look like almost anything. Every lawyer knows that. In order for any one to have an intelligent idea as to what is proved and what is not proved before that commission, it would be necessary for him to sit down and study that book, and I venture to say that no man in this House or out of it is competent to decide that, and to arrive at a definite and reasonable conclusion, without spending at least one solid week in comparing the various portions of the evidence with each other. It happens here and there that a witness makes a seeming misstatement. For instance, Mr. Fawcett made a statement in one place that a certain woman, Mrs. Koch, did not get a claim, while Mr. Fawcett in another place says she did get a claim. The explanation is, that when he was asked at first, he answered off-hand, according to

his memory, but when he looked up the records afterwards, he found it necessary to correct his evidence. If you take one part of that evidence you would say that such and such was proved, and if you take another part you would say that such another thing was proved. You cannot come to any proper conclusion in regard to evidence of that kind, except by a thorough sifting and comparison of the whole evidence, and that would take any member of this House fully a week, and then he would not be sure that he had fully appreciated all the points in connection with it. I looked specially into one particular case which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) referred to at some length, and he referred to it, I believe, for the purpose of showing that Major Walsh had been guilty of some impropriety in connection with that case. It was the case of Mrs. Koch, who appears to have had a permit to locate a claim on Dominion Creek. I examined the evidence in that case specially, and in my judgment as a lawyer, the evidence in that case simply proves that Mrs. Koch, who was a cook or a restaurant-keeper, was informed by or through a man named Ambrose Cyrette, who was an Indian servant to Major Walsh, that he had overheard Major Walsh speaking about permits being granted on Dominion Creek. This woman Koch thought she would like to get a permit and locate a claim on Dominion Creek. She got another woman to see Major Walsh. It does not appear, and it is not stated anywhere in the evidence what the other woman said to Major Walsh, or what Major Walsh said to the other woman, but the other woman came back and told Mrs. Koch that she had better go and see Mr. Fawcett and ask for the permit. The woman went to Mr. Fawcett, and there the evidence begins to conflict. The woman says in her evidence that she did not mention Major Walsh's name to Mr. Fawcett, but Mr. Fawcett says she did, or he thinks the women did, mention Major Walsh's name. There is a dispute about that; but anyway the woman went there and got the permit from Mr. Fawcett. Fawcett made a mistake; there is no doubt about that. He did a foolish thing in giving a permit. The woman showed the permit to Major Walsh's brother, and Major Walsh's brother went upstairs to see him. What happens?—and this throws light on the whole thing. Major Walsh immediately after came downstairs, and according to the evidence of Mr. Fawcett, and according to the evidence of the woman, Mrs. Koch, he said: It is a mistake; it should not have been done; that permit should not have been issued. That shows conclusively that he never intended to authorize the permit to be issued, and that he was not a party to it in any way. There is nothing remarkable about that transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. She gave it up.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, she did not give it back.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the whole statement of the case?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Oh, no. Then Mrs. Koch went out and she located her claim. Major Walsh, when he said "it is a mistake," said to Fawcett something to the effect that the permit should be got back. The woman was permitted to go out, and Fawcett said afterwards, when he was asked about it, that he did not think she ever got a claim, but when he came to look it up, he found she had gone out and located her claim, filed her application, and that some time in August, long after the creek was open to everybody, this woman had got her claim. Here we have a thing which might have happened to the most honest officers in the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A similar transaction might happen in my office.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It might happen in the Prime Minister's office; it might happen anywhere.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not accept any imputation from the ironical "hear, hear," of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I say that when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) desires to charge me with anything dishonourable he has got the Table of the House before him there, and he can lay his charge on the Table. After a careful examination of the evidence, I say that with regard to that transaction, there is nothing in the evidence that shows complicity or impropriety on the part of any one, not the least. Here is a woman who, like other people there, was trying to get ahead of every one else. They all knew about this Dominion Creek; they were all trying to get claims, and the Indian servant overheard Major Walsh talking about it; the news leaked out; this woman got the permit from Mr. Fawcett, and Mr. Fawcett admits he was wrong in giving it. But where is the suggestion of dishonesty? Is there a suggestion that Major Walsh profited by that claim being registered? Is there a suggestion that Mr. Fawcett profited by it? And if they did not, and if it is not suggested, where is the question of dishonesty? Here is simply a question of official information leaking out to

a servant, and of a mistake being made by an officer such as might happen under any circumstances or at any time, by the most honest officer in the world. And, Mr. Speaker, after all the talk there has been about the maladministration of the Yukon, when it comes down to this: that it is a question of whether they can prove that a cook accidentally got information which enabled her to get a claim upon Dominion Creek; if that is all the hon. gentlemen opposite have to base their attack upon this Administration upon, the hon. gentlemen are entitled to all the comfort they can get out of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are after the cooks.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer for one moment to the desire of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for the purity of the public service, and to the great responsibility which the hon. gentleman, almost with tears in his eyes——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR—was prepared to take in this House for the purpose of purifying the public service, which, it appears, will never be properly and honestly carried on, so long as it is not controlled by the Tupper family. Sir, the hon. gentleman is willing to risk his seat in this House. It is not a very valuable commodity at the present time. The hon. gentleman has abandoned his constituents. His constituents are in Pictou County, N.S. I believe he has left his constiuency. Not before his party was almost wiped out of existence through the instrumentality of my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and his friends in that province.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman, knowing that his political career in Nova Scotia had come to an end, has betaken himself to the Pacific coast, and he sits in this House without responsibility as a member of this House, because he has no constituents to whom he intends to return for their endorsation. The hon. gentleman's prospect for parliamentary honours in future depends upon the remote possibility of his finding a constituency that will be so misguided and so reckless as to elect him. That is what the hon. gentleman has to risk in this House at the present time; and the hon. gentleman, in his holy zeal, says: "I, with the fullest sense of responsibility, on account of the great good that will come to Canada, am prepared to risk my seat in this House and my chance of political preferment for all time to come." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said that the seat is not a valuable commodity at the present time, and I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman's chance of political preferment is a very valuable commodity to wager, either. But the hon. gentleman, a political orphan, as he is at present, is willing to wager his seat, if he does what? If he fails to prove—that is his statement—every statement that is made in that resolution. Sir, I have choked down his throat several of them to-day. One of the statements which the hon. gentleman has risked his political reputation and his chance of political preferment, if he does not prove, was the statement that these Philps got the mining permits and mining leases which he recites in that resolution. Is he going to prove that? I really do not think it would be possible for a member of this House to make a more utter and complete exhibition of himself than the hon. gentleman has done.

Sir, I am not going to pass this over without reference to one or two other matters. My hon. friend the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is one of the oldest and most respected members of this House. I do not think there is a member on either side of this House—I hope there is not—who has any unkind feeling towards the hon. member for South Grey. At my hon. friend's request, I sent his son, in a subordinate capacity, with Mr. Fawcett's party, when they went to the Yukon. The young man is there now, and I am happy to say that he is doing no discredit to the hon. member at whose request he was sent. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), in his desire to throw discredit on somebody, to blacken somebody, to show that somebody was doing something which he ought not to do, made the statement that the Surveyor General had written a private and confidential letter to Mr. Fawcett. The letter will be found on page 206 of the printed evidence taken before Mr. Ogilvie. The hon. gentleman refers to this private and confidential letter, and he does so for the purpose of trying to create the impression that there is some illicit and improper connection between myself, and the Surveyor General, and the hon. member for South Grey. Nothing stops the hon. gentleman; he does not care whom he bespatters. Here is the Surveyor General, a man who has for years been in the public service, an honoured and trusted public servant, a man without a blemish on his reputation; and the hon. gentleman jumps up in this House, and, without a moment's hesitation, accuses him of doing the most improper and outrageous thing. There is nothing outrageous and nothing improper in what he did. What he did was a perfectly proper thing, and there is not a man of common sense in this House who will say anything else. Here is the Surveyor General, an old officer of the Government, writing to Mr. Fawcett, also an old officer of the Government. They have been in the Government service together for

many years. The Surveyor General sends to Mr. Fawcett his official instructions; and one day, thinking that Mr. Fawcett is out there, exercising great responsibility, he sits down and writes him a private letter of advice. Is there anything improper in that? Is there any man in this House who would suggest that there was anything improper in it? Yet we have a lecture from the hon. gentleman, in which he suggests that Captain Deville had done a thing so improper that it would warrant his dismissal from office; and, in order to throw across the House a most contemptible imputation upon my hon. friend from South Grey, he says, at page 5963 of "Hansard":

> Then, we have the combination of Landerkin and Landerkin, a member of this House, who has his son sent out there. I would say nothing about it except that in the very evidence that comes up before this commission there is a private and confidential note from one of the Minister of the Interior's officers, asking Mr. Fawcett to say a good word for Mr. Landerkin in his official report.

I say the hon. gentleman's statement is untrue. I say there is no such statement in Mr. Deville's letter. Things have come to a pretty pass in this House, Mr. Speaker, when an ex-Minister of Justice, reading from an official document, printed and in his hands, will not read it as it is written, for the purpose of casting an imputation upon an hon. member of this House. Now, this is what Mr. Deville says:

> When you write to us, do not forget to put in a few words about Landerkin.

Nothing about an official report at all. It might have been taken to refer to an official report, but he does not say so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Go on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (reading):

> I will communicate them to his father, and he will be pleased.

The hon. gentleman puts in the word "good"—why? For the purpose of creating the impression that I had led the Surveyor General to communicate with Mr. Fawcett, that he might say a good word, and puff Mr. Landerkin's son, when he was making his official report.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was a shame.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I want to call attention to the fact that when we find a gentleman who cannot or will not read an official document correctly, but who, upon the spur of the moment, for the purpose of saying nasty things across the floor and hurting the feelings of a member of this House, will misread and change the meaning of an official paper which he has in his hand, it does not seem to me that he is a gentleman whose services the Attorney General requires for the purpose of clearing up matters in the Yukon.

I want to call attention to a few of the things which this hon. gentleman wants to have referred to a commission of judges. I will only give a few, but they are fair illustrations of the hon. gentleman's judgment and discretion as to what it would be proper to bring before a commission of judges, clothed with these special powers and sent to the Yukon district for the special purpose of making this investigation. These are a number of things which the hon. gentleman wants investigated. He wants investigated the statement that I took an opinion from the Department of Justice in June, 1898, and that Major Walsh violated that opinion in the previous March. That is one thing the hon. gentleman wants to have investigated, namely, that I got an opinion from the Department of Justice in Ottawa, in June, 1898, and that Major Walsh violated the terms of that opinion in the Yukon district several months before. I do not care to bother or delay the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But the hon. gentleman apparently does not understand the meaning of the simplest thing connected with these transactions, and gravely puts into this motion a recital of the opinion which I obtained for a specific purpose. When the Yukon district was separated from the North-west Territories, there were certain liquor permits which had been granted by the North-west Territories Government. It was a question of law as to whether a permit granted by the Territorial Government, before the separation of the Yukon district, would be good, and authorize those holding them to take their goods into that district after the separation had taken place. I submitted the question to the Department of Justice, and that department advised me that the permits were good. Consequently, I acted accordingly. The hon. gentleman recites that opinion, and then he proceeds to attack Major Walsh for having done something contrary to that opinion three months before it is given. I cannot imagine incoherence or silliness going much further. Then we have—and I think this is the neatest thing in the whole resolution, and I will trespass upon the attention of the House by reading it—I think it is really the most logical and pointed thing there is in the whole resolution. I would ask the House to observe the date. The hon. gentleman to-day was at great pains to correct a number of dates in connection with his resolution, and inasmuch as he corrected them all with great care and did not alter this one, I apprehend that this particular date has been the subject of much consideration on his part. On page 6037 will be found the following paragraph in his motion:—

That in Dawson City, containing, at a moderate estimate, some 25,000 of a population, there was not, on the 1st April, 1899, a single road, bridge or drain—nothing that might be termed a public work in any form. In Dawson City there was neither pavement, roadway, drain or ditch, no water supply, nor lighting; and the matter of the disposal of refuse had, up to that date, been one of individual responsibility only.

This condition of affairs resulted in an epidemic of typhoid fever in 1896.

Mr. Speaker, typhoid germs must be very vigorous there, if they should cause an outbreak of typhoid fever before the place had any existence. And the truth of this allegation is to be referred to a commission of judges. And, as my hon. colleague, the Postmaster General, reminds me, the hon. gentleman has declared from his place in the House that if he does not prove it, he will forfeit his seat.

Then the hon. gentleman's resolution goes on and he devotes four pages—space is nothing to the hon. gentleman—to the statement that four years ago the late Government sent up twenty policemen and a surveyor to the Yukon district. What he wants to refer to the commission of judges, in addition to this charge about typhoid fever, are, the various acts of the Adminstration which have taken place from the time we were charged with it until the present; the legality of the various actions of the Government: the itinerary of the officers of the Government, and, so far as he has been able to get them into this resolution, the dates when each officer left each particular place, and if it should turn out that any one of our officers did not leave the place on the date the hon. gentleman said he did in this resolution, the hon. gentleman will have to resign his seat in Parliament, because he has pledged himself to prove all these charges.

Then he has this startling proposition that I recommend to the attention of the House. He is going to refer to this commission of judges the startling allegation that Mr. McGregor was a livery stable keeper; that Mr. Norwood was a non-certificated master of a whaling vessel; that unsanitary conditions prevailed in Dawson City, and that abuses were connected with the issuing of liquor permits—but no statement as to what these abuses were. And then he is going to have investigated whether Major Walsh did or did not send a report by each mail. Also, that Major Walsh allowed a woman named Lucille Elliott—the judges would appreciate the dignity of investigating this question; it would add to the dignity of the bench of Canada—to keep a cigar-stand and sell light drinks on Sunday, mixed, presumably, with stronger liquors, and carried on improper relations with this woman; that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—who is a much worse man than I—has been guilty of the most outrageous maladministration; that the Postmaster General was even worse; and that the correspondent of the London "Times," Miss Shaw, said there was a widely spread belief that official corruption existed—not that the belief was well-founded, but that she said there was such a belief. That is what the hon. gentleman asks this House, composed of men of common sense and judgment, to send to a commission of judges of Canada.

If we could get into the inner hearts of hon. gentlemen on the other side, I would like to know how many of them are not ashamed that they are in any way responsible for this resolution.

Then, Mr. Speaker, what is the explanation of all this? Is it possible that a gentleman who has been the legal adviser of the Crown in Canada does not know better than to put such a farrago of rubbish upon the Table of the House as he has done? Sir, I cannot conceive that even a gentleman who could not read a printed return correctly would not know better than that. I am driven to the conclusion that the only possible explanation of the hon. gentleman's conduct is this—and it is an explanation that is not creditable to him or to anybody who acts in his support—that he has framed that resolution so that it will have to be voted down, so that no self-respecting House of Commons would adopt it. Will any man from the other side of the House say that it would be a proper thing for this House of Commons to refer the question of administration to a commission of judges? Would any one of them in his sober senses say that it would be proper to refer to a special committee of judges such stuff as I have read from the hon. gentleman's resolution? But if that was not clear, the hon. gentleman has made it clear. Why? Because, not satisfied with what I have said, he has imported into this resolution an attack upon a judge of the Superior Court. Sir, the hon. gentleman is a lawyer, but there is no laymen in this House who could not tell him that you cannot bring the question of the conduct of a Superior Court judge before this House in that fashion. Every man in this House, lawyer or layman, knows that we have a constitutional method provided for attacking a judge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not so cowardly as is suggested by the efforts——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I rise to a point of order, and ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to withdraw the word "cowardly."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said that the Minister of the Interior was

not so cowardly as this interruption would indicate. I rise——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I ask the permission of the Minister of the Interior to correct him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of the Interior, very properly, proceeded to criticise a position which he assumes I took ; and I know he would not be adverse to my correcting him in regard to Judge Dugas. I did not attack Judge Dugas as a judge of the Superior Court——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are these hon. gentlemen the judges ? I did not attack——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I speak with the permission of the Minister of the Interior. I did not attack, nor does my resolution attack, the judge qua judge ; I attack him as a member of the Executive Council, and also as Judge Dugas——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let me finish. The position is this—that Judge Dugas as a member of the Executive Council—I may be right or I may be wrong —has no right to be interested in the mining interests of the Yukon which he is attempting to administer under an Act of Parliament. I also refer to the——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the Minister of the Interior object ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No ; but his cowards do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to withdraw that expression.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was about to say that——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I heard an hon. member of this House characterize some hon. members as being cowards.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What do you think yourself, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I refer to an expression used by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I finish what I was——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman making a statement, but I do object to his making a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I heard an hon. member characterize some hon. members of this House as being cowards. I would like him to withdraw that expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh ! Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What do hon. gentlemen mean ? The hon. member for Pictou asked permission of the Minister of the Interior to make an important statement touching a point which that hon. gentleman had raised. The hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) received permission to make that statement, and he said that the hon. Minister was not so cowardly as the hon. gentlemen behind him would make it appear. What I said was that others were.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I heard the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) say distinctly "those cowards," referring to some hon. members of this House.

Mr. BERGERON. He spoke of those outside the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the expression should be withdrawn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, do you wish me to say that I think it was a bold act on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to refuse to allow an explanation to be made ? I said it was a cowardly act, and I repeat it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What I say is that it is not permitted to an hon. member of this House to characterize any hon. members as being cowards ; and I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw. Chair.

An hon. MEMBER. Name him.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed, I would appeal to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), who is the veteran of this House. It would be most distasteful that we should have need to take the unusual proceeding of naming an hon. member. He is the oldest member of this House ; and, for my part, I should not like to have to take harsh proceedings against him. But he knows very well that the expression he has used is not parliamentary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the right hon. leader of the House and of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) what he expects me to say ? All I said was that it was cowardly on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite——

An hon. MEMBER. That is not what you said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I said was that it was cowardly on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to prevent a member making an explanation which was authorized by the gentleman who had the floor. That is the position I took. I cannot recall the word ; I cannot recall the opinion that it was cowardly—I did not say cowardly on the part of any hon. gentleman in particular but on the part of gentlemen who were interrupting—to deny an opportunity for the making of an explanation that the Minister of the Interior had given the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) permission to make. What would the right hon. gentleman do in my place ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very sorry, but, as I said, I heard the hon. member very distinctly characterize members of this House in these words—" those cowards." I think the circumstances——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you are mistaken in saying that I said " those cowards." But if I used those words, and you rule that it is necessary for me to withdraw the statement, I bow to the decision of the Chair.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not finished my statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will confine himself to a statement, I have no objection.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish also to withdraw the feeling I had which was expressed by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I did not use the language, but I felt just what he said. I want to finish the explanation I had to make. It was, that I did not, nor does my resolution, attack Judge Dugas as a judge of the Superior Court. I understand that he cannot be impeached—and I want the Minister of the Interior to understand my position on that—but, being a member of the Executive Council, he is subject to this sort of attack, as any other judge in the land would be who should accept a position outside of his ordinary judicial duties to carry out the ordinary laws of this country. That is my position in reference to him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite anticipated the statement which the hon. gentleman has made. Any person of ordinary intelligence, in reading the resolution which he has drawn, would know that that was the explanation he would give of it. But, by giving that explanation and by drawing the resolution in this way, he has shown that he does not understand what he is doing, and that he does not understand the position in which he is placing himself. The government of the Yukon territory is carried on under the Yukon Government Act, and under that Act the judge is, ex-officio, member of the Council, and part of his duty as judge is to be a member of that Council. More than that ; does the hon. gentleman mean to assert that that rule in regard to an attack upon a judge is confined to his action in regard to official matters ? There is no such rule. The rule is, that the character or conduct of a judge cannot be attacked at all in Parliament, except proper proceedings be taken to impeach him. There are authorities to that effect, but I am not going to bother the House at this time with reading them, because I am not going into a discussion of constitutional law. But the authorities are perfectly clear, and have been enforced in this House before now, that an attack upon the character of a judge cannot be entertained by the House, unless it is founded upon proper proceedings, and unless proper proceedings are taken for the purpose of enforcing it, and for the purpose of giving the judge a proper opportunity of defending himself. But we have here the hon. gentleman taking this judge, and pitchforking his case in amongst the rest, and not giving the judge the courtesy of a notice that his character is going to be attacked, or in respect of what it is going to be attacked. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well—there is nobody in this House of the least experience in public matters but knows perfectly well—that no self-respecting House of Commons, in view of our law and constitution, would think of passing a resolution which was a direct imputation and attack upon the character of a judge, when no proceedings were taken for impeachment. We all know that, we all know that the proposition is indisputable, and the hon. gentleman has violated it, and, if there were no other reasons than that reason alone, the hon. gentleman has put his resolution outside of the pale of the support of this House.

Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman does more than that. In the course of his speech, he goes out of his way to attack the judiciary. He says that Judge Maguire has been guilty of the most outrageous conduct. In respect of what ? Because Judge Maguire offered counsel and advice to the Gold Commissioner in Dawson City. Judge Maguire has been judge of the North-west Territories, he is judge of the North-west Territories now, and any man who is acquainted with the proceedings of government in relation to that country, knows that for many years in the past the judges there did constantly offer counsel and advice to administrators of the

government in various capacities. But it was counsel of an advisory, of a friendly character; it was not paid for; it was the advice which one high member of the administration, removed from the ordinary advantages of counsel and advice in other ways, would naturally give to another member of the administration of the district. And I can imagine nothing that would be more absurd than for Judge Maguire to wrap around himself his robes of office in Dawson City, and refuse to give counsel and advice to the officials of the Government who were in need of it, under circumstances of special emergency. I do not think that there is the slightest shadow of ground for suggesting that Judge Maguire was wrong in giving counsel and advice to the Gold Commissioner; I do not think that there is the slightest ground for the suggestion that he was wrong, when he went in and sat upon a case which has been brought before us, the case of Nelson vs. Donnelly. What was there wrong about it? There was a judge of the Superior Court, there was a complicated gold-mining case. The law gave the Gold Commissioner power to deal with and to decide that case. The Gold Commissioner felt himself incompetent to unravel the evidence and decide upon the case, and he asked the judge of the Superior Court to come and sit beside him to sift the evidence, and to give his opinion as to the case. Is there anything improper about that? Why, the hon. gentleman says, it is an outrage to bring a judge into a matter of this kind; but it is not an outrage to bring a commission of judges into a dispute between two political parties. The hon. gentleman has in terms advocated a principle in one place which he denounces as most outrageous when the same principle is applied, in a very much modified degree, in another place, and when it was necessary in order that justice might be done. So, I say the hon. gentleman has done in this case what he ought not to have done, what he has no liberty to do, what the principles of our constitution and parliamentary law do not authorize him to do—he has not hesitated to make an unwarranted and unfounded attack upon the judiciary of this country, at the same time that he is arguing that the only men who are competent to pass judgment upon the public affairs of this country, would be a commission of judges.

Now, Sir, I want to say a very few words only about Major Walsh. Major Walsh has been violently and bitterly attacked in connection with his acceptance of office, and with his conduct of affairs in the Yukon district. I have said already, in a previous debate upon this same subject, that I had known Major Walsh fifteen or sixteen years, that I had known him as an honourable man, as a man who had a high reputation in the public service, as a man who had courage, who had nerve, who had capacity, who had resource, and who had never failed in the discharge of his duty, so far as I knew. That was the reputation which he had, that was the estimation in which the people of Canada held him, when he was appointed to that position. He accepted the office under the very greatest pressure; he had no desire to go; he had a strong desire not to go, and it was only upon the greatest pressure by myself, when the urgent necessity of the case at that time caused me to think that an experienced officer, like him, would be of some service to the country—it was under those circumstances that he accepted. I want to say, in the presence of this House, that, with all the knowledge that I have derived from the affairs of government in that district, from the information which has come before me, to this minute I do not believe that Major Walsh did a single act in connection with the administration of that territory which he did not believe to be in the best interest of Canada, and for the purpose of loyally carrying out his commission. There has never been a man in Canada that had in so short a time the same power of being corrupt, and corrupt for his own advantage, as had Major Walsh. We sent him there with extraordinary power: we sent him there when hundreds of thousands of dollars were being handed around in the most reckless way and when large sums of money were being paid over on the most shadowy grounds for claims and various kinds of property. We sent him there to do what? We gave him power to modify mining regulations, power to remit the royalty, with practically an absolute control of the entire business of that country. And, Sir, we are asked in the Parliament of Canada, because this man's cook got a mining claim, to declare that he was corrupt. Did you ever hear such a proposition before put before a lot of sensible men? Here is a man who had absolute control of the mining operations by virtue of his power to modify the regulations; he had power to change the value of property, power to elevate the value of property, power to depress the value of property, power which would have enabled him to make hundreds of thousands of dollars without the least difficulty, if he had been corrupt. But we do not find to this minute one single reputable man in Canada that will stand up, or will put over his own statement the statement that J. M. Walsh in any respect violated his oath of office, or did anything that was corrupt or improper in connection with the transactions of government.

But, Sir, an Indian servant lets out some information, and a cook, by a mistake of the Gold Commissioner, gets a claim which, perhaps, she should not have got, and this is brought before us as a corrupt act, as an indictment of Major Walsh and of his administration of the Yukon. So far as the hon. gentleman's charges against his private

character are concerned, I have nothing to say. I am not here to answer for Major Walsh's private character, or the private character of anybody else. I refuse to be drawn into a discussion of that kind. But I will say that I thank God that I stand here to defend a brave man, to prevent him from being unjustly traduced and his character taken away, rather than in the place of the hon. gentleman, who is trying to hound and follow him into private life.

We have had lectures from the hon. gentleman in regard to commissions of investigation that have been issued in the past. We heard a good deal of praise from the hon. gentleman about a commission issued by Sir John Macdonald. That great statesman, in the generosity of his heart and in the desire for purity of administration, issued a royal commission. What was it to investigate? It was to investigate the conduct of his political opponents. It was not to investigate the administration of his own officers. There had been a change of Government. Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and his Government went out of power, and Sir John Macdonald issued a commission to investigate the conduct of his predecessors in office, for the purpose of trying to fasten upon them some wrong-doing. This is the case which the hon. gentleman cites as a precedent, and as a reason for the issue of a commission of investigation. What did the hon. gentleman do, when their own conduct was called in question? The hon. gentleman has heard of the Curran bridge. He says that an officer of the Government should be detailed to investigate the Curran bridge matter, in which $200,000 was stolen.

Mr. HAGGART. Was it only $200,000 that was stolen?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Two or three hundred thousand dollars. Who was sent down to investigate? Whom did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) send down to investigate? He sent down the officers of his own department, the very men who were responsible, if anybody was, in connection with that charge.

Mr. HAGGART. May I be allowed to answer the question of the hon. gentleman as to how that matter was investigated? It was investigated by the courts, and investigated for two months before the Public Accounts Committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Afterwards.

Mr. HAGGART. It could not be before.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The officers of the department were sent to investigate this matter, to get information, and to examine into it. That is what was done, and what is being done in this case? An officer of the Government is investigating the charges, the evidence will be laid before Parliament, and if any further investigation is required, that investigation will be held. What happens when we get a little further on? When we come to the North-west Territories, when it was a notorious fact that the Indian tribes of the North-west Territories were fed with rotten food, and whereby disease and starvation, driven into rebellion, when it was a notorious fact that the parasites and friends of the Government attempted to steal the homesteads of the half-breeds of the North-west on the banks of the Saskatchewan River, when these men were driven into rebellion—as peaceable a class of people as ever lived in any country—when this was done, what investigation was held? Did these hon. gentlemen think that the fair name of Canada required that an investigation should be held, and that judges should be sent up there to investigate? When, after scores of lives had been lost, when millions of dollars had been lost, when the men who were sent up to that country to put down the rebellion, had plundered and robbed the people, were there any judges sent up to investigate? Sir, the hon. gentleman has a short memory if he expects that his talk about the fair name of Canada is going to impose upon any hon. member of this House, or upon any person in this country or is going to make them believe that he has the slightest idea of anything except a virulent desire to injure a political opponent by the action he has taken? The fair name of Canada! I can tell the hon. gentleman what it is that involves the fair name of Canada. The fair name of Canada is involved in the character of her public men. The fair name of Canada does not depend upon whether a cook gets a mining claim that she ought not to get in Dawson City; it does not depend upon whether an Indian dog-driver takes a bribe in Dawson City; it depends upon the character of the public men of Canada, and the hon. gentleman's resolution is a certificate that, so far as he knows, there is nothing against the public men of Canada as they are represented on this side of the House at the present moment. What did the hon. gentleman think when he was a member of the Administration? Did he think that the fair name of Canada was suffering when a member of the Government was driven from the Government by virtue of the fact that personal bribery and corruption were charged against him? Did he think that any action would be required to protect the fair name of Canada when one of his colleagues was proven to have taken $25,000 of money from a railway subsidy to corrupt the electors with, and I understand he admitted it in this House?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would say to the hon. gentleman that, so far as the reputation of Canada is concerned, it has never suffered when a Liberal Administration was in power, and if there is no change of Government, it will not be likely to suffer again.

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

After Recess.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Mr. Speaker, in presenting my observations to the House to-night, I shall endeavour to make them as brief as possible, consistent with the importance of the subject we are discussing. I suppose, Sir, that in the whole history of the Canadian Parliament, more serious charges have never been brought to the attention of the House of Commons. We have here charges involving the whole Government, but more particularly the Minister of the Interior, in whose department the administration of the Yukon largely lay, and charges involving also the Postmaster General of Canada, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Customs. The Minister of the Interior has declined to submit his conduct to an impartial and competent tribunal of judges, and in his statement presented to the House to-day, I have been utterly unable to find that justification for his course which Parliament might have expected from him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) did not act with very much grace or courtesy towards the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), when he referred to him in a sneering way as not risking a very valuable commodity at the present time, when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was risking his seat in this House, his position and reputation in the country, in preferring his charges on his responsibility as a member of Parliament. Well, Sir, I have had the glorious privilege of disagreeing with the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibert Tupper) on important matters of public policy, but I must say, that I found that gentleman as honourable and manly an opponent as I ever met in the Parliament of Canada. His reputation from the day he first became a Minister down to the present hour is such as should have saved him from such a jeer and such a sneer from the Minister of the Interior. As a Minister occupying a responsible position in the Parliament of Canada for eight or nine years, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) can point with satisfaction and with pride to the fact, that although he occupied this responsible position for so long, to-day no member of the House of Commons, no man in this country, dare make a charge of personal corruption or wrong-doing against the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He stands here to-day with as clean a record as any Minister who ever presided over a department of Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and it comes with ill-grace from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who, now two years and a half in office, was not a Minister for six months until scandals were charged against him and his department, until charges were made, and until to-day these charges have culminated in the most direct, the most positive, and the most forcible indictment ever made against any Minister during the twenty years I have been in this Parliament. It comes with ill-grace from that Minister (Mr. Sifton) to make the sneering allusion that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's seat was not a valuable commodity at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I would a hundred times rather stand in the proud position of the member for Pictou, occupying a seat on the Opposition benches—even were I to be in opposition all my political career; I would a thousand times rather that than occupy the position of the Minister of the Interior to-day. What is the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton)? The department over which he presides is charged with the most corrupt transactions, dishonest officials, dishonest acts by which he himself is surrounded and entangled; his partners, the men closest to him in his own constituency charged with corruption; all these winding a web around the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who, if those charges be true, was the centre and promoting figure in the wrong-doing that have taken place. I say, Sir, I would rather a hundred times occupy the honourable position of the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in this House, than occupy the position which the Minister of the Interior does. We had the boast of the Minister of the Interior some time ago that if any one dared on his responsibility as a member to make those charges, he would make him rue the day he did so. What becomes of his boasting now? He (Mr. Sifton) said in this House:

> I challenge the member for Pictou, or any man in this House, to lay upon the Table of the House the charges he has to make,——

Not, as stated by the Minister of the Interior this afternoon, the charges that the Minister of the Interior would want him to make, but the charges which the member for Pictou wants himself to make. Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had made these charges. Further, the Minister (Mr. Sifton) said:

> ——and if he declare his ability to substantiate them by evidence he will get this investigation, and I will be able to convince the hon. gentleman who makes that charge that discretion on his part would have been the better part of valor.

Where is the proud boast of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to-day? The charges have been made, and where is he

to make the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) regret, and to show him that discretion is the better part of valor. To-day we have the humiliating spectacle of a Minister, charged specifically, as no other Minister has ever been in this House, with accumulated evidence, and point after point made definitely, complaining that the resolution took an hour and a quarter to read; which simply means that the multiplicity of the charges, definitely and specifically stated, is so great, and the maladministration of his department during the short time that he has been in charge of it, in one branch alone, is so extensive, that the recital of those charges takes an hour and a quarter. It shows still further that the hon. member for Pictou has not failed courageously to give full particulars of the evidence by which he substantiates the charges which he has made. Why, Sir, I have been amazed, when listening to the statement of the Minister of the Interior this afternoon, at seeing the course which the Government propose to take. Look at any other country under the sun which has as full a measure of self-government as we have in Canada; go to England, the mother of Parliaments and of free government, and what do you find there? The public men of England, those entrusted with the responsibility of office, are most jealous of their reputations, and they are continually on the watch to protect their departments from the tongue of scandal. Go to the United States, too. Last year we saw a thorough investigation, because there were charges of wrong-doing on the part of the Government which implicated the head of the Department of War. That investigation was most thorough. No Minister would have dared to burk it or prevent a full inquiry. And look at the history of our own country, until to-day, and we find that the Government were anxious and willing—because they had to be—to have an investigation into any charges of wrong-doing made against them. And, Sir, why should it not be so? Every Government is day by day upon its trial. A Government exists by having its acts criticised and examined, and it cannot refuse to permit an investigation into its affairs. What are we here for? We start in to investigate. I am free to confess that our investigations have often been hindered and delayed by the inertness of the Government, their want of responsibility to the demands of Parliament, their imagining that they are superior to Parliament, and that when Parliament makes an order they can obey it or neglect it as their fancy pleases. The theory of our Government, and the practice, too—although it may be stopped for a time—is that the Parliament of Canada is the supreme arbiter of the affairs of the nation. It is true, in this Government we have the extraordinary spectacle of each Minister being a law unto himself. We have not that government by Governor in Council that would combine all the wisdom of the Government to secure harmonious and united action; but we have, as has often been shown in this House, more particularly during the present session, each Minister running his own department without any reference to or regard for other departments. What has been the result? Just the other day we saw the humiliating spectacle for those who were engaged in it—and a spectacle that was humiliating also to the whole Parliament of Canada—of one Minister writing to a company: "Go on with your enterprise, the Government of Canada give you their sympathy and support, and will help you along with it"; and another Minister at the very same moment planning a whole campaign to do the work himself and to take away the business from this company to which the Parliament of Canada had given a charter. So the Government is largely a Government by each Minister, regardless of the Premier and the other Ministers, who ought to be consulted in order to have harmonious action.

Now, with regard to some statements made by the Minister of the Interior to-day. He thought he was doing a very clever and a very brilliant thing when he referred to the hon. member for Pictou as having put into his resolution the statement that in April, 1899, there were no streets, drains or sanitary arrangements in Dawson City, and that that was the cause of the typhoid fever in 1896. Every one knows that 1896 referred to the year 1898, in which there was an epidemic of typhoid fever. But even supposing that epidemic had taken place in 1896, the statement of the hon. member for Pictou would be as consistent and logical as could be desired. The meaning of the statement, and the statement itself, is this: that from the erection of the first building in that city until the 1st of April, 1899, there were no streets, drains or sanitary arrangements; and for any period previous to that in which typhoid fever had broken out he might very properly put the blame on the Government, so far as the Government could be responsible for failing to provide these sanitary arrangements; and the Government must assume full responsibility, and why? Because they have instituted no form of municipal government but that which they have authorized from here. They have appointed their officers to rule and govern in every direction, and I say it is a crying shame that in a place of 25,000 or more, with the Government drawing in money from every source, they have failed to provide such arrangements. It must be remembered that the inhabitants are nearly all men, and that, therefore, they would consume nearly as much produce and pay as much customs duties as five or perhaps ten times that population in ordinary parts of the Dominion. They have an enormous revenue from customs, and they have a large revenue, or should have a large revenue,

from their 10 per cent tax upon the products of the mines. But if they had no sources of revenue, and if the people by the mere force of circumstances and necessity congregated in large cities in any part of Canada, it would be the duty of the Government of Canada to provide the necessary municipal and sanitary machinery and regulations in order to protect the lives of the citizens of the country. This they have utterly failed to do, and the only answer of the Minister of the Interior is, "Oh, he made the mistake of putting 1896 instead of 1898." The difference in the date is immaterial. The only question is when did the typhoid fever break out in that city? The typhoid fever broke out in 1898, and it was caused by the want of care of the Government, and the Government must assume the responsibility for that negligence.

There is another point. The hon. Minister of the Interior referred to the fact that Mr. Philp and Mr. Burnett and some other persons, whom the hon. member for Pictou mentions in his statement of charges, on page 540 of Votes and Proceedings, applied for and obtained leases of good placer mining or gold dredging areas in the Yukon district. These parties were:

A. E. Philp, said to be of Brandon.
A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa.
G. Philp, said to be of London.
J. A. Philp, said to be of Ottawa.
A. D. Cameron, said to be of Ottawa.

And so on. I understood the hon. Minister to say that not one of these had received a license to dredge in the Yukon. If that were the case, there is much behind it. There is much further on, which includes the Burnetts and the Philps and all these. What is that:

That the said Philp, heretofore a partner of the Minister of the Interior, represented in writing that he was engaged in a dredging venture in the Yukon, and endeavouring to induce another to join him, representing in writing that Mr. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, and Major Walsh were also interested with him, but that their names could not appear, as he wrote, "for obvious reasons."

The Minister of the Interior did not refer to that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, he did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did he say?

Mr. McMULLEN. Read "Hansard," and you will find out.

Mr. WALLACE. He slipped through that like greased lightning. It was a very damaging statement, and he did not want to read it. He said that no one of those parties received a dredging license, and he took up the return, which he said the hon. member for Pictou should have in his hand. What does that return show? Not that not one of those had received a dredging license. Here is one item:

A. E. Philp, of Brandon, Man., and the river or creek on which he had got his license was the Klondike.

Of all the rivers in the world, the Klondike, and how much did he get? Twenty miles of the Klondike, for which he paid $2,000. I think that a mining location up there is about 250 feet one way by 50 feet another. 250 feet across the creek would mean more than twenty licenses in one mile, but here are twenty miles. Multiply 20 by 20, and you have 400 mining claims granted on the richest river in the world. Yet the hon. Minister of the Interior says that not one of these parties got a mining license. With his own report in his hand, the Minister of the Interior makes that statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman not know that there is a difference between mining claims and dredging claims?

Mr. SPEAKER. Just allow me to repeat what I have already had to say before, and that is, that when an hon. member desires to interrupt, he must ask permission of the member who has the floor.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and you may tell that to the hon. member for North Wellington five times a day for a hundred days, and he will utterly disregard it the next day. That is my experience. He asks if I do not know the difference between a mining lease and a dredging lease. I can say that if on the bank of a river, you have to dig down twenty or thirty feet through clay or rock or sand, and if, right alongside, in the bed of the river, you have the whole mine exposed, I think I would prefer a dredging to a mining lease. Calculate twenty mining leases to the mile, along the length of that river, and you have 400 dredging and mining licenses, and you can mine on a dredging license just as well as on any other license. And all that was got on the payment of $2,000—all that twenty miles, which is one-half of the valuable portion of the Yukon river.

The charge was first that the Minister had partners, or those who had been his partners, who were getting these licenses, and the charge is made here in no vague and indefinite way, but by a positive statement, that this Mr. Philp, who had been a partner of the Minister of the Interior, wrote that he had a dredging lease in connection with the Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh, but that for obvious reasons the names of these gentlemen could not appear openly in this transaction. And this declaration was made, not by a man who, the Minister said, was so innocent and ignorant that he did not know, when writing out his application, that he did not reside in Ottawa, but gave the clerk to understand, by his innocence, that he lived in the city of Ottawa instead of in the city of Brandon, but it was made by a former partner of the Minister. With that serious charge, and a large number of other serious charges made against the Minister, we find him, after his vain boasting

that if any one dared to put his name to a charge and place it on the Table, he would make him bitterly regret having done so, shirking his promise. Where is his courage to-day, where is his pledge to the Parliament of Canada? Does he propose to-day to have an investigation or an impartial inquiry into these matters? No, Sir, the Minister of the Interior, notwithstanding the array of definite and specific charges made, intends to fall back upon the jury that he thinks he has under his control. What are the charges? For instance, one that the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, has been guilty of scandalous neglect, delay and mismanagement in the administration of his department in the Yukon; another that the Government of Canada appointed, on the recommendation of the Hon. Clifford Sifton certain officials who were incapable, incompetent, inefficient and corrupt, to positions requiring experience, technical knowldege and integrity of character; another that the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, has been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon in the North-west Territories. And so it goes on with serious charges against the Minister of the Interior, against other Ministers and against the officials.

But these gentlemen say: Oh, we are not responsible for the acts of our officials. Mr. Speaker, for myself, and speaking only for myself, I am strongly in favour of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility. We know that some years ago an investigation was held in the case of one Minister of the Crown, Sir Hector Langevin. It was not proven that in any case Sir Hector Langevin had received a dollar of money improperly. But they said: wrong-doing was going on in your department; you were the watch-dog; you were the custodian of the Public Works, and as such you failed to detect wrong-doing. And Sir Hector Langevin had to leave the Cabinet. I assert the same doctrine of ministerial responsibility to-day. It will not do for the Minister to say: I appointed officers; they were a thousand miles away, and, if they did wrong, I disclaim all responsibility. Mr. Speaker, here was a succession of office-holders against whom charges were made in whose cases the hon. member for Pictou demands an investigation, an impartial investigation by judges of the land, a thorough investigation. The Minister of the Interior assumes that this is like a trial before a judge and that a man is to be found guilty or not guilty; and if found guilty, judgment is to be pronounced by the court. But, Sir, we are the court, we of the Parliament of Canada are the ones who are to receive the report of the judges with the evidence taken before them, and any conclusion to which they have arrived, if they arrive at any conclusion. So that the Parliament of Canada, to whom the judges will report, and the people of Canada behind the Parliament, will be the final court of appeal in this case. We want these matters investigated; we want the public to be informed of all the circumstances in connection with the matter. That inquiry is to be denied. They say: Mr. Ogilvie has been sent up there; Mr. Ogilvie is a competent man, a man with a high reputation; and, therefore, after Mr. Ogilvie has investigated and reported, there is nothing further to do. Mr. Speaker, I entirely dissent from that proposition. I say, in the first place, as has been stated by the hon. member for Pictou, that the investigation was started in a way that would almost kill it at the outset. No provision was made for the payment of witnesses. You expect men to come from all parts of the Yukon, from the four corners of the earth, for that matter to prove cases of wrong-doing at their own expense. Men will not do it. Then, if there were wrong-doing, it was committed, not only by the officials, but by those who paid them or bribed them to do wrong. It is no justification in law to say that they could not get their rights unless they paid money to bribe the officials, and so these men are amenable to the law. There was no provision, either, for the payment of witnesses or for their protection if they exposed wrong-doing in which they themselves were concerned. This was enough to block the investigation. But, as if that was not enough, the rule was made that there should be no investigation of acts committed after the 25th August, 1898. Sir, on the 25th August all wrong-doing did not cease. The Minister of the Interior said: Why, you are going to try men on charges respecting things that they had not committed when the charges were made. But this is not like a trial in court; this is inquisitorial—it is an investigation. The Government still continues in existence; they did not abdicate on the 25th August; they still control the management of affairs. If this were a Government that desired fairly and honestly to search out wrong-doing where it exists, they would give instructions for a thorough investigation up to the very day the investigation was held. Why not? Is there any reason in law, any reason in fair-play or common sense why such a thing should not be done? I know of none; I am sure the people of Canada will demand that there be a full investigation, that all the cases of wrong-doing shall be gone into. They tell us that Mr. Ogilvie implored people to come forward and give evidence. He might implore men to leave their $10 and $20 a day to come and give evidence and run the risk of being incarcerated for wrong-doing. Mr. Ogilvie could not clear these men from the penalties of

the law; no such power was given him. So, Mr. Ogilvie vainly implored men to come and tell that they had broken the law in conjunction with Government officials. And now hon. gentlemen opposite say: Look at the investigation; it has not disclosed this or it has not disclosed that. The marvel to me is that it has disclosed as much of the rascality and the wrong-doing as it has.

There is another charge of wrong-doing; for instance, there is a charge that there was a lease of the water front to two men, Morrison and Macdonald. This water front was very valuable; it was the centre of the town, a town built within very narrow limits, and the business was done along the water front. Morrison and McDonald got a lease of land. We were told two or three different stories in this House about that lease. First, the Minister told us there was a lease carefully drawn up giving all the restrictions and so on. Later on, the Minister was forced to admit that there had been no lease at all. Mr. Fawcett, I think, swore before the court that there was a lease, and that he signed it, and that he was compelled to sign by some influences that he did not explain very clearly. Apparently, he was compelled to sign this lease. Now, I would like to have the lease produced; I would like to have some information about it. The statement is openly made that the lawyer who had this matter in hand, who was acting for the Government on one hand and for the lessee on the other, got a retainer fee from these gentlemen of $10,000. I think that the charge is of sufficient seriousness to warrant a full and thorough investigation to ascertain what are the facts with regard to it.

Yet the Ministers tell us by their course to-day, that they are not going to permit these charges to be investigated. Why, Mr. Speaker, every one up there appeared to be a law unto himself. There was no authority that they would not exercise, whether they had the power or not. In the first place, I think the Government utterly misunderstood the situation. They failed to realize the importance of the country and the conditions under which their administration of it was to be carried on. Why, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) tells us to-night that as soon as he knew that, he went to work with the greatest expedition. Sir, the records prove exactly the contrary. The records prove that these gentlemen did not at any time realize the facts, or if they did realize them, there were some sinister influences at work preventing them from carrying out improvements and making the laws effective, administering the affairs of government, and doing what a Government should do, having no municipal authorities there. But they utterly misunderstood the situation. The records show that in August, 1896, Mr. Ogilvie warned the Government of the fact.

Mr. Ogilvie reported to the Department of the Interior the richness of the gold deposits, and advised them that a great development was expected, and that a great rush was likely to be made to the Klondike.

Even in 1894 the Government sent up a small squad of the North-west Mounted Police; and I myself, as Controller of Customs, appointed the sergeant-major of police as collector of customs, and thousands of dollars of customs duties were collected there in the year 1894. The Government knew these things. In 1896 Mr. Ogilvie reported that a great rush was likely to be made for the Klondike. They had full knowledge of these things in the fall of 1896. What was done in 1896? The Government simply folded their arms and did nothing. While they were sitting here in Parliament, in March, of 1897, the Government had information from Mr. Ogilvie of the enormous richness of the Klondike; they did not communicate that information to Parliament or to the people, it was apparently locked up in the minds of the Government, or in their records in the department, and the Minister of the Interior, for some purpose which we do not know to-day, and which we can only surmise, did not let the people of Canada know, in March, 1896, as he should have done, the report that Mr. Ogilvie had made of the enormous richness of the gold findings. But it appears that in July or August, 1897, returning Klondikers coming out with enormous quantities of gold, set the whole country on fire. Well, many people went in then, but the Government knew there would be an enormous influx of settlers next year. The whole country, the whole of Europe, Australia, South Africa, the United States, were amazed at the marvellous reports from the Klondike, which had been verified and found to be accurate. Then, if at any time, the Government might have been expected to do their duty, but there was a supineness, a negligence, a carelessness, a disregard of everything excepting one thing. We found that there was to be a railroad built in there, we found it under circumstances that have made the people of Canada suspicious ever since that behind that railroad scheme there was the most enormous piece of jobbery that Canada has ever seen, and there was too, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that. If these men had got that enormous heritage that they were to get in the Yukon regions for building that narrow gauge tramway, they would have made tens upon tens of millions of dollars profit at a very small expenditure indeed. But outside of that there was apparently very little done. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Pictou they neglected sanitary precautions, they neglected all those things that they had taken upon themselves to do. If they had established municipal govern-

ment, if they had given the people the management of their own affairs, then they might have said: We have conferred powers upon the people and if they neglect them it will be to their own cost. But the Government here delegated no powers to the people, gave them no opportunities. I am not finding fault with them for that, if they had justified the retention of power by themselves by doing what was required in the interest of humanity and of civilization. But they failed entirely in their duty, and the Minister of the Interior is the one, I presume, upon whom rests whatever responsibility there is. Then I say that not only was the Minister of the Interior responsible for wrong-doing, but other Ministers are also. Take the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who is so calmly slumbering—and I hate to raise my voice for fear I will awaken him. We are told that a vessel was taken in there and transferred to the Canadian Register because it could then do the local business, and that although that vessel was worth $60,000 before it was taken in, they valued it at $10,000. That is the statement we hear. We would like to hear from the Minister of Customs an explanation of that transaction. I have no doubt we will. But I only mentioned this to show that not only the Minister of the Interior but other Ministers in other departments were negligent of their duty. It is charged, too, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) appointed a man with a most unsavory record to be an inspector. Well, Sir, if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has any defence to make to that, and to the further charges that are made here against him—because there are other charges besides that——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes:

That the laws respecting the certificates of masters and mates have not been properly enforced in the Yukon district, but uncertificated officers, and officers disqualified, have been permitted to act as officers upon Canadian registered vessels, contrary to law, to the detriment of Canadian mariners holding certificates under Canadian laws.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the Minister of Customs.

Mr. WALLACE. No, that is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of Customs does not give certificates to masters and mates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but he sees whether they go on the vessels.

Mr. WALLACE. The charge is that these men have been given certificates, and officers disqualified have been permitted to act. Look at that statement in the London "Times," and last year the hon. Minister of the Interior sneered at the London "Times," as he does at everything that does not suit himself, but you cannot afford to ignore statements that are made in papers of such great authority and influence as the London "Times."

Mr. McMULLEN. Or the Toronto "Mail."

Mr. WALLACE. "Or the Toronto 'Mail,'" the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says. The correspondent of the London "Times," who visited that country, said:

It is deplorable to have to admit, but it is idle to ignore the fact that the administration of the Klondike district and the relations which exist between the representatives of the Government and the public leave almost everything to be desired. The population remains, on the whole, orderly and law-abiding, but it is in an open and emphatically expressed anticipation of changes which, to give satisfaction, must include within their operation both the system and the personnel. To put the position as plainly as is daily and hourly stated on the mining fields and in the streets of Dawson, there is a widely prevalent conviction not only that the laws are bad, but that the officers through whom they are administered are corrupt. It is hard on innocent and upright individuals whose administrative duties may be performed with scrupulous integrity to be associated in the sweeping charge which is made against the whole official body, but there is no disguising the universal dissatisfaction, and innocent and guilty stand at present together. It is impossible to talk for five minutes on business with any one on the mines or in the streets without some allusion occurring to the subject, and it is a painful experience for Englishmen proud of the purity of the British system of government to be compelled to listen to the plain-spoken comments of Americans and foreigners.

It is humiliating to every Canadian to know that such things are stated in the London "Times," and scattered broadcast, without any contradiction being given to them. The contradiction made by the Minister of the Interior is not worth anything, because his denial here to-night of things that are recorded against him, his simple denial of this commission, his refusal to have a thorough investigation, shows that he is not desirous of having the whole truth come out in regard to these matters. Take another point, and it is the supineness and carelessness of the Government from start to finish. They appointed Major Walsh with a great flourish of trumpets to the world, and pointed to his reputation for bravery, saying: You want a brave man up there. Well, I have been in British Columbia; I have been in the mining regions of Rossland, where six or seven thousand miners from all parts of the world are congregated. When I was there, Constable Kirkup was the only officer amongst the whole six or seven thousand people. You could go through the streets of Rossland any hour of the day or night in

perfect security. Patsy Clarke told me that he never saw anything like it. He said that he had been in the mining regions of the United States, where he had 100 American soldiers protecting himself and his men, and he added: "I did not feel as secure as I do in Rossland with a population of 6,000 or 7,000 and only one policeman. The Government sent up 200 of the permanent force of Canada, and I am told that they also sent up 250 of the North-west Mounted Police. I understood, of my own knowledge, that only 175 police were sent up. That would make 450 altogether. Have they demonstrated the necessity of that great force? Look at the enormous cost of maintaining those men there, and the enormous expenditure entailed in sending them in. Look every way, and you see the grossest extravagance, the grossest mismanagement, the most culpable neglect and carelessness in every direction. Major Walsh, as I say, was heralded as a courageous and brave man, and he was to be placed where brave men were required. He was called out in hot haste, apparently, because his services were required as an administrator, as one who should be in charge of the Mounted Police and the military force and who should control the whole government of the Yukon. He received his appointment on the 17th August, 1897; I think that is the date of the Order in Council appointing him. We heard that, although Major Walsh was appointed—and I certainly was amazed to hear it—he was not going out just yet. There was this extraordinary influx into that country, the necessity for soldiers and Mounted Police, the necessity for a strong hand, such as Major Walsh possessed, and which justified his appointment; but Major Walsh goes waltzing around the province of Ontario. He does not start for the Yukon on the 17th of August, nor the 18th of August, and the 18th of the next month still finds him in Ontario. It was not until the 27th of September that he started for the Yukon, and he stopped at Winnipeg and some place else. Then, when he was stranded on the way, we have the hon. Minister of the Interior telling us that he was not to go into Dawson City at all, where the miners were, where tens of thousands of people were, and in the direction of which they were expected to be rushing, but he was to stay at some wayside station. He was appointed on the 17th of August; he reached his destination on the 21st of May of the following year, nine months afterwards. What was the country doing? You see, these men take a long time to come in, but, when they are coming out, although they have to walk the stream, they do it in a very much shorter time than when they go in. This is one example of the bad management of this department. Here is a man whose presence, we were told, was necessary in the Yukon, a man of courage and energy, a man who could control these unruly elements that were going up there, and that would be a menace to free government and British institutions. There was no necessity for that large force of soldiers, or for all those mounted policemen. It was, I do not know why, a period of incapacity and of blundering. This Government, that boast that they are a business Government, that they have, in themselves, the business faculty to a greater degree than any Government that ever preceded them, although they have been most fortunate in many ways and have had the current running with them, at every step they have taken in connection with this matter to which I have called the attention of the House, have been guilty of mismanagement and blundering.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us that over again.

Mr. WALLACE. I might repeat it, Mr. Speaker, a hundred times, and it would not have the slightest effect on the hon. member for North Wellington.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have heard it more than that already.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that the whole course of the Government has been one of colossal and extravagant expenditure. They have taken funds that they have collected from the percentages given by the miners, from the customs returns, from the payments that were made by miners on their claims, and from all the sources, and they have expended all these moneys. I do not know the particulars, but I would like to know the full particulars of the course that the Government take in the collection of their revenues there, particularly in reference to the Department of Customs. It appears to me that in that community, which consumes an enormous quantity of goods, which paid the highest duties, such as liquors, tobaccos, wines and ales, we ought have had a very large revenue from it. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) gave me the statement, so far as he had received it, but these returns were not of very recent date, and were, I am sure, not satisfactory to the Minister (Mr. Paterson) himself. And now, with regard to the Postmaster General, who is absent to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. He is up in a back seat there.

Mr. WALLACE. If any Minister utterly neglected his duties it is the Postmaster General of Canada. When a new population gathers in any part of the country, the first duty of the Government is to provide it with mail facilities. Upon the first knowledge the Government had of the enormous finds of gold, the Post Office Department should have immediately organized a scheme for transmitting the mails. Indeed, Sir, if that had been done, it would have saved the Government many times over the neces-

sary expenditure that would be incurred. The Postmaster General failed in his duty, and as I understand from his own statement, he made no proper arrangement for carrying the mails until this very date, the first of July of the present year. The Mounted Police, and other agencies were employed in the mail service; but as Faith Fenton tells us in the "Globe," couriers were charging $1 a letter, and thousands of people were glad to pay that high sum to have their letters taken out. That is an extraordinary state of affairs. The Government themselves were the chief sufferers from the neglect of the Postmaster General. They have had to confess in this House that the mail was so slow and so uncertain, that they could not know what was going on in the territory, and that, therefore, they could not be held responsible. That being the case, the Postmaster General, in failing to provide the necessary mail facilities in the Yukon was grossly culpable and negligent. In view of all this mismanagement and wrong-doing by the Government, the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has taken his political life in his hands, and he tells the country that if he fails to make good his charges against the Minister of the Interior and against the others, it will be his duty to walk out of this House, and lose his position and reputation as a member of Parliament. In the face of a member of Parliament doing that, the Government now deny the privilege of a proper investigation. They tell us that Mr. Ogilvie made an investigation, but I tell them that Mr. Ogilvie was utterly debarred from making a thorough investigation. Mr. Ogilvie is a relative of the Minister of the Interior, and he is an official under the Minister of the Interior, and it is the Minister of the Interior who is the principal man aimed at by these charges. He surrounded himself with these officials. It is charged that he is in collusion, it is charged that he has been in with these men and their wrong-doing. I do not care what Mr. Ogilvie's qualifications otherwise may be, the very fact that he is an official of the Minister (Mr. Sifton) debars him from sitting in judgment upon his superior officer, and in addition to that he is a relative. These two things utterly preclude Mr. Ogilvie from being a judge in this case. He may judge these officials who are under him, but he cannot judge the man who appoints him and has full control over him. The Government refuse an investigation. They believe they have a majority behind them who will without investigation and without evidence vote them all right. But, Mr. Speaker, there is another jury to judge them. That jury is the people of Canada, who do not care very much which political party is in power, so long as they get honest and capable government. The people will be appealed to and they will give their verdict. Sir, if I am not very much mistaken, that verdict will be against the present Government, who, to-

Mr. WALLACE.

day, in this House of Commons, deny any proper inquiry into their misdeeds and bad government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of continuing this debate in the tone maintained by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) who has just taken his seat. This debate, in my humble opinion, is now at an end. It was completed and finished by the admirable and thorough and paramount reply given this afternoon by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to the indictment presented against him by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tuppr). I rise simply, in pursuance of the duty which is incumbent upon me as head of the Government and as leader of the House, to present the policy which I think the Government must assume upon this question, and to express what is the conduct which I believe it becomes the duty of the House to pursue. I have followed, as it was my duty to do, with close and minute attention every syllable that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I was anxious to know what were the new facts which he had to bring forward, what were the arguments which he was to base upon these new facts, and what were the conclusions which he would derive from them. I may say, and I call the special attention of the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to this: That if he was in earnest and sincere in his professed desire and object of attaining that investigation into the administration of the Yukon, he selected a strange and an absolutely unexampled method of attaining his object. I cannot resist the conclusion expressed by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had not for his object to obtain from this House an investigation and the granting of his motion, but simply to place before the House and before the country, an indictment which he knew the House perforce would have to reject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I say that the statement made by the Prime Minister is out of order in imputing to me insincerity, or any other object than that which I expressed in the most emphatic and direct language which it was possible for a man to use in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It did not occur to me, when I heard the remarks of the First Minister, that there was any wilful misrepresentation imputed to the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

The PRIME MINISTER. I will go further, and I will assume the position which is taken by the hon. gentleman. If he disclaims that that was his view, which I do not attribute to him so positively as he maintains, and that his object was merely to ob-

tain an investigation and the granting of his motion——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. If he disclaims it, I accept his disclaimer without any qualification ; I accept it in toto. But I must say that if it was his object, I cannot admire his judgment. Sir, the hon. gentleman has followed a course which is absolutely unprecedented in matters of this kind. This the hon. gentleman will not deny. There have been precedents by the dozens and the scores in this House, of motions to investigate the conduct of governments or of individual members of governments, and will the hon. gentleman ever point out a motion such as we have before us to-day ? Will he not admit at once that the course which he follows on this occasion has never been followed before ? Whenever a motion of this kind has been made, whenever a member of this House has thought it his duty to charge against the Government or against a member of the Government anything that he thought should be investigated, he has done it by first making a solemn declaration from his seat that he was credibly informed and thought he could prove such and such facts, and thereupon he has made a substantive motion. But when before this occasion, I ask the hon. gentleman, was ever such a motion moved—not as a substantive motion, but as an amendment to going into Committee of Supply ? This is the first time it has ever been done, and if it was not done with an object, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what it was done for ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman if I may. My object was that the vote of this House should be direct and not on any side issue—either the inquiry or not, and not as on a former occasion, when my motion was met by an amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman cannot, I think, assume any more wisdom than other members of this House. I suppose he will admit that there have been other members of this House as wise, as learned, and as anxious for the public weal as he is. No one has ever before been afraid to offer a motion which could bear the brunt of the criticism of the House ; but the hon. gentleman has just stated that his intention is to present a motion which cannot be amended. It has to be voted on as it is, whether right or wrong—as a whole, without any exception. This motion, which covers twenty pages of the Votes and Proceedings of this House, which it took the Speaker an hour and fifteen minutes to read, must be voted on without the omission of one single syllable. If there are in it propositions which are untenable or offensive, and which ought not to be inquired into, the House is not at liberty to eliminate them. There may be in this resolution charges which ought to be investigated ; but there are others which ought not to be investigated. In what position, then, are we ? Either the resolution has to be negatived in toto or affirmed in toto. Either the charges which ought to be investigated have to be refused investigation, or those which ought not to be investigated have to be given an investigation. This is the proposition before us, and this is the object which the hon. gentleman with his own mouth now tells us he had in view in making it.

But, Sir, I will go further. The hon. gentleman has a certain position in this House; but even after the speech which was delivered by the hon. Minister of the Interior this afternoon, the levity—I speak advisedly—which was displayed by the hon. gentleman is incredible. It is not worthy of the position he occupies in this House. It was not worthy of him to make charges against my hon. friend in a solemn document, which even at this moment, before an investigation is granted, are proved to be baseless and false.

The House, I maintain, could not grant this investigation as it is demanded in that resolution, because it would involve a procedure which would be unconstitutional. It would involve a breach of the constitution of this country, and I am sure the House could not consent to that. Sir, if we have to take this resolution as it is framed, carefully framed, with an object, as we know from the lips of the hon. gentleman himself, it includes, wilfully and deliberately, a charge against Mr. Justice Dugas. The hon. gentleman told us this afternoon that he did not propose to proceed against Mr. Justice Dugas as Judge Dugas, but as a member of the Executive Council of the Yukon district. Sir, it was proved this afternoon aganst the hon. gentleman, who has been clamouring day in and day out for returns, that he did not read the returns when they were brought down. I say he has not read his own motion, for I will show immediately that the charge which he has made against Mr. Justice Dugas is not made against him simply as a member of the Executive Council of the Yukon district, but is at the same time made against him as a judge. The allegation does not read this way : that the said Mr. Justice Dugas, while a member of the Executive Council thereof, became, was, and is pecuniarily interested in mining claims in said district. If such were the language of the motion, my hon. friend could disclaim any intention of proceeding against Mr. Justice Dugas as Judge Dugas. But what is the language of the motion ?

That the said Mr. Justice Dugas, while a judge for the Yukon judicial district, and while a member of the Executive Council thereof, became, was and is pecuniarily interested in mining claims in said district.

What is the consequence of this accusation ? Is it not stated here and now that

Mr. Justice Dugas, if he became pecuniarily interested in mining claims, violated his duty both as a member of the Executive Council and as a judge? So that the hon. gentleman makes a direct charge against Mr. Justice Dugas, not only in one capacity, but in both capacities which he occupies in that district. And the hon. gentleman, seeing now that he cannot wriggle out of the position he has taken, says: "We must divide Mr. Justice Dugas into two parts; one is impeachable, but the other I impeach; I do not attack the judge; I simply attack the member of the Executive Council." I have shown that the hon. gentleman has forgotten his motion already, or he has not read it carefully, for it attacks Mr. Justice Dugas as a judge. But, Sir, I may say at once to the hon. gentleman that I care not whether or not the accusation is made against Mr. Justice Dugas, not in his capacity as a judge, but as a member of the Executive Council. I will show the hon. gentleman that he cannot take refuge in that pretense. I need not remind the House that there is nothing in the constitution or the laws of England so carefully guarded and protected as the honour and dignity of the bench; and this feature of the laws and constitution of England has been imported into our constitution. The British North America Act provides that no judge can be attacked except in a certain solemn manner:

Section 99. The judges of the Superior Court shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on an Address of the Senate and House of Commons.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. And the hon. gentleman knows very well that it is not open for him to attack a judge in this House except for the purpose of removing him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Minister allow me to interrupt?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to follow the right hon. gentleman intelligently. I would like to ask him whether he is arguing that because a judge is not removable without an Address of both Houses, this House cannot inquire into the conduct of a judge, but is constitutionally prevented from doing so, even though the charge be made here—or whether he is not, for instance, responsible in a court of law for crimes outside altogether of this procedure that the right hon. gentleman refers to, contemplating his removal?

The PRIME MINISTER. If a judge commits a crime, he is indictable before a court of law, but if he commits an act which is not of such a gross nature as to impel his dismissal upon impeachment, the hon. gentleman has no right to bring that to the attention of Parliament. The hon. gentleman must know that, or he ought to, if he does not. Here is the duty of the House in that regard, as defined in Todd, at page 873:

Bearing in mind the general responsibility of the Ministers of the Crown for the due administration of justice throughout the kingdom, and the obligation which they owe to the dispensers of justice to preserve them from injurious attacks and calumnious accusations, it is necessary that, before consenting to any motion for a parliamentary inquiry into the conduct of a judge—or even for the reception of a petition complaining of the conduct of a judge and not asking for his removal from office in accordance with the statute—or not alleging reasonable grounds for such a proceeding—Ministers should themselves have investigated the matter of complaint, and be prepared either to oppose or facilitate the interference of Parliament on the particular occasion.

Therefore, before the matter is brought to the attention of Parliament, the Ministers must be informed of the accusations themselves, they must have the opportunity of looking into it and advising Parliament whether or not it is a fit subject for inquiry.

I see some hon. gentlemen opposite laughing at this. Shall I again read the language of the authority:

Ministers should themselves have investigated the matter of complaint, and be prepared either to oppose or facilitate the interference of Parliament on the particular occasion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Suppose they do not?

The PRIME MINISTER. Have the Ministers been informed? Have they had an opportunity of investigating? Are they able to-day to advise Parliament whether Parliament should interfere or not? And here is the principle laid down, in clear language, that before Parliament can be called on to investigate, the matter must be brought before the executive and the Ministers must advise Parliament. Was this matter ever brought before the Ministers? Was this simple elementary justice to Judge G. Dugas ever done? Whoever complained of Judge Dugas before we saw this motion? The Government never were made aware of any complaint. So that the first safeguard which protects the judiciary has been violated. Let me read further:

That the House of Commons should not initiate, and Ministers of the Crown ought not to sanction, any attempt to institute criminative charges against any one, unless upon some distinct and definite basis; and, in the case of a judge, such charges should only be entertained upon allegations of misconduct that would be sufficient, if proved, to justify his removal from the bench.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Unless a charge is brought against a judge which, if proved, would justify his removal from the bench, such a charge should not be entertained. Consequently, if this charge brought against Judge Dugas is sufficiently grave in its character to warrant his impeachment, that is the course which should be resorted to. The writer then goes on to say :

> But it is immaterial whether such misconduct had been the result of an improper exercise of his judicial functions, or whether it was solely attributable to him in his private capacity, provided only that it had been of a nature to unfit him for the honourable discharge of the judicial office.

Here is the elementary law, that no judge ought to be impugned unless the matter has been brought before the executive, so that it may be prepared to advise Parliament whether or not the charge is to be entertained. No judge is to be impugned before the charge against him has been brought to the attention of the executive. Parliament has not the initiative, but the executive must first be advised of the charge. These two conditions have been violated, and this motion is absolutely unconstitutional. But there is more than that. Whoever heard of a judge being impugned before Parliament before he had been given an opportunity of defending himself ? This is a simple, broad statement of law applicable not only to judges, to the humblest subjects in the land, that no man is to be traduced except he is given the opportunity of a fair trial. Who will tell me that Judge Dugas has had a fair trial, when he never heard the charge brought against him ? Here is the law again :

> That no address for the removal of a judge ought to be adopted by either House of Parliament, except after the fullest and fairest inquiry into the matter of complaint by the whole House or a committee of the whole House, at the bar ; notwithstanding that the same may have already undergone a thorough investigation before other tribunals.
>
> The application of this principle will obviously necessitate that the person complained of shall be duly informed of the intended proceedings against him at every stage of the inquiry.

Judge Dugas never heard of this motion, yet the hon. gentleman does not scruple to ask Parliament to pass judgment upon him and to traduce him before a commission of judges, who are to inquire into whether or not he is guilty of the charges brought against him.

There are precedents in this matter. Judges have been traduced before in this House, and these principles laid down by Todd have always been rigidly adhered to. In 1877 a motion was made to impeach Mr. Justice Loranger. On the 15th February, 1877, the following motion was moved :—

> Moved by Mr. Béchard :
>
> "That a special committee, consisting of Messrs. Béchard, Holton, MacDonnell (Inverness), Appleby, Kirkpatrick, Irving, Masson, Desjardins, Brooks, Baby, Jette, Taschereau and Laurier, be appointed to inquire into the administration of justice in the district of Richelieu, in the province of Quebec, and that the petition of F. X. A. Biron, notary, and others, of the said district of Richelieu, complaining of the conduct of the Hon. Thomas Jean Jacques Loranger, judge of the Superior Court of the said province of Quebec, and petition of the Hon. Justice Loranger be referred to the said committee, and that the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

Now, Sir, this was the last stage of a series of proceedings that had taken place. This was not the first petition which had been presented against Mr. Justice Loranger. A petition had been prepared and sent to the executive, and by the executive sent to Judge Loranger, who sent his reply, and then the whole was investigated. Hon. Edward Blake at that time was Minister of Justice, and no greater authority upon such matters ever lived in this country, and this is what he said :

> A person approached me on behalf of the learned judge, and represented that, as he had not had an opportunity of answering those petitions which, it was presumed, contained charges against him, it would not be proper to bring them down in the manner proposed. I quite agreed in that view. It was subsequently thought proper not further to delay in the matter, and the complaint was transmitted to the learned judge. From ill-health and other causes he delayed his answer until very recently ; indeed, until within a few days from the opening of the session. The answer was in very considerable detail, and the petitioners had been allowed to make observations upon it. I have not had time or opportunity to verify the allegations of the answer, but I think it due to the learned judge to say that, assuming his statement to be in the main correct, it dissipates the allegations of that particular article of the charge.

And upon this Mr. Blake advised the reference of the case to a committee, the committee met and the matter was adjudicated. Now, none of these precautions have been taken here ; none of these safeguards which have been brought down from remote ages for the security and dignity of the bench, and for the independence of the judiciary are observed. This motion is unconstitutional, yet the hon. gentleman asks, without preliminary investigations and without observing any of these formalities, to refer this case of Judge Dugas to a commission of judges to investigate his conduct. The hon. gentleman appealed, not to the Government, but to the House. I also appeal to the House. I appeal, not to this side of the House alone, but to the other side ; I appeal to the members who sit on that side, and I ask them if they are prepared, any one of them to say that they will drag Judge Dugas before a committee of investigation without his having had an opportunity to hear these

charges and answer them. I appeal to gentlemen on the other side, not for any favour, but I appeal to fair play, for simply British fair-play for Judge Dugas on this occasion. And I shall be much surprised, indeed, if this appeal is not listened to. Now, this case alone is enough to compel the House not to grant this investigation, even if on other points the House thought there was a case for investigation. My attention is called to an authority, which is not Todd, it is true, but which I hope, in the eyes of the hon. gentlemen, will be considered at least equal to Todd—I wish to quote the language of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper himself. In a speech delivered this very session, this is what the hon. gentleman said :

> Now, in these cases regard has heretofore very properly been had to the solemn and careful steps that are taken in the case of an impeachment of a Superior Court judge ; that is to say, the Government is bound, before even calling on a judge to answer charges that have been presented to the proper department against his conduct, to see that these charges are themselves so specific and so exact that they are not only ready for issue to be taken upon them, but that they are of such a character that, if established in the form in which they are presented, they would constitute a case for the removal of the judge from his position.

What are the special charges brought against the judge ?

> That the said Mr. Justice Dugas, while a judge for the Yukon judicial district, and while a member of the Executive Council thereof, became, was and is pecuniarily interested in mining claims in said district.

These are all the particulars given to Judge Dugas upon which to defend himself. And he has not even seen that much, little as it is. But there are, in this indictment, if I may so dignify this long rigmarole of incoherent sentences put together, there are other charges, which I, for one, am not prepared to refer to a commission of judges, though there is not the constitutional objection to them which I have shown in the case of the charge against Judge Dugas. For my part, I am not disposed to call upon the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Sir Henry Strong, a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to investigate the charges made here, for instances, of delinquencies which may have been committed by Levere Villeneuve, a dog-driver of the Mounted Police. This is purely ludicrous. But there are things which are odious as well as ludicrous. I am not prepared to call upon a commission of judges to determine whether or not Major Walsh, while discharging his duties, was intemperate. Sir, it is not a commendable thing for any man to appear, not merely in the discharge of public duties, but to appear at all, under the influence of liquor. Of course, it becomes him who is without sin to cast the first stone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise with the permission, no doubt, of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ask whether he wishes to insinuate anything in the observation which is received with cheers and jeers by his followers, and which seems to refer to a remark or two with which I was interrupted during my speech, or does he wish to make a specific charge ?

The PRIME MINISTER. In this matter my object is to cast the mantle of charity. I think the hon. gentleman would have done well, even if Major Walsh had been guilty of anything of the kind, not to cast the stone of obloquy upon him, but to let his act pass into oblivion. The hon. gentleman is absolutely without excuse.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the right hon. gentleman answer my question, whether he wishes to insinuate that I was under the influence of liquor during the discharge of my public duty ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I never insinuated anything ; when I wish to make a charge I make it. I have no charge to make against the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He is not in issue. I do not understand the interruption of the hon. member for York that I had "better not," or something of that kind. I am the judge of what I shall do, and he has nothing to say.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has——

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say the hon. member for West York, I said the hon. member for York.

Mr. WALLACE. He said the hon. member for West York.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. But there is more than that. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) not only charges Major Walsh with being intemperate, but charges him with immorality. And he says he wants a commission of judges to investigate the charge he makes :

> That while acting as the chief executive officer of the Canadian Government, Major Walsh carried on in the Yukon a liaison with one known as Lucille Elliott.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And more.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will come to that presently. I will cite the sentence with which the hon. gentleman concluded. But before I quote that I want to reiterate and emphasize what I said a moment ago—that the hon. gentleman is absolutely without excuse for having brought the name of Lucille Elliott into this matter to make a charge against Major Walsh. Now, I quote what follows, for here is the charge :

That Lucille Elliott was permitted to enjoy privileges, advantages and favours from the local authorities in said district.

There is a charge ; it might be investigated, perhaps it will be investigated. There might be an investigation as to whether these privileges and favours were illegally granted to that woman. But, Sir, if these undue and illegal favours were granted to that woman, does the alleged immoral relations of Major Walsh with her, whether before or after these illegal favours, make the charge any stronger ? Why, Sir, if these undue and illegal favours were granted to that woman, Lucille Elliott, the charge against him would be just as strong, if his relations with her had been absolutely innocent. Therefore, how can the hon. gentleman make his charge any stronger by proving the indictment of immoral relations ? The hon. gentleman ought to remember that Major Walsh has a wife and children. He has pleaded his duty. It may be sometimes the duty of a brave man to be severe on another man, but I never can conceive that it is the duty of any man to be cruel to a defenceless woman and innocent children. I, for one, am not disposed to appoint a judge to investigate into the relations, proper or improper, between Major Walsh and Lucille Elliott. There might, perhaps, be some colour of excuse in the fact that Major Walsh was a civil officer of this Government ; but Major Walsh is no longer an officer of this Government, he is a private citizen. But, even though all the hon. gentleman's allegations of immorality were true, how could they effect the case? Sir, it was simple, wanton cruelty on the part of the hon. gentleman to add those charges. The hon. gentleman might have been justified in bringing in anything and everything that would strengthen his case, but he had no excuse to bring in needless charges of immorality, which can only give pain to some people, and which cannot add an iota to the strength of the case which he has brought before the House.

Now, Sir, I will say, without any hesitation, that there may be things which might be the subject of inquiry; there may be things which may still be the subject of inquiry. We know there have been reports and charges of improper conduct, and we have appointed a commission to investigate them. Now, whether the commission which we have appointed to investigate them is sufficient or not, will depend upon the report which has been brought down, and a further report, which is yet to be brought down. The commission has gone a certain length ; we have a report here, which report has been printed and has been in the hands of members of this House for three days. How many members of this House have read that report ? There are not ten, there are not five, there is not even one. The hon. gentleman himself may have looked into it cursorily, but he has not read it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have read it from cover to cover.

The PRIME MINISTER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement without reservation ; but, if he has read it, he has only read it very cursorily, and I am sure he has not digested it, as his speech proves. But that is only one report ; there is another report to come. We know that there is now on the way down here a further and conclusive part of this report. When it arrives, and we have taken cognizance of it, then we shall know whether this investigation now going on will be sufficient or not.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman yesterday dilated for about one hour—if I remember rightly—upon the case of the water front, which he alleged had been improperly, illegally and corruptly sold by Mr. Wade to a certain firm of which McDonald was a member. We know that Mr. Wade has given his evidence upon this transaction, and, when we have this final report, then our duty, will be, as a Government to determine whether the investigation on this point has been sufficient or otherwise. But, until these reports have come down, until we know their tenor, I say that we should not be called upon to order any further investigation. But I will say this, speaking under my responsibility as head of the Government, that if this investigation is not sufficient, another investigation will be ordered. We must probe these Yukon delinquencies, so-called, to the bottom. No officer of the Government must be allowed to rest under any suspicion.

As I said a moment ago, we have already had an investigation carried on by Mr. Ogilvie. Mr. Ogilvie has been assailed, but, while everybody must admit the great merit of that gentleman, let me add to the testimony in his favour given by two members of the Government, and by officials of the Government in the Yukon territory, a paragraph that was published in the Montreal "Gazette" on August 1st, 1898 :

According to our Ottawa correspondent, Judge Dugas, of Montreal, has not yet been formally appointed judge of the Yukon district, but the matter is practically settled. The Government and the judge are alike to be congratulated. If all appointments were as justifiable as those of Judge Dugas and Mr. Ogilvie, the Opposition's task of criticism on this head would be a sinecure, but of that there seems little danger.

The Montreal "Gazette" will not, apparently, appreciate the fair criticism of the hon. member for Pictou. Now, Sir, I have only a word to say with regard to the personal charges made against my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend rightly called attention to the fact that no personal charge of corruption is made against him in this indictment. It is true, however, that in one single paragraph the hon. member for Pictou came near to making an assertion of that nature, but he did not. This is the nearest that he came to it :

That the Hon. Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, has been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon, in the North-west Territories.

That, as appears by a Return (83), 3rd Session, 8th Parliament, 61 Victoria, 1898 (Canada), the following parties applied for and obtained leases of good placer mining or gold dredging areas in the Yukon district :—

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Bonanza Creek.

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on S. Fork (Stewart).

G. Philp, said to be of London, for lease on B. Salmon.

A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Indian River or Creek.

J. A. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Teslin River or Creek.

A. D. Cameron, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease on Stewart's River or Creek.

Now, Sir, the Minister of the Interior has shown this afternoon that this statement is absolutely incorrect. None of the Philp's have obtained any of the leases there mentioned. I will come to the other point presently in regard to which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) shakes his head. But this indictment goes on to say :

That Mr. A. E. Philp and Mr. A. D. Cameron, aforesaid, were partners in business with the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, when that gentleman became Minister of the Interior, and all were members of the firm of Sifton, Philp & Cameron, of Brandon.

There is an insinuation, not a charge, that Messrs. Philp and Cameron, being partners of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), had obtained, because of that partnership, this lease. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says so, but as a matter of fact they were no longer partners of the hon. Minister of the Interior. The hon. member for West York came to the rescue of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and how did he meet the charge ? He said that Mr. Philp obtained a dredging lease on the Klondike. Well, Sir, is that a charge against the hon. Minister of the Interior ? Is it alleged here in this indictment that Mr. Philp has obtained a dredging lease upon the Klondike? There is not a word in the indictment, and the answer given by the hon. member for West York is altogether out of the indictment. It is possible that Mr. Philp may have obtained a dredging lease on the Klondike. I do not know that Mr. Philp was not just as open as anybody else to have that lease, but how could the hon. Minister of the Interior answer that insinuation when it was not to be found in the indictment ? The hon. Minister of the Interior, having demolished the indictment these hon. gentlemen say that there is something beside that. When the charge is made the hon. Minister of the Interior will answer it, but he is not bound to answer it until the charge is made. Let me say to the hon. member for West York, and to the hon. member for Pictou that if these hon. gentlemen or any one else will say that Mr. Philp has obtained that dredging lease on the Klondike through any corrupt collusion with the hon. Minister of the Interior I have only here to repeat what the hon. Minister of the Interior said a moment ago, he will have a commission of investigation, the very minute that such a charge is made. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior showed conclusively this afternoon that we are not to surrender the privileges of Parliament. It is not to a commission of judges that we have to answer. It is to Parliament and to Parliament we are responsible. If any hon. gentleman will move for a committee of investigation and charge a corrupt act against us he will have that committee immediately, and we will take the responsibility. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has had the honour to have brought upon his head the ire of the Opposition. Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite and in so saying I am sure that I voice the feeling of every man in the Liberal party, that we love him for the enemies he has made, and we have every confidence in him for the ability and courage with which he has discharged the duties entrusted to his care.

Mr. GEORGE E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rose with the expressed idea of heightening the tone of debate, of raising it from the somewhat low level to to which he alleged it had been degraded by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Well, the right hon. gentleman was almost immediately successful in so elevating the tone of debate as to attribute to an hon. gentleman, on this side of the House, dishonest motives in bringing in the resolution which has been brought in by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and I doubt if his subsequent remarks, in the heated and somewhat angry tone in which he has addressed them to the House, have been conspicuous as a successful effort to raise the tone of debate to the dignified level to which it was his aspiration to have it elevated. I am, I may say, a little diffident at taking upon myself the liberty of addressing any more remarks to this House at this stage, when my right hon. friend has declared, in his strongest terms, that the debate is now ended. It was ended he says by the admirable address of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I suppose I will bring down upon my devoted head the ire, not only of the hon. gentleman, but of his followers, if I pretend for a single moment to doubt that it is ended and to follow with a few remarks even after the "admirable" speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior, supplemented by the no less admirable speech of the right hon. Prime Minister. At least I will plead my privilege as a member of Parliament to question the statement

that this debate is ended. My right hon. friend was very anxious for new facts, and the same anxiety was observable in the whole address of the hon. Minister of the Interior. New facts are what they want. On this side of the House we have the idea that the old facts are quite sufficient, and until the old facts have been met and disposed of it is rather inviting disaster for hon. gentlemen to be over anxious for new facts. My right hon. friend has strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel. In his anxiety about some little matters in reference to the outside of the platter he has called upon his devoted followers to assist him in preventing the cleansing of the platter itself. What are these tremendously heavy and weighty matters which intervene between this Parliament and the appointment of a judicial commission to make inquiry into what the right hon. gentleman, his Government and his party have, over and over again declared, by their action in this House, ought to be inquired into. Almost the last sentence that the right hon. gentleman used was that this inquiry should not stop until everything was probed to the bottom as long as any cloud of suspicion rested upon any official of this Government. I think, then, my right hon. friend has given away the ground entirely as to the necessity for new facts and as to the desirability of the investigation not being pressed. The simple difference between this side of the House and the other seems to be not in the conviction if we might attribute sincerity to words, not in the conviction that inquiry is necessary, inquiry that goes to the bottom and probes this matter, and does not rest until the shadow of suspicion is removed from every official of the Government. I think the only difference between us, then is a difference as to how this might be best carried out. The Prime Minister says: Not by a commission of judges as prayed for in the resolution of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) Oh, no. Why not? Because, he says, the method is unexampled. The essence of the matter is to get at the truth and probe it to the bottom. But no, he says, you must not do that if it be by an unexampled method. You must not do it if the object is not an honest one, and my right hon. friend implied, yes, directly asserted—so did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) who made that admirable address—that my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was not honest in his preferment of this indictment. It is said that he was looking for some party advantage, in the sense that he strove to have an indictment put before this House of such a nature that, perforce, Parliament could not accept his motion and approve an investigation on these lines. We are told that the course was never followed before. We are told in effect that a man must get up and say that he was credibly informed and he must then make a substantive motion. There was the whole of the absolute difficulty my right hon. friend met in this line of investigation. Reduced down to a point it was: that the hon. member for Pictou had not made a substantive motion; that if he got up in this House and moved the very same series of resolutions in a substantive motion, everything would have been right, in the estimation of my right hon. friend. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) chose to move it as a motion, about which the hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot quibble and shift and evade, a motion which must be taken as it is put, and voted upon as it was designed. And because it was moved in that way, and not as a substantive motion, there is a mountain in the way of its being adopted by Parliament.

The Prime Minister told us: Some charges in it may be investigated, others may not. I will take the right hon. gentleman on his own ground. If he has any sincerity in making that as one of his arguments, and feels that it is a vital one, the right hon. gentleman could easily have pointed out to his followers these things in the motion which he considered involved subjects that ought not to be investigated, and told his followers: Vote this motion down, and I will put before you a motion embracing these things which it is proper to investigate, and to investigate in this way. My right hon. friend did not do that. There was another course open to him. If he is really desirous that this matter should be probed to the bottom by a competent commission, as this motion has been before this House for some time, he could have suggested to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that it might be amended in certain ways in which the Government would accept it. There are various ways by which a gentleman who is really anxious not to throw his own weight and the force of his Government between the investigation of wrong and the wrong itself, might have had this matter arranged so that the House could have voted it. My right hon. friend did none of these. He simply raised these as mountains—veritable mole-hills they are—and presented them before his followers as reasons why they should not vote for this motion. But there was another reason given by him, and that was the extreme levity with which the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) conceived these resolutions, and spoke to them afterwards.

The right hon. gentleman told us that the procedure is unconstitutional. Why? Because, he said, within the four corners of that resolution there is one clause that mentions a judge, and if that one clause mentions a judge, no matter in what capacity the judge may be mentioned, that is unconstitutional. Consequently, the consti-

tution of Great Britain and of Canada must be invoked against the desire of good meaning men on the opposite side of the House, to see that an investigation is carried on by a competent tribunal. I am not a lawyer, I am not even a constitutional lawyer, but if the right hon. gentleman appeals to the constitution, I shall appeal to common sense, which, I believe, is prior to any constitution, and is the foundation of all the best constitutions. And, Sir, so long as I am a member of this House, and so long as this Government make judges a part of the executive to carry on any portion of the Government of any part of this country, just so long I will exercise my right as a member of this House to criticise the conduct of that judge as an executive officer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Todd was read, and the ghost of a great constitutional writer was brought up in order to frighten this House from voting these resolutions. I have not been able to read all that Todd wrote with reference to that in the short time since my right hon. friend quoted the authority, but I venture to say that all the cases that are cited, and consequently the whole force of the writing of Todd and the conclusions of Todd in that respect, go upon the assumption that judges are being charged as judges, that their conduct is being investigated as judges, and not as executive councillors appointed by a party government, undertaking the execution of the machinery of government in any district, under the instruction of gentlemen who form a party government, and who are consequently responsible for carrying out these matters. I do not think that within the four corners of Todd you will find that he contemplates a judge as an executive officer, as an officer in a political capacity rather than that of a judge; so that, therefore, none of the principles that Todd lays down, or the strictures he makes are predicated upon that assumption or upon that possibility at all.

Any way, Sir, common sense teaches me, and teaches, I believe, every other member in this House, that if a party is going to appoint judges to help them in governing this country, make mining laws, constitute themselves judges of claims, do all these things that a Cabinet may do, that executive officers may do in the Yukon or any other part of this country, they must expect that these men's actions will be criticised as they ought to be criticised, with reference to the duties which they have been appointed to discharge as executive officers. My right hon. friend would like to shelter himself behind that doctrine, but the common sense of the people of Canada will give him no shelter there. Carried to its absurdity, all my right hon. friend has to do is to appoint a council composed entirely of judges, and this House would be absolutely debarred from any criticism of the council of the Yukon, unless upon what? Unless on the initiative of the precious party Government that appointed them for their own purposes. That is the direct and the absolutely logical conclusion of the principle that my right hon. friend has laid down. I am willing to rest that with the common sense of the people of this country, and I say again, and with all respect for judges as judges, that if Judge Dugas is ten thousand times a judge, if he does what I think is wrong as an executive officer of a party Government, I will criticise in him what I think is wrong.

My right hon. friend followed the cue of the admirable speaker of the afternoon (Mr. Sifton), and what was the cue of the admirable speaker of the afternoon? One fair criticism of the admirable speech is this: that while the Minister (Mr. Sifton) very deftly laid hold of two or three unimportant points, he rested his whole case on these. That was the trick of a smart advocate, of a clever lawyer: but he left the weighty charges which are involved in that resolution severely and discreetly alone. I will give the House one example. Wonderful speech! Admirable speech! And oh, the weight of the argument! The typewriter in rewriting the resolution of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made a mistake in a date and put it down "1896," when it should have been "1898." And what was the charge involved? It is one of the gravest that has yet been brought against that gentleman's administration—that, forsooth, in the town of Dawson, where some 10,000 to 30,000 people congregated, had to live summer months and winter months, with an unlimited treasury at his disposal, with millions taken out of the Yukon itself; that up to a late period there was not a sign of nor a step taken with reference to the simplest sanitation of the town of Dawson, and that as a consequence discomfort and disease and epidemic visited that city and wrought its havoc on the people who had to live there. That was the charge. That was an important charge. How did this admirable speaker deal with it? He dealt with it in this way: "There was an epidemic charged in 1896. This Dawson City grew up after that, and this Government's powers were exercised after 1896. Therefore, the member for Pictou has charged that on account of certain actions done after 1896, an epidemic broke out before the actions were done. Now, he says, "let the member for Pictou vacate his seat." That is the way this admirable gentleman settled this debate, so that there is no longer any chance for argument.

Mr. BERGERON. They applauded that for five minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, as my hon. friend says, they applauded that. The weighty

things of the law were never touched, but the little tithes of anise and cummin, of smart, shrewd and not very honourable pleading in a Minister of the Crown, tickled the palates of his followers, and made them say, as I heard one saying out, "That is the strongest and most admirable speech I ever heard in that House." That is the way my admirable friend made his admirable defence.

One other thing he touched and proved to his own satisfaction, and it is now before this House—that the member for Pictou, in a certain compilation from a report that had been brought down to this House, had wrongly quoted, in so far as it appears, with reference to leases having been obtained; and he dwelt upon that, which was simply an error, without concealment, because my hon. friend quoted the return itself, which every man in this House could read, with no purpose of deceiving at all. Why, it would have been silly to have done that, with the report given by himself and in the hands of the members of this House. One of two things may be said in reference to that. It may be an error in taking out these items from the report; or it may be that my hon. friend is able to prove what the report does not show on the face of it, and what hon. gentlemen opposite have not successfully contradicted.

Now, then, those two points, and those two alone, were the only points that the Minister of the Interior was effective upon at all. He dwelt on those lengthily and to his own satisfaction; and, after you have taken the pith of them, they are the merest froth on the top of the topmost wave; whilst he did not attempt to touch the strong foundation charges which were made in the indictment of my hon. friend from Pictou. Yet this admirable advocate settled this debate by his admirable speech.

Again, strong eulogies were passed on two gentlemen, Mr. Senkler and Mr. Ogilvie, but nothing was said of a number of others. That was the old trick of the former discussion carried on in this House by the hon. Minister of the Interior—to slip very lightly over the doubtful and charged ones, and to make a strong eulogium upon those whom no one attacked; and my right hon. friend follows the same admirable method, and quotes from the "Gazette," an article to show that the appointments of Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Justice Dugas were good and fit appointments. Good and fit for what? Nobody has challenged that the appointment of Mr. Dugas was a fit appointment as a judge. Nobody has challenged that the appointment of Mr. Ogilvie was a fit and good appointment as a commissioner for the Yukon territory. But Judge Dugas, acting as an executive councillor, and Mr. Ogilvie acting as a judge commissioned to try a case, are two very different things from Judge Dugas as a judge, and Mr. Ogilvie as the commissioner of the Yukon appointed to carry out his civil functions in that district. Now, Sir, what we say is—and we say it with no detriment to him as a man—that Mr. Ogilvie is not the fittest person for the best carrying out of an investigation into these charges, and for several reasons. One of them has been made very light of. First, we say that it is not meeting the sense of fitness in Canada and in the British Empire, which is seized of these allegations or facts, whichever you may call them, to take a man who is a subordinate and in the pay of the Minister himself, and to appoint him to hold a court of inquiry into the malfeasance, as is alleged, of the officials under that same Minister's department and under that Government. Whatever you may say about relations—and I believe this admirable speaker, prompted by my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), was almost on the point of saying that he had never seen his aunt to whom Mr. Ogilvie is married—the very moment you appoint Mr. Ogilvie to take the place of a judge and hold a court to investigate matters under his own and his superior's administration, that moment you should be careful to keep relationship entirely out of the position of the judge who is to preside and make the inquiry. Why, that is the plainest principle that obtains with judges on the bench. Not only is relationship debarred, but the least interest is debarred on the part of judges. In every court you will find instances of a judge absenting himself from a case because he has some slight interest in it, in some way or other, and you will find judges refusing to adjudicate on cases because they are related in some way to some of those who have the case before them. It is the simplest principle, for the protection of judges and the judicial authority, that they should be kept as far as possible from the suspicion of interest, either pecuniarily or in the point of relationship. That is why we say that the sense of fitness and justice has not been met by the appointment of a relative, and paid officer of this Minister to conduct these investigations into his own administration of the Yukon.

But there is one thing which the right hon. gentleman consoles himself with, that from this time forth he is able to love this admirable Minister of the Interior; and one of the strangest grounds on which affection from my right hon. friend is placed, is not, for instance, even the admirable qualities of this admirable Minister—not even his great abilities as they show themselves to my right hon. friend. No such well-reasoned and sensible grounds for basing his affections for the Minister of the Interior. No, he loves him because the member for Pictou hates him. That may be a very good reason, a very good ground on which to base one's affections, but generally we would think that there should be a better reason, a better basis, for affection and friendship than that. But what is the

cause of all this attempt to draw pity to the poor Minister of the Interior? Because he is hounded bitterly, and abused, and followed. In what sense has he been hounded, or followed, or bitterly abused? I have failed to see or hear it in this House. He presides over a department in this Government. With reference to his management of that department, he is open to criticism. He has been criticised, and will hereafter be criticised; but, because the Opposition criticises the department and the head of the department on account of what they believe to be the inefficient, the neglectful way in which it is managed, it by no means follows that they abuse him, or follow him, or hound him. We love this admirable Minister of the Interior, and we love him not because anybody hates him. We love him just as far as his loving and lovable qualities will give us a basis for our affections and no further. But we do not consider him of such majestic mien or wonderful power that we are hurling all the envenomed shafts of hatred and bitterness against him as a shining mark. We have no such thought as that in our minds. He and his colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, both suffer from a little halucination in that respect. They are not, however, so important in the eyes of the Opposition and the country as they think, but they happen, whether by accident or otherwise, to have very important departments under them at present. And, consequently, they become, not in their personality, but in their administration, shining marks for good and reasonable criticism on the Opposition side—only that, and nothing more.

Now, I think I must come for a little while to the admirable speech of the admirable Minister of the Interior. I have already said that the genius of his speech, if you may call it such, consisted in his deftly catching two or three unimportant points, making the most of them, and sliding over the difficult ones, the fundamental charges that were made. I beg leave to say that, although he disparaged the value of the seat of my hon. friend from Pictou, although he seemed to think it had not much commercial value—he may be a judge at that; I do not know—he evidently does not intend to put his own seat, whatever value it may have, in any jeopardy. He distinctly argued this afternoon that, because he himself was not charged with personal corruption, though we might prove that all the appointments he made were corrupt, and his whole management corrupt, inefficient, shamelessly inept, grossly negligent, he, the admirable Minister, intended to hold on to his seat. I venture to say that Canada is a different country from what he thinks it is, and public opinion is a little more alive than hon. gentlemen opposite nowadays think it is, and that if these charges were once put before a thoroughly independent commission, and if even a tithe of them proved, the present admirable Minister of the Interior could not long be a Minister in this country. You may talk about ministerial responsibility this way or that way, but the man who is at the head of a department is supposed to keep his eye upon that department, and, if he does not do it, if his appointments are unworthy, if his administration is careless and more than careless, he cannot retain the confidence of his party as a Minister of the Executive and the Government, and there will be found a very speedy way of translating the present Minister of the Interior to some office of emolument within the gift of the Crown, and the installation of some one else in his place. But it will not be with the will and the agreeable acquiescence of the Minister of the Interior. He has served that notice on his party already. With the coming statement of the Prime Minister, to which I would attach much more force, if it had not followed about a thousand in order of other statements and promises made which have not been fulfilled, during the career of my right hon. friend; but, with that statement in prospect, the hon. gentleman, I think, was trying to serve notice upon the party that, through this probing to the very bottom whatever might be proved with reference to official corruption, he, at least, was not going to vacate his seat and to relieve the Government of his place in the Cabinet to make room for any one else.

There was one moment of intense relief and intense elation on the other side. It was when this admirable Minister, as a sequence to some of his first remarks, turned around to his followers and declared that in the whole length and breadth of this indictment there was not one charge of personal corruption against him or any member of the Government. We then heard the welkin ring with the cheers of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Evidently, suspense was relieved; evidently, that announcement was a surprise, and they congratulated themselves, and sent their pæans up to the gods that they were spared what they had feared—the personal indictment of some one of their Ministers.

But there is another great difficulty. The constitution is in danger again—in danger, according to the admirable Minister of the Interior; in danger again, according to the erudite leader of the Government. In what respect? Another great constitutional principle is involved. Turning to their followers, both said: Are you going to relegate to judges your duties as members of Parliament? We are responsible to Parliament, and not to the judges. Therefore, we cannot have a commission of judges to inquire into official corruption, as it is alleged, in the Yukon district. Now, whilst I advocate ministerial responsibility, while it is the basis of our parliamentary system, I do not think there is anything inconsistent with parliamentary

responsibility, that Parliament should inform itself, and inform itself by a commission of whatever character it chooses, judges or not. Nobody supposes that the judges are to go into this investigation and depose the Minister of the Interior, or the Postmaster General, or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a special sinner in this case, through having put that man Russell into an appointment of honour and responsibility in British Columbia and the Yukon. No one supposed that the judges were going to decapitate these gentlemen, however much they may merit decapitation. All that the judges were to do was to inquire into this matter, to probe it, as my right hon. friend said, to the bottom, and give information to the members of this House, upon which information parliamentary responsibility could rest secure. Information is needed, needed by members on both sides of the House. Despite all that has been written, all that has been said, all the rumours and all the facts that have been current throughout this country and throughout the British Empire for the past year and a half, how little specific information members on either side of the House as to what has been going on in the Yukon. All that time, and I charge it against the Government, all that time, whilst this flood of accusation, and of suspicion of misconduct, and proof of misconduct in case after case, have been current the world around, this Administration has been interposing its bulk between a thorough investigation of these allegations and charges and the great outside public who want to know, who want to purge Canada's good name and to purge the name of popular self-government as represented in Canada. They have great advantages; they do not have to fight on the aggressive. All these gentlemen have to do is simply to maintain a position of masterly inactivity; time and distance will do the rest. That dispersion of evidence which inevitably takes place in a country like the Yukon, with its thousands going and coming over immense distances, makes it impossible to produce to-morrow the evidence which you have under your hand to-day. All that you have to do is by dilatory methods, to keep the thing over for three months, for six months, for nine months or for a year—and by that time you will have buried any evidence that could possibly have been got together at any time to convict these men. Here is another principle enunciated to-night. In the kaleidoscopic changes that are taking place, all the officials of yesterday will be out to-morrow. And the doctrine is laid down here to-night that the moment an executive officer, no matter what he may have done while in office, is out of office you have no right to follow him into private life. Everything will work lovely for these gentlemen if they will just be dilatory a few months longer. What a most absurd and unworthy position it was—for the Minister of the Interior—that admirable gentleman—to take, that this miner's committee which suffered under and was cognizant of the evil which afflicted the community from January to the 25th August, 1898, that that committee having been in Dawson, where the evil was rife, and when six months after the commission was opened they could not prove anything, that shows that they had no reasonable case and had no evidence upon which to base their charges. I say, Sir, that in a period of six months, or even three months, in a mining camp like Dawson, things could easily have been proved at the time the charges were made and the facts were current would be absolutely impossible of proof except by the most herculean efforts. Yet the commission was limited. The miners did not ask it to be limited; the mining community in Dawson did not ask it to be limited; Mr. Ogilvie himself did not ask it to be limited. Yet this Government took the liberty to limit it to the 25th August. And Mr. Ogilvie, against his own wish, and will, and opinion over and over again expressed, was forced to confine the investigation to what took place before the 25th August, much as he regretted it. What were the charges? Lack of confidence in the officials. Is that a matter which must be kept to a certain period of time when the same officials were in office? If the court is open there, and a man comes into court and says: I have a piece of evidence of an occurrence that took place yesterday which will prove that an official is inefficient and unworthy, the judge must say: Your proof is entirely irrelevant, sir; this charge was made on the 25th August, and no matter what may be the failings, the incapacity, the actual fraud and cheatery of these officials since, it is of no account at all; you must not bring any evidence that has not to do with an act committed before the 25th August, 1898. That is the action of a Government which wants to probe to the bottom, which will not rest satisfied until every shadow of suspicion is lifted from that land of the midnight sun. How the professions and actions of these hon. gentlemen are poles asunder. I say, Sir, that after their eulogiums upon Mr. Ogilvie, after the statements that have been made through every part of the country as to Mr. Ogilvie. Mr. Ogilvie's opinion may now be quoted against themselves and quoted with great force. Mr. Ogilvie's opinion was that it was an unfortunate thing that the investigation was limited to what had occurred previous to the 25th of August. I want to prove that. I will read only a few of the statements made by Commissioner Ogilvie. At page 72, of the evidence, it will be found that the commissioner, being asked for his ruling and being pressed to rule that he could not take evidence upon what had occurred subsequent to the 25th August, said:

Do you want it now? I have consulted with

the legal adviser here and have come to the conclusion that I can only hear charges under that commission that occurred before the 25th of August. If there is any way in which I can go and hear others, I am quite willing to do so,—if there is any legal method—and, further, I intend to refer the matter to the Minister, and ask for another commission or an enlargement of this.

Again, on page 73, when Mr. McDougall, one of the miners' committee, or acting for them, is urging the hardship upon them of confining it to what had occurred previous to the 25th of August, he says:

They refer to certain actions made from day to day, and made still, and it is utterly impossible to read it any other way than that this investigation should consider charges up to the present time.

The Commissioner.—Unfortunately, it is otherwise.

Again, on page 73, he makes about the same admission. On page 74, when Mr. Tabor is urging the legal objection, he (Mr. Tabor) says:

It may be a questionable point whether this very commission would be entitled to inquire into the acts of civil servants, because there is another Act provided for it.

The Commissioner.—That is a misfortune.

That is the way he designates the commission. Again, in reply to Col. McGregor, who says:

The way I understand it was the commissioner that was to investigate into charges was not limited to the date of the commission, but up to the time that his labours would be considered to be completed.

The Commissioner.—I wish it had been so.

Col. McGregor, a little later, says:

I have no desire to induce you to go beyond that power.

The Commissioner.—If there is any other legal way to take the investigation up, I will do so, and will urge the Minister by the next mail to extend this commission, or have a new one. * * * Even the Minister does not always utter the law. Even the Minister cannot override the law. I am sorry I am stopped.

On page 75, he declares again: Meanwhile as I cannot go on any other way than to limit myself to what occurred before the 25th of August:

Meantime, I will ask the Minister for another commission or an extension of this.

Again, on the same page, Mr. McDougall says:

Can you be surprised that any one cannot carry on a prosecution which commences, say the 25th of February, before which no matters can be brought up which occurred after the 25th of August?

The Commissioner.—It may be surprising, but all I can say is I am quite as much surprised and disappointed as you are. I regret it, but I will take such steps by any legal method I can to go on with the investigation, and if you wish I shall ask for an enlargement of the commission, or a new one, to end on such a date, so that everybody will be satisfied. I cannot override the commission; there is no use.

That, Sir, is but a sample of many statements made by Mr. Ogilvie himself, every one of which goes to show that his matured opinion was that it was a pity, a misfortune and a mistake that this commission was limited to the 25th of August, and that it should have gone on to take in cases up to the date of the sitting of the commission.

Now, Sir, when the Minister of the Interior undertakes his defence, he says that such officers as were to be appointed were appointed as soon as possible, and as soon as it was practicable. First, so and so went up; then Mr. Walsh and his staff went up, and Mr. Walsh was thought to be the right man. The Minister evidently all the way through strives to ward off responsibility for his appointment under the statement that the country generally approved of the appointment of Mr. Walsh. That does not alter the Minister's responsibility for his appointment one single iota. Only a little period any way, says the Minister, should be investigated, that is the little period from June to September, 1898. It is only a past wrong, no wrongs are now alleged. It would be difficult to understand what wrong could be inquired into except a past wrong. Future wrongs are indefinite, and may never transpire. But the hon. Minister's argument was this, that it is past, and that it is all folly to talk about investigating anything during the period from June to September, 1898. It was a little period, and, therefore, it does not amount to much. He says that the miners' committee being in Dawson at the time of these occurrences are said to have taken place, and remaining there, ought to have been able to prove their charges if the charges were true, and if they had any proof upon which they based them at first. He goes on to say that the charges were false, that the men were false, and that it was simply, as he puts it, a bare-faced attempt of the miners' committee and those they represented to bring opprobrium upon the Government.

There is a point that has been dealt with by the gentlemen who have spoken, but I do not think it can be too often dealt with, namely, the extreme difficulty of getting proof and presenting charges under the circumstances in the Yukon. What were the circumstances, in brief? In the first place, a disorganized state of society, where men are going and coming every hour of every day during every month of the year, and where the men were the principals in an action or wronged by an action of to-day, may be thousands of miles away or hundreds of miles away to-morrow, and proof impossible to be obtained except at great expense and trouble. That is one thing Now, when you take that into account and look through all the ramifications of that one circumstance which is ever present, the difficulty comes to be seen as enormous for any gentleman or any lawyer to undertake

to press a case before him. For, mind you. Mr. Ogilvie did not sit there as a commissioner of inquiry, he did not sit there with a desire every hour that he sat there to probe into these matters ; he sat there, as he was advised to sit, as a judge in a court of law asking parties to formulate their charges. Having Mr. Tabor at his side, and Mr. Clement, he would not allow even a witness to mention another man's name in the course of his evidence if it was thought that he might imply a charge against the other man, until a specific charge had been formulated against that other man. He demanded that in every case specific charges should be formulated and supported by evidence, that these charges should be put into the hands of the persons charged, and sufficient time given to them to prepare their defence. That was not a committee of inquiry, that was an imitation of a court of law, where the judge sits on his bench and does not do anything except by a question now and then to help to the elucidation of a point which is being discussed before him, or a fact in evidence. It is not an inquiry into a state of things alleged to have taken place, an act alleged to have been wrong and bad. That was how Mr. Ogilvie sat, that was how that investigation went on ; and the very moment when the men who were trying to conduct a case came up point blank against something or other which they wanted to prove, and said they could prove, by evidence, that happened after the 25th of August, they were ruled out, it was impossible to bring in that evidence. That is a fact which is patent on every page of the evidence produced by the Government with reference to that investigation. What other thing is patent ? We find that there was no provision at all for procuring evidence. First, there was no provision that a man who gave evidence should be properly protected, because in many cases no safeguard could be given by the commissioner, and second, there was no provision for the expenses of witnesses, in the least, provided. Now, you put these things together and the difficulties were simply enormous. With untrained men, working with their own private resources, at their own expenses, and at the neglect of their own business, without sufficient legal advice, or power to get it, I say the difficulties were enormous for these men to carry out an investigation and to go to the root of the matter. I venture to say that no hon. gentleman can read that evidence, as I have read it from cover to cover, without being impressed with the fact that that investigation was totally inadequate to bring out the true state of the facts which were alleged to have existed and to exist at that time. I do not think any sensible business man, or any lawyer, could read through the evidence without coming to that conclusion. I state that without any implication against men who were trying to conduct this busness. I go further and I say that the last half of the investigation which was carried on, the difficulties of which are shown in about the last half of the evidence, where we had the investigation, which could not go on, under the terms of the commission, and where Mr. Ogilvie endeavoured to get witnesses to state their evidence and to make a statutory declaration to him, shows that, in almost every particular, the investigation was not well conducted, but that it had degenerated into a farce. Why ? From inapitude on the part of those who had thrown upon them the onus of carrying out this investigation and because of the utter lack of any kind of machinery for getting at the real statement of the case, for defraying the expenses of witnesses and for safeguarding them against incriminating themselves, or any of those safeguards necessary to inquire into the facts. So that I think the case is not proven at all to the satisfaction of this House, that the hon. Minister of the Interior and the Government are free of blame entirely, because, under these circumstances, the investigation has not brought out the facts which were alleged by the miners' committee. It is stated that the Opposition have a desire to blast Mr. Ogilvie's reputation. I do not think so ; I do not think a single word can be cited to show that. We may be perfectly well agreed that Mr. Ogilvie is a first rate man, a good man, in the line of his professional occupation, but we may have a totally different view as to his capacity to take the place of judge, or, as to his eligibility, under the circumstances, to be in the position of a judge, to pass upon the administration of his own employer and of his own relative by marriage. When, says the hon. Minister of the Interior, did Mr. Ogilvie become incompetent ? If you will allow an answer to that question, in a guarded way, in the view of the Opposition, Mr. Ogilvie became incompetent when he was appointed to take charge of the investigation into the department of his own Minister and to occupy the place of a judge, and his incompetence is no disgrace to him. Every man is not born a judge. Every good surveyor, every good general man of business, every good honest man is not necessarily the proper man to conduct a judicial inquiry and to probe these matters to the bottom, as the right hon. gentleman said they ought to be probed. The hon. Minister of the Interior says that he begged for charges. That does not help the matter. What, if a few notices were sent out here and there over the Yukon district, telling the miners, that if they have any charges against men who hold every fortune that they have got within the hollow of their hand, they may prefer them when they must walk in from their claims at their own expense, neglect their work and face all the legal ability and a court constituted as this one was ! I tell hon. gentlemen that it is simply absurd to tell us, with a notice sent

out in that way, that this was an adequate inquiry. What, then, is the Government's position ? They say, first, that they are waiting for the full result. They have been waiting for the last year and a half. All they have to do to stave off the inquiry is to await about a year longer, and every official will have passed away or every scintilla of evidence that could have been gathered will have been dissipated. They say : If the grounds are shown we will further investigate. That means simply taffy for their followers. We know that the grounds will be judged by these hon. gentlemen, and the way they will judge the grounds may be taken from the manner in which they have acted for the last year and a half in reference to these charges. They say that their political responsibility would be taken from Parliament and handed over to the judges of the land. No one asks them to hand it over. The only question is as to whether this Parliament is properly informed on these matters. In no way can parliamentary responsibility be fairly carried out with an uninformed set of members of Parliament, speaking, of course, with all respect, of hon. members. If it is necessary for the best parliamentary responsibility that the clearest and surest information should be got, the argument is that you should get the best tribunal to gather the information and then you will be in a position to discharge the duties of members of Parliament and to judge with discretion, with knowledge and with information. Says the hon. Minister of the Interior : Mr. Wade has been attacked, and by the reports Mr. Wade has been exonerated. The hon. Minister declares in the end that it is all boiled down to this : On what does the fair fame of Canada rest ? On the character of her public men, not in the fact that Major Walsh's cook accidentally got a permit. Now, Sir, I do not want any sentence more damnatory than that from the hon. Minister of the Interior, as a member of that Government, when an hon. gentleman, occupying the responsible position that he does, having heard all that has been said, knowing all that has been alleged, knowing all that has been actually proved, comes down, and with the dignity and from the position of a member of the Government declares that it is all boiled down to this that a cook of Major Walsh accidentally got a permit and that all this pother is about that. The fair fame of Canada, he says, rests upon the character of its public men, and the character of its public men is shown by their acts. The fair fame of Canada, he declared, has always been safe with Liberal Governments. That is sufficient for his followers and for his party. But the memory of this country is not absolutely deadened, and we do not have to go back many years to the impersonification of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec under a certain Mr. Mercier, in whose Liberal hands the fair fame of the province of Quebec was safe. The Pacauds flourished then like the green bay tree, and the right hon. gentleman who sits there as Prime Minister of Canada partook in the results and fruits of the plunder that Pacaud stole from the public treasury of the province of Quebec. And the gentleman who sits behind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries participated in the plunder that was taken from the province of Quebec and used it in the elections in the province of New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) allow me to make a remark ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to say that what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) states is utterly and entirely untrue. I never handled a dollar, I never saw a dollar, I never participated in any shape or form in the expenditure of a dollar of money which came from any such source ?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) deny that a cheque for $5,000 came from the province of Quebec for use in the New Brunswick elections, in behalf of the party and the Government that he led at that time in the province of New Brunswick ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do unquestionably deny it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) denies it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to take his denial, but the last has not been heard on this question. But there is no denial possible of the first statement that I made, or the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government would get up and deny it. His majority sits here today, a majority which was propped up, supported, bought by the plunder which was taken from the provincial treasury of Quebec under a Liberal Government, in whose hands the fair fame of Canada can always be trusted.

Mr. Hardy leads a Liberal Government in this province of Ontario—and, under Liberal Governments, the fair fame of Canada can always be trusted. What is this revelation that has lately come from Elgin? This revelation in which a Liberal candidate became a Liberal member by the grossest frauds that were ever brought to light in any country ; I do not care if you go back to the rotten borough days of old England.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where is Preston ?

Mr. FOSTER. Preston now in receipt of a larger salary from this Government. was the man, I believe, who planned that campaign, who established the Liberal organization, which reaches into every county, and which reached into that county, which personated honest men as keepers of the ballot-boxes, slept over night with the ballot-boxes, and fixed them to their liking; imposed on a sheriff too willing to be imposed on, too easily lending himself to be imposed upon; who stole the constituency under the flying banners of the Hardy Liberal organization in the province of Ontario; kept it in spite of all decency and conscience, until the damning facts came out, and then gave up what had been stolen and made a disclosure, poor innocent man, that he never knew such a thing was going on in his county. And yet, the fair fame of Canada is safe in the hands of Liberal Governments.

The Postmaster General sits there, the man who goes cheek by jowl with that organization on the side lines of every contested Dominion election in this country, who herds with them, sleeps with them, who carries on this business in connection with them. And yet, under a Liberal Government always the fair fame of Canada can always be trusted.

Mr. GIBSON. The high tone of debate.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the admirable Minister of the Interior and the high tone of debate that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is talking about. Why, we are getting very high-toned. I was somewhat surprised when the Prime Minister put in his voice for high tone to-night, but we expected it of him. I am very much surprised that the member for Lincoln finds fault with the tone of debate, especially when that tone shows him something of the fallacy of the appeal of the Minister of the Interior, that under Liberal Governments the fair fame of Canada could always be trusted to remain unsmirched.

Now, Sir, about this Mrs. Koch who accidentally got a permit. When the Minister of the Interior was going over that bit of evidence, I asked him if that was all, and after he had finished he said it was all. To my mind it is not all, and I propose to ask the attention of this House to what I consider is a very important point which is developed in this evidence such as has been gained, and which I think it is right this House should be made cognizant of from first to last. Would you believe it, that this gentleman who acts as judge in this commission to probe to the bottom and make his report to this House, actually had unfolded before him by unqualified and uncontradicted testimony, one of the foulest things that has been perpetrated in that Yukon territory with reference to Dominion Creek permits and claims, and whilst this commissioner was very anxious to put as fair a gloss as possible on every other case, he never mentioned that by one single word or one single line. Neither was it mentioned by the admirable Minister of the Interior, who is certainly admirable in avoiding all the weak spots of his case. But, Sir, the evidence is there, and I propose to put some of that evidence before the House to-night. In the fall of 1897, trouble arose on Dominion Creek. Mr. Fawcett was the Gold Commissioner. There was overlapping, and bad descriptions of the different claims, and in the end Mr. Fawcett thought the easiest way out of it was to close Dominion Creek, and he closed it on the 15th November, 1897—the creek alone and not the hills and benches. There was part of the creek even which was afterwards opened, but the main part where the difficulties of description and overlapping of claim existed is not yet open, or was not at the date that this evidence was closed. Now, after he had closed Dominion Creek he awaited a survey. The creek was closed in November; the hillsides and benches were not closed, and men prospected on the hillsides and benches, and they brought down their applications and made them, but Mr. Fawcett recorded none of them. He said to them in effect: Go ahead, prospect, make what description you can, make your application here, and when we get the surveys made, these will be taken into account and we will have these matters fixed up. So it remained until Mr. Walsh came into the country, and on the 30th day of May, Major Walsh and the council stopped this privilege of prospecting on the hillsides and benches of Dominion Creek, and closed not only the creek which Mr. Fawcett had closed, but closed the hillsides and benches as well. Mr. Fawcett said: that is not fair, Mr. Walsh; I have allowed prospecting on the hillsides and benches that have never been closed; I have taken their applications; I have given them to understand that these applications would have prior right with me; if you close all of these you close them out, and when you do open them everybody will have an equal chance to go in there, and that is unfair to these men who have prospected under my permission, and in fact under my directions. And so it happened, that after a fortnight's time he prevailed, and a proclamation or notice was issued that permits would be allowed on and after the 11th day of July on Dominion Creek. But, Sir, what happens? It happens that Mr. Walsh sends down one day a notice to Mr. Fawcett to be signed. Mr. Fawcett, worried and bothered, and with the discussion which had been going on between himself and Mr. Walsh, took that notice as it came to him, and just signed it and sent it back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the date of that?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was the 6th of July.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think you are wrong there. I think it was about the 27th of May.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it was not so early. But, as my hon. friend has raised the point, I will refer to the references. I suppose there is no doubt about the notice that was issued making those accessible for permits on and after the 11th of July. That was posted on the 30th of June. Now, on page 89 of the evidence, I will read, first, the notice closing the hillsides and benches, issued by Major Walsh :

Any locations made on a creek after it has been closed will not be recognized or put on record. This includes hill and bench claims as well as creek claims.

Dominion Creek having been closed since the middle of November last, it has been decided that the creek shall remain closed until further notice. This decision applies to hill and bench claims as well as to creek claims.

This was passed by the Council, and posted on the 30th of June. Mr. Fawcett objected to that :

Q. Did you object to that being done ?—A. I did.

Q. Why ?—A. Because a great many miners had gone to the hills with my permission and staked their claims, made applications and had the applications accepted as far as protecting of claims, so far as we could pending the returns of the survey. I considered I had granted them a right, and this motion was taking the right away from them ; that is why I objected ; I would not have had any objection had that not been the case ; I did object on that ground.

Q. Your objection was overruled ?—A. I was in the minority.

Q. How long did that remain closed in accordance with the resolution ?—A. I brought up this matter on several subsequent meetings ; I carried the bench claims book up with me about two weeks later, and showed the commissioner that it would be an injustice to these people who had gone out with my permission and staked this ground and had their applications accepted, if their ground should be taken away from them in that way, and that, in my opinion, they would have ground for complaint. The commissioner seemed to acquiesce in this. Mr. Pattullo in the meantime turned to this resolution, and he said : "I think that was disposed of two weeks ago," and read these clauses I have just read. Major Walsh said : "Certainly, that was disposed of ; we can't take cognizance of it any more ; we can't be doing and undoing ; so that practically settles that."

Q. Well, then, were the hill-sides open after all ?—A. They were open upon the publication of that notice (pointing to the notice).

That is not the notice I have been speaking of, but is another notice.

Q. What led to the issuance of this notice ?—A. There was a good deal transpired between ; there was a notice posted in June notifying the people that after a certain date permits would be issued.

Q. What date ?—A. I think it must have been about the end of June, or somewhere near this ; it was to have been posted on the 30th June or the 1st of July, stating that permits would be issued on the 11th.

Q. Have you a copy of that notice now ?—A. No. The first time I noticed that notice with my name in large print was when I saw the notice posted up. My objection to the whole thing was, their considering that I didn't say anything that would seem to be in favour of my idea that there was no occasion for closing the hill-sides.

Q. Was that your signature ?—A. Yes.

That is, the second notice.

Q. Did you issue it ?—A. Well, on one occasion Mr. Pattullo came with a notice, asking me to sign it; it was in relation to closing the hill-sides, but I objected on the ground that I considered there was no basis for the hill-sides being closed; I still maintained my objection to what had been done in council as Gold Commissioner, and I refused to sign the notice. Major Walsh sent and summoned me before him, and he gave me a very strong reprimand. As near as I can remember, he said : "Mr. Fawcett, I want you to understand that it is impertinent on your part to question anything that has been decided in council, and when I sent that notice for you to sign, I want you to sign it." On the spur of the moment I signed this notice without reading it.

Why did he sign that? Because, by the powers vested by this Government in Major Walsh, he had the supreme authority over every officer, and he could dismiss him, or do anything he liked. No wonder that Mr. Fawcett says : "On the spur of the moment, I signed this notice without reading it." Then the commissioner asked him :

Q. Were you not simple in not reading it ?—A. Yes, I was simple ; I acknowledge this.

Q. Don't you think you should have kept a copy for your own protection ?—A. I never thought of the thing at all.

Q. Don't you think you should have made a copy of it before you let it go ?—A. Well, I never thought anything would arise out of it. I didn't think any blame or weight would be attached to me.

No wonder he did not. The lord high admiral was in the land, and the lord high admiral had a sword put into his hand by this Government which gave him the power to dismiss instantly any officer in the civil or the military force at that time in the Yukon —every one except the judge of the Superior Court.

Q. What was in this notice ?—A. It stated that on and after 11th July that permits to prospect bench claims on Dominion Creek would be granted—for prospecting and staking, and I think there was something that applications would be accepted if approved of by the mining inspector.

Then he was asked, if he could get a copy of that notice, and after a while the copy of the notice was given, and here it is. This is the notice which Mr. Fawcett signed without reading it :

HILL AND BENCH CLAIMS

On Dominion Creek are now open for Location and Prospecting by all Free Miners.

Those claims shown in the appended sketch, with one exception, will be open only to those who made application for them prior to the com-

pletion of the survey, which application was filed at the office of the Gold Commissioner.

Dated at Dawson, Yukon district, this 8th day of July, A.D. 1898.

By order,
THOMAS FAWCETT,
Gold Commissioner.

When Mr. Fawcett saw that notice, which he had signed without reading, at the command of the man who could have cut his head off instantly, if he had not obeyed, he found that his long-time contention was entirely done away with, and that the men to whom he had given assurances that if they made application, their applications would be considered, were entirely left out, he sits down and writes a letter to Mr. Walsh on the 7th July, in which he puts his views strongly before him. That letter I shall not take up the time of the House in reading, but it will be found on page 99 of the evidence, and in it he reiterates his own ground. Now, when was this 2nd notice dated? It was dated on the 8th July. Who put in the date? Not Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Fawcett was for carrying out his good faith to the miners. He signed that notice, and, when he had it in his mind, and after he had signed it and found out what it was, he signed it, as he says, and meant that it should not bear date until the 11th July, so that these men who had prospected and made their applications to him, might have a chance to get their permits, and not be done out of them by the general mining public, who might rush in there without having done any previous prospecting at all. On the 8th July it was signed. The very moment it was signed, Dominion Creek was opened. The 11th July was three days distant. The very moment that was signed, and before it went to the printer, it was a document that had force, and Dominion Creek was opened for anybody who could get the information. What was done by the judicious commissioner and his entourage? Mr. Swineheart, of the printing office, was called up to Major Walsh's office, and was asked when he could do some printing, when he could get it out; and finally was told what it was, and he joked with the commissioner about it, and wished he had a miners' license, for, if he had, he would start at once, and get his stakes down, and get his claim. The notice went down to the printing office. Man after man was at the commissioner's office in order to get hold of this document and ascertain its date. The printer refused any who did not bring an order from Mr. Walsh. Ultimately, an order was brought from Mr. Walsh, and these notices were taken out on the 9th to be posted. But what happened? This happened, that on the 8th July, the very date the order was signed and dated by Mr. Walsh, some people knew that Dominion Creek was opened, and they could make tracks for it. Who made tracks for Dominion Creek? Mr. Fawcett, in his evidence, page 84, when he was pressed, said:

If you wish to know whether I knew of any parties who had information, I think I knew of a person who, I subsequently heard, had information, who went and staked a claim and left Dawson on the evening of the 8th.

Q. Who is he? A. Mr. Carbeno.

Let us look a little more into Mr. Carbeno's position. On page 102, Mr. Carbeno himself is asked to stand up, and the commissioner asked him:

Can you give us the names of those men who accompanied you out to Dominion Creek?—Mr. Carbeno, the Colum boys.

Q. Can you say if they are in the country?—A. No, sir, they are not; they went out with Major Walsh. There was a man named Marseile; he didn't come into Dawson with us; he went out from Bennett.

Q. Do you know if he staked a claim elsewhere?—A. He staked a claim on Phil Walsh Creek, below the Big Salmon.

Q. Have you any personal knowledge that he was in the same contract that you were?

Carbeno, it appears, was in a contract.

A. Yes, the same agreement was drawn up.

Q. And he had likewise to give a three-fourths interest?—A. He drew up an agreement on the typewriter, as I remember it, and Marseille got an agreement.

So, Carbeno says that the Collum boys went out with him. What is the next step in this? Turn to page 258:

Louis Carbeno, called and sworn.

By Mr. Fawcett:

Q. Where were you on the 8th July?—A. Well, I was in camp until about 10 o'clock.

Mind you, this 8th July was before the notices were printed and put up, but after they had been signed by the order of Major Walsh.

Q. Where?—A. It would be at the hospital.

Q. In what capacity were you working?—A. I was working for Major Walsh.

Q. Were you there all that day?—A. Yes, sir, I was.

Q. On the evening of the 8th July?—A. Until evening.

Mr. Fawcett is examining, and seems to do it with a right-good will.

Q. Where were you later on in the evening?—A. I was up Bonanza.

Q. For what purpose?—A. Going up to Dominion.

Q. Why were you on the way to Dominion?—A. Because I was informed that it was going to be opened on the 9th.

Q. Informed when?—A. About 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Q. On what date?—A. The 8th.

Q. Where did you acquire the information?—A. I received that from one of our dog-drivers.

Q. Who?—A. McBeth.

Q. Is he here now?—A. Yes; he is an Indian.

Q. And he told you it was open?—A. Well, he didn't tell me; it was rumoured about the camp. I asked Major Walsh's brother if the creek was going to be thrown open on the 9th, and he said he thought it was.

Q. Where was McBeth at this time?—A. He had been down the street.

Q. Where was he when he gave you this information ?—A. In camp.

Q. Where was McBeth ?—A. He had been down the street, and he came back to camp.

Q. Was Major Walsh present ?—A. No.

Q. Was McBeth working for Major Walsh ?—A. Yes.

Q. And he told you that the creek would be opened on the 9th?—A. He said he heard it would be opened on the 9th.

Q. That was on the afternoon of the 8th ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he tell you how he came by that information ?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did you stake your claim ?—A. I staked it on the 9th, about 10.30.

By the Commissioner :

Q. In the morning ?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Fawcett :

Q. You subsequently recorded that claim ?—A. Yes.

Q. What time did you start ?—A. At 10.30 on the evening of the 8th.

Q. Would anybody have any interest in giving you any information as to this creek being opened on the 9th ?—A. No, not that I know of, except Major Walsh's brother.

Q. What interests had he ?—A. He didn't have any interests. I suppose it was his interest, in one way, to give me information.

Q. What arrangement was there between you and Major Walsh or any of his brothers with reference to any claims you might stake ?—A. There was a document drawn up between him and his brother to give me a three-fourth interest in anything I got in the country, providing he paid all my expenses, and the working of any ground I took up in the country.

Q. Would you recognize that agreement if you saw it ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you tell me if this is the document ? (Showing an agreement between Louis Carbeno and Lewis Walsh) which reads as follows :—

Port Arthur, 23rd Sept., 1897.

This agreement made this day, between Lewis Walsh, known as the party of the first part, and Louis Carbeno, of the town of Brockville, known as the party of the second part,

Witness that in consideration of the party of the first part furnishing the party of the second part with an outfit, and paying all expenses necessary for the working of any claim that the party of the second part may discover or take up in the Yukon district, in the North-west Territories, the party of the second part hereby agrees to give the party of the first part a one undivided three-quarter interest in the said claim, reserving to himself a one-quarter interest.

LEWIS WALSH.
LOUIS CARBENO.

Witness : PHIL. WALSH.

Q. That is your signature ?—A. Yes, sir ; that is the agreement between me and Lewis Walsh.

Q. Where was that made ?—A. That was drew up and signed at the Big Salmon last winter.

Q. Where was it drawn up ?—A. In Port Arthur.

Q. When did you sign it ?—A. Last winter ; there was another agreement which his brother drew up, and I wouldn't sign it.

Q. Phil. Walsh drew it up ?—A. This was made at Port Arthur and forwarded to Big Salmon.

Q. Why was it dated the 24th of September ?—A. That was the date on which we made the arrangement.

Q. You were at Port Arthur on the 23rd of September ?—A. Yes ; that was dated then.

Mr. FOSTER.

Q. You didn't sign it till last winter. Who was the witness ?—A. Phil. Walsh.

By the Commissioner :

Q. You staked the claim in the way you said ?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you do with that claim ?—A. I turned it over as I agreed.

By Mr. Fawcett :

Q. According to that agreement you made for part of that claim, did you—— A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom did you convey that ?—A. To Phil. Walsh.

Q. Is that something like the bill of sale ? That is the bill of sale ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was given after this agreement which you signed ?—A. Yes, sir.

Then the commissioner takes a hand in :

By the Commissioner :

Q. Why did you give this to Philip Walsh and not to Lewis?—A. Because Major Walsh instructed me he did not want Lewis's name brought into the office, and it would be just as well to have the property made over to him.

Mr. McLENNAN. Who is Lewis ?

Mr. FOSTER. Major Walsh's brother.

I told him that it was not proper ; that the agreement would not stand law, and I couldn't get anything, and asked him to make out another agreement. He argued the point, and I told Mr. Pattullo and Pattullo drew that agreement up ; he said it would be all right, and I went to work and signed it.

Q. What consideration did you receive?—A. Not a cent.

Q. What were you to receive for the three-fourths ; you were to receive one-fourth instead of what belonged to you ?—A. He was to look after it, and pay any expenses of any mine I took up.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Mr. Pattullo ?

Mr. FOSTER. Major Walsh's private secretary.

Q. Had this agreement been made before you left down east ?—A. We talked the agreement over, but the agreement hadn't been drawn up, and it had to be signed at Big Salmon.

Q. Did you think at that time that this was a fair agreement ?—A. I didn't.

Q. Why did you sign it ?—A. Because I was in a position and I couldn't very well get out of it ; I didn't want to go out of the country.

Q. If you had refused, what would have been the result ?—A. I wouldn't have been permitted to go ; I would have had to have gone out.

Q. What position did you hold ?—A. He promised me the position I have now—cooking for the officials ; and I suppose if I hadn't signed that document I would not be in the position I hold now.

Q. Who promised you ?—A. Major Walsh.

Q. Do you think you would have been in the same position now if you hadn't ?—A. No, I don't think I would ; nothing said about that.

Q. Was there any compulsion of any kind used to make you sign that ?—A. He laid in his tent—

That is Major Walsh.

——not over 15 feet away ; he knew it was wrong and I knew it was wrong.

Q. He didn't in any way try to compel you to sign it ?—A. No.

Q. What reason have you for saying that you did not think you would be here ?—A. I said I

wouldn't have held the position I am holding now if I had not signed it.

Q. What were you doing then ?—A. Cooking.

Q. How much were you getting ?—A. $60 a month.

Paid by this Government.

Q. What now ?—A. $100 per month.

Paid by this Governmnt.

Q. When did you get an advance in your wages ?—A. Last August ; but he told me he would give me 125, then he cut it to 100. I said I would take the hundred and stayed in.

Q. You don't mean to connect his saying that with this bill ?—A. No ; I told his brother when they drew it up it was not right.

Q. What value would you place on the consideration you got for this ?—A. The agreement was that we were to receive a prospecting outfit.

Then, he goes on to say how much that was worth.

Q. The Government paid you wages and living expenses, so that has nothing to do with the case ?—A. I think about $40 or $50.

That is the expense of an outfit

Q. You would place the value of an outfit to stake a claim at forty or fifty dollars. Well, before you left camp to go on that trip,——

Out to Dominion on the 8th of July, at 10.30 o'clock.

——did you ask Major Walsh's permission ?—A. I did.

Q. Did you tell him what you were going for ?—A. I told him I was going to Dominion Creek.

Q. What did he say ?—A. He said yes.

Q. Did you tell him you were going to stake ?—A. I did not.

Q. Do you think he knew ?—A. Yes, he would not think I was going for a walk ; that was in the evening, about 8 or 10 o'clock.

By Mr. Tabor :

Q. Did any other officials go with you ?—A. Yes, one, an Indian ; and when I had gone five or ten miles I was joined by another Indian.

Q. Were these Major Walsh's Indians ?—A. Just the two of them.

Q. Who were they ?—A. Two of the Cullum boys.

I read you his evidence before that two of the Cullum boys went with him. So that these were two of Major Walsh's Indians, and one of whom went with him, while the other caught up with him before he had gone more than ten miles out.

Q. In saying an outfit worth $40 or $50, what do you mean ?—A. Going to Dominion Creek and coming back.

By the Commissioner :

Q. Have you any personal knowledge of the standing of these Indians ; were they going to stake on the same terms as you did ?—A. Yes, going on the same terms ; I don't know whether they signed a contract or not ; I know there was an agreement, but I am not positive about the contract.

Q. Similar to yours ?—A. Similar to mine.

Q. Did they transfer a three-quarter interest to Philip Walsh as you did ?—A. Yes ; you will find duplicates there in the recording office.

Q. Have you any knowledge of any other person on behalf of any official of the Government ?—A. No, sir, I have not.

Q. No knowledge of any other but yourself and these two ?—A. No other ; that is all that went or came.

Q. Were these men employed in the camp ?—A. They came in with us.

Q. Were they employed around the camp ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They would have to get permission from Major Walsh, the same as you did ?—A. Yes, sir.

Then Mr. Galpin comes in.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he ?

Mr. FOSTER. He is a lawyer, I fancy.

By Mr. Galpin :

Q. You say you waited until 10.30 o'clock on the 8th July, Friday night. Will you tell us how many people you overtook, or overtook you, before you got to stake the claim ?—A. Twenty or thirty ; there was quite a lot of people who passed us, but we passed the whole outfit.

And so on. Now, if you will look over Mr. Swinehart's evidence—I am not going to read it—you will find that Mr. Swinehart, who printed the notice, swore that Major Walsh when this came up—and it soon leaked out—got uneasy ; and Mr. Swinehart put some questions to him as a newspaper interviewer. Major Walsh got so uneasy that he sent down a typewritten document purporting to be a statement of Mr. Carbeno, but unsigned, in which Carbeno was made to say that he did not get any information from Major Walsh and that Major Walsh did not know he had gone out. Now, at page 262, Mr. Fawcett asked Carbeno, evidently with a good deal of gusto :

By Mr. Fawcett :

Q. Did you ever make a statement which was typewritten to Major Walsh that you didn't receive information, and didn't start out to Dominion Creek on the night of the 8th, you never did?—A. No, sir.

Then the commissioner asks :

Q. How long did it take you?—A. I left for Dominion at 10.30 Friday evening ; went to Dominion and staked and came back to Mr. McCormick's that night—Saturday night at 9 o'clock. Didn't leave there till 10 o'clock Sunday, and arrived here about 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon.

By Mr. Galpin :

Q. When did you come to the office to record ?—A. Monday morning.

Q. What time ?—A. About 3 in the afternoon.

Q. At the side door ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Took your turn ?—A. Yes, the same as anybody else.

Mr. Swinehart comes in at this point, asking Carbeno :

Q. Did he ever make out a statement for Pattullo or Major Walsh regarding this matter when the rumour came up after Major Walsh gave him a tip ? It was reported around town that he——

That is you——

——went out and located as a result of information that he had received. Did he——

That is you——

——make a statement and give it to Major Walsh or Pattullo to hand to the "Midnight Sun ?"—A. No, sir ; I never did.

Q. Did they ask you any questions ?—A. Never.
Q. You are positive of that ?—A. I am positive.
Q. Never made any statement ?—A. Never was asked to do so.

Now, Mr. Fawcett comes in :

Q. In your examination yesterday, Mr. Carbeno, in answering one of the questions, you stated that you thought your present position was the result of signing that agreement, or something to that effect ?—A. Yes.
Q. Was there not part of the evidence in that connection which you forgot to give us yesterday ?—A. I forgot to say that other papers were drawn up and I would not sign them.
Q. When was this ?—A. Coming up on board the "Quadra."
Q. You would not sign them—why ?—A. I said the papers were not legal, and would not sign them till I got legal ones. That afternoon I was called to Major Walsh's state-room, and he asked me if I had made an arrangement at Port Arthur before I left.
Q. You said you did ?—A. He said : "Why didn't you sign the papers ?" I said : "I didn't because they were not legal." He said : "If you don't sign those papers, when this boat goes back I will send you back on it." That was all that was said until we got to Big Salmon, then other papers came on, and therefore I signed them.
By the Commissioner :
Q. Why did you consider those papers illegal ?—A. Because they were not drawn up by a lawyer ; he drew them up with a lead pencil.
Q. Who ?—A. Phil. Walsh.
Q. Where were they drawn up ?—A. On board the "Quadra," when we came out.
Q. You had made an agreement with Lewis Walsh at Port Arthur ?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Why were these not signed at Port Arthur ?—A. Because he said he had not time.
Q. The document is dated the 23rd. Is it the document we have here ?—A. No. The document he drew up on board the "Quadra" is not the same as I agreed to it.
Q. What was the nature of the terms ?—A. He left it where I was to be paid my expenses in coming into the country, and furnish me with an outfit.
Q. How could that be when the Government was paying your expenses ?—A. That was stated in the agreement before I left.
Q. That was understood at Port Arthur—that they were to pay your expenses to come into the country ?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. At the same time you were employed as a Government servant. Don't you think it was inconsistent to offer to pay your expenses if you came in as a Government employee ?—A. Well, I was giving the way it was agreed to.

Mark that. The commissioner is very anxious to know if this poor man does not think it a little inconsistent to have Major Walsh pay his expenses and the Government also ; and within the covers of this report that the commissioner has sent down, there is not a word as to the impropriety of all this truck I have been reading over, not one single word.

Q. Then this lead pencil document admitted that ?—A. Yes, it is in this way only. (Mr. Carbeno reads the document.)
The Commissioner.—There is no reference there for your expenses to be paid into the country. It would grant the expense of working the claim, but not the expenses in connection with your entry here.
By Mr. Fawcett :
Q. You refused to sign this lead pencil document on board the "Quadra ?"—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you were told if you didn't you would be sent back ?—A. Yes, sir ; and I said I would not sign any paper until a proper one was drawn up.
Q. When you signed this at Big Salmon did it seem strange to you that it was dated at Port Arthur ?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What was the actual date of the signature ?—A. I could not exactly tell you. I think it was in June some time.
Q. Three months after the agreement had been entered into ?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Was there any cause—was the question mentioned at all ? Was it dated at Port Arthur—why not at Big Salmon ?—A. Well, I didn't ask any questions ; they brought in the document and I signed it, that was all. I saw the signature, and I knew it came from him.
Q. Whose signature is it ?—A. Lewis Walsh's. His signature is on the bottom of it.
Q. Have you any reason to know his signature ?—A. Yes, I will swear to it.
Q. You have no reason to assign why the document was dated 23rd September, and executed at Big Salmon some time in June ?—A. No.
Q. This agreement you entered into at Port Arthur ?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. This document you refused to sign, on whose behalf was it made ?—A. Lewis Walsh's.

That ends the evidence and this investigation. In reference to that whole transaction, if that evidence, uncontradicted and unrefuted as it is, borne out by the documents which the commissioner and Mr. Fawcett had before them, if that evidence is true there was not a more reprehensible transaction in the whole Yukon business than this transaction the history of which I have read from the evidence gathered by Mr. Ogilvie himself.

Now, Sir, who benefited by that information ? Who was the repository of that information and should have guarded it ? Who benefited by it ? There is only one answer to all these questions, it was Mr. Walsh, the gentleman who was at the head of everybody. Now, I say that when it appears, as it does appear, that the judges were getting mining claims, and some of them giving opinions to the Gold Commissioner on mining claims, when it appears that Mr. Wade was getting mining claims for himself, in his own name and an interest in many others, when it is shown that the other officials were doing the same, there you have it from the head of the Government, more despotic than the Czar of Russia, entrusted with authority that these gentlemen did not have and could not confer, but holding the authority and carrying out that authority as if it were absolute, and absolute and good, when from that executive head of the Government down through the judges, the land registrars and the clerks in the department, they were all getting claims for themselves in their own names, and interests in others, when they were getting these

held over for a year because they had influence and were Government officers—when all this was going on, is there any wonder that the official life of that country from one end of it to the other was permeated with the idea : They are all in it, let us get everything we can. Hurdman worked over hours, too busy during office hours, gave the information which he was paid as a clerk to give, and received therefor fees of $5 and $10. In the evidence of a lawyer, Mr. Lisle he tells us that he paid over and over again, $5 and $10, and was quite willing to do it ; in fact Mr. Ogilvie himself says treats it as a matter of course that the clerks took these fees, that the door-keepers held out their pockets, and held out their right hands, and took these fees for getting men in off the regular line. All that was going on, and Major Walsh's cook, and Major Walsh's Indians, and Major Walsh's brothers, under an agreement made whilst they were on the way to that country with the knowledge and interest of the High Commissioner under the high obligations and responsibilities entrusted to him by this Government, plotting and successfully carrying out their plots to loot the country of its best claims through wrongful and illicit knowledge. When Major Walsh came to the conclusion, or his council came to the conclusion, that they should open these bench claims against Mr. Fawcett's proper ideas, in my mind, against all that is fair as shown by the records, and dated them on the 8th so as to forestall those who were trusting the public notice to get them on the 11th, then the information went out, and Major Walsh's Carbeno, and Major Walsh's Cullom boys started with his knowledge and consent, and I can see the smile of Carbeno as he virtually told him to go up to Dominion Creek, starting him at ten o'clock at night.

I say that this state of things is shown to be as rotten a state of things as could possibly be disclosed. There is the Government, which stands behind it all. They apologize for it all, and they stand between Parliament and any thorough investigation of that rottenness ; they take the responsibility of teaching the civil service of this country : Steal while you can. We have the Government telling the honest electors of this country : We put men into that country ; we make them high commissioners, lords of all; we give them the totality of inside information, and then we sustain them when they filch out from the gold regions the choicest spots by chicanery, by trickery and by agreements which they formed and drew up under the very noses of the members of the Government, whilst they were appointing them, seeking to make gain, even paying men for prospecting the claims they have out of Government money and charging it to the people of this country. Yet there is noth'ng to investigate. Yet Major Walsh, because he is not now high commissioner, must go scot free, and Mr. Wade must go scot free. I tell you that no unprejudiced man, reading that evidence there, inadequate as the investigation was, can come to any other conclusion than that there was a state of things in that country which ought to be investigated for the fair name of Canada and in the interest of honest government. That right hon. gentleman who sits there, had the effrontery, in the city of Toronto, and in other places, to get upon the platform before the electorate, previous to the elections of 1896, and say, naming men in the late Government : Whatever you get from a Liberal Government, you will get pure men and pure government. This is the way they carry it out, from the Prime Minister down to least Minister. They stand back of this official looting of claims in the Yukon by the men to whom they gave sovereign powers, to whom no man in that country dare say no, who simply walked down and called Mr. Fawcett out, and said to him : "Sign that." "No, I do not believe in it." "Sign it ; I will have no impertinence like that. When I say to you to sign it, sign it." What became of Mr. Fawcett's responsibility ? Do you not see what that meant ? It meant the undermining of the responsibility of every official in the Yukon, because every official was put at the mercy of one man, who could absolutely suspend him. Mr. Fawcett said : "I do not take any responsibility ; Major Walsh has the responsibility, and he should take the responsibility." That is a state of things that is absolutely proved up to this present day by evidence which is unrepudiated, and which is undenied. Yet there is no need for an investigation. These hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, if they have ever had it, seem to have lost all idea of the balance of things in a constitutionally governed country. Will the right hon. Prime Minister say that when this House is prorogued, next August, or September, if it is prorogued then, that when we have gone home, he and his Cabinet, when they sit in that chamber over there, can make laws and carry them out in this country ? Have they legislative authority ? No, not even if they will say so ; but they gave Major Walsh legislative authority, and sent him to exercise it, and he exercised it. They gave him what they did not have—legislative authority. If we pass a mining law, or any other law, and we enact the principles and clauses of that law, and then we say that, under this, regulations may be made by the Governor in Council, what other white man can make these regulations but the Governor in Council ? No one constitutionally or legally. These hon. gentlemen gave Major Walsh the power to enact legislation, to make laws, to add regulations, to place fees, to gather revenues, to put taxes upon certain goods, all of which he did ; but, above all things, they gave him power to make judges, justices of the peace, and he actually made justices of the peace up in the North-west. These hon. gentle-

men think this is all right. They have come to the conclusion, evidently, as one of their hon. members expressed it not long ago: You fellows may talk, but the country does not take any stock in what you say. These hon. gentlemen evidently believe that the country takes no stock in what is being done, and that all they have to do is to go out and say: We are Liberals; we can do no wrong, and that they will keep the confidence of the country. They are mistaken. Has one of them uttered a word of excuse, of palliation, of defence, of their illegal acts in conferring these powers on Major Walsh, some of which they do not possess themselves, and not a single one of which they can delegate to any person? Where, in Heaven's name was the Governor General, when an order of that kind was signed, granting to Major Walsh the power to legislate, the power to make justices of the peace, the power to put on taxes and to impose fees? Was it necessary? Absolutely unnecessary. It was done in defiance of constitution and law. Yet these hon. gentlemen sit there, as dumb as men can be, simply with a sort of obstinate expression: We did it, and we will do it again; we do not care whether there is any constitution or law at all. We are supreme in this country. And the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) will sit behind them and sanction this sort of thing. When the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was talking about Major Walsh imposing a permit fee of $2, and speaking of what he did in regard to these permits in the Northwest, an hon. gentleman nudged his fellow-member, and said: He could not do it. The hon. member for Halifax knows that he could not, but he will not stand up on his legs and say so. He will vote for these hon. gentlemen; he will stand behind them in a transaction in which a cook and a doctor, both of them ladies, were concerned, one of whom got a claim illegally, and the other came very near getting a permit: in which the Collum boys and Carbeno entered into an arrangement, to which Major Walsh was a party, when on the "Quadra" he said: If you do not sign that paper, Carbeno, I will send you back to Brockville.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have heard that a dozen times to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not see my necessity? I have such a rebellious lot to talk to, and the conscience of hon. gentlemen who were, at one time, such zealous and honest defenders of all the principles of good government and economy have become so dulled that I must take line upon line, precept upon precept, to try to impress them. Conscience has so deteriorated that I must use precept upon precept, line upon line, to try to impress my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen). I am not sure that if he and I as good friends just sat down and had a smoke together, and talked business over, as we may sometimes—I am not sure we would be miles apart in our ideas. Honest Indian now? I think we would be pretty close together. I have faith yet in my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), and I know, by the smile of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell), we would be right in each other's arms upon this question.

Mr. COCHRANE. What about the Postmaster General?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I give him up. I think he has had too much to do with the McNish business, and the like of that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is quite forgetting himself in making that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. What?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is making an abuse of his position on the floor of this House in making that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. That will simply be a difference of opinion between myself and the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is a highly indecent statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) had better curb his tongue.

Mr. MILLS. Is the word "indecent" in order?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, it is in order.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes, it is in order, but I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) had better curb his tongue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has certain experience recorded not far back when he was in Opposition, and when he used language compared with which my language would be a mild panacea. Any way, I have no hesitation at all in saying, that we have never heard, and I do not believe we ever will hear one word of condemnation from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) for methods such as he has been pursuing in the by-elections.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) state what methods he refers to?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am not adverse to teaching in a fairly reasonable way, but when we have newspapers in this country, and fairly enterprising ones, with all that is spread on their pages, and when my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) can read, I do not think I need take up the time of the House in attempting to teach him as to what happened in West Elgin.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am being interrupted, and just as I was coming to my peroration.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish to say—if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) allows me ; if not, I will not trespass on his time.

Mr. FOSTER. Go on.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has any observations to make reflecting upon my honour in connection with any elections, there is a proper way for him to make these charges, and I challenge him or any one else to make any charge he likes against me. If it is a proper subject of inquiry, he shall have an inquiry, but I object to his insinuating, as he has done to-day—I am told the word "cowardly" is not in order, and I do not wish to get out of order—but I will not let him make any insinuations, and have them pass uncontradicted and unchallenged in my presence.

Mr. TALBOT. It is in the nature of the "baste."

Mr. SPEAKER. That last observation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) is entirely uncalled for, and very improper.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling.

An hon. MEMBER. Make him withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) must not call a gentleman in this House a beast, and he should apologize.

Mr. TALBOT. I did not mention any one in particular.

Mr. SPEAKER. I know, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) cannot get out of it in that way. There is no doubt whatever that language like that addressed across the House is exceedingly undignified. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) will be good enough to apologize for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I repeat, the hon. member (Mr. Talbot) will be good enough to apologize for that language.

Mr. TALBOT. I did not mention anybody in particular.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. TALBOT. I submit to the ruling of the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Apologize.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) will please apologize.

Mr. TALBOT. I cannot apologize to anybody, because I did not mention any one.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) called across the House to an hon. member in very improper language. I shall insist upon an apology. I shall absolutely insist upon it no matter what the consequence may be.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) must submit to the Chair, and give an example of obedience to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. TALBOT. To whom will I apologize?

Mr. SPEAKER. To the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster).

Mr. TALBOT. I did not mean the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster).

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Apologize to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) did not mean the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), he will be good enough to apologize to the House.

Mr. TALBOT. I will apologize to the House, under your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I have any more observations to make on this subject. I am in favour of the motion of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who so ably moved and supported these resolutions. I do not believe that any proper investigation has been made into these matters in the Yukon, I do not believe that a proper investigation can be made by the commission appointed. I believe that the public sense of this country and the public sense of all British countries where these allegations have been made requires that something adequate should be done, as the right hon. gentleman said, to probe this thing to the very bottom. I, therefore, am in favour of a commission of judges, not to take away our parliamentary responsibility, but to furnish us with that information which shall be unbiassed, full, and absolutely certain ; which will enable us the better to carry out the responsibilities which we have as members of this Canadian Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I will promise the House to be very brief. I do not think I would have intervened at all before the vote, if it were not that the department of which I am the head has been specially charged with delinquencies in the resolution of the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)—not so much charged in the resolution which he proposed, as in the speech with which he supported it. I would not have intervened, I say, because I am perfectly satisfied that there has been such a thorough discussion on the main points which the House has to decide upon that no further remarks are needed. I agree with my right hon. friend and leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the de-

bate was ended on this resolution when the Minister of the Interior finished his speech this afternoon, and if I had had any doubts upon that point, these doubts would have been entirely removed by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster). Why, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for the last hour and a half been trying to prove? He has been reading evidence taken before the commission issued by this Government, laid on the Table of this House and placed before the country, to prove that there has been such a thorough and exhaustive examination into all the facts in connection with Dominion Creek, that something must be done by the Government of the day to punish those, who, he says, are proved to be guilty. He tells us that not a stone has been left unturned by Mr. Ogilvie and by those who prosecuted before him, to lay bare the entire facts. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has proved to his own satisfaction and proved to the satisfaction of his friends around him, that these facts have not only been thoroughly exposed, but that they have been exposed so as to put Mr. Walsh in peril of prosecution. It, therefore, rests with this Parliament and this Government, if they come to the same conclusion as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) does, to initiate that prosecution against any public officer who has been proved by this evidence to have been guilty of any common law or statutory offence; but what that has to do with the resolution before the House, except to disprove the necessity for the tribunal the resolution calls for; I am at a loss to understand. What have we got here?

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has talked—I was going to say by the hour—about all manner of irrelevant subjects. He has failed to devote himself to the kernel of the question. He has failed to show that the investigation which has been held, and the results of which we have partially received, has not been thorough and complete, and that there should be a further one; but he has devoted himself on the contrary, so far as he has devoted himself at all to the evidence—to show that that part of it on which he has informed himself, has been thorough and complete, and has convicted certain persons of certain offences; and he has, therefore, proved that there is no necessity for any further investigation on those points at least.

Now, Sir, I am going to pass very rapidly over the evidence, because the few remarks which I have to make will be made with reference to my own departmnt. We have a resolution brought in by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asking for the appointment of a commission of judges to investigate certain alleged charges of wrong-doing in the Yukon. How is that resolution brought before the House? It is brought before the House and proposed in a form in which it cannot be amended—in a form in which, if it contains false or untrue statements, members must vote for those false or untrue statements if they vote for the resolution at all. It is brought in a form in which judges are unconstitutionally and illegally impeached; in a form in which members of this House are asked to violate every principle which heretofore has controlled the House in relation to——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to rise to a question of order. I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you propose to allow the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to charge an hon. member of this House with having made false and untrue statements?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have made no such charge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has just made the declaration that this resolution contains false and untrue statements.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I said the resolution was brought in a form in which, if it contained false or untrue statements, members who voted for it would have to vote for false or untrue statements.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is what I understood.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not what I understood.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want that to be thoroughly understood. For reasons of his own—I do not know what they were, and I do not care what they were—the hon. gentleman has chosen a method of bringing this matter before the House which forces every member of the House who votes for the resolution at all, to support every single statement of fact it contains. There were other methods which the hon. gentleman could have adopted. He could have moved this as a substantive resolution before the House, when it could have been amended. He could have moved it so that a very large proportion of that which is objectionable, and which we hold to be untrue, could be eliminated from it; and if the House were determined to have at present another commission of investigation, it could be done after the objectionable matter in the resolution was removed. But the hon. gentleman has not taken that particular mode of moving. He is forcing hon. members, even if they did desire at the present moment to have another investigation, to take that investigation coupled with all the irrelevant and as I say incorrect and improper statements which his resolution contains. Well, Sir, what does the resolution contain? The hon. leader of the Opposition says I charge the hon. member for Pictou with making false statements. I make no such charge; but I do charge this, that it was proved beyond peradventure today that the statements which the hon. gen-

tleman made, purporting to be quoted from returns brought down to this House, are untrue—seven or eight of them. They were the kernel, the crux, the great charges about which all the others grouped themselves, imputing personal wrong and corruption to the Minister of the Interior in connection with certain mining leases alleged to have been given by him to his former partners. Why, Sir, the whole country was ringing with the hon. gentleman's charge made directly against Sifton for having, under the cover of his late partners' names, practically giving mining leases to himself. And now it turns out—it requires no argument—every member on both sides of the House knows it now—that the returns brought down, from which the hon. gentleman's alleged quotations were made, proves that every one of those charges was improperly, incorrectly and untruly stated, and that the very opposite to what was stated is true. Hon. members of this House possessing self-respect are asked to put themselves on record as declaring that to be true which the record shows is untrue, and to falsify themselves and their consciences before this country. Sir, can they do it? Is the hon. leader of the Opposition himself, with that resolution unamended, prepared to put himself on record as affirming that to be true which he knows now is not true? Is the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), who will go as far for his party in his vote or statement as any other man in public life in Canada, prepared to so far forget himself as to vote in favour of statements in the resolution which he must know now are not true? Are hon. gentlemen behind him going to do it? And still, Sir, they ask hon. members of this House to vote for this resolution and to vote for these statements. I would not say that it is cowardly, because that is unparliamentary; I would not say that it is indecent, because that is unparliamentary; but I say it is unconstitutional and unjust to ask an hon. member so to vote in the House, and I do not believe any hon. member who values his independence will do so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. member allow me to say, because I think that is a misconception of his, that no member in the House, in voting for this resolution, votes to endorse one single statement; but that the part which the members of the House are asked to commit themselves to is, that a commission be appointed to inquire into the truth of these statements.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. First, the resolution affirms a certain thing to be true, and then it asks the House to send a commission of judges to the Yukon to report upon the truth of that statement; and the fact that it is untrue, as proved by the records lying on the Table of the House, and from which the hon. gentleman undertook to quote——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise again to a question of order. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if you decide, as you have ruled again and again in the case of gentlemen on this side of the House, that an hon. member cannot charge that a statement made by another hon. member is untrue, you cannot permit the hon. gentleman to say that it has been proved that a statement made in this resolution has been proved to be untrue. You have again and again ruled that that statement cannot be made by one member of this House to another, and I must ask that the same rule shall apply to one side of the House as to the other.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Speaking to the point of order, such a ruling has never been made in my hearing in this House. I cannot charge that a gentleman states wilfully a thing which is untrue; but I can make a charge that a statement in itself is not true. I say here is a document on the Table which shows that no lease was issued and no payment made—which says that a statement is not true which the resolution affirms is true.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to say this. You quoted the authority and showed that the word "untrue" could not be used. You ruled that it might be said that a statement was not founded in fact, but you distinctly ruled that it was not permissible to say that it was untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me that the point does not apply in this case. A statement made by an hon. member on his personal honour or assurance should not be questioned, and the word "untrue" or "untruthful" should not be applied to it. This is, of course, a charge—an official, formal, public charge—made against the Government, and I think that parliamentary debate could not go on if the Government were not entitled to refute that official charge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman, in this resolution, moved at a time when he knew it was not amendable, making charges which are disproved by the official records, also makes an illegal and unconstitutional attempt—one which he must have known to be unconstitutional—to impeach a judge in this roundabout way. There is no member of this House who, judging by the repeated statements he has made, has posted himself more thoroughly as to the practice which ought to prevail with regard to impeaching a judge, than the hon. member for Pictou. Time and again he has laid down in this House the proper mode of procedure to adopt, and has called members to order who attempted to deviate in the slightest degree from those constitutional rules which experience and usage have consecrated. Last session, I very well remember the hon. gentleman calling my hon.

friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to order for some statement he made with respect to the judiciary. What did the hon. gentleman say? I am quoting from "Hansard," of 1898, page 6154. He said:

I rise again to a point of order. It is quite clear that the object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is to bring into contempt the judges of the land, and I have under my hand an authority which would, I think, warrant the members of the Government in protecting the judges from these aspersions and insinuations which I submit are not manly. The authority is this:

Bearing in mind the general responsibility of Ministers of the Crown for the due administration of justice throughout the Kingdom, and the obligations which they owe to the dispensers of justice to preserve them from injurious attacks or calumnious accusations, it is necessary that before consenting to any motion for a parliamentary inquiry into the conduct of a judge, or even for the reception of a petition complaining of the conduct of a judge, and not asking for his removal from office in accordance with the statute, or not alleging reasonable ground for such proceeding, Ministers should themselves have investigated the matter of complaint and be prepared either to oppose or facilitate the interference of Parliament on the particular occasion.

The other day he also laid down the law in almost similar terms, and gave the quotations from Todd which my right hon. friend the leader of the House gave us this evening. He then said:

Now, in these cases regard has heretofore very properly been had to the solemn and careful steps that are taken in the case of an impeachment of a Superior Court Judge; that is to say, the Government is bound, before even calling on a judge to answer charges that have been presented to the proper department against his conduct, to see that these charges are themselves so specific and so exact that they are not only ready for issue to be taken upon them, but that they are of such a character that, if established in the form in which they are presented, they would constitute a case for the removal of the judge from his position. That is following, as I say, the procedure in a case of impeachment where a great many preliminary forms having regard to the exalted position and the many important considerations attaching to it, are regarded, tabling the articles practically, having them carefully considered, having them sent to the party affected, before any other stage in the procedure is taken. So, following on after these specific charges have been formulated and carried up to the standard which I have mentioned, the very proper procedure and practice have been to communicate those to the judge, and even in that case should the charge be serious enough and come under the rules that I have mentioned, still it does not follow that a commission should issue; in that case it is still necessary to ascertain from the judge what explanation he may have to give.

What one of these preliminary forms has this hon. gentleman condescended to take before attempting to impeach Judge Dugas, before demanding the issue of a commission to go up to the Yukon to try him? Not one. After repeatedly insisting on the very great necessity there is for observing these preliminary forms, he is the first one to break down every rule which has ever been established, and to ask this House to impeach this judge without giving him notice of the charge brought against him, or without a preliminary investigation by Her Majesty's executive to ascertain whether the charges have any foundation. The resolution asks us to destroy every constitutional rule and practice, and to launch out into a new procedure which he has gathered I do not know where.

We have here a commission issued by this Government; we have a portion of the evidence returned and laid on the Table, and I venture to say very few members have read two dozen pages of it. The evidence upon one of the main charges has not been returned, but it has been taken. The commission is closed, the evidence is on its way to Parliament, and the hon. gentleman, before all the evidence has reached Parliament, before we know where it is complete or conclusive or not, before we can tell whether it should be supplemented or not, asks us to say that in our opinion the evidence has not been properly taken, to declare, in point of fact, that it is not worthy of consideration, and to send out a new commission to take new evidence. How can the hon. member justify such a request? Is it not common sense that we should have the complete report before us so that we may examine it, and ascertain if in any respect it is wanting, before asking Parliament to go to the expense and trouble and delay of issuing a new commission to go to the Yukon and take further evidence.

We are asked to violate another constitutional rule of the very highest importance. If there is one rule which Parliament in this country, and at home, and in all the British colonies, has cherished and guarded with the utmost loyalty, it is this, that, so far as parliamentary government is concerned and the conduct of a Minister is concerned, that shall be regulated, and controlled, and approved, or condemned, by Parliament itself or by a committee of Parliament. And, if the Ministers of the Crown have proved themselves false to the trust which Parliament reposed in them, if they have been parties to wrong-doing in their departments or in any other position in relation to the Government, Parliament, acting as a whole or by its committee, will call them to account; but Parliament will not delegate to any judge or any other person that right, which belongs solely, and should belong solely, to itself. Why, the idea of issuing a writ of ejectment to try before a judge whether a Minister of the Crown is entitled to retain his position or not, is such an amusing misconception of the relation which the Minister of the Crown bears to the people and to Parliament that I am astonished—I was going to say, I was ashamed—that a gentleman who has occupied a position as a Minister of the Crown, should propose it. But the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr.

Foster) says that one of the gravest charges we are asked to investigate is the unsanitary condition of Dawson. It appears, Sir, that this is the point around which the question is going to revolve; and the hon. gentleman pronounced it one of the gravest charges. It appears that Mr. Ogilvie, who has spent the best part of a lifetime in that country, is not competent to take evidence upon such a matter; but that the question whether the proper number of drains have been laid, and whether the proper number of closets have been built, must be referred to a judge of the Supreme Court. Why, Sir, the matter need only be stated to make it a laughing-stock. I venture to say that every hon. member who has not allowed his party feeling to carry him away, would willingly concede that Mr. Ogilvie, the commissioner, is better qualified to take evidence and report his opinion to this House upon that question than is any judge of the Supreme Court or of any Superior Court of Canada. Let us remember also, Sir, that Mr. Ogilvie was not there as a judge to pronounce judgment upon the evidence he took. He was sent there as an experienced commissioner, having a knowledge of the country and a knowledge of the miners, a better knowledge of the country and the miners than anybody else could have. And he was sent to do what? To take from any and all of those people who choose to give it, any evidence they chose to give upon specific charges which were presented to the Government on the 25th August last, whether that evidence was favourable or unfavourable. And, as we heard from the Minister of the Interior to-day, the commissioner did not regulate his conduct as a commissioner by those rules which would control a judge, but allowed all sorts of evidence, even hearsay, which a judge would not permit. The commissioner reports that evidence to the House. It does not matter what Mr. Ogilvie's opinion upon it is. It is Parliament that is to pronounce as to that evidence. The commissioner having reported the facts, it is for Parliament to pass judgment upon the facts and to say who are or who are not incriminated by them.

It is also alleged here, as a crime against Mr. Ogilvie, as something wrong, that he required charges to be made before he would allow them to be entered upon. I say it is not only common sense, but it is British fair-play and British justice, to observe that rule. No man should be allowed, at his mere will, to make a charge against an official which might imperil that official's character for ever, unless and until the charge was submitted to Mr. Ogilvie beforehand, so that the official might have notice and have an opportunity to answer it. Otherwise, the most innocent man in the Yukon territory might have had his character destroyed by evidence which would put on record forever, without having the slightest information or notice that he was to be attacked at all. I say, therefore, that Mr. Ogilvie, in requiring that before evidence impugning the official character or conduct of any of the officials up there would be received, notice should be given to him of the intention to make the charge, so that the official so incriminated might be notified, was only doing what any honest commissioner would have done under the circumstances. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that when we issued this commission, we should have pronounced and declared that the witnesses were to have every immunity for any statements they made before the commission. And the hon. member for York stated that that was not given. Well, Sir, he may be right; but, if he is right, I fail to understand the English language.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment? I endeavoured to explain a misapprehension that appeared in the press. The point is this—not that there was no immunity possible for witnesses, in so far as the statements they made were concerned, but differing from the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act, there was no provision under which the witness who made a full revelation, should be pardoned. In one case no one could be indicted for the offence which had been confessed in giving testimony. In the case before Mr. Ogilivie a man could be indicted, and evidence outside his statement could be used against him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Precisely. I was referring to the statement made by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), which I took down, that no immunity was offered to witnesses in giving testimony before this commission. At page 7 of the commission of inquiry, the commissioner states the following to be the law:—

> No witness examined before such commissioners or before any commissioners appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province of Canada to conduct any inquiry into and concerning the good government of such province, or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof, or the administration of justice therein, or in reference to any municipal matters, shall be excused from answering any question put to him on the ground that the answer thereto may criminate or tend to criminate him; but no evidence so taken shall be admissible against any such witness in any criminal proceeding, except in the case of a witness charged with having given false evidence at any such inquiry, or with having procured, or attempted or conspired to procure, the giving of such evidence.

That was the law. That law was promulgated by the commissioner throughout the Yukon. When the debate took place in Parliament before, I had in my hand copies of the "Klondike Nugget," at or about the time the commission sat. The official statement of Mr. Ogilvie that witnesses could

give their evidence without any danger of criminating themselves or of being prosecuted was proclaimed in every issue of the "Nugget" during the whole time the commission was sitting, and witnesses were implored to come forward, if they had any evidence, the statutory assurance being repeated day by day, that they could do so with perfect immunity from subsequent prosecution for the evidence they gave.

Then, the hon. gentleman said the commission should not have been limited to the 25th August. I do not know whether any further remarks are necessary on that subject, because the hon. gentleman's arguments have been answered already. Hon. gentlemen can take the return brought down by Parliament, and they will find in it the petition of the miners themselves, dated 25th August, 1898, reciting the grievances under which they laboured, the charges they had against the officials, and which they were prepared to prove, if the Government could be successfully moved to issue a commission to enable them to do so.

Why, Sir, the Government could not do anything more than act upon the statements which the miners had submitted to them. They said: We are prepared to prove thus and so, not something that is going to happen in the future, after the 25th of August, but something which had happened prior to the 25th of August; send us out a commission and we will give evidence, and we will prove these charges. The Government sent out the commission, the commission recited the very petition which they had submitted to the Government, and it was held, and I think most lawyers will agree, correctly held, that the commissioner was limited in taking his evidence to the date when the charges were made. I regret it, I have no desire to see this inquiry either burked or controlled by dates, or limited in any way as to person or as to time. I desire, and I believe every member of the Government desires, that the inquiry should be thorough and should be exhaustive. What have we to gain by shielding any of these officials? If they have been guilty of wrong-doing, let the facts come out, let the facts be probed to the bottom. If it turns out when Mr. Ogilvie's full report is in, if the evidence shows that it is defective in any respect, if it shows that a further commission would probably bring forth fuller or further evidence, why, Sir, I have not the shadow of a doubt that that further commission will issue, and that further evidence will be taken; we have had the pledge of the Prime Minister to do that. So I say that with these facts before us there is no justification for any member of this House who values his good name, fame or reputation, voting for this resolution which the hon. gentleman has presented.

Now, Sir, it is stated here as one of the charges—I do not think it is involved in this resolution, although the hon. gentleman dwelt a great deal upon it, and the hon. member for York, who followed, seemed to assume that everybody conceded the point—that Mr. Walsh's commission was altogether illegal. Sir, I challenge that assumption; it is not a true statement of the law. I say that the Governor in Council was justified in issuing Major Walsh's commission. There may be a question as to one part of the powers conferred on that commissioner, but that the Government had power to issue that commission I was astonished to hear anybody deny, laying claim to a shred of constitutional knowledge. What powers have the Governor General in this country? Does he not possess the same powers in relation to Canada that the Queen does in relation to her Empire?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I say he does, in regard to these matters of which we are talking, I say he does. Look at the instructions to the Governor General and see what they say:

> We do further authorize and empower our said Governor General to constitute and appoint in our name and in our behalf all such judges, commissioners, and justices of the peace and other necessary officers and Ministers of our said Dominion as may be lawfully constitued or appointed by us.

So that any commissioner, Minister or official necessary for the due administration of government in this Dominion, can be as constitutionally appointed by a Governor General of this Dominion as by the Queen herself, and she has delegated her power to him. I am astonished to know that any hon. gentlemen possessing the experience of the hon. member for York should stand up here and challenge that to be a correct statement of constitutional law. Well, if that is true, we have there an unsettled part of this Dominion, an unorganized part of the North-west Territories, a part of the North-west Territories—and I speak now under correction—over which the ordinances of the North-west Council do not extend, a part of territory, therefore, that the Queen herself would have a perfect and absolute right to send a commissioner to administer. And if the Queen had the right to send a commissioner to administer it, so had the Governor General, under the letters patent which he held and the instructions I have just read. Therefore, I say the commission to Major Walsh to go to the Yukon, to the unorganized North-west Territories, and there to administer the laws of the land, to secure peace, order and good government, was a legal, a proper and a constitutional commission. But the hon. gentleman may say—and on that point I admit there is some argument: But you gave him power to amend the mining laws. Well, let us look at that. How did

the Queen, how did the Governor General issue that commission? By virtue of the statute? Not at all, not by virtue of any statute; that commission issued by virtue of his prerogative power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) answered the question across the House that the commission was issued under the statute.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember what the hon. gentleman said; I am arguing the law point now.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman asked the question by what authority the commission was issued under the great seal. The statute referred to gives authority to the Governor General in Council to decide what commission shall be issued under the great seal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The commission itself, the parchment, was issued under the great seal, but the authority and powers contained in it, were vested in Commissioner Walsh, not by virtue of any statutory power which the Governor had, but by virtue of the prerogative power of the Queen, which she had vested in him by royal instructions, and I will challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side possessing a knowledge of constitutional law, to deny the accuracy of that statement. But while that commission vesting him with full power to constitute government there, to depose officials and appoint others, to do all that was necessary to secure peace, order and good government—while that commission was perfectly legal and constitutional, the point may come up whether he had power, as it was given in the commission, to amend the mining regulations. And how does that stand? The Dominion land law of this country prescribes the method by which the lands of this Dominion shall be sold and disposed of. But the Dominion Lands Act, in its 47th clause, especially exempts the mineral lands from the operation and from the regulations of that statute. It says in so many words, that these mineral lands shall be disposed of in such manner as the Governor in Council may by regulation appoint. Now, is that an enabling statute? Is that an enabling clause enabling the Governor to do something that he could not otherwise do? Not at all; the Governor, by virtue of his prerogative power, the Queen, by virtue of her prerogative right, could dispose of those mining lands unless her prerogative power had been controlled by statute, and that declaration in the 47th section of the Dominion Act may well be argued to be, not an enabling statute, an enabling clause, but a declaratory clause of what the law was. If that argument is correct, and it can be fairly well argued, then I say that the commission giving Major Walsh power to amend the mining laws was in itself good as a power conferred by the Governor out of his prerogative power. And so I say this twaddle which we have been listening to for hours and for days about Major Walsh administering the Government illegally and improperly, his commission not being worth the paper on which it was printed, and all that kind of thing, has no foundation whatever in fact. The only point which, in my humble judgment, is arguable, and I admit that to be arguable, is whether the Governor could by his prerogative power confer upon Major Walsh the right of amending the mining regulations. That would depend very much upon whether that section of the statute is held to be an enabling section, or whether it is a declaratory section.

I have taken very much longer than I intended to speak upon these general matters, and I now propose to call the attention of the House, before I sit down, to the charges which have been made by the hon. gentleman against myself in the administration of my department. Sir, I do not complain of the statement which the hon. gentleman has placed in the resolution:

> That the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, appointed to the office of inspector of steamboats one Russell, who had been previously dismissed from the said service of the Government on account of improper conduct, and detailed said officer to Dawson to act as steamboat inspector.

I do not complain of that statement so much but what I do complain of, what I have the right to complain of is that the hon. gentleman should have supplemented that statement with the remarks in the speech he made, at a time, after I had brought down and placed before him, in the form of a return, all the facts in regard to Mr. Russell's former dismissal. What did the hon. gentleman say? The hon. gentleman made a statement in this House calculated to lead this House and this country to believe that Mr. Russell was a man who had been dismissed from office because, when he was in office in 1890, he had accepted bribes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman cheers that. I will quote his language and we will see, in a moment, how very far that statement is from the facts which have been proved, and which the hon. gentleman has in his hands. All I can say is that if the hon. gentleman's statements and charges, in respect to the officials in the Interior Department, are as far removed from the facts as his statements in respect to this official in my department, I would not give much for any one of the statements in the resolu-

tion. I am in a position to contradict formally and distinctly this charge in reference to Mr. Russell. I will do it so that the hon. gentleman himself will acknowledge that he has misstated the facts, and that this man ought not to be allowed to remain under the cloud in which he has attempted to envelope his character. The hon. gentleman says, in his statement, at page 6255 of "Hansard":

> Later on, he applied to be permitted to act as inspector for a private company, and he was told that he could not so act. Complaints were renewed in 1889, charging Russell with taking bribes; and in January, 1890, Capt. Devereux was appointed a commissioner to investigate the charges.

That is correct. Captain Devereux was so appointed, Captain Devereux made his report, and now the point is: Was it proved and did the report show the hon. gentleman whether it was proved?

Mr. PRIOR. It is true.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) says it is true. I think that is a very improper statement to come from him. He was, as the records show, the gentleman who forwarded these charges to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. His letter is there to-day, as well as the report made by Captain Devereux. He was the politician who was seeking to oust Mr. Russell from office in 1890, and it will be shown in the report, that the charges were untrue.

Mr. PRIOR. They were true; I do not care what the report is; they were true.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman stands up here and has the hardihood to take advantage of his position in this House to make a statement——

Mr. PRIOR. I will do it outside.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Had he the pluck to go before Captain Devereux, the commissioner, and make charges when he had the opportunity?

Mr. PRIOR. I will do that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman had the opportunity. When Captain Devereux went there and held an investigation in 1890 into a charge preferred by the hon. member himself, did he go before the commission and sustain it? No, he had not a word to say. But the hon. gentleman comes here nine years afterwards and talks about it. What does the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) say further:

> He was convicted, therefore, of falsehood, as well as of violating his instructions and of taking money, which he called fees, but which others would call bribes.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

The hon. gentleman goes on to say that the man was convicted of taking bribes, and that he was dismissed for it. I say he was never convicted of it; I say he was not dismissed for it. The hon. gentleman had his report in his hand, and that report showed that on his own recommendation the man was not dismissed for taking bribes, but upon the following grounds.

Mr. PRIOR. He took them just the same.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it is honourable for that hon. gentleman to make that statement. No hon. gentleman should make such statements.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must request the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) not to interrupt, unless he obtains the permission of the hon. gentleman who has the floor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The report made to Council by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. member for Pictou, says:

> Taking, therefore, into consideration the evidence adduced at the investigation and the definite instructions given to Mr. Russell by the department, and in view of the necessity of an inspector being above suspicion and free from the influence of owners of boilers and steamboats, whose property he is required to inspect in his official capacity, the undersigned has the honour to submit that in his opinion it will not be in the public interest, after the disclosures made, to retain Mr. Russell as steamboat inspector, and to recommend that his services be dispensed with.

Is there one word about his having taken bribes in that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What are the disclosures referred to?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The disclosures will not show that he was guilty of taking bribes. When the hon. gentleman made that statement he had a report in his hands from one of the most experienced Deputy Ministers that has ever been in the public service, the late William Smith, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That gentleman had reported on the evidence to the Minister, and he had reported to him that there was no evidence whatever that this man had taken bribes in any instance. I will read the report from beginning to end. I do not know Mr. Russell, I never saw him.

Mr. PRIOR. We do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You may know him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) evidently bears a bitter animus against him, and I think it would be becoming in him if he concealed his animus a little more than he does.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) allow me to make a remark?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I prefer to read Mr. Smith's statement. I say that I do not know Mr. Russell, and I never saw him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Neither did I.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Russell is reported to me a gentleman and a scholar, and he has certificates from Captain Devereux and Mr. Meneilly, chairman of the Board of Boiler Inspectors, of the Marine and Fisheries Department. What does this report say? Mind you, this report was made by the Deputy Minister for the hon. gentleman who was then the Minister to act upon, reporting what the evidence proved and what it did not prove. It is as follows:

The accompanying report of Capt. Devereux relative to the investigation into the charges made against Mr. Russell, the steamboat inspector, is herewith submitted for your consideration. I have not sent the evidence along with it until I hear from you, as it is too bulky; but I think there is enough in Devereux's report and Russell's statement to enable you to form an opinion on the matter.

I do not consider that anything is proved against Russell beyond what we know very well about him, viz., that certain steamboat owners pressed him to prepare plans and specifications of new boilers, which, when built, there would be no difficulty about getting passed, and that in certain cases he prepared such plans and specifications and made a charge for them. In the most of cases they appear to have been very reasonable.

If he made plans and specifications at all they could not expect him to make them for nothing, as it took up a good deal of his spare time, and would by any possibility be looked upon as a bribe to pass inferior work. In fact, some of them seem to think he was too strict with the boilers, and Captain Irving, the manager of the C. P. N. Co. is of opinion that he has done a great deal of good in British Columbia by elevating the standard of the machinery and boilers of steamboats.

That the late Mr. Dunsmuir, the coal millionaire, said to me he considered it was a great advantage to British Columbia that he was appointed inspector, and if it would have been sanctioned by the Minister he would have been glad to have given him $500 a year just to look after a boiler or machinery which he required to have made. He told me he was the best engineer he had ever known in British Columbia.

On the whole, therefore, I am of opinion that there is no evidence whatever that he was bribed on any occasion, but that he did certain work to oblige steamboat owners and got paid for it, he does not at all deny. If this system is to be stopped, and I presume it should be stopped, he should be informed of it, but I think $1,200 is too small a salary if he cannot do anything to supplement it. I think it would cause a great deal of difficulty to get another man who could come from British Columbia here and pass an examination and take the situation at $1,200 salary.

When he got it before he only tried for it because nobody else, named by the members, could pass the examination, and I believe we will never get a better inspector at a similar salary.

I think he should be given another trial with a letter of his instructions not to work for anybody or take pay for extra work.

I think he would have no difficulty whatever in getting $2,000 a year in San Francisco, as Mr. Risley told me he considered him a first-class educated English engineer.

(Signed) WM. SMITH.

6th March, 1890.

Ottawa, 4th March, 1890.

The Chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection, reports:

The charges against Mr. W. A. Russell of taking money improperly or in any way of bribes from manufacturers of engines and boilers and from owners of steamboats, have not been sustained by the evidence submitted by the commissioner, Mr. John Devereux.

(Signed) W. J. MENEILLY,
Chairman.

5th April, 1890.

On the 4th ult., when the foregoing was written, did not know of letter of 5th January, 1887, from the department to Mr. Russell, instructing him, "you will be expected not to engage in outside work, but confine yourself strictly to your duties of office." In the absence of proof there is a probability Mr. Russell did not get this instruction, and would incline to give him the benefit of the doubt.

(Signed) W. J. MENEILLY,
Chairman.

So that the only offence that I could discover Mr. Russell to have ever been guilty of, was neglecting to obey a caution said to have been sent him from the department not to engage in outside work, and with regard to which the Chairman of the Board of Inspectors reported, that the preponderance of evidence showed, that it never reached Mr. Russell at all. There is not a scintilla of moral wrong reported against Russell, and there was no reason in the wide world why he should not be reinstated in office. Hon. members of the House cannot but have watched the animus which evidently prompts the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) to interrupt so frequently in this matter. Mr. Russell was dismissed and I reinstated him, why?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, why?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will tell the hon. gentleman. In the first place, because I saw there was no more wrong committed, and that the deputy of the department reported that in no possible way could he be held guilty of having taken bribes of any kind whatever; that he was a first-class educated engineer, and the best man that could be got in British Columbia. In 1898 when it was reported to me that it was necessary to have another boiler inspector, because of the increased shipping arising out of the Yukon trade, I sent out the chairman of the board to British Columbia to publish a notice calling on all persons who desired to do so to come forward and pass the examinations if they could. There were only three who presented themselves, and two of these failed

to pass; and the only one that did pass was the second engineer of the "Quadra," and I have a report at the time from the chairman of the board, that he was not satisfactory. What was I to do? This gentleman was recommended to me, I looked at his record and found he was reported to be the best engineer in British Columbia. I found he had done nothing wrong, I believe he was dismissed to gratify the political animus of some of our opponents, and under these circumstances I had no hesitation in appointing him. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says I appointed Mr. Russell illegally, and although he ought know better, the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says, that the work Mr. Russell did in the Yukon was illegal. I deny it. I say that his appointment was as legal as any appointment ever made by His Excellency.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) does not understand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman does.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Wait a moment, I want this point cleared up.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not say that his appointment as boiler inspector was illegal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You said it was illegal, so far as the Yukon was concerned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said that detailing him to the Yukon was illegal. I said that there was a way in which he could have been detailed there, that that was not done, and that all the work he did there was illegal; taking fees was illegal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let us see about that. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) if he looks at the statute will see, that inspectors of boilers are appointed at some particular places, but for no specified district and the appointing of them for a specified district is a matter of administrative detail alone. The inspector of boilers appointed at Toronto, at Vancouver, or at Halifax can legally inspect boilers anywhere throughout the Dominion, and the inspection made by the Halifax officer at Vancouver, if he is sent there by me, is just as legal as the inspection made by him at Halifax. The law does not say that he is to be appointed for a particular district. It says you must appoint an inspector at certain places. We appoint one at Halifax, one at Quebec, one at Toronto, one at Kingston, one at Vancouver, and then we define the districts in which they are to do their work for administrative purposes, so that they will not clash one with the other. I define, as a rule, within what lines they are to work, but from time to time we called them from one district to another. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did so when he was Minister. This morning I looked up the records to see whether he did not do what the law contemplates should be done. I looked through the statute, and I find that the statute, section 41, expressly provides for this:

> Any inspector may at any time visit any steamboat and inspect and examine the same.

Therefore, I say, that any inspector at any time may be called upon by the department to inspect any steamboat, whether it is within the bounds of the district that he is instructed to confine himself to in the first instance or not. His appointment is general and for the whole Dominion. What did my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) do when he was Minister? Did he follow that rule which he now condemns? Certainly he did, and every other Minister of Marine did so. Why, the chief inspector to-day, who was then the inspector at Kingston, was by the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) when Minister of Marine, on the 7th day of October, 1889, instructed to leave Kingston and go up to Toronto district and inspect a steamboat boiler there. Was that inspector's work all illegal, was the then Minister (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) incompetent, as he designated me for making a similar order? I ordered this man to go from British Columbia, if necessary, up to the Yukon to inspect the boilers there, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did a similar thing when he was Minister. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did more. He did not scruple to send some of his inspectors out of the Dominion altogether.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have an order in my hand where he sent an inspector to Boston to inspect boilers there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Was the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) acting illegally then, and was he incompetent when he did that? Why, Sir, the contention of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is ridiculous. The appointment of Mr. Russell, made by the Governor General, was that of measuring surveyor of shipping both for British Columbia and the Yukon district, and the appointment as steamboat and boiler inspector was for British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman say that he was

appointed as boiler inspector by Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. He was appointed, after the revised Act of last session, as Inspector of Hulls. As inspector of boilers, he was only by law to be appointed at a particular place, and the place at which he was put was in British Columbia ; there was no other man there, but he was ordered by the chief inspector to go to the Yukon and inspect there, as any other inspectors are ordered to go from one place to another and report, just as I ordered Mr. Stevens, the other day, to leave Halifax to inspect some boilers at Quebec. The law provides for it, and everything that man did was strictly legal and proper, strictly in accordance with the precedent which the hon. gentleman himself set, when he was Minister of Marine. And so this bugaboo which the hon. gentleman has raised about Mr. Russell, has not a single shred of foundation on which to stand. The man was not dismissed from office for any offence of an immoral character or any offence which would disqualify him from being appointed again to an office. But he was dismissed from office because it was alleged that he did not obey a caution which had been sent to him in a circular letter, which letter there was no evidence he ever received at all. Under these circumstances, I claim that, so far as the charge made against my department is concerned, it rests upon an absolutely baseless foundation ; and, if the charges against the officials in the other departments are as baseless and void as those against my own, the hon. gentleman's resolution ought not to have the support of a single member of this House.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). It is not my intention to delay the House for more than a moment or two ; but I do not feel inclined to give a silent vote on this occasion. The matter we are discussing is one of very great gravity. It is one that has attracted the attention—it would scarcely be too much to say—of the civilized world. It is one which, at all events, has attracted the attention of the mother country, the United States, our friends in Australasia, and many countries in Europe besides the mother country. A question of that kind is one which cannot be lightly set aside. It is a question which involves the fair fame of this country. Now, it has been suggested, because there may be inaccuracies in the indictment which has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), that the whole of this inquiry which he desires to have made, should be set aside, and that no one should support this resolution. It seems to me that the principle of the resolution is, that there shall be an inquiry by an impartial tribunal ; and, if the hon. member for Pictou has accidentally substituted a return for leasing for a return for dredging, I do not think that is a reason why I should vote against the resolution. I am firmly of opinion that it is of the utmost importance that that should be done which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister himself says he desires to have done, which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) says he desires to have done, that is, that this matter should be probed to the bottom. Taking these statements of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in good faith, as I am sure they are so made, it seems to me that the only difference that exists between the two sides of the House is as to the method of the inquiry. Both sides of the House are desirous to have this matter probed to the bottom. The right hon. gentleman supports one kind of inquiry; the hon. member who has moved this resolution supports another. The right hon. gentleman supports an inquiry by a commissioner. Now, I do not wish to say anything disrespectful of Mr. Ogilvie ; quite the reverse. I have the highest opinion of Mr. Ogilvie. I think he is a most upright and honourable man ; but that is beside the mark, to a large extent. I do not think that, outside of Canada, in those countries whose attention has been directed to this matter, it will in any degree enhance the reputation of this country that it should be known that, when grave charges of this kind have been preferred, and when a demand for an inquiry has gone abroad, we, in Canada, appointed a gentleman, no matter how great his integrity may be, who is an officer and a subordinate of a Minister who is involved in these charges, and who is a relative of his. I do not think it is fair to Canada. I think that one fact alone, that a gentleman occupying that position should be appointed to investigate these charges, is a reason for the gravest complaint in regard to this matter. When the Government refuse to allow these charges to be investigated by an impartial tribunal, and an expert tribunal, I feel satisfied that the people of this country will think that there is something behind which the Government desire to conceal. Now, I have listened to the speeches that have been made. I heard the very clever speech of the Minister of the Interior ; but I thought that he went a great deal too far for his own sake, because his speech went to show, so far as I could gather, that there had been no wrong done at all. He proved too much. Then I listened to the eloquent and impassioned speech of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I did not gather from that speech that my right hon. friend was really grappling with the main issue here, as to whether we should have an inquiry by an impartial tribunal or not. I did not hear him take that question up and argue it. I have not heard any one gentleman on the Government side of the House who has addressed the House, venture to argue that question.

The argument which has been addressed to the House in support of that position is absolutely unanswered. The difference between the Government and the Opposition is whether the inquiry shall be conducted by Mr. Ogilvie or by a commission of judges. The right hon. gentleman says he wishes the commission to be thorough. So do we. He says the investigation should go to the root. We also wish it to go to the root. He says that if this commission, which he has appointed, turns out to be defective, he will do something else. Why, the commissioner appointed by the Government says it is defective. Over and over again the commissioner distinctly tells us that it is defective, but still the Government do not do anything. Does the right hon. gentleman say that if this commission is defective, he will appoint a commission of judges? Perhaps my right hon. friend will do me the grace to answer that question. I think it is a fair question to ask, because otherwise we are arguing somewhat in the dark. My hon. friend will not answer, although I think it is a fair question, and one to which the country has a right to have an answer. I do not see, from my point of view, on what ground the Government can persist in not answering a question of that kind. Over and over again, the commissioner has told us distinctly, in this book, as read here by my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), that the commission is defective. What is the good then of the Government telling us that if it is defective they will appoint another commission. Without desiring to say anything out of order or discourteous, I must say that my right hon. friend is practically trifling with the House and the country. This is too grave a matter. It is not a matter between the Minister of the Interior and my hon. friend from Pictou, but it is a question involving the fair fame of this country. It is something in which the people are deeply interested, and I think it devolves upon every member of this House to do his utmost to endeavour to have the fair fame of the country cleared of the stain that rests upon it at present.

No one can doubt, no one does doubt, that there has been a condition of things existing in the Yukon which is a disgrace to Canada. Let us have the matter, as my right hon. friend says, probed to the bottom, and find out all about it. How can my hon. friend contend that he is really desirous of having this matter probed to the bottom, and yet at the same time refuse now to say that he will appoint another commission? If my right hon. friend will remember that his own commissioner tells him that this is a defective commission, he ought at once, if he wishes to have the matter probed to the bottom, to say here and now: I will have another commission appointed at once. I will consider what commission ought to be appointed, but one will certainly be appointed. That is not what has been done, however. On the contrary, it seems to me, the desire has been simply to deal with the technicalities of the resolution before the House, but this is too grave a matter to be decided solely on technicalities. If my hon. friend desires to deal with it in the way it ought to be dealt with, the technicalities could be disposed of very easily by consent. If there are technical defects in the resolution, that difficulty could be easily settled by consent. I think this is too grave a matter to have technical objection interposed between the House and its decision as to whether we are to have this matter thoroughly investigated or not. I shall vote for this resolution on the ground that it is of the utmost importance this matter should be probed to the bottom as my right hon. friend has said he desires it should be.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I shall not take up very long the time of the House by attempting to answer what has been so ably answered by hon. gentlemen on this side who have preceded me. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. McNeill) will pardon me if I do not make allusion to what he has said. His speech struck me as that of one who felt he would be in a very peculiar and awkward position if he had to vote for the resolution before the Chair. He seemed to be very anxious to be relieved of that duty. With that remark, I will address myself to a paragraph in this long resolution reflecting on the Department of Customs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him? I wish to ask the right hon. leader of the House whether he thinks anything will be gained by our sitting later. Very few persons want to speak on this side, and we might arrange to take the vote before six o'clock tomorrow afternoon. In that case, perhaps the hon. Minister of Customs would prefer to move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. We ought to finish the debate during this sitting.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will just confine myself to the short allusion made to the department over which I preside. The hon. gentleman, in his resolution, did not do myself or my department the honour of making any direct charge against us. But the paragraph relating to the Customs Department, reads as follows:—

That gross and scandalous abuses have occurred in the Department of Customs in the Yukon District, United States vessels having been admitted to the Canadian registry in the said district upon fraudulent undervaluation, as in the case of the steamer "John C. Barr," which was worth at least $60,000, but was allowed to be passed at the customs at a valuation of $10,000.

That is all that is stated with reference to the Department of Customs. If it proved to be true that, by false and fraudulent under-valuation, of a vessel worth $60,000 was entered at $10,000, that is a matter that

would have to be dealt with. But I think it is not a matter that will require two judges of the Supreme Court to ascertain, it is a matter that appertains to the department, and it is their duty to attend to it—and I think the department will be able to attend to it. I can only say that action has been taken in reference to the matter. On the 3rd of May the following notices appeared in the notice paper:

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper—On Friday next—Inquiry of Ministry—Can the Honourable Minister of Customs, without inconvenience, state the names and tonnage of United States built boats which have been given Canadian registry by the Collector of Customs at Dawson, from July 1st, 1898, to latest date known at Ottawa, the duty paid, the amount of valuation of each vessel and by whom such valuation was made, and the names of British owners of the same; and will a complete return as above, down to date, be laid upon the Table at an early day?

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper—On Friday next—Inquiry of Ministry—Has the Department of Customs any report as to the value of the SS. "John C. Barr," recently admitted to Canadian registry at Dawson? If so, what was the valuation for customs purposes?

When these notices appeared the Commissioner of Customs, on May 5th, when he received the notices, immediately wrote the following letter, addressed to Mr. D. W. Davis, collector of customs, Dawson City, Yukon:

I inclose copies of two inquiries of Ministry proposed to be made in the House of Commons to-day by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper. Please forward to this department, without delay, all the information asked for in these inquiries so as to enable the department to answer the questions fully.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner.

When the hon. gentleman came to ask the questions, I answered him that I was unable to give him the information with reference to the first question. As to the second question, the answer was as follows:—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The steamer "John C. Barr" was entered for duty at Dawson, 6th October, 1898, on application for Canadian registry, upon a valuation of $10,000.

Then, Sir, having given the hon. gentleman the information, on the 21st May, in discussion upon the Estimates, the hon. gentleman made an allusion to this answer of mine, and made the statement that he understood the vessel was worth $60,000, and that she had been admitted for $10,000. I considered that was a statement that should be attended to at once, that it was my bounden duty as administering the department, to inquire into the matter without delay. I mentioned to the commissioner what had been stated in the House, and asked him to get the "Hansard" and cut out the statements that were made and send the page to Mr. Ogilvie, who, besides being commissioner of the Yukon district, has been clothed by the Department of Customs with all the powers of inspector of customs. The commissioner sent this to Mr. Ogilvie in the following letter:—

W. Ogilvie, Esq.,
Commissioner of the Yukon District,
Dawson, N.W.T.

Sir,—I send you herewith pages 3162 and 3163 of "Hansard," of May 12th, 1899, containing statements respecting the valuation of the steamer "John C. Barr," upon application for Canadian registry.

Please investigate this matter and ascertain, by the best means in your power, the fair market value of the vessel at the time of application for Canadian register and report the facts for the information of the Honourable the Minister of Customs. The question of undervaluation can be dealt with in due course under the provisions of the Customs laws.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

Of course, to that we have no answer as yet. Now, what is to be said about a case of this kind? At Dawson we have a collector of customs. He is far away, as the House well knows, and very difficult to get at. He was not appointed by me or by this Government; he was appointed by the late Government; he was a colleague in this House of the gentlemen who sat on this side for many years. He was appointed by the Government of which the mover of this resolution was a member. He was, therefore, I may say, the nominee of the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) himself. I might ask at this point how the hon. gentleman knows that this vessel was worth $60,000?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been credibly informed by those in the business.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Has the hon. gentleman seen the vessel?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) will remember I told the House very frankly that I had no personal knowledge, no direct knowledge of the facts that occurred at Dawson; I never was there in my life; but I said in the resolution that I had been credibly informed and believed. And I may remind the hon. gentleman that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) stated in the House that he had seen the vessel, and, if my recollection is right—and if so the statement will be found in 'Hansard"—he said the vessel was worth $60,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think he did say something like that. Perhaps he is different from the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and may have seen it. But even on the testimony of the hon. member for Pictou, who has given

it upon the authority or upon the judgment of the hon. member for New Westminster —who, if he said so, no doubt believed it to be true—I do not think that I could do more than seek to learn the facts, and, when the facts are ascertained, deal with the case. I confess that I can hardly conceive it possible that the facts are as stated. I take it that the gentleman who was appointed by the late Government to be collector of customs at Dawson, being appointed at such a distant place must have been one in whom they had more than ordinary confidence.

If he was to be sent away where there could be no supervision over him, where he could handle customs fees, where no inspector could reach him, where he would be the sole custodian of the funds, with no one to give account to, with no mails going out scarcely, and remittances only once in a while, I therefore took it for granted that when they had appointed a collector there they had by that fact declared that he could be trusted honestly to fulfil the duties of his office. That is the gentleman who made this entry. An inquiry has now gone up to Mr. Ogilvie to ascertain the facts in reference to this, and if it should be found, as the member for Pictou has charged, that a vessel which was worth $60,000 has, by that officer, been admitted at $10,000, then, as soon as the facts are ascertained, action will be taken by the department in reference to that matter. But what blame can be attached in any shape to the department? Would the hon. gentleman ask me, upon his mere statement here, that I should suspend D. W. Davis from being collector at Dawson, without giving him a chance to answer, or without having a report from an officer? Yet he puts it in that position. It is a singular charge that he makes against the department in this matter. I believe in giving an opportunity to every officer to defend himself, but if the charge is true, there will have been in the meantime something that should have gone into the treasury that has not gone in; but the public revenue, I think, is not in serious danger from the fact that the vessel is there. The question of undervaluation can be dealt with. Similar questions are being dealt with frequently, questions submitted by able officers, questions going on some times for weeks before they can be dealt with. This will be dealt with when we have the proper information to enable us to deal with it.

Now, Sir, I will, with your permission and with the consent of the House, because it is alluding to a previous debate mention another matter to show how unsafe it is to give heed to the statements that are made and to much of the testimony which is embodied in this resolution of the hon. member for Pictou. It will be remembered that upon a previous occasion when the Yukon debate was up, the hon member for Victoria, B.C.

(Mr. Prior) made this statement in his speech on the 16th of June:

It was a common practice—they told me—I do not say it prevails now, for them to get their goods through at a small sum compared with what they should have paid. I will give you one instance—the case of a man called Charles Beam. He went out, and at Lake Tagish was stopped by the collector and showed the goods he had that were dutiable. The duty came to $350. This is what I am informed by a man who says he knows the facts of the case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). About what date would it be?

Mr. PRIOR. I do not have it down here, but this man told it to me. It is within six months, I think. He said the duty came to $350. The collector's name was Thorne; he was the collector or the collector's subordinate, and he says he gave him $5 and a flask of whisky, and that this man passed his goods through for $150. The duty which he should have paid was $350, but by giving a $5 bribe and a flask of whisky, this custom-house officer passes his goods for $150.

Mr. MAXWELL. Would the hon. gentleman kindly give me the name of that man again?

Mr. PRIOR. I was informed that it was a man by the name of Charles Beam.

Mr. MAXWELL. No, but the name of the customs official.

Mr. PRIOR. I am told that his name is Thorne.

As soon as that statement was made, when I reached my office the next morning I mentioned the fact to the commissioner, and said that I wanted to have instant and full, inquiry made into it. We ascertained that this man was one of the North-west Mounted Police, acting as an assistant to the customs officer, that he was not now in our service, but was in the service of the North-west Mounted Police. I will read to the House the correspondence that took place on the subject:

Customs Department,
Ottawa, April 14th, 1899.

Fred White, Esq.,
Comptroller of North-west Mounted Police,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I send you herewith an extract from a speech made by Col. Prior, M.P., in the House of Commons on the 6th instant, containing charges of misconduct against F. P. Thorn, one of the North-west Mounted Police, who appears to have been acting as a customs officer at White Pass in 1898.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner.

North-west Mounted Police,
Ottawa, 29th May, 1899.
Office of the Comptroller,

Sir,—Referring to your letter of 14th April last, enclosing an extract from a speech made by Col. Prior, M.P., in the House of Commons on the 6th of that month, containing charges of misconduct against F. P. Thorn, one of the North-west Mounted Police acting as customs officer at White Pass in 1898.

I transmit herewith a copy of the investigation into this matter, which I trust will be satisfactory to the Honourable the Minister of Customs.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
FRED WHITE,
Comptroller.

John McDougald, Esq.,
Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa.

Customs Department,
Ottawa, April 14th, 1899.

Fred White, Esq.,
Comptroller of North-west Mounted Police,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I send you herewith an extract from a speech made by Col. Prior, M.P., in the House of Commons on the 6th instant, containing charges of misconduct against F. P. Thorn, one of the North-west Mounted Police, who appears to have been acting as a customs officer at White Pass in 1898.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner.

Referred to Supt. Wood for thorough investigation and report at the earliest possible moment.
(Signed) FRED WHITE,
Comptroller.

North-west Mounted Police,
Tagish, May 8th, 1899.

The Comptroller, North-west Mounted Police,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In compliance with your instructions contained in a memo. forwarding the Commissioner of Customs' letter of the 14th April, I beg to forward herewith evidence taken under oath regarding the charge made by Col. Prior, M.P., against Reg. No. 2440, Constable F. P. Thorn.

The latter denies the charge, and is supported by Sub-collector of Customs Peele and Customs Officer Stevens, who state that Constable Thorn did not accept entries, and therefore was not in a position to pass any one through. He was simply a landing waiter, whose duties were to check goods by the invoices after the latter had passed through the customs officials hands. Mr. Peele himself signs the customs receipts, which are afterwards presented here by persons entering the country.

Col. Prior says he thinks the alleged case of bribery occurred during the past six months. Now, there has been no collector of customs, nor customs official here since 11th February, 1898, or for more than a year past.

No such name as Charles Beam appears on customs books since 1st July, 1898, when the books were opened.

During the time there was a collector here, Constable Thorn had nothing to do with the customs, so could not any one.

He has been in the force for eight years, has borne a good character, and only a month ago I strongly recommended him for promotion. He has been in charge of the Skagway detachment since February last, and, in my opinion, would not accept a bribe under any circumstances.

Inspector Cartwright and Mr. McMartin, of the Customs Department, both of whom were acting as sub-collectors when Constable Thorn was acting as landing waiter, are now in Dawson, so I have forwarded a copy of charge and evidence to Supt. Steele, to get their statements.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
R. G. HOOPER,
Commanding Tagish District.

Inspector Jarvis, Bennett.

Investigate this matter as quickly and thoroughly as you can and report.

Call upon any witnesses Constable Thorn has.
(Signed) Z. T. WOOD, Supt.

Tagish, 30th April, 1899.

O. C. Tagish.

Evidence herewith attached.
(Signed) A. M. JARVIS,
Inspector.

Log Cabin, 4, 5, 99.

Log Cabin, Bennett Sub-District, 4, 5, 99.
North-west Mounted Police,

To the Commanding Officer,
Tagish District.

Sir,—I have the honour to attach herewith file of papers in case of Reg. No. 2440, Constable F. P. Thorn. I also attach the evidence taken and sworn to before me. In connection with this case, I beg to report that I have examined the Outport cash book of customs station of White Pass, B.C., from 1st day of July, 1898, which was the date the customs business was taken over from the North-west Mounted Police by Customs Inspector Clute, to the 28th February, which is the date Constable Thorn was transferred to Skagway to take charge of the police there. Between the dates mentioned no such name as Charles Beam appears on the books of the customs station.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) A. M. JARVIS,
Inspector.

Reg. No. 2440, Constable Thorn, F.P., on his oath says: I have been in the Customs Department since March, 1898, until February, 1899, when I was sent over to Skagway, Alaska, to take charge of the office and forward all supplies into the Yukon. I do not know any man by the name of Charles Beam. I have never had any connection whatever with the customs at Tagish, and, in fact, only visited there once with a freighting party, and that was before I had any position in the Customs Department at all. This was in February, 1898; I stayed there over night, leaving the following day. My position in the customs was that of landing waiter, performing the duties of checking goods as per invoice. This charge made by Mr. Prior is ridiculous and false. If I had wished to do such a thing it would be an impossibility, as the collector was there all the time. I have never acted as collector, but only as landing waiter.

(Signed) F. P. THORN,
Constable.

Taken and sworn before me at Skagway, Alaska, this 3rd day of May, 1899.
(Signed) A. M. JARVIS,
Inspector.

Percy R. Peele, being sworn, states: I am acting sub-collector, outport of White Pass, B.C. I took charge of this station on the first day of September, 1898, succeeding Mr. Jas. H. McMartin, now of the customs, Dawson City, Yukon Territory. From the time I took charge until the time Constable Thorn was sent to Skagway, which was in February last, I have no record of any such man by the name of Charles Beam ever having cleared goods at this outport of White Pass; furthermore, upon looking over the outport cash book of this station, which dates July 1st, 1898, until the time I took charge, there is no record of any such name. Constable Thorn

was never in the customs service at Tagish, and while on this station was engaged as acting landing waiter. His duties consisting solely of checking goods according to invoices. He never handled any moneys, nor accepted entries, and I have always found him a thoroughly trustworthy man in every respect.

(Signed) PERCY R. PEELE.

Taken and sworn before me at Log Cabin, B.C., this 4th day of May, 1899.

(Signed) A. M. JARVIS, Inspector.

David Stevens, being sworn, states: I am customs officer on duty at Log Cabin Outport, B.C. Frank P. Thorn was on duty with me from the 26th January to 24th February, 1899, and am fully convinced that he was not open to bribery. I have looked through the customs records as far back as July the 1st, 1898, and have been unable to find any entry made by Charles Beam.

(Signed) D. STEVENS.

Taken and sworn before me at Log Cabin, B.C., this 4th day of May, 1899.

(Signed) A. M. JARVIS, Inspector.

Inspector Strickland, on oath, states: I was acting collector of customs on White Pass Summit from 27th February to 27th March, 1898. Constable Thorn was not on trail duty, though he was stationed at the Summit. It was impossible for Constable Thorn to have passed any one through while I was in charge at the Summit.

Since 27th March, 1898, I have been at Tagish. The sub-collector of Customs, Mr. John Godson, left Tagish on the 11th February, 1898, and since then no duty has been collected here nor has there been any customs officer or collector here.

As far as I know, no such man as Beam passed here.

(Signed) D. A. STRICKLAND, Inspector.

Sworn before me at Tagish this 8th day of May, 1899.

(Signed) Z. T. WOOD, J. P.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the indulgence of the House. I thought it was only fair to the House to place these statements before it, and I think that they will illustrate the value of the statements we have heard the hon. member for Victoria and of the statement of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) against the characters of men in the service of the Government. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) was evidently impressed with the truth of what this man said to him.

Mr. PRIOR. I was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He accepts that statement as true, comes and puts it on the records of the House, and a man who had been in the Mounted Police eight years, who, according to the testimony of his superior officers, has borne an excellent character, a fact which is emphasized by his promotion for his services, suffers this injustice. Yet these statements are put upon the records of this House, and they go down for every one to read that he has been solemnly charged by the hon. member for Victoria with wrong-doing. When these charges were investigated it is found that they do not amount to anything. In regard to these other statements, we are told that, so far as the investigation goes, the charges have not been sustained. We know that from the newspapers; the full reports have not yet reached us of the later investigation, but we are told that these gentlemen have been exonerated by Mr. Ogilvie. But, hon. gentlemen say, you cannot accept that; it is a biassed report. The commissioner is married to the aunt of the wife of the hon. Minister of the Interior. But here is a case in which a charge is made against an officer in regard to the Tagish office when that office has been closed for six months after the time that this irregularity is said to have happened. But the inspector investigated the charge and sent over to the White Pass, to which the custom-house has been removed, and after taking statements on oath, he cannot find any such man as Beam. Then you have the declaration that this man did not handle money at all, that he did not make entries, but that his sole duty was that when goods were opened up to be examined, he was employed at $1.50 per day to put them back. I venture to say that the hon. member for Victoria has as good a foundation for bringing that statement into this House as the hon. member for Pictou has for bringing in many of the statements he has, and placing them on record here. He asks that two judges of the Supreme Court shall be solemnly appointed to ascertain whether the customs office at Dawson allowed a boat in at an undervaluation. The Customs Department will attend to that. That does not need any commission of judges. I said I would not speak further. The answer that has been given to the hon. gentlemen who have sought to impugn the character and the transactions of officials under the Government by other speakers who have preceded me has been such as to bring discomfiture to these hon. gentlemen making the charges. I will not detain the House. But I think that in putting on record the result of the investigation which has been made into this charge the House will agree with me that it is but doing common justice to the man himsef who has been referred to.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I shall make will be brief, and will simply concern one or two points raised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—one of which was advanced by the Prime Minister himself. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) made an appeal to gentlemen on his own side of the House, informing them that if they voted for this resolution they would vote for the truth of all the allegations contained in the charges. Just what

the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) meant I do not know, but I must assume his meaning from the statement he has made. With respect to that matter, I may say that with the exception of two or three allegations of fact, in the opening paragraphs of the information, as I might call it, laid before the House by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) which are found on pages 528, 529 and 530 and top of 531 of the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday—with the exception of these statements which no one in this House will question in the slightest degree, there is not an item contained in this information but which is alleged, as a matter of belief and information, as follows:—

That Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, a member of the Privy Council of Canada, and a member of this House, having stated from his place in Parliament that he is credibly informed and believes that with the same co-operation (and through the supervision of the Department of Justice) as was given by the Government of Canada to the said the Hon. Clifford Sifton, as indicated by the said correspondence hereinbefore referred to, and the evidence contained in the report of the said committee, he can establish before a commission comprised of eminent judges and clothed with powers as hereinafter suggested, the following facts and charges:

Thus, every charge that is made by the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is made as a matter of information, "he is informed and believes." Then, the conclusion of the information or charge is in the resolution in these words:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency to desire that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to give immediate orders to his Attorney General that the most effectual means be taken for discovering the facts in any way relating to the above charges, and that His Excellency will also be graciously pleased to order the issue of a Royal Commission to two or more judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Superior Courts of any province of Canada, granting and conferring the fullest possible powers for a complete, effectual and exhaustive inquiry with a view to the discovery of the truth of the statements and charges aforesaid, and to this end that His Excellency be advised that in the opinion of this House such a Commission should be clothed by a special Act containing similar provisions, powers, jurisdiction, discretion and authority as are conferred by the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 10, being "An Act respecting inquiries as to corrupt practices at Elections of Members of the House of Commons."

I simply cite this for the purpose of showing—were it not unparliamentary I would say the insincerity of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; a gentleman of his standing at the bar, a gentleman who is perfectly familiar with the language and form of an information, that is made as a matter of practice almost always on information and belief—to attempt to rope his followers into line by assuring them that in voting for this resolution they were voting for the truth of the different allegations and charges set forth in the information, places himself in an unenviable position. That statement of the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) is, at least, calculated to incite considerable dubiousness in the minds of sensible men, as to the sincerity of the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite of their belief that there is no truth in these charges and allegations. I am not going now to refer to these charges and allegations, for the simple reason that so much evidence has been given by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) in support of them, that it would be a work of supererogation. However, Mr. Speaker, I shall direct attention to another point that is attempted to be made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and that is: That this action of the hon. member for Pictou is an unconstitutional proceeding because it contains a charge against a judge. I beg leave to take issue squarely with that statement of constitutional law. The right hon. the First Minister read an extract from a very authoritative book, "Todd on Parliamentary Government." After Todd discusses the question of judges in relation to the Crown, he sums up in five or six sections, the procedure with respect to charges against them. The first it is unnecessary to read. I shall read the second:

2. It is also evident that the action of Parliament for the removal of a judge may originate in various ways. It may be invoked upon articles of charge presented to the House of Commons by a member in his place, recapitulating the cases of misconduct of which the judge complained of has been guilty; or, after a preliminary inquiry —by a royal commission (at the instance of Government, or at the request of either House of Parliament, or by a Select Committee of the House—into the judicial conduct——

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize the term "judicial conduct."

—of the individual in question; or, upon a petition presented to the House from some person or persons who may have a cause of complaint against a judge; provided, that, while the interposition of Parliament may be sought by petition for the application of the remedy prescribed by law for a special grievance in any particular instance, no petition should be received by either House, that otherwise reflects injuriously upon the character or conduct of the courts of justice. And no petition impugning the conduct of a judge should be permitted to remain upon the Table of the House, unless within a reasonable period, some member undertakes to invite the House to proceed upon the charges contained therein.

3. Bearing in mind the general responsibility of Ministers of the Crown for the due administration of justice throughout the kingdom,——

I would commend this to the leader of the Government and his followers in respect to a matter which was brought up in the House the other day, namely, the responsibility of Government in respect to the legislation of this House:

——and the obligation which they owe to the dispensers of justice to preserve them from injurious attack or calumnious accusations, it is necessary that before consenting to any motion for a parliamentary inquiry into the conduct of a judge—or even for the reception of a petition complaining of the conduct of a judge, and not asking for his removal from office in accordance with the statute—or not alleging reasonable grounds for such a proceeding—ministers should themselves have investigated the matter of complaint, and be prepared either to oppose or facilitate the interference of Parliament on the particular occasion.

4. That the House of Commons should not initiate, and Ministers of the Crown ought not to sanction, any attempt to institute criminative charges against any one, unless upon some distinct and definite basis; and in the case of a judge, such charges should only be entertained upon allegations of misconduct that would be sufficient, if proved, to justify his removal from the bench. But it is immaterial whether such misconduct had been the result of an improper exercise of his judicial functions, or whether it was solely attributable to him in his private capacity, provided only that it had been of a nature to unfit him for the honourable discharge of the judicial office.

The meaning of the last section is this: That the Parliament is not confined to matters which are judicial sins, but that if a man is disreputable in his character and private life, Parliament has a right to investigate this matter and to dismiss him for it. These rules are laid down with respect to offences; with regard to what we may call "judicial offences." If the right hon. gentleman had taken the pains to look to the authorities that are relied on by Mr. Todd, and upon which these propositions are based, he would find that there is not a single one of these authorities, with the exception of one, that touches in any way on offences by a judge in his private capacity. In that particular case the proceeding was different, and the round of procedure that was claimed by the First Minister to be applicable to this case was not followed. This case before us is an exceptional case, and the only authority I know of I will cite. It is not apparently given in Todd, but I am familiar with the case, and from Nash's Biography of Lord Westbury, I am enabled to get its date.

The difficulty in this case is that where there are two personalities, so to speak, in a judge, one political and the other judicial. This House, which has power to inquire into the doings of every one exercising a political function, can pursue the investigation of charges committed by him in his political capacity, utterly regardless of the requirements of the law in respect to a judicial personality, if the offence is political. As proof of this contention I will cite the case of Lord Westbury, who, as we all know, was Lord High Chancellor of England, the highest judicial functionary in the British Empire. That office caused him to perform what may be called two functions—the judicial function of hearing cases on appeal in the Chancery Court and in the House of Lords, and political function as a member of the executive. As Lord High Chancellor he had considerable patronage, and in the exercise of his political function the disposal of this patronage became the subject of a scandal which came before the House of Commons. Let us look at the course which the House of Commons in England pursued with respect to Lord Westbury. His case and the case of Judge Dugas are exactly parallel. In the case of Judge Dugas, we have a gentleman who unites in himself two personalities—first, that of a judge, and secondly, that of a political officer. Lord Westbury united in himself the two functionaries—that of the highest judge in the British Empire, and that of an executive officer. What was done when the matter came before the House? It came before the House in this way. From Nash's History I got the date, and then I consulted "Hansard," and got the facts from the original source. On May 15 a gentleman of the name of Farrand asked a question of the Attorney General on the floor of the House as to the resignation of a gentleman of the name of Wilde, whom Lord Westbury had asked to resign his position in order that he might appoint his son to the vacancy. An answer was given to that question on May 15. Farrand followed it up with further questions on the 16th, and asked that a certain letter which had been written to Lord Westbury be laid on the Table of the House. This was done. Now, mark you, without any communication having been had with Lord Westbury, Mr. Farrand on May 19 placed on the notice paper a notice that on May 23 he would move for a committee of Parliament to inquire into the scandals respecting Lord Westbury. On May 23 he made his motion. Lord Palmerston, who was the leader of the Government at the time, said that the Government had no objection whatever to the motion being proceeded with immediately. It was discussed, but there was no opposition offered to it. The consequence was that on that day the motion was passed unanimously by the House, and the committee of investigation was appointed. It went to work, and made a report, which was presented to the House on July 3—and here I may say, for the information of the House, that Lord Westbury was completely exculpated from any personal act of even impropriety, but the committee thought that he had scarcely exercised that degree of diligence which he should have exercised as Chancellor over the affairs of his department; and on this mild criticism of his position, Lord Palmerston thought, after an adverse vote of the House, that Lord Westbury ought to resign his position as Chancellor, which he accordingly did on the 4th of July, 1865. The position taken by the First Minister is entirely inconsistent with this, which is the only real precedent I know of in English parliamen-

tary history. The right hon. gentleman has cited cases in which the man is a judge, and the act complained of is in the exercise of his judicial functions or by virtue of his judicial capacity or in his individual capacity.

Again, under the procedure as laid down by Mr. Todd. the Government have been rather slow. When a gentleman from his place in Parliament casts any reflection upon a judge in the exercise of his functions of his office, it is the duty of the Speaker, to stop him then and there. It is the duty of the member who is going to prefer the charges to communicate with the Government and let them know what charges he intends to prefer, and give them a copy of the charges, so that they can consider them and send a copy to the judge. After the member does that, he can introduce his resolution or petition to the House or Table it in the ordinary way. Even if the contention of the Government is right, this matter has been allowed to go on after the copy has been given to them ; the motion has been allowed to be made and the discussion entered into. At this late stage, under a contention which has no precedent behind it, the Government attempt to burk inquiry. Instead of shirking the inquiry on the contention that the course pursued by the hon. member for Pictou is unconstitutional, the Ministers should boldly face the charges. They must know that it is not only constitutional, but stands on all fours with the case of Lord Westbury, which is quite a late precedent.

There is another matter to which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred. It was in reply to the statement of the hon. member for Pictou, who complained that in Mr. Ogilvie's investigation there was not given to the witnesses a guarantee that they would not be prosecuted. In reply to that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries grew very excited indeed. He assumed the air of one talking upon the stump, and in the strongest terms of declamatory invective assailed the hon. member for Pictou for having made a statement which he claimed that gentleman knew to be incorrect. Now, Sir, the very statement of commission which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries read was the condemnation of the statement he made. Mr. Ogilvie stated to the witnesses that any statement they made would not be used in the case of any prosecution against them. There is immunity from what? Not immunity from prosecution, but immunity from having the particular testimony they were giving put in evidence against them. What was wanted? Does not any practising lawyer know that in nine cases out of ten what you do not want your opponent to know are the exact facts which could be got from the witnesses before Mr. Ogilvie by a skilful cross-examination. So that the immunity guaranteed by him was practically no immunity at all. What the witnesses required was immunity from prosecution which could only be given by the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, the prerogative of pardon. I shall not detain the House longer, except to say that these charges are very serious matters, and, when I heard the Minister of the Interior—and I must say I admired the calm and strong speech that he made, the astuteness with which he marshalled his facts, and also the very deliberative and shrewd manner in which he selected the points he felt to be weak in the armour of the hon. gentleman from Pictou—I regretted he did not grapple with the main points of the indictment, which contains the matters this country desires to be enlightened upon. These constitutional niceties the country does not wish to be enlightened upon, but there is one thing on which it does wish to be enlightened, and that is, whether or not things are rotten in the Yukon. That suspicion which is in the public mind, will never be allayed by any report brought in by the man who is the uncle by marriage of the Minister responsible for the administration of the Yukon. The interests of these gentlemen themselves, the interest particularly of the Minister of the Interior, if his skirts are entirely clear, if there is nothing he is ashamed to have brought out by the most searching investigation, demand that he should court an independent inquiry, that he should court the judgment of an independent commission, which would carry conviction to the mind of very man in Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. He should ask for it himself.

Mr. POWELL. Certainly. Any man who felt the strength of innocence, whose "strength is as the strength of ten, because his heart is pure," would court the fullest and most independent inquiry, so that his character might be freed from the aspersion which political or other enemies have cast upon it. He especially, who is one of the custodians of the honour of Canada—for I agree with him, that the honour of any country does rest in its public men—should see to it that he is not besmirched, and that his Government should present to the world the appearance of a Government free from these grave charges, which have been so widely scattered throughout the whole civilized world, and which, rightly or wrongly, are believed by the great majority of men.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Before the question is put, I wish to say a few words to explain the vote I am about to give. We heard my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, I think, at his best. I do not think I ever heard from him an abler speech, and the right hon. gentleman the leader of the House rose to the plane of eloquence to which he is so capable of rising. But I find that these hon. gentlemen gave their attention entirely al-

most to the form of the motion of the hon. member for Pictou. And, as the right hon. Prime Minister made what seemed to him a very strong point respecting form, I rise to point out to any gentleman here who may have been impressed by the argument of the First Minister, that I think my right hon. friend put that argument hastily. He argued that this motion was unconstitutional, because a judge was assailed in it, and he went so far as to say that you cannot assail a judge in this House in that manner. Let it be assumed, for argument's sake, that the hon. member for Pictou did assail Judge Dugas. I think the First Minister was hasty in his contention, and I will give him my authority very briefly. The position which has just been taken by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), namely, that you can divide a personality, like a judge, and try him, either as a judge or as a member of the Executive Council is the correct one; but, supposing you cannot divide his personality, are the members of this House to be debarred from discussing the conduct of a judge, or even accusing him? I myself will not say that you can here accuse a judge in his judicial capacity. A private member has actually done it, because I remember, in 1894, the member then from L'Islet, now Minister of Public Works, accused Judge Bossé, in the strongest terms of actually taking bribes from Mr. McGreevy, and of misconduct on the bench; and he also accused Judge Ouimet in very strong language. I then expressed the opinion, which I still hold, that the conduct of the Minister of Public Works was improper, and the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy spoke as follows:—

I had intended to make a few observations somewhat in the same strain as those of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, who has just taken his seat, but I do not desire to use language quite so strong. I will not characterize those proceedings as disgraceful, but as painful in the extreme.

When the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), now Minister of Public Works, assailed the judiciary of Quebec, who came to the rescue of the present Minister of Public Works? I do not think that the Prime Minister, to use his own language, with regard to another person, will dispute the authority of the parliamentarian to whom I now refer. The right hon. gentleman then said:

I do not care, at this period of the session, to enter into any controversy with the right hon. gentleman as to the conclusion he has arrived at with regard to the accusations brought forward by my hon. friend from L'Islet. This is a subject which it is altogether too late to discuss as fully as it might be discussed. This, however, I think may be said, that it is the undoubted privilege, not only the privilege, but the right, of any member of this House to accuse any man in this country, let him be high or low, against whom he has charges to bring.

That authority of the right hon. gentleman, who now leads the House, annuls the authority of the right hon. gentleman to-day. In my opinion, he puts that altogether too strongly; I do not think it can be supported, especially with his own authority against himself, which I have just read, that it is the undoubted privilege, aye, the right, of any hon. member of this House to accuse any man, be his position high or low. The speech of the Minister of the Interior was, as I say, a clever speech. It struck me as too clever, if anything. He thought he saw, and he did see, an opportunity of making points of a popular kind against the form of the motion, and certain features of it. He was content with making largely technical points. There evidently is a mistake in the extract from that return 83. There may be other points that, for instance, I myself would differ from. But when it comes to a question of voting on the subject of a more thorough inquiry, would these things justify anybody in voting against the motion? I confess that I do not think the position of the Minister of the Interior that we must vote for everything in this long motion if we vote for it at all, is tenable; I consider that all we vote for in supporting it is a thorough and exhaustive inquiry. In voting for it, as I will if I am in the House, I do not take it that I shall be voting for everything in the motion. I might be inclined to say that I differ from the form of the motion—probably improperly, because, I think, from his experience and for other reasons, my hon. friend from Pictou could frame a motion of that sort better than I could. Still, I, myself would not have framed the motion in that form. But, would an objection of that kind justify me in voting against it? I do not think it would. And for this reason—the Prime Minister himself acknowledged that it is necessary to probe these charges to the bottom. Having this and the admission of Mr. Ogilvie himself, as well as the outcry from hundreds of people that the commission of Mr. Ogilvie has failed, how can we vote against a motion for a thorough inquiry on the ground that there are some minor features of it that we individually do not agree with? The Ogilvie commission failed. It could not but fail in the Yukon. It would have failed anywhere, because what was wanted was an inquisitorial inquiry, with power to send for persons and papers, with power, and with instructions, to initiate investigation and with power to pay witnesses. I ventured, on a previous occasion, to refer to the precedent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission. I refer to it on this occasion more readily because it was referred to—but referred mistakenly—by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. Here is an inquiry of an inquisitorial character. The commission was issued to three persons—Judge Clarke, Mr. Miall and Mr. Keefer. They sat here in Ottawa, and they went to Winnipeg, and I think they went elsewhere. They sub-

pœnaed men—Tom, Dick and Harry; Brown Jones and Robinson—anybody who could give information in regard to the matter into which they were instructed to inquire. The result was that every subject that came within their purview they ran to earth, and got the fullest information concerning it. That is a precedent that might well be followed. The Minister of the Interior said that it was a commission to inquire into the acts of the opponents of the Government of Sir John Macdonald. I have the commission here. There are some seventy-two contracts inquired into, as well as a large number of other questions; and anybody who looks into it will see that we inquired carefully, inquisitorially, not merely into the contracts made by Mr. Mackenzie, but into the contractors made by the Conservative Ministers. We had Sir Charles Tupper before us, I think, for four or five days, and examined him very closely in regard to every transaction that had passed through his hands connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The late John Henry Pope, who was Minister of Public Works, did not want to come before us. We adopted the course, with regard to men of any distinction, of sending them a polite message saying that we should be glad to have them present themselves for examination. Mr. Pope refused to come. I myself went to Sheriff Powell and had a subpœna issued and had Mr. Pope before the commission, and we examined him inquisitorially. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper said very properly that this commission was issued without any instructions whatever. The language of the commission is of the widest—merely to inquire into all the acts regarding the Canadian Pacific Railway from its inception to the issue of the commission. I can emphasize that with a little private history. I took the liberty, when coming from the Rideau Club one day in company with the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, to broach the subject of the commission to him. I said: "That commission is very wide; it might take until 1900 to finish the inquiry." And I ventured to ask: "What is its object? Is there any special object in it?" He turned to me and said: There is your commission; make your inquiry without fear or favour, no matter whose body you go over. And the inquiry was made without fear or favour, and it is an inquiry like that that we want on the present occasion.

Now, there will be a great disappointment throughout the country, in my opinion, and great disappointment in the ranks of the supporters of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself unless we have such an inquiry as is called for by the latter part of this resolution. The right hon. gentleman says that if it is found that this inquiry is not such as to satisfy the public conscience there will be a further inquiry, and that everything will be probed to the bottom. In saying that, he admits that he himself is convinced that there are things to be searched into.

Well, Sir, we have to face the dissatisfaction that exists to-day in the public mind; we have to take into account the fact that men came away from Dawson and would not go before Mr. Ogilvie because they were not able to secure the attendance of witnesses to complete their case. I may mention that I have letters here from men occupying important positions, who would have been glad to go before Mr. Ogilvie if they were sure that the inquiry would have been through, but they came away from Dawson without giving their evidence. I have a letter from a gentleman living in Paris, if I mentioned his name his respectability would be known to gentlemen in this House. It is dated March 29th, 1899, and as the letter is written in French, I will translate it. He thanks me for having brought as much of the Yukon case as I did before the House. He assures me that the position I took would be entirely maintained, and says he is ready to go before such a commission as I happened to indicate and such as is asked for by the motion of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I had said that there must be a thorough inquiry, and he concludes by saying that he is ready to go before such a commision and give his evidence. I do not want to give that gentleman's name, but I will in confidence let anybody see it who wishes. There are dozens of such letters. I do not see why the Government, whatever views they may take about the form of this motion, should not be willing to meet the wish of the country and to grant an exhaustive and inquisitorial inquiry. This inquiry has not failed merely because we could not inquire about anything that occurred after a certain date in August; it has failed in regard to things that occurred before that date, and it has failed because of the character of the inquiry. Nobody supposes that in Dawson or anywhere else you can tell a man to sit down and say: Now, I am ready to hear any evidence that is brought before me, and in that way an inquiry that will satisfy the public conscience. I say it is admitted by friend and foe, in fact the only gentleman who seems to take a different view is the Minister of the Interior. There were parts of his speech that justified what my hon friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said, and which seemed to indicate that he did not think there was any wrong-doing at all. He seemed to justify Mr. Wade, he seemed to justify Mr. McGregor. I have here a letter about Mr. McGregor, signed by a thoroughly respectable man. I will not read the letter, but it is at the disposal of any one who wishes to see it. Here we have Mr. Wade and Mr. McGregor declaring that they violated the Order in Council, and yet the report comes from Dawson that before Mr. Ogilvie, Mr. Wade stand completely justi-

fied. I repeat that I did not intend to address the House at all; I had hoped there would be a vote earlier in the evening. But after the statement made by the right hon. gentleman that this was unconstitutional, and the reason he gave, I thought it desirable I should quote his own authority against himself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I do not intend to discuss the general issue of this resolution here but to confine my observations to a portion of it which refers to the Post Office Department. I may, however, be permitted to make a slight exception in reference to a portion of the indictment, if I may so dignify it, which has confessedly failed on the admission not only of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Davin), but of other members of this House. The general charges may be divided into two classes; one class which attacks Ministers, and another class which attacks those who have been employed by the Ministers carrying on the public business. The most serious, of course, is the class which aims at the Ministers; and probably it will be conceded that the most serious charge of all is that made against the Minister of the Interior in connection with the alleged granting of mining leases. Now, the ex-Minister of Justice, in his resolution, declares that he is credibly informed and believes that if an opportunity is afforded him he can prove conclusively the charges contained on page 540, namely, that the Philps and Cameron applied for and obtained mining leases. Does the hon. gentleman now, in view of what has taken place, adhere to that statement? The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), with a frankness that I think the House will appreciate, admitted that that portion of this charge has absolutely fallen to the ground. I cannot pass from the observations of the hon. member for West Assiniboia without saying that I was struck with the fairness of his observations, especially considering that as a rule he and the Minister of the Interior at times take very widely different views upon public questions. I think he showed good taste in dealing with the matter as he did. But I come back to the ex-Minister of Justice. Now does he, as a man of honour, as a member of this House, adhere to his statement in this resolution, or does he withdraw that portion of it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman put that question for an answer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to answer it. Does he now say, in view of the light that has been thrown upon matters since this discussion began, does he now adhere to the statement contained in this resolution that he is informed, and believes, and can establish, if the opportunity is given, that these persons, the Philps and Cameron, obtained the leases named on page 540?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) will sit down for one moment, I will explain. I do not wish to argue the matter. I only rise, with a great deal of pleasure, to answer the question. The hon. Postmaster General is the first hon. gentleman who has been good enough to put a question to me on the matter of that kind. It is quite clear that the statement, as it is in the resolution, is inaccurate. I never supposed any one would imagine that there was an intention to conceal anything. The hon. Minister of the Interior charged ignorance on my part and carelessness. But the point I wish to make, and in which I wish to be frank with the House, is this, that, of course, the language, as it is, is inaccurate in part. It does not appear by the return to which I referred, and which is on the Table of the House, that all of these parties who applied for these leases, obtained them; but, supposing I had the opportunity of being heard before a commission, and afterwards there was a return showing that these applications were not all granted, my point would be, that, out of this return, showing these applications by the Philps and Mr. Cameron, the law partners of the Minister, a dredging lease was got, and that Mr. Philp represented in writing to a gentleman, known to me, that the hon. Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh were both interested in this dredging lease. I could not charge more. I very properly stopped there, for I did not know, although informed directly that the statement is true. I do not think I am taking undue advantage of the opportunity given me. Nevertheless, the point lay largely in the fact that Mr. Philp was found describing himself in these different ways in that return, that Messrs. Philp & Cameron appeared from the return to have obtained a dredging lease out of these various applications, and there was the statement by Mr. Philp, that the hon. Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh were both interested, but that, for obvious reasons, their names could not appear. It would not be urged against me that I had, in this motion, made a reckless and false charge, supposing I proved that much, because it appeared by the return which was produced, and which is referred to here, that there were several applications not granted. That is the explanation, and I do not think it is an unreasonable one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has gone so far as he has, and he has not completely, I think, vindicated his course.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a matter of opinion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is my opinion. There is a great deal between

a dredging lease and large number of mining leases.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not for the purpose of this charge.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have it now from the hon. gentleman that he must fail to prove that important charge contained in the resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say I can prove the substance of that charge.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This charge must absolutely fail. I submit that the framing of this charge is open to serious criticism. I could understand perhaps the inference that the hon. gentleman desires to be drawn from this language, but that is an inference which the language does not bear out, namely, that the hon. Minister of the Interior took advantage of his position and was guilty of a breach of trust that he profited in some way by the granting of these leases which were never granted. But, assuming that they had been granted, the hon. gentleman is not frank and courageous enough to make a charge in an unmistakable way. He simply states two separate things and asks the public to assume that these must lead to certain conclusions. This is not the sort of treatment that one member of Parliament is entitled to receive from another. If it is intended to make a charge against an hon. gentleman that would ruin him in the minds of the public, if true, I think it is due both to the accused and the accuser that a charge should be made frankly and in an unmistakable language. If the hon. gentleman could have proved everything in this charge it would not have led to the conclusion that he seeks, apparently, to impress upon the public mind. If he means to charge the hon. Minister of the Interior with having abused his position, committed a breach of trust, having been guilty of malfeasance in the way he administered his office, surely clear language could be discovered and the charge could have been put in such language. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman seriously exposes himself to criticism, as not being fair and frank, and as lacking that courage that he has claimed to himself in connection with this matter.

I do not intend, as I say, to go into the general issue, but just to refer to the portion of the indictment which refers to the Post Office Department. The language of the resolution is as follows :

That the Honourable the Postmaster General was guilty of gross neglect in the administration of the Post Office Department and from the year 1896 to 1899 did not provide a reasonably efficient postal service to and from the Yukon Territory, but, on the contrary, appointed insufficient, inefficient and corrupt officials and provided such inadequate and unsuitable accommodation and postal arrangements that a large community consisting of the inhabitants of Dawson, N.W.T., suffered distress, inconvenience and pecuniary losses.

That F. Harper was postmaster of Dawson City and gave the exclusive right of delivery of letters in Dawson to a company known as the Yukon Mail and Express Delivery Company.

These are all the allegations I discover. In regard to the first charge that the Postmaster General was guilty of gross neglect in the administration of the department, I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the defective pleading there. If it is intended to limit the charge to gross neglect in the Yukon, it should have been so stated, but it is not so stated, although other portions of the paragraph refer to the Yukon. The charge is that the Postmaster General was guilty of gross neglect in the administration of his department. I would have to speculate as to whether this is to be limited to the Yukon or not. I would like to know if that would be the proper form of a charge, because to say that the Postmaster General has been guilty of gross neglect in the administration of his department, the ramifications of which extend over this vast country, is vague and indefinite, and I think, condemns itself. I assume that the hon. gentleman has no particulars except those we have in the resolution. He charges that from 1896 to 1899 I failed to provide proper mail facilities for the Yukon. There we have a date and a charge that the facilities were not reasonably adequate. What are facts ? There was no pretense, or effort, to provide mail facilities for the Yukon in the early part of 1896. I assume no complaint could be made because the Government did not extend its various branches of the public service into the Yukon until the gold fever began, and it was not until well on into the summer of 1897.

A few explorers had worked their way in ; rumours began to come out in the winter of 1896-97, and in that winter the police did attempt to bring in the mails. At that time there was little or no travel through the Passes. An avalanche overtook them, the mail bags were buried in the snow and could not be recovered until the spring of the year 1897, and I do not know that the police or any other human agency could have prevented that occurrence. The mails were placed in the hands of the Mounted Police, and it is, therefore, not a question to be decided by judges, but it is a question that can be dealt with by any person having a fair mind, as to whether it was wiser exercise of judgment to place the service in the hands of the police than in the hands of some other persons. I think it was the only possible way to accomplish it at that moment, and I think so still. I do not think there is any person who considers the subject who will not say, that until the country becomes better known, until there are better facilities for carrying on the service, it is safer to keep the mails, to some extent, in the hands of the Mounted Police. It does not require a

tribunal of judges, it does not require evidence to determine whether it is wise or unwise to put the mail service in the charge of the police. They have carried it on with varying success, and if they have not made an unqualified success of it, the question is would any other body of men have done so. They have had all the resources of the service to enable them to carry it on. It is a service, the difficulties of which are not equalled on the face of the earth to-day. It is a service penetrating into the Arctic Circle and thousands of miles away from the seat of Government. I would like to know where there is any similar service on the face of the earth to-day, maintained in the same state of efficiency as the service in the Yukon. I propose, as long as it seems wise, to leave the service in the hands of the Mounted Police.

Mr. WALLACE. What were the terms of the arrangement with the Mounted Police?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Mounted Police first tried to perform a monthly service, and later on when they got their huts established and their force strengthened, and the number of dog trains added to, they maintained a fortnightly service. This coming year we may be able to maintain a weekly service. It is charged here that Mr. Harper was postmaster at Dawson City, and that he gave the exclusive right of delivering the mails in Dawson to the Yukon Mail and Express Delivery Company. A question was asked me in the House about that, and it appears on the Journals of the 27th of March, and if that question correctly sets forth what is said to have occurred, I may read it to explain what seems to have happened:

The North-west Mounted Police,
Dawson, August 23, 1898.

To whom it may concern: The Yukon Mail and Express Delivery Company is going to endevaour to establish a service for the delivery of mail in the town of Dawson. They have interviewed me regarding this service, and I have agreed to help them in any way I can in giving them letters for those who may wish to avail themselves of this accommodation for a small charge. This is entirely voluntarily on any one's part who may wish to obtain their mail through this source, and is done entirely for the public benefit. As a good deal of expense will be incurred in connection with this delivery, I have given the within mentioned the sole right of delivery for the time being.

FRANK HARPER,
Postmaster, Dawson.

Now, Mr. Frank Harper is an inspector of the Mounted Police; he was appointed to the service by the late Administration; he had been in the service more than ten years when we took office; he is in the service still. He was not postmaster in the full sense of the word. The Administration of the Post Office Department in the Yukon was vested in the Mounted Police, and the supreme control of it in that district given to Major Walsh, and subsequently to Mr. Ogilvie. Frank Harper was one of the Mounted Police officers, and as such I suppose he was put in the office as postmaster. He is not postmaster now, because last fall the Post Office Department appointed a postmaster outside of the police. All that appears to have occurred was, that Mr. Frank Harper, solely in the interests of the public, stated, that if any people of Dawson City chose to employ this company to bring their mails to them, instead of going individually to the post office he would endeavour to facilitate their doing so. It was entirely voluntary with the citizens as to whether they chose to obtain their mails in that way. If these are the facts, and I believe they are, I would like to know what inquiry is necessary to tell the House what should be its judgment as to whether or not Mr. Frank Harper adopted a wise or unwise, a corrupt or an honest course in that matter. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), will not here say, that Mr. Frank Harper was guilty of any corrupt act or intent in adopting that measure in connection with the Dawson post office. The hon. gentleman must know Mr. Harper. Mr. Harper is, I am told, one of the most trusted officers of the North-west Mounted police. He was the choice of the late Government, and the present Government found him in office. How is it he becomes unworthy of confidence when we took office, when he was for ten years a trusted officer of the Conservative Government. The very fact that the Conservative Government appointed him and retained him and permitted him to have their confidence, gave us a prima facie right to think he was trustworthy.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is Mr. Harper still in office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he is inspector of the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is he postmaster?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—was he dismissed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was not dismissed for any supposed wrong-doing or anything of that kind. Apparently the hon. gentleman was not listening to me when I explained that last fall a postmaster was appointed at Dawson City outside of the police, and then Mr. Frank Harper, I presume resumed his ordinary police duties.

Mr. WALLACE. Who was appointed to the postmastership at Dawson?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. J. J. Hartman.

Mr. WALLACE. Of North York?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He once had the honour of being in North York; a most respectable man, a man of great experience, a man deserving the confidence and enjoying the confidence of the country.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Was Mr. Harper dismissed on account of his instituting that service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was not. The change in the postmastership was made last fall, and I never heard of this until it was brought to my attention in the House this spring. That the Mounted Police have not altogether failed in their duties I may say that I received a letter a short time ago from Mr. Shakespeare, the postmaster of Victoria, B.C., in which he writes :

Victoria, B.C., 19th April, 1899.

Sir,—By the inclosed letters which I have received, it will be seen that the Canadian mail service to the Yukon is evidently preferred to that of the United States. Almost every mail I receive similar letters.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
N. SHAKESPEARE,
Postmaster.

He sends me a number of letters.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do these relate to the service before 1899, or since ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This letter is dated April 19th, 1899. If the hon. gentleman is curious I will give him some of them. The hon. gentleman will see whether they bear on the service prior to their dates or not :

Dear Sir,—Will you please be so kind as to forward this letter to Dawson, as I have heard the Canadian mail makes unusually quick time, and oblige,

MISS HATTIE PALMER.
Hotel York,

Seattle, Wash., April 10th, 1899.

The Postmaster, Victoria, B.C.

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly forward inclosed letter ? Many of our letters to the Klondike failed to reach there, but we are told that those with Canadian postage are always delivered,

Respectfully,
MRS. O. H. HENDERSON.

Yankee Jims, Cal., April 6th, 1899.

Salem, Mo., April 11th, 1899.

Postmaster, Victoria, B.C.

My son, in the Klondike, says that the Canada mail is the most reliable, so I have procured some Canada stamps and would ask you to kindly mail this letter at your office, and oblige,

Yours truly,
E. B. SANKEY.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the Postmaster General if there is any other mail than the Canadian mail going into Dawson ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Where from ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will deal with that subject later on. I have also a letter from J. C. McLachlan, of Toronto, dated April 28th, 1899 :

Dear Sir,—Herewith we beg to hand you an envelope mailed in Dawson City on the 23rd February last, and received in Toronto on the 3rd April. We consider this to be good mail service from Dawson.

Here is a letter from the Alaska Commercial Co. to myself :

Alaska Commercial Co.,
Dawson, Y. T., March 22, 1899.

Sir,—We take the liberty of addressing a few lines to inform you of our appreciation of the present management of the Dawson Post Office, which is being conducted by Mr. Hartman in a truly efficient and satisfactory manner.

Only those who have lived on the Yukon and experienced the annoyance of having letters delayed months, and even years, in transit, can understand and appreciate fully the relief of having such service as is at present in force, and which is as nearly perfect as we can expect.

The North-west Mounted Police are sending the mail here, and Mr. Hartman is distributing same, with a promptness and regularity which is highly commendable.

We may also add that the feeling of satisfaction in Dawson is general.

Respectfully yours,
ALASKA COMMERCIAL CO.,
(Signed) Per WM. M. HAM,
Agent.

An hon. gentleman a few moments ago remarked that it took a letter 30 days to reach Dawson City. Here is a letter bearing on that point :

Ottawa, April 26th, 1899.

The Hon. Wm. Mulock,
Postmaster General.

Sir,—In regard to the mails arriving from Dawson, I take pleasure in saying that I lately received a letter from my son there in the short space of 25 days from Dawson to Ottawa.

Respectfully yours,
JOS. McTELLERVEY.

I would also read to the House an extract from a letter which appeared in the Toronto "Globe" on April 29, 1899, signed by Rev. L. Minehan, pastor of St. Peter's church, as follows :

On the 20th of last month a letter was written to me by my brother Thomas, a member of the mining party sent out from Toronto a year ago by the Telford Company. The writer was then working on one of the creeks of the Stewart River, upwards of 90 miles from Dawson City. As the letter was dated March 20th it probably did not reach the nearest postal station for a day or two afterwards. It was delivered at my address on the morning of April 20th. In a month (or less if a margin be allowed between the date of writing and posting)) this letter had travelled some 700 miles at least from a creek of the Stewart River to Lake Bennett, thence 22 miles to Sunset camping ground, then over the White Pass to Skagway, all this distance being covered by dog teams. The next stage of the journey was a trip of more than a thousand miles from Skagway to Vancouver with probably a delay of some days before a steamboat called. After the western outpost of the C. P. R. was touched a stretch of some three thousand miles remained to be traversed before the letter in question reached me. Considering the immense

distance to be covered and the tremendous difficulties to be encountered, I doubt if any postal administration on earth to-day could parallel the achievement I have recorded.

I read an extract from the Montreal "Witness" of May 20, 1899, containing a copy of a communication of the correspondent of the New York "Tribune" in the Yukon, who wrote in April last this communication, and I will read a portion of it:

> The writer recently made the trip from Dawson to Skagway in nineteen days by using the greatest exertion and having a first-class dog team, but a police mail team followed him out of Dawson and made Skagway in nine days, with five hundred pounds of mail, averaging sixty miles a day
>
> Of the many thousand Americans living along the Yukon west of Dawson, on the Alaskan side not one has received his mail since last summer, and except from persons coming in, no one has heard that the war is over. Until last month, and since last September, the American mail has been hung up at Lake Bennett. The United States Government contracts with men who have not the means to forward it, and her citizens suffer accordingly. Eight tons of letters are somewhere between Lake Bennett and Dawson for the people on the American side. People who have heard nothing from their families and friends are anxious. Eight tons of letters would ease their minds and Colonel Steele has undertaken to please these Americans. He has, with the approval of the Governor General, and the American consul at Dawson, ordered his wonderful police force to pick this mail up and take it to the American line at Eagle City, and to handle all the American mail from now on the same as they do their own Canadian mail. The police are handling this bulky American mail over the rough ice and snow in weather which New Yorkers would call a continuous blizzard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that would go to show that the mail service is being as efficiently conducted as possible, and I doubt if there is any better or more effective way. It is merely a question, then, whether or not it was a wise exercise of judgment, to entrust the Yukon mails to the Mounted Police. I can only repeat that I adhere to the view I took when the mails were placed in their hands as the only available or effective means, unless it can be possible to secure guarantees from strong companies, and even then I would hesitate entirely to remove the mail service at present from the Police, lest private contractors should break down. I contemplate attempting to divorce the mail service from the Police, but gradually; so that should private contractors fail, there will not be a total failure, but the portion entrusted to the police will to a large extent prevent any serious public inconvenience.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). When this question was before the House the last time, I voted against the motion for a judicial inquiry. I objected to the stand taken by the mover of that motion with regard to the inquiry then going on, of which we now have the report. It was contended at that time that that inquiry was not adequate and could not bring about any good result, but I held it was a proper inquiry and, in all reasonable probability, would bring about good results. That inquiry has been held, we have the report, and I consider that the character of the report justifies the position I took on that occasion. I said at the time that I had not that belief in the righteousness of the Yukon officials, which some other hon. gentlemen on this side had. I consider that the evidence submitted before Mr. Ogilvie and his report on that evidence, substantiate the position I then took, and fully substantiate the reports we have had, from time to time, from the Yukon concerning the actions of the officials there. Mr. Ogilvie states in his report that it has been proven that the doorkeeper did take money, that the officials inside did work for pay from outsiders, that on Dominion Creek two discovery claims were allowed to be located, which resulted in a confusion of claims. These were the principal allegations made against the administration of the Yukon, and these have been proven by Mr. Ogilvie's investigation. But I consider something more than an investigation is needed. I consider that a great wrong has been done to many people who went out as pioneers to that country; and while it may be impossible to redress these wrongs, it is not impossible to punish those who perpetrated them. I will vote for the motion of the hon. member for Pictou, not because I support all that his motion contains or the position he takes in every particular, but because I wish to place before the House and the country, in the most emphatic manner possible, my desire that the offences which have been committed against the pioneers of the Yukon by certain officials of the Government should be punished and punished as severely as possible, as the result of any investigation that may be held. I consider that it is necessary to hold an investigation for the credit of the officials as well as for their punishment. All were not guilty and all were not equally guilty, but that certain officials were guilty has been proven by the departmental investigation held by Mr. Ogilvie. It is desirable for the good name of those who did no wrong and the punishment of those who did wrong, that the right should be sifted from the wrong.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Before the motion is put, I wish to make a brief explanation. When the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) moved his resolution, some two or three months ago, the Government asked that we should wait until Mr. Ogilvie's report came down. I felt then, although I did not consider that Mr. Ogilvie was the proper man to make the investigation, that the request of the Government was a reasonable one, and therefore voted against the motion of the hon. gentleman, but in explaining my vote, I made the statement that when that report came down, if it was not satisfactory to any considerable sec-

tion of the House, so far as I was concerned, I would vote for the fullest inquiry. I have followed the doings out in the Yukon closely for a year or two, and am satisfied that a great deal of skallawaggery has taken place there. I believe that the Government and the country have nothing to lose in having the very fullest investigation possible into the wrong-doings. I never entertained the view that the Government is in any way connected with this wrong-doing, and I think the very able speech from the hon. Minister of the Interior this afternoon must have convinced the majority of the House that the Government is very little to blame, if at all, in this matter. But I take the view that if any wrong has been done, if any miner has been wronged, reparation should be made. No harm can come from the very fullest investigation into the matter. I do not approve of the resolution in its entirety. The right hon. leader of the House tells us that some portions are unconstiutional. If they are, I presume that the tribunal, which it is proposed to appoint, will take cognizance of that and not inquire into matters that are unconstitutional, but the way I look at it is this. Supposing I refuse to vote for this resolution, how am I to appear before my constituents and the country as supporting the fullest possible investigation into what I am satisfied is wrong-doing. I thought at first of voting against the resolution and then introducing one myself, but after studying the matter over very carefully for nearly twenty-four hours and given a great deal of worry to it, I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to vote for the fullest inquiry into the Yukon, and that being the case I propose to vote for this motion.

House divided on amendment of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,
Bell (Pictou),
Bergeron,
Broder,
Carscallen,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Davin,
Dugas,
Earle,
Foster,
Hodgins,
Kendry,
Kloepfer,
LaRivière,
McAlister,
McDougall,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McNeill,
Marcotte,
Mills,
Morin,
Oliver,
Prior,
Richardson,
Robertson,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Wilson—32

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,
Bain,
Bazinet,
Beausoleil,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bernier,
Bertram,
Blair,
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Burnett,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Casey,
Champagne,
Costigan,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Davis,
Dechene,
Demers,
Dupré,
Edwards,
Erb,
Ethier,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Gauthier,
Godbout,
Graham,
Haley,
Harwood,
Holmes,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Landerkin,
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
Mackie,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McHugh,
McIsaac,
McLellan,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Malouin,
Marcil,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Mignault,
Monet,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Parmalee,
Paterson,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rogers,
Ross,
Rutherford,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Sifton,
Snetsinger,
Stenson,
Stubbs,
Talbot,
Tucker—82.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Christie,	Roddick,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cowan,	Montague,
Britton,	Cargill,
Penny,	Quinn,
Gibson,	Corby,
Ellis,	Powell,
Sutherland,	Taylor,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Ratz,	Ingram,
Logan,	MacLaren,
McLennan (Inverness),	Gillies,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Calvert,	Hughes,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Macdonell,	Guillet,
Flint,	Kaulbach,
Bethune,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Gauvreau,	Monk,
Wood,	Gilmour,
Comstock,	Reid,
Dobell,	Osler,
Somerville,	Bennett,
Heyd,	Ganong,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Johnston,	Martin,
Tolmie,	Macdonald (P.E.I.),
Douglas,	Roche,
Domville,	McCleary,
Desmarais,	Maclean,
Tarte,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Copp,	Robinson,

Turcot,	Blanchard,
Rinfret,	Hale,
Geoffrion,	Pope,
Fortin,	Chauvin,
Madore,	Ives,
Martineau,	Henderson,
Legris,	Seagram,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Hurley,	Craig,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who is in the House, has not voted.

Mr. POWELL. I was paired with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the amendment.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) has not voted.

Mr. CALVERT. I am paired with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

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

Committee rose and reported progress.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 167)—from the Senate—to provide for the administration of criminal justice in the territories of Manitoba and Keewatin, north of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Sifton).

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

Mr. FOSTER. What business does the Government intend to take up to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.50 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 30th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That from this day to the end of the session Government Orders have precedence on Mondays after routine business, and that an hour be devoted to private Bills from half-past seven o'clock p.m., as on Wednesdays and Fridays, under rule 19.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose there will be no objection to questions by members being put before Government orders.

The PRIME MINISTER. No objection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to take the opportunity of saying to my right hon. friend that I am not sorry to see this motion passed, having reached a stage in the session when I think every one is anxious to get through the business as rapidly as possible. I see it stated, however, in the press, with some degree of minuteness, that I have an engagement in London on the 3rd August, and will sail on the 20th of this month from New York. This is all news to me. I hope to have the pleasure of remaining in the House until my right hon. friend opposite leaves with me, and the earlier that can be brought about, the more agreeable it will be to me.

Mr. BRITTON. Can the right hon. Premier give us any idea as to the length of the session. So many people are very anxious to know about their arrangements for pleasure and business during the heated term, and if we could know when the session will end, it would be a great advantage to all of us.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say that the Government have no business to introduce except what is generally expected. We propose to introduce early next week the supplementaries of next year. We may have to introduce some railway resolutions and the Senate Resolution, of which I have given notice. That is all I propose to introduce this session. If it were agreeable to the House, we might consider the propriety of meeting at eleven o'clock and having morning sittings.

Mr. BERGERON. The committees are busy in the morning.

The PRIME MINISTER. The committees will soon be over, and then perhaps we can sit in the morning.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry my hon. friend has taken away our private day so soon. He might leave us one more Monday, because I find very important measures on the Order paper, one or two of which my hon. friend the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has charge of. I do not see him in his place, but they are very important measures. However, I suppose there is no use in fighting against fate.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is very true, but my hon. friend has forgotten the very important notice he has on the Order paper relating to the woes of Ireland ; but Ireland has been suffering so long, I suppose she can suffer patiently a little longer.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not entirely forget that, and, if the opportunity presented itself, I think something very worth while pondering by the right hon. gentleman would have been brought to his attention.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I call attention to a very important Bill which will be thrown over and in fact might be thrown over in any event, owing to the point of order suggested, and possibly well taken by the right hon. gentleman. I refer to the Bill on Chinese immigration. Not long ago the right hon. gentleman said that legislation in that direction by the Government was under consideration. Can he inform us whether the Government have reached any conclusion?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will be able to make an announcement on the subject on Monday.

Mr. CLANCY. Might I ask what progress has been made by the committee to which the Bill by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) was referred, and whether it is likely that Bill will receive the consideration of this House during this session. I ask this question because the measure is one of considerable importance, and I think that, when the motion to adjourn the debate was granted, the promise was made that that was not for the purpose of sidetracking the measure.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is under the impression that I am a member of that committee, but he has as much power as I have in regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. We are justified in the belief that the intention was to sidetrack the Bill, since nothing has been done and the committee to which it was referred was selected by the right hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest, before leaving this subject, that it would perhaps be convenient, as the last private day is thus taken away, to make an exception and run over the list of unopposed motions, say, on Monday next.

The PRIME MINISTER. We can do that on Monday next.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion, then, is amended so as to allow questions to be asked before Government orders.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SUPPLY—MEASURES AGAINST TUBERCULOSIS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. THOMAS G. RODDICK (St. Antoine, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, if in order, before going into Supply, I should like to make a few remarks with reference to a very important question, a question that is now engaging the attention of the whole civilized world—the subject of tuberculosis both human and bovine. I have in my hand, a series of resolutions recently passed by the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Montreal, one of the largest and most important medical societies in the Dominion of Canada. With your permission, I will read these resolutions, and then, perhaps, make a few remarks upon them:

That whereas tuberculosis is exceedingly prevalent in this as in other countries and contributes largely to the mortality rate, and

Whereas it is fully recognized that pulmonary tuberculosis is a communicable and infectious disease, and

Whereas a room or house which is or has been occupied by a person suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis must be considered a source of infection to healthy persons thereafter occupying such compartments, and

Whereas the expectoration of tuberculosis sputum in public places and conveyances is another great source of infection, and

Whereas the successful treatment and comparative eradication of the disease can only be carried out in special institutions adapted to this end,

Be it resolved that the Medico-Chirurgical Society hereby recommends to the Government of the Dominion the enactment of such laws by the Parliament of the Dominion as shall ensure the diminution of tuberculosis, and recognizing that the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament in these matters extends over large areas of territory which have not provincial autonomy, humbly begs the Government to take such steps as will ensure passage of laws applicable, if not to Canada in general, at least to those territories under the direct jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament—laws so framed as to bring about the following for the public good:—

1. The compulsory notification in local boards of health in the cities and towns of this Dominion of all cases of pulmonary tuberculosis occurring within the limits of these cities and towns by the physician attending such cases, to the intent that specially infected areas may be detected and means taken to arrest the spread of the disease.

2. The disinfection of domiciles by the municipal authorities following upon the occurrence of death from tuberculosis in those domiciles, or of the removal of a tuberculosis patient from the same.

3. The posting of notices in railway and street cars, on steamboats, public markets and municipal buildings, courts of justice and public waiting-rooms—forbidding spitting.

4. The ready conviction and punishment by fixed penalty of offenders found spitting in public places, contrary to above.

5. The establishment of provincial sanitoria for the treatment of tuberculosis patients who are unable to pay for such treatment.

Further resolved that the above resolution be transmitted to T. G. Roddick, Esq., M.D., member of Parliament for the St. Antoine division of this city, begging him to take such steps as

are proper to present the above resolution to the Government of the Dominion.

J. GEORGE ADAMI, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.E.,
President.

ALFRED T. BAZIN, M.D.,
Secretary.

The second of series of resolutions have to do with bovine tuberculosis, and are as follows :—

That whereas the connection between tuberculosis in the human being and tuberculosis in cattle and other lower animals has been definitely established, and

Whereas the well-being of the cattle of the Dominion is a matter of national import, and the existence of tuberculosis among these cattle a cause of very serious loss to farmers, and

Whereas by the employment of tuberculin it is possible to detect with great certainty the existence of this disease in individual cattle, and

Whereas further, the observations of the veterinary inspectors of this Dominion would seem clearly to have proved that, relatively to other countries, this Dominion is in a most favourable position, in that the proportion of diseased to healthy cattle is apparently less than has been found in any large extent of territory in the old or in the new world, and

Whereas further it is not anticipated that the cost to the Government for compensation will be excessive, and it will be to the credit of the Dominion and to the great augmentation in the value of our cattle, if this disease can be practically eradicated from the Dominion.

Your petitioners, the president, council and members of the Montreal Medico-Chirurgical Society, respectfully recommend that the Government of the Dominion take such steps as will lead to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis by means of systematic inspection of the cattle throughout the Dominion and by compensation where found necessary, and by prohibition of the movement of such cattle as react to the tuberculin test.

Resolved further that the above resolution be transferred to T. G. Roddick, Esq., M.D., member of Parliament for the St. Antoine division of this city, begging him to take such steps as are proper to present the above resolution to the Government of the Dominion.

J. GEORGE ADAMI, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.E.,
President.

ALFRED T. BAZIN, M.D.,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to this subject, I may say that as you are doubtless aware, a very important congress has recently been sitting in Berlin—in fact it only rose the other day—composed of representatives from almost every civilized country on the face of the globe. Our country, Canada, was represented by Dr. Farrel, a very able member of our profession, and one who has done much in the direction of promoting public health. This congress was called by the German Government and the German profession with a view of comparing notes with the other countries of the world regarding this great subject of tuberculosis. They took it up in all its aspects ; they took it up as occurring in the human form in its various phases, pulmonary tuberculosis, glandular tuberculosis, brain tuberculosis, abdominal tuberculosis, and also skin tuberculosis. And they also went into the question of the erection of proper buildings and the treatment of the disease in both human and bovine cases. The Germans were roused to action some years ago, from the fact that they discovered that they had in Germany one million persons suffering from this disease alone, and that they lost over a hundred thousand every year. They began at once to arrange for the erection of buildings for the purpose of isolation. They arranged buildings for the better classes and also for poor persons, and separated those who were curable from those who were incurable. And after four or five years they thought it their duty to call together the profession of the world in order to let them know exactly what they were doing. I think that we in this country should not be behind in this important matter. Already South Australia has moved. The other day in the legislature of South Australia a Bill was introduced providing that every medical man, whether attending a patient or in consultation, who should see a case of tuberculosis should be obliged to report the case to the proper authorities.

It may be said, Sir, that this is not the place to bring this question forward, that it is a matter to be dealt with through the several provinces. But I think this is a greater question than can be overtaken by the provincial authorities. It is a question of a national character, and it is simply and absolutely impossible for disjointed, disconnected provinces with a series of boundary lines imaginary or otherwise to carry out a proper scheme of war against this great plague of our race. Though one province may endeavour by every possible means to eradicate this disease, an adjoining province may be lukewarm and indifferent, and the consequences is that the state of things remains most unsatisfactory. Exactly how this desired result is to be accomplished I do not know, but there are several phases of this question that can be dealt with by the Government. In the first place, the employment of persons in factories may be very properly dealt with by this House. It is well known now that a great many cases of tuberculosis occur in our factories. It has been demonstrated conclusively that a girl with consumption, for instance, may contaminate another person at a distance of not more than from five to ten feet from her, if the two are obliged to be constantly in each other's company. Another matter that this House might properly consider in regard to this disease is immigration. That question is becoming a live one for this nation, and I think the time has come when our immigration department should see that all immigrants are examined for tuberculosis elements in their bodies before they are allowed to depart from the other side. We know that there are countries in Europe especially where tuberculosis is very

prevalent, and it happens that the two countries of the world where it occurs most frequently, Russia and Austria, are the two countries from which we have recently received large numbers of immigrants. Therefore, I think it is not sufficient to stop the immigrant when he reaches our shores, but he should be carefully examined before he leaves the other side, if such a thing be practicable. Now, there are certain portions of this country, our extensive territories, where the Dominion Government has exclusive control of questions of this kind, and where this Government can act without regard to any provincial legislatures. Another thing that I hope this Government will take up vigorously is the matter of statistics. At present it is impossible to find any sanitary statistics of an intelligible character regarding this Canada of ours. I have looked everywhere, and those that I can find are disjointed, disconnected and very unsatisfactory. There is no possibility with such statistics as are now compiled, of obtaining any satisfactory results, and I hope this Parliament will also take this matter into consideration.

Now, with reference to the subject of bovine tuberculosis, that, of course, is entirely under the control of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), so that it can be dealt with by this Parliament thoroughly. All I have to say is that I quite concur with the method he has adopted, with the assistance of his veterinary surgeons, in connection with the tuberculin test, which is now proved to be not actually infallible, but only very accurate, so that the disease can be detected in an animal in almost the very first stage, I say that test should be very carefully made, and whenever possible, it should be placed in the hands of a veterinary surgeon, because we know that if done by farmers it is usually very indifferently done, and the result is not so satisfactory. I would also impress upon him the necessity of a more careful supervision of the milk supply. It is known that in order to get sterile milk, it must be removed from the cow as if you were performing an antiseptic operation; that means that the udder of the cow should be thoroughly cleansed as well as the hands of the person who milks the cow. The milk should also be introduced into tins instead of the old-fashioned buckets, and these tins should be thoroughly sterilized in boiling water. The hygiene of the animal must also be attended to. We know now that tuberculosis in one animal will contaminate a whole stableful, for the simple reason that the amount of air space is not sufficient. A cow requires as much air space as a human being. A cow giving milk should have at least 2,000 cubic feet of air, and we know that very often cows do not get more than 200 cubic feet of air each. That much, at least, can be done in the right direction. I maintain that where there is any doubt as to the presence of tuberculosis, not with a view of destroying the animal, but in view of the milk supply, the tuberculin test should be made in order that the public may be protected from the use of affected milk. The milk, at any rate, may be carefully examined. We know that very often tuberculosis does not come from the interior of the cow, but it comes from the udder itself. The udder is very liable to tuberculosis ulcerations, small sores, which are almost imperceptible, and which require to be carefully guarded against. I have felt impelled to make these remarks with a view to elicit some expression of opinion from hon. members in the House, so that the world may know that in the Dominion of Canada we are fully alive to this question, and that we are prepared to go as far as any other country in trying to stamp out this great plague, consumption, called the white plague, in all its phases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the House is deeply indebted to my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) for the very able and concise observations which he has made to the House. However anxious we may be to proceed with public business, there is no question that could intervene more important than that which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us. I am, perhaps, less qualified than any of my professional brethren in this House to speak on this subject, because I regret to say that fifty-six years ago, when I took the degree of doctor of medicine in the University of Edinburgh, any person would have been laughed at for making such a speech as the one we have just listened to with profound attention from my hon. friend from Montreal West (Mr. Roddick). The modern view of the contagious character of consumption is in antagonism with the view that prevailed at that time, when almost the entire profession held that consumption was a strictly hereditary disease, and that when the parents on both sides were suffering from consumption it was all but hopeless to expect that their children would escape an early death from the same cause. But subsequent great discoveries in medicine have effectually dispelled that idea, and at this moment there is a consensus of opinion in the medical profession throughout the world that consumption, instead of being a hereditary disease and one that must necessarily prove fatal, may be entirely prevented by taking proper measures to protect one's self from its contagion. While parties who otherwise looked upon their future with despair owing to the consumptive character of their parents, have been relieved, the general public have learned with great surprise and great alarm that the strongest man is not, perhaps, equally, but, is absolutely exposed to the contagion of consumption, provided he is subjected, for any length of time, to the causes which

may produce it. The result of these great discoveries tend to show that it is the most fatal, the most formidable form of disease to which the human constitution is subject, but one that is absolutely curable, and with proper care and proper precautions in its early stages, its extension may be prevented. The importance of this discovery only requires to be mentioned to those who know anything of the statistics of the disease and especially of the character of tuberculosis, to attract attention. I regret to say that, unfortunately, this House has not the power that it should have in regard to this matter. Tomorrow we will enter upon another year of the confederation. Any person who will take the trouble to recall the great difficulty of dealing with so comprehensive a subject as that which presented itself in 1864 must come to the conclusion that, if we were now, after thirty-two years, in the light of our present experience, taking up the question of confederation, there are very few matters upon which we would be able to make any very important improvements, but, I say, that one of the blots that, undoubtedly, in my opinion, does exist in the Confederation Act is, that the question of the public health was remitted to the provinces, and the Federal Parliament deprived, to a large extent, of the power that otherwise, in such an important emergency as the present existing state of things, they would be able to exercise. What the United Kingdom can do, in regard to this important question, is entirely different from that which lies within the scope, under our present constitution, of the federal authorities of Canada. But, to whatever extent that power can be exercised, I am certain that, after listening, with the attention that the House has listened to my hon. friend, hon. members will come to the conclusion that anything and everything that this House has found to be in the power of this Parliament to do in connection with this great question of the prevention of the contagion of consumption, or tuberculosis, will be cheerfully done by the Government, and that Parliament will be most ready to support it. The question, unfortunately, under the present state of things, is one which largely devolves upon the provincial authorities. I quite admit that is true as respects the portion of the question bearing on tuberculosis in the human family, but when you come to the question of tuberculosis in cattle, fortunately for us, this Government and this Parliament are clothed with supreme power and we are the only parties who can attempt to effectually grapple with this question. My hon. friend, who has evidently given this subject a great deal of attention, from both points of view, that affecting the human family and cattle as well, has pointed out, by a fertile source of tuberculosis, affecting directly all persons who are at all predisposed, in any of its forms, to consumption, is tuberculosis in milk. The means of dealing with that subject, the discoveries that have been made, although, perhaps, they are not actually and technically perfect discoveries, have gone far enough to show that by the use of tuberculin in bovine cattle, you may determine almost to a certainty whether the disease exists or not. My hon. friend has pointed out that there are few countries in a better position, owing to the general healthiness of the climate and the cattle in the country, to deal effectually with this subject, than the Dominion of Canada. The attention, I am sure, of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and of the Government, will be drawn to this matter, and every means and every precaution will be taken, and, perhaps, a certain amount of public money will be authorized in the effort to exterminate this disease and to get it under control, with the view of entirely eradicating it from the cattle of Canada. Such an effort, I believe, would meet with the hearty approval of the House and hearty support of the country. I do not intend to take more time than to merely say that the subject introduced by my hon. friend with perspicuity and ability, and with such a thorough knowledge and grasp of the whole question, is one that is attracting the attention of the civilized world, and I hope that Canada will not be behind other countries in taking hold of the new and great discoveries that have been made that touch such a vital matter as that of human life, and that they will be considered of such importance as to receive the attention from the Government and from Parliament that they deserve.

Mr. JOHN G. RUTHERFORD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest and appreciation to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick), who introduced this important subject to the notice of the House. It is very gratifying to see that the medical profession are at last taking the interest which they ought to have taken in this particular phase of the question many years ago. I may say that the profession to which I belong, the veterinary profession, long years before the discovery of the baccilus, by Koch, in 1882, came to the conclusion that the disease existing in cattle and in the human subject under the name of tuberculosis, was one and the same disease, and the better class of veterinarians, as far back as thirty years ago, were constantly cautioning people against the use of milk and meat from tuberculous cattle. It was in 1882 that the medical profession began to take up the connection between the disease in cattle and the disease in the human subject. While I am fully aware of the great risk which exists of the contagion spreading from one human being to another, I am still more convinced that the great cause of the spread of this terrible disease, which decimates countries throughout the civilized world, is the use of milk from tuberculous cows. I am satis-

fied of this, and any one who will look into the statistics and the history of the disease, will be convinced in the same way as I am. There are countries in the world where tuberculosis is unknown, and these are the countries where the dairy cow is also unknown. In Egypt, although human tuberculosis has been introduced time and again, it seems to get no hold and does not spread, simply because dairy products are little used in that country. I understand that the disease was unknown in Australia until the introduction of the dairy cow, and when one studies the subject thoroughly he will become convinced that the great source of the evil is the use of the milk of tuberculosis cows.

Now, Sir, this is a very alarming disease. Over 10 per cent of the deaths which occur in the civilized world from all causes are said to be due to tuberculosis, and the percentage of infant mortality from this cause is simply tremendous. When we bear in mind that these forms of the disease which attack infants, are exactly the same forms of the disease which attack calves, when fed with the milk of tuberculous cows, it is certainly a very striking corroboration of what I have stated. I am in sympathy with all the efforts which the medical profession are making to prevent the spread of the disease by contagion, from one human being to another. With that subject, however, I am not in a position to deal as thoroughly and effectively as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) who introduced the subject, or his fellow-members of his honourable profession. But on the particular phase of the question, as to the part which the dairy cow plays in this disease, I claim that I have some little right to speak. Following the example of my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick), I would like to read a short resolution which was passed by the Veterinary Association of Manitoba last February, and which deals with this subject. This particular phase of the question is, as has been mentioned, completely under the control of the Dominion Government, and it is for the Minister of Agriculture to deal with the matter from the point of view of bovine tuberculosis. This resolution deals more in detail with the particular matter which was mentioned in this connection by the hon. gentleman from Montreal. It reads as follows :—

Whereas it has now been fully recognized by the highest medical and veterinary authorities that there is a great danger to human and particularly infant life, from the use of the meat and milk of tuberculous cattle, the disease being identical in the human and bovine species ; and whereas stock-owners generally are alive to the fact that the presence of tuberculous animals in their herds is a source of serious financial loss and detrimental to their interests generally ; and whereas the general consensus of opinion, after full trial and experiment, is in favour of the reliability and efficacy of the tuberculin test as a diagnostic agent ; therefore the members of the Veterinary Association of Manitoba feel it their duty to urge upon the Dominion and local governments, municipal councils, the public generally and stock-owners in particular, the advisability of, in their several capacities, adopting at the earliest possible date, systematic measures for the suppression and eradication of the disease among cattle. Such measures comprise : 1. An intelligent use of the tuberculin test by properly qualified and responsible men.

I would say here, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick), in regard to the use of this test being confined to professional men, is a very wise and a very important suggestion, and for various reasons. In the first place, no one but a thoroughly qualified and very careful professional man can make a satisfactory tuberculin test. In the second place, there is a peculiar condition existing in regard to this test, for, after one or two tests, the animal, as a rule, unless very far advanced in tuberculosis, ceases to react, and an unprincipled or dishonest stock owner by making repeated tests on his herd would be able to sell animals subject to the tuberculin test which would pass that test, on account of the immunity conferred by previous tests. The innocent purchaser might, consequently, become possessed of an animal whose system, though full of disease, at the same time, would not, owing to the previous tests, react to the tuberculin test, and the purchaser would in this way be deceived. This is a very serious risk, and, while my feelings are very strong in favour of the test, I am convinced that the use of tuberculin by any other than a thoroughly qualified medical man, or veterinary surgeon, should be proscribed by law. I do not think that any layman should have the right to purchase or use tuberculin, because in the way I have pointed out, what is one of the greatest benefits and blessings to mankind, namely, the tuberculin test as a diagnostic agent in cattle, is capable of being rendered useless and unreliable.

2. The destruction and proper disposal of the carcasses of all animals showing physical signs of tuberculosis.

This is important. It refers to animals which have clinical symptoms. There are many animals, and, I may say, many human beings, who are affected with tuberculosis, but who present no physical or clinical signs of the disease whatever. The autopsies held in the various hospitals throughout the country, show, in a very large percentage of cases, the existence of old tubercular lesions in the organs of the body, which were not suspected by anybody, not even by the people themselves, when alive. Many who have died from other causes have been found, on examination, to be affected with this disease. In the same way, in the ordinary abattoirs and slaughter-houses throughout the country, animals in the pink of health, seemingly, and in perfect condi-

tion, are slaughtered for meat, and we find in them those tubercular lesions. The carcass of any animal in that condition, with localized tuberculosis cysts throughout the internal viscera, is not necessarily unfit for human food. The disease is there confined to a limited area, and the general tissues of the animal are not affected, and so it would be a very foolish policy on the part of the Government to order the destruction of such carcasses. It would be a sinful waste of good food, and quite unnecessary in the interests of public health. But the carcasses of all cattle showing physical or clinical signs of tuberculosis should be utterly destroyed.

3. The isolation of all animals reacting to the tuberculin test, with the view to their subsequent slaughter and the utilization of such carcasses, as after inspection may be deemed fit, for human food.

It is also very important to keep them isolated, but that point was covered by my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick), and it is unnecessary for me to dilate upon it, except to say that the greatest risk is in the large dairy stables in the neighbourhood of cities, where the cubic space per head for the cattle is far from being adequate for proper ventilation or hygienic conditions. Such dairy stables should be thoroughly examined and inspected, and a careful standard of ventilation kept up.

And, as a meantime measure, the careful pasteurization of the milk from cows so affected, whether intended for human food or for the lower animals.

I may say that, after careful consideration, we have come to the conclusion that the aseptic process described by my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick), that is, milking the cows in the same way you would conduct an aseptic surgical operation, is not practical, but, as a safeguard, the pasteurization of the milk, by which all the germs are destroyed and the milk rendered safe for use, is preferable. That can be thoroughly carried out without going to anything like the expense or trouble which would be involved in the somewhat complicated system the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) has advised. In the latter part of that sentence of the resolution with regard to the lower animals, calves or pigs, it is very important that the milk from tuberculous cows should not be fed to the young of these animals. In a series of experiments conducted under the control of the government at Copenhagen, Denmark, by Professor Bang, he has been able to demonstrate that calves from tuberculous mothers, if removed from these mothers, and if the milk from these same cows be sterilized and fed to them, the calves will remain immune, and that, although the mothers themselves may be badly affected with tuberculosis, still the calves will remain healthy, provided they are kept away from the dams and not fed with their milk in an unsterilized condition.

4. The careful disinfection of premises in which affected animals have been kept.

That has been very much neglected up till now. Herds have been destroyed, and the premises have been reoccupied by other cattle, and it is very important that all these premises should be carefully disinfected.

5. Careful attention to light, ventilation, drainage and general sanitation of stables.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not quite understand from the hon. gentleman how the milk was to be treated, according to his view.

M. RUTHERFORD. It is to be pasteurized.

Mr. McNEILL. How?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. It has to be heated up to, I think, between 160 and 170 degrees, and allowed to suddenly cool down. I cannot give the exact temperature from memory, but it is to be heated to that point, and cooled.

Mr. RODDICK. One hundred and sixty degrees.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Yes, it has to be heated to 160 degrees, and suddenly cooled. In that way it is rendered sterile, and there is very little risk in using it. While the heat destroys the germs, it does not affect the flavour of the milk at all. Then careful attention should be paid to light, ventilation, drainage and general sanitation of the stable. So far as the present Act is concerned, I have no particular fault to find with its wording. I would like to see it amended, however, in some particulars; above all, I would like to see the arrangements for carrying on this work perfected, so that the system would be entirely reliable. I am satisfied that the greatest cause of this disease in human subjects is milk from tuberculous cows; and while I am prepared to support, with all my heart and soul, any reasonable measure which the medical profession may suggest in the interest of humanity in coping with tuberculosis, I cannot refrain from expressing myself forcibly as being of the opinion that the true root of the trouble is in the dairy cow, and that attention to that phase of the question will produce far greater results than all the measures which may be adopted having a bearing solely upon the human race.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would not say anything on this subject but for my desire to give whatever support my position in this House may enable me to give to the suggestions made by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick). All will agree, I think, that no more important question could engage the attention of this House. But it seems to me that we are limited within the sphere of practical action

by the British North America Act, which assigns to us but two subjects which we can deal with in connection with this matter—one is quarantine and the establishment of marine hospitals, and the other is census and statistics. As the matter of the public health has been relegated to the provincial legislatures, it is practically out of our domain; but it has always seemed to me to have been a mistake that at confederation that subject was not put under the jurisdiction of the Dominion instead of being assigned to the provinces. In my judgment we can only remedy the mistake by having a conference with the provincial governments for the purpose of securing an amendment to the Imperial Act giving that power to the Dominion. Not having that power, all we can do is to deal with the diseases which come to our shores from foreign countries, by means of quarantine. I admit that we can do a great deal in that respect, because we can, as the hon. member for Montreal suggests, examine all immigrants who propose to come to our country before they leave the place of debarkation. We exercise that right to-day over children coming to the country, and, therefore, by parity of reasoning, in my judgment, we could exercise it over adults as well. We need not incur the trouble and expense of bringing immigrants to our shores and disposing of them afterwards, if found diseased and unfit for settlers, if we make provision for having them examined before we import them. Again, while I have always thought that we ought to have isolation hospitals in the country to deal with contagious and infectious diseases, we have not the power to control these matters. All we can deal with is the marine hospital, which is of very little advantage to us in the interior of the country. I am quite sure that the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, and has spoken of it many times before in this House, to my knowledge, is well aware of the limitations that surround us in carrying on a system which might otherwise be of great benefit to the country. I know that as one of the fathers of confederation, and as one who was instrumental in outlining the Confederation Act, he has many times seen its defects; but, like many others, I presume that he finds it more difficult to amend the Act than it was to get the provision in it at first. With regard to tuberculosis in cattle, it seems to me that we might do something. We might pass a law making it compulsory to have dairy herds inspected from time to time, and subjected to the tuberculin test. I have no doubt that the time will come when that will be the rule in every province in the Dominion, especially in those provinces which are alive to the health of the people. While an effort was made in Ontario a few years ago, especially around the large cities, to enforce some such regulation, through the boards of health, I regret to say that it was allowed to fall into disuse after a limited trial, and to-day it is practically a dead letter, especially around Toronto, Hamilton and London. But I believe the time will come when no dairyman will be allowed to supply milk to towns and cities whose cattle have not been inspected and subjected to the tuberculin test from time to time. There is another way in which we could help to eradicate disease in the country, which is within the power of the Minister of Agriculture. We should pass a law making it compulsory on those who import cattle for the improvement of stock to subject them to the tuberculin test before being allowed to bring them into the country. I know that importers who have an eye to their own interest do that at the present time, and will not purchase in the old country any cattle which have not been subjected to the tuberculin test before being exported. We might very well go further and make that system compulsory on everybody who imports stock for the improvement of the stock of this country. In that way we would avoid importing disease from abroad. Then we might devise ways and means to eradicate disease in the country. These are the two lines on which we might attack it. With regard to census and statistics, we have control over that subject, and it has been a matter of surprise to me that the statistics supplied to us are of such a crude nature. I agree entirely with every word uttered by the hon. member for Montreal. If you endeavour to collate statistics with regard to the conditions of health and mortality in the country, or on similar lines, and to base a judgment upon them, you find our statistics to be very crude and unsatisfactory. They are not by any means carefully prepared, and, therefore, they are of no great value to us at present. That is a subject under the control of the Minister of Agriculture, and in my judgment there is room for improvement in them. A few years ago that subject was taken up in this House, and a commencement made in the direction of improvement by the late Minister of Agriculture, Sir John Carling; but I regretted to find that after a fair commencement was made, the system was not elaborated on the lines suggested at the outset. But it was dropped almost immediately after its inception. I say that these are the lines on which we could, in my opinion, employ our time to practical advantage. We can only do it on the lines on which we have the power to act, and that is, by checking the immigration and the importation of cattle. We need not import a single head of cattle infected with tuberculosis, because we have the power to stop the importation at any time. Then, afterwards, whether by the provincial government, or whether by an amendment to the British North America Act, we are given power to do so, we may hope to stamp it out throughout the country

much more readily by preventing the importation of diseased cattle. It would be very important to establish isolation hospitals. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) declare that this subject had engaged the attention of veterinarians before it did the attention of the medical profession. I understood him to say that it was only within the last few years it was taken up by the medical profession. Why, I can remember very distinctly some 35 years ago——

Mr. RUTHERFORD. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, what I said was that the connection between bovine and human tuberculosis was recognized by the veterinarians long before it was acknowledged by the medical profession. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the medical profession did not devote proper time and attention to the subject of human tuberculosis, but bovine tuberculosis they considered beneath their notice until the discovery of the bacillus proved they were identical.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman cannot be well informed on medical works, because—and I can refer to the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick) to substantiate what I say—there is scarcely an important medical standard work that did not deal with this question at least as far back as half a century ago. The question was, no doubt, not as well understood then as it is to-day, but it was dealt with as one of the most important questions in the medical colleges, and I remember distinctly the lectures given me some 35 years ago on the relationship between the two and the danger of communication from the bovine to the human species.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Did the medical profession ever take any precaution or instruct their clients to take any precaution as to whether the cows from which they were getting their milk supply were diseased or sound, until after 1883?

Mr. SPROULE. I can remember, in 1865, 1866 and 1867, lectures being given us on the subject, and we were admonished, in the strongest possible language, of the desirability of, as far as possible, avoiding feeding milk to children and adults from animals infected with tuberculosis and other diseases. The hon. gentleman's impression can only be due to the fact that he is not as conversant with the standard works of the medical profession as those engaged in it. I think that one of the acts carried out by the present Administration militates rather against any improvement in the health of the country. I refer to the Act doing away with the quarantine regulations which existed between us and the United States, because, in my judgment, the regulations formerly in existence were very important, inasmuch as they tended to restrict freedom in the importation of cattle. No doubt, on its face, that Act appeared to be a great advantage to the farmers, but there are dangers that lurk in a too free importation that are outside the notice of the ordinary human mind. The importation of insidious disease cannot be prevented as effectively to-day as when the former regulations were in force. To-day we are importing diseased cattle from the United States over and over again. There is most perfunctory inspection made of the cattle, and I do not think we will be doing what we should in the way of preventing such importation until we enforce more stringent quarantine regulations.

I am also inclined very strongly to the opinion that the immigration now coming to our shores, and which was mentioned by my hon. friend from Montreal—for instance, the Doukhobors from Russia, who, I am told, are literally rotten with disease, is a source of great danger to the health of our people. These people are allowed to come in here without being subject to anything save the bare requirements of the quarantine regulations at the frontier, to determine whether they are infected with any contagious disease. Under these regulations, that disease only can be detected which is apparent to ordinary inspection, and we are doing incalculable injury to our people by the unrestrained importation of that class of immigrants. These immigrants we are bringing from the very hotbed of the disease, from a country which is literally becoming depopulated by it. We are told that one in every five hundred in that country, die of it every year, yet we are bringing these people in by the thousands, and take no precautions beyond the ordinary examination required at the frontier to see whether they have some infectious disease that may be apparent at a glance without closer inspection. In this respect, we are not doing our duty, and the present Government is far behind its predecesssors. It has introduced a very dangerous innovation, which is going to have great and far-reaching results to the detriment of the people of this country, and the sooner that state of things is remedied the better. The sooner we amend the British North America Act, and give the Dominion power over health, the better, because then we could devise a system applicable to every province, and the country as a whole. If the medical men of this House will take the interest they ought to take——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So far as immigration is concerned, we have the power.

Mr. SPROULE. But I say that if we could bring the control of the health in this country under the Dominion Government, we would be taking a great step in advance, and if the medical men would take the matter up, a conference might be had between this Government and the provincial governments, and an understanding arrived at to obtain such amendment to the British

North America Act as would give us the power to deal with the public health. The sooner we do that the better for the country.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). I believe that this is one of the most important questions in connection with stock that we can take up: It is one that reaches to the foundation of the very best stock we have in Canada to-day. I have been a farmer for the last thirty-six years in this country, and have learned long ago that the buildings we keep our stock in ought to be disinfected every year, whether the animals are healthy or not. There is as much need to keep the stables of healthy animals in as good conditons as the dwellings of human beings. My own buildings are all whitewashed every year with hot lime down to the boxes the animals feed in. One of the great causes that lead to disease is the fact that the buildings are not properly disinfected every year, and not well ventilated and plenty of good sunlight allowed to enter. There is something also that prevails largely in Canada to-day, and that is breeding from immature animals. This leads to a predisposition to that disease, because the animals that are born under such conditions come into the world with weakened constitutions and are thus more particularly subject to infection.

There is one statement made by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) with which I do not agree, and that is that a law should be passed preventing any individual from using the tuberculin test except experienced veterinary surgeons. I am a farmer in the province of Ontario, and have been for the last fifty-six years, and my impression is that every young farmer should go to some veterinary college and get a few lessons to qualify himself properly to use the tuberculine test. I believe we shall never get the disease entirely eradicated until something of this kind is done. Why do I say this? Suppose a farmer has a good herd of cattle, and sells certain of the animals, and it is then found that there is one diseased animal in the herd, the fact ruins that farmer's herd for many years to come, so far as sales are concerned. But if the farmer himself or one of his sons is trained to make the tuberculin test—and there is an opportunity now given in the Agricultural College of Guelph for young men to go there and, under practiced veterinary surgeons learn to make the test, and I believe they can make it successfully—it will afford a means of stamping out the disease which we can never have so long as the use of this test is confined to veterinarians. From my experience, farmers are not always behind veterinary surgeons in their knowledge of this matter. I saw one animal that had been under the care of a veterinary surgeon for three months and he could not tell what was wrong with it. I detected the disease and told him the animal had tuberculosis. The animal was afterwards killed and the lungs examined, and it was shown that I was right. A thoroughly practical farmer is accustomed to be among cattle all the time, with a few lessons, can be made quite capable of administering the test. Not only that, but the farmers would be capable of attending to the animals in a manner which a veterinary surgeon, in many cases, cannot equal. I have nothing to say against veterinary surgeons; they are necessary, and we have many that are a credit to their profession; but we have many of such a character that I would rather put an animal of mine under the charge of a thoroughly experienced farmer who had been brought up among animals and had paid attention to their diseases, than that of many veterinarians. I have seen the tuberculin test applied by a veterinarian, and also by a farmer's son, and the veterinarian admitted that the farmer's son, both in making the preliminary test of the temperature of the animal and in ejecting tuberculin, was as competent as any veterinarian could be. When we have so many large and valuable herds, it has become almost necessary that a young farmer should have a fair amount of veterinary education; and it is not necessary that he should spend three or four years at the profession in order to make the tuberculin test efficiently. A great deal has been said about cows, but I have not heard anything said about the male animals. Yet I know of one locality in which at one time there was no tuberculosis, and into which a male animal was brought, and that locality in a few years was overrun with tuberculosis. I should like to ask my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Roddick), and also my hon. friend from Macdonald their opinion on this question. They tell us that a calf from a cow that is affected can be raised to be a sound and healthy animal. I believe, from what I have read and seen, that such is the case. But I would ask these hon. gentleman if there is no danger of using a tuberculosis male, even if the disease is in its incipient stages? This is a question of great importance indeed to our farmers and one in which our farmers generally take a deep interest. I contend that the farmers should keep their buildings in a proper condition—that is the first thing to be done. I think it is beyond controversy also that herds that are kept in the house all the time, are more liable to the disease than others. There is little tuberculosis in the country where the herds are let out in the fields in summer and are properly cared for in winter.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). I am glad that this subject has been introduced by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Roddick). It is a subject of very great im-

portance indeed to Canada. While I admit that it is a subject that should be discussed by the medical men in the House, at the same time, being a practical farmer, like my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), I would like to say a few words upon it. I have said that this is an important question to Canada. It is important not only because of its relation to the health of and well-being of the people, but it is of very great importance, in a commercial sense. It is so for the reason that in the breeding of animals, northern countries like Canada must always supply the foundation for the herds of more southern countries. Canada enjoys a very enviable position in this respect. Except Great Britain, perhaps, there is no country in the world that is more capable of raising good animals of every kind than Canada. It is not often that I disagree with my hon. friend from Huron, but in this instance, I am sorry to say, I must disagree with him. I do not at all approve of the tuberculin —and this is the only branch of the subject I desire, for a few moments, to discuss—being placed in the hands of our farmers generally or in the hands of any other class of people than the professional class —doctors and veterinary surgeons. And I will give my reasons. I will admit at once that, as my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) has said, it is quite possible for a young man to go to such a college as the Ontario Agricultural College, and there acquire a perfectly good education for the applying of the tuberculin test. But, if you could confine it to these men who do go to the agricultural colleges and acquire the qualification, it might be reasonably safe. But can you limit it to this class? And if not, if you place it in the hands of the farmers of Canada generally, what is the result? We have, unfourtunately, dishonest as well as honest farmers.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, we have not a large percentage of them, perhaps not as large a percentage as among the professional classes. Still, we have a few of them; and, this being so, I wish to show how disastrous results might follow the placing of tuberculin in the hands of the farmers generally. As my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) has very properly said, it is certainly a slur upon a herd when it is known that tuberculosis exists in that herd. And, if tuberculosis exists, the farmer will try to conceal it, if he is dishonest. And if it be true, as has been stated—quite correctly, I believe—by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) that if the tuberculin is applied for a few times in too rapid succession, it ceases to react. What difficulty is there, then, in the way of the dishonest farmer so treating an animal that it may be sold and pass the test successfully, yet be actually tuberculous? If I had not heard of cases of this kind, I should not be so much impressed with the possibility of such cases as I am now giving. But I have heard of animals being disposed of having passed the test perfectly well, and in a short time all slaughtered because of their being full of tuberculosis. Although at first they do not respond to the test, only a short time afterwards external appearances prove conclusively that the animals were full of tuberculosis. There is great danger in this respect, and I think it is highly desirable that the Dominion Government should take the most stringent steps, and so far as I am aware they are acting in this matter with all possible vigour. But if any further steps can be taken, it is highly desirable in the interest of Canada that they should be taken. I simply desire to express the opinion that it should be against the law for any individual whatever to apply the tuberculin test except properly qualified doctors and veterinary surgeons.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I desire to say a word upon a phase of the question that has not yet been touched. It sometimes happens that there is less tuberculosis in one province than in another. In Prince Edward Island, for instance, we are almost entirely free from it. By the examinations that have been recently made, only a small percentage of the cases examined have been found to be affected. Under these circumstances, should there not be some law that will enable one province to protect itself against another? I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that in Prince Edward Island, during the past year, the local legislature has placed upon the statute-book a law providing that no cattle shall be imported into that province from the rest of the Dominion unless they have first been submitted to the tuberculin test. Now, is that desirable Act constitutional? I have some doubt. I think it is a matter of trade and commerce, which comes within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. If so, then there are some phases of this question over which the federal legislature has absolute control. To enable one province to guard its cattle against the tuberculosis that may prevail in other provinces the Federal Parliament might pass a general Act applicable to the whole Dominion—but only to be brought into effect in any province by a resolution of a local legislature or by a provincial Order in Council. Such a statute would be somewhat on the principle of the Scott Act and would meet such a condition of things as is required to be safeguarded in Prince Edward Island. In regard to the broad question of the constitutionality of a Dominion measure, dealing with tuberculosis, it has been contended by the hon. member for East Grey and by the leader of the Opposition that we have no power in this Parliament to legislate in this direction. I have been led to a dif-

ferent conclusion. I think this Parliament has the power and can assume and draw jurisdiction to itself. For instance, the Scott Act prohibited the sale of liquor throughout Canada. The question afterward came before the courts for adjudication as to what power the Parliament of Canada had to deal with that question. As it was a matter affecting health, it was contended that it belonged exclusively to the jurisdiction of the local legislatures. But the highest authority in the realm decided that the prohibition of the sale of liquor came within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. It was a national matter affecting the whole Dominion. By the Act itself this Parliament declared that it was a national matter, and in consequence of its being so, and being so declared, the court held that it properly came under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. The constitution declares that this Parliament has power over matters affecting the welfare of the Dominion and generally can pass laws for the order and good government of Canada. Now, if any question affects the whole Dominion of Canada in a most vital degree, this comes within that category. I think, therefore, that the Dominion Parliament would have the same right to deal with this general question of tuberculosis, bot as respects cattle and as respects humanity, as it has to deal with the sale of liquor under the Scott Act. Generally speaking, also, it is the right of the Dominion Parliament to declare what subjects are of such a national character as that this Parliament can legislate upon them. For instance, the Dominion Government may declare that a local railway is a road of national importance, and so may assume jurisdiction over it. In like manner the Dominion Parliament in many cases not defined by the British North America Act has the right to assume and exercise jurisdiction over and to pass laws concerning any matter of a national character. Therefore, there is no need in this case of asking for an amendment to the constitution, as we have already ample powers to deal with this important subject. My chief object, however, in speaking was to draw the attention of the Government to the circumstances that exist in Prince Edward Island, and to the necessity of providing some means by which one province can safeguard itself as against other provinces, as well as against the outside world.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I feel that the action of the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick), in bringing this matter before the House of Commons, is more than justified by the importance of the question. I will also take the opportunity of complimenting the hon. gentleman, not only on the fact that he has brought this question before the House, but on the clear and concise manner in which he has laid the principal points before us. I need not say that any words upon a medical subject that come from the lips of that hon. gentleman must be received with attention and respect. His position in the profession, and the way in which he has always dealt with matters of professional interest, are such that his opinion must command respect. I am able to endorse everything that he has said with regard to the necessity of dealing with this disease of tuberculosis. I am not a professional man myself, but it has been my duty, since taking charge of the Department of Agriculture, to study somewhat matters concerning public health and quarantine; and perhaps the fact that I am the son of a physician and was brought up in the atmosphere of medical discussion, may have had something to do in exciting my interest in these matters. I have given considerable time to the study of this matter of tuberculosis since I have been in charge of the department. My hon. friend from Montreal has read to us the resolutions of the Montreal Medical and Chirurgical Society upon this question. Those resolutions ask us as the Parliament of the Dominion to take up this question and deal with it on national lines. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the constitutional question alluded to by the hon. leader of the Opposition as to the rights that this Parliament may have in dealing with this matter. There is evidently some little difference of opinion, although I must say, that my own opinion has always coincided with that of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the position which he stated has been the generally accepted one in Canada for long years that questions affecting public health, the management of restrictions and especially municipal regulations, in regard to public health, are essentially within the sphere of the provincial legislatures. This being the case it is questionable how far this Parliament might go, but there are some matters of purely municipal regulation, alluded to in these resolutions, which it would be unwise and perhaps unconstitutional to try to meddle with. There are perhaps other points that we, in this Parliament, might deal with, and it is quite possible that, in the North-west Territories, those parts of the country which are practically under the administration of the Federal Parliament, or of a council delegated with powers from this Parliament, we might deal with this matter. I am only giving that as my opinion, but in the North-west Territories, that sparsely-settled portion of our country in which the climate seems to be specially hostile to the introduction of tuberculosis, and where the germs of the disease seem to have difficulty in spreading, or even in existing, is perhaps the place where it is the least necessary to deal with tuberculosis in Canada. Still, no doubt, wherever people are there will be tuberculosis. I take so much interest in this question, and believe it

of such importance to the people of this country that, a little while ago, I took the responsibility of recommending to Council the appointment of a delegate from Canada to the congress which has just taken place in Berlin to discuss this question. Dr. Farrel, of Halifax, one of the best known physicians in Canada, a gentleman who occupied a high position in the medical associations of Canada, and a gentleman whose name is synonymous with questions of public health, in the province in which he lives, was appointed to go there, and I expect that in a short time we will have an interesting report from him of the proceedings of the congress, by a perusal of which we will be able to find out a great deal about the disease and the modern methods of its treatment. In the course of the last few years an immense stride has been made in our knowledge of this disease, and of the methods of treating it. As the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) stated a little while ago, the intimate connection between the disease in the animal, especially in horned cattle and the disease in the human being has been abundantly proved and is now being thoroughly discussed and ventilated. I am not going into the question of the disease as affecting the human race; and further, I would prefer to leave that in the hands of the medical profession, except to say that having lately appointed Dr. Montizambert, Superintendent General of Public Health for the Dominion, his duties being to deal with the quarantine examination of people coming into the country for the purpose of preventing the introduction of disease, that gentleman is also devoting considerable attention to the study of tuberculosis, and perhaps, in the course of time, public opinion will reach the point where an effective examination for tuberculosis of people entering the country may be made. The subject is in too hazy a condition to make any definite statement in regard to it, or to say that that time is within measurable distance, but that question has been attracting the attention of physicians in different parts of the world and also of our own quarantine officers. As regards cattle, we have in this Parliament dealt with the contagious diseases of animals, and I believe we rightly did so when Parliament undertook that duty. The result is that to-day contagious diseases of animals and tuberculosis come properly within the sphere of the Department of Agriculture for the Dominion, and ever since I have been in charge of that department it has been my duty to try and see in what way this disease could be minimized amongst our animals. The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick), and others who have spoken, have alluded to what has been done, but perhaps it may not be out of place for me to say a little about what has been done. There had been nothing done in regard to this disease definitely before I came into office myself. But about two years ago, I asked Parliament to give a grant for the purpose of dealing with tuberculosis. In the explanation which I gave, when that grant was voted, I said that what I believed was necessary first to spread information in regard to this disease amongst the owners of cattle, to try and encourage the testing of animals with the tuberculin test, wherever possible, so that our Animal Contagious Disease Act might be applied to animals, where animals were found to be affected with this disease. That programme has been carried out. Last year again a sum of money was placed at my disposal for this purpose. That has been just about expended, in the course of the current year, and I am proposing to ask Parliament to give me another sum of money to continue the same propaganda and the same campaign. When this matter first came up to be discussed in Parliament, and before that, amongst the farmers of the country, there was quite a difference of opinion as to how far it would be possible to go in dealing with this disease. Some urged that we should make testing compulsory and make slaughter immediately compulsory. Other countries had tried this and had failed. A number of states in the American Union had tried to make testing compulsory; they had voted large sums of money for the purpose of carrying out this compulsory test and for paying compensation to farmers whose cattle had been slaughtered for the public safety. The State of Massachusetts was obliged to abandon this course; Vermont was obliged to largely abandon it and to change its programme. In England, and in the old countries generally, the question was thoroughly discussed, but public opinion would never allow the authorities of those countries to undertake compulsory testing or slaughter. Mr. Bang, in Denmark, and M. Nocard, in France, who are amongst the first scientists, went into the study of this question most thoroughly. They discovered what they believe to be a system which will entirely obviate the necessity of claughtering the animals. This system is generally spoken of as the Bang system. It is the one which has been somewhat described by the hon. member for Macdonald, and I need not go into it except to say that the diseased animals are kept isolated and the products of these animals are sterilized so as to be innocuous and harmless. The animals are allowed to reproduce and to produce their milk if they are cows. This system has been successfully carried out by Mr. Bang in Denmark, and to-day, there is a large number of animals in Denmark, Germany and France which are producing milk for human food and whose flesh is used for human food which are known to be tuberculous, but the work is carried on under such restrictions and safeguards that the scientists of these countries say that it is done with perfect

safety as regards the public health Under these circumstances, and in view of the public opinion in this country, so evidently expressed by the people generally, and the farmers in their great convention of two years ago, I felt that it would be quite impossible for us to undertake anything in the nature of compulsory testing or compulsory slaughter. Therefore, I did not go so far. But I offered, on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, that any one who would make an application on a properly drawn up form of the department, would have his animals tested free of charge. This was done for the purpose of encouraging the people to test.

Mr. SPROULE. I have never yet been able to discover whether it was possible to get the animals tested in different localities. I understood they could be tested free of charge, if they were here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no; they will be tested in any place in the country, where the owner asks that the Government shall test his animals, submitting himself to certain conditions and safeguards provided by the department. When that is done, the veterinary appointed by the department is sent to make the test.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware of that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That has been published in all the agricultural papers in the country; it has been published in the press generally, and it has been announced over and over again at agricultural meetings, and fully ventilated before the farmers and stock-owners.

Mr. WALLACE. Did you put it in the Report of the Department of Agriculture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is the full report there, with a statement of the tests and everything else.

Mr. WALLACE. Did you put in the statement which you have just mentioned?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The description of the work that is being carried on is in the report of the department, as well as the bulletins and proclamations that were issued in regard to it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it in the report, that it was done without charge?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Without charge to any owner of animals who sends the application in the proper form.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is that embodied in the report?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. The conditions imposed are: First, that every animal on the farm should be tested. I did not consider it wise that a man should be allowed to pick out a few animals, and have them tested, and have them kept along with other animals which had not been tested, and might be diseased.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that mean every anmal on the farm?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, only horned cattle; I accept the hon. gentleman's correction. The other condition is, that no compensation should be asked for, if the animals are slaughtered. They are not ordered to be slaughtered by the department. They are slaughtered entirely at the discretion of the owner; but, if they are found to be diseased, they must be isolated and quarantined, so that they may not spread the disease to other animals.

A large number of tests have been made all through the country. I have in my hand a statement by provinces of the tests made, but, as I have read it to the House already, I will only say that, in the course of the last two years, nearly 16,000 tests have been made by the appointees of the department, and, of these 16,000 animals, 1,017 have been found diseased, or just about 6½ per cent of those which have been tested. I consider this a most favourable showing as to the health of the herds of Canada, and I so consider it for two reasons. In the first place, it is a much lower percentage than has been commonly talked of by persons in discussing this matter. Wild statements were made, that all the way from 20 per cent up to 50 per cent of the horned cattle of Canada were diseased. In other countries estimates have been made of the number of diseased animals, and, though I have not in my memory what these were, they have ranged all the way from 10 per cent to as high as 30 and 35 per cent. Canada has been found, in so far as we have tested the animals, only to have 6½ per cent of her cattle diseased.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister said that out of 16,000 tested, about 1,000 were diseased. That would be one out of sixteen, and would be more than 6½ per cent.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would take a pencil and figure it, he would find it is not. This is a most satisfactory showing for another reason, because, as a general rule, the herds which have been tested in this way have been herds which were suspected. The ordinary farmer who does not suspect anything about his cattle, does not ask to have them tested as a rule, but in this case a large number of them have been dairy herds in the neighbourhood of large cities, and belonging to people who are forced to have them tested by municipal by-laws. I may say that out of this 16,000 cases, very much the largest proportion of animals which have been found diseased, have been found in the byres of city milkmen who have their cattle in the close neighbourhood of

cities, and supply these cities with milk. The conditions of such barns seem to be more favourable to the spread of the disease, and I may say that, judging from the investigations which have been held by our veterinary surgeons throughout the country, if an animal in a certain stage of the disease be introduced into a perfectly healthy barn-full of dairy cows—under the ordinary conditions of winter-keeping of stock in the neighbourhood of cities—it is almost sure that a large proportion of the rest of that herd will become diseased in a short time. I think there is no doubt whatever of the absolute accuracy of the statment which I have just made and I make it with emphasis, because I think it is right and necessary that the people of this country should thoroughly understand this condition of affairs and try to prevent it.

I am not going to continue now at any great length, but one or two statements have been made on the floor of this House which I would like to allude to. In the first place, I am under an obligation to my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) for the very clear way in which he put this whole question, as connected with cattle, before the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford) is himself a veterinarian of high standing. He is a gentleman whom I know, from many and many a conversation with him, has very carefully studied and probed this whole question, and I do not think that any more valuable contribution could have been made to the debate this afternoon than that which he presented to the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question is one of the utmost importance to our stock-holders in Canada. As my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) said: Canada is specially well adapted to the growing of good, healthy live stock. We have the reputation to-day for the production of such healthy stock, and, with the exception of the mother country, I believe there is no place in the world where live stock of a higher or healthier class can be obtained than in Canada. I am glad to know that the stock-owners of Canada are to-day sending out of the country large numbers of animals, getting good prices for them, and acquiring a great reputation for the production of the best live stock possible. This being the case, it is of the utmost importance that the health of our herds shall be maintained, and it is of the utmost importance that the people who are managing our live stock should thoroughly understand this question.

In conjunction with the testing of animals in the country, my department has been carrying on a propaganda of information. Wherever we have been able to reach the farmers at public meetings, I have tried to secure the attendance of veterinary surgeons or others who are well acquainted with this disease, to give public addresses at institute meetings and gatherings of farmers throughout the country. I have had a number of bulletins printed and distributed largely, explaining this disease, the best methods to deal with it, and the best methods to prevent its spread. I believe that, in the course of the last year, there has been a great deal of information supplied to the stock-owners of Canada, which shall be of the utmost value to them in combatting this disease, and, consequently, of the utmost value to the people of the country at large. In these two ways, the testing of animals at the public expense, and the spread of information in regard to the disease, I have been working; and, until public opinion in regard to this matter is advanced to a more determinate point, I am satisfied that we cannot do any more than this in the way of the prevention of disease in the country.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the disease itself. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) explained that the calves born of diseased cows are not necessarily diseased. As a matter of fact, it has been found, on careful investigation of a very large number of cases, that it is almost unheard-of that a calf should be born affected with tuberculosis. If the calf is taken away from its mother before it had an opportunity to suckle the mother, and before the mother has had an opportunity of licking it, and possibly passing on the disease through the saliva with which her mouth is saturated, the calf will be pretty surely free from the disease. The danger is that in the first milk which the young calf draws from its mother, and in licking by the mother to cleanse the calf, which is the well-known practice of cows, the disease is communicated. But Mr. Bang, by his system in Denmark, has been remarkably successful in raising calves from diseased mothers, which calves have afterwards been perfectly healthy cattle. In addition to this, there is no doubt that thoroughly ventilated and well-aired barns are necessary for the keeping of our cattle. I need not dwell on this. It is a thing which every student of stock-keeping knows perfectly well. But, unfortunately, the practice of the people of our country is not as good as their knowledge. Frequently animals are kept in places which are no doubt saturated with the germs of this disease, and in which any healthy cow is in danger of being attacked by it. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan has spoken of whitewashing. There is no doubt that the disinfection of stables is an absolute necessity, and any well-regulated stock farm must have its stables thoroughly disinfected by whitewashing or in some other way at least once or twice every year. If this is done, I have no hesitation in saying that the spread of this disease will be enormously decreased.

In addition to the work I have spoken of, we are carrying on some careful experiments in the way of investigations of milk which comes from diseased animals. It will be within the memory of a great many members of the House that about a year and a half ago a number of tuberculous cows were found on the Experimental Farm. In clearing the farm of these diseased animals, I directed that some of them should be kept, and that specimens of their milk should be taken every day and carefully inspected in a bacteriological laboratory to see how many germs it contained. This work has reached a certain stage, but not by any means a conclusive stage, and therefore I do not wish to make any statement founded upon it. But the experiment is being continued, and I will only say one word in regard to it. An hon. gentleman said a little while ago that there were a large number of cows affected in the udder. It is well known that animals affected in the udder are much more likely to communicate disease through their milk than animals otherwise affected by the disease. I and my officers have been searching in Canada for the last year to find cows whose udders are affected, and up to the present moment we have not succeeded in getting an animal to put into our experimental work whose udder is definitely affected with tuberculosis. I say this because I do not wish it to go abroad that it is a common thing in this country for the udders of cows to be affected with tuberculosis. I believe, on the contrary, it is a very uncommon thing indeed. There is a general opinion amongst medical men and veterinary surgeons that it is only when the udder is diseased that the milk is dangerous. I am not prepared to endorse that opinion; I do not know enough about it to say; but if that is the case, there is no doubt that the milk of cattle in this country is almost entirely safe. Still, there is a danger, and those best acquainted with the disease say that as long as an animal is diseased, the only safe way is either not to use its milk or to thoroughly sterilize it before it is used. I would recommend, as a matter of caution and safety, that the milk of any animal which has been tested and found to be tuberculous, should be carefully sterilized before it is used for any purpose whatever, whether as food for infants, for human beings or for other animals; and especially I would recommend that no milk from tuberculous cows should be fed to pigs or calves that has not been thoroughly sterilized. I regret to say that in the experience of veterinary surgeons and farmers, there is a considerable spread of tuberculosis amongst swine in the country, in consequence of the fact that these are fed principally upon milk which comes probably from tuberculous cattle. We have not made tests of swine, and I do not suppose that the real amount of the disease is very great. At the same time, the only safe way, where it is known that a cow is affected with the disease, is to have the milk thoroughly sterilized before it is fed to the swine or any other animals, or to human beings.

I want to refer to one or two things which were mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I must say that I am rather surprised that the hon. gentleman, a member of the House of Commons who takes a special interest in agricultural matters, has evidently not followed what has been going on in regard to tuberculosis and our quarantine arrangements. The hon. gentleman said that one of the most important things we could do would be to see that no animals were imported into the country without being tested for tuberculosis. The hon. gentleman is not aware that for two years past, since I made the arrangement with the United States, every horned animal that comes into Canada from abroad, whether for breeding purposes or for dairy purpose, is tested for tuberculosis before it is allowed to enter the country. I am glad to find that the department has anticipated the hon. gentleman's recommendation by about two years.

Mr. SPROULE. I made the recommendation about ten or twelve years ago.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman, then, ought to have appreciated the fact that it was done, and ought to have congratulated us on having followed his advice. Further, the hon. gentleman said that the removal of the quarantine between us and the United States had created a danger with reference to tuberculosis. Before that was done, there was no necessity for animals coming from the United States or elsewhere to be tested for tuberculosis, although the animals that came in had to remain ninety days in quarantine.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not refer to tuberculosis alone, but to any other disease to which animals are subject.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is tuberculosis that we are talking about. But I may say that all animals coming from the United States have not only to be tested for tuberculosis, but have to be accompanied by a certificate that they are free from disease. If they are not accompanied by this certificate, they are held at the frontier to be tested for tuberculosis before they are allowed to enter the country. So that the hon. gentleman will see that we are taking this precaution very effectually. The hon. gentleman made another remark which I regretted very much to hear. Referring to the Doukbohors, he said that these people were rotten with tuberculosis, and were being imported in such large numbers that they were a men-

ace to the health of the people of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? The quarantine regulations imposing that restriction, I believe, only apply to thoroughbred cattle which are imported for improving the stock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman again shows his ignorance, for it applies to all cattle imported for breeding or dairy purposes, as well as to cattle imported for the improvement of stock.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be that my ignorance is dense; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that if that is the regulation, there are hundreds of cattle crossing the lines without any such test and without any certificate. They are going out of our country in hundreds without the certificate ever being seen.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is talking now about cattle going from here to the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. Minister to say both ways.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the animals are going into the United States for butchering purposes alone, the United States authorities allow them in without a certificate. As a matter of fact, no animals come into this country from the United States for butchering purposes, but all animals that come in for breeding purposes—not only thoroughbreds, but any animal—are not allowed in except when accompanied by a certificate of test. That regulation has been published two years all through the country, and is thoroughly well known to the farmers and stock-raisers of this country and the United States.

I am now coming back to the question of the Doukhobors, to which I was about to address myself when interrupted by the hon. gentleman. He said that they were rotten with tuberculosis, and were a menace to the health of our people. I do not know on what he has based his statement, and if he had not pretty good proof he ought not to have made any such statement on the floor of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I based it on an article in one of our medical monthlies with regard to the prevalence of this disease in Russia, and the percentage of people who died from consumption in that country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What is the percentage?

Mr. SPROULE. About one in every five hundred.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman says he based that statement on the fact that he has read in a certain paper that the Doukhobors were largely infected with tuberculosis, and that in the country from which they came, the people die from that disease at the rate of one in every five hundred per year. If the hon. gentleman will figure out a little, he will find that one in five hundred means two-tenths of one per cent, and he will find that the average death rate the world over from the disease is about ten per cent of the mortality from all the diseases that occur. Therefore, instead of saying that the Doukhobors are rotten with tuberculosis, the percentage he gave shows that they are the cleanest and healthiest people on the face of the earth.

Mr. SPROULE. My statement is entirely misleading. There is a number of countries in which tuberculosis is very scarce, and if you take these countries and add their population to the population of those where the death rate is high from tuberculosis, you bring the rate to what the hon. gentleman has said it is. But that is no index whether the percentage is high or low in one country as compared with another.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, who is a practitioner, I believe, in good standing, what is the death rate from tuberculosis in this country? If he cannot tell us, there are other physicians who should know. No doubt the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, will be able to tell him.

Mr. RODDICK. Our statistics are so inaccurate that it is really impossible to get the figure, but it is very much lower than the ten per cent you mention.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is it as low as two-tenths of one per cent?

Mr. RODDICK. No, two or three per cent, I think. May I say that in referring to that question, I was simply cautioning the hon. member with reference to Russia and Austria, which are the two countries in which the highest percentage is obtained in European countries, and I simply referred to the fact that recently from both these countries immigrants have been brought to Canada. But I am not aware that the Doukhobors are infected to the extent my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says they are. I do not think they are, but that they are infected to a considerable extent is likely, from the fact that the disease is so prevalent in these two countries from which they come.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not taking any exception to what the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, said with regard to immigration from these countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman was making a statement directly opposite to what the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, said.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is entirely misrepresenting me. I was simply referring to the statement of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the Doukhobors were rotten with tuberculosis.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And the hon. Minister met that statement by saying that these people came from a country less affected by tuberculosis than any country he was aware of, and he called on the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, who tells him the very reverse is the case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has again misrepresented me by putting words into my mouth that I did not utter. He evidently did not follow the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did, very closely.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows I said nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know the very reverse. "Hansard" will show which is right.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman must accept my statement. I said nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, the hon. gentleman must accept mine.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. Minister should not misrepresent me; I did not say the Doukhobors were rotten with the disease.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, you did.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that as the disease was so prevalent in the country from which they came, I was justified in coming to the conclusion that a very large percentage of them would be affected by it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman takes back his statement that they were rotten with tuberculosis, I am very glad indeed. My ears told me the contrary, and so did the ears of a number of gentlemen who are near me, but I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman withdraws his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not withdraw a word of what I said. What I said was correct, and I am standing by it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Very well. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he said that of these Doukhobors at home, one in five hundreed died per annum of tuberculosis. I replied that that statement shows they are of the healthiest of peoples, as regards tuberculosis, in the world. I am not questioning the statement of the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, or giving an expression of opinion on my own part.

Mr. FOSTER. This is obstruction. Let us go on with our work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Does the hon. gentleman wish to interrupt?

Mr. FOSTER. I only made a remark, and I humbly beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Granted. The hon. gentleman is so fond of interrupting and interjecting remarks, that I rather expected an interruption.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend at this juncture is taking a tone that is very supercilious and very offensive to members on this side——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) understands very well what I mean.

Mr. FOSTER—and which does not sit well on him at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a matter for my opinion and not the opinion of the hon. member for York.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a matter for the House to judge.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am perfectly prepared to abide by its decision. I shall not take lessons in politeness from the hon. member for York, or anybody else he chooses to indicate.

Mr. FOSTER. Necessity sometimes knows no law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The point I wish to emphasize is that the Doukhobors are not a people who are rotten with tuberculosis, and their immigration into this country is in no sense a menace to the health of our people. I can quote the report of my own quarantine officer, Dr. Montizambert, who has had more opportunity of judging the Doukhobors than anybody else probably in Canada. He was present at Halifax, where some 2,000 of them were detained three weeks in quarantine in consequence of the discovery of a case of small-pox among them, and he was also present in Grosse Isle, where 2,700 of them were detained three weeks, in consequence of another case of small-pox being discovered on board, and he found that he had never come into contact with a cleaner or healthier lot of immigrants in the whole thirty-three years of his experience as chief quarantine officer of the Dominion than these Doukhobors in both lots. That being the case, I think we can fairly say that the statement that they are rotten or very largely infected with the disease, is not well founded.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister is attributing to me a statement which I emphatically deny having made use of.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, you did.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) ought to know more about the rules of the House than to insist on saying that I did.

Mr. SPEAKER. The debate is assuming a very irregular character. I suppose the hon. member who has the floor will allow interruption for questions or explanations, as we go along; but cross-firing across the House, irrespective of that, should not go on.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask your ruling as to whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is not in duty bound to accept the statement I make, that I did not say what he atrributes to me.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I certainly accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), that he did not say the Doukhobors were rotten with tuberculosis. I will say that he said they were very largely affected by that disease.

Mr. SPROULE. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is better to allow the hon. gentleman to finish.

Mr. SPROULE. What I said was, that the death rate from consumption, in the country from which they come, was very high; and we must naturally come to the conclusion that a large percentage of these people would be.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would be what?

Mr. SPROULE. It would naturally be expected that a large percentage of them would be affected.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would be affected with what—tuberculosis?

Mr. SPROULE. If the death rate in any country from any particular disease is very high, and if that disease is of a lingering character before it causes death, then, taking a hundred, or a thousand, or ten thousand, of the people of that country, the percentage of cases of the disease among them is likely to be high.

Mr. McMULLEN. I heard distinctly the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not allowable for the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) to contradict the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Sproule). The statement must be accepted, and I have no doubt that it will be.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I accept the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) statement. I think the statement of Dr. Montizambert on this question, and the facts which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) stated, as to the percentage of disease in the country, show that these people are not a menace to the health of the people of Canada.

There was one other matter upon which I wish to say a word, and that was the matter brought up by the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell). The province of Prince Edward Island is freer, as far as our tests show, from the disease of tuberculosis amongst animals than any other province in the Dominion. We have had some 425 tests made in the province of Prince Edward Island, and only 16 cases of disease were found, showing an average of less than 4 per cent. The hon. gentleman says that the local legislature of Prince Edward Island has passed an Act by which the importation of cattle into the Island from any part of the world, the rest of Canada included, is forbidden, unless accompanied with a certificate of the tuberculin test. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) seems to think that this is unconstitutional. I am not prepared to give him an opinion on the constitutional question; but I would remind him, the legislature of Manitoba, some time ago, passed an Act forbidding the importation of horses from the North-west Territories, unless accompanied with a certificate of having been tested for glanders, or unless an examination and test for glanders were made at the frontier of the province, as the animal came in.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). May I ask, is that Act in force yet?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. It was disallowed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was in force for a little while. My own opinion is that, while perhaps it may be, that Prince Edward cannot forbid the entry of the animals, it can force the person importing them to subject them to a test in that province, and not allow them to be sent into other parts of the province until they have been so tested—this, a matter of municipal regulation. There is no question that, so far as subjecting cows which are supplying milk to cities and towns to an examination, or the inspection of meat sold in those cities is concerned, the provincial authorities and the local health board have absolute control—this, as a matter of municipal regulation which they choose to impose. And it seems to me—not pretending, of course, to speak as a constitutional authority—that the Island could perfectly well impose such a regulation as would require any animal landed within its borders, when once landed, to be so tested. This, of course, is a matter especially of municipal regulation. The pro-

vince of Ontario, I might say, has for some time had on its statute-books a law which empowers the municipalities to compel a test of cows which supply milk to be sold within the municipality. This law has been, to a certain extent, enforced in the province of Ontario.

Quite recently, the city of Ottawa and a number of other towns and cities in Ontario have passed regulations by which all vendors of milk within their bounds were obliged to see to it that the cows which produced the milk had been tested for tuberculosis. This kind of work is rapidly and effectively spreading information among the people, information which is of the greatest value, and which will lead to the improvement of the laws in regard to this question, and, still more, to the improvement of the methods of keeping animals in this country. I congratulate Canada upon the fact that this disease is likely before long to come under practical control. I would only again, before sitting down, thank the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick) for having brought this matter up, thus affording an opportunity for the ventilation of the subject on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. ERB. I rise to ask the question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher): Did I understand him to say that there was no country in the world where cattle were so free from tuberculosis as Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said I believed that in no country in the world were the cattle so free from tuberculosis as in Canada. But I have not all the statistics in regard to other countries, though I have them in regard to Canada; so, I only give that as an opinion, and not as a statement of fact.

Mr. ERB. I understood the hon. Minister to say that, next to Great Britain, Canada was freer from tuberculosis than any other country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; I said that, next to Great Britain, Canada had probably the finest stock in the world, and was sending out the best animals.

Mr. ERB. It is evident that I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I could not reconcile the statement, as I understood it, with a statement that I find in the Report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1896, made, I believe, by the Dominion Veterinary Inspector:

To such an extent does it exist——

That is, tuberculosis.

——in Great Britain that it is stated on good authority that nearly 50 per cent of the herds are affected.

Mr. CLANCY. There seems to be a consensus of opinion in favour of guarding against the spread of tuberculosis in Canada. That has been so thoroughly discussed that it would be a waste of time now to continue the discussion upon that line. But there seems to be another side of the question, to which I took the liberty of calling the attention of the Minister of Agriculture a short time ago, and that is in reference to taking some decided steps to prevent it. I was told, on that occasion, that it was not the policy of the Government of Canada to undertake more than to quarantine diseased animals and to leave them to be slaughtered entirely at the will of the owner. It does seem to me that this is a faint-hearted and limping policy. I have no hesitation in saying that if the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) has been overawed by public opinion, he has been overawed in an entirely wrong direction. I would like to ask any sensible man, in this House or out of it, how we can stop the progress of disease of that kind, when we permit it to exist and nurse it in every locality in Canada. You permit men to keep animals in a quarantine which is one only in name and not in fact, and these animals are entrusted entirely to the owner, who believes that there is some value attached to them so long as they are kept alive, and every member of his family, every person who comes in contact with those animals, is in danger. Yet the hon. gentleman says that he has for the first time inaugurated a new policy, and he proposes now by his policy of inaction to leave alone a disease that threatens both the life and property of the people of this country. There is no greater need in Canada than the need of stamping out this disease, if for no other reason than to keep Canadian herds pure. But the hon. gentleman ignores that. He made a rather humiliating admission an evening or two ago in the House, when he said that he was not responsible for the old law. My answer to the hon. gentleman is that it is an old error, and the sooner we get rid of it the better. The only plan it seems to me for the people is not to pursue a faint-hearted policy, nor a parsimonious policy. Let us acknowledge the fact, the great deterrent to action is the cost, the additional taxation. And yet the hon. gentleman has before him the experience of European countries. A little more than a year ago the British House of Commons appointed a royal commission for the purpose of investigating this question of tuberculosis, and their recommendation was upon the line of compensation for slaughtered animals. It may be said that that policy will become abused in this country, that cattle will be slaughtered in great numbers, and that it will entail a great tax upon the people. That may be partly true, but it is no reason for the Government to stand by and make a mocking pretense of doing something to minimize the disease, when their very system itself is hatching the disease in

every quarter of Canada. Just so long as the owners of cattle are permitted to keep them in a half dying condition until they drop off, so long will the disease be promoted rather than minimized. I had hoped something better from the hon. gentleman in dealing with a more vigorous hand, and using more effectively the money we have granted him. I am not complaining of the way he has used it, but I do complain that the hon. gentleman refuses to deal vigorously with this greatest evil that now threatens our country.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Government to a statement that is made by a "Star" correspondent from Moncton, N.B., which I will read:

It is reported in railway circles here that the Intercolonial is contemplating large additions to its rolling stock.

Mr. G. R. Joughins, the mechanical superintendent, has been for some weeks engaged in preparation of an estimate of the cost and the extent of the new equipment; and so far it is stated his estimate is close to $3,000,000. For the purpose of the road Mr. Joughins estimates that 120 more new locomotives may be required. Since his occupancy of his present position Mr. Jughins has added 30 new locomotives to the Intercolonial's rolling stock. It is also stated that the road will add to its present equipment a large number of freight and passenger cars. This phenomenal increase in the expenditure of the mechanical department of the road will, your correspondent learns, be charged to capital account. Under the Conservative regime the acquisition of rolling stock was accounted for in the statement of current revenue and expenditure. But under Mr. Blair's management such charges are made against capital account.

I wanted to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) respecting that, as some people wished me to do so. They are naturally anxious about a rumour that such a large expenditure is to be incurred, and that the vicious principle is then to be resorted to of charging it to capital account. The Minister of Railways is not here; I suppose, therefore, I shall have to wait until he comes, but meanwhile he will see it in "Hansard."

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) when I may expect the two returns ordered by the House some time ago; one with regard to the dismissal of W. D. McMillan, light-keeper, Prince Edward Island, the other with regard to fines for the infraction of lobster fishery laws in Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The return in regard to fines has been brought down. I will see that the other one is brought down at once.

Mr. MARTIN. I would ask the Postmaster General when I may expect two returns ordered; one with regard to the appointment of a postmaster at New London, P.E.I., and one with regard to the proposed change of mails for Grandview, P.E.I.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). No doubt I will be able to bring those down on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that a return which he brought down in answer to an order of the House with reference to postal notes, is defective in this important respect, that the order asked for the cost of postal notes exclusive of paper, and that piece of information is not given. I hope my hon. friend will have that brought down, and make the return complete.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that the contract, which I think was laid on the Table included in some other returns, requires the contractor to supply notes, including paper, at so much per thousand. There is nothing to show the separate cost of labour and material. Tenders were called for, and the contract provided that the contractors were to supply paper, material and labour at so much per thousand.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Postmaster General must recollect that the order of the House is one thing and a contract is another thing. The order of the House did not simply ask for the contract, but it asked for other information beside, and one of the items of information that was asked for was the cost of the postal notes outside of the paper. Of course, that is very easily obtained; the hon. gentleman can easily get the information as his department no doubt has it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is quite impossible to furnish any such information. The House may have ordered it, but supposing that the contract, instead of being to supply postal notes, was to erect a building, and the contract required the contractor to provide labour and material at a certain contract price. Suppose it were a Government building. By what process could you separate the labour from the material, and say so much of the contract price is assignable to the cost of labour and so much for material? I have no objection to the order going in any form that is desired, nor to comply with it if it is possible, but when I tell the hon. gentleman that there is nothing to show what portion is for labour and what portion is for material, I

see no way by which I can give the information to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can get the information in five minutes if he wishes to.

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

Militia and Defence—
For pay of troops, erection of barracks, transportation of troops and supplies and necessary expenditures in the Yukon $250,000

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) will explain what was the necessity for sending the militia to the Yukon at all. My information is that all that was needed for the preservation of peace and order could have been done by the Mounted Police, and I believe that Judge Dugas has already written to that effect, either to the hon. Minister of the Interior, or to the right hon. Prime Minister, or, it may have been, to the hon. Minister of Militia. The information I have is that the expenditure connected with sending the militia to the Yukon was perfectly useless.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Mr. Chairman, the question as to whether the militia should be sent to the Yukon, was discussed very fully last year in this House, and in so far as I remember, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), who has just spoken, took no exception whatever to the policy of sending the militia there. The fact is it was accepted in the country at large and in this House as a reasonable and proper thing to do, as a precautionary measure which this Government was bound to take in view of the condition of things which existed at that time. At that time the policy of sending the militia in there was admitted. That was in February or March, 1898. It was believed on all hands that a very large influx of miners from all parts of the world would take place into that country, and as a precautionary measure, in the interest of the maintenance of peace and order, it was considered to be proper and necessary to send this force to the Yukon. The matter was discussed in this House, and by the silence of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) it was considered that he approved of the course which the Government have taken, and it is rather late in the day now to undertake to attack the policy of sending the militia in there. It is well understood that in mining communities, such as that in the Yukon, there is always danger to peace and order; it is well understood further, that the presence of a force amongst that population, such as that which has gone into that country, will serve to preserve order, though these men have not been called upon to actively interfere. That is what has happened in this case. It is altogether unjustifiable for the hon. gentleman or any one else, to attempt to argue that, because that force has not been actually called out to use its firearms, it, therefore, is unnecessary. It is true there has been good order in that country, but there has been good order because the Government had taken the precaution of sending the Mounted Police there and sending the militia there to see that good order was preserved. The majesty of the law has been supported, but I will venture to say that the class of men who have gone into that country and who are there to-day are no better than the average of the class that has formed any mining camp in the world. To hear people talk sometimes you would imagine that they were a class of angels who had gone in to mine gold, but, from what I know, from what I have read and heard, they are precisely the same class of men who form every mining camp in the world, and if it had not been for the precaution which the Government has taken to maintain peace and order there serious difficulties would have occurred. I believe that one of the most important steps which has been taken, and the most justifiable is the sending of this force into that country. I thought the hon. gentleman would ask why it was that this large sum of money was asked in addition to the amount we asked for a year ago, which is practically increased by $250,000 above the amount which we estimated and which we asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. What did you ask for last year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We asked for $140,000 for the current year which ends to-day. I will explain briefly to the House how it happens that we are asking for this large sum in addition. First, we estimated that we would be able to use a considerable sum of money out of the ordinary vote for the permanent force. We found afterwards that the Auditor General objected to this, and not a single dollar of the money voted for the current year for the permanent force has been used, either as pay or otherwise, for the force in the Yukon. Next, our estimate of the cost of sending men from Glenora to Fort Selkirk was about $50,000. The fact is that the expense has been nearly $100,000 more, something like $130,000 odd to send men from Glenora to Fort Selkirk. I think I explained to the House last year that an arrangement had been made with the Hudson Bay Company for taking charge of the expedition to Glenora and carrying it through to Lake Teslin. The arrangement made with the Hudson Bay Company was that they should proceed, and that the Government should pay them 20 per cent upon the gross amount of their expenditure, and be credited back with the sale of any of the plant used in transporting these supplies

and troops. I have the accounts and shall be very glad to lay them on the Table of the House, or to bring them up before the Public Accounts Committee, or to read from them such extracts as I may be asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. Give in detail the total amount for transportation.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The total for transportation, as nearly as we can get at it now, is about $240,000.

Mr. FOSTER. For how many men ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Two hundred men, and of course that includes their supplies for two full years. The transportation for the men themselves is not much ; it is nearly all for supplies.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want is the distinction between the cost of the transportation of the men and the supplies.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I could not at this moment say as to the cost of the transportation of the troops, but it is a small matter compared with the total expenditure. The supplies which we supposed had to be carried in from Vancouver via Glenora to Fort Selkirk was eighty tons. It turned out that the weight by measurement, as shown in the Canada Pacific Navigation Company's account was 177 tons. That is more than double the quantity that we had estimated, and that is the explanation why, instead of $50,000 we have had considerably over $100,000 to pay.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister mean to say that he took in 177 tons of supplies and not eighty tons ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you buy 177 tons of supplies ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We had eighty tons by weight, but we were charged by measurement.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you have a contract ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is always done in the transportation by steamboats. I think my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle), will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. EARLE. I can correct the Minister in that respect. It is not always done, but when your contracts were being discussed last year I brought the matter up and stated that your contract with the Boston and Alaskan Commercial Company, which called for weight or measurement at the ship's option, would amount to between two and three times the amount as on dead weight which was offered to you by other companies. In this instance, as steamers do, if they are allowed to do it, they took the measurement instead of the weight, which shows that by measurement averages over double the quantity of freight, you would have to pay for if you contracted by weight. All shippers today, in shipping to Dawson via the White Pass and Yukon Railway, and all these routes, invariably ship by weight, as they do to all mining districts.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) will agree with me, that in all shipments by steamboats, or in nearly all, the payment for freight is made by measurement, and the Canada Pacific Navigation Company, of which I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) himself is a director, charges us for 177 tons measurement, which equalled about eighty or eighty-five tons by weight. I do not think their charge is excessive, I think the charge a fair one, and the rates we paid were the same rates that we paid to his company.

Mr. WALLACE. How much a ton ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Forty dollars.

Mr. WALLACE. Measurement ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, weight or measurement, ship's option. That is the usual way.

Mr. EARLE. That is the usual custom, but there is no merchant who is shipping freight to these districts at these high rates would think of shipping by ship's option. It is never done, and all the traders at Glenora and other points contracted for their freight last year by weight. All the steamers, I know many of them at least, and I know some of the traders up there who got their freight, and they got it at very low figures by weight. It is customary, where freight runs at from $4 to $5 a ton, as from California to Victoria, to allow freight to go in the ordinary way, but when freight advances to the rate of $60 or $80 a ton, no merchant would think of allowing his goods to be charged at ship's option. That was the question we discussed here last year. I claimed that your contract was leading you astray ; leading you to believe that you were getting your goods at $200 a ton, when the fact of the matter is you have to pay $500 or $600. All the goods taken in by merchants are shipped by weight, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. WOOD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) must know that the practice of all shippers is to take a certain class of goods by weight and a certain class by measurement, forty cubic feet to the ton. That is the invariable practice in shipping from England to this country, or in fact from

shipping anywhere. It is always at ship's option.

Mr. EARLE. I can inform my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) that I am just as well aware as he is of what the custom in shipping is. If you ship ordinary goods from England, at low rates of freight, the ships insist on taking them in that way. But when you get up to $80 or $100 or $200 a ton, no one would be foolish enough to ship their goods by measurement; particularly bulky goods. It is simply out of the question. But the point is this. The question came up last year in regard to the advantages that were secured by letting the contract to these people at a low figure for freight, I told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) what would happen then, and so we find when the bills come to be paid that instead of paying for eighty tons, we are paying for 177 tons.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle), I suppose, will hardly say that the Canada Pacific Navigation Company, of which he is a director, would attempt to play a trick of that kind on the Government or that they have played a trick of that kind on the Government. As a matter of fact, the company which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) represents—and I think he was very much annoyed because they did not get all the freight to carry last year—did charge us upon 177 tons at the rate stipulated, when we supposed we had only eighty tons. That is a fact. I do not believe that company did anything unfair. I believe they are honourable men, notwithstanding the imputation which their director endeavours to cast upon them in this House. We paid that bill and we paid precisely the rates which every one had to pay, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) knows perfectly well that the rate which the Canada Pacific Navigation Company charges to Glenora is precisely the rate, a better rate, than his company was getting from other people. Yet, he attempts to cast the insinuation here that we were paying three times a higher rate than we ought to. With regard to the other company, I wish to say that the rate which we made, at the time we made it was the same rate as the North-west Mounted Police were paying, and the North American Transportation Company and the Alaska Commercial Company refused to carry one single pound of our freight at the rate which we succeeded in getting it carried for.

Now, I have accounted for a considerable portion of this deficiency by the fact, first, that we have taken nothing from the vote for the permanent force; secondly, that the transportation of freight from Glenora to Selkirk cost over $100,000 more than our estimate; and, thirdly, that the transportation of freight via St. Micheals cost us about $50,000 more than our estimate. We estimated that we had 300 tons, and we paid on 500 tons, though 50 tons of that belongs to the Mounted Police. I have accounted for about $100,000 of the amount paid for transportation via Teslin, and some $70,000 or $80,000 which we estimated we would receive from the permanent force vote. The only additional item is the item for buildings, which we had not estimated for, and which amounts to about $30,000. These items taken together will account for the $250,000 which we are asking for. My hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has asked me for a separate statement of the amount paid for the troops themselves and the amount paid for freight. The amount for the troops, by railway and steamboat, was about $10,000 from here to Glenora. Of course, the men walked from there to Teslin. There were 60 men who went down Lake Teslin on the steamer; the rest went on barges which they built for themselves; so that the charge from there down was very small—in the neighbourhood of $4,000 or $5,000. The total amount paid as travelling expenses for the troops was relatively very small. The great expense was in the transportation of freight to its destination.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is that?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. $127,700 for the freight via St. Michaels and up the Yukon, out of which $12,500 would have to be taken for the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the contract price?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. The amount paid to the Hudson Bay Company is $130,000 in addition. That was by an entirely different route.

Mr. FOSTER. That represented how much freight?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Five hundred tons, via St. Michaels—about 300 tons or perhaps a little more by weight—and 177 tons, which weighed between 80 and 90 tons, via Vancouver and Glenora.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 106) to incorporate the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company. —(Mr. Bertram.)

Bill (No. 150) incorporating the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada. —(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 130) respecting "The London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, (Limited)."—(Mr. Bain.)

MONTREAL ISLAND BELT LINE RAILWAY.

House resolved itself in committee on Bill (No. 112) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Lemieux.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to hear from the promoter of this Bill if any changes have been made, and as to whether the harbour commissioners are satisfied with the Bill as it is ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have been asked to move an amendment to this section. I think the amendment has been agreed to by all the parties interested. It is as follows :—

To amend the said Bill by adding after the words "city of Montreal" in line 31 of subsection (c) of section 2 the following :—"But the powers and franchises of the company cannot be exercised to build upon or over any property vested in the harbour commissioners in Montreal, so as to affect the property of the said harbour commissioners, except upon agreement with the commissioners and on terms satisfactory to them ; or, in the case of their failing to agree, upon terms to be approved by the Governor in Council."

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to obstruct the Bill or anything of that kind, but I do think this is a very important Bill and ought not to be dealt with with only one member of the Government present, and he, probably, one who has not given any special attention to this measure. There are two very important bodies interested in this Bill, one being the harbour commissioners of Montreal, in which we as a Parliament have a very strong interest, because they are a body of men who have made large improvements under aids loaned by the Government. It seems to me we ought to hear from the Government whether or not this matter is arranged or if there is not a conflict of opinion or one party overriding the other.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This matter was discussed in committee at very great length, and an amendment was adopted which the committee agreed to almost unanimously ; but it was not altogether satisfactory to the harbour commissioners of Montreal. Now, the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet) has given notice of an amendment. As I understand, that amendment will be entirely satisfactory to the harbour commissioners and to this House. It is now getting somewhat late in the session and this Bill has been up from time to time. As the committee will remember, it was referred back to the Committee on Railways and Canals the other night for the sole purpose of considering the objection of the commissioners. The members of the Harbour Commission were themselves before the committee with their solicitor, and, after very full discussion, it was passed as it is now before the House. The amendment now proposed by my hon. friend of which notice was given by the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville, I think ought to be satisfactory to the harbour commissioners and to the House. The promoters of the Bill have not accepted the amendment. The proposition that I would make is that we adopt the amendment in committee and allow the Bill to stand until Monday, when both parties will have had an opportunity of seeing whether the amendment is fully satisfactory. There is no other point of the Bill to be considered, as it is otherwise satisfactory to both parties, I believe. If hon. members will listen to the amendment, I think they will see that it reaches the objections raised by the representatives of the Harbour Board and will reasonably fulfil their wishes. If we pass the Bill and allow it to stand for third reading until Monday night, both sides will have an opportunity of seeing the full effect of it and making their wishes known.

Mr. FOSTER. As I said before, I do not wish to put any obstacles in the way of the Bill going through in the form in which the House wants it to go through. Of course, there may be some difference of opinion about it. I would like the hon. gentleman to make his proposition in a little different form if he could agree to it. I would suggest that this amendment should be moved and allowed to go on record, as it will, if it is moved. Then we shall vote the amendment and the Bill and we can let the whole thing stand in that way until Monday night. If we pass the Bill in committee now nothing would remain but the third reading. I think the discussion in committee should not be cut off.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think that should be satisfactory.

Mr. WOOD. It seems to me that the amendment may meet the objection raised by the harbour commissioners of Montreal. I agree with the Chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Sutherland) that it would be well to leave the whole thing over to Monday night, when, if there is any objections to the Bill or the amendment, the harbour commissioners can have an opportunity to represent their own case.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill was considered by committee and as that committee was asked the question if the commissioners were satisfied with the Bill. Some parties on behalf of the commissioners said they were perfectly satisfied. The Bill was reported to the House. Afterwards, it was referred back to the committee for reconsideration

with a view to amendment in the direction suggested by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) representing the Harbour Board. After exhaustive and careful debate, a clause was drawn by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), which, in the judgment of the committee, met the requirements of the Harbour Commission, and it was agreed to by all parties, or at least, the committee by a large majority passed that amendment.

Mr. WOOD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) knows that the harbour commissioners would not accept that amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. But in the judgment of the committee, there was sufficient in it to satisfy the harbour commissioners, because it was left subject to the approval of the Governor in Council to whom the harbour commissioners could make their representations.

Now, the amendment is moved exactly upon the lines on which the Bill was asked to be amended when it was in this House before. It is coming back to the same thing. If we take that course now, it will indicate that no matter how carefully we consider a Bill, and whatever report we make, it is of no use, and an amendment is proposed as soon as the Bill reaches this House after being referred back the second time. The Minister of Railways and Canals had presented us a carefully drawn clause, and the judgment of the committee was that that clause was right, and I think the Bill ought to be allowed to pass this House without that amendment.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend is a little in error in the view he has presented to the House. The harbour commissioners represented to the committee that they wanted to have the Belt Line Railway placed on the same footing with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway do not control their lines on the harbour of Montreal, they are entirely under the control of the harbour commissioners. No one can plant a post or do anything on the harbour without the consent of the commissioners. Now, the Belt Line wanted to be placed upon the same footing as these two railways so far as the harbour commissioners were concerned. The Bill, as amended, does not do that, it virtually removes the harbour commissioners, and leaves the question as to the terms upon which the Belt Line shall occupy the harbour to be negotiated between the Belt Line and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at Ottawa. That is the point the harbour commissioners objected to. The harbour commissioners of Montreal are a body corporate for a specific purpose; they are supposed to control the entire harbour in the interests of the country. Now, they claim that if in the past they have well performed the duty devolving upon them, and as the Government has made the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway responsible to them for the manner in which they use the harbour and lay their tracks, they ask now why we should transfer that power to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, in so far as the Belt Line is concerned. Now, they say, place the Belt Line, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway on an equal footing before the harbour commissioners. But they say that if they, as harbour commissioners, and the Belt Line Company cannot come to an understanding with regard to any matter that may arise in dispute, they are willing that the Privy Council of Canada should be the referee, and that they should have power to settle it. That is the amendment, and I think it is a very fair amendment. My opinion is that it would be wise for us to go slowly until such time as the matter is adjusted, for the simple reason that the harbour of Montreal does not belong to Montreal, it does not belong to the province of Quebec, it belongs to this entire Dominion. We are all interested in it, and we hope and believe that Montreal is going to become the Liverpool of Canada, the great port to which will focus the entire trade of our North-west, and accommodation must be provided there for its shipment. In that case we should go very carefully in this matter. Let us put this Bill into such a shape that we may not seriously tie up the hands of the harbour commissioners, but enable them to look as carefully and as well after the interest of that harbour as they have done in the past. I do not say for a moment that the relations between the Belt Line and harbour commissioners would not be safe in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But why should that step be taken at this juncture in the history of the harbour of Montreal? It has never been done before, why do it now? Would we not cast a certain reflection upon the harbour commissioners? If in the past they have performed their duties without any friction, without any complaint, and in such a manner as to show that they are an efficient and capable board, why should we now say that it is better in future that negotiations with regard to the use of that harbour should be conducted between the parties seeking those advantages and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, ignoring the harbour board altogether?

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in what respect the member for East Grey was mistaken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell him in what respect. In the first place my hon. friend said that we had passed the Bill and afterwards referred it back, and when it was referred back all parties had agreed to the

Bill. My hon. friend said he heard somebody agreed on behalf of the harbour commissioners.

Mr. SPROULE. No, you are entirely mistaken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood him to say so

Mr. SPROULE. I said that at the first meeting, when I asked the question if this was satisfactory to the harbour commissioners, somebody on behalf of the commissioners said they were perfectly satisfied, and that the city council was satisfied; therefore, the committee passed the Bill without any further discussion. When it reached this House it was objected to by the Mayor of Montreal, who is a member of this House, on behalf of the harbour commissioners, and it was referred back to the committee with instructions to amend it in such a direction. But after considering the amendment proposed by the harbour commissioners the committee did not see fit to pass it as they desired. Then, a new amendment was drawn by the Minister of Railways and Canals, which was accepted by the committee by a large majority. That was my statement, not that all parties were satisfied. What was the contention of the harbour commissioners? That this railway will require power to lay down tracks along the front of the river, and that the railway cannot have power to expropriate land, because the commissioners have control over it. It is contended, on the other hand, that as the Belt Line is passing over property and grounds of the Crown, and as the Crown is represented by the Governor in Council, this latter body ought to be the tribunal to apply to. The harbour commissioners are only trustees of the Crown property, and negotiations between the Belt Line and the commissioners should be subject to the consent of the Governor in Council. This was regarded as the safest amendment to put in the Bill, and it was put in. Now, we have the amendment:

> Nothing in this Act or in any previous Act of the Parliament of Canada shall be taken to confer upon the company the right to enter upon, use or occupy for the purposes of its undertaking any lands or privileges vested in the harbour commissioners of the city of Montreal in trust, without the consent of the Governor in Council.

As the Governor in Council represents the Crown who holds the property, it was thought they were the proper parties to get consent from. The contention of the Minister of Railways and Canals was that this Bill ought not to take away rights, and to satisfy the company that if it did take away rights, which he did not believe, then they should not be allowed to take away those rights unless by consent of the Governor in Council to whom the commissioners may make representations.

Mr. WOOD. Why should not the harbour commissioners have the right to appear before the Privy Council? The amendment the hon. gentleman read just now excludes the harbour commissioners altogether.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not at all.

Mr. WOOD. It does, because they are not parties to it at all. There are only two parties, one is the Belt Line Railway and the other is the Crown. The Crown are the trustees for the people, and, therefore, they should be consulted and they should have the right to appear before the Railway Committee as well as the Belt Line Railway Company. They are excluded altogether——

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. WOOD—and simply made useless. They have no voice in the direction of the matter at all so far as this Belt Line is concerned, and, therefore, when the suggestion comes it should be accepted, and the amendment allowed to stand until next Monday night, when we will be able to ascertain the views of the parties interested. We are really looking after the interest of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) may laugh, but the harbour of Montreal does not belong to Montreal alone.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It belongs to the Government.

Mr. WOOD. It belongs to the country and we are interested in seeing that nothing interferes with the usefulness of that harbour. The matter should be allowed to stand.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Chairman, nothing will be gained by discussing this question. I think the suggestion that it should be allowed to stand until Monday is the better one. Let us get on to other business.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is an old maxim which may be applied to this case: Vigilantibus non dormientibus veniunt jura, which means that rights will not come to those who sleep but to those who are vigilant. When, in 1895, this Bill came before the House and the Belt Line Railway Company got their charter, the harbour commissioners of Montreal were not represented, although the Bill had been advertised for months previously. The rights, which some hon. members seek to deprive them of this evening, they have by their charter from Parliament. When they came to this House to amend their charter, and appeared before the Railway Committee, were the harbour commissioners represented? We sat for one day, and the harbour commissioners were not represented. However, as my hon. friend from Grey (Hr. Sproule) said a moment ago, the question was brought as to whether the harbour commissioners had any objection to the Bill as it stood. Then I heard Mr. Archer, the law partner of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) answer

that the harbour commissioners of Montreal had no objection to the Bill as presented.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He had no instructions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He said that they had no objection to it as it stood. Later on, the Bill came before this House. Now I am speaking for myself, just as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) may speak for himself. I met, in No. 16, three of the harbour commissioners, Mr. McKay, Mr. Bickerdike, and another, one of the French commissioners, whose name I have forgotten just now. We spoke together about this Bill, and I was told, most positively, by the gentlemen representing the harbour commissioners, that if we inserted in the Bill a clause by which the harbour commissioners and the directors of the Belt Line Railway Company could go before the Privy Council before expropriating any portion of the lands belonging to the harbour commissioners, they would be perfectly satisfied. Now, the hon. member for Hamilton would like to postpone the passage of the Bill so as to give another chance to the harbour commissioners to be heard. I may say to this committee that the commissioners are not standing in the way, but that the Montreal Street Railway Company is in the way. The Montreal Street Railway Company is represented on the board of the commissioners, and it is the street railway company that is blocking the way of the Bill. I hope the committee will not listen—will listen, yes, but will not stay proceedings, but that it will pass this Bill as it was amended by the Railway Committee at the instance of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that careful reading of the amendment, which has been proposed by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), will lead one to the conclusion that, if the harbour commissioners are ignored in the Bill as we have it before us, they can be ignored in the Bill as proposed to be amended. It is optional for the company to accept the terms which the harbour commissioners may offer them to give them the right to enter upon their lands or ignore the offer and come direct to the Privy Council. It is not at all likely that the Governor in Council would act on the representation of the company without consulting the harbour commissioners, and, in my judgment, in view of the history of this Bill since it has been before the House and the committee, we ought to be very careful as to making further amendments to it. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, it was discussed again and again in the committee, and the amendment proposed suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was thought a reasonable one, and was accepted by the committee. After the remark made by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) that there are other influences at work to prevent the passage of this Bill and to practically destroy it, the committee should be very careful before making amendments that would have the effect of destroying this enterprise, which, it is conceded, will, if carried out, be of substantial benefit to the city of Montreal and the adjacent district.

Mr. COCHRANE. As a member of the committee, I am very much surprised that we should have this discussion here at all, after this Bill has been referred back. From my experience of that committee, I think I am safe in saying that there has not been a Bill before it, for many years, that has received more discussion than this Bill. I do not know that we are here necessarily to register the wishes of the harbour commissioners of Montreal harbour. I think we are here to bring our best judgment to bear on this Bill, and to arrive at the conclusion that seems best in the interest of the country. It was because of the fact that we are all interested in the harbour of Montreal that I consented to allow that matter to be referred to the Privy Council for settlement, thinking that was the best tribunal to finally settle the question. I did not understand the question as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) understood it. I heard that story that he told. The question was as to the difference of opinion of the solicitors representing the harbour commissioners and the Belt Line Company. When the company obtained the powers of this present Bill the harbour commissioners did not appear. The company consider that they do not obtain any powers under the present Bill than they obtained under the previous one. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals proposed an amendment so that neither party should be interfered with in the rights they had before, and that if they were not satisfied when they came to deal with the question of expropriation, the Council should settle the question. After the Bill was thrashed out at two sessions of the committee, and when the committee was almost unanimous, when the Bill was finally passed, I think the decision of the committee was proper and that it should be sustained.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that the Railway Committee is not being treated fairly in this matter. Due notice was given in the Montreal papers of this legislation, and notwithstanding the fact that we spent about two days in the Railway Committee discussing the Bill, the commissioners did not see fit to put in an appearance at all. After being guilty of such laches as this and when the matter came in the regular course of procedure before the House at a late hour, the suggestion was made that the harbour commissioners would like to have some further discussion of the matter and wished to have the Bill referred back to the committee. It was referred back to the committee and we spent another

day discussing it. We agreed upon an amendment almost unanimously. The commissioners were represented. Now it comes back to the Committee of the Whole House again and it is proposed, after the Railway Committee has spent three days giving this matter the fullest discussion, that they are to be treated in a rather cavalier and discourteous manner by having their recommendation quietly ignored.

As to the amendment which has just been mentioned, there is one feature of it which shows the preposterous contention of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners or of those acting on behalf of them. It says that these people shall not pass through the property of the harbour commissioners, and shall not do anything that in any way shall affect the property of the harbour commissioners; that is that if they make a ratile of cars near to any building of the harbour commissioners, an injunction shall lie. It is simply preposterous. We may as well dispense with the Railway Committee if the last decision of that committee is not acted upon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) is mistaken. If the amendment moved here had been moved in the committee, I believe it would have been satisfactory to all parties.

Mr. POWELL. That amendment was moved.

Mr. SPROULE. And rejected.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. POWELL. I certainly heard this amendment read two or three times before the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We have had all the lawyers in the House disagreeing as to what the effect of this Bill will be, but in my opinion there was nothing in it, even as it originally came from the committee, to interfere with the rights of the harbour commissioners. To make that perfectly clear, the Minister of Railways moved the amendment which passed the committee. The harbour commissioners now are not satisfied with that amendment. I think hon. members will agree with me that in legislation of this kind, where the parties agree between themselves and where the House is satisfied that the legislation is in the public interest, we generally adopt it. I believe having heard the discussion in the committee, and having heard from the harbour commissioners privately, that they will be satisfied with this amendment as now proposed. We might as well dispose of this legislation to-night, and it has been suggested to adopt this amendment and leave the Bill in committee stage for another night. The only difference between this Bill and any ordinary Bill passed by this House is, that the ordinary Bill leaves it to the company to deal with the property owners under the Railway Act. It is provided in this Bill, and for very good reasons probably, that if the parties could not agree between themselves or under some process of law, the Governor General in Council is made an arbiter between the two. The committee having apparently unanimously adopted that principle, I do think we should adopt this amendment now, in which the promoters of the Bill are willing to still further meet the views of the harbour commissioners. The Bill can be left in the committee stage if it is thought necessary, and the harbour commissioners can have an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the amendment, before the next sitting of the House. I really believe if we adopt this amendment it will be found satisfactory to the House, to the harbour commissioners, and to the railway company.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has the company agreed to this?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not hear the discussion in the Railway Committee, but it seems to me the difficulty is as to whether under an ordinary Bill you could expropriate as against the harbour commissioners. If the harbour commissioners had the user of that property for a number of years and a lease, the company could proceed by expropriation under the ordinary law, and it would not be necessary to get the consent of the Crown. The Minister of Railways carefully guarded against that, and provided that if the Crown had rights in the property, the company would have to get the consent of the Crown. We have given to the harbour commissioners of Montreal the user and the responsibility of the management of our property; but we are going past the harbour commissioners altogether both in the Bill and in the amendment proposed. The amendment proposed by the Minister is, that if the two parties cannot agree between themselves then the Privy Council has the right to settle the dispute. What I would like to see provided is that the consent of the harbour commissioners, to whom we have given the management of the property, should be obtained also.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) was quite correct in assuming that I had given no special attention to this Bill; but my colleague the Minister of Railways did give a great deal of attention to it, and I should not like to see the Bill pass its final stage until he had an opportunity of considering this later development. This afternoon, in common with several of my colleagues, I received a telegram from Mr. MacKay, which I wish to communicate to the House:

At a meeting of the harbour commissioners held this afternoon the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

"That in view of the report made to this board by the delegation that appeared before the Committee of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines in Ottawa to present the objections of the board to the Bill concerning the Belt Line Railway Company, so that all railway companies should be placed on the same footing, the board approve of the attitude taken by said delegation to protect the interests of the harbour of Montreal, and are of opinion that all efforts and representations should be made to Parliament to have inserted in said Bill a clause which would protect the harbour against any encroachment without the consent of this board, and that the clauses proposed before the said committee should be pressed before the House of Commons, and the board desire to have the consideration of the Bill deferred until Wednesday evening, 5th July, so that they may appear."

(Sgd.) ROBERT MacKAY,
President.

Mr. POWELL. He was present at the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume Mr. MacKay's telegram and the resolution of the board have reference to the amendment as it now stands in the Bill, and that Mr. MacKay was not aware that my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) had in view this suggestion that has been offered in the way of compromise. It may be that the amendment now proposed will meet the view of the Harbour Board. However, I think it my duty to the Harbour Board to convey this telegram to the House, and I myself would be willing that the matter should now make some progress, but remain in committee, so that we may have an opportunity, when the Minister of Railways is present, to look into it more fully. Whether that is done in committee or on the third reading is not a vital point; but I think it would be as well to let the Bill remain in committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It seems to me that this amendment is a very proper one. It only provides that property which is vested in the harbour commissioners of Montreal shall not be crossed or affected by this railway, except with their consent, and that if they do not consent, rather than block the whole railway, which, I understand, the people of Montreal want, then, the matter shall be referred to the Governor in Council for settlement. That is all there is in the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. Practically the same resolution was read in the committee, and rejected by the committee. The whole contention of Mr. McKay and Mr. Préfontaine, representing the harbour commission, was that this Bill gave greater rights than the old charter. The contention of the Minister of Railways, on the other hand, was, that it did not give greater rights; and we moved that amendment for the purpose of saying that it did give greater rights, the company should not exercise those rights unless by the approval of the Governor in Council, to whom the harbour commissioners could make their representations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. After hearing the views which have been expressed, I think it would be better to adopt the suggestion. But I wish to say on my own behalf, and I believe on behalf of the great majority of the members of the Committee on Railways and Canals, that if my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) had been present, he would not have made the remarks he has made to-night. The original charter was granted in 1894, and it was amended in 1896 and in 1898; and if he had an opportunity of seeing the various clauses, he would see that some gentlemen had a right to feel that probably some clauses in the Act did give the company powers not usually granted in railway charters. One clause which raises a doubt is the one which gives this company power to occupy lands in the city of Montreal with the consent of the city; and the point on which the lawyers differed was whether that referred to this property held by the harbour commissioners. However, the commission can hardly expect the Railway Committee or this House to carry out what they suggest in this telegram, for this reason—that this company has been granted a charter for reasons quite different to anything that exists at the present time; because it was thought to be in the interest of the city of Montreal that the company should have greater rights, and that elevated roads should be built for the purpose of conveying freight to the boats in a different way from the lines owned by the harbour commission and leased to the present railway. If Parliament sees fit to grant a charter, it cannot agree to put it on the terms of the notice given by the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Préfontaine) or those suggested in this telegram. But as I said before, when these gentlemen have an opportunity of conferring, I believe they will adopt this amendment; and I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 162) to incorporate the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hurley.)

Bill (No. 166) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia and Defence—
For pay of troops, erection of barracks, transportation of troops and supplies and necessary expenditures in the Yukon..... $250,000

Mr. FOSTER. When the House rose at six o'clock, we were talking of the freight carried into the Yukon. This is the way the matter comes to my mind, that for the current year the cost of the transport of troops amounts to about $15,000, and the freight on the supplies via St. Michael's cost $127,700, less $12,500 which would be paid by the North-west Mounted Police, being net cost to the Militia Department of $115,200. That was for 300 tons in all, of which 250 tons were for the Militia Department via St. Michael's, and about 80 tons weight which went in by Glenora, and which cost $130,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEDEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Rather more than that. That was the bill of the Hudson Bay Company. It was $40 a ton for 177 tons.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole cost of freight on the supplies both ways amounts to $250,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, about that.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the first cost of those 330 tons?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I must explain that part of this was ammunition. The supplies of food cost about $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The cost of the supplies of food—were there 330 tons of food?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That includes ammunition and everything.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the 330 tons?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot give the exact weight, but excluding the guns and ammunition, the supplies cost about $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And the ammunition?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The machine guns are worth $2,500 apiece, and the ammunition I could not tell the cost. I hardly expected to be asked this.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not so very material. The astounding thing is that for $40,000 worth of provisions, except the guns and ammunition, the total cost of which would not be very large, I suppose, you had to pay $252,000 for simple transport. It illustrates the cost of the journey, and I am inclined to think it illustrates something else. It seems almost unaccountable, and the larger part went in by water the whole way. It seems almost unaccountable that 330 tons in weight of stuff would have cost the enormous sum of $252,000 to get into the Yukon district. That is at the rate of $750 a ton. Did the hon. gentleman ask for tenders for the carrying of this by both routes?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the tenders were to Dawson on the one by the water?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Selkirk in both cases, with an option at Dawson.

Mr. FOSTER. And the hon. gentleman called for tenders?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And you had three or four tenders?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We asked four or five people to tender, and I think we only had three tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the tender price for this work?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Via the Yukon was $250 to Dawson, and $300 to Selkirk per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it specified in the tender that it was $250 or $300 per ton weight?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, what was the tender into Selkirk via the other way?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I have explained that we made an arrangement with the Hudson Bay Company to pay them a percentage of profit. They were to do the work with the assistance of our men, and we paid 20 per cent upon the gross cost to them. They were to show us all their accounts, and to deduct any plant which they had purchased, after selling it for what it brought. They were to deduct what it brought.

Mr. FOSTER. You were to give them a profit of 20 per cent on their cost?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. You have gone over all those accounts. The gross cost was $137,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have the items: Disbursements, $117,913.90, less sales, $7,450.94—making a net of $110,462.86. Commission of 20 per cent was $21,302.93, bringing the

amount up to $131,765.69, and the company still has on hand some horses and mules not sold. Probably not very much will come from that.

Mr. FOSTER. Any sales that were made were sales of what you had bought and you were simply getting your money back.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What you really paid was $117,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. $117,000 less $7,000. That made $110,000, and then there was the 20 per cent profit, or $21,000. That was for eighty tons.

Mr. FOSTER. In round figures, $1,400 a ton.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That included the men assisting our men through. You could hardly separate the freight and the men. The men, for instance, had to use horses and mules to get there, and that is all included.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Two hundred.

Mr. FOSTER. They did their share of the work?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the Hudson Bay Company had the advantage of the work of 200 men going through.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We had twelve men attached to the force, who did a certain amount of work, of course. I presume they all assisted in getting through. The men had their own baggage in addition to the freight which was being carried.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Hudson Bay Company furnish the horses for all these men?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, they furnished everything.

Mr. FOSTER. The men rode rather than walked?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Some of them.

Mr. FOSTER. How many horses were there to the men?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am told that the men did not use the horses. They marched, and the horses were used for carrying the supplies.

Mr. FOSTER. The men looked after their baggage. The baggage, of course, was cared for, as far as the carriage was concerned, by the Hudson Bay Company?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In addition to the eighty tons.

Mr. FOSTER. So, but for the assistance of these men, the Hudson's Bay Company would have required a much larger force to take in these supplies?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. To some extent, I suppose, that is true. But it would be difficult to say exactly how much they had assisted the Hudson's Bay Company.

Mr. FOSTER. This $1,400 per ton was from what place to what place?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. From Glenora to Teslin, or practically to Selkirk. From Teslin it was by water carriage.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Hudson's Bay Company's responsibility ceased at Teslin?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. About what time did these men start in?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Early in June they started from Glenora. They left Vancouver in the middle of May. The first 60 men got to Teslin before the 1st July, and to Selkirk the first week in July. The remainder reached Selkirk early in September.

Mr. FOSTER. How much did the freight cost to Glenora?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The goods were purchased, delivered at Vancouver. Then there was the freight from Vancouver by the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company at $40 a ton measurement as I have stated, roughly $7,000. This delivered the goods at Glenora. From Glenora to Telegraph Creek they were taken by boat by the Hudson's Bay Company. At Telegraph Creek the work of transporting them across the land began.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the Hudson's Bay Company took them over at Glenora?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. EARLE. Did the Hudson's Bay Company transport these goods with their own horses or contract with other packers?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as we know, with their own horses.

Mr. EARLE. As a matter of fact, they had a contract with pack trains at a very large figure. A train was packing all summer at forty cents a pound for the Government under arrangement made with the Hudson's Bay Company. While I am on my feet, I desire to point out one matter to the hon. Minister. He stated that the goods were both delivered at Vancouver. But if

he will refer to the account of H. N. Bate & Company, he will find a charge for freight. He will find the account at L—77 and 78. There are also a number of extraordinary charges. The hon. gentleman stated last year that the prices were better than those offered on the coast. But he will find, if he will compare the bills, that not only are the prices on the coast cheaper, but there are no such charges as those which run through the bill of H. N. Bate & Company. For instance, here is a charge for 1,200 tin boxes for biscuit, $300; time strengthening packages, &c., repacking, 793 hours, $118.75; material used in strapping, clutch nails, &c., $174; freight on car, $243; freight on car, $225; freight, $256; freight on car, $302; freight on car, $226; freight on car, $315. All this has been paid by the department, and it is certainly a clear contradiction of the statement made by the hon. Minister last year when these accounts were before us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did he say?

Mr. EARLE. In reply to a question by myself, the hon. gentleman said:

> With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Earle), I may say that in addition to correspondence with parties in British Columbia, we got a list of prices early in March which were being paid by the North-west Mounted Police in British Columbia for goods, and we found that the prices at which we were offered the same goods here, delivered on the coast, were better than the prices which had actually been paid up to that time by the North-west Mounted Police.

Now, on reference to the Auditor General's Report, we find the exact contrary to be the case; the goods are not cheaper, and these large amounts are charged for freight. I should like if the Minister would explain how that comes about?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as the prices are concerned——

Mr. EARLE. I would not quibble about prices; there is not enough difference for that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as the prices are concerned, it will be necessary, as the hon. gentleman knows better than I do, to know almost the exact date, the exact week, in which the prices were quoted, in order to know whether the purchases took place at practically the same moment, because there are fluctuations in the prices. But I must say that I am surprised, and this is the first time my attention has been called to it, that that charge for freight should have been made, because most of the goods were to be delivered at the coast. I am informed by my officers that so far as the goods which were to go up via Glenora and Teslin were concerned, the first lot that we bought we paid freight on them, and the others were to be delivered on the coast. I am bound to say that that was not my understanding.

Mr. EARLE. The prices are higher than the prices of similar goods supplied on the coast to the Mounted Police at various dates all through the early part of the season.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can tell the hon. gentleman one circumstance which I remember distinctly. There was some rivalry between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway about getting this business, and the Canadian Pacific Railway succeeded in getting the business from Mr. Bate. It was a matter with which we had no concern at all. We told them at once it was not a matter that concerned us, that these people were to put the freight on the coast wherever they liked, because they paid for it. I am very much surprised to see this item.

Mr. EARLE. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is not present, but he has the freight bills, paid and certified, and a memorandum of the cheques. So, as a matter of fact, the department paid the freight in addition to the prices which they claimed were prices delivered on the coast. So that Messrs. Bate & Son, in addition to getting pretty round prices for their goods, get a lump sum of over $2,000 for freight, and $800 to $900 for packing.

Mr. FOSTER. In colloquial language, this is a pretty how-do-you-do. The Minister stated last year that these gentlemen were to pay the freight. They got the order for the goods on that understanding. The railway companies came bothering the department about freight rates, and the Minister referred them to Mr. Bate, saying: That is none of our business at all; you make your terms with Mr. Bate. Mr. Bate has to pay the freight. The Minister tell us tonight that that was the understanding upon which they got this order. He told us a moment ago that is what he told the railway companies who came to ask him for it. And yet we find the extraordinary thing that Bate & Co. have been paid freight on every car of goods they took there, seeminly. Here is the freight bill: 9 cars of goods, $2,051.64. I do not know what is the custom of business men, but it seems to me that if I went to a store and ordered a lot of goods to be sent over to Victoria or anywhere else, I would not have to pay for the time that was taken up in packing these goods, that I would not have to pay for all the cases and the like of that. Here we find they have charged for the goods, and besides, as my hon. friend said, they have charged for their time in strengthening the packages, in repacking, so much an hour, and then they have gone to work and charged time for marking the goods. Then, they have charged for the material used in strap-

ping and packing goods, even the clutch nails they put in they have charged for. Then, the freight on the goods, wharfage, and so on. This is certainly an extraordinary account.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was necessary to pack these goods in a very special way, very different from ordinary packing.

Mr. FOSTER. And Bate & Son got a very special order. Recollect that Bate's bill amounts to $34,744. That is not an order that comes to a man like Mr. Bate, or a man like my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood), every hour of the day.

Mr. WOOD. The packages are always charged for.

Mr. FOSTER. When I go into my hon. friend's place of business and give him an order for $34,000 worth of goods, does he charge me his time for marking those goods? No, I should think not. Here they charge for all the little boxes in which the goods are put up.

Mr. WOOD. Small boxes are charged for.

Mr. FOSTER. Cigar-boxes and the like of that?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are not charged here.

Mr. WOOD. These packages have to be carried on men's shoulders, and they are packed with 50 to 75 pounds each. These small packages really in the aggregate cost more than large ones, therefore, they are charged for. They have got to be supplied with iron hooks and all this kind of thing.

Mr. EARLE. I would invite the Minister or any one else who knows anything about the way Government business is conducted, to step down to the office of the Controller of Mounted Police. He has just now a bill of goods to be delivered, part in Victoria and part in Vancouver, and they call for them to be put up in a certain way. They call for 2 tons of oatmeal to be put in 10-pound tins, and they state distinctly in all these cases that the price is to include the package. In this case the outside price is charged in every instance for package. I do not know the price of oats in this country, but they are charged here $48 for 2,000 pounds.

Mr. WOOD. You do not mean to say that the packages in which these 10-pound lots would be packed would be given free?

Mr. EARLE. I mean to say that they invariably call for goods to be put up in certain ways, and you have to tender for them put up in these sized packages, and you cannot charge for the packages. The bills are here.

Mr. WOOD. I am shipping goods to the Klondike, and I charge for packages.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. member is shipping a keg of nails, does he charge for the keg?

Mr. WOOD. Certainly not.

Mr. EARLE. Fancy $48 a ton for oats. I never saw any such prices paid for them in our country. Everybody knows that oats go in bags—you do not take oats and throw them around loose—and the bag goes with them. Here they make a charge of $48 a ton, and on top of that some $10 or $12 besides for package. It runs all through the bills that I have gone through. I have not gone through every item, because there are many little things that are charged for that may not be worth one-half of what is charged.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an extraordinary charge here. Mr. Bate charges for 120 working days, of 10 hours per day, for packing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For one man per day?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. You never can get me to believe, that to pack all that was included in that Bill, would take one man 120 days, working 10 hours a day, or 120 men working one day. It is simply preposterous. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Bate has had the run of the yard. There was every reason why he should have it. There was no reason why he should not have it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the reason?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason is that there were no tenders called for. The hon. Minister knows as well as anybody that he simply gave to this man, gave to the other man, and gave to the third man in his line of specialties. Mr. Bate received $34,000 of an order from this Government without practically a shadow of anything like a tender. That was all threshed out last year and there is no need of going over it again, because the hon. Minister had to defend himself for making these purchases without tender. There was hurry; there was this and that and the other, all of which, in our opinion, were but excuses for giving Mr. Bate this great order. Mr. Bate got this $34,000 order, and in addition he has charged for packages, strengthening, marking goods, strapping and clutch nails. He has charged 1,205 hours at 15 cents an hour for packing. It seems to me perfectly absurd. Then $2,000 odd dollars have been paid to him for freight when the bargain was that he was to deliver his goods freight free at Vancouver. There must be some reason why the hon. Minister and the staff of his department were so utterly regardless of the money of the country and of business methods as to allow this. There is not a man that ought to be allowed to stay in the department five minutes who had charge of this, if he knew what the contract was. knew what his Minister had said here and

allowed all these charges which were expressly against the arrangement made, as was made clear by the hon. Minister in this House. I think this committee ought to know the reason, because the hon. Minister is as much surprised as any one, but surprise does not bring the money back to the country which has been taken from it wrongfully. The idea of a man charging for 120 days' work in packing an order that was given him! It must have gone out wide and broad that the Government was fair plunder for certain men and they took advantage of it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The business of making this contract and having these goods put up properly was in the hands of the then Quartermaster General.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not care whose hands it was in.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does, but I am only telling him. He is a reputable officer of the Imperial Army, a man whose reputation for straightforwardness and ability was generally believed to be excellent. Last year I read a statement from Col. Lake to the House, as follows :—

The points to be noted with regard to the allotment of tenders for stores for the Yukon force to the successful tenderers appear to me to be as follows :—

The first order given for the preparation of the force contemplated that the force should start in ten days' time from the giving of the order. As every detail had to be worked out, from the settling of the uniform to be worn, the amount and nature of the daily ration each day, down to the actual detail of the men to compose the force, it is evident that we were very much pressed for time, and that practically it was all but impossible to advertise in the press for tenders for these supplies to be submitted in the usual way. As a matter of fact, several firms were invited and did submit tenders. For instance, Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons, the Hudson's Bay Company, Mr. J. Strachan, of Montreal, the Ogilvie Milling Company, Harris Brothers, Hamilton, Mr. J. Jamieson, of Ottawa, the Bovril Co. (Limited), and one or two others.

Mr. CLARKE. Were they all for groceries ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, not all. That of the Bovril Company was not, of course. Messrs. Bate & Sons, Mr. Strachan, and Hudson's Bay Company tendered for groceries. The Ogilvie Milling Company tendered for flour: Harris Bros., of Hamilton, for biscuit, and I do not know what Mr. Jamieson of Ottawa tendered for.

Mr. FOSTER. Biscuit.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE—

Secondly, in allowing these contracts, considerable attention had to be paid to the uncertainty of the conditions of the route and the means of transport. For instance, it was for some time uncertain whether the stores would be conveyed by sleighs, by toboggans, by pack transport, or by men. Further, we were constantly receiving additional information about the route. It was, therefore, most desirable, it may be said essential, that we should have our contractors close at hand in order that we might direct them as to the method of packing, and answer the numerous questions of detail which arose in the course of the fulfilment of the contracts. I may say that from the time that the contract was allotted to Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons to the time the goods were delivered to the railway company for transport, we were in almost daily communication with their representative, as to the manner in which the stores were to be packed and preserved for keeping, &c. In the case of the Hudson's Bay Company, to whom a considerable portion of the contract was allotted, we had personal instructions given to them by the officer commanding the force, and we were, in addition, fortified by our knowledge of the vast experience of this company in packing.

At the same time, that it may be seen that the prices paid by us to our contractors were not excessive, a list of the more important articles, and the price for each, is attached, together with a list of the prices current in the wholesale market at the present time. It may also be remarked that it was a matter of common knowledge from newspapers that a force of men would be sent to the Yukon district, and that they would, of course, require supplies ; and it may be stated that the Hudson's Bay Company submitted their tender solely on information derived from the press. It was, therefore, open to any other contractors to have adopted the same course.

It is true that the expedition did not start until May, although ordered early in March ; but it must be borne in mind that throughout the whole of the period it was impossible to say how soon the force might be required to move, and it was, therefore, necessary to be prepared with our arrangements without loss of time.

It will be remembered that there were two main supplies of stores : first, the supplies actually taken with the detachment itself for its use ; secondly, the reserve supplies for delivery by sea, and via the mouth of the Yukon River. Having arranged for the delivery of the first consignment by certain contractors, and having explained to them all the conditions attending the transaction, there was evident advantage in giving the further contracts to the same people, and avoiding a repetition of process of giving instructions. Further, these contractors were in a position to secure us, as they did secure us, against the extra expense which would otherwise have been incurred consequent upon the great rise in the wholesale prices of all provisions, which was brought about early in April by the war between the United States and Spain.

Mr. EARLE. I am not finding fault with the prices charged, if the goods were delivered as it was stated they would be delivered.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are the prices charged admitted to be reasonable ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, they are not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not ask the hon. mem-

ber for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall); he knows nothing about it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have as good a right to answer as any member in this House.

Mr. EARLE. The prices, as far as I have had time to look over them—I have not gone into them minutely—are slightly higher than you have paid on the coast for similar goods for the Mounted Police. But on top of that is this large amount charged for extras and freight. Now, what does the Minister propose to do about this? Is he going to permit it? When he tried to refute my argument last year, as to our ability to supply goods on the coast at equally low prices with the eastern people, he said he was doing better here, and that he could lay the goods down cheaper in British Columbia than he could buy them there. But now we find when the bills come in that the Minister did not state the facts. He has to pay, and has paid these heavy charges on top of the actual cost of the goods. It is extremely unfair to subject our people on the coast to such competition as that. It is simply giving the contractor here a bonus over and above the prices which he should supply them at under reasonable competition. Now, I am not speaking for myself, for I have no interest in the matter, because I could not do any business with the Government, being a member of Parliament, but our people on the coast feel that if the Government have any business or trade to give, they should at least have a fair share of it. We have men in the business there who are quite able to pack such goods without having a man standing over them. As I told the Minister last year, the idea of appointing a man like Col. Lake to superintend the packing of these goods, a man who knows nothing whatever of the manner in which goods should be packed for handling in this country, to appoint him to that position was nonsensical, when you could get men on the coast who have thirty or thirty-five years' experience in that business. Last year the Minister told us as one of the reasons why the goods should be purchased in Ottawa, that somebody should supervise the packing of them for their destination. That is, as I have said, simply nonsense. The House certainly deserves some further explanation as to what is to be done about this amount paid for freight to Messrs. Bate & Sons.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Col. Lake had great experience in matters of this kind in India in the Imperial service, and it was part of his duty as Quartermaster General to see to this matter. Besides, we have Capt. Benoit in the department, who was there during the whole of the North-west trouble, and no doubt he had a great deal of experience in forwarding supplies. So far as the item for freight is concerned, I can only say that I am surprised to see that item there. I have not the explanation at the present time, but I shall get it, and I will give the fullest explanation on the Yukon item in the main estimate.

Mr. EARLE. As far as I am concerned, I shall certainly demand that the item stand until we get the information. This matter is too serious to pass over in that way. It certainly is not an ordinary item. I look upon it as a very serious matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Most extraordinary.

Mr. EARLE. Yes, I consider it most extraordinary, and because of that the item should stand.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This vote is really required.

Mr. COCHRANE. It should not be required at all.

Mr. EARLE. This bill has been paid.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, it was paid out of the vote which was taken for the year 1897-98, but you might as well stop the whole of the militia Estimates as this one, so far as that goes. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) will not press his objection, I think I can get him a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. EARLE. I think my objection is a very reasonable one.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is a strange thing to find the Minister of Militia trying to get behind one of his officers for a defence. We have too much of that kind of thing done by the Ministers. Why do you not come out and assume the responsibility?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do.

Mr. COCHRANE. You were taking refuge behind one of your officers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said Col. Lake was in charge of this.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is not this an astounding thing? Did I understand the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Earle) to say that the Minister of Militia paid in Ottawa about the same prices, or a little higher, as he would have to pay in Victoria for similar goods?

Mr. EARLE. Yes. I have not looked exhaustively through the accounts, but I should say the prices run a little higher.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is an astounding thing, and I do not see how any Minister can attempt to justify it. Here we find them buying milk on the coast at about half what they paid for it in Nova Scotia,

although it originally came from Nova Scotia.

Mr. CLARKE. That was reindeer milk.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, but the Reindeer milk is the same price all over. At all events, it should be cheaper in Nova Scotia than British Columbia, but it appears that the Government have some friends here, that they think they are entitled to more consideration than their friends on the Pacific coast.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That explains the milk in the cocoanut.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is too serious a thing for the Minister of Marine to joke about. He was serious enough when he was in Opposition on this side of the House. He has the fact staring him in the face that he paid $8 per case for Reindeer milk in Nova Scotia, where it was condensed, and only $5.60 in British Columbia after it was taken across the continent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I deny that point blank.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not look into the matter myself, but the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) said you paid double. Anyhow you cannot deny the fact in the Auditor General's Report that you paid more for goods in Ottawa than you could get the same goods for in British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member (Mr. Earle) does not complain of the prices.

Mr. COCHRANE. He does. He says you paid a little higher for them in Ottawa than you would have had to pay for the same goods in Victoria, and in addition to that, you pay $2,000 for freight across the continent, and you pay a large sum to men for packing the goods. It is the most astounding piece of business that I ever heard of. You pay slightly more in Ottawa for the goods than they could be got for on the coast; then, you pay for packing and all other expenses, and after that you pay $2,000 or $3,000 for freight. In British Columbia, where you could get the goods at less money, and I dare say already packed, besides you would have the advantage of the freight. I do not object to the Ministers giving the advantage to their friends when other things are equal; but, as a representative of the taxpayers of Canada, I object to you giving it to your friends at such enormous cost. I say give the whole community a chance, and then, other things being equal, give the work to your friends. But, in the first place, you have deceived the electors by getting the position you occupy under false pretenses. You told us, when you were on this side of the House, that we were robbing the country with our extravagance, and that we should not do anything of this kind without tender. And now the Minister, with that bland smile of his, tells us that it was an official in whom he had every confidence who did this job. I think it is a humiliating position for a Minister to occupy to get up in this House and tell us that he has allowed his officials to run riot with the people's money, instead of having the manliness to get up and tell us that he gave this business to his friends and put a job on the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked a very proper question, when he asked the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle) if he had any complaint to make of the prices, and whether there was more paid for the goods here than on the coast. The rather startling answer came, that a little higher price was paid in Ottawa than would be paid for the same goods on the coast. But there was something in addition to that: there was the freight from here to British Columbia to be added. There was more—the packing of the goods. There was still another item—the packages. The hon. member for Victoria made it pretty clear that the trade is so well settled that when goods are ordered, they are ordered in certain sized packages, the prices including the packages in every case. There is surely some mistake about this. I cannot bring myself to believe that this transaction is so bad as it appears, but it is so bad that there is no necessity so urgent as to induce the committee to consent to the item going through until there is an explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we were taking a vote for the payment of this bill, there would be something in the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite; but this bill, be it wise or unwise, has been paid. There will be ample opportunity at a later stage for the House to review it, and I would suggest to hon. gentlemen that we might let the item pass on the understanding that it will be the subject of full discussion under the vote for the Yukon. I think that is a fair way to deal with it.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to refer to another transaction. We want to see what kind of bargains are made by the Minister of Militia. I have nothing to say about Col. Lake. He may have selected the goods, while the payments went through other officers, and the strictures have reference to them and the Minister who has them in charge, and who consented to the payments. Does the committee think it is a business-like arrangement to go to a company and ask it to take a certain amount of freight 150 miles, and to supply 200 men going at the same time—able-bodied men, soldiers every one of them, who do their share of the work right

along—so that the company will make an actual profit, above every cent of cost to them, of $21,000, with the men's services given free ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is not quite correct. The company have shown items of the account, and they have not charged anything for the men. They supplied horses, mules and men of their own.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say they charged for the men. I say that the Hudson Bay Company undertook to take these supplies from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, and they supplied what horses and what pack mules were necessary to carry it. They had whatever services were given, be they great or small, by the 200 men who went over. Whatever those services were worth, they got them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I may be wrong, but it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is making an argument which will not hold, in the light of the facts. I understand that these men did a certain amount of work; but the Hudson Bay Company only got paid their actual outlay, and the work which the men did prevented a certain outlay on the part of the company, and saved a corresponding amount to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so. The Hudson Bay Company paid actual costs and charges, and these men did whatever work they could.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Hudson Bay Company were not paid for that.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not paid, so far as actual costs and charges were concerned, but they were paid their bonus of 20 per cent, amounting to $21,293 ; and I say they earned their bonus much more easily for having the 200 able-bodied men whom they simply took over.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Suppose the men had not been there. Assuming the hon. gentleman's argument to be sound, and that it cost the Hudson Bay Company double, the country would have had to pay $41,000 commission, instead of $21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not pressing that part of the argument very strongly ; but I am saying that it was an advantage to the Hudson Bay Company to have 200 men, all able-bodied, drilled and disciplined, to help to do that work. While it kept the actual costs and charges down, it at the same time enabled them to earn their bonus much more easily and with much less trouble than if they had had to go to the expense of getting men. Now, they took the freight over 150 miles, and they did it in what time ? About the 1st of June they took the stuff in charge, and by the 1st of July they had got the first batch of 60 over. Then they took over the second batch—140 men. That would take them about the same time, or it might take them a little longer. Anyway the first batch went over in thirty days or about that, and the second batch took twice as long, or sixty days. There were ninety days of work, and for that ninety days of work the Hudson Bay Company was paid every cent of the cost and charges, and then given a bonus of $21,293. That does not look to me like good business management. It is a tremendous profit to give over and above every cent of the cost and charges. $20,000 for two or two and a half months' work. I do not think that it shows good management either that my hon. friend paid on about $50,000 worth of goods, $257,000 for transport alone from Vancouver, a part of it around by Wrangel and a part of it through from Glenora or Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake and so down by water carriage. It is a tremendous amount to pay. My hon. friend was let in. When he had competition, when he had freight carriers, and when he had the making of a contract with these men, he was not careful to make it a condition of this large order that he was to pay $250 per ton and $300 per ton, per ton weight and not ton measurement. He left that option open, so that they exercised their option, and instead of his paying for ton by weight, he paid for the tonnage at the rate of $250 and $300 per ton, according as it was Dawson or Selkirk, under measurement, which was between two and three times as much as it would have been by weight. He had offers to take this freight Dawson per weight ton and not measurement ton for $275. The offer was made to Mr. Peters by a reputable and worthy firm on the coast, who would have been glad to have got the contract, because it was a large order. But instead of that the hon. gentleman pays that much per ton measurement, which is twice as many tons as per weight measurement. All these things put together show an amount of extravagant mismanagement for which the country has to pay most roundly. The hon. Minister says this item might be allowed to go through because the bill has been paid. I suppose nearly all the bills have been paid. How much of that $250,000 which he is asking does he still owe ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably not as much as that when you come to shave it down close. Where did the hon. gentleman find the money to pay the $200,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Governor General's warrant.

Mr. FOSTER. How did he first propose to pay it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In our Estimates for the current year, we estimated $75,000 to pay the goods which went up via the Yukon, and about $50,000 to pay for those that went across via Teslin, and we expected to have had under the ordinary vote for the permanent force, a considerable amount of money which we have not used, and which remains still unused. But the Auditor General objected to our using it. He called our attention to the fact that if we wanted money, we must get it in some other way.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend had a vote for the payment of the permanent force. These 200 men belonged to the permanent force. It was not the most violent stretch that has been made in Cabinet appropriations to say that if you have a vote for the permanent force, you might use a portion of the money to pay a portion of the permanent force in the Yukon, and you tried to divert that vote. Parliament did not suppose you were going to do that when you asked for that vote for the permanent militia, and the Auditor General said: No, these appropriations mean what they say and you will not be allowed to do it. There is a certain method by which you can get money; you can get a Governor General's warrant. That is a fact well worth being kept in mind. The Auditor General found out from the Minister, who was frank enough to tell him, that he wanted to use a certain amount of money for that purpose. Being forewarned, he said: No, you cannot take it from that vote. Did other Minister's divert votes without the Auditor General knowing anything about it? There is positive truth that in the Auditor General's opinion, these votes mean what they say, and you ought not to divert them even to matters intimately connected, such as, for instance, the payment of a part of the permanent force, not employed in that capacity, but for another purpose.

What does the hon. Minister propose to do with reference to the freight charges? Does he propose to say to Mr. Bate: These must be refunded. We want an answer to that, and then we will talk about this item going through, with the privilege, of course, of discussing some points of it when we come to another vote. The Minister knows the terms of the contract. He told the House in good faith what it was. I think he cannot do less than demand that the money should be refunded.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will to-morrow morning inquire into the whole matter and see exactly what the situation is. As the hon. gentleman is good enough to say, I certainly made my statement here in good faith last year, and I have my own recollection of what took place. But I cannot make any further promise than that I shall see the letter of the contract entered into with Mr. Bate carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you have a written contract?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not sure that we have—correspondence, I suppose.

Mr. EARLE. Can we not take the statement of the hon. Minister, given on the floor, at a time when these things were fresh, as a correct statement of the contract?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will make a statement to the House at the very earliest moment on Monday or Tuesday, of everything connected with the matter. I cannot promise any more than that to-night.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Where did the hon. gentleman receive the flour in Messrs. Bate's bill, was it in the city of Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, delivered in Vancouver.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was there none of the $2,051 of freight charged paid on that flour?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman now. I have promised a full statement on Monday.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The flour is the heaviest article in the whole bill, and if we find $2,051 charged on the rest of the goods, it will be found to be a very great charge.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will get the hon. gentleman all the prices. Let it stand until Monday.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it would be hardly fair to ask the Minister of Militia to make any statement which would imply a reflection upon Messrs Bate & Sons without giving him an opportunity of seeing them. They are a respectable firm in this city, and no one would want to assume that there was any intentional overcharge on their part. I do not think he should be called upon to make an engagement to demand a refund on the ground of overcharge without asking for an explanation. There is an apparent discrepancy, it is true, between the Minister's statement and the account, and the Minister said that he would see the contractors and get an explanation. The firm is one of high standing, and I am bound to assume, until they have had an opportunity to explain the matter, that they have an explanation which will be forthcoming in due course.

Mr. FOSTER. There is evidently a misunderstanding here. The Minister understood and now understands that freight was to be paid by Messrs. Bate and Sons. I have not a word to say against the firm of

Bate and Sons. Of course everybody knows them to be a respectable firm. If they made this charge, it was contrary to what the Minister thinks was the agreement. I do not think it is unreasonable for the Minister to say: I will see Messrs. Bate & Sons, and we will talk the matter over. If the agreement is such as I thought it to be, I will ask the firm to refund that freight.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have said that already.

Mr. FOSTER. That being so, I do not think we can do other than adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Finance. But I do think this packing business, and so on should not be allowed. I wish the hon. Minister would get an explanation of that at the same time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will get that at the same time. Messrs. Bate & Sons are a firm that cannot afford to have accusations of this kind brought before them without an explanation. I am sure they will want to take the earliest opportunity of placing an explanation of these items in my hands.

Mr. EARLE. I am content to let the item go through and discuss the subject when some other item comes up. Of course, I cannot afford, as you can understand, as a representative of a Pacific coast town to allow these matters to pass without criticism. It is only a matter of fairness to our traders. It did seem extraordinary to me that Messrs. Bate & Sons should wilfully do a thing of that sort. They could not afford to do it. But the figures are there, and an explanation is naturally called for. Can the Minister give us a statement of the amount of freight that went by the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in when I stated there was 500 tons by measurement and 300 by weight.

Mr. EARLE. Was it to be delivered at Dawson? I presume it has all been delivered—250 tons at Fort Selkirk and 250 tons at Dawson, of which 50 tons are for the North-west Mounted Police. Did the Boston and Alaska Transportation Company deliver that freight?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was delivered in their vessels. But they got into difficulties going up the river and Commissioner Ogilvie really had to make arrangements to have the vessels taken charge of and the goods delivered. He paid the bills, and we paid him. So far as the Boston and Alaska Company are concerned, we have made no settlement with it, absolutely; we have not paid them a dollar nor do we intend to do so until the goods are all delivered according to contract. That is, so far as they can be delivered according to contract; for the time limit was 31st August. When that time limit expired, we gave them notice that we were not held. We propose to give them what they are fairly entitled to, after deducting every charge that can fairly be made against the company.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did you take hold of that freight?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Below Dawson.

Mr. EARLE. Can you tell how much these goods have cost you delivered at these points?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They cost $300 at Selkirk; $250 at Dawson.

Mr. EARLE. Measurement tons?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When the Minister brings the information, I would like to ask him to be kind enough to bring information with regard to the price charged for oats?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I tell the hon. gentleman that, now that my attention has been called to this matter, I will get information with regard to every item in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. The main part of the information is yet to come. We would like a short statement from the Minister as to what these troops have been doing and where they have been stationed during the current year. I do not want to go into the whole matter of policy under this vote. We will take that under the main vote. I just want to know what they have been doing during the present year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At first they were all stationed at Selkirk. That was in the last of September. Barracks were constructed there. Shortly after that and before the close of navigation Commissioner Ogilvie made a requisition for fifty men to go to Dawson and assist the Mounted Police. The detachment now at Dawson consists of two officers and seventy non-commissioned officers and men. The duty of the force there, as that of all military forces, is rather one of reserve power in case of necessity. These men, it seems, have been actively engaged in certain duties. The men at Fort Selkirk have been a reserve force ready to act in case they were required in any part of the Yukon district.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what has been the total cost of these men, taking transport, supplies and everything, for the current year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is very difficult, as my hon.

friend will see, to give an estimate, because in this very heavy expenditure for carrying freight is included the cost of provisions for about two years; so it is not fair to charge it all to the present year. But the actual expenditure for the present year has been $350,000. We expended $100,000 in the previous year.

Mr. FOSTER. Which really belongs to this year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There were two months, of course, of the pay, allowances, clothing and all that and we have on hand food for a large part of next year. Probably, fully two years' food and clothing were provided at the time the force left here in April, 1898.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you tell us exactly what is the cost per day of the force?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The pay is $95,000 per year, and the rest is about $60,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That report my hon. friend read, is that the only report in his department?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, there are other reports, but none yet published.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not you have regular reports coming from your commanding officer detailing everything that these men are doing?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, and they will appear in the next annual report of the militia. There are some very interesting reports, among them a valuable report as to the progress of the force over the route from Glenora to Teslin. I have here a map of the district made by a graduate of the Royal Military College.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the Minister to bring down to the House as soon as possible what will give the House a fair idea of the work of those soldiers during the year. It would be interesting to know how they got in there, but that will come out in the general report. I want to get at the usefulness of the force, and what they are doing from day to-day.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have a detailed report for several months. I would be glad to furnish that.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the Minister to revise the figures so as to have them accurate, with reference to the total cost of getting in there. Of course, he has got the approximate cost.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will endeavour to produce what the hon. gentleman requires.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have that a little while before the main vote comes on. With that information before us it would facilitate the vote.

Post Office—
Amount required for this service, including special allowance to railway mail clerk, A. C. James, now on special duty in the Yukon district, making his salary equal to $2,000 a year since October 1st, 1898 ..... $103,900 90

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I move to reduce that item to $28,900. The vote estimated for the Mounted Police includes this item, and it is not necessary to take it in two departments. The cost will be apportioned as a matter of book-keeping between the two departments. The Mounted Police will be paid out of the vote, and then the officers will apportion the cost between the two departments. We deduct $75,000, which is in the estimate of the Mounted Police.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend think that that $75,000 should be voted here, and should be dropped from the Mounted Police, when we come on to concurrence? There is no other way of doing it. The appropriation is made here, and if the appropriation is made here for Mounted Police, it is impossible for you to transfer it in your books. It cannot appear in the accounts. It is an appropriation for Mounted Police, and what you want is an appropriation for mail service. If $75,000 is your calculation of what the Post Office Department will require to pay for this mail service there, that $75,000 should be voted for mail service and never should have been put under Mounted Police in the first place. In doing it that way you will have a parliamentary appropriation, and you have a basis for your accounts. Is there any reason why it should not be done in that way?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no reason, except that it is not necessary to vote it twice, and at present the scheme my hon. friend suggests is an impracticable one. Nobody can tell precisely until the end of the fiscal year, until all the accounts are brought in, how much of the cost of the police service is properly chargeable to one department and how much to the other department. When we come to the item of the Mounted Police, if it is necessary to earmark it by making the very proper provision and safeguard that we should attach to these votes that a portion is to go to the mail service, it is quite easy to get over the difficulty that my hon. friend has mentioned by indicating in connection with that vote: "including the cost of mail service, and to be apportioned," or some such words as these. There is a larger vote for Mounted Police, and it includes the two services.

quite recognize the force of the hon. gentleman's observation that there should be something in connection with every vote of money indicating the service to which it belongs, but that point can be easily provided for when we come to the other item, the item of the Mounted Police, which includes this service and the other service. I will have no objection to having some words inserted which will get over my hon. friend's objection, an objection which perhaps has force in it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to that; I think it is reasonable. Of course, that item is passed, but I imagine after the statement that has been made by the hon. Postmaster General, that on concurrence it will be possible to indicate in this vote that it is to include the cost of postal service to be apportioned and charged ultimately to the Post Office Department. I quite acknowledge that it is rather difficult to apportion the cost until you get all the accounts in. I suppose you really have them pretty well in now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I asked Col. White. If I could have got the information, I would have given it.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be that it will require some time for adjustment. I think, either now or before the item for the Mounted Police is concurred in, that we should have a general statement from one of the Ministers as to the principle upon which they propose to make this apportionment. If the hon. Postmaster General will be prepared upon concurrence on the item that these words should be put in to indicate to the House, then the House knows something of what it is doing, and the Auditor General has an indication of what Parliament meant.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have asked Col. White, but he could not give me anything sufficiently definite; but if it is possible to be anything sufficiently definite before we reach that stage of the Estimates, I will see that my hon. friend has that information.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know the principle upon which the distribution shall be made in the Yukon. Will the hon. gentleman give us an explanation of that $28,000 vote?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have organized a post office at Dawson City, where there are a postmaster and about ten clerks. The postmaster is paid at the rate of $3,200 a year. He did not enter upon his duties until about three months after the beginning of the fiscal year, so that this includes about three-quarters of the year's salary as postmaster of Dawson City.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the postmaster?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Hartman.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is he?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He at one time lived in York County. When he was appointed to the position, he was, I think, residing in Guelph. He is the son of a former member of Parliament, Joseph Hartman, who before confederation represented the riding that I have now the honour to represent.

Mr. FOSTER. He was not in the service previously?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was never in this service, but he had been a postmaster. In his early life he was afflicted with pulmonary troubles, and he went to Colorado, where he became a postmaster in a mining district. He grew out of his weakness, returned to his native land and engaged in business. In seeking for a man of capacity and experience, I selected Mr. Hartman, and I am told that he is giving general satisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. When was this post office instituted?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under him?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he was appointed in September.

Mr. FOSTER. What charge had the hon. gentleman himself of postal matters in Dawson up to the time that Mr. Hartman went there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course, I am the responsible head of the department. We placed the matter in the hands of the police, and I gave Major Walsh whatever authority I could give him. His position was that of a sort of Governor. I treated him as a sort of inspector in that remote district, when he went up there in the fall of 1897, giving him general authority.

Mr. FOSTER. He could not issue postage stamps?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, but I wanted some person with authority there in charge of the Mounted Police, and I authorized him, in writing, to take charge of the mail service in Dawson City. There are ten clerks, who in salary or living allowance cost about $135 a month.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not paid equally?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is about what it costs. I think they are pretty nearly equally paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman give them salary and allowance?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have to pay about $75 a month board. The board is more than the salary. Each one gets about $60 salary and board, which comes to

$135 a month for each man. Mr. Hartman's salary for ten months is $2,934. The ten clerks have been on duty about the whole time. Their account amounts to $16,400. There are also sundry expenses that will amount to $750. Then, we have an officer stationed at Bennett, who receives the mails for distribution and forces them on their way north and easterly to Dawson and Atlin.

Mr. FOSTER. A sort of travelling postmaster.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he is stationary at Bennett. I took a Mr. James an experienced mail clerk, a very energetic and capable man from Winnipeg, and sent him to Skagway. Of course, it is hardly necessary to remind hon. gentlemen that the post office at Skagway is on territory at present in the possession of the United States. At first, we had to receive our mails at Dyea, which was the exchange office established by the United States. Subsequently Skagway was established as the exchange office instead. It is not for me to say, but it was said, that the United States postmaster there was not as keen in forwarding the mails when they arrived, and sending them to the interior of the Canadian Yukon as we could have desired. I appointed Mr. James to go to Skagway, and the American Government appointed an officer in their behalf to go to Skagway. These two officers are at Skagway now. They have been there since last year, and when the mails come in, some for Alaska and some for the Canadian Yukon, these two officers receive them from the postmaster at Skagway and send them on, Mr. James forwarding those for the Canadian Yukon.

In that way Mr. James gets possession of them, and pushes them on to their destination. They used to be packed across the White Pass, but now, I think, they go to the summit by rail, and if the line is not completed down to Bennett, of course they have to be packed there. At Bennett our officer delivers them to the couriers for Dawson and also for Atlin. He attends to the local business, and has also supervision of the forwarding. Mr. James is a mail clerk in the civil service, and it is necessary to have this special provision in the vote, or otherwise he could only be paid the statutory salary, which is $960. He was a first-class mail clerk with a good run in Manitoba, and made altogether about $1,500 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you give him now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Upon the recommendation of the controller I selected him as a man of special fitness, having a good constitution, about 35 years old. He is a level-headed man, and I told him I would have his office worth to him $2,000 above his expenses. Of course, he does not give up his railway mail clerkship, as he has the option of coming back if he wishes. He is at Skagway.

Mr. EARLE. You stated he was a very robust man, which led me to think he would have to travel up and down the Yukon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is constantly going over the mountain and he showed a great deal of endurance and courage last winter. He was with a party of five, three of whom lost their lives, and he and another only escaped. He is constantly going to Bennett to keep the service moving.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the postmaster at Bennett ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Kane.

Mr. EARLE. From North York ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was at Rat Portage, originally from North York.

Mr. EARLE. With regard to the despatch of mails from Victoria to Vancouver, do they go by the steamers that leave our coast, or do they go to Seattle as they did some time ago ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have a contract with Captain Irvine, I think it is, or the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company, to carry the mails between Vancouver and Victoria. We have a contract also with Captain Irvine, or the same company, for the carriage of the mails, between Vancouver and Skagway once a week, I think. We pay them so much a pound for lettetrs and so much for newspapers, and so on.

Mr. EARLE. You do not pay by measurement ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We pay so much a pound, as is done by the United States, and most European countries, although, hitherto, it has not been done by Canada.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How long has that contract been in force ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It began on the 1st of June or some time this spring.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there any delivery of mail except in Dawson City in that district ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I instructed the postmaster at Dawson to establish post offices at centres where there were communities.

Mr. EARLE. On the other creeks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has instructions to do that so as to save the people the necessity of coming into Dawson. I have no doubt when I get his report it will show he has striven to develop the service in that way.

Mr. EARLE. He cannot do that without money; have you provided any for him? It is a matter of great importance that the miners in these districts should have a mail service, and it should be given to them promptly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I agree with you.

Mr. EARLE. There are some 7,000 or 8,000 people in Atlin now. Has any post office been established there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, we started sending mails once a week from Bennett to Dawson, shortly after the new year, and we made a contract with Captain Irvine for a mail service between Bennett and Atlin, semi-weekly, during navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the balance of the items?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The total salary of the postmaster at Bennett is $1.750, and there is $875 in this vote for the balance of this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he get any allowance besides?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. We suppose the salary to be $1,000, and the $750 is given to him to pay his board, which we think is more satisfactory than supplying him with rations. There is $2,040. which is the proportion of the salary for Mr. James, and living expenses at $60 a month for nine months. There is an item of $1,000 for his travelling expenses, for which he will have to put in his account, and he also has to pay the packers for the transport of mail over to Bennett.

Mr. EARLE. That is exactly my idea about your officer at Dawson. He ought to be provided with a fund.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will make my hon. friend's mind easy on that point. The cost of the services from the beginning of navigation up to the 30th of June between Bennett and Dawson and between Bennett and Atlin is estimated to be somewhere in the vicinity of $2,937.50. We have a contract with Capt. Irving. I put the services up at so much per round trip and so much for the season, and the contract was awarded to Capt. Irving. The rate per round trip between Bennett and Dawson is $300, and between Bennett and Atlin $50.

Mr. EARLE. Are these weekly?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Dawson service is weekly; I think the Atlin service is semi-weekly. Then there is an intermediate point between Bennett and Dawson, where it was thought there might be some settlement. It is a little off the route, and the contract contains a provision that we may, at our option, require the contractor to provide a special service at that point for $50 per trip; but we have not had occasion to exercise that option. That is by water. There is another item, which makes up the total to $28,963.50. With reference to my hon. friend's inquiry whether there is any fund yet provided to enable the postmaster at Dawson to establish these extra services, I think that can be accomplished in this way. We do not know anything about that at the present time. The services will be more or less expensive, I am afraid. Still, they have to be established, and we have the general post office vote, which is not limited to any particular service, and which will be quite sufficient to carry us through till Parliament meets. If there is any surplus in it, we shall not have to ask Parliament for any special vote for the Yukon. In the meantime, it will place the department in funds for the Yukon service; and all that would be necessary would be to include in the supplementary Estimates next session any shortage to meet the year's services, in consequence of having unexpected expenditure in connection with the services in the Dawson district.

Mr. EARLE. I drew the hon. gentleman's attention to the matter so that it would not be overlooked, more than for anything else.

Yukon Provisional District—
Amount required to cover expenditure by the Department of the Interior. (The sums paid from this amount are to be charged to the several services for which the expenditure was made.) $150,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This appropriation is for the purpose of covering the cost of a Governor General's warrant that was issued on the 6th of February, 1899. The facts which led to the issue of the warrant are somewhat as follows. The House will understand, from discussions which have already taken place, that during the last session of Parliament we were practically without any information which would enable us to form a detailed estimate of the requirements of the Yukon district. Major Walsh only arrived in Dawson on, I think, the 20th of June, and the House adjourned about that time. I had an estimate of $50,000 for the requirements of the Department of the Interior. The Post Office Department had, I think, no special appropriation; the Public Works Department had no appropriation except $15,000 for work upon the rivers; and no appropriation was made for buildings of any kind except in the general vote for the Mounted Police. Our officials were absolutely unable to form anything like an accurate idea of the expenditure that would take place. In the case of every department the expenditure was very much under-estimated. The Militia Department underestimated their expenditure by $250,000, for which a special warrant was subsequently issued. The Mounted Police expenditure was very much under-estimated, although

that department was in a better position than any other to make an accurate estimate. In the Department of the Interior we found ourselves in very much the same position. We had practically no definite information until a short time before Major Walsh returned, and then we had already despatched Mr. Ogilvie to the district. He left, I think, on the 4th of August, taking with him a letter of credit for $10,000. When he reached Dawson, he found that the $10,000 was only a drop in the bucket compared with what was required; and Major Walsh was compelled to disburse considerable sums of money which he got from the revenues.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did the officers keep those revenues?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Up to the time the Bank of Commerce established an office in Dawson City, the officers had to keep the money in their own custody.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it kept by the Mounted Police?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. The Gold Commissioner, I believe, kept the money himself until a robbery took place, and after that I believe it was placed in charge of the Mounted Police. I am not speaking with any great degree of positiveness with regard to that. The larger portion of the money was collected at other points outside Dawson City by the officers of the Mounted Police in connection with the customs officers, and the money was under the custody of the Mounted Police. I think, at Dawson City it was kept by the collector of customs himself and the Gold Commissioner. Mr. Ogilvie went up with a letter of credit for $10,000, but he found that was quite inadequate for even immediate requirements, and he took the responsibility of securing a credit from the Bank of Commerce there, which he checked upon for immediate expenditure, and advised the department as quickly as he could.

Mr. FOSTER. He created his own credit.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The bank advanced the money, believing the Government would endorse Mr. Ogilvie's action. If the Government had refused to endorse it, the bank would, of course, have had recourse only against Mr. Ogilvie.

Mr. FOSTER. You did give him a letter of credit here?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, for $10,000, but that was not sufficient. He told the bank that he was out of money and the necessities were urgent, and the bank advanced the money, trusting that the Government would ratify what Mr. Ogilvie did. Mr. Ogilvie got up there about the middle of September. There was a space of time during which there was no mail communication, which accounted for delay in getting advice from him, but we got the advice in the latter part of January, and on the 6th February we took a Governor General's warrant for $150,000, and we did it upon the following estimate: The commissioner advised us that he had issued cheques to the amount of $39,094.67. It was thought then that Parliament would be sitting in May, and that if there was not sufficient money to carry on the service, we could then come to Parliament and ask for an emergency vote. Our estimate was based on the requirements of the service until the 31st May. We estimated for fuel and light $31,510.50; for post office requirements, $10,000; for general administration of the Department of the Interior, which embraced all the salaries and whatever other expenses there were in connection with the officers of the department, $70,000.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not include the customs officials.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, no drafts were made upon our department for them. This estimate was made upon the best information we could obtain at that time, in the belief that that amount would be required on or before the 1st May. I will now give the expenditure up to the 1st March at the head office and at Dawson, so that the committee will see what the operations of the year have been. The expenditure at Dawson, from the time Mr. Ogilvie got up there, prior to the 1st October, was $21,101.28.

In October	$14,974	04
November	17,019	35
December	19,102	31
January	10,388	33
February	13,703	66
March	16,266	54

At the head office, up to the end of March, the expenditure was $29,818.41. The hon. gentleman will see that that makes a total of $142,373.92. We have since been refunded $5,850 by the North-west Mounted Police, and $1,504.50, travelling expenses of officials, will be accounted for on their return—altogether $7,354.50. So that the expenses of the Department of the Interior at Dawson City since Mr. Ogilvie arrived there, and at the head office since the 1st July of this fiscal year, has been $135,019.42. We have the $150,000 for which we took the Governor General's warrant, and the $50,000 appropriation, which we took last year, which will furnish sufficient to meet the requirements of the Minister of the Interior. The expenditure did not turn out to be as large during the latter portion of the year as anticipated, when the Governor General's warrant was made out, so that we have sufficient to meet the requirements of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. Take one month and just give us a sample of the expenes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have a statement which perhaps I had better read, as I thought the committee would like to know, in a general way, what the expenses are like and what the money was being paid out for. The $39,094.67, which is the first item in the amounts that make up our estimate, is made up in this way. It is made up of the first three items in the monthly expenditure which are given. The committee will remember that the first item in the expenditure was $21,101.28, the next $14,974.04, and the next $17,019.35. Those being added together, and the $10,000 which Mr. Ogilvie had in the shape of a letter of credit, being subtracted as well as the $4,000 which was refunded by the Mounted Police, makes the balance $39,094.67. I have the items of three months' expenditure, and I might as well give them :

YUKON TERRITORY.

Expenditure connected with Governor General's Warrant.

Cheques drawn by Mr. Ogilvie :

September, 1898.

Salaries for August, 1898	$ 1,816 09
Salaries for September, 1898	2,683 66
Morrison & McDonald, rent of building for post office, 3 months	3,000 00

Mr. FOSTER. A thousand dollars a month for rent ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. When Mr. Ogilvie went up there, of course the question of the position of the post office had been a matter of common discussion. I need not say much about it, but the position of the post office was very bad. I told Mr. Ogilvie when he went there that in case immediate action was necessary he would have to take the responsibility of doing what was necessary to relieve the pressure. He found no possibility of dealing with the post office satisfactorily, except by renting this building, and he had to pay $1,000 a month for it.

J. W. Willison, account survey expenses	$ 500 00
A. J. Prudhomme, building rear Gold Commissioner's residence and carpenter work at office	1,037 00
W. H. Rourke, balance contract building official residence, $500 ; fixtures, $30	530 00
Lake Bennett and Klondike Nav. Co., balance of account, fares of Wm. Ogilvie and party, Bennett to Dawson	3,139 78
Wm. Maddin, account, expenses inspecting	100 00
W. H. Rourke, account, buildings constructed and under construction for for N.-W. Mounted Police at Dawson	4,000 00
W. H. Lynch, account, travelling expenses, Dawson to Ottawa	500 00
"Midnight Sun," printing	125 00
H. A. Bliss, account, travelling expenses	400 00
S. Henry, cartage	20 00
C. G. Caldwell, packing: police, $1,850 ; mining recorder, $337.50	$2,187 50
J. W. Willison, account, expenses	500 00
Thos. Fawcett, account, expenses	500 00
Louis Carbeno, bread for Commissioner's staff	5 00
J. Holme & Co., stove-pipes, &c., Government building	25 25
Graham & Connor, garbage work	32 00
	21,101 28
Letter of credit, established Aug. 2, 1898	10,000 00

(Letter of credit over-expended, Sept. 30, 1898, $11,101.28.)

October, 1898.

Salaries	$ 4,745 09
Salaries (post office)	124 00
E. McKeown, acc. travelling expenses.	400 00
J. W. Willison, acc. building Crown Timber and Land office	377 81
Anderson Bros., acc: for papering commissioner's office	63 00
T. D. Macfarlane, acc. travelling expenses, Dawson to Ottawa	400 00
G. F. Dow, caulking Government building	40 00
W. H. Rourke—	
Fitting post office with boxes, &c...	1,600 00
Fitting commissioner's and comptroller's offices and council-room	1,017 50
Pickett and Devlin, cartage on canoes.	10 00
McLennan & Co., stove, lamps, &c....	218 50
Bennett Lake and Klondike Nav. Co., freight per SS. "Flora"	13 80
August Bense—	
Log-cabin for mining recorder	700 00
Rent of log-cabin, Bonanza Creek...	25 00
Tripple Paris, partitions in Crown Timber and Land office and registrar's office	880 00
Graham & Connor, scavenger work	32 00
Homer & Co., cartage for commissioner	10 00
"Klondike Miner," printing forms, &c.	72 00
Beaver & Lory—	
Lamps, wood and oil for post office..	622 00
Wood for commissioner's building...	445 00
Rent of building, Sept. 20 to Oct. 17, 1898, at $700 per annum	644 38
Chas. Weber, sawing, splitting and piling wood	61 50
J. T. Lithgow—	
Petty disbursements	16 50
Travelling expenses, Grand Forks..	9 00
Holmes & Co., tar paper, &c	18 50
Alaska Com. Co., acc. rations, blankets, &c	564 25
Smith & Hobbs, extra work, post office, destroyed by fire	1,419 71
N. A. Trading and Transportation Co., rations, cotton, &c	378 50
Hart & Cotes, spring mattrasses	50 00
J. P. O'Connor, scavenger work	16 00
	14,974 04

(Letter of credit over-expended, Oct. 31, 1898, $26,075.32.)

November, 1898.

Salaries	$ 3,951 06
Salaries (post office)	1,074 00
W. Johnston—	
Carpenter work, Gold Commissioner	115 85
Carpenter work, C. T. and Land office	267 50
Smith & Hobbs, carpenter work, post office	932 11
D. A. Shindler, padlocks for post office	229 50

A. J. Prudhomme, carpenter, Gold Commissioner's office	$979 70
J. Ladue & Co., lumber	556 58
Pickett & Devlin, cartage of lumber	25 00
"Midnight Sun," printing	170 00
J. Ladue & Co., lumber	147 20
N. A. Trading and Transportation Co., furnishing Crown Timber and Land offices	209 75
J. E. Binet, 1 month's rent	1,000 00
Thos. Fawcett, rations	2,470 60
Beaver & Lory—	
1 month's rent, Commissioner's office	850 00
1 month's rent, post office	850 00
N. A. Trading and Transportation Co., Rations	848 15
J. O'Connor, scavenger work	16 00
R. J. Jephson, acc. survey town lots	1,500 00
D. Torrance, acc. wood contract	500 00
Alaska Com. Co., rations, outfits, &c.	174 45
McLennan & Co., furnishing	98 90
Geo. McCord, gas-pipe for stove	3 00
	$17,019 35
Letter of credit over-expended, Nov.	$43,094 67
Less—Amount refunded by N.W. Mounted Police	4,000 00
	$39,094 67

The total of these items is $53,094.67. From this we take $10,000, the amount of Mr. Ogilvie's letter of credit, and $4,000 refunded by the Mounted Police, leaving a balance of $39,094.67, which is the first item of our estimate of $150,000. Our estimate for building, fuel, &c., was $31,210.50, made up as follows :—

Estimate—Building, rent, fuel, &c.

Fuel	$15,000 00
Rent of commissioner and comptroller's officers and council-room	6,300 00
Rent of Crown Timber and Land offices and living-rooms	9,000 00
Amount due to A. J. Prudhomme, for balance of account for buildings	1,037 00
	$31,337 00
Less—Amount included in payments made from revenue which was omitted in making statement for Governor General's warrant	126 50
	$31,210 50

We have expended at the head office here on account of the Yukon government in various ways a considerable sum. Our largest expenditure is for salaries. Men from the east have been appointed whose salaries are paid to their families here through permanent orders left in the department. There are expenses of fittings and small matters of equipment, and so on, to be paid. I will give the committee these tables, showing expenditure in the Yukon territory :

Expenditure at Head Office, 1st July, 1898, to 30th Nov., 1898 (5 months.)

1898—July	$ 5,240 96*
August	3,644 74†
September	3,733 87
October	3,242 57
November	2,965 75
	$18,827 89

*Includes $2,500 to Mr. Ogilvie on acc. travelling expenses. † Includes $500 to Mr. Ogilvie on acc. travelling expenses.

Expended from 1st Dec., 1898, to 31st March, 1899.

1898—December	$2,929 17
1899—January	2,996 57
February	2,830 12
March	2,234 66
	$10,990 52
Total	$29,818 41

Expenditure at Dawson City, 1st Sept. to 31st March, 1899.

1898—September	$21,101 28
October	14,974 04
November	17,019 35
December	19,102 31
1899—January	10,388 33
February	13,703 66
March	16,266 54
Dawson City	$112,555 51
	29,818 41
	$142,373 92
Less—Refunds by other departments and refund on advances for travelling expenses	7,354 50
	$135,019 42

I have a statement here which may be of interest, in which the various classes of expenditure are taken out of the itemized statements and classified. This total expenditure, which I have said is up to the 31st of March, $135,019.42, after taking out $7,354.50, which was refunds, is classified as follows :—

Salaries	$45,555 55
Travelling expenses, outfits, &c.	21,052 93
Buildings, rent, &c. (Public Works Department)	28,710 73
Rent and salaries, &c., post office	21,069 90
Miscellaneous	1,368 60
Survey expenses (capital not yet transferred to survey vote)	7,872 50
Printing and stationery	4,514 01
Packing, provisions, express, &c.	4,880 20
	$135,019 42

That item for travelling expenses is very large, but there is no necessity, I should judge, for the item being so large in future. The passage of officials in and out has cost more than it will in future, I think. Of course, that includes the expenditure of Mr. Ogilvie's party going in, and of the Gold Commissioner and other officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I propose to the Minister of Finance that, having had this statement read, and it will go upon the "Hansard," as it is impossible to see what it is until we see it in print, we will let the item go with the idea that on concurrence we have the same privilege of discussion as in committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Perhaps it would be only fair that I should give a short statement in detail of the next item so that it may go on "Hansard."

Mr. POWELL. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that we are rather antiquated in the matter of postal accommodation, while these big expenditures are made in the west. I think it would add greatly to the convenience of the members if we had boxes in our post office here, so that after six o'clock on Sunday evening, or at other times and on holidays, when the officials are not in, the members could obtain their mail. If we happen to be late coming to the office on Saturday night we cannot get our mail until Monday morning. I do not think it would add much to the expenditure of the Post Office Department, or add much to the contingencies of the House, if the matter comes immediately under the jurisdiction of the Speaker.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I fancy that an improvement of that kind would have to be directed by a committee of the House, but I shall have pleasure in bringing it to the attention of the Premier. I agree with my hon. friend that it seems to be a very reasonable suggestion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That seems to belong to the Internal Economy Committee.

Sum required to recoup the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the amount of customs revenue, $106,976.37, and of Dominion Lands, revenue, $93,427.48, used without legal authority by the officials charged with the administration of the Government of the Yukon provisional district in carrying on the different services under their control, viz. :

North-west Mounted Police.....	$144,077 19
Public Works	15,836 90
Customs	15,565 32
Government of the Yukon provisional district	24,924 44
	$200,403 85

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The total sum of $200,403.85 was spent out of revenue, of which $106,976.37 was customs revenue, and $93,427.48 out of Dominion lands revenue. Dominion lands revenue technically includes mining fees and things of that kind. They are made up by the items that I referred to here in the resolution. The committee will remember that the other evening, when we were passing the Mounted Police estimates, I mentioned that a great deal of that item of $144,077.19 was handed over to the Mounted Police at various places, or rather was collected by them and charged to the customs. But there was that much spent by the Mounted Police out of the revenue that came into their hands directly and indirectly. I do not wish to confuse the account, but I wish to say in connection with that item of $144,077.19, which was included in the total statement which I gave the other evening, respecting the expenditure of the Mounted Police in the Yukon district, that $35,675.39 of it was expended by Major Walsh at Dawson. The items thereof are as follows :—

W. R. Rourke, work on warehouse.	$ 3,000 00
Capt. Starnes, disbursements for July, 1896	6,845 80
W. R. Rourke—	
Acc. building warehouse	6,000 00
Acc. work on barracks	10,000 00
D. G. Stewart, wood, N.W.M.P.....	1,000 00
C. G. Caldwell, packing, Dawson to McQuestin River	1,500 00
Capt. Starnes, disbursements for Aug., 1898	7,329 59
	$35,675 39

I want to make myself clear concerning this part of the $144,077.19, so as not to create any confusion. I have the special items of that expenditure made at Dawson City, and I give them to the committee. I have the special items for the expenditure which was made at Dawson City, and I thought it would be worth while to give that to the committee. It was a Mounted Police expenditure, but the expenditure was more or less of a special character, and, therefore, I have called special attention to it. The next item in the resolution is for public works, amounting to $15,836.90. It is made up as follows :

Arctic Saw-mill Co., lumber for Government buildings	$3,000 00
W. R. Rourke, acc. contract	1,500 00
A. J. Prudhomme, building addition to Gold Commissioner's house and office fixtures	4,882 00
Smith & Hobbs, tables and pigeon-holes for Gold Commissioner's office.....	304 40
Geise & Apple—	
Stove-pipes and weights for same....	20 50
Work, Gold Commissioner's house..	48 50
W. R. Rourke—	
Work on house for Government officials	2,500 00
Extras on Government building.....	725 00
Fitting-up house, &c.....	230 00
M. Watson, stove-pipes	31 50
Hart & Cotes, furniture	95 00
Louis Coste, acc. travelling expenses..	2,500 00
	$15,836 90

The next item is $15,565.32, which was paid out for the Customs Department, as shown by the resolution. The items of expenditure on account of the Customs Department are as follows :—

Dawson	$5,250 00
Tagish	3,536 94
Chilcoot Pass	3,357 73
White Pass	3,225 35
Atlin	195 30
Total	$15,565 32

This amount was retained by the collector, Mr. Davis, to meet the contingencies at his port. The Customs Department have not furnished me with the details of that expenditure of $5,000, but I have no doubt

that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will furnish the items.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Mr. Davis, the collector, retained the amount, largely to pay rent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The assistant inspector, Mr. McMartin, retained the sum of $250 to meet his living expenses. At Tagish the expenditure was $3,563.94, made up as follows :—

John Godson, collector, 9 months' salary, from August to May, at $43.71 per month	$393 39
(Mr. Godson received a salary of $700 per year at Victoria, and this amount was to make his salary up to $100 per month.)	
F. W. Davy, services from July to Nov., at the rate of $46.92 per month	$159 50
(Mr. Davy was an officer at Victoria, salary, $650, and this differential brought the salary up to $100 per month.)	
Geo. W. Dillon, services for 5 months, August to December, at the rate of $100 per month	500 00
Provisions for officers	499 45
Tent, $25 ; packing goods, $1,423	1,448 00
Conveyance of officers and effects	388 25
Stove, $20 ; boat, $95 ; sundries, $33.35	148 35

The amount of $3,357.73 for Chilkoot Pass is made up as follows, viz :—

Salary of F. Charman, June, 1898, to Jan., 1899, at the rate of $100 per month (only served 12 days in Nov.)	640 00
Salary of W. H. Carmichael, June, to Jan., at $100	800 00
Board of these officers during that time at the rate of $60 per month	700 00
Salary of F. J. Hoskins for Aug., 1898	30 00
Salary of G. A. Pringle, Sept. and Oct., 1898	60 00
Log-cabin	800 00
Papering and caulking custom-house	140 00
Furniture, $32.50 ; lumber, $38.65 ; wood, $15.09	86 24
Postage, $25 ; freighting goods, $68.24 ; hardware, $8.25	101 49

The amount of $3,225.35 at White Pass is made up as follows :—

John Godson, salary, 5 months, May to Sept., at $43.71	$218 55
J. A. McMartin, salary, 3 months at $68 per month	204 00
(This is deferential salary to $1,600, the officer's salary at New Westminster being $800.)	
Salary of F. P. Thorn, 6 months, July to Jan., at $30	180 00
Salary of P. R. Peele, 6 months, Aug. to Jan., at $81.06	445 83
(Only served part of the month of August, and the salary is differential, as he receives a salary of $650 at New Westminster.)	
Salary of David Stevens for Jan., 1899	100 00
Board of—	
Officer McMartin, Aug. and Sept	120 00
Godson, September	60 00
Peele, 5 months, Sept. to Jan	300 00
Packing goods, $145.52 ; lumber, $390 ; postage, $15.40	550 92
Custom-house, $708.50 ; stove, &c., $37.80	746 30
Travelling expenses, $60.75 ; bags for entries, $2.40	$ 63 15
Hardware, $53.10 ; tar paper, nails, &c., $122.50	175 60
Coal oil, $39.90 ; wood, $13 ; furniture, $8	60 90

The amount at Atlin is made up as follows, viz :—

Salary of Officer David Menzies for Jan., 1899	$100 00
Packing of office supplies, Log-cabin to Atlin	60 00
Board of officer and freight on supplies	36 30

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is $24,924.44 for the government of the Yukon provisional district. This is properly chargeable to the Interior Department. The items are as follows :—

Donations to hospitals—		
Rev. Father Judge		$5,000 00
Secretary general hospital		2,500 00
D. W. Davis, trustee, engine for fire protection		2,500 00
Sundry persons—		
Packing provisions and gold dust		467 25
Provisions		2,337 41
Gold-bags		292 00
Printing and stationery		678 35
Miscellaneous		454 75
Refund of royalty		459 37
Salaries		2,608 81
Travelling expenses—		
J. M. Walsh	$3,860 00	
H. H. Norwood	1,551 50	
J. D. McGregor	1,257 50	
J. W. Willison	230 00	
R. W. Cautley	125 00	
T. D. Pattullo	200 00	
J. Gibbon	2 50	
F. C. Wade	400 00	
		$7,626 50
		24,924 44
Total		$76,436 73

These are officers of the Government. That gives the total of the details, as far as I am able to furnish them.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister gave us that first item of the North-west Mounted Police, $35,000, as expended by Major Walsh, but no statement as to show how the remainder was expended.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gave the explanation of the whole of it. That was included in the $144,077.19 of which I gave an explanation, but I called attention to this special amount expended by Major Walsh in Dawson City because it was expended for special things which I thought might be of interest.

Mr. FOSTER. We might just put that wording in, but I think it would be better to put it in the general police vote that we took the other night.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps we can go back to the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is understood that on concurrence we have the same liberty as in committee on these items.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you include the revenue for mines under Dominion lands?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It apparently has always been done.

Mr. FOSTER. You are getting a large proportion of your revenue now from mines and it is very important to keep our mining statistics, as far as possible, distinct.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That might be done next year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We might have the same general heading, but divide the mining and lands branch.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very important that should be done. As to this amount of $200,403, that is revenue which never came out of the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were appropriated by various officers into whose hands they came for creditors, as stated. They never went into the Receiver General.

Mr. FOSTER. What authority had these officers for that? Was there any Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. I think I am safe in saying that no member of the Government knew it was done until after it was done.

Mr. FOSTER. It was done entirely without any authority?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We will discuss that afterwards. They have no safes in that country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have now. Everything is in perfect order now so far as the financial part of the public service is concerned. We sent up light steel boxes as safes, and the Minister of Finance sent up experienced officers to have everything in first-class order. I might explain to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), with reference to one part of the revenue which was in the hands of Major Wood at Tagish. He had about $75,000 that he did not know what in the world to do with. His men were scattered and he became alarmed, and so he took four men and started down to Victoria with the money. He had a dreadful time of it. He was followed by a party of men who tried to rob him, and one of his pack mules fell from a precipice with $30,000 or $40.000, and when he got to Skagway bandits watched him all night, and made a desperate attempt to get possession of the money and actually chased him in a small steamboat over to Skagway. This money was carried in bags and tied up with old stockings and rags and all that sort of thing, as that was the only way they had of conveying it down. A considerable portion of this vote was spent by Major Wood at Tagish for the transport of Mounted Police supplies. It is just a question whether Major Wood would carry his money down again to Victoria under the circumstances of the first time, then get it changed into other money and carry it back and spend it there. I do not minimize the importance of the absolute necessity, under all reasonable circumstances, of the law being complied with. But I desire the House to understand the very extraordinary and exceptional circumstances under which this took place. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will discuss it later at length. As to the manner in which it took place in Dawson City during most of the time there was absolutely no means of getting communication in or out.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose since the banks have been established at Dawson, the officers there deposit under the same rules as here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). What is the authority for this grant to an hospital?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was a case of urgency, and there are English authorities for saying that expenditure of this sort can be justified under certain circumstances, relying on the good sense of the House to recognize the urgency.

Mr. CLANCY. You mean the generosity of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think the English rule says the good sense of Parliament. There are two or three items in the main Estimates which I should be glad to have adopted under the same reserve with regard to further discussion. I refer especially to the item for Mounted Police, which it will be necessary to pass, as we are at the end of the financial year.

Mr. FOSTER. Any other item?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The immigration item.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot consent to that, but I have no objection to take the Mounted Police item under reserve, and I do it with particular reference to the plea that was made shortly after three o'clock this afternoon.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd July, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION BUILDINGS AND MUNICIPALITIES.

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Mills) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to indemnify every city or town in Canada, where there are Dominion public buildings, as they intend to do for the city of Ottawa, as per resolution before Parliament?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend who gave notice of this question is over-inquisitive and over-zealous. I am happy to inform him that no town or city has claimed the same privileges as are claimed by the city of Ottawa.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY—SUPERANNUATIONS.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. McDougall) asked:

1. Have any employees, guards or other officers of the Kingston Penitentiary been recommended for superannuation since the 1st January, 1899?
2. If so, what is the name, age and length of service of each such employee, guard or officer?
3. By whom were such recommendations made to the Government?
4. Who selected the officer to make the recommendations regarding superannuation?
5. Will all the recommendations as to superannuations be carried into effect by the Government, and if so, at what date?
6. If the Government do not intend to carry out all the recommendations made as to superannuations, in what cases are the exceptions to be made, and for what reasons?
7. Were the persons recommended for superannuation medically examined, and if so, by whom?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. None have been recommended for superannuation, but several have been retired with a gratuity on the ground of physical incapacity. 2. Michael Brennan, age 56 years, length of service 33 years six months. T. Conley, age 63 years, service 11 years 3 months. J. Evans, age 63 years, service 17 years 3 months. W. Hurst, age 58 years, service 21 years 5 months. I. Houghton, age 61 years, service 7 years 4 months. Edward Mooney, age 56 years, service 34 years 7 months. John Mills, age 48 years, service 23 years 6 months. James Mathewson, age 63 years, service 39 years 6 months. William Newman, age 51 years, service 10 years 6 months. A. Spence, age 45 years, service 6 years 10 months. L. Walsh, age 55 years, service 22 years 4 months. C. Woods, age 43 years, service 8 years 3 months. 3. The penitentiary surgeon. 4. He acted under instructions from the Inspector. 5. Yes, at once. 6. See answer to No. 5. 7. Yes, by the surgeon.

MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAYS ON GRENVILLE CANAL.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked:

Has the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals received a letter from Mr. G. S. Conway, of which the following is said to be a copy:—

"Hon. A. G. Blair,
"Minister of Railways and Canals,
"Ottawa.

"Sir,—I would most respectfully beg to call your attention to the fact that the farmers' roadway on the south bank of the Grenville Canal is in a dangerous and impassable condition for traffic, being too rough and too narrow for the hauling of hay or grain, and would, owing to the loose stones and boulders on the surface, break mowing or reaping machines if driven over it.

"The engineer, in widening the canal under the present contract, took away in many places all the roadway and allowed the excavations to be dumped on the bank of the canal on the only remaining ordnance lands, therefore leaving no road of any kind, completely blocking the farmers off their lands for the best part of two years, excepting the winter months, when we could cross on the ice.

"The section of roadway which I now speak of is west of lock No. 5, on the south bank of the canal, and the walling and the waste weir is completed as far as can be seen; there was, therefore, no reason why this part of the road should not have been graded down to a uniformity with the coping of the wall and the new bridge across the waste weir, and the road-bed made to a width of at least 17 feet for safety of teams and property.

"This has not been done, the engineer having allowed the contractors to get up and level off the top of the dump, without any regard to uniformity as to grade or width of roadway, the road-bed varying in height above coping from 1 to 4 feet, and width of roadway from 16 down to 12 feet, at the highest points, so that two teams could not pass without empty hay racks, as you will see by diagram in margin.

"The contractors have to all appearance abandoned the work, and when the superintendent, Mr. Simpson, was asked to put the road in shape for traffic he refused to have anything to do with it until the Government gave instructions. It cannot be possible that the Government have also abandoned the work, and left the farmers to furnish their own road on ordnance land under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals. Or is it possible that the farmers are to again this season lose the use of their lands for the want of a proper road which, for the past fifty years, has been kept in repair by the Government for the sole benefit of those farmers whose lands are crossed by this canal?

"The improvement now being made on this canal has been done in a scandalous manner from the first to the last, and has been a public nuisance to the farmers whose lands have to be reached by the canal bank.

"You are aware that we have from time to time called your attention to the loss of our roadway, and the great damages we have been subjected to in consequence.

"We have appealed by petition to the Government for justice. We have time and again called the attention of the engineers in charge of this work to the fact that our road was destroyed, and we have appealed to the superintendent, Mr. Simpson, for a road, all to no effect.

"I don't want you to understand that I am the only farmer who is deprived of a road, or who is finding fault; all the rest, with the exception of Mr. Robinson, have been compelled to sign off their claims for road and damages, before they or their teams were allowed employment in the public improvements being made on this canal. Yet these same farmers want me now to press the Government for a road, because they are afraid to speak for themselves.

"It was about time we received justice at the hands of the Government. It is a roadway we now want, so we can begin our hay harvest, the damages can come later on.

"All of which we would beg to submit for your immediate consideration, as the harvest is on us.

"I have the honour to remain,

"Yours truly,

"(Sgd.) G. S. CONWAY.

"Stonefield, June 27th, 1899."

If so, what action does the Government intend to take to render relief to the farmers said to be aggrieved?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The communication referred to has been received by me, and is now under consideration.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS AND OTTAWA POST OFFICE—ILLUMINATION OF CLOCK DIALS.

Mr. DUGAS (by Mr. McDougall) asked:

1. What is the new system adopted by the Government in connection with the illuminated clock dial on the tower of the Parliament Buildings and on that of the Ottawa city post office?
2. Who is the inventor of that system?
3. To whom was the order given for installing the new light?
4. What will be the saving of light on Parliament Buildings and on city post office, and also the cost of same?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. Before the system of lighting was changed, the lights were placed inside the dials, and now they are placed on the outside of the dials. 2. Dr. Gareau. 3. Dr. Gareau. 4. The saving on Parliament Buildings, twelve 50 c.p. lights, and on the city post office, two 16 c. p. lights. The cost of the same is $80 and $4 respectively.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO OFFICE.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to an item that appears in the Victoria "Daily Colonist," of the 22nd June last:

The Vancouver "World" says that Mr. Maxwell, M.P., will be appointed postmaster at Vancouver before the close of the present session. We greatly deprecate the filling of offices by members of the House of Commons. It is a practice that is wholly objectionable, because it is susceptible of being abused to an almost unlimited degree.

I would take this opportunity of asking the right hon. gentleman whether there is any truth in this report, whether the hon. member has been appointed, or is going to be appointed, or whether this is another case of an hon. gentleman sitting in this House with a commission in his pocket, and voting in his seat?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am happy to relieve the anxious sentiments of my hon. friend by telling him that he need have no fear that the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) has a commission in his pocket. There has been no suggestion at all of appointing my hon. friend to any office whatever. The House, I am sure, would be sorry to lose his services, and I hope that he will long continue to adorn the House by his presence.

BIRTHDAY OF SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

The PRIME MINISTER. While I am on my feet, I may be permitted to offer my congratulations to the leader of the Opposition on his eightieth birthday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Seventy-eighth.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I hope he will see many more years, and that he will long continue to occupy the position which he now so ably fills.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may perhaps be permitted briefly to express my hearty thanks to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government for the very kind manner in which he has referred to the fact that I reached my seventy-eighth birthday yesterday. I cannot afford at this time of life to allow even the smallest possible addition to my age beyond the actual figure.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions adopted in Committee of Supply.

The Department of Railways and Canals, including $2,200 for L. K Jones, $1,800 to be paid to the law clerk, and $700 each for J. H. J. Gleason and S. Loftus, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $41,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I propose to amend that item by inserting, after the word "Law Clerk," in the second line, the following words:—"Gerald E. Ruel, to be appointed first-class clerk at a maximum salary of $1,800."

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the explanations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I understand that the Auditor General is somewhat concerned lest there should be ambiguity in these items, and in order to avoid any question at all, these words have been added. It will be noticed that in the original item as proposed, the provision was for the appointment of a law clerk at a salary of $1,800. It appears now that the Civil Service Act requires that a statement should be added that he is appointed as a first-class clerk at the maximum salary in order that there may be no doubt as to his right to receive this salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the appointee ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Ruel.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he a clerk ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has just entered upon the duties of the office.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a new appointment?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is Mr. Ruel, and where is he from ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Ruel belonged to the city of St. John, and is a barrister of standing.

Mr. FOSTER. He has not been previously in the service ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Ocean and river service $39,624

Mr. FOSTER. I avail of this opportunity to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to a matter of some importance from a point of view not strictly of business. I read a very well written article in the "Century" magazine for July, in which the writer gives a description of bird life on Bird Rock, in the mouth of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The plea is on behalf of science, in part, and the statement is made that the bird life is being destroyed by wanton taking of the eggs and destruction of the birds, and that between now and, say, fifty or sixty years ago, there has been a very great decrease in the number of birds. Of course, my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) knows that the bird life there is very unique of its kind, and it seems to be a sort of breeding place for sea-birds, as the rookeries in the North Pacific Ocean are for seals. What is suggested is a close season so as to give the birds security for laying their eggs and nesting between certain periods. It is a food supply in one sense, but it is of greater interest in order to preserve the bird life of that great area in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. If the Minister would look into it, he might find it advisable to adopt some regulations to prevent the reckless taking of eggs and killing of the birds.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for calling my attention to the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not take any exception to the item, but I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) to a communication which I received from a very able and intelligent sea captain, Mr. George W. Bunkler. He is the captain of one of those large four-masted schooners plying between the United States and the port of Louisbourg, and when I was there last summer he drew my attention to the great importance of having a fog horn, or a steam trumpet, or, perhaps better, an explosive signal at or near the vicinity of Guion's Island, ten miles to the westward of the port of Louisbourg. He says that point is very subject to fogs, and that it is very dangerous for vessels approaching Louisbourg, in consequence of the rocky approach and the impossibility of ascertaining exact bearings. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will send him the communication, and ask him to give it such attention as he thinks the case merits.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should be very much obliged to the hon. gentleman.

Towards the construction of Upper Traverse permanent lighthouse, to replace lightship $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. Has that cribwork yet left Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think so. I cannot say positively. Colonel Anderson went there to be present at the sinking of it, and my deputy also went down. I am in hopes to have a telegram almost every hour.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman know that it has left Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not positively. I assume that it has. It was to have left on Saturday.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, my hon. friend will not need all of this $20,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We shall not spend it all if we do not need it.

Mr. FOSTER. Generally it is not supposed to be necessary to take a vote if you do not expect to spend it. Can my hon. friend tell me how much has been spent on the cribwork ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I cannot. Colonel Anderson said he desired to be present to have

personal supervision over the floating of this cribwork, as he considered it very important.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend would get that information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will make a note of it.

Victoria public building—Vault, fittings, furniture, post office box fronts, &c., work done $3,839 29

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to this vote. The old post office building at Victoria, so the House was informed by the hon. gentleman, is now being rented out for stores. It seems to me and to my colleague and to our constituents that it would be far better to have that building used for a mint. In the first place, I do not think it is quite the proper thing for the Government to enter into competition with owners of other buildings in the city of Victoria by renting out the Government property for stores or similar purposes. This property does not pay any municipal taxes, and the Government have to that extent an unfair advantage over the owners of adjoining stores. It seems to be the general impression of the people there that this building would have been a splendid building for a mint. As has been pointed out in this House by other gentlemen from British Columbia, a mint would be of the greatest importance there. Miners coming down from the Yukon who go to Seattle and sell their gold, would be tempted to stop at Victoria if they could have their gold melted down, and get the full price for it. It would be the means of largely increasing the trade on our Pacific coast instead of allowing it to go to American territory. I am not going to say much about the matter, because it is evident, from what has already been said in the House, that the Government are very much opposed to the establishment of a mint. At the same time, our constituents feel that it would be a far better use to make of that building than the use to which it is at present put by the Postmaster General.

ThePOSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I do not think the Post Office Department has to do with buildings of that sort. The buildings are under the control of the Department of Public Works, and I presume that upon the post office being moved from the old building to the new one, that department has put the old building to such use as seemed advisable. I do not know that we could leave Government buildings idle simply because renting them might bring them into competition with other buildings. Though I do not know what the law is on the subject, it would appear to me that when Government property is used for private purposes, it ought to be no more exempt from municipal taxes than it would be if owned by private citizens. I am aware that property vested in the Crown in Toronto and used by private citizens, is subject to taxation just as other propery. As to whether the building would be better utilized for the purposes of a mint, I would refer my hon. friend to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. PRIOR. I forgot at the moment that the Minister of Public Works had given me an answer in regard to the building, and he stated that the Government did not pay any municipal taxes on it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Crown may not pay taxes, but is not the tenant liable when he rents Crown property ?

Mr. PRIOR. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it right that the country should be allowed to keep property shut up, simply because, if rented, it might come into competition with other properties. If any one occupies the property and has stock there, he will certainly pay taxes on the stock.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, that is right.

Mr. McMULLEN. The only thing that could be exempt would be the building itself.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman is too good a business man not to see that the Government can rent cheaper than a private holder of property.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The tenant becomes liable for taxes.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—
Gas and electric light, including road and bridges—additional amount required for 1898-99..... $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Finance Minister was to bring down the contract and some information with reference to the lighting of the buildings. I have not seen it as yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My impression was that the understanding was that when the corresponding items in the main Estimates came up, that information should be furnished; and I gave instructions accordingly. I have some of the information, but not in complete form. I shall be glad to bring it at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that it does not do to bring the information just when the item is before us. I would ask him to bring it as soon as possible, so that we may be able to see it before the item comes up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will do that.

To purchase wharf at Mount Stewart, P.E.I..... ..... $3,500

Mr. FOSTER. Before this passes, I think the hon. Minister was to bring down the report of his engineer upon which this property was bought and the letters or correspondence that passed in connection with it. He showed me privately the original letters and asked if I thought it was necessary that copies should be brought down, because he did not wish to lose the original letter.

Post Office—
Amount required to increase the salary of Mr A. Bolduc, post office inspector, from $2,000 to $2,200 a year from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1899, Mr. Bolduc having completed 10 years' service as inspector $400

Mr. PRIOR. May I ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) whether he has decided in regard to the payment of an extra $200 a year to the postmaster of Victoria, and also the same to the assistant postmaster?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have submitted the question to the Department of Justice, and will be governed by their opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask what question the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has submitted?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will remember that when we were in Supply the other evening, my attention was called to the revenue of the post office at Victoria, and I then expressed the opinion in regard to inspectors and postmasters, that they were entitled to increase automatically. With regard to the inspectors, I think there can be no doubt about that point; but, on looking at the Civil Service Act, I find under the heading "Postmasters—increases in salary" there are some words at the bottom of the schedule—"as the Postmaster General may determine." I had not those words in mind when speaking generally about the two classes of officials, but rather the case of inspectors. I spoke that evening as though the Minister of Justice had advised upon the subject. The facts were that the Auditor General had, in connection with the case of the postmaster of London, intimated that to be his opinion, and it was considered as the law; but when it comes up to be determined as the law, I find there is no legal opinion of the Department of Justice, and I preferred to have one. I do not know whether the Auditor General had an opinion from the Department of Justice, but I preferred to get one on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has no doubt that he has the power to make the increase, even though it be not obligatory.

Mr. FIELDING

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that I have the power to make the increases. I think what I can do is to submit it to Council, and they would have to submit it to Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. PRIOR. Could the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) say whether the letter carriers are in the same category—whether their increase is mandatory or permissive?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It appears to me that the increase is only permissive, unless otherwise ordered. With regard to the letter carriers, certain things must take place before they are entitled to an increase, among other things a recommendation. There is nothing to compel the Ministers to recommend an increase.

Mr. PRIOR. What I mean is this: Suppose the opinion is given by the Department of Justice that it is mandatory that the postmaster and the deputy postmaster shall have an increase, does the same apply to the letter carriers?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is different phraseology. There may be discretion given in one class of officials, and not in the other. There is no doubt that, as far as statutory increases of the civil service are concerned, it is a matter to a large extent of a discretionary character.

Yukon Provisional District—
North-west Mounted Police—Required to complete the service of the year. $385,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to move to add the following to that vote:—

This vote covers certain expenditures for carriage of mails, rents, services, &c., on account of the Post Office Department, the amount of which, when ascertained, is to be charged to that department.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this an instruction to the Auditor General? How will the Auditor General manage with the vote?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One department is performing services for two departments. Instead of the Post Office Department taking a vote, at present the service is being performed by the Mounted Police; and when the year's accounts are in, the two departments will adjust the accounts and divide the disbursements.

Mr. HAGGART. I think that you will find that the Auditor General will not pass the expenditure until he finds out which department it is for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is being paid out now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what is wanted: we want to have a proper division made, and no person seems better qualified to ascertain the accuracy of that than the

Auditor General. So, when the matter is submitted to the Auditor General, it will be for the departments to show him that it is a proper division of the expenditure, that the service which was performed by one department should be charged to another.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will work out right, I think.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

Militia and Defence..... $274,290

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) to the fact that in Victoria, B.C., we are sadly in need of a rifle range. The range we have been using for a great number of years at Clover Point the owner will not allow the militia to use any longer. A new range was talked of at Oak Bay, but having been examined by the district officer commanding and other experts, they came to the conclusion that it was not a good range, and I quite agree with them. But a new range has been found, as the hon. gentleman perhaps knows, close to the present barracks of the Imperial troops, a range that I think, from my own observation, and from what I have heard from experts and military men down there, would make a magnificent range. Everybody connected with the militia and also a large number of private citizens are anxious that the purchase of a range should be put through as quickly as possible. There was a vote of $6,000 last year, but I am afraid it has lapsed, owing to the fact that no range has been bought. If the hon. gentleman does not push the matter I am afraid it will be too late for any rifle practice to take place this year. Of course the regiment stationed out there will suffer materially owing to the want of a range. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give his best consideration and immediate attention to the matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman that the matter is receiving the attention of the department. As he has correctly said, we had selected a range, but it was objected to and we had to look elsewhere. The site to which the hon. gentleman refers will probably answer the purpose, and negotiations are going on now with the Hudson Bay Company who, I think, are the owners, with a view to acquiring the land. I saw the representative of the Hudson Bay Company here the other day and spoke to him about it. He says they are not disposed to sell, but would be ready to give a lease for a long term of years. I shall press the matter on as rapidly as possible. Of course, until we can make some arrangement with the Hudson Bay Company, it will be impossible for us to prepare a range. So far as the vote is concerned, I shall see that the money is revoted.

On order 16, receiving report of Committee of Supply of June 30th,

Mr. FOSTER. The evils of leaving over discussions for concurrence are apparent on these Yukon items. The understanding was that we were to take up another item of business to-day, and consequently I left my notes at home.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is no fault of mine, if you left them at home.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not finding any fault. I am pointing out the difficulty that has occurred, and I am going to make a suggestion to overcome it. There were three items, one in Militia and Defence, one in the Interior, and one in Miscellaneous, in regard to the Yukon. I would ask the Minister of Finance if, when we get into the main Estimates, he will take an item, no matter where it is, on which we may discuss these other items, and under that condition we will pass this vote now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be no difficulty whatever in doing so on any item the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the three Ministers, the Minister of the Interior especially, to be ready with their information.

Mr. HAGGART. There is another item. I would like the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Railways and Canals to bring down all the papers on the item in the supplementaries to pay the Kingston and Montreal Forwarding Company a rebate of tolls on grain which passed through the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals in 1891 and 1892, and which was transhipped at Ogdensburg.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals and of the Minister of Customs to that item.

Post Office—
Amount required for this service, including special allowance to railway mail clerk A. C. James, now on special duty in the Yukon district, making his salary equal to $2,000 a year since 1st October, 1898 ..... $103,900 90

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to add the following words:—

Including allowance for living expenses of Mr. James.

Mr. James is a member of the civil service. That is his salary, and we pay his board, whatever it may be, and I think the Civil Service Act has an express provision against any allowance to a member of the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. "Special allowance" would take that in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But that seems to be limited to the money. That

special allowance is for the salary. We pay him $2,000 and his living allowance.

Item, as amended, concurred in.

LOAN COMPANIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 164)—from the Senate—respecting Loan Companies. He said: This is a Bill of a general character, and somewhat lengthy, and I am sure that the House will agree that it can be much better dealt with by the Committee on Banking and Commerce than that we should take it up in all its details. I, therefore, propose that it shall be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) if this is the Bill in regard to which the Attorney General of Ontario has drawn the attention of the Government to some objections?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes; at the earlier stage of the matter there was some correspondence with the Government of Ontario, but I think that the hon. Minister of Justice has satisfied the Ontario Government that this Bill is not open to their objections. At all events, that matter can be considered before the committee.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 86) to further amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This Bill is somewhat lengthy, and, in its character, somewhat technical, but it is largely a re-enactment of existing clauses. The chief clause of the Bill is that which relates to the rate of interest to be earned on the reserves of insurance companies. It was a question of considerable importance, enlisting the interest of insurance companies and financial people generally to a large extent. There was a large attendance, and a protracted debate before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and I think I am safe in saying that the Bill is reasonably satisfactory to all concerned. Having given the committee the assurance that the matter was very thoroughly considered by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and that the debatable portions of the Bill were the subject of what I may call a reasonable compromise on the part of all concerned, hon. gentlemen will, perhaps, have no difficulty in allowing the Bill to pass through its present stage without much discussion. If there are any points on which information is needed, I shall be glad to furnish it.

On section 6,

Mr. HAGGART. How does the superintendent value the assets?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I believe there never has been any case in which we have been called upon to make a special examination. We accept the statement of the company, unless there is something in that statement which leads to the supposition that it is incorrect. In all cases so far the valuations submitted by the companies have been found to be satisfactory; but if the superintendent is not satisfied, this section gives him power to make a valuation for himself.

Mr. HAGGART. The superintendent is responsible for the valuation in his report to the Minister?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, he is responsible. He would have to accept their valuation, or, if dissatisfied, he would have to make a valuation for himself.

Mr. HAGGART. The result of this legislation depends entirely on the value of the assets of the company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is true, but with the knowledge that the superintendent has that power, the valuation is likely to be very carefully made.

On section 8,

Mr. FOSTER. What extension is made in the investing powers of insurance companies, compared with what have hitherto existed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is aware that the practice has been, in the absence of any general law, for each insurance company to make a special application and obtain special powers. The result has been a lack of uniformity. Our aim has been, as far as possible, to establish uniformity in this way, and this is substantially, with a slight variation, the same legislation that we granted last session to two or three companies. We have adopted that as a standard, and propose to extend it to all. There are one or two companies who have powers beyond these, and while we do not diminish their powers, the effect of the section is to broaden the powers of other companies. The principal stocks we have included are those of trust companies, navigation companies, rolling-stock companies, bridge construction companies, harbour trust companies or commissions, fire insurance companies, and the debentures or bonds of steam railway companies. We have been restricting insurance companies to a high class of securities, and they complain that they cannot earn the rate of interest we desire them to earn, and have been constantly asking for a broadening of the field. We have broadened the field, but we still think it is within safe lines.

Mr. HAGGART. What companies does this clause not apply to ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Canada Life, which has a very old charter, the Sun Life, the British America and the Western. All of these, by their charters, have powers somewhat broader, and we have not felt it necessary to diminish their charter powers.

Mr. FOSTER. What could you add to these ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have managed to keep out a good many things, notwithstanding that this is a fairly broad list.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a tremendously broad list, it seems to me. There are securities included in this list which open up a very doubtful range.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What would my hon. friend suggest as being open to criticism ?

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest navigation companies and railway companies. The section includes the debentures or bonds of any steam railway company whatever. We have companies in this Dominion whose debentures and bonds. I am afraid, would not be considered a very safe investment. Of course, the trouble began last year when additional powers were given to one or two companies that applied for them, and the argument was used very strongly that if we were going to open these lines of investment to one company we would have to do it for all ; and the logical sequence is this clause. Then, you have rolling stock companies. What does my hon. friend mean by that ? Is it a company for the manufacture of rolling stock for railways ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The rolling stock company has, I think, a well-understood meaning. It is intended to mean a company which manufactures rolling stock for railways, and I think it is generally known as that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, there is a harbour trust company or commission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would mean the bonds of a harbour commission.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we have some harbour commissions in this country whose bonds would not be at the present time a profitable investment. Altogether, it seems to me that the range of securities is a tremendously broad one, and to that extent it diminishes the security of policy-holders. I would much rather see the range more restricted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My own mind runs in the direction of a wholesome conservatism on that question, and I do not feel like opposing my hon. friend's views. The difficulty is that among these companies there are some concerns which are good and others which are not good, and if you shut them all out, you exclude the insurance companies from a legitimate class of investment. The insurance companies, I suppose, will exercise their discretion between the good and the bad. This is a balancing of the good and the evil. We thought that to exclude all that class of security from investment would be an extreme step, and we trust the companies to exercise their powers with moderation.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says we will open a bad security, and trust to the discretion of the companies. He makes an argument for doing away with any restriction at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite see that.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government take the position that they are to a certain extent the trustees and guarantors to those who insure. A large proportion of our railway securities, I am sorry to say, in a young country like ours, with new regions constantly opening up, are utterly worthless as securities. But you place in the hands of an insurance company's management, who may be interested in some of these stocks, the power of buying them up. Why could not that power be guarded in some way to make it more safe ; providing, for instance, that the railway company should be one which pays a dividend, or which has a surplus of income over running expenses, or something of that kind ? Otherwise, you might just as well do away with the clause altogether, and leave the matter entirely in the discretion of the companies, which, I understand, is the English plan, to a very large extent. Take railway securities and harbour trust commissions—I do not like to particularize, but I could particularize two or three securities which are simply worthless. We should hope that the discretion of insurance companies would not allow them to invest in these. I should like to see the railway company clause somewhat restricted, if any practical way can be devised.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am so much impressed with the importance of having the securities first-class, our insurance investments being in the nature of a trust, that my hon. friend's suggestion has my entire sympathy, and I think we had better let this clause stand and consider it later on.

Mr. HAGGART. From the whole tenor of the Bill, I think that the Government are responsible that the securities are perfectly good, because the superintendent calculates the value of the securities and reports to the

Minister. The duty of the superintendent is to see that the securities are all right. From the tenor of the Bill, the Government accept responsibility, through its superintendent, as to the value of the security.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is substantially correct. I think it is the duty of the Government to see, from time to time, that the invested securities have the value represented in the insurance company's statements. The superintendent should examine them closely, and if he finds that they have not the value put upon them, he must so report and the value must be put down to what it really is. I entirely accept the view of my hon. friend, and I think that view will be taken by the superintendent of insurance.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend would not offer the opinion that if an insurance company invests in railway stocks, for instance, and the investment were practically worthless, the Government would be responsible to the policy-holders for the amounts of their policies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not mean responsible to any individual, but responsible, in the broad sense, to the public. Having undertaken a paternal charge of these companies, we are responsible, so far as the supervision can go, to see that their securities are of the value put upon them, and the moment we find a company publishing an official statement of assets which will not bear investigation, the superintendent makes a report, and the valuation is cut down.

Section allowed to stand.

Section 5, subsection 3,

Mr. FOSTER. Is that in the present law ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is in the charters of individual companies, but we have no general clause governing it.

Mr. FOSTER. This is taken from the charters of some companies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The deposits would have to be in some chartered banks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily. The Governments of other countries may require certain deposits, and these will have to be made as required, but not necessarily with a bank.

On subsection 6,

Mr. HAGGART. As to the investments of these companies doing business in foreign countries, if made under the terms of the Act, they would not be subject to revaluation by your superintendent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They would come in the statement of the company's finances and we should have to value them. The superintendent would have to go over that part of the statement as over the rest. I grant that our opportunities for the valuation of these securities at a distance are not very great.

Mr. HAGGART. But where you permit them to make these investments, and they proceed under the provisions of the Act, they could not be re-valued.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; if in the superintendent's opinion, any security was valued too high, he would put on it his own valuation.

Committee rose and reported progress.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 146) further to amend the Act respecting the Geological Survey.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On subsection " c " of amendment to section 4 of the Act,

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have an explanation for the necessity of this subsection " c." It seems to me it might as well read that the Minister may appoint any person he pleases.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no change made by this Bill in the law except in subsection "a." The law as it now stands provides that a man may be appointed when :

(a) He is a science graduate of either a Canadian or a foreign university or of the Mining School of London or the " Ecole des Mines " of Paris or of some other recognized science school of standing equal to that of the said universities and schools, or a graduate of the Royal Military College.

And it goes on to say :

And in each case, only after having served a probation of not less than two years in the scientific work of the department.

So that even a graduate could not be appointed until he has served two years in the scientific department. The director told me that the intention of the clause—and it had always been so acted upon—was that if a candidate had the necessary qualifications, that is, if he was a graduate of one of these schools or colleges or was otherwise eligible for appointment, he was appointed, but in a probationary way, and these appointments were confirmed at the end of two years. When the point came up, he showed me the Act. I said : I do not know what the intention was, but if that was the intention, I think the Act does not carry it out ; my impression is

that you cannot appoint anybody until he has served two years. He asked me, quite naturally: How, then, is a man to get into the service unless he be appointed? My answer was: He can be appointed at $400 a year; but he told me that the men who were required could not be had at $400 a year, and that that was not the intention; though after discussing it with him it appeared clear that it was a mistake in drafting the Act. It was not evident what intention the parties who were acting under the Act had in regard to it, so I said I would bring in an amendment. The only change is one by which such a graduate can be appointed. Then in the latter part of the clause I am now dealing with, the hon. gentleman will see that the appointment will be made permanent at the expiration of one year instead of two years. One year, I think, is quite sufficient. I quite agree with the director who said that one year was long enough to tell whether an officer was qualified to discharge the duties of the position. At the end of one year he will be prepared to say whether the appointment should be made permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt he would. I have no objection to the change in (a) and (b) clauses, so that it will not require a scienced graduate to serve a probation of five years before he is appointed; I think that is not necessary. Subsection (c) may have been in the old Act, but I am inclined to think that it vitiates the two preceding subsections.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is very vague; I have never appointed any one under it at all.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all the more reason why that might be allowed to drop out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection to striking that out. Cases have come up two or three times where I have been asked to hold certain persons to be qualified under that clause, and I have always held they were. I have found it difficult to say when a man should claim to come under it; "similar work" I have always held to be scientific work; but of course it is rather a dangerous expression. However, I have not the least objection to its being struck out.

Bill reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 168)—from the Senate—further to amend the Criminal Code of 1892.—(Sir Louis Davies.)

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have an explanation of that. It seems to me that that makes a very large hole in a door which is already sufficiently open. What would the Minister consider the classes of service as coming under this section 1?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The only officers to whom it can apply in my department are the officers in the Surveyor General's branch. It is altogether for the purpose of that branch that the Act is being introduced.

Mr. FOSTER. It applies to any branch here, and we have already had some instances where a Minister argued that a certain profession was a technical profession in order to get a man in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection to making it apply to the Surveyor General's branch; it would not answer the purpose to make it applicable to the surveyors only. Take, for instance, one particular case that we have under consideration now; I am not sure whether the man is a surveyor, he is a computer, a man with special mathematical qualifications in the astronomer's branch. We might easily come across a case where that would mean a man who is fit for that purpose and who might not be a surveyor. This man is appointed simply on account of his qualification as a mathematician.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be a case.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the particular case that has given us most of the trouble.

Mr. FOSTER. That would occur very seldom, and hon. Ministers have not found it at all difficult to overcome matters of that kind by inserting three or four magic words—"notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." I think it would be better if the hon. Minister would make it apply to the surveyors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am willing that it shall apply, but I think I cannot limit it to the surveyors.

Mr. FOSTER. Say "surveyors or astronomers."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. "Mathematicians."

Mr. FOSTER. "Mathematicians" would only indicate a common branch of knowledge.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) refers to is, no doubt, the case of a man being forced upon the Minister into the service on account of his technical qualifications when he was not required for the service. When you limit it to the Surveyor General's branch and when you say that he shall be appointed by the Minister on the certificate of the Deputy Minister and of the Surveyor General, if he is fit and possesses the qualifications, it would be practically impossible that there should be any abuse. I apprehended that this objection would be raised when I contemplated bringing the Bill in. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that if it is confined to the Surveyor General's branch, it would be out of the question for the terms of the Act to be complied with unless everything was in accordance with the spirit of the Act, that is to say, that a man was required and that he actually possessed the qualifications. I think it would be hardly conceivable that the Surveyor General would join in recommending a man who is not fit and who is not required.

Mr. FOSTER. The Surveyor General will come in under it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, as head of the branch.

Mr. FOSTER. Make your amendment in that way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved:

That the words, in the second line of section 1, "or any branch of it" be struck out, and that the words "the Surveyor General's branch of" be inserted after the word "in"; that, in the 11th line, the words "head of the branch where such assistants are required," be struck out and the words "Surveyor General" inserted in lieu thereof.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved:

That the word "any" in the first line be struck out and that the words "the Surveyor General's" be inserted in lieu thereof, and that in the third and fourth lines the words "the head of the branch where he is employed" be struck out and that the words "or the Surveyor General" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. FOSTER. Does that refer simply to those officers under sections 1 and 2, as amended?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. It says it shall not be necessary for any person so employed or continued, &c. It refers to nobody except these.

Bill reported.

Mr. FOSTER.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 148) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself in committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Hon. gentlemen will see that the Bill has been reprinted and some amendments added.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman point out the effect of these amendments as compared with the existing law?

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the law as it stands, one-fifth of the purchase price of school lands was paid down, but this amendment provides that one-tenth shall be paid down. It gives easier terms of payment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So that you may get a higher price?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the lands must be sold at public auction as heretofore. There is a provision also by which when a town lot is on school land, the town lot can be surveyed out of it, and sold by auction. That has been done as a matter of custom, but I thought we should have the authority of law for doing it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the experience of the Minister that the instalments and interest have been paid with regularity heretofore?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It depends altogether on whether the farmer has a good crop or not. If he has a good crop and some surplus money he pays, and if he has a bad crop he thinks the Government ought to wait. My impression is that the past sales are now pretty well paid up. Times have been very good in the Northwest, and I think the farmers have pretty well paid up their indebtedness on the school lands.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Could the Minister give us a statement of the amount of school lands which have been sold, the amount of money they have brought, and the quantity of these lands that remain unsold?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not got the information on hand, but I will get it for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) to-morrow.

On sections 2 and 3,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These two sections are intended for the pur-

pose of bringing the law into harmony with the practice of the department. Before I took office, the department issued patents upon the expiration of three years from the time the settler got his entry, and not from the time he perfected his entry as the law provides. I was not aware of that practice until a year ago, and I thought that if it were a uniform practice, the law should be made to conform with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is perfecting an entry ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It means, under the Act, taking up permanent residence upon the land.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This section is for the purpose of enabling the Government to deal with the half-breeds. Under the law as it stands, the granting of land in satisfaction of claims of half-breeds is circumscribed to those resident in the territories, outside the limits of Manitoba, previous to the 15th of July, 1870. This date was fixed because it was the date of the transfer from the Hudson Bay Company. The transfer did not affect in any way the half-breeds resident in the district of Athabasca and the adjoining territories. The effect of the amendment to the Act will be to enable us to give scrip to the half-breeds in the Athabasca district as it was given to the half-breeds of the province of Manitoba.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing about the Athabasca district in this clause.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, it is not specially limited to that district. It will also enable us to deal with a number of half-breeds in the North-west Territories who were not dealt with at the time of the transfer, as the Manitoba half-breeds were. After the rebellion in 1885, a commission was sent up there and gave those half-breeds their scrip, but they have always claimed, and I think with justice, that they should have been dealt with on the basis of a settlement in 1885, so that their children born up to the year 1885 should have scrip issued to them. That is the intention of the Government under this clause—to deal with those half-breeds on the same basis on which the Manitoba half-breeds were dealt with in 1870, dating the settlement 1885, and dating the Athabasca settlement 1889.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You strike out the limitation clause in the former Act and substitute this for it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. I simply sent the clause to the Department of Justice, saying this is the intention of the Government, and this is the clause just as the Department of Justice drew it.

Mr. FOSTER. What will this amount to with reference to the half-breed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have about 1,000 half-breeds in the Athabasca district, and I think about 3,000 in the North-west Territories. But there has been no enumeration made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are about 3,000, I understand, outside of those already provided for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes ; that is, in the older portions of the North-west Territories.

Mr. FOSTER. What will they get ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $240 in scrip.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows, I suppose, where the scrip goes. He issues it to the half-breeds, and it is bought from them for a song by brokers, and such like. These men get full value, but the half-breeds get only half value or one-fourth value. Does my hon. friend intend to give the broker another harvest ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the system is entirely vicious in the way in which it is practically carried out. I do not suppose that it has been ameliorated. A few years ago I had occasion to look into it, and it turned out in this way. The Dominion, in its generosity, provided a certain amount of scrip for the half-breeds, worth so many dollars ; but the half-breeds, who were very improvident, away from banks, and the like of that, parted with it at a very small figure. These brokers got the advantage of the Government's generosity, but the half-breeds got almost nothing. It is inevitable that something like that will occur if the hon. gentleman gives them scrip. What he ought to do is to guard that in some way, by either giving them land or a cash payment. This scrip is not redeemed in cash, but goes in payment for land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr, FOSTER. That is the same as cash to the white settler who wants to buy lands. If the object is to get these half-breeds to settle on lands, why does not the Minister give them the lands ; or, if the object is to get into the hands of the half-breeds an equivalent value, why not pay them in cash, under certain regulations which would ensure as far as possible the half-breed getting the value which the Government pay ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have the option of taking land. As a matter of fact, however, I suppose these half-breeds all have land. The question which the hon. gentleman has referred to

is no doubt an important question. I have to some extent improved on the old method by changing the form of the certificate. Formerly the certificate seemed to have been drawn up by the brokers themselves. I do not suppose the brokers performed that work for the Department of the Interior; but anybody who looks at the old form of certificate will come to the conclusion that no better form could have been devised for the purpose of facilitating speculation in scrip. It was made out to John Smith or bearer, and no endorsement was required. If a man went to the half-breeds and got the certificates from them and presented them to the department, he was entitled to the scrip. The form has been changed, so that an assignment is required, which will have to be filed and duly certified and passed upon by the department. I do not know whether the difficulty to which the hon. gentleman refers can be effectively dealt with or not. I have already given the matter some consideration. I discussed it to some extent with Father Lacombe, when he was here. He takes strong ground on it; but he recognizes, as everybody else does, that it takes two to make a bargain, and that when we are giving the half-breed something to satisfy a sort of political claim which he has against the Government, for the extinction of the aboriginal rights to the land, for that is what it is, we must give him what he will accept. There is no use of talking about compelling the half-breeds to accept land. They contend that the Government should treat them in the same way as it treated the other half-breeds, and give them scrip. But if there is any plan by which the scrip can be secured to them, that will be very desirable, and I intend to give the subject some further consideration before any action is actually taken in connection with the issuing of scrip. Scrip will not be issued for some little time yet. At present the commissioners are simply going out there for the purpose of enumerating the half-breeds and returning a list to the department showing who are entitled to the scrip. I cannot say that I have arrived at any plan by which, with the consent of the half-breeds, we will be able to make an arrangement to prevent their improperly disposing of the scrip.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says there are about 3,000 of those half-breeds who have to be reckoned with; $240 each is, I understand, the amount of the scrip, or nearly three-quarters of a million dollars of money. That means, if you carry out your plan, that you may be giving some persons other than half-breeds more than nine-tenths of that amount. The issue of this scrip is not going to benefit the half-breeds, unless they are very much changed from those who received the scrip before, and the result would be that this country will have expended $720,000, and will have that much less to receive for the lands which it will sell to others, and will not have benefited the half-breeds to any considerable degree. Either by trustees in whom they have confidence, or by commutation for many payments, payments lasting over many years, this money might be expended. I should be very sorry to see this legislation pass and power given to distribute $720,000, unless under some scheme by which the money would really benefit the half-breeds themselves. If it were put into a fund, or invested and accounted for in some way, and extended for the education of their children, or in payment of lands when they require them, or in a dozen different ways which it might be worth while to consider, something might really be done which would benefit these people. A fund invested will ultimately give those people quite a large amount of money. But if it is paid out in the old form of scrip, to which I was opposed the whole time that system was carried on, it will be found that that scrip will be of very little benefit, as far as the half-breeds are concerned.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend well worthy of consideration. Unless Father Lacombe has greatly changed his mind, he has a strong conviction that land should be given to the half-breeds. I know that when I conversed with him some years ago, and the late Archbishop Taché, both had the strongest possible objection to the giving of scrip.

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

After Recess.

MONTREAL ISLAND BELT LINE RAILWAY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 112) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MONET. The other day I gave notice of an amendment to this clause which I understand is practically admitted on both sides. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), who represents the company, tells me that he accepts our amendment. The amendment is as follows:—

To add after the word "Montreal" in the 31st line in subsection 1 the following words:—"But the powers and franchises of the company cannot be exercised by it over or upon any property vested in the harbour commissioners of Montreal, or so as to affect the same, except upon notarial agreement with the commissioners and upon terms satisfactory to them, or, in case of their failing to agree, approved by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. POWELL. This section provides for a division of the line into sections for the purpose of raising a revenue. Would it not be better to make an independent section of the amendment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it would be better to substitute it for clause 8, which was an amendment carried by the committee much to the same effect. If you will just change that and substitute it for clause 8.

Mr. MONET. I have no objection. Of course, this will necessitate the withdrawal of the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals in committee.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, by Mr. Cargill.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 165) to incorporate the Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 148) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Sifton.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Chairman, in reference to this clause there is a great deal in what has been said this afternoon in regard to the issue of scrip to the half-breeds. When the abolition of the territorial rights of the half-breeds through their Indian title was first provided for by this Parliament, a certain amount of land, 1,400,000 acres, was set apart in Manitoba and allotted to the half-breed children who were born before the 15th of July, 1870. When the first census was taken, it was found that each child was entitled to 240 acres of land, so that the territory that was first set apart by the commission that was appointed at the time, was subdivided into as many lots of 240 acres as there were children entitled to the same. Under the clause enacted in this Bill the children in the Territories are allotted scrip of $240 as the price of their land in the Territories, but as the price of land in the Territories is, I believe, $2.50 or $3 an acre, it will be seen that the children of the half-breeds in the North-west Territories will not get as large a grant with their scrip of $240 as the children in Manitoba received since 1870. On the other hand, I believe that this system of issuing scrip, representing so many dollars, is more apt to lead to speculation, because these half-breeds, not knowing what to do with their scrip, representing, it is true, certain value, will dispose of it to speculators, while if the system that was adopted in Manitoba in the first place was adopted in this instance, instead of receiving scrip which at the face value would be worth $240, they would receive 240 acres of land, the amount which has been allotted to the half-breeds in Manitoba. These lands could be selected in the same way as they were in our province. Instead of receiving this money, as I have said, they would receive land, which could be selected in the best part of the territory to which they belong, and this land, of course, would not be bought up by banking institutions and speculators in that kind of business. They would not want to buy land, while if scrip is granted, the half-breeds could dispose of it to any one who has money to pay the Government. This scrip will be bought by the agents of speculators; it will be brought to Winnipeg, or some of the centres in the east, and then it will be applied to land bought in Manitoba upon which there are still payments due, and it will be applied in the same way, while if their land were allotted to these half-breeds in lots of 240 each, that land would remain for these half-breeds and for the children who are not yet of age, so that they might settle upon it when they become of age. It is true that in our province most of the half-breeds who had land allotted to them disposed of it. But there are still in Manitoba half-breeds who have received their lands from the Government, who are still holding them. These lands were not taxable until the half-breeds were of age, and, therefore, they were kept intact, so that they might settle upon them when they became of age. If a tract of land in the North-west Territories, large enough to meet the requirements of the case, were set apart and allotted to the half-breeds, there would be less speculation, and the half-breeds would benefit by the adoption of this system. If this were not done, I think it would be better if the Government gave the half-breeds themselves a certain sum of money, instead of giving them scrip payable to bearer, by which the Government could obtain a quit-claim deed from them as to their title to these lands in the North-west Territories. The half-breeds would have a certain sum of money coming direct to them from the Government, and they would get the benefit of it, while in this case they will dispose of their scrip to the best advantage they can, but they will be in the hands of speculators, who will fix the price of it, and they will be, of necessity, obliged to accept whatever price is offered, and will, therefore, not get anything near $240, which is supposed to be the amount that this scrip is worth. If the Government would allow them a fixed sum of money, which they would pay directly to the half-breeds, there would be no speculation in the scrip, and the half-breeds would get a good

deal more than they will under the present system. Of course, my remarks apply to what has been done in the past as well as to what will be done in the future. The hon. Minister is not making a new departure in this case, because he is just doing what has been done in the past, but when we find out that we have made mistakes in the past, it is the best of times to remedy these mistakes. Under the circumstances, I would ask the hon. Minister to look more carefully into this matter and devise some means whereby the half-breeds will get the greatest amount of benefit that it is possible for them to have.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Chairman, this is a question which requires some consideration, but which, in my judgment, does not admit of any more delay. All the trouble that we have had in Manitoba and the North-west Territories in regard to this question of the extinguishment of Indian title, so far as the half-breeds are concerned, has arisen from the objections which were made from time to time to the manner in which the half-breed title has been extinguished in Manitoba, and from the delay which rose in consequence of the adoption of this system. In 1869, when the Hudson Bay Territories became part of Canada, the half-breeds' title in the province of Manitoba was extinguished, as we know, not as the Indians' title was extinguished, but by a grant of land made to the half-breeds and to the children born before 15th July, 1869.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The 15th July, 1870.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it was in 1869. There is no question that this manner of extinguishing the Indian title possessed by the half-breeds was of very little benefit to the half-breeds. It is on record that they squandered the scrip that was issued to them, and that the speculators derived much greater benefit and advantage from the bounty of Parliament than did the half-breeds themselves. It is also on record that when the question arose how the Indian title, in so far as the half-breeds was concerned, in the North-west Territories was to be extinguished, objections, and very serious objections, were made to the re-adoption of the plan which has been carried out in Manitoba. It was objected to by Bishop Taché, amongst others, and by most of the missionaries, that the bounty of Parliament had been abused, that the half-breeds, who in many respects are children, had become the prey of speculators who had obtained their scrip for a bagatelle, and that the result was not only no benefit to the half-breeds but an actual detriment to them. Several plans were proposed to deal with the question in a different manner. We have only to look at the papers brought down in 1885, at the time of the Riel rebellion, to see that Archbishop Taché had one plan, the Bishop of Rupert's Land had another plan, Commissioner Dennis had a plan of his own—and there were so many plans to choose from that nothing was done. Years and years elapsed, and the rebellion broke out before anything was done. When the rebellion broke out, commissioners were sent at once to deal with the question and settle it, to interview the half-breeds, to meet them wherever they were to be found and to issue them scrip in the same manner as had been done in the province of Manitoba. And, I am sorry to say, that this was no greater source of profit to the half-breeds than the plan had been to their brothers in Manitoba in 1869.

Now, in 1899, we have a certain number of half-breeds whose claims have not been recognized and whose claims must be recognized. There is a latent discontent amongst these half-breeds of the North-west Territories who have not been settled with, a belief that faith has not been kept with them. Everybody will admit that it is not a healthy condition that we should have this latent discontent going on from year to year as it has been going on. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) has undertaken to deal with the matter and settle it. He proposes to settle it according to the old plan with some modifications. Now, I understand my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), and my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), and also my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) point out the objections to dealing with the half-breeds in the same manner as formerly. But while these gentlemen point out that the mode in which we have dealt with the half-breeds' claims up to this time has not been satisfactory, so far as I have listened to them, not one of them is prepared to suggest any substitute for the plan that is proposed. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) tells us that he has given a good deal of attention to this question and has consulted with the best men whose advice could be had. He has consulted with Father Lacombe, who, upon a question of this kind is an authority. For my part, I have talked this matter over several times with my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and while I would advise, that the settlement made in 1869 in Manitoba and in 1885 in the North-west Territories was far from being wholly satisfactory, still, I would impress upon him the necessity of dealing at once with this question, and if nothing better can be done to settle on the old plan rather than leave the question open. After all, it is better that the half-breeds should be paid even if they squander, as their brothers have done, the bounty of Parliament, rather than that this open sore should be kept running and this discontent kept for ever alive amongst this class of our population. They will at least be paid a certain number of acres of land. Land is not such a scarce article, it is not such a valuable commodity in the North-west Ter-

ritories that we cannot afford to be generous with the half-breed, the first occupant of the soil. Even if they squander the land given them, better have it thus than have these people living under the belief and constantly making the assertion that the faith of the Crown has not been kept with them. Any man who has been in the North-west Territories and met this class of people knows that they pretend to be the first occupants of the soil, and to have a direct right in it, so that they should not be dispossessed without compensation. My hon. friend from Provencher knows that better than I do. If anything better can be suggested than what has been done heretofore, I would strongly urge my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to consider it with a view to adopting it. But if nothing better is suggested, let us revert to the old form of settlement, imperfect as it is, but let this question be settled once for all with the half-breed, and let him feel that he has been given a compensation to which he is entitled, let him be satisfied with his allegiance, and let him believe in his heart that the Crown has dealt fairly and equitably with him. That is the purpose of the Bill, that is the intention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior in dealing with this matter; and I am sure it must commend itself to the judgment of every hon. member of this House. I heartily wish that something could be done better than has been done, and I hope that the Minister will be able to find something better; but if he can do no more than has been done in the past, let him settle this question and settle it once for all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There does not seem to be any division of opinion in the committee as to the desirability of dealing with this question in some way. I confess, however, that I have not heard a statement of the ground on which this claim is made. As I understand it, the law recognized the claim of the half-breeds and sought to extinguish that claim as regards the half-breeds born before 1870. But do you not here recognize the claim of parties who were born since 1870? And, if that is the case, how do you reach any finality? How do we know that, 30 years hence, children now unborn will not make a similar claim? I have listened with some interest to see how it was proposed to reach a final solution of the matter, but I have not yet heard it suggested. Now, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says, and with a great deal of force, that the course pursued on previous occasions was not satisfactory, in carrying out the design of the Government to meet fully and fairly the claims of the half-breeds. We failed owing to the character of that class of the population and their being imposed upon by speculators who, for small amounts obtained very valuable considerations, thus preventing any great advantage inuring to the parties for whose benefit the concession was intended. My right hon. friend says that he is not able to adopt at the present time any suggestions for an improved condition of things. Assuming that it is our duty to meet these claims, we all agree that they should be dealt with in the manner most advantageous to the half-breeds themselves, and in that connection I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the suggestion of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere), who speaks with more direct knowledge of the subject than most of us. I ask the right hon. gentleman to consider as to whether it would not be better to substitute money payments for scrip, the issue of which has resulted in the past in more advantage to the speculator than to the people we wish to aid. This suggestion could probably be carried out at a less cost to the Government, but whether or not, if it were more beneficial to the half-breeds, it would be well for the Government to consider it. Was it part of the former proposal, that assuming they take the land in change for the scrip, they are only entitled to 160 acres?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The 160 acres does not at all affect the half-breed title. This is in favour of the actual squatters or settlers upon the land, and they are entitled to 160 acres. Anything above that they would have to pay the Government for. It has no reference at all to the half-breed question we are now discussing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was going to say that the value of the 160 acres of land to-day would be very much more valuable than when this settlement was made.

The PRIME MINISTER. The settlement adopted included, for instance, that half-breeds who were settled on river lots were to be dealt with as ordinary settlers. They would be entitled to the land they actually occupied to the extent of 160 acres. But apart from that, a grant of 240 acres was made to the children in extinguishment of the Indian title, or right to the soil.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It occurred to me that as my right hon. friend was rather inviting suggestions, that the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) was well worthy of consideration.

Mr. DAVIN. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was referring to the well-known fact, which I think the Minister (Mr. Sifton) is aware of, that Father Lacombe and the late Archbishop Taché were much opposed to giving scrip to the half-breeds. Did I understand from the Minister that Father Lacombe has changed his view in that regard?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not intend to say anything with regard to Father Lacombe's views. I discussed the

matter with him, but I did not pretend to speak as to his views at all.

Mr. DAVIN. I discussed the matter with Father Lacombe and with the late Archbishop Taché, and I know they were opposed to giving scrip owing to what took place on the first issue, and which was to some extent repeated when scrip was subsequently issued by the late Government. What happened was this: The agents of private banks accompanied the commissioner, and they bought in the certificates of scrip for a song. The result, as stated by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), was that the only persons who gained by what is after all a large expenditure by the Government, were the note shavers and the financial sharks who followed the commission, just as we read of sharks following a ship. I am inclined to think that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) would be better, namely, that money should be given instead of scrip. If this were done it would insure that the half-breeds would, at least, get the value of the interest they surrender. On the occasion of the first issue of scrip, it is well known that half-breeds holding scrip for 240 acres sold it in Winnipeg for $5, and some of them sold it for a few drinks over a bar. I do not know that anything like that took place on the last issue of scrip, but there cannot be the least doubt that the agents of people who are well known to the Minister of the Interior at Winnipeg, these agents got scrip at a large discount on its face value, and a short time afterwards we saw advertised "scrip for sale." Persons who wanted to buy land from the Government bought this scrip at a small discount, and then the Government had to acknowledge its face value when these people came to pay for their land. It is a most unsatisfactory arrangement. So far as any little influence I had before is concerned, I urged on the then Minister of the Interior, subsequent to the rebellion, that he should adopt some other method than the issue of scrip, the unfortunate character of which had been abundantly established. This suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) would, I think, be better than giving scrip. But it would be much better to give the land to the half-breed, or, if he did not want the land, to keep it for his children. Anything would be better than to give him a means of sacrificing an interest which he possesses for a mere trifle, which rapidly passes out of his hands, and by which the only persons who can benefit are the agents of speculators.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Would the Minister of the Interior kindly state what is the face value of this scrip, and what is its approximate present value?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The scrip to each half-breed, if it were issued, would be $240, credited on the purchase of Dominion lands. The value of the scrip is just like the value of a bond or any other ordinary security for money. It is only of value in paying the Government for Dominion lands, and the proportion which the amount of scrip in the hands of the public bears to the amount of Dominion lands that are unpaid for and that are likely in the near future to come into the market, fixes the amount which traders are prepared to pay for scrip. That is what gives it its value. I do not know what Dominion land scrip is worth at the present time. I think what is out is quoted at between 90 and 100. If a large quantity of scrip is issued, its value may go down to 60 or 65 cents on the dollar.

Mr. FOSTER. For how much per acre do you sell Dominion lands now?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The ruling price, when we sell any lands in the ordinary way, is $3 an acre.

Mr. FOSTER. And you will take scrip at the face value instead of money?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We take scrip, having a face value of $240, for the value of $240—not for 240 acres of land.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do I understand that each half-breed has the option to take scrip for $240 or to take 240 acres of land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the intention.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But the holder of the scrip cannot get 240 acres of land if the price of the land is $3 an acre?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not decided all the details of the arrangement, and I am prepared to consider the views of the committee, which are just the same as my own. I am quite anxious to do everything I can to secure to the half-breeds the due and proper benefit they ought to derive from the assistance the Government is giving them. It is our intention, at the present time, to give the half-breed the privilege of taking 240 acres of land if he chooses; if not, he will get $240 of scrip. While on my feet I wish to refer, first, to a remark made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that is, that there would be no finality about the claims of the half-breeds for scrip. That idea arises, in my hon. friend's mind, I suppose, from the fact that we dealt with the half-breeds of Manitoba in 1870, with those of the North-west in 1885, and are now dealing with those of the Athabasca district; but after this settlement is made there can be no further claims on behalf of the half-breeds. The half-breeds of Manitoba and their children were settled with; but a considerable number of the Manitoba half-breeds moved to the North-west Territories, and they were not dealt with; and they claim that

until the Government deal with them, they and their children have the same rights as had the half-breeds of Manitoba. I think their claim is perfectly just, and cannot on any logical ground be refused. If the half-breed had any claim at all, it was on account of his Indian blood and his occupation of that territory, and because the Government of the Dominion, in taking possession of the territory, was bound to recognize his position and extinguish his title, as was done in the case of the half-breeds in the province of Manitoba. I think, therefore, the late Government made a mistake, when dealing with the half-breeds in 1885, in not settling the whole question then. We have to deal with the Athabasca half-breeds in the same way.

Mr. FOSTER. What was done in 1885 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In 1885, the Half-breed Commission hunted up the half-breeds who had been born prior to 1870, and who lived in the North-west Territories, and gave them scrip, but did not recognize their children. So, I say that when the settlement is made on the basis we propose, the whole question will be wiped out, and cannot arise again. The hon. member for Provencher suggested a money payment. While I am quite ready to consider any suggestion made by any member of the House, especially one who has a knowledge of the whole question like my hon. friend from Provencher, I am bound to say that the knowledge I have of how affairs have gone in the North-west Territories does not at all indicate that a money payment would be better than a scrip payment, except possibly that it might be better for the Government. We might be able to satisfy them with a smaller amount of money, but I am satisfied that it would be no better for the half-breed ; for he would as quickly and improvidently dispose of the money as he would of the scrip. The same thing happens practically with the Indians when their treaty payments are made. There is no way that any Government officer can devise that would prevent the Indians, when they get their treaty payments, from squandering their money. The traders go and camp around their reserve, and the Indians squander their money in a very short time. My experience and observation would not lead me to suppose that a money payment would be any better, so far as the half-breeds are concerned, though the suggestion is worthy of consideration, and it might be better from the standpoint of the Government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Could not my hon. friend make it payable by instalments and then his objection would not stand ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not believe any settlement could be made that the half-breeds would accept which would compel them to take their payments by instalments. We are apt to consider these people in the same light as the Indians, and to think we can make with they any arrangements we choose. But that is an entire mistake. They are intelligent men and citizens and they do not consider that they are getting any charity or favour from the Government. They say that they were in that country before us, and perfectly able to take care of themselves, and that we came and took possession, and they want what they claim as their just rights. No reason can be assigned why the amount should be $240 in scrip any more than any other sum, except that that was the amount given to the others. They consider they have a right to the same treatment as the other half-breeds got. The main difficulty is not to devise a plan whereby so much money could be spent in a way that would give the greatest benefit to the half-breeds, but the difficulty is in dealing with a number of men who are not by any means children, who are not, if you like, a very provident race, who are not well able to take care of themselves in competition with white people, but who do not consider that they are by any means bound to take what the Government give them. No amicable satisfactory settlement can be made with them which does not recognize them as independent and able to take care of their own property. That is the real difficulty. Whatever may be our desire to spend this money in a way we think will do these people the most good, we are not in a position to do as we please. The difficulty is a political one which must be settled in a way satisfactory to the persons who have to be settled with.

Mr. FOSTER. What special pressure, if any, is being brought now by the half-breeds in the North-west for settlement ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The matter has been pressed upon me constantly ever since I took office. A colleague of the hon. gentleman some years ago, promised a settlement to the half-breeds upon the basis I am suggesting. The matter was brought before the right hon. First Minister and pressed strongly upon him, and it has been pressed upon me ever since I have been a member of the Government, particularly by members from the North-west, who have numbers of these half-breeds residing in their constituencies. It has also been pressed upon me by members of the Territorial Government. I have from time to time put off settlement on the plea that pressure of work prevented me from taking the matter up as quickly as I desired, and it is in consequence of this representation of mine that there has been no public demonstration.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are those half-breeds distributed, and what are they doing? Is any proportion of them farmers ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The larger portion of them, I may say substantially all of them, are in the electoral division of Saskatchewan, largely along the Saskatchewan River, in and around Prince Albert, west, north-west and north-east of Prince Albert. In addition there is a considerable number who are at the settlement of St. Albert, not a great way from Edmonton. They are largely an agricultural population. They are to some extent engaged in trading for the Hudson Bay Company, and the class of work which half-breeds do in that section of country. Their time is occupied between that and agricultural pursuits in a small way. A couple of townships of land have been set apart north of the Saskatchewan beyond Prince Albert, in regard to which no special action has been taken, except that the department has declined to allow other settlers to go in. Father Lacombe has been told that upon that territory he will be allowed to settle any half-breeds that he can induce to go there. His object is to induce them to go there and form a separate settlement, where they will not be subjected to the close competition of white people, his idea being that he will be able to develop them in a higher way by this means than by having them centered among other people. We have done nothing substantially in this regard except refuse to take homestead entries for that small piece of territory. It has been suggested that we should give—and I expect to submit to Parliament, before the session is over, a vote for a small sum of money to assist in the preparation of that settlement, but I need not discuss that now. I only mention it in connection with the suggestion of the hon. member for Provencher.

Mr. DAVIN. I quite recognize the justice of dealing with the half-breeds on the basis proposed by the hon. gentleman, and the basis on which the hon. gentleman proposed to deal with them was discussed some years ago by those who are acquainted with the subject and pretty well accepted. The only thing that strikes me is the method. I doubt very much, with our experience of the two cases we have before us—with our experience of the first and second issue of scrip, and of the waste that resulted to the half-breeds and gain on the part of persons who are mere sharks——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What would you suggest?

Mr. DAVIN. Why not make the experiment of giving them land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the hon. gentleman think that would satisfy them?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman says that he proposes to set apart a certain amount of land on which Father Lacombe will settle them. People who know the half-breeds better than I or anybody in this House tell that if the half-breeds had been settled with on the basis of giving them land and letting them settle on the land, that would have been the true solution. There was the strong opinion of Archbishop Taché. In 1879, when I was up in Winnipeg, Archbishop Taché and Father Lacombe urged me in the strongest way to impress on the Government not to give scrip but to give land, so as to force the half-breeds to settle on the land. There is not the slightest doubt that a mistake was made at that time in giving the scrip. If at that time the Government said to the half-breeds: We will give both of you 240 acres of land in settlement of your claim and for the extinction of the Indian title, the result would have been that the half-breeds would be wealthier to-day than they are. The hon. gentleman knows this also—that that scrip that was given the first time melted out of their hands like snow, and a large amount of the scrip that was given on the second issue melted likewise; and this will not remain long in the hands of many. It is true, there are many of these persons having claims who are thrifty, industrious, excellent farmers, good citizens, and no doubt they will take care of whatever opportunities are placed in their hands. But my hon. friends know very well that a large number of them will part with their certificates, with the result that a number of persons, probably very few, will make a big haul out of the transaction, and probably one or two years after the settlement the half-breeds will be very little better off. It would be worth trying the experiment. If it were found, after a few years, that they were not satisfied with the land, some other course might be taken.

Now, look how much this proposition is to the advantage of the half-breeds. At present the value of land in the North-west Territory is greater than it was when the original settlement was made. At that time land was worth $1 an acre—at least, that was what was thought to be the value of it. A large quantity of it was alienated by the Mackenzie Government at that figure. Now, my hon. friend says the selling price of land is $3 an acre.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knows that Dominion lands would not run $3 an acre or anything like it. When I speak of the value of land, it must be remembered that we only get a chance to sell Dominion lands where they are valuable on account of location. But if the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to look at the map and see the amount of land that was taken up by the railway land grants, which cover almost the entire fertile portion of the North-west, and that for homesteads, he will see that there is very little available. It is not suggested that the half-breeds would be able to take up lands worth $3 an acre.

Mr. DAVIN. That proves my contention that the value of the lands must be very much greater than it was twenty years ago.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, but the whole country was available then; you could put down scrip anywhere.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, but if so much land is taken up and there is such a very little percentage that can be put into the market, it is only a question in economics, and we need not come down to the facts at all; we know very well that the value per acre must be greater than it was. We know, as a matter of fact, that the companies that have lands to sell now, are selling them pretty well; and even the hon. gentleman's department is selling lands better than in former years, except in certain boom years when there was a special value attaching to land. I have visited some of the districts where the half-breeds that will be benefited by this arrangement are, and I can bear testimony to what an industrious, intelligent class of farmers they are; and I am very much inclined to think that if, instead of giving them the option, they were shut up to taking land as satisfaction for their claim under this head, a great many of them would take the land, and take it willingly, while the freeing of others from the temptation of scrip would be an advantage. I think it would be worth the hon. gentleman's while to try the experiment anyway; but if he does not do that, the suggestion of my hon. friend from Provencher would be of advantage to the half-breeds. As we are proceeding to settle, once for all, the claim under the Indian title in the North-west Territories, why, let us do it in the most advantageous way for the half-breeds. Let us consider the interests of that interesting class of our population; and the suggestion of my hon. friend from Provencher would certainly be a better solution than the issue of scrip. It would amount to the same thing for the Government, because it means three-quarters of a million dollars out of the pocket of the Government in the end.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) knows one thing—he will agree with me that in this measure the first thing that the Government must have in view is to have peace, harmony and satisfaction among that class of our population. There is absolute force in the statement made a moment ago by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that the half-breeds hold that they have a right to the soil, and nobody knows better than my hon. friend, who has been a resident of the North-west Territories for a long time, that every half-breed on the bank of the Saskatchewan who was not fully settled with in 1885, has a grievance, and of this fact the Government must not lose sight. Every child born in the North-west Territories since 1870 who has not been settled with, has a grievance. The basis of the settlement must be, that we recognize their claim and give them compensation. We determined at the outset, when we acquired the territory of the Hudson Bay Company, that we would treat the half-breeds as we would the Indians—that is, as first occupants of the soil. It has been the policy of the British Government from time immemorial not to take a possession of any lands without having in some way settled with the first occupants and giving them compensation. The British Government has always recognized the title of the Indian, and has also extinguished that title before allowing white people to settle in the Indian country. The question arose in 1870, how we should deal with the half-breed. We could not deal with them absolutely as Indians, nor could we deal with them as white people. We adopted a peculiar settlement—that is, we gave them compensation, but instead of dealing with them as we dealt with the Indians, giving compensation to the tribe, we decided to give compensation to the individual half-breeds, and that compensation we fixed at 240 acres. Now, we all recognize that we should settle with the half-breeds in the Athabasca district, which we are now invading. The only question is as to the mode of settlement. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) says: Make an experiment. For my part, I would not be inclined to do so. The one thing we must do is to give satisfaction to these people. If you make a settlement satisfactory to them, even though it is not profitable to them, you have, at all events, settled the question; you have satisfied them and removed the cause of discontent. But if you make an experiment and leave a feeling of hardship in their hearts, you have the same thing as you have now—latent discontent among this class of our population. We must all agree, I am sure we do all agree, that we must have everybody satisfied in this country, whether Indian or half-breed, that the British Crown is giving him his full due, and is recognizing his right to everything to which he is entitled. I wish for my part that we could devise some settlement different from that which has been followed hitherto. My hon. friend has referred to the opinion of Archbishop Taché upon this subject, and no one could speak with greater authority than Archbishop Taché. As far back as 1869, he tendered to the Government of that day advice that the half-breeds ought not to be settled with by scrip in the Territories as they had been in Manitoba, but that it would be better to settle with them by giving them lands and keeping them somewhat as wards of the nation. That advice was not followed, and why? Well, probably because the officers of the department at that time thought, and thought with some truth, that the half-breeds would not be satisfied to be dealt with as wards of the nation. My hon. friend knows

as well as I do that those half-breeds, a mixture of Indian and white blood, are a very independent race, very independent in their nature, and very intolerant of any kind of subjection. However, the department would not treat with them ; the only mistake which was made at that time was to do nothing at all. It would have been far better to make a settlement of some kind, although it might not have been the best possible settlement. But I say again we must settle this question. We cannot allow it to go on from year to year as it has been going on. We have now reached 1899, we are invading the Territories of the north where the Indians and half-breeds have not been disturbed up to this moment. White settlement has not gone north to the Saskatchewan hitherto, but now it is going as far as Slave Lake, Lake Athabasca and Mackenzie River. In order to meet the Indians and half-breeds, we have sent a commission to deal with them ; we must deal with them, we must satisfy them. Again I say, that for my part I wish we could make a profitable settlement with them, but even if it be not a profitable settlement, we must make some arrangement that will make every one of them feel that they have received the compensation to which they are entitled. My hon. friend says some of them are good agriculturists. I know some of them were pretty well advanced in agriculture, and these have, no doubt, received their scrip and will take up land. But there are others who are not so advanced, and who will get rid of their scrip. No doubt many will squander it, I am pretty sure of that. But how that can be prevented is more than I can tell. If my hon. friend will suggest to me any method that will satisfy them, and at the same time be profitable to them, I will be glad to take it. But if he cannot do so, I can only repeat that we must settle with them anyhow, and in a manner to give them entire satisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me my hon. friend is more anxious to settle than he is to find some reasonable means of improving on the old settlement which he himself acknowledges to be faulty and a wasteful one. I do not know whether we quite understand what this question means. If the Minister of the Interior should come down to-night and ask for $750,000, this House would begin to wonder what that was for, and they would require a most approved plan for the economical and useful distribution of that money. Although my hon. friend does not come down and ask for that sum of money, it is exactly the same thing, for this $750,000 worth of scrip just means even as respects what it is sold to a broker or middleman—it just means $750,000 of an appropriation by this Parliament out of the funds of the Crown. Now, I do not think any of us want to rush in too quickly to the disposition of $750,000, unless we can make all that a wise Parliament ought to be able to make, in provision for a useful distribution of the money. Push the argument of my hon. friend to its conclusion, and it means that whatever may be the whim, the wish of these people, who have rights undoubtedly which we all acknowledge, and which we are all anxious to satisfy —whatever may be their whim or their wish, even though it be positively dangerous to them, we must gratify it in order that they may not feel a grievance. Now, let us ask ourselves whether a man is best treated who has a desire to have his right recognized, and when a Government offers him a substantial recognition of that right, which, taking an extreme case, we will say that man barters for drink, or for $5, or for a small sum, and wakes up the next day or the day after, to find that he is not one whit better off than he was before his rights were recognized, and that he has to face the world just as poor and just as badly equipped as was before ; and that for ten, or fifteen, or twenty, or forty years of his life. Is it better to fling into that man's way an opportunity for damaging himself, or is it better for us to sit down and think out, even though it takes a little time, some plan which whilst we recognize his fullest right, we may also place the recognition of that right on a basis where it will be an actual good to the man himself. Now, is it not possible to do that ? I believe it is, and although these children of nature may have their whims, and although they are independent as children of nature will be, and feel that they have a right to something, and to do with it as they like, there are no men more amenable to their proper guides and their true friends than are the half-breeds of the North-west. I believe it is possible by consultation, by some method of machinery in conjunction with those in whom they have confidence, to adopt a plan by means of which this grant may prove to the greatest extent useful to them. The Minister of the Interior has said that these men are mostly engaged in rural occupations, and are not scattered over a wide extent of territory. That is favourable to some method being adopted which may tend to conserve the interests they have. If they are agriculturally inclined, is it not possible that if their rights are recognized to the full by a grant of land, our purpose would be attained ? When we went there and took possession of that territory the half-breeds had nothing but land, they had no money. It was the unfortunate substitution of scrip for land which gave them the idea that they had a right to something outside of what they possessed in the North-west when the white man invaded that portion of our country. That right is absolutely satisfied when they get their proper proportion of the land, all of which was theirs before, and on that was based the settlement. Now, if they are agriculturally inclined, would not the larger part of them think that they were justly dealt with if 240 acres of

land were conserved to them and put at their disposal? Perhaps you would find some of them who would say: No, we have land enough. If they have land enough, and are agriculturally inclined, if they have the wheat they want, if they have the implements they want, and instead of getting this miserable scrip, which may go out of their hands for a mere song, could there not be, through a commission of their friends, acting with the Government, a plan by which those who have lands enough at the present time could get improved stock for their lands, agricultural machinery if they wanted it, which would be actually useful to them, and of great benefit to them? Then, after you exhaust all this, you will find remaining a remnant who will say: We don't want land, we don't want ploughs or harrows, we don't want stock; we want our scrip such as you gave to the Indians of the Northwest. You have a minority who will take that unreasonable position. If the matter is properly dealt with, and that minority can very easily be dealt with, I think, by a Government which is considerate and at the same time firm, and by their own friends, who would be in the arrangement, I think a satisfactory settlement could be made. There is another thing that I strongly object to: it was done before, but that is no argument. When I became Minister of Finance in the Government, I set my face strongly against any one having the power to issue currency—that is what it means. Here we are under our financial system, and under our currency system, and the issue of currency is a matter of the greatest moment. Here under cover where few understand it, and with the great bulk of the country knowing nothing about it, where there is no way of accounting for what he issues at all, you give to any Minister, in any department, power to issue scrip to the amount of hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars. I do not know how much has been issued, but it is something like $2,000,000 altogether. Does the hon. Minister know?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The whole amount contemplated here?

Mr. FOSTER. No, but that which has been issued.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think over $2,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Over $2,000,000 has been issued, and here we will have an addition of $750,000 or thereabouts. It is really an unlimited currency which is set afloat in this country redeemable in land. It all comes back and is redeemed in the equivalent of hard money so far as the treasury is concerned. I do not think it is a healthy power to place in the hands of any individual Minister, not saying anything about any particular Minister, the power of issuing money or scrip up to a certain limit, unlimited here. It is actually unlimited, but because it goes into the hands of two thousand, three thousand, four thousand or five thousand persons, and in this way the hon. Minister issues his redeemable currency, limited to a certain extent and sets it afloat in the country. I do not think it is proper finance or a proper thing to do. I am not saying this because I would object to this Minister any more than I would to a Minister in any preceding Government. I am trying to argue this on no party ground; I give the fullest recognition to the rights of freemen of the soil to the extinguishment of their claims. They have a right to it; we are strong enough and generous enough to give it to them, but cannot we give it to them with benefit rather than injury. Is it not possible to have a plan by which it will be bestowed in such a manner that it will be of actual advantage and by which it will not be wasted? Of this $2,000,000 of scrip, not one-tenth of it has really been a benefit to the men who were supposed to get it, and who have these great natural rights to the land which a generous people are willing to recognize. What these freemen of the soil should have is soil. Give them soil and give them something to work the soil with; give them agricultural implements, cattle, improved stock, and if this is properly gone about I believe that these people will be benefited. It will go to make their lands valuable and to help them to work the land. But, rather than give them this scrip, I would say: Let us make an end of these currency debts circulating through the country and give these men their money. Let us settle with them for so much money in lieu of their lands. That will not hurt them any more than the scrip, and I do not think it would hurt them so much. If scrip is given all the profit goes to the speculator, but if you give money that goes into general circulation and into the general line of trade, and benefits the community in that way, it might be arranged with those who do not want land and who just want money to have it paid in instalments from year to year as it is wanted under a commission constituted in some such way as I have hinted at. It would be a sterling benefit to these men and not liable to be wasted. I do not know whether these suggestions that we have made are at all acceptable or not, but I would make a plea for the sake of these people. What these men want to see, certainly, is an expression of the desire to satisfy their claims; and they want to see the machinery put in operation. If it is put in operation it does not matter so much whether it is done with a rush and in a few months or whether it is done in a reasonable way and they are approached in a reasonable way with the idea always that what is being done will inure to their greatest advantage.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago I had a case, which will illustrate

how these people get value for their scrip, placed before me in connection with a matter of public business. A gentleman, who had purchased scrip in the North-west Territories of the second issue, not of the first, which shows that scrip was bought also by speculators in regard to the second issue, as well as the first, owed the Department of the Interior $1,250. He told me that he was paying that amount by paying the Government $50 in cash and by giving them $1,200 worth of scrip which he had purchased from the half-breeds for $90. The Government were giving the half-breeds $90 and actually paying out of the treasury $1,200, or its equivalent, to a speculator who had purchased the half-breeds' scrip. The right hon. Prime Minister has said that it is his desire above all things, that there should be peace, harmony and satisfaction. The only difference between the position of the right hon. gentleman and the contention on this side of the House is that this side of the House desires that there should be peace, harmony and satisfaction amongst the half-breeds with the greatest possible advantage to the half-breeds themselves. It appears to me that the right hon. Prime Minister has insisted too strongly upon the necessity of dealing with these half-breeds as other half-breeds are dealt with. You are giving them no advantage whatever. You say: Here is scrip which is redeemable in land. You have scrip which will represent 240 acres of land. Why cannot you give them an option? Why cannot you say to them: We will give you scrip, as we gave it to the other half-breeds, or, if you like, we will give you so much cash. Can the half-breed be less satisfied, can he be the less contented, can there be less peace and harmony if he has his choice of money or scrip than as though you gave him scrip and gave him no choice of the money? The right hon. Prime Minister shakes his head.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would rather have the plan suggested by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster).

Mr. MONTAGUE. It comes to the same thing exactly, because you give him his choice, and, as I understand the plan of the hon. member for York, it was to give him his choice.

The PRIME MINISTER. It was to give stock and implements but no money.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not saying whether it should be cash or implements, but my suggestion is, that they should get value which they can use themselves, and which will not pass into the hands of the speculators. The incident I have given to this Parliament shows that the scrip does not get into the hands of the half-breeds at all, but goes to the speculator, and in the suggestions made from this side of the House—and they are not made in a party sense at all—the idea is to give the half-breeds more value. Do you mean to tell me that the half-breed in the North-west Territory is not able to do some sort of figuring? Do you mean to tell me that he does not know himself that he will sell that scrip for $25 or $50; and do you mean to tell me that he would not rather accept a proposal made on the part of the Government, that they will give him $50 this year, and $50 the next year, and $50 the next year, and $50 the year following, and $40 for the final year, instead of scrip? I believe that the half-breed, with $240 paid to him in five years, will be much more contented and satisfied than by getting a scrap of paper, which the day following he will turn over to a speculator for $25 or $30.

Mr. DAVIN. This letter has just come to me by the post from Fort Qu'Appelle:

Fort Qu'Appelle, Assa.,
June 29th, 1899.

Dear Mr. Davin,—It is rumoured here that the half-breeds born between 1870 and 1885 are to receive scrip, and in consequence the majority of them are selling their claims for $40 and $45, getting $5 or $10 down. The uselessness of giving them negotiable scrip is thus easily seen.

Would you mind asking the following questions in the House:—

1. Is the Government going to issue scrip to the half-breeds born in the North-west Territories between the years 1870 and 1885?

2. Will the scrip, if issued, be similar to the former issued, or will the Government make it only for land, and arrange it so that the latter cannot be disposed of, thus proving a benefit to the poor people entitled to it, and not for the advantage of the speculators who traffic in it?

3. Is the Government aware that half-breeds at Fort Qu'Appelle and Touchwood Hills are already disposing of their claims to such scrip for $40 and $45?

If the Government want information as to the third question, ask them to refer to the police detachments here and at Touchwood.

The matter is a serious one, for at the prices mentioned the Government virtually makes a present of $100 to speculators for each scrip issued, and it does no good to the half-breeds, as the small sum received is mostly spent in whisky.

Yours faithfully,
GEORGE F. GUERNSEY.

This letter is not marked "private," and the gentleman who wrote it is a notary public and conveyancer, a well-known man, and I do not believe he would have any objection to having his name mentioned. Mr. Guernsey has been in the North-west Territories since 1878, and you see the impression made on him in regard to that question. He used originally to be in the North-west Mounted Police, and his testimony is very valuable at this time. I do not think that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) caught exactly the point of the argument I endeavoured to make. I did not say that every one of the half-breeds would say he was satisfied, if the Government decided: We will give you $240 each in the way that has been suggested. I am quite certain a number of them would be more satisfied to

put a few dollars present money into their pockets. But the leaders and the more thoughtful amongst them will be more satisfied if the Government make the proposal which has come from this side of the House, and even those who now would be more pleased to get a few current bills into their pockets, will in the end be much more satisfied if the present Government follows a wiser policy than that adopted by their predecessors. I do not think the argument, as put by the right hon. gentleman, is very cogent. What he says is this: Whether the half-breeds squander it or not, let us satisfy them. I do not think that is the way in which the question should be regarded by the Parliament of Canada, and the Government of Canada, and the right hon. the Premier, and the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Without treating the half-breeds too paternally, without treating them as we treat Indians on the reserves, I think we might feel we have a special responsibility towards them, as we have a responsibility towards all citizens, and that if we can make an arrangement—taking into account the moral qualities and the social development of any section of the community—an arrangement that while satisfying the demands of justice, will also be in the end highly beneficial to that class, we should make that arrangement rather than take a course that will be simply washing our hands of it, and by which we will permit a large sum of money to be simply thrown to the dogs, or worse.

Mr. CLANCY. There is no difference of opinion as to recognizing the claims of the half-breeds, but the difficulty exists only as to the best mode of dealing with the question in order that the half-breeds themselves may get the most benefit from it. It seems to me that some plan can be adopted as an alternative. The half-breed might first be offered the 240 acres, or scrip to the extent of $240. As I understand the Minister, scrip in the hands of a half-breed would purchase more land than in the hands of anybody else.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. The half-breed might take 240 acres of land, if he wishes, or he might take $240 scrip. If he takes the $240 scrip, when it is presented, it goes in at par, dollar for dollar.

Mr. CLANCY. I was endeavouring to make that clear. The land is not allotted where it is only worth $1 an acre. The half-breed may get 240 acres of Dominion lands anywhere, and, since he can take 240 acres of land or $240 worth of scrip, he may have land more valuable than another person's land with that $240 worth of scrip in his hands. I would suggest, for the consideration of the Government, that in order to prevent the possibility of these speculators trafficking in scrip, the half-breeds would first be offered the land, and the land alone. I would not confine them to that choice, however, because, as the First Minister says, we must deal with these people justly, and we must satisfy them. I have no doubt that it is often very difficult to satisfy them. The first proposition which the Government would make to the half-breeds, under my suggestion, would be this: We will give you the land, and if you do not want the land, we will give you scrip, but we will give you, as an alternative, the value which that scrip would be worth in the hands of a third party for the purpose of purchasing land. In other words, it would be determined by the value of the land purchased. That would give him all the advantages he would have by selling it, and a great deal more. It would completely drive out the middleman who purchases the scrip at a nominal sum. The half-breed would get what the scrip was worth, measured by the price of the land. It seems to me that is a reasonable proposition, and it would obviate the difficulty which the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) points out.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that it is not possible for the Minister now, after the letter which has been read by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), not to consider this matter as to means. That is just the practical fact, that the very moment the word has gone out that there is going to be an issue of scrip, that very moment, like a swarm of wasps, you have these men lying in wait for every possible half-breed they can find, and by different arguments, getting his claim from him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me point out to my hon. friend what has been done already. The practice in former years was to issue to the half-breeds a certificate which was so drawn that one might fancy it had been drawn for the express purpose of making it as easy as possible for a broker to get hold of it. Notwithstanding all the years I lived in the North-west, I never saw one of these original certificates until I came to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That is because you were not a half-breed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When I came to examine the certificate, I found that it simply said: "This certificate entitles John Smith or the bearer to $240 worth of scrip," setting out the particulars. So that when a certificate was issued, all that a broker had to do was to get possession of it without making himself liable for stealing it, and he would be entitled to come here and make a demand for the scrip. I decided to have the form altered to say that the assignee would be recognized upon a proper assignment being filed in the department. I venture to say

that assignments cannot be filed in the department for a large number of the certificates, for the simple reason that probably two-thirds of the half-breeds are now under age, and are not legally qualified to make an assignment, and the certificate would be simply held by them until they were qualified. At the same time, they would feel that their rights were recognized. The chances are that the people buying scrip, to whom the hon. member for West Assiniboia refers, are people who think that the certificates are going to be issued in the same form as in previous years, but they will be woefully disappointed when they find that the half-breed no longer gets a certificate which he can simply hand over. In former years the certificate of minors were issued in this form, and the result was that the practice to which my hon. friend refers was practically encouraged by the action of the department; but everything the department could do to stop that practice has been done, and I fancy that the simple step I have taken will go far to prevent it. It is a matter of notoriety in the North-west that when certificates for scrip were delivered in former years there was a free use of whisky in the immediate neighbourhood of the proceeding, and a great many half-breeds, while under the influence of liquor, imprudently gave away their scrip for trifling sums. I do not want to make any insinuation against the friend of the hon. member for Haldimand, but it looks as if he had in his possession $1,200 of scrip which he got for $90. The half-breed knows very well the value of his scrip, and unless he is got under the influence of liquor by unscrupulous persons, he gets within a reasonable percentage of what the scrip is supposed at the time to be worth on the market. Cases arose of this kind. Certificates were issued perhaps to a man with a family of five. They were all handed to the nearest relative, and sometimes the half-breed was got under the influence of liquor, and all of them were turned over to some one else for a mere song. That cannot be done under the arrangement I have made, in the large proportion of cases. Those hon. members who think these half-breeds can be treated like children are suggesting an arrangement that cannot be carried out. In answer to the suggestion of the hon. member for York as to the immediate necessity of dealing with the half-breeds, I may state that it was brought to my attention by men familiar with the whole question that the half-breeds living in the Athabasca district are in more or less constant communication with those who live in the more southerly portion of the North-west Territories; and it was pointed out to me by these men that it would be utterly impossible for the Indian commission to undertake to deal with the Indians unless some arrangement were made for dealing with the half-breeds too

They live and associate with them very largely, and the half-breeds have a great deal of influence with the Indians, and I have been assured by men best posted on the subject that it would be quite useless to send out a commission to undertake to deal with the Indians unless they were in a position to satisfy the half-breeds at the same time. We would not be in a position to make a satisfactory arrangement with the half-breeds of the Athabasca district without dealing with the whole of them. Therefore, is it necessary to take power to deal with the whole question at once. I recognize fully the difficulty, but every one must recognize the fact that when you are settling a political grievance you have to settle it in a way satisfactory to the men who have it—of course I do not mean to satisfy any whim they may have. If the late Government had never issued the scrip, I would be the last to suggest it, but since a certain course of action was followed, these people claim they are entitled to the same treatment. If they were willing to take anything else, we would be willing to give it to them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Give them the option.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The best opinion I can get from the men best posted leads me to suppose that there is no immediate prospect of settling this question except by giving them land or scrip, redeemable in land, as we suggest, with any limitations we can place to prevent immediate alienation. If prevented from alienating the scrip for the first three months, the immediate danger is averted, that is the danger of their being induced to part with the scrip by people who will follow the commissioners and resort to those peculiar means of obtaining the scrip which are resorted to in such cases. That is the only means I can suggest as likely to improve the position of affairs and make the assistance we are giving more beneficial.

Mr. HAGGART. What will this scrip be received in payment of?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Land.

Mr. HAGGART. Only land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Only land.

Mr. HAGGART. The other scrip was received in payment of mining licenses, the purchase of coal lands, the purchase of ranches. Is this Bill drawn differently?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is nothing in the Act that authorizes the scrip to be received in payment of anything except land.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman proposes to issue scrip, and I understand that in the case of alienation, an assignment must be lodged in the department in order to make

the alienation effective. I suppose the course taken by the agent of a private bank or broker would be this. They would have an attorney present and have an assignment when they would be lodged with the Department of the Interior, and that would give them the title to the land.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. How will they do that in the case of a minor ?

Mr. DAVIN. Let us deal with one who is of age. The assignment will be with the Department of the Interior. What safeguard is there in that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The safeguard is what the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, namely, that in four cases out of five the broker never could get an assignment executed at all. The scrip issued by the late Government did not require any assignment or endorsation, but was practically like a note of hand payable to bearer. Why was it made thus ? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the men who passed that law did not know what they were doing ? The scrip was made out in that way because of the difficulty of obtaining an assignment. You can get a certificate out of the possession of a half-breed when you could not get an assignment from him signed before a witness.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a certain safeguard. But my hon. friend said that that would create some dissatisfaction, and in that respect he is going contrary to the principle laid down by the Prime Minister, who said the great object was to satisfy these people.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What I say is this. I want to do everything possible to protect the half-breeds, without treating them as a ward. If he says : I wish to sell this scrip and am prepared to execute a legal assignment just as if he were selling a farm, there is nothing to prevent his doing so. If we prevent his doing that we are simply refusing to recognize him as a citizen and treating him as a ward or an infant not fit to deal with his own property. But I do not propose making it as easy for him to part with his scrip as he would with a promissory note, payable to bearer, but to subject him to the legal formality of making an assignment, and this will protect him to some extent. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the half-breed may be got very readily to dispose of his scrip, especially if under the influence of liquor. But when the person who desires to purchase it has to get an assignment in proper form attested by a witness, he is under certain restraint, and an inquiry can be made at any time into the manner in which this scrip was obtained. If the half-breed would afterwards say that he had not parted with the scrip, or that he was under the influence of liquor when he parted with it, that assignment is of record and the facts can be investigated and the scrip cancelled or steps taken to call it in, if it has not already been presented for payment. So that it is not at all the same thing to permit a man to hand his property over without any assignment at all and to compel him to make a formal assignment of it before the transfer is complete. It will make the difference of perhaps two-fifths of the scrip being disposed of very quickly and a very small fraction being disposed of it.

Mr. DAVIN. But does not the hon. gentleman see what an argument that puts in the hands of the Opposition against the contention of the Prime Minister, which was that we should satisfy these people ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think they will be satisfied.

Mr. DAVIN. A few moments ago the hon. gentleman said that no doubt that would not be as satisfactory to them——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What ?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman said that the new departure would not be as satisfactory to them as the old arrangement. He said they preferred the old arrangement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me.

Mr. DAVIN. No, the hon. gentleman will find it in "Hansard." But even without trying to pin him to anything he said a moment ago, does he suppose that this arrangement will be as satisfactory, at the first blush, to the half-breeds, as the old system.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). This is an arrangement which, it seems to me, they could not object to when it was presented to them. We say : You are getting the scrip, as people got it before, and when you want to dispose of it you are in a position to dispose of it by executing a legal document, and this safeguard is placed there in order that the document may not be transferred without the exercise of your capacity as a citizen to dispose of your property. They may say : We want to dispose of it by simply handing it over. But I do not think many of them would take that position, but would be satisfied with the arrangement we propose.

Mr. DAVIN. Then why not go further and offer them the land ? Would not the same intelligence that the hon. Minister relies upon justify him in taking that step ? Land is really worth more than $240, or $1 per acre. Why, the time is coming very soon when you will not be able to get an acre of land

in the North-west Territories for less than $10.

Mr. MONTAGUE. After a change of Government.

Mr. DAVIN. No doubt, there will be a change of Government before that time; but I would not attribute this increase of value to a change of Government, but to the real cause—that the country is settling up and land becoming scarcer. Taking the reasoning of the hon. Minister of the Interior himself, we are forced to the position suggested by this side, namely, that we should trust the wisdom of the half-breeds and say: We will not give you scrip for those who are improvident amongst you to squander: what we will do is to give you land that your best friends, like Archbishop Taché, hold should not be made alienable at your hands; we will give you lands, which as it accretes in value will be a great resource for you and your children. You will raise their self-respect and you will do the best thing both for them and for Canada. The Minister sees the viciousness of the old course. But why should he not depart further from it? He says it was a vicious thing to make an arrangement that enabled the half-breed to alienate his scrip the moment it came into his hands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have a check upon that.

Mr. DAVIN. But why not adopt a more effective check?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is perfectly effective, within the rights of a citizen to dispose of his property.

Mr. DAVIN. But the hon. gentleman knows well that the moment this is published, that moment you will have not merely the broker's agent, but accompanying the broker's agent you will have a solicitor, and that solicitor with his assignments all ready and witnesses that will witness anything.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Minister of the Interior has answered himself. He stated very fairly and plausibly that a change in the old practice would cause dissatisfaction among the half-breeds when the settlement was entered upon. Now, as I understood the hon. gentleman will not issue certificates for scrip to minors. Am I correct in that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me explain. The commissioners who were sent up on the occasion of former settlements did not issue scrip directly, but issued to the half-breed a certificate for scrip. The certificate gave power to claim scrip. The certificate which is being issued to the half-breeds of the Athabasca district will not entitle the bearer to claim the scrip, but will enable the person to whom it is issued or his legal assignees to claim it.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And a minor cannot assign it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, we quite understand the hon. Minister. Under the old system, the father of seven children came to the commissioner and said: I want eight certificates for scrip. And having got them, he could sell them, and the party who bought them could get the scrip for them. Now, let us see how it is at the present time. The half-breed, who is such a delicate and peculiar character to deal with, and is suspicious that he is not being dealt with as fairly as his brother was a few years ago, walks up with his seven children and asks for certificates for himself and them. He gets a certificate for himself, and if he assigns it properly he can sell it. But when he comes to dispose of the certificates of his children, he finds he cannot dispose of them, because he cannot assign them; consequently he says to himself: I am not treated the same as the half-breed was a few years ago. Now, I am supposing he is as improvident as can be and desires to get rid of this scrip belonging to his children. He recalls the fact that his brother, ten years ago got scrip for his whole family and could dispose of it at once, while he is hedged around with difficulties. This will cause dissatisfaction. The Minister said that if the half-breed would take anything else than a certificate for scrip he would be glad to give it to him. But he does not offer him anything but the certificate.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have the power to give him the land or the scrip.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is to say, he can assign his scrip and take the land. But suppose he would prefer to take the money, you have not power to give it to him?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was dealing with the proposition we should make to Parliament. I said that we would be happy to make an arrangement, if we thought the House would accept it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What we contend for is that the half-breed should be given an opportunity to take cash if he wants it. The Minister said that if he would prefer to take that, he would rather see him get it than the certificate for the scrip. What we say is that the Minister should give him power to take scrip or an annuity for a certain number of years, if he wants it, instead of giving him a certificate that he can dispose of for a song. Now, I want to refer to what the Minister said in regard to the figures I gave him. I have no personal knowledge of the deal. It was a gentleman who came here to purchase some lands of the Goverament, and who gave me the figures—that was in 1888. What have we now? He paid $18 for

the scrip ten years ago, five certificates at $18 each, $90, and my hon. friend produces a letter from the field where operations are begun at the present time, and where they are only paying $40. Notwithstanding that the Minister says that the half-breeds know the value of scrip pretty well, here is a statement directly from the North-west Territories, where these certificates will be issued, saying that they are actually selling them for $40, and accepting $5 in cash for them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I thought the hon. gentleman said that his friend got $1,200 in scrip for $90.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, I did say that. I said that he got $1,250 worth of scrip, for which he only paid $90, and under the price which seems to rule at the present time, he paid $200. Now, there is not such an awful difference between $200 and $90, when you count nine years of increased enlightenment, and increased intelligence, and increased arithmetic, in the minds of the half-breeds of the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friends on the other side of the House see a difficulty in dealing with this question which they did not realize when they were in office, because when they were in office they had the doing of it. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that all these things were brought to their attention at the time. They did not even take the small step I have taken in the way of changing the certificate, they let the certificate go fixed up just to suit the broker. One would think the broker must have drawn the certificate himself, or got a lawyer to draw it, because there is no other explanation for it. It was drawn to enable the broker to get hold of that scrip in the easiest possible way. I think my hon. friends opposite lose sight of the fact that this is not a new question, is not a thing that we are beginning to deal with now, is not a thing which we have no knowledge about in so far as the disposition of the people we have to deal with, is concerned. Every man there knows exactly what he thinks he is entitled to from the Government; he knows, or thinks he knows, that he is entitled to $240 in scrip, and I do not believe any arrangement could be made with these people except by giving them 240 acres in land or the equivalent in scrip. I am inclined to think that the limit of interference on the part of the Government will be reached when we say to these people: We will do our best to prevent an improvident alienation of the property. We may be able to devise other and more effective means to prevent alienation, but I think that is as far as the Government will be able to go.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no form of certificate here. Where does he provide for the form?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a departmental matter. It was never put in the Bill, and I would not care to put it in, because experience might suggest some change. It is a matter that will go on for the next three or four years. As a matter of fact, the Athabasca half-breeds are the only ones that will be dealt with this year by the commission that has gone up there. I do not expect that we will deal with the half-breeds of the more southerly portion of the North-west Territories until next year, and we will have time to give a good deal of consideration to this measure.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman states that the late Government made no change in that respect, that they issued only scrip to the half-breeds. If my memory serves me right, instead of issuing scrip altogether to the half-breeds, there was some provision suggested by the hon. member from Saskatchewan by which three or four townships were reserved to them, which it was intended to give them instead of scrip.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think they had the privilege of taking land, and we intend to give them the same privilege; but they took scrip.

Mr. HAGGART. But the whole issue of scrip was not given them; three or four townships were retained for them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That was a different scheme altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand the Minister to say that there have been some townships reserved north of the Saskatchewan, under Father Lacombe's patronage, where he is now trying to get the half-breeds to go?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed to give the half-breeds who are willing to go there a certain amount of land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If they go there they will go there simply as homesteaders, they will take up a homestead in the ordinary way under the Act; they will get no special privileges.

Mr. FOSTER. So, any of those whose title you extinguish by this method would not get any added advantage there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I still believe it is practicable for the hon. gentleman, in the coming year, to form a commission a little different

to the present one, that is, a commission one of whose members would be Father Lacombe, if he would undertake it, to see what might be done in the way of confining this to lands, and to agricultural implements, and to cattle for those who have as much land as they wish; or they might take up part land and take stock for the farm as well. As for the residuum, those who will say: We don't want lands, nor scrip, nor anything like that; the commission would say to these: Well, if you don't want that, commute it for so much money, and let that money be paid to you, so much per year. Now, if the half-breed knows, as he can be told, that the House is a unit, that the House has given its adhesion to his rights, and is trying to do the best it can for the half-breeds, it seems to me that you will overtake the great mass of that difficulty which you see in the way of the half-breeds wanting to be treated just as they were treated before. You have departed from that; you are not treating him in the same way; you are keeping his children's scrip until they grow up. There you are making a change. Commissions have been appointed for trivial purposes, and on some occasions unworthy purposes; it would be rather a good thing to have a commission appointed here to try to do as much good as possible for these half-breeds. How does the hon. gentleman propose to enumerate the half-breeds who are to partake of this benefit?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have appointed a commission of two men.

Mr. FOSTER. Will they be enumerators for the North-west half-breeds as well as for those in Athabasca?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They will be later. I do not expect they will get to the North-west half-breeds this season.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much of the time of the committee on this question, but I may say that, perhaps, the best ideas that we can express upon this question may not be practicable on account of the class of people we have to deal with. In this matter, unless we can go one better than has been done in the past, it will not be acceptable to the half-breeds. These people will not stand any tutorship. They think, and I say they are right, that they are entitled to be treated as white people are treated and that they are entitled to look after their own affairs. But, Sir, at the same time, I think that we made mistakes, first, when we granted a large area of land in Manitoba which the half-breeds sold for a mere song, as has been stated, and second, when we issued scrip that was negotiable with anybody except with the Government which issued it. This scrip should have been negotiable with the Government, either in land or cash, and I still contend that instead of issuing certificates which are transferable to Tom, Dick and Harry, that is to say, to the speculators, scrip should be issued to the parties who are entitled to receive it, and then those parties should be entitled to get as many acres of land as that scrip called for. If they did not choose to take land the Government should make that scrip negotiable in the monetary institutions, and at the Government offices, for its face value. This would do away with the speculator and the middle man. This scrip would be negotiable in the market at the face value of $240, and the half-breeds would know that they were entitled to get $240 for their scrip. Therefore, they would not accept less money for it. But what is being done? The commission sits; a claim is made by a half-breed; it is examined by the commissioners, and the moment they find out that it is a good one a certificate is issued. The hon. Minister of the Interior says that these certificates will not be good hereafter to the bearer, but it comes to the same thing. He will accept an assignment of these certificates; these assignments will be prepared by members of the legal profession, who will be entitled to a fee and that fee will be paid, not by the purchaser, but by the poor half-breed, as has been done on many former occasions in Manitoba. Therefore, these assignments, being acknowledged by the Government, will come here by the bundle; they will be handed over to the speculators who will have got these certificates and scrip will be issued to these speculators. No certificates should be issued, but this scrip should be issued by the Government direct to the parties entitled to receive it. This scrip could be used to purchase 240 acres of land, or the Government could pay the face value of it, $240, either in the departmental office here, or it could be made negotiable in the banks and acceptable by the Government from the banks. In this way you would, in effect, reduce the modus operandi by which this scrip is issued, and the Government would not lose a cent from the fact that they accepted this scrip afterwards from the speculators at the face value, at the rate on the dollar, for the purchase of land and whatever difference there is between what the half-breed receives and what the Government accepts it at, goes to the speculator and not to the half-breed. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has just read a letter which says that scrip has already been bought in advance for $30 or $40 which is worth $240. This scrip will be accepted at the face value of $240, and, therefore, $200 will go to the speculator, and the poor half-breed will receive only $30 or $40. The Government should pay the half-breed $240 for his scrip, or give 240 acres of land for it. In that way there would be no middleman, and the half-breed would get the full value and be perfectly satisfied, because he would,

under this arrangement, be better treated than he has been on former occasions.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am utterly at a loss to find out just what the committee is intending to do. I hold in my hand the Bill which we are now considering. By clause 4 it is intended to strike out section "f" of clause 90 of the Dominion Lands Act and substitute therefor the words:

> Grant lands in satisfaction of claims of half-breeds arising out of the extinguishment of the Indian title.

It seems to me that we have, for the last two hours been discussing some question that is not really before the committee. What is really before the committee is the consideration of granting lands in satisfaction of these half-breeds claims, and not scrip at all. I would like to ask the hon. Minister where we would find the law relative to the granting of scrip, or under what authority he proposes to grant scrip? Certainly, there is nothing in the Bill before us, and I can find nothing in the Act which he proposes to amend. While I am on my feet I would say that, if there is a law anywhere authorizing the Government to grant scrip, and if it is the desire of the Government to prevent that scrip getting into the hands of speculators, I think a very simple plan could be adopted, and it would be printing across the face of the certificate, in plain letters, in red ink, that "This certificate is not transferable." If it is bought by any speculator he buys it on the distinct understanding that he cannot realize one cent on it. The half-breed would be entirely protected. He could not be imposed upon by any speculator, and he could only have the scrip redeemed by surrendering it for land or surrendering it to the Government for its full price, so that the money would go into the pocket of the half-breed instead of into the pocket of the speculator. I would like the hon. Minister to give the information to those of us who have not been following the debate very closely, and to say under what statute scrip is granted?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Subsection "f" of section 4 is the clause under which authority will be given to the Government to issue scrip. The words are substantially the same as they were in the old Act, and are held by the Department of Justice to be sufficient for the purposes suggested. As to restricting the negotiability of the certificate and printing that across the scrip, I may say that the late Government when they first issued scrip tried that, and for reasons best known to themselves they abandoned it. The department found that, notwithstanding the fact that they placed across the face of the scrip a statement that it was not negotiable, yet others took an assignment of the scrip as they would of a farm, and ultimately the Government had to recognize it. You cannot say to a man that he shall not sell his property. Unless he is a minor or insane, he can sell his property and you cannot make any arrangement that you can adhere to, by which you refuse to recognize the right of a man to sell his property when once he gets it.

Mr. HENDERSON. That to me is very strange reasoning. If the Government advances a certificate to a half-breed, on the distinct understanding that the money will not be paid or that the land will not be given to another person but the half-breed, no law in the world, it appears to me, can compel the Government to make that good to a third party. We have in Ontario a law with regard to notes given for patents, and across the face of the note is printed these words, "this note is good for a patent right." and if any man purchases that note he takes it at his own risk. If the maker does not owe it, the maker has not to pay it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We cannot say we did not owe it?

Mr. HENDERSON. But you can say that you do not owe it to the third party who has possession of it. If the law is properly carried out, I do not think any power could compel the Government to make that scrip good to a third party. It was something that he had no right to receive and concerning which he had abundant notice that he could not possibly collect. I commend to the Minister a plan of that kind with regard to the scrip, and that he should adhere to it emphatically and distinctly that none but the original holder of the scrip shall benefit by it. I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me strange if the courts would not bear the Minister out in his refusal to pay the money to a third party under the circumstances. The danger the Minister fears is that for some reason or other, not known to the House, but apparently known to himself, he might be forced to do it, but most certainly the law would not force him.

Mr. McMULLEN. The question appears to be surrounded by a great many difficulties. It is quite clear that a loss would be sustained by the half-breeds, but if you print across the face of the scrip that it is not good for anybody else, then the half-breed to whom the scrip is given will at once cry out that he is not treated as the others have been treated, and if you can get another Louis Riel in the North-west, these men would be ready to go into rebellion. The cry would be: Why not permit us to sell our scrip as the others have been permitted to sell it. The hon. gentleman from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) suggested that we should pay money instead of scrip. I do not think the country should pay $240 to a half-breed simply because he refuses to take 240 acres of land.

Mr. DAVIN. Is my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) under the impression that the coun-

try will not have to pay the $240 in any case ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite understand the Government will have to accept it in payment for land. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) suggests that it should be redeemed in money and not in land.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is right the country should be called upon to do that. If a half-breed sells his scrip for a song or for a glass of whisky, as some hon. gentleman said, that is not the fault of the country. These half-breeds have the inheritance of the land and the proper way is to give it to them. I hold that if you refuse them the permission to use their scrip as they wish, there will be a great deal of trouble amongst these half-breeds.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) says he does not want to see the Government give the half-breeds the money, but he would rather see the Government give the money to the speculators. The Government has got to give the money.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government absolutely has to give the money.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend will not force me to admit what is not a fact. The Government issues the scrip to the half-breeds worth 240 acres, but to any other person it is good for $240 worth of land. That is not money.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, suppose my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) is a half-breed, and suppose I am a white man. He gets his scrip for $240, and he can walk into the land office, and take 240 acres of land, and pay for it with that scrip of $240. But suppose he does not want to do that. The contention of my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) is : I do not want to see the Government give money for that. Well, I am a white man and I am buying 500 acres of land from the Government and I have to pay the Government $3 an acre or $1,500. I can either pay the $1,500 in cash, or I can buy your scrip and hand the Government $1,260, and the $240 worth of scrip. Is not that money ? I say that money should go into the hands of the half-breeds, and not into the hands of the speculators. Why should the Government give me $240 for what I bought from the half-breed for $10, when the half-breed himself got it for $240 in value or for what was better, if he took it, namely, 240 acres of land. What I want the Government to hold in mind is this : that they must ultimately pay for every dollar in scrip at least $1 in hard cash. I say : Pay to the man to whom you owe it, and not to the speculator, and even though the man to whom you owe it squanders it, let him have the pleasure of squandering the whole of it. My contention is that it could be so arranged by proper machinery, that it would be paid to him gradually. My first contention is that nothing should be given but land ; but if that will not satisfy, and scrip has to be given let the man to whom you give the scrip get the full benefit, and not the speculator ; and my contention is that it could be given to him in annuities of, say, $40 a year, which would be likely to secure for him the whole benefit of the scrip. Then, if he squandered the whole of it, it would be his own business.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are doing all we can to get the North-west settled, by spending money on immigration agents and in other ways ; and when we pay out the $240 in land, it is not the same as paying $240 in cash. It secures another settler in the North-west. If the half-breed chooses to sacrifice his interest in the land, and hand it over to somebody else, you cannot prevent that, unless you adopted the annuity which my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) loses sight of the fact that if this scrip issues now, it will be all paid back by parties who owe the Government for land which they purchased last year. They will pay in scrip when they would otherwise have paid in money.

Mr. McGREGOR. I have had the pleasure of being in the North-west as early as 1867, again in 1869, in 1872, in 1874, and so on. I had the pleasure of living there for a number of years, and if the Opposition in this House think that these half-breeds are fools, they do not know whom they are talking about. These men are quite as able to make bargains as any other men in this country. They are quite able to take care of themselves in most positions in life. When scrip is being issued to the half-breeds, there are a number of people going around to the different towns where it is given out, for the purpose of bidding for it, and to my knowledge it has gone up to $170 or $180. In Calgary, in 1886, the larger proportion of all the scrip that was issued brought $175, and the half-breeds used the money in buying horses, wagons and other articles required on their farms. It is true, there are a few among them who spend their money freely, but you could not find any communities in Ontario or Quebec where the same would not be the case. If you try to make a bargain with these people, you will find that they make as close a bargain as almost any other people you meet. So I do not think the loss as between the native and the purchaser would be very great. When the scrip is issued, you have bankers, brokers and speculators going about, all anxious to get the scrip, and willing to pay the highest market price for it. If it is sold at once to the highest bidder, I am satisfied that the half-breed gets all there is in it for him.

Mr. DAVIN. I am fully sensible of what my hon. friend says. I know very well that you can find as shrewd traders amongst the half-breeds of the North-west Territories as amongst any other class in the world—and as shrewd farmers, too. But I have met thoughtful and able men amongst them who were thoroughly convinced that if the course had been taken which it is admitted was suggested by Archbishop Taché, of giving them land and not its equivalent in scrip their interests would have been better served. I would ask the Minister of the Interior, for he must know, whether Father Lacombe is in favour of the issue of scrip?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not speak positively as to his views.

Mr. DAVIN. If the Minister has conversed with Father Lacombe, I am inclined to think that Father Lacombe, unless he has changed his mind, would have impressed him strongly with the view that the giving of land was the better course.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I always hesitate to express any other man's opinion. I may say that I discussed this matter with Father Lacombe, and, according to the best of my recollection, he did not express himself positively to me. We spoke generally of the question of giving land, and, if I remember correctly, he approved of that as an alternative, but did not express himself positively as to the giving of scrip.

On section 5.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that sections 5, 6 and 7, as printed in the reprint, be added to the Bill. To save time, I will explain them all together. They are for the purpose of dealing with the board of examiners for Dominion land surveyors. The board at present consists of eight members, which is an unnecessarily large number. The Surveyor General has strongly recommended that the number be reduced to three, and these three sections provide for recasting the board.

On section 7,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This section provides that if any member of the board be unable, through illness or other cause, to attend a meeting, his place may be temporarily filled by another duly qualified Dominion topographical surveyor, to be appointed by Order in Council, as the occasion requires.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The only difference between this and clause 119 of the present law is, that, under the present law, a member is not entitled to any pay if he does come more than 100 miles. There were eight members of the board. In the new clause, he will be entitled to pay, if ordered to come and attend the meetings. Under the new provision, there will be only three members, but they will be working members and come when wanted, upon instructions, and consequently be entitled to pay. This Bill will reduce the cost of the meetings.

The committee rose and reported.

LAND TITLES ACT.

Bill (No. 149) further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894 (Mr. Sifton) read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I explained the first clause, when introducing the Bill. It simply provides that plans may be cancelled in cases where town sites were registered against lands that are not required for town site privileges, without certificates of title being taken out for the separate lots. The law at present requires that certificate of title be taken out for the different lots. The difficulty is, that in some cases the proceedings to get a certificate of title would cost more than the whole land is worth. The next clause provides for an omission in the law; it provides that we may register a plan of the survey of an Indian reserve.

The committee rost and reported.

GAME PRESERVATION ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 153) to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that all after the words "thereof" in the first section be struck out. I may explain that the Bill is for the purpose of extending the protection to the buffalo. It runs now to 1900. The proposition is to extend it to 1902. A couple of clauses inserted here state what might be done after 1902; but it is thought that the better way would be to wait until nearer that time, when the House can decide what is to be done.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved second reading of Bill (No. 154) further to amend the Customs Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Section 63 of the Customs Act provides that, in cases where entry has been made of goods and there has been an error in the invoice and some goods have not come in the shipment covered by the invoice, within ten days after the entry a correction can be made and a refund of duty given. In many cases, entries are made before the goods arrive at the port, and it is found that the time is too short in some cases for the party to make a claim within ten days of the entry. It is proposed by adding the words "or landing" to allow ten days after the landing which will give an opportunity for the deficiency to be ascertained.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Section 245 of the Customs Act empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations for a great many different purposes, arranged under sections distinguished by letters of the alphabet. It is proposed to add to the Act giving the Governor in Council power to make provisions that will permit the export of deer under conditions to be determined upon. As hon. gentlemen know, under the laws of the several provinces the killing of deer is permitted to those who take out licenses from the provincial government. In Ontario I believe each licensee is permitted to kill two deer, in Quebec five or six, and in New Brunswick some other number. Now, chap. 16 of 61 Victoria absolutely prohibits the export of deer or any part of the carcass of a deer. The sporstmen from other countries want to take back a deer that they have shot as a trophy. It is proposed, under this section, to empower the Governor in Council to make regulations that will permit the export of deer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there any export duty on deer?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The export is prohibited.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it intended to put an export duty on?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is a change of policy; what is the reason for it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot say that it has been asked for by the provincial government of Ontario, but they have no objections to it. Representatives from the province of Quebec have spoken to me saying they were anxious to have such a change, and I believe it is the wish of the government of that province.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman heard from the Fish and Game Commissioner with regard to this?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There can be no danger in this. Under the provincial laws sporstmen are allowed to kill deer. I suppose the reason for the law forbidding the export of deer was that it was found that deer were being slaughtered too rapidly and there was danger of destroying them as game altogether. It is proposed, under proper regulations, to allow a sporstman from a foreign country to take home a deer as a trophy just as the sportsmen of Ontario may do.

Mr. CLANCY. The object of the game laws in the province of Ontario is to minimize as much as possible the number of deer that might be killed, and you prevent that object by this Bill, because you induce men from a foreign country to kill within the regulation, and, by allowing exportation, to destroy the number of deer in the country. This will entirely undo the object of limiting the number. You might just as well increase the number each man might kill, as to increase the number of men who may come and kill. The hon. gentleman, by this Bill, will increase the number of sportsmen who might kill, for the simple reason that they can take the carcass home.

Mr. FLINT. What is the objection to allowing them to take it home?

Mr. CLANCY. It was thought to be a serious objection that you induce men to come from a foreign country. The number of sportsmen is great enough in this country to kill off the deer more rapidly than they are being reproduced. For that reason you limited the number of men who might kill. The hon. gentleman is doing away with the protection given in Ontario for the deer, and I think there ought to be some expression from the game commission. I am afraid this is being done without their having known about it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it was the game warden of Quebec that came with the members, and he is very anxious for it. You see, the provincial government allow the slaughter of deer anyway. The American sportsman comes over and gets his license from the provincial government, and goes out and kills deer.

Mr. CLANCY. But he will not come if he cannot take the carcass back.

Th MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The province of Quebec went to great expense last year in making an exhibition of game in

New York, and aroused quite an interest among the sportsmen. These men came and spent large sums of money in the country. There is a clause in the game laws of the province of Quebec that they must not allow the carcass to be destroyed or wasted. The Dominion law says they shall not take it home with them. So, where is the danger ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is giving a privilege to a few persons, namely, sportsmen from the United States and sportsmen here, while there is a general feeling that there are others who have rights.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Supposing, under the present arrangement, a few sportsmen from other countries do come and shoot, though they are not permitted to take away the deer, the number of those who will come when this arrangement is in force will be much greater than it is at the present time. I am not a sportsman myself, and, therefore, am not au fait with the circumstances, but I would suggest to the Minister that he should make haste slowly. It is a matter regarding which the province of Ontario, I know, has spent a great deal of money and careful thought, and now they believe they have a pretty perfect system for the protection, especially, of the larger game. I think the Minister has not had formal consultation with the provincial authorities, and has not acted upon the advice of the game commissioners. He should leave this over for the present, rather than legislate at the request of a few private individuals, or even at the request of one province, when it is a matter that affects the provinces. I know there is a strong feeling among the sportsmen of this province for the better protection of game, instead of lessening the regulations.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The question has been discussed in the press, and the game associations, while they have not communicated with me directly, are fully apprised of this measure. The provincial governments have it in their hands at any time to grant or withhold licenses. Granting licenses to shoot is wholly within the power of the provincial governments; this does not interfere with them at all. It simply removes the embargoes that prevent a customs duty, allowing a man, if he shoots a deer under a provincial license, to take the deer home. The reason I propose the amendment in this way is, that if there should be any danger, such as that apprehended by hon. gentlemen opposite, it will not need an Act of Parliament to repeal it. We are only taking power by Governor in Council to make certain regulations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman knows that to increase the slaughter of deer in the province of Ontario for one year or two years, while he is finding out whether any harm is done, is a very serious matter to the game interests in the province of Ontario. With regard to the laws of the province of Quebec, how are foreigners treated?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are licensed to shoot, the same as Canadians; all have to take a license.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So, we are treated the same as aliens. Each province is trying to protect its game interests in its own way, and I think unless the Minister has had the formal approval of the provincial authorities, he ought to hesitate.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The provincial government need not grant the licenses; it is they who are charged with the preservation of the game.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, who is this Bill going to benefit ? Is it for the benefit of the sportsmen of Ontario and the sportsmen of Quebec ? It certainly is not; it is for the benefit of foreign sportsmen, and that is just what this Parliament should not pass.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not object.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Our sportsmen should have the first call on our game.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are doing this at the request of the sportsmen of the provinces.

Mr. MONTAGUE. At the request of one of the provinces, but will the hon. Minister (Mr. Paterson) say that it is at the request of the sportsmen of Ontario or of the Ontario Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) think that we should object to American sportsmen coming here ? On the contrary, within limits, I think we all desire that they shall come over. We advertise Canada as the sportsmen's paradise. We contribute to the exhibitions in the United States, and in every way we can we picture the attractions that Canada possesses. The hon. gentleman says he is not much of a sportsman; neither am I, but I have observed the extraordinary pride that a man takes when he carries home his own game. No man knows what that pride is, unless he be a Scotchman with his bagpipes, except a man who takes a salmon and carries it home. When an American comes over here and spends a few thousand dollars in trying to shoot a deer, if he is not allowed to take his game home, he has paid his money for nothing. I do not think we ought to deprive him of that privilege. I quite agree that if this were going to lead to the slaughter of deer we should not encourage it, but I think it is only a little recognition of the pride of the sportsman to allow him to carry home the result of his own prowess. The Order in Council on the subject and the provincial regulations would

provide such limits as will restrict the sportsman to a limited number.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That matter of pride enters into other things as well. It is a matter of pride for a Canadian to go over to the other side and win success in business, but it it not his privilege. It is a matter of pride for the American manufacturer to supply the Canadian market, but that sentiment does not prevail even under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Will the hon. gentleman tell me of the purpose of the laws in the provinces is not to restricting the killing of deer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To keep it within reasonable limits.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the object of this clause which said that deer should not be exported ? It was necessary for the protection of our game that it should not be exported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The provincial laws were not in force at the time. It may have been to protect the game.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is lots of time to get a report in regard to the matter. I have no objection to the fish and game commissioners, although they are strong opponents of mine. There is no reason why we should not have the Bill submitted to the fish and game commissioners and get their opinion on it.

Mr. ELLIS. It seems to me it is rather churlish, when the provinces allow the shooting of game under certain regulations. that because a man lives across the line. to say that he shall not take his deer across to where he lives. If a man comes in and kills a deer he finds that he is not able to take it home with him because the Dominion law prevents him doing so. These deer having been killed in accordance with the provincial regulations, it seems to me that the Dominion should not prevent them being carried away. There is another view of it. Our own sportsmen are, so far as I am aware, always glad to see these sportsmen come into the country. They are liberal spenders of money, and while I dare say that the price mentioned by the hon. Minister of Finance, which they pay for killing a deer, is rather high, I have no doubt it costs a very large sum, and I do not think that we should deprive them of the privilege of taking their game home.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What proof are you going to have that the sportsman shot this game that he takes away ?

Mr. ELLIS. The local game wardens.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is all very well, but a man comes across and into the hunting grounds——

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He must have his license first.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the license does not direct his shot. He may buy the deer, and he will get outside of the law entirely.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I propose that I shall designate certain ports at which alone deer can be exported. A party comes to make an export entry ; he will have to bring his provincial license and everything to show that he had a right to shoot the deer and the right to export. I propose to limit the number that any man may take out, not by the number in the province of Quebec, but by the limit fixed by the province of Ontario. For each license not more than two deer may be exported. We must make regulations providing that the deer must go out at certain ports and that the license must be produced. It is a matter in the hands of the provincial legislatures which grant these licenses. If they find that the deer are being slaughtered faster than they desire they must limit the number of these licenses. All we propose is that, if a sportsman, having a license from a provincial government, shoots two deer he may be allowed to take them away. We do not give him the privilege of shooting them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister of Customs says that the provincial governments must limit the number of licenses in order to prevent the slaughter of deer. No province will do that. No province will say to the first ten men that they should get their licenses and that those who come afterwards cannot get their licenses.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They can limit the number of deer to be shot or establish a close season.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They have done both. They have done their very best to preserve the game, and I am saying that of a Liberal administration. as I am willing to say on all occasions when they have done their best. They have done their very best to prevent that which is being encouraged by this Bill. What evidence is there that the party shot the deer ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Governor in Council may make regulations.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The regulations will provide that the party must give satisfactory proof that he shot the deer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No matter how much sentiment there may be in favour of this Bill, you are loosening the strings which the provinces have tightened. What province could ever have suggested such legislation?

Mr. ELLIS. New Brunswick wants it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quebec wants it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will not say that Quebec wants it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend (Mr. Champagne) says that Quebec wants it. The province spent a large sum of money in making an exhibit in New York last year for the purpose of pointing out the resources that they have in the way of game, and they are anxious for it. The railways are interested because these people travel. There is a large expenditure of money wherever they go. If you are weakening that protection, it would be a different thing, but the provincial government can make whatever regulations they please, and they can suspend all licenses, if they think it necessary. All this Bill proposes is to allow a man who shoots a deer to take it home with him. We can make regulations under this Act. For instance, we could require the sportsman to produce his license, we could limit certain ports as ports of export, and when a deer was exported at one port the collectors at the other ports could be notified that the holder of such a license had exported a deer. This would insure that he could not export more than he was entitled to kill by sending them out at different ports.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister (Mr. Paterson) must see that my contention is not unreasonable. There is no reason in the world why this Bill should not be sent to the Provincial Secretary of the province of Ontario, who would at once consult the Fish and Game Commission of the province. There is lots of time, and the Bill can stand over for a few days. If there is nothing in it which is opposed to the spirit of the game protection laws of the province of Ontario, there is no reason why it should not be submitted for their opinion. If it is the province of Ontario against the province of Quebec, let them discuss it. I submit that while the sportsmen of the province of Quebec should have the very fullest consideration of the Minister, the sportsmen and game authorities of the province of Ontario should have the same consideration. If this Bill is in their opinion prejudicial to the game laws of the province, I do not think it should be allowed to pass this House.

Mr. QUINN. I think the Minister should adopt the suggestion of the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). The Minister states that notice of this Bill has been given in the papers, but I am perfectly certain that our game protection societies in the province of Quebec have heard nothing about it, and I should like to have this Bill reserved and submitted for their consideration. We have several societies in Montreal which take a great interest in the protection of game, and I am satisfied that their opinion would be opposed to this Bill. The Minister says that this Bill merely permits a sportsman of the United States to take the game which he kills home. There is no such restriction in the Bill. It gives permission for the export of game shot by any person, and it is not necessary under the Bill that the man who exports it should be the person who shot it. It is not even necessary under the Bill that the person who shot the game and exported it should be an American who came to Canada for sport. He may come here for sport, or buy this game from the person who shot it and then export it. Once the permission exists, it would be impossible under the law to prevent him taking the game with him, which he may have purchased in Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill is not a permission to export, but merely a power to make regulations.

Mr. QUINN. Why, the Bill says:

(s) For regulating the number of deer and parts thereof which may be exported in any year, when shot, under provincial or territorial authority in Canada, by any person for sport.

Mr. CLANCY. I have a vivid recollection of a heated discussion in the Ontario legislature on this game protection question. My recollection is that great reliance was placed on the fact that the export of game was not allowed. And under the Ontario law, any person killing even the limited number of two deer is not permitted to sell the venison to his neighbour, the idea being that it should be of no use to any person except the one who killed it. That being the case, if you open the door for exportation, it will be a very dangerous thing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A man could buy the game and export it under this law.

Mr. CLANCY. But he cannot purchase it under the Ontario law, unless, of course, he evades the law. The Hon. Mr. Gibson takes a great interest in this matter, and is well acquainted with the opinions of sportsmen on this matter, and I think the Minister should let the Bill stand until it has been submitted to Mr. Gibson for his consideration.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The notice of this Bill has been published in the Montreal "Star" and the Montreal "Gazette," and I think the "Mail and Empire," and it has been discussed since May 27th. If there were any objections to it, I would be sure to have these objections stated to me before this.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What objection is there to let the Bill stand?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no necessity for it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no danger in my suggestion, but there is danger in the suggestion of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What possible danger ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. You may be running against the wishes of the province of Ontario, which is strongly in favour of the protection of game.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The province of Ontario has the matter entirely in their own hands. They need not issue licenses nor need they allow a single deer to be shot, if they wish.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. It seems to me that the proposition of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is a most reasonable one. I have read the Toronto papers, and other papers of the province of Ontario pretty regularly for the last month or two, and I have never seen any notice with regard to this proposal of the Minister of Customs. The Minister, speaking on the Bill, says it is for the benefit of Americans, to place them on the same footing as Canadians who shoot deer, and to allow them to export the deer they shoot. But this proposed amendment clearly states that the deer, when shot under provincial or territorial authority in Canada by any person for sport, may be exported. It seems to me that this amendment is the suggestion of those who perhaps have herds of deer. It certainly looks as if the intention were to encourage Canadians to supply the American market with venison, and not for the purpose of sport at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the Minister will read the clause, he will see that it is not restricted at all to citizens of any other country. At the present time, no one can export a deer, whether he is a citizen of another country or a Canadian. That provision was for the purpose of protecting our game. Under this provision the Minister takes power to say that a man who comes in from the United States and shoots two deer, or whatever number he may legally shoot, may take them to his own home. It also says that a Canadian may export the deer he shoots. I submit, notwithstanding the opinions of his supporters who have spoken to him, and the press opinions which his friends may have collected for him, that in making this provision the Minister is undermining the whole strength of the protection of deer in the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it is only fair to say that among the different extracts from papers which I have, I do find that the Toronto "Telegram" of May 17th, has an article that is not in favour of the measure. I think that is the only one. I speak subject to correction, but I believe that I have in the office a letter from the Hon. Mr. Gibson, of Ontario, saying that he does not object to the measure. But I do not wish to use that to-night, as I am not certain, and I am willing that the Bill should stand for its third reading so that I can see if I have got that. I thought it best to deal with the matter, as we deal with so many other subjects, by giving the power to the Governor in Council. Then, if it were ever represented by the provincial governments that they would like to have the export forbidden again, all that would be necessary would be to repeal the Order in Council, which could be done at any time without having to wait for Parliament to act. I cannot myself see where there is any danger. Everything is not laid down in the Bill, because we propose to make regulations by Orders in Council so that it shall only be a bona fide licensed sportsman who will be permitted to take home the deer which he has shot. The papers I have show that the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario all favour the measure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With every desire to advance the Bill, if it is one that is unobjectionable, I do not feel inclined to accept the suggestion to let it go out of the committee stage and go to the third reading, where debate is very much restricted. I submit that the hon. gentleman is either ingenious or he does not clearly see what his Bill does. There are two classes of people affected. The first is the man who wants to encourage the export of deer for his own profit. The other is the man who wants to restrict the killing of deer in every possible way except for the purposes of legitimate sport. This Bill is in the interest of the man who wants to make money out of the game.

The MINISTER OF CUTOMS. No, no.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What does the game law do ? The protection of game is partly in the hands of the provincial authorities and partly in the hands of this Parliament. The provincial authorities can make regulations as to the number of deer that can be killed, the open season, and the exposure of those deer on the open market, and this House can determine whether any of those deer may be exported. The hon. gentleman is going further than he did when he explained the Bill.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In what way ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman told us that the intention was to allow foreign sportsmen to carry home their deer, and the appeal of the Finance Minister was along the same line. Yet the Bill itself, as suggested by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) permits any man who shoots deer in the province of Ontario to export them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman has no faith in the Governor in Council doing what I say I propose to recommend, then, of course, he would want to have the Bill framed with all the pro-

visions in it that would be in the Order in Council. But I think the better way is to make the provisions in the Order in Council, so that if any harm resulted at any time, it could be at once stopped by rescinding the Order in Council. When the Governor in Council adopts the regulations, the things which the hon. gentleman desires will be provided for. The export of deer will be limited to foreign sportsmen who have been licensed to shoot deer, and the export will be limited to two deer and to certain specified field sports. The object is only to give the American or the Briton or the resident of any other country who may come here to shoot deer under provincial license, the privilege of taking with him the hides and horns, which are forbidden to be exported now. Every precaution will be taken to prevent the sport being engaged in for the sake of the money, and to confine it solely to sportsmen. If an American sportsman comes over here, pays for his license, and spends his money, he will be allowed to take his deer home. The regulations will be made as stringent as possible, and the advantage of an Order in Council is, that these regulations may be at once revised, should they be found wanting in any respect.

Mr. CLANCY. Under the law, a Canadian now is limited to two deer, and an American is prevented from taking any deer away, so that the one restriction is the equivalent to the other. A Canadian cannot sell to his neighbour, and the object is to do away with every incitement to kill more than two deer. The provincial legislatures have not power to prevent the export.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Now that they have abundance of deer, they want to encourage foreign sportsmen to come in.

Mr. CLANCY. Not in the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In New Brunswick.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman will confine his Bill to New Brunswick, I have not a word to say.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I understand that a man in Ontario, or any other province, must take out a license to kill deer, just the same as an American. He cannot shoot more than two deer, and these two deer he can shoot only for his own use; he cannot sell them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He can sell them in the open market between the 1st and 15th of November.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Then, it is the worse for the hon. gentleman's argument. When a man comes from the United States, and pays for his license, and spends hundreds of dollars here, ought he not to be allowed to take back with him for his own use the two deer he has shot, especially when a man belonging to the country can sell to his neighbour?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman misses the main point, which is this: whether you do not encourage the killing of deer to a greater extent by allowing the export?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There is not a sportsman from the other side who is coming here for the sake of two deer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If that is not the point, how is this going to encourage the killing of deer. The only way in which encouragement could be given would be by making it profitable. But there can be no money in it under this Bill. A man is allowed to kill only two deer, and I venture to say that it is not for the meat of the animals that he wishes to bring them home with him for, but for the horn.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose it has none.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Perhaps that is the kind they have in Ontario. In Ontario they often kill calves for deer. In the lower provinces the animals, like the men, show just what they are.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the doe horns in the hon. gentleman's province?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Under our law he does not shoot does.

Mr. CLANCY. You can in season.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If that is the law in Ontario, then it requires amending, because a great protection is to forbid females being shot. A sportsman will come over here for the shooting in the first place, and, secondly, to get the horn. If a sportsman gets a license and spends his money here, he should be permitted to take home any part of the animal he likes.

Mr. QUINN. There is just one objection. The object of enacting a law to prevent the export of deer was for the protection of game. The provincial laws not only limit the number of deer that may be shot, but prevent the export to any other province of any of the deer shot in one province. An Ontario man cannot send a deer to Quebec, nor can a New Brunswick man send a barrel of partridge to a friend in Quebec. But the Minister of Customs wants to put the American sportsman on a better footing by letting him come across into any one of our provinces for the purpose of shooting here, and then allow him to take the deer home with him, although a Quebec man cannot cross into Ontario and shoot a deer and bring it back to this province. Is that the intention? If not, how is my hon. friend

going to meet that ? Is he going to compel the provincial legislature to pass a law allowing the Quebec sportsmen to go into New Brunswick, shoot a deer and bring it in Quebec, or go into Ontario, shoot a deer, and bring it into Quebec ? Or will he compel the province of Quebec to pass a law of that kind with respect to sportsmen of other provinces. If not. he puts the American sportsman on a better footing than the Canadian sportsman is in his own country.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Did the hon. gentleman say that each province prohibits the export of game that is killed ?

Mr. QUINN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I never heard of that except in the province of Manitoba. which prohibits the export of prairie chicken. It is not the case in the lower provinces.

Mr. COWAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) to say that no game shot in the province of Ontario can be exported to another province ?

Mr. QUINN. I do not know what the game law of Ontario is on that subject.

Mr. COWAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the game laws of the provinces prohibited the export of game into other provinces. If the hon. gentleman said so he is incorrect. You can export duck from the province of Ontario to the United States.

Mr. CLANCY. Can you export deer ?

Mr. BEATTIE. Can you export quail from Ontario ?

Mr. COWAN. Certainly.

Mr. BEATTIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. COWAN. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he has not read the game laws of Ontario.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am a member of the quail preserve, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that quail may not be exported from the province.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not rise at all to deal with the details of the game law of Ontario. I am ignorant of a good many subjects, and probably more ignorant of that than of many others. But I do know that the provincial authorities have taken the greatest possible pains to protect our game. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and other members from the province of Ontario, know that it has been a labour of anxiety and a labour of love for the legislature of Ontario to throw around the destruction of our game every restriction. All I ask is whether this proposed law will relax those safeguards ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course it will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I prefer to take the opinion of the game commissioners of Ontario rather than that of a representative of Quebec, who sits by the Minister and urges this Bill through. I prefer to take the opinion of men who have worked out the question with great pains and with great patriotism, so far as their own province is concerned, and with the greatest regard for the manly sport sought to be protected by the laws of Ontario. All I ask the hon. Minister to do is to hesitate, to wait three days, to wait two days.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He said he was willing to do that. He will let the third reading stand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) knows that on the third reading debate is restricted. Is there any reason why we should hesitate at the third reading that is not as strong a reason for hesitating now ? Unless there is some sinister motive which I do not think there can be, for I know the hon. Minister too well for that, there can be no reason why this Bill should not stop here. It may be that there is not the weight of a feather of what I am saying or in what has been said by hon. gentlemen on this side. We do not pretend to minute knowledge, but we ask the Minister of Customs, before he takes this radical step, to consult those people in Ontario who are specialists in this matter, who are paid to protect our game, who have made regulations at very great expense for its protection. And notwithstanding the eloquence of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), I ask the Minister to consult these people before he takes down the bars. I may be entirely ignorant on the subject, but it seems to me that the bars which he proposes to remove are the main protection to game in the province of Ontario under the provincial regulations.

Mr. McHUGH. I do not think it is going to make any difference to the provinces whether this Bill is passed or not—they will still be able to protect themselves. They now grant a license to foreigners coming in to shoot deer, a fee being paid for each license. If too many of these foreigners come in, the provincial authorities can refuse to grant further licenses, except to residents of the province. But so long as they grant licenses to these parties to shoot deer, the people who pay for the privilege ought to have the right to take the deer away.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me we have missed a very pertinent point in the discussion. I would ask the Minister whether he has considered the question whether the province of Ontario has passed laws prohibiting the exportation of deer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How could they do that ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Very easily, I think. They have prohibited the export of logs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not prohibit the export.

Mr. HENDERSON. They do, absolutely. They say that logs cut upon certain lands shall not be exported. They allow the American licensee to cut the timber, and then forbid him to export the logs from the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a condition of the license.

Mr. HENDERSON. And they can make the non-export of deer a condition of the license to shoot. And if the Ontario Government has made such a restriction, this Government should not usurp their powers and interfere with the protection which they have thrown around the game in the province.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The province owns the logs, but they do not own the deer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then who owns the deer? The province owns them in the same way as it owns the timber. No man can cut timber on Crown property without a license from the provincial government, neither can he shoot a deer without their license. It seems to me that if the Minister has not caused inquiry to be made into that point as to whether the Ontario legislature has prohibited the export of deer, he should do so before passing a law which may conflict with that of the province. As to the proposed Order in Council, the Minister admits that it will not be so broad as the power he is asking the House to give him. In fairness to the House, he should limit the power he has taken. I, for one, am very much opposed to this system of passing laws allowing the country to be governed by Order in Council. In the province of Ontario we have overstepped all reasonable limits in that direction. As I have stated in this House before, by simple Order in Council, we have sunk the province in millions of dollars of debt, the legislature of Ontario having no control whatever, because they have handed over the power to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I think Parliament should control everything as much as possible, and in all the discussions to-night, I fail to see any good reason why this power should be taken out of the hands of Parliament and placed in the hands of the executive. So much does the province of Ontario value her game laws and her game that the legislature would hesitate to permit the Government to exercise absolute control.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The regulation of the details of this matter is left to the Government by Order in Council, and the Minister has already explained the necessity and the benefits of that, and so the Bill is put in a shape that it can be abolished if found to work badly. I rise for the purpose of appealing to my hon. friends. As the Minister of Customs has explained, this matter is not sprung upon the country, it has been before the country for months, it has been discussed in the press. Now, we have had the advantage of a very lengthy discussion in the House; and with that, and the statement from the Minister that he does not propose to ask for the third reading to-night. I hope my hon. friends will allow the Bill to take this stage.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am always willing to admit when I am wrong. If I had read the Ontario statute half an hour ago, I would not have made the contention that I have made. I fancy the hon. gentleman knows that I was not raising a point for technical purposes, but simply for fear that some licensing restriction might be made by the Minister against the desire of the province of Ontario. But I see that what he is going to do is provided for in the statute:

> Any person not a resident and domiciled in the province, who has for any year been granted a license under the provisions of section 4 of this Act, and has paid the fee therefor, shall, so far as the authority of the legislature of the province of Ontario extends, be at liberty to export out of the province the two deer which, under the provisions of this Act, he is allowed to kill.

Now, I only ask that when hon. gentlemen opposite see that they are wrong, they shall be equally ready to admit it as I am.

Bill reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th July, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon.

Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when the further supplementaries are likely to be down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Well, they are in an advanced state, but I am not able to name the day to my hon. friend. I will try to do it as early as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. It is stated outside by the press that is supposed to know the inside, that there are Estimates to the amount of seven millions coming down. Members are really leaving for home, and it is somewhat of an imposition to have a large amount of supplementary Estimates kept until this time of the session when it is perfectly impossible to give them any fair consideration by the House as whole.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, there is really some force in my hon. friend's criticism. I can do no more than promise to expedite their preparation as much as possible. They are in a very advanced stage, and I hope soon to be able to fix a day when they can be brought down. My hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated that he hoped to have them on the Table early this week. That is perhaps a little too much to promise, but I hope before the week is out that they will be on the Table.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 146) further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Interior.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 149) further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 153) to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.—(Mr. Sifton.)

DOMINION LANDS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 148) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, before this is read the third time, whether anything is to be done this session in regard to the subject that I brought to his attention early in the session, namely, the seed grain indebtedness, and the seed grain liens against lands, and the bonded indebtedness. Also, in regard to some other lands, I am inclined to think that I brought to his attention a petition that was presented to him by some persons around Regina in regard to lands that are in the names of certain parties, all of whom have left the country, and here are the lands with no occupants on them, and yet people who come in cannot settle on them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that I am afraid that I cannot undertake this session to deal with the question of these seed grain liens. I fully recognize that there is much in what has been urged by the hon. gentleman and by other members of the House upon the question; but I have not yet been able to settle in my mind definitely upon a plan concerning which I could give the House any information. I think, however, I can give the hon. gentleman a pledge that I will take it up and deal with it next session. I intend to give it my immediate attention, and arrive at some definite conclusion as soon as the press of the sessional work is over. As to the second matter the hon. gentleman has brought up, I understand he refers to lands which were settled under the auspices of the Canada Settlers Company and others; is that not the case?

Mr. DAVIN. No, it refers to lands around towns, like Regina. I think the hon. gentleman has had a petition from certain residents in and around Regina in regard to the lands. They are lands that are locked up; people entered for them, and have done a certain amount of improvements; then they have gone away, and there are the lands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Why cannot they be cancelled? Anybody can cancel them.

Mr. DAVIN. That is my own opinion. But nevertheless, these people have sent petitions to my hon. friend. I have written back that in all cases like that——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There must be something more than that. If a man has taken up a homestead under the Dominion Lands Act, and he is in default, he can be cancelled. There must be something more than that in it.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think these people think that the department is in some way withstanding cancellation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The circumstance to which the hon. gentleman refers has entirely escaped my memory. There are a great many petitions in the Department of the Interior, and I would not undertake to say that there is not a petition there on this subject. But I can only say that I will look into it at once. The rule is very definite and clear. When a man takes up a homestead under the Dominion Lands Act and he is in default, he is liable to be cancelled. The only way he can avoid having his claim cancelled is by making special application to me, and if he sets out what I think is reasonable ground for delaying the matter and giving him more time, I very

often extend his time, or give him a little consideration. But that is not done in a wholesale way, only when some special reason is given. I have no recollection of any special circumstance in relation to the matter the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a grievance back of that which will be very hard to deal with, cases where men have not only entered for land, but have got a patent, and have gone away years ago, and apparently never intend to return. It is a very hard thing to deal with.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They own the land; we do not own it.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I understand that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no more right to deal with it than I have to take possession of a lot on Sparks Street.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see how you could deal with it.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. Minister to say that there really would be no action taken on that portion of this Bill which refers to the extinguishment of the title of the half-breeds in the North-west Territories this year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think it is at all likely that we will be in a position to issue any certificate or scrip this year.

Mr. FOSTER. In that case we may have a chance to debate it again, and in the interval the hon. Minister may come to the conclusion that some method may be found which will obviate the difficulties that we all acknowledged to exist last night.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not impossible.

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

SALE OF SCHOOL LANDS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Last evening, while the debate on one of the Bills before the House was proceeding, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), asked me to furnish him with certain information in regard to the sale of school lands. I have had a statement prepared giving the information which the hon. gentleman asked for. The area of school lands sold down to the 1st May, 1899, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, is 87,775,57-100 acres. The total amount for which such lands were sold is $674,210.10. The amount paid on account, including interest, is $569,029.99. The hon. gentleman will see that that bears out the information I gave last night. I thought the payments had been pretty well made up. The amount of principal still due is $177,196.06. There is of course a considerable amount of accrued interest upon these last payments which I have not calculated because it is a matter of great labour and involves a large amount of detail. There is some interest still due. I will hand the hon. gentleman a copy of the statement.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Chairman, we are now in the first week of the new fiscal year and the public service might soon become embarrassed if there were not some understanding in regard to the supplies for the year which we have entered upon. I need hardly point out that, although we have made some progress with our Estimates, we have not yet got any Supply Bill. We have disposed in Committee of Supply of all the supplementary Estimates for the year which closed on Friday last, and concurrence has been taken thereon. We have also discussed in Committee of Supply, and taken concurrence on, a number of items in the main Estimates, but these are not of legal effect until they are incorporated in the Supply Bill and passed through their final stage. We desire that that stage shall be taken as quickly as possible, and we also desire that temporary provision may be made for supplies for the year upon which we have now entered. We desire that this step shall be taken by what is commonly known as a vote on account. I have had a conference with the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), who has kindly agreed that we shall proceed to take a vote for one-tenth of the Estimates which are before the committee. There are precedents for that which the House, no doubt, is familiar with. I shall move a resolution that the House shall appropriate to the supply of Her Majesty one-tenth of the amounts contained in the Estimates that have not been passed by the committee. It is understood that in passing a vote of this character neither the House nor the committee will commit themselves to any question involved in these appropriations, but that every matter relating to them shall remain fully before the committee and be subject to discussion at all future stages.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is correct in saying that I talked the matter over with him. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have no desire to embarrass the public service to any extent at all nor to drive hon. gentlemen opposite to any dubious expedient to raise the wind, provided we do not give them these Estimates. I know, that in giving assent, a generous assent is always best, but there is a good deal of human nature yet around this House, and some on this side of the

House, and in giving this frank and prompt assent to a measure which will facilitate the operations of the Government, that the public service may not be embarrassed, to any degree at all, I do it asking hon. gentlemen opposite to contrast this period with a certain period early before the end of the financial year of 1896, when it was absolutely certain that months after the next fiscal year, at least one month, and may be more, must have passed before any of the supplies could be obtained from Parliament and before any special vote could be taken in any way, and when it was asked that one-tenth of the vote should be allowed in order that the public service might not be embarrassed, hon. gentlemen opposite put their feet down and declared that not a cent should be given and not one cent was given. Well, we are strong, and we propose to be generous, so we agree with the Finance Minister in this step to-day. The object lesson, however, read by comparison is instructive.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster), will find a more apposite subject of comparison in the year 1891 than in 1896. The hon. gentleman remembers that the session of 1891 lasted through May, June, July, August and until September, and if my memory serves me rightly, and I do not think it fails me, we gave him, not one, but two votes on account, for July and August.

Mr. FOSTER. That was in your earlier and fresher period.

The PRIME MINISTER. I applaud the hon. gentleman's generosity, still I can point to a mark showing that we are standing ahead of him yet.

Resolution reported, and read a first and second time.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The House again resolved itself in Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved:

1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1899, the sum of $2,522,054.44 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1900, the sum of $6,978,585.72 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions to be reported.

Resolutions read the first and second times and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1899, and 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In moving my resolutions in the committee, I omitted to state that as respects one item, that of pensions, we have taken one-half, and not one-tenth, as these pensions are paid half-yearly.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mulock for the second reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has the floor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was understood that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) would speak when this question came up.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) moved the adjournment and he therefore has the right to the floor unless he sees fit to give way to another hon. gentleman. With reference to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), technically he has already spoken, because he moved an amendment to the motion, which was lost, and the hon. gentleman, therefore, has exhausted his right to speak. If he addresses the House now it must be with the unanimous consent of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will give him that consent in return for the generosity which has just been displayed by the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a small favour for the large abount of money we have just given you.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I thank hon. gentlemen opposite for their favour in permitting me to address the House on this occasion. Let me call attention to the attitude of the Prime Minister and of those who are promoting this Redistribution Bill. The Premier, who is generally so amiable in the House, apparently lost that good nature which characterizes him when this Bill came up for discussion on a former occasion.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. The right hon. gentleman seemed determined, in a way I never saw before in this House, to force this Bill through, and he wanted to get the leader of the Opposition to pledge himself that the debate would conclude the following week, a pledge which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) pointedly refused to give. The proposition which the Premier made to the House is startling, in its attempt to prevent discussion on this important measure, and no more important measure could come before this Parliament, especially in this case where fifty-four seats in the province of Ontario are gerrymandered, or changed, or turned upside down, at the will of the Administration—or will be if the Bill should become law. The Prime Minister used some very violent language, such as this:

> We have seen so many things that are not seemly. We have seen the debate on the Address protracted by a repetition of the same things over and over again for four weeks or more. That was not seemly. We have seen the business of the Government obstructed at every turn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am fairly in the judgment of the House when I say that that statement is very inaccurate. We found, when Parliament met, that the Government had no business to present, and it was quite within our right to debate the Address on which we could discuss the affairs of the nation in a general way. The right hon. gentleman, instead of censuring us, should have given us his high commendation for relieving him of a very great difficulty, because he was confronted by Parliament, and his Government were totally unready, and more than unready, to present any business for the consideration of Parliament. They were unwilling, Mr. Speaker, to comply with the demands of Parliament and to furnish those documents and papers which are necessary for the consideration of this question by the House. The Bill itself was not introduced until sixty-five days of the session had elapsed; the second reading of it did not come up until the ninety-third day of the session; and now, at the 111th day of the session, is the third time we have had an opportunity of discussing it.

I must say, when the Postmaster General proposed the second reading of this Bill, it struck me as the crudest and most ill-considered Bill which had ever come before the House for its consideration. There was only one feature in it, and that was the determination, which was emphasized by the words of the Postmaster General himself, that this was to be a vindictive measure—that we had done wrong in 1882, and that now had come the period for reprisals and vengeance. Mr. Speaker, I propose to contrast the Redistribution Bill of 1882 with the Gerrymander Bill of 1899; and I think I shall be able to show that this is a most unfair and unjust Bill—that it does an injustice to dozens of Conservative constituencies; while that of 1882 was, in its main provisions and in the general carrying of it out, a fair redistribution of the constituencies.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, never. You never said it was.

Mr. WALLACE. I say it now, and I shall endeavour to prove it, notwithstanding the angry and unseemly interruption of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). When the Postmaster General got up to explain this Bill, and point-blank refused to give information, when he evidently did not understand the Bill himself, it struck me, why, this is all on a par with the previous course of the Postmaster General, when he passed an Act, saying, "I, William Mulock, arrange that foreign postage shall be less than our local postage." When he found that he had not the power to do it, he made another blunder, and another, and another, and so on through the whole course of his acts with regard to the Post Office Department; and we find the same series of blunders characterizing the Bill which he has now proposed for the consideration of the House.

Then, Sir, we come to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). With an assurance and a want of modesty characteristic of him, with that magnificent fog-horn voice of his, he told the House that he was going to confine himself to a discussion of the Bill itself; and, Mr. Speaker, it is within the remembrance of all those members who heard him that during the several hours he addressed the House he scarcely ever alluded to the Bill. He discussed the Bill of 1882, and he made a series of misrepresentations of that Bill from one end to the other, such as he has made for 17 years, until I suppose that he actually believes himself that they are true. I remember 13 or 14 years ago, in an election in the county of Haldimand, I think it was, when I came back at 1 o'clock in the morning from a meeting we had held, there was the then member for South Brant making the identical speech which he made here the other night, spreading himself out, and telling how this constituency was torn from that and flung into the other, and how the constituencies had been gerrymandered. The other night, the hon. gentleman made this statement with regard to the leader of the Opposition:

> He has not used an argument worthy of being considered in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House will conclude, both sides of it, who listened to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that he made a marvellously grasping speech—one that covered the whole situation—and we on this side could fairly leave the case just as it was

left by the leader of the Opposition. He discussed the constitutionality of the question, and since then we have not heard a word from those who were before claiming that it was constitutional, and that it had precedents to justify it. He discussed the question from every point of view, and made an able and exhaustive speech, and the sneer of the Minister of Customs was as ill-timed as it was inaccurate. But the Minister of Customs said further:

> How was the Bill of 1882 prepared by these hon. gentlemen themselves? Did they want this matter argued by both political parties? No; in a chamber, with closed doors, they summoned their heelers and their party workers from all the different counties, and there they sat down, with a map before them, took this township out of that riding, that township out of this riding, placed this township into that riding, and that township into this riding.

And so on, and so forth—a repetition all the way through. Who were the men who were entrusted by the Conservative party with this work? So far as my information at that time went, they were the Hon. Mackenzie Bowell and the Hon. J. C. Aikens, who had the province of Ontario in charge—to comply with the law, to add six new members, and to readjust the constituencies on the basis, contradictory to the statement made by the Postmaster General, of representation by population, as I shall show.

Mr. McMULLEN. Ah.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I repudiate any such statement being made with regard to these gentlemen. They are men who have occupied, and who occupy to-day, a high place in the esteem of the people of this country. It will not be pretended even by their political opponents that those two gentlemen would stoop to anything dishonourable or mean.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, no, not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Wellington does not apparently know those courtesies which are required in this House, and I suppose we shall have to excuse him on that account.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the House will observe order, and that members will not interrupt unless they ask the permission of the member who has the floor.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the contrast between the work done in 1882 by the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the Hon. Mr. Aikens, and the work done by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1899? Do we not know, Mr. Speaker, that the heelers were brought in, in 1899, to assist in the Gerrymander Bill now before the House? Do we not know that Captain Sullivan was in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear—here for a week.

Mr. WALLACE. Here for a week, assisting them in the readjustment of the Gerrymander Bill now before the House. Do we not know that Simeon Hewitt and others were here; and the courts have since declared that these two gerrymanderers are outlaws in this country. These are the men who were in this city of Ottawa to assist hon. gentlemen opposite to gerrymander the constituencies in Ontario. I understand that they were cheek-by-jowl with the Minister of Customs assisting in this gerrymander.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Who did the hon. gentleman say were with me?

Mr. WALLACE. Captain Sullivan and Simeon Hewitt.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know Captain Sullivan. Simon Hewitt. I have no recollection of being in the city at all, nor do I think he is.

Mr. WALLACE. Exactly so. Is it not a remarkable circumstance that the Minister of Customs tells exactly the same story as John Dryden did in South Ontario, and MacNish in West Elgin. He never knew them—a perfectly innocent gentleman, who went through the riding with these men, assisting them to perform the most nefarious acts of corruption that Canada has ever seen politically——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman made a definite statement with reference to my having consulted with Captain Sullivan and Mr. Simeon Hewitt about this Bill, and said that we were sitting side by side and jowl by jowl. I gave that statement an emphatic denial. The hon. gentleman did not accept my denial, and is in a peculiar position.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. gentleman the right, Mr. Speaker, to make a speech, as well as to raise a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think he is right in saying that he made a personal statement, which the hon. gentleman must accept.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not refuse to accept that statement. I did not say one word in rebuttal of it, but I said: Was it not a remarkable coincidence that the denial of the Minister of Customs was precisely, in similar terms, the denial of John Dryden in South Ontario, and of MacNish in West Elgin, who made a similar denial that he never saw, never knew, never dreamed of these men being there, did not know of the corruption going on all around him?

Mr. FOSTER. And they were all Liberals.

Mr. WALLACE. All Liberals together. It is a wonderful coincidence, a fact which I shall not deny, that the Minister of Customs was just as innocent as the two other innocent birds to whom I refer. Mr. Simeon

Hewitt, of his own town, brought up under his own tuition—brought up by the Minister of Customs—taught his political exercises and his political games, was here in the city of Ottawa, and the Minister of Customs—we accept his statement unreservedly—never saw or knew he was here. I think the hon. Minister of Customs might repeat the words of Preston, and say: "Hug the machine for me."

There is another matter on which the Minister of Customs waxed eloquent. He waxed eloquent when he referred to the assassins, no less, on this side of the House, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the Hon. J. C. Aikens and those who assisted them, whom he charged with attempting to assassinate—whom? The bright and genial James Trow, member for South Perth. All of us who were in the old Parliament, knew the genial James Trow. We admired his personality, and I think, politically, he had as many friends upon the Conservative side as upon the Liberal side. There was not a man in my experience who ever said an unkind word politically of the genial James Trow. Yet the Minister of Customs says that we attempted to assassinate him. I fling back the assertion in his teeth. He was assassinated, but by men on that side of the House and their political friends outside. What is the history of that? In South Perth the candidate against James Trow said: It is no use for the Conservatives to run in South Perth against Trow, because he produces the speech of Sir John Macdonald, in which Sir John said: We hope to see Trow back in Parliament again: we hope to see his genial face here again in Parliament. Sir John was kindly to Mr. Trow personally, and he declared so on the floor of Parliament. Mr. Trow, as was quite proper, made the best use of that speech, and the Conservatives decided there was no use in trying to defeat him, and he was elected again. But there came another day. At the by-elections he was defeated by Mr. Pridham. What happened? The leaders of the Liberal party in the House and the then hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who appears to be one of them, by his position to-day as Minister of Customs, threw him over, and Mr. Trow bitterly bewailed the fact that he was assassinated by his own political friends. Instead of having the election trial go on, it was settled behind his back, contrary to his wishes, and he was thereby thrown out of political life, for which he had a very strong liking. He died brokenhearted, owing to the conduct of his political friends, and not because of anything done by his opponents. That is the history of genial James Trow, and when those gentlemen get up and say, as the Minister of Customs did, that we had assassinated Mr. Trow by taking out a township from his county which gave some hundreds of a Liberal majority, what is the history? Mr. Trow's majority in 1878 was 77. After the Redistribution Act of 1882 we went to the country. According to the Minister of Customs, he was assassinated by that Act, his constituency was torn, and divided, and gerrymandered. But what occurred? His majority, after the redistribution of 1882, was 179, as against 77 in 1878. That did not look like being assassinated. That did not look as if any injustice had been done to Mr. James Trow, and I would like to ask the Minister of Customs that question, and have an answer now.

With regard to other men, the Minister of Customs said that there were Mills, Alex. Mackenzie, Joe Rymal and himself—all of whom we attempted to politically assassinate. But what is the history of Mr. Mackenzie in Lambton? The county of Lambton was one constituency in 1878, and Mr. Mackenzie had a majority in that year of 146. He was thrown out of Lambton by his own political friends. What did we do? We divided it into the constituencies of East and West Lambton. Mr. Mackenzie had been member for the constituency of Lambton for many years, and presumably he could have had his choice of either division, or he ought to have had his choice, if his political friends had been true and faithful to him. But they thrust him out. They did not permit him to run there. They did not give him the opportunity to which his declining health fairly entitled him, but they threw him out, and Lister became member with 341 of a majority for one of the Lambtons, and Fairbanks became a member for the other with a majority of 165. The constituency was fairly divided, and each had the population necessary to elect a member, and there was no gerrymander. It was a fair distribution, and no injustice was done. But Mr. Mackenzie was brought down to East York, where there had been a Conservative majority in the previous election of 108. The sympathy cry was raised. Here, they said, is the grand old Canadian statesman; it is the duty of every citizen to set politics aside and elect this man to a seat in Parliament. That influenced many Conservatives, and Mr. Mackenzie was elected by the Conservative vote of East York. Yet the Minister of Customs tells us that we attempted to assassinate him. Who attempted to assassinate him, except his own political friends? Take Bothwell. Mr. Mills, now Senator, had a majority in Bothwell. There was a redistribution in the county of Bothwell. There had to be a redistribution somewhere, for you had six new members to place. The principle adopted, as I shall show, was the principle of representation by population. In 1872 Mr. Mills had been elected by 592; in 1874 by 463, in 1878 by 285, and in 1882 by 12—a constantly decreasing majority, but still Mr. Mills was returned from Bothwell in 1882 by a majority of the electors. Then we are told that Mr.

Joe Rymal was attempted to be assassinated also. I think his successor, the hon. member for Wentworth and North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is in this House to-day; and in the general election of 1882, he had a majority of over 900. I should like to know what evidence of attempted assassination there was there? Take the case of the Minister of Customs. His majority in South Brant in 1874 was 444; in 1878 it had dwindled to 198, less than half what it was before, and in 1882 when this infamous gerrymander was imposed upon him, he had still a majority of 174, or within 24 of his previous majority. I would like to know, judging by the facts—and that is the only way you can judge—where there was any infamous gerrymander in that. It is true that the hon. gentleman got a larger majority in some succeeding elections; but it was the same constituency, and he kept it until 1896, when it was discovered by the electors of South Brant—what we knew in Parliament years before—that he was trying to ride two horses going in different directions; and as soon as the electors of South Brant found that out they left him behind by a majority of 91 in 1896. These are the facts with reference to all the parties the hon. gentleman named in his speech that were assassinated or were attempted to be assassinated by the Conservative party. If they were assassinated, it was by their own political friends as I have demonstrated in every case.

Now, as to this Bill itself, the right hon. First Minister when he introduced it on the 19th of May said that there was one principle on which this Bill was founded:

> We think it is a principle which will commend itself universally to public opinion that the basis of representation in this House should be the municipal county organization.

And the Postmaster General, when he proposed the second reading of the Bill on 16th June, said:

> We have taken the ground in Parliament and before the public that county boundaries shall govern, that no county should be divided into two or more divisions and broken up to provide for constituencies.

He said, further, a sentence I would like him to rise and explain:

> If it is that a county's population is not sufficient to entitle it to have two members, it shall have only one; if its population is not sufficient to entitle it to three or more than two, or between two and three, it shall be limited to two or three. In any case, where there is a fragment of one county detached politically, that one county shall be annexed to another in order to create a constituency.

Where is the system of county boundaries there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not a correct report.

Mr. WALLACE. I listened to the hon. gentleman as he spoke these words, and they seemed to me just about what is reported here. But I shall be glad if he will correct what is wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to correct it now?

Mr. WALLACE. Well——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What I said was that if a county was too small for one member—if there is such a thing—the only way you could represent that county was to annex it to another. I am not aware of such a case.

Mr. FOSTER. That was done in the case of St. John County, N.B., I suppose.

Mr. WALLACE. And the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said:

> We have maintained to county boundaries as we said we would.

Why, you have not to go outside the boundaries of this very city to find that principle violated. New Edinburgh, which is part of Ottawa municipally, is a part of the county of Russell for Dominion electoral purposes. Take the county of Carleton, the very first outside this city. Notwithstanding that the Premier says: We have adopted a principle "which commends itself universally to public opinion," the principle of respecting county boundaries, what have we in Carleton? I am not finding fault with it myself——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I will refer to that later on. I am calling attention to the fact that these gentlemen started out to establish a principle to make that principle of universal application, and there was to be no exception. And right outside the city of Ottawa, the townships of Fitzroy and Huntley belong to the county of South Lanark for Dominion electoral purposes. The county boundaries are not respected here, because politically it does not suit these hon. gentlemen. Then take Gloucester and Osgoode in the county of Carleton—they are attached to the county of Russell for Dominion electoral purposes, and these gentlemen do not propose to change this so as to leave them attached to the county of Carleton. For, if they did, it would be necessary to give two members for the county of Carleton, because the population would justify it, and these two would, presumably, be Conservatives. And so the county of Carleton is not distributed according to the principle which the Prime Minister, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and every hon. gentleman on the other side who has spoken on the subject say is the principle to be followed. Then take the county of Addington. I have a list showing that county as it is for local and as it is for Dominion electoral purposes. In the case of the Dominion there are thirteen townships

from Frontenac added to Addington, and for the local legislature they have ten townships taken from Frontenac and added to Addington. If county boundaries are to be held sacred, if the mere fact that they are county boundaries is to end the discussion—a principle that I deny—what about the township boundaries? Local interests are more closely combined in a township than in a county, and if the county boundaries should be respected, much more should the township boundaries be respected. Do we find that to be the case? Look at the acts of the local government. These gentlemen may say: We are not responsible for the acts of the local government. I say they are responsible, for they are of the same political party, the same lines divide the parties, and the Ontario Government is, as the Prime Minister said not long ago, the right arm of the Dominion Government. And what do we see in the ridings for the local legislature? We find the county of Huron divided into three ridings for the local legislature. The south riding, it is provided:

Shall consist of the townships of Tuckersmith, Usborne, Stephen, Hay and Stanley, THAT PORTION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GODERICH SOUTH OF THE LINE KNOWN AS "THE CUT LINE" and Huron road, the town of Seaforth and the villages of Bayfield and Exeter.

"A portion of a township." Then you come to the east riding, and it gives a list of townships; then it says:

That part of the township of Hullett which lies east of the road commonly called the Gravel road, and so on.

They are dividing townships. Then you go to the west riding, and you find there a number of townships:

Colborne and that part of the township of Hullett which lies west of the road commonly called the Gravel road, and that part of the township of Goderich north of the said Huron road and "cut line" and the township of Goderich, &c.

So they are not content with dividing counties, but they are dividing townships, cutting through the smallest municipality, and giving part of it to one county and part of it to another, when hon. gentlemen declare to this House that county boundaries are so sacred that when once they state they have established county boundaries that disposes of all. Well, I have this to say of county boundaries, that it is desirable that they should be respected where the principle of representation by population is not violated. But I do say that they have violated it in the province of Ontario, at any rate, where that battle was fought by hon. gentlemen opposite, and where the principles of representation by population, founded on fairness, on justice, are respected, where they have been respected in all the redistribution Bills that have been passed since confederation, and I say that in contradiction to the statement of the Postmaster General, as I shall endeavour to prove before I sit down, that principle is a sound one, it has been carried out by Conservative Governments when they were in power, and it has been violated by this Bill. They do not make even a pretense of advocating it, but they say: Oh, the Conservative party, when they were in power, did not advocate it either.

I was going to refer, though, to the county of Brant, where the same state of affairs prevails as in the county of Huron. There they have divided up townships:

The north riding of Brant shall consist of certain townships, and the northerly portion of the township of Brantford and the town of Paris. The south riding shall consist of the township of Burford, Oakland and the southerly portion of the township of Brantford, and the city of Brantford.

Showing that they have violated the principle upon which they started out in their Bill as the keystone of the whole system, and one which they say would commend it to the electors. But I say that they have violated it in the fact that they have not respected county boundaries as in the case of Carleton and Frontenac, and they have not respected the municipal boundaries of townships, as in the cases in the counties of Brant and Huron.

Now, with reference to the redistribution of 1882, which the Postmaster General described as iniquitous, and which was the justification, he said, for the present Bill. They do not propose to discuss much the Redistribution Bill of 1892. Well, the Postmaster General, I believe, is a medallist in mathematics in the University of Toronto, and I would invite him to analyse the statement I now make, and to contradict it if he can. In the elections of 1882 the Conservative majorities, where they elected their members, aggregated 13,740, and they elected fifty-three members. The Reform majorities were 9,561, and they elected thirty-nine members. The average Conservative majority was 259, and the average Liberal majority was 248. Subtract the Reform majorities from the Conservative majorities and you have 4,179. The Conservative majority in the province of Ontario was fourteen members. Dividing that number into the 4,179, and we have an average majority of 298½. I think most of us members of Parliament would be highly gratified if we were sure in the next election of having a majority of 298.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. And I presume a good many of those hon. gentlemen behind him would say "hear, hear," too.

Mr. McGREGOR. How about those behind you?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not complaining at all. So I say that is a demonstration that there was no gerrymander, that there

was no improper redistribution, the figures I have given prove it in general terms. Then, take up the constituencies. The Postmaster General told us that we had hived the Grits, and he mentioned a number of constituencies in which he said the Grits were hived. These were North Brant, West Brant, West Elgin, South Huron, South Middlesex, West Ontario, North Oxford and South Oxford. Well, if you add these eight constituencies together you will find a population of 176,000. Divide that by eight, and it gives you 22,000 as the average of population. The unit of population for 1882 was 20,900. It comes remarkably close when we consider that North Brant had in 1881 a population of 11,800, West Elgin had 14,000, North Oxford had far over the unit of population, 25,300. But when the redistribution took place there was as near as could be the principle of representation by population thoroughly carried out. If you take the individual constituencies, West Bruce had 24,000, since come down to 21,000, West Elgin had 23,000, South Huron 21,000, South Middlesex 19,000, West Ontario 20,000, North Oxford 24,000, and South Oxford 24,000. So that the principle of representation was adopted for these. But we find these 176,000 in constituencies which they claim were gerrymandered, giving them eight members in Parliament, while 200,000 in the city of Toronto to-day have given them, tardily, five members of Parliament, an average of 40,000 each. That is the difference between the conduct of the Conservative party towards Liberal constituencies, and the conduct of the Liberal party towards Conservative constituencies. We recognized the principle of representation by population in those Grit constituencies, while they have totally ignored it, and have come down with a Bill giving us four members for 200,000, which was so flagrantly unjust that they have had to amend it, and give five members, which is still a gross injustice, because it means that there is only one member for over 40,000. Go over the whole of this Redistribution Bill of 1882. They say that in some places there was an injustice done to the Liberal party. I would ask them what Liberal lost his seat through the redistribution of 1882? What injustice was done all around? Every one of those that the hon. Minister of Customs referred to, I think, except the member for North Bruce, was returned at the next election. I do not remember of any other case where the redistribution worked to the injury of the candidate: it may have been that his majority was reduced just as Conservative majorities were reduced. It may be that a man was put out of his constituency, as the hon. member for East Grey was, when the redistribution took place. He found himself in South Grey instead of in the constituency to which he formerly belonged. Cases of that kind might have occurred, but I venture the assertion that the Conservatives could find as much fault, if fault could be found, with that redistribution as the Liberals. Let us take for instance the two constituencies that are wiped out. We put two Conservative constituencies together, Cornwall and Stormont, and gave them one member, displacing a Conservative candidate and a member of Parliament. The same thing was done with Niagara and Lincoln. Of course there could be no justification for Niagara retaining a member because its population had decreased while that of the surrounding counties had increased. It was allowed to retain its member no doubt on account of historical associations, but the time had arrived when it had to be wiped out and the Conservative party, although it was a Conservative constituency, without a moment's hesitation, did their duty in that regard. The Conservatives had two members of Parliament from Simcoe. The population was largely increased and we might have made three Conservative constituencies, but we made two constituencies, by the redistribution, which gave two Conservatives and a third one which returned a Liberal, Mr. Cook. Since then I am glad to say that we have the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), who sits in this House as the Conservative representative of East Simcoe, the new constituency to-day. But I am speaking of the election of 1882 and of the immediate results of the Redistribution Bill. Next, take the county of Brant. One of these constituencies had a population of about 11,800, and the other one had a little over the unit of population, 21,975, according to my figures. A readjustment was made and South Brant had 20,482; North Brant, while it did not come up to the unit of population, came largely that way as the population was increased about 6,000, so that it totalled 17,645. In that regard the county of Brant received justice. Take the county of Elgin. One constituency there had 28,000 and the other 14,000. A readjustment was made giving East Elgin 25,000 of a population and West Elgin 23,000 instead of 14,200.

Mr. McMULLEN. When did it have 14,000?

Mr. WALLACE. By the census of 1881.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have the figures which show that the hon. gentleman is mistaken. East Elgin had a population of 25,745 and West Elgin 23,480.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) can make his speech when I get through. In his endeavour to correct me he is simply making, as he always does, another stupid blunder. I say that West Elgin, according to the census of 1881, had a population of 14,214.

Mr. McMULLEN. It had not; it had 23,480.

Mr. WALLACE. And by the readjustment the population was made 23,480. The boundaries of West Elgin were changed, but the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does not appear to have any knowledge of that fact. If he would study up a little before he attempts to mislead the House it would be better for him. Lambton had a population of 42,600 by the census of 1881. By the readjustment of 1882 it was made into East Lambton with a population of 21,700, and West Lambton with a population of 21,890. So it goes all the way through. Many constituencies were not touched and county boundaries were respected. This is a commendable thing to do where the principle of representation by population is not violently interfered with, as for instance, in regard to Glengarry, which was kept the same with a population of 22,200. Prescott was kept the same with a population of 22,887. Ottawa city was not changed for reasons that we all know. The national question had been coming into the city of Ottawa and it was recognized that, notwithstanding that its population was a little lower than the unit, it was a growing city. We had to realize what would occur in the future, and the city has since attained a population which justifies what was done at that time. The county of Carleton was readjusted so that, instead of having about 25,000 the population was reduced to nearly 19,000, coming closer to the unit of population than previously. It has since grown so rapidly that it is to-day beyond the unit of population, justifying the course that the Government took on that occasion. South Leeds with a population of 22,200 remained the same. South Lanark was readjusted. It had 20,000 of a population; it was reduced to 18,000, but North Lanark, which had a population of 13,900 was given a population of 19,855, or very close to the unit of population which was 20,900. So we might go through all these counties where no changes were made. In most of them the population was nearly such that it would justify no interference and permit of a respect being shown for county boundaries, so far as that could be done. If you take within 3,500 on either side of the unit of population, there were 61 constituencies in Ontario in 1882, which would conform to that rule, and 3,500, I think, is a fair margin to allow one side or the other of the unit, having regard to the fact that you are respecting county boundaries so far as you can possibly do it. But there is a higher principle than county boundaries and it is the principle of representation by population. North Perth had a population of 34,000. South Perth was close to the unit of population and its population was scarcely changed while that of North Perth was reduced by 8,000, or to 26,000. Wherever changes were desirable, in establishing the principle of representation by population, these changes were made by the Redistribution Bill of 1892. But they say: We are establishing this principle of county boundaries, which is a correct principle. I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen what is there about county boundaries that is so sacred. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) quoted a speech of the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald on that question, in which he claimed that he was advocating county boundaries. The whole tenor of that speech read by the right hon. gentleman was something entirely different from that. It was outlining the experience that men acquired before they became members of Parliament. He said, that a man became a member of the municipal council, reeve of a municipality, and warden, and he came to Parliament surrounded with municipal experience that qualified him for being a member of Parliament, and that that was the true system. I see the First Minister across the House. Did he come into Parliament by that circuitous route? I think he will answer "no." Did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the Postmaster General, or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, come into Parliament in the manner indicated by the late Sir John Macdonald? I think each one of them will have to answer "no." Therefore, I do not see the appositeness of the statement made by the First Minister in that regard. And suppose the principle of county boundaries is to be held sacred as these hon. gentlemen say. We must not forget that for twenty years Sir Oliver Mowat, the most astute of Liberal politicians, has been gerrymandering the province of Ontario. I will give you one example. There were a number of counties adjoining that were pretty close politically, and Sir Oliver Mowat conceived the idea of creating a new county called Dufferin. He took the township of Amaranth, with 212 Conservative majority, Melancthon, with 125 Conservative majority, Mono, with 350 Conservative majority, the town of Shelburne, with 100 Conservative majority, Garafraxa, with 201 Conservative majority, East Luther, where there was a tie, Orangeville, with 150 Conservative majority, Mulmer, with 250 Conservative majority, a total Conservative majority of 1,388. Sir Oliver Mowat made these townships into a county which was a Conservative hive, and he weakened the Conservative vote in all the surrounding constituencies. Those that were pretty evenly balanced before became Liberal, because the Conservative townships were taken away. Every municipality in Dufferin, with the exception of East Luther, which was a tie, had enormous Conservative majorities, and these were taken from four or five electoral districts so that these electoral districts might return Liberals to the local legislature. And yet we are asked to fall down and worship this form of respecting county boundaries; county boundaries that have been gerrymandered by Sir Oliver Mowat for twenty years

whenever it suited his purpose. It is the same thing all over the province of Ontario. These gentlemen opposite want us to respect such gerrymandered county boundaries, but I do not think the people of Canada will tolerate that. The Postmaster General, after elaborating his Bill the other day, gloated over the fact that he thought the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was going to lose his constituency under this gerrymander, and no wonder the Postmaster General said : Great is the power of the gerrymander. Well might he say it, if his Government can get this gerrymander through. This iniquitous Bill is, I claim, unconstitutional, and unprecedented, and was never contemplated by the Act of Confederation. As the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has clearly proved, there never was any previous attempt to change constituencies until the time mentioned in the Confederation Act, viz., after the decennial census, when the population is ascertained up to date, and an immediate redistribution of constituencies is provided for. The strongest objection to this Bill is that it does not deal with the state of affairs existing to-day. The promoter of the Bill (Mr. Mulock) told us that the judges were not to consider the present population and not to consider the many changes that have taken place since the census was taken in April, 1891. The judges are not to consider these changed conditions, nor did the Government consider them in their gerrymander, and so, we are asked to legislate on a condition of affairs which does not exist. Such a thing has never been proposed in Parliament before. If they pleaded that in the Rossland district, or in any other district where population had increased, there should be changed, a person could understand that ; but the Government tell us that we are to shut our eyes to everything that has happened in Canada for the last nine years, and that we are to legislate to-day as if we were legislating nine years ago. I challenge them to produce a piece of legislation in this or any other country, parallel to this old fogey, fossilized attempt they are making to redistribute the constituencies in the interests of the Liberal party. And why do they introduce this Bill ? As pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, they are doing it because they are afraid, even to meet the constituencies that returned them to power. They are afraid to go back to these constituencies ; they are afraid to wait for a year or two until the census is taken, and when they, or some other Government, can make a proper redistribution of seats.

Another objection to this Bill is, that it would introduce constant changes into our representation. If this be permitted to become law, it will form a precedent, and any new Government coming into power, being dissatisfied with the distribution of the constituencies, can make any change they desire when they have a majority at their back. This Bill would create such a system of unrest, and such a system of change, as would be very disastrous to the best interests of the country. I contend that the Parliament of Canada would be justified in relegating this Bill back to the gentlemen who have promoted it, until the census is taken and until it has been ascertained what changes are justifiable, and legal, and constitutional, and in the interests of the country. The leader of the Opposition gave some instances to show that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was not an unfair one, and I will repeat his figures with regard to the province of Ontario. In Ontario, at the general elections in 1896, there were 191,052 Conservative votes polled, and 43 Conservative members elected ; there were 166,335 Liberal votes polled, and there were 44 Liberal members of Parliament elected. Does that look as if there was a gerrymander in the province of Ontario ? To my mind it conclusively proves, that the Conservative party had, as always, been too generous to their opponents.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WALLACE. In 1896, there were 413,000 Conservative votes polled in the whole Dominion, and 397,114 Liberal votes polled, or a majority of 16,000 Conservative votes. Yet the Liberals are sitting on the Government benches and the Conservatives are in Opposition. Does that prove that there was a gerrymander in 1882, or that the elections were held under a gerrymander redistribution Bill ? It disproves it, to my mind, entirely.

The PRIME MINISTER. Everybody ought to be displeased with that Act. We do not want it, and you say you do not want it either.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that when an Act gives the Liberal party more than fair-play, they cannot complain of injustice.

The PRIME MINISTER. But we do. We do not want more than fair-play.

Mr. WALLACE. But the Liberal party were not satisfied with having more than their share ; they want to gobble up the whole of this country. They want a gerrymander that will give two members to the county of Brant, with its 33,612 of population. These figures I get from the Act of the local legislature. Then, in the county of Norfolk, with about 30,000, is to have two members. Both of these are Liberal counties, taking the population as a whole ; but, being Liberal counties, they are to have more than their share ; while the county of Carleton, if it were given the municipalities that belong to it, would be more than entitled to two members ; but as those two members would certainly be Conservatives, that is not to be permitted. So it goes all through the Bill. It is hiving the

Conservatives in such a way that even though they had a majority of the electors of the province of Ontario, the members they would have in this House would be in a large minority. Therefore, I say that this Bill is unjustifiable, it is illegal, it is unconstitutional. There is no necessity for it to-day except on the ground that these hon. gentlemen are afraid to meet their constituents without having a measure of this kind passed through the House. For all these reasons, I think we ought to reject the Bill. I am afraid, however, that I have not made that impression on the members on the opposite side of the House that I should desire, because I am afraid they are attached to their idols. But, Sir, we do not despair. The public conscience is not dead. It looked a short time ago as if all kinds of rascality in election matters would be condoned by the electors. But the local government of Ontario are shivering in their boots to-day, and that shivering process will reach the members of this Government, if it has not done so already. It will react all over this country, and the public conscience will be awakened to every act of wrong-doing on the part of this Government and their henchmen outside. When the people of this country are demanding progressive legislation, these men do not bring in anything to promote the prosperity of the people. They simply bring in disturbing legislation for the promotion of the interests of one political party, and the attempted destruction of the other.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is any member of this House except the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who would undertake to present the statements that have been presented to-day by that hon. gentleman. He has given the population of several counties, and in doing so he has committed very serious errors. I do not know where he got his figures—certainly not from the census of 1881 or the census of 1891. The hon. gentleman made some reference to a gentleman who was at one time a very popular and distinguished member of this House, the late lamented Mr. Trow. He stated that that gentleman was knifed in his own riding by his own friends, and that he had made extended use of a note which had been sent to him by the late Sir John Macdonald, expressing sympathy with him after he had been unseated, and hoping to see him back in the House. I may say that I went through South Perth with Mr. Trow, and was at every meeting he attended, and I never knew him in a single instance to use that note; but I know that if any one thing injured him more than another it was the fact that the Government of that day, headed by Sir John Macdonald——

Mr. WALLACE. I rise to a point of order. I understand the hon. member for North Wellington to say that I made the statement that Sir John Macdonald had written a letter to Mr. Trow regarding his defeat. I made no such statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not a proper point of order, simply to deny a statement that has been made by an hon. member.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was going on to state when I was interrupted——

Mr. WALLACE. I simply claim the right to say that I made no such statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that no point of order can be raised by simply denying a statement that has been made by a member who has the floor.

Mr. WALLACE. I may say further——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE—that Sir John Macdonald was not alive when the gentleman was defeated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has the habit, which has become chronic with him, of interrupting members of this House when they undertake to address the House, especially when they follow himself. I was going on to state that Mr. Trow, after he had been unfortunately unseated, received from Sir John Macdonald, either by word of mouth or by note, an expression of regret and sympathy, and a hope that he would see him back in the House. He was under the impression that Sir John Macdonald was not opposed to his being returned in South Perth; and therefore what amazed him and what tended to break his heart more than anything else, was the fact that a member of Sir John Macdonald's Government then came to South Perth to try to defeat Mr. Trow. The hon. member for West York says it was the feeling that his own friends had gone back on him. I say it was the feeling that while a member of that Government expressed sympathy for him and appreciation of his fair-mindedness in the discharge of his duties as Whip of this House for many years, his courtesy and kindness to members on both sides of the House, and his desire for peace and harmony and good-feeling, yet, when he was in the throes of his last election, a member of the Cabinet came to South Perth to try to defeat him.

My hon. friend made some reference to the constituencies of North and South Perth. It is amazing with what an amount of sincerity, apparently, my hon. friend approaches this question, and I was amused at the great appreciation which his leader

evinced, as he energetically cheered his utterances. If there ever was an Act put upon the statutes of Canada that constitutes the blackest page of its history, from confederation down to the present, it is the Gerrymander Act passed in 1882. There never was an Act that carried with it such evidence of injustice and unfairness, of a desire to tie the hands and cripple the efforts of the Reform party. The hon. leader of the Opposition to-day realizes what an advantage that Act gave them, and was never more unwilling than now to go before the country, except under that Gerrymander Act, which tied up the hands of the Liberal party.

I am amazed by the manner in which the hon. member for West York treated those who are to carry out the measure now proposed. It must be a compliment to the judges to know that my esteemed friend has given them such a high and dignified name as "heelers." According to the hon. member, they are nothing better than a set of heelers.

Mr. WALLACE. I was referring to Capt. Sullivan and Simeon Hewitt.

Mr. McMULLEN. The present Administration have a mandate from the people to carry out the measure now proposed. That was one of the reforms laid down by the convention in Ottawa. Every Reformer appealed to his constituency on the principles contained in that platform of that convention, one of which was the abolition of the vicious Gerrymander Act.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say we have made no effort to carry out our pledges. The hon. leader of the Opposition made this charge several times, which I would rather attribute to a loss of memory on his part than to intention. We are endeavouring now to carry out a pledge which the people exacted from us, and on which they returned us to power, and that is the pledge to abolish the Gerrymander Act. What does my hon. friend from West York say by the course he takes this afternoon. He virtually admits that if it were not by virtue of the gerrymander, he would not be here. He says to the electors of West York: I am afraid to trust my political existence in your hands. If I cannot have an addition made to you, brought in from Toronto, I am afraid to trust you. I am astonished to find a man who occupies the very distinguished position my hon. friend does in this country—a man at the head of an influential party—so scared of his political life that he is going to fight for the Gerrymander Act because if West York is ungerrymandered, that county will no longer be safe for him. I thought my hon. friend had a better opinion of himself. He has told us that he is in this House by the grace of gerrymander, and he wants to continue the gerrymander, so that he may be elected again.

But what we want is to go back to the condition that existed before any of these measures were ever brought into life—to the condition that existed before 1882. We are willing to meet hon. gentlemen opposite on a fair field, but do not want to go before the electorate with our hands tied behind our backs. The hon. leader of the Opposition would like to see us forced to do that, but the feeling of the country is, that we have had enough of gerrymander. We know perfectly well that Sir John Macdonald himself held that county boundaries should not be interfered with. My hon. friend tried to abolish them, but, nevertheless, he went on to say why he thought the county boundaries should be preserved. He said that men came out for the purpose of seeking municipal honours, that after being elected to the council, they became elected to the office of deputy reeve and reeve, and that then, if they showed ability, they were elected wardens, and after that became members of Parliament. In that way the counties had an opportunity of picking out the best men, but the moment you break down county boundaries, you destroy that opportunity. I hold that county boundaries are the proper thing, though I do not say that in every case you can give to the population in every county the representation it is entitled to; but, taking all in all, the county boundaries should be preserved, whoever may lose or gain.

My hon. friend said something with regard to the manner in which the Gerrymander Act of 1882 was inaugurated, in so far as Ontario is concerned. He said that Mr. Bowell and Mr. Aikens were the two individuals chosen for the purpose of readjusting the province of Ontario. Well, Mr. Bowell was, in my humble opinion, a very fit man to perform the piece of manipulation that was performed in connection with the Gerrymander Act of 1882. Mr. Aikens was at one time a Reformer, but he left the Reform ranks. He held by the coat-tails of George Brown and the "Globe" for many years, until he got the position of Cabinet Minister in a coalition Government, and chose to remain there, for reasons we do not know. He did, however, remain there, and has been with our opponents to this day. And he helped to carry out that arrangement, feeling, I presume, somewhat bitter over the castigations and criticisms that were poured upon him owing to the manner in which he had deserted the principles that he had told us he held so dear in years gone by. Now, in regard to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, my hon. friend said that he left West Lambton and came to East York, in fact the hon. gentleman said he was turned out of West Lambton, that the people of that riding did not want him any more. If my hon. friend has familiarized himself with the history of Mr. Mackenzie's life—and I hope he has, because, I am sure, it would do him good—he will know that Mr. Mackenzie

could have had West Lambton, that, in fact, it was offered him ; but he was urged to take East York, because, as he had removed to Toronto, it would be more convenient to his home, and he could easily carry it. He took East York and carried it. And the best evidence that he could have had West Lambton is the fact that Mr. Lister, who is now a judge, was elected by something like a thousand majority in that constituency. But my hon. friend, to throw a reflection on the memory of a dead statesman, a man whom political friends and political opponents alike know to have been an upright, patriotic man, one of the best that Canada ever knew, says that he had to leave West Lambton and go to East York. The facts are as I have stated. Mr. Mackenzie was greatly appreciated by the people of Canada, and I can tell my hon. friend that he will not gain in popularity by this attempt to cast a slur upon his memory.

The hon. gentleman mentioned also the case of Bothwell and Mr. Mills. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that Bothwell was gerrymandered, and gerrymandered for the purpose of turning the Hon. David Mills, the present Minister of Justice, out of his seat. That was at first accomplished, but through a protest, the seat was opened, and the Hon. David Mills was returned. We know perfectly well that one of the most iniquitous features of the gerrymander was the abolition of the seat held by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). That was done because of his marvellous ability and his fighting qualities. His opponents thought it would be a grand thing if they could get him out of Parliament altogether—and they made a big attempt to do it. But the hon. gentleman got his seat and is here to-day. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) knows perfectly well that the gerrymander accomplished a great deal for his party in 1882. Notwithstanding the fact that a few years before they had inaugurated the National Policy, and spoke loud and eloquently in praise of that policy, they were not willing to go before the electors and risk their political lives without tying the hands of the Reformers—and that was the reason why they gerrymandered the counties. Take my own case. I have the honour to represent North Wellington. My constituency, Sir, is composed of parts of three counties, Dufferin, Wellington and Perth. After my nomination took place, the riding was gerrymandered. A township which gave a very respectable Reform majority, was put out of my riding, a township from North Perth, which gave 176 Conservative majority, was put in. This was not done to equalize population, as will be seen clearly if you look at the manner in which the Bill was drawn, for when they put in the township of Wallace, they brought up the population to within a few hundred of what it had been before. The purpose was, if possible to secure to hon. gentlemen opposite a representative from that constituency to support them. But, after all, North Wellington did not return a man in sympathy with them but returned a man in opposition, and he has been in the House ever since and he is here to-day, notwithstanding the fact of the gerrymander and of persistent protests. Yes, that was carried to the Supreme Court at Ottawa. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought North Wellington was a little Tory inheritance that they were entitled to have, and that I was virtually an interloper. They sought by means of the law and by every scheme they could think of to keep me out ; but I am here still. So far as I am concerned, I have no great desire to part with any township in my riding ; still, I am willing that the riding should be adjusted. My hon. friend talked of the county of Dufferin, and said that Sir Oliver Mowat had created Dufferin in order to hive the Tories. That statement is as true as many of the other statements the hon. gentleman made to-day, and those statements and the truth are just as far apart as are the north pole and the south pole. If my hon. friend knew the history of that movement he would know there was not a single township in the county of Dufferin that had not memorialized the Ontario Government in favour of that county formation, and the people adopted it by vote. Some portions of the territory now forming the county of Dufferin were, in those days, very far from the places where the people had to go to do their county business—50 or 60 miles. Some of them went down to the county of Peel, some to the county of Grey—up to Owen Sound—and some to the county of Wellington, a distance of 50 miles. The people felt that it would be a decided advantage to them if they could form a new county, and these townships, every one of them, by their municipal officials, by resolutions or otherwise, memorialized the Ontario Government to set them up as a county by themselves. And, allow me to say, the Bill was not introduced by the Government, but was introduced by a private member of the House. It was not carried through by a force vote by the Reformers, but was carried through by the hon. gentleman's own friends. But, notwithstanding that, and though hon. gentlemen opposite knew that in 1882 the county of Dufferin was entitled to a member, they gave it no member. Why ? Because it was so solidly Conservative that they thought they could make better use of it by diffusing its votes amongst the surrounding counties to give them a Tory complexion rather than by giving them a member to themselves, who would be elected, as my hon. friend said, by twelve or fifteen hundred majority. A portion of it does duty in assisting my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to get elected. Another portion of it is in my riding—nice, decent people, they are. The township of Amaranth, in which

they live, rolls up a majority against me, but they are getting better all the time, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I think so much of them that I should hate to part with them. But I am willing that Dufferin should have representation, and I believe it will. Another portion of Dufferin is put into the riding of Centre Wellington in the hope of defeating my hon. friend (Mr. Semple) who represents that riding. So, Dufferin is represented by sections.

An hon. MEMBER. Cardwell.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, Cardwell, and so the main part of the county of Peel, and part of the county of Dufferin, and Simcoe. Now, my hon. friend has denounced this Bill in very strong terms, he said it was an iniquitous Bill. Sir, I cannot understand how any gentleman can get up and pronounce a Bill iniquitous that goes back to a condition of things that existed before gerrymander was known in Canada, and proposes to recognize county boundaries, to recognize a principle that was declared by the leader they delight so much to honour, should never have been violated, and a Bill that will be left entirely to the judges as to the internal arrangements of each county and each riding. I cannot see how hon. gentlemen opposite can fancy that any injustice will be done them. For my part, although the Government have power to pass a Bill that would do them injustice, I would scorn to support a Bill that had in it the vicious features of the Bill of 1882. I would never want to occupy a seat in Parliament and to be charged by the people of this country with having lent my aid to put upon the statute-book a Bill with so many vicious features and injustices as the Gerrymander Act of 1882. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in this House at the time that Bill passed, and I hope that he is now possessed of that spirit of fairness, having arrived at his advanced age—we are sorry that he is not younger—I had hoped that in the evening of his political existence, for once in his life he would admit that whereas an iniquitous Bill had been passed years ago, he was now willing to undo that and to go back to a just measure such as the one now introduced. The Conservative press in the country also are disposed to pronounce it a Gerrymander Act. The "Mail and Empire," of Toronto, for instance, has been loud in its denunciations of this Bill. It calls it the most vicious act that could be conceived in the breast of any man in order to bring about some advantages for the Reform party. That is the daily outpouring of the "Mail and Empire." I often wonder how the political editor of the "Mail and Empire" was ever able to compile, day after day, the fabrications and untruths that are heralded forth to its readers without the slightest foundation in fact. I have often thought that if his Satanic Majesty was domiciled in any place in this country, it certainly must be in the "Mail and Empire" office; and if he is not so specially domiciled in the "Mail and Empire" office, he certainly runs a big risk of losing one of his honorary titles, that of the father of lies, for the political editor of the "Mail and Empire" can beat him every day in the year. Sir, it is an amazing thing to watch the never-ending stream of fabrications that are published in that paper every day in order, if possible, to convince its readers that the present Government are corrupt, that they are robbing this country, that they will not consent to anything that is fair, and decent, and honest, that everything they do is characterized by mismanagement and extravagance, and that the Act now proposed is one of the worst Gerrymander Acts that have ever been introduced. Sir, I do not believe that the people of this country are disposed to take stock in any such utterances, whether made by the "Mail and Empire" or any other paper. I believe that the people are sick and tired of the never-ending outpouring of such statements as those. I believe they see in this Bill evidences of honesty, evidences of a desire to do what is right, evidences on the part of the Reform party not to mete out to their opponents the measure of injustice that they meted out to us in 1882. While they did an injustice, that is no reason why we should do an injustice; and we contend that the Bill now before the House cannot be characterized as anything else than an entirely just measure. No doubt it will place some men on the other side of the House in an awkward position, but it also places men on this side of the House in an equally awkward position. Men that are supporting the Government to-day will be deprived of their seats altogether. But notwithstanding that fact, it cannot be said that we are manipulating the constituencies, that we are seeking to destroy our political opponents. We do not care, to use a common phrase, whose ox is gored. The Bill itself has got to go through with that measure of equity and fairness that I believe it is the desire of the First Minister to mete out to his opponents, taking no advantage and asking none.

Now, some remarks were made about the gerrymander of 1892. After the census of 1891 we had a Redistribution Bill, but when hon. gentlemen opposite went over the several constituencies they found that if they interfered with the existing conditions at all they could not better their own position politically, on the other hand they would virtually injure themselves. I dare say that every man who held a seat here was anxious to continue and enjoy all the advantages that he had under the existing arrangement; and the result was that although there was some small changes made, on the whole the Bill did not make much change unless in the case of Haldimand and one or two other places. Let

me point out where no changes were made in the constituencies in 1892. Under the census of 1891 the population of South Brant was 23,359, while the population of East Bruce was 15,853. The population of North Brant in 1891 was 16,993. Then take Cornwall and Stormont, which had a population of 27,156, while the population of East Durham was 17,503, virtually 10,000 of a difference. But after all no change was made to bring about equalization. West Durham had 15,397, and East Elgin had 26,724, a difference of nearly 11,000, but there was no proposition to make any change. Then again in North Essex there were 31,000, while in Frontenac there were only 13,445. Then you have in North Grey, 26,341, while you have in Haldimand 16,365. Then you have in Kent 31,134, while you have in Lennox, 14,000, but little over one-half the population of Kent. Then you have again in Middlesex East, 25,569, while in Middlesex West you had only 17,288. And so on through the whole list of ridings in Ontario, you find that very serious discrepancies exist. In North Perth the population in 1891 was 26,907, of South Perth, 19,400, nearly 7,000 of a difference. Although that difference existed, and although it was at a time when readjustment ought to take place, as a fact no readjustment did take place, no change was made simply because it suited hon. gentlemen opposite to keep things as they were. Then, you have East Simcoe with a population of 35,801, while North Victoria has a population of 16,840, South Wellington with a population of 24,375, and Wentworth with a population of 14,591. So that, in all these different constituencies, the discrepancy between the populations, as they then existed, shows clearly that, although there should have been a readjustment, there was no readjustment, because it did not suit hon. gentlemen opposite to have a readjustment. It suited them better to keep the constituencies as they were, because, if they had been readjusted, and if each riding had been brought up to the proportion of population, as near as possible to the unit of population, they would have interfered with the gerrymander of 1882, and it was for that reason that, in 1892, hon. gentlemen allowed these constituencies to remain largely as they were. The electoral district of Brockville, with two townships attached, had a population of 15,855; South Leeds, adjoining, had a population of 22,449, yet no change was made. Cardwell had a population of 15,382, while we had North Wellington with a population of 24,956, within a few of 25,000; South Wellington with a population of 24,373, Durham West with a population of 15,324 and Ontario South with a population of 19,033, just 4,000 of a difference. Notwithstanding the fact that these differences existed in 1891, no change was made. There was no attempt at representation by population, simply because it did not suit hon. gentlemen opposite to make any changes, because, if they had made changes, the probabilities are that some hon. gentlemen who are here to-day would not have been here. There is Frontenac, which had a population of 15,445 in 1891, while South Leeds, adjoining, had a population of 22,449, showing a serious discrepancy between these two ridings. South Grenville had a population in 1891 of 12,929, a few short of 13,000, while you had the adjoining county of Dundas, with a population of 20,132. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that, unless you break county boundaries and bring together minor municipalities, you cannot equitably adjust the representation. But I am now showing that, while they broke county boundaries and while they pitchforked, from one place to another, minor municipalities, it was not to produce representation by population, but it was for the sinister purpose of helping themselves politically, because the population, as shown by the census of 1891, clearly proves that there was no attempt to adjust the representation by population at all. It was to further their own purposes and to carry out their own schemes that the gerrymander of 1882 was perpetrated and they did not want to touch it in 1892, knowing that they could not make it better serve their own political ends. There was no occasion to attempt to make any improvement upon the gerrymander of 1882; it had been so complete. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) this afternoon pointed out some irregularities in regard to the Bill before the House. The Bill is now up for its second reading. It is subject to amendment when we get into committee, and I am quite sure that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), if any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will point out where any just or equitable amendment can be made to the Bill as it has been introduced, is open to conviction, if hon. gentlemen can show that such a condition exists. But I am quite sure that he is not open to the criticism that was made in 1882, because after the Gerrymander Bill had been introduced in that session, and when it came up for its second reading, the Opposition, headed by Mr. Blake, challenged the Bill on the ground that it was not the same as that which had been introduced, and which had got its first reading. Under the rules of the House he compelled the then Government to withdraw the motion for the second reading of the Bill, and it was read a first time again because it had changed its countenance so completely that it was no more like what it was then, compared with its appearance when first introduced, than a Chinaman is like an African Hottentot. There was no comparison at all, and they had to introduce the Bill a second time. Now we

come to some other counties which go further to show that there was no attempt made to approach the unit of representation, as nearly as possible, either by the Gerrymander Act of 1882 or by the readjustment of 1892, because it would not suit their political purposes to have representation by population. Representation by population is a principle that they never liked, nor have they ever practiced it, and it would not be practiced as long as they were in power, but we are going to try to do what we can to give the people proper representation. Under the constitution of this country it was the duty of the Government to increase the population of counties where it was far below the unit and to readjust it by increasing the representation when it was far above the unit, so as to make a proper representation. North Leeds and Grenville had a population of only 13,521 in 1891, while the adjoining county of Carleton had a population of 21,746. Their desire to readjust the constituencies so as to approach the unit of population as nearly as possible, was such that they left constituencies of this kind. They had adopted the principle of transferring minor municipalities from one county to another, and, although this is a practice that would largely facilitate the readjustment of the population, it did not suit them to do so. They had so manipulated the constituencies under the gerrymander of 1882 that they could not interfere with their friends who held these constituencies in order to bring them up to the unit of population, and they were, therefore, allowed to remain as they were. Lennox had a population of 14,000, while Addington, adjoining, had 24,151, so that there was very nearly 10,000 of a difference between these two counties, one alongside of the other, the census taken in 1891, the constitution calling for a readjustment every ten years, but no readjustment took place because it did not suit the political convenience and advantage of hon. gentlemen opposite, and these constituencies were allowed to remain as they were. Northumberland West had a population of 14,949, and alongside of it was the east riding of the same county, with a population of 22,000—14,000 in one riding, 22,000 in another, the census taken, the returns made, the constitution demanding a readjustment, but no readjustment was made, and the reason was that the political advantage enjoyed under the gerrymander of 1882 might be interfered with, and these hon. gentlemen would not be able to hold their seats. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is very fond of pointing to the constitution and of calling upon the Government to obey it, but when he was a Minister of the Crown, and he sat as a Cabinet Minister at that time, he sang very low as to the readjustment of these counties, because it did not suit his own purpose. Take Cardwell, having 15,466, and place that alongside West York, with a population of 41,857. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) has a very large constituency, and in order to properly adjust the representation, it is necessary that West Toronto should be taken from West York and put into the constituency of Toronto, where it belongs; so that West York can have the honour of a member for itself, as it has a right to. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) go back to the people of West York and tell them that that is infamous? Will he tell them: Although there are 41,000 people in my riding, I am so suspicious of your loyalty to me that I do not want to trust my political life in your hands, and I am going to fight to keep West Toronto in West York in order to elect me? He (Mr. Wallace) has lived in the constituency for forty years, and what sort of confidence is that to have in his people. If I were a voter in West York, and if I were represented in this House by a man who had so little confidence in his constituents, I would say to him: If that is all the confidence you have in us, then we will have no more to do with you. That would be the proper reply for the people of West York to give to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace). The hon. gentleman has a good deal of hard-headed common sense, and I was astonished to find that he would make such a statement in the House, and leave himself open to such a charge from his constituents. It is a most infamous thing for my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) to treat his old constituency in that way. The same applies to any hon. gentleman who gets up in this House and protests because some little adjustment is made in his county in the interests of justice. I would like to know how many gentlemen in this House who oppose this Bill, are willing to admit that they never would have been representatives of the people, were it not for the infamous gerrymander of 1882. Sir, I believe that the true patriot is the man who is willing to face his constituents without the help of a gerrymander, present his principles and his deeds before his people, and ask for their support on his merits. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) apparently thinks that if this Bill passes, his chances before the country are very slim. I tell him that if he could go before the people of this country and show that the Liberal Government have been recreant to the best interests of the Dominion, that they have sacrificed its interests, or squandered its resources, he would stand a thousand times a better chance to get the confidence of the Canadian people than he would by clinging to a mean, contemptible Gerrymander Act. The people of Canada would appreciate a man who had the manliness to stand up and repudiate this infamous gerrymander that has been pronounced by all fair-minded people as a disgrace to any political party. Now that I

have answered all the points raised by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), let me express the hope that this Bill will become law, because I believe it is a fair Bill in itself, and bears the word "justice" written upon the face of it. Above all, it is introduced by a man in this House, and introduced by a Prime Minister, that would scorn to take a mean, contemptible advantage of any one. We are willing to go before the people of the country, and fight our battle on the high principles of statesmanship, and we want no gerrymander to help the Liberal party to be returned to power. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) should give expression to such language as he has given expression to to-day. I am sorry for the respectable and intelligent constituency he represents. I do not know but that he was born in the riding; at all events, he has lived a long time in it, and I am sorry he should have forgotten himself so far as to express unlimited want of confidence in its people, and to tell them they will not elect him unless he has the gerrymander to support him. I trust that this Bill willl pass through its various stages without any unnecessary delay. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any just and reasonable suggestions to make, I believe the Postmaster General is prepared to open his mind and his ear, and to receive them in a good spirit. In conclusion, let me say that I believe the Bill is so fair and so just at the present moment that it will meet with unanimous approval by the people of the country.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). The House will agree with me, I think, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. (McMullen) has discussed almost every other subject except anything which is pertinent to this Bill. The House will, no doubt, be amused at the patriotism and courage of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), in view of the fact that he has not been entirely unselfish in having obtained a rearrangement of his own constituency. Is he afraid to go back to North Welligton, that he must have his position strengthened by the addition of Liberal votes? Why, the confession is still warm on his lips, that he is afraid to meet his old constituents. Let him apply the argument to his own case that he applied to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and he will have the answer from himself that he is afraid of his present constituents. And what is the position of his leader? Why, the Prime Minister is himself afraid to go back to the constituencies in the province of Ontario which gave him their confidence in 1896.

The hon. gentleman could not have made a stronger case against himself if he had been discussing it the whole day than he did in the closing remarks of his speech, namely, that the hon. member for West York was afraid to go back because it was possible that his constituents might reject him. The hon. member for West York has pursued a very different course from what the hon. gentleman did on a different occasion. Those who consult "Hansard" will see that the Minister of Customs did not take that course. He pleaded for his life; he asked why his head should be taken off. I do not think that was a patriotic or courageous course to take. So far as I am concerned, I would disdain to ask any favours from hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the redistribution of the constituencies. The interests of a single member of this House are not to be weighed against the great general interest. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been denouncing the Act of 1882 from that time up to this moment. One of the chief sinners has been the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who has declared it to be one of the most infamous Bills ever passed. The hon. member for North Wellington declared that the blackest page in the history of Canada was the Redistribution Bill of 1882. Yet, will you believe it, the hon. gentleman sat down without mentioning a single case; and I defy him now to point out a single constituency in the forty-eight now under consideration, in which a Liberal candidate was defeated as the result of the redistribution of 1882. Yet the hon. gentleman declares that it was the blackest page in the history of Canada. Is it not too idle, too silly, too unworthy of a full-grown man to make a statement of that kind so utterly at variance with the facts? He says the Liberal members have been hived and hampered. I will sit down if the hon. gentleman will accept my challenge to point out one single case in which a Liberal candidate has been defeated as a result of that Act. If he cannot do that, he has made an exhibition that it utterly unworthy of any member of this House. I ask him will he sit silent, or will he take the challenge? No, he will not take the challenge. The exhibition that was made by the hon. gentleman to-day was faint in comparison with that made by the Minister of Customs, or with that made by the Postmaster General; I mean in exaggeration. These hon. gentlemen might have been excused in 1882; they might have had grave fears at that time; but what excuse have they, 18 years or more afterwards, for rising in this House and declaring that the Act of 1882 had tied the hands of Liberal members, had enslaved them, had legislated them out of their seats, when they cannot put their finger upon a single case to prove that that was the result? I am going to give an example of the hon. gentleman's comparisons. In speaking of the inequality between the constituencies, he selects cases which are not sanctioned by reason or honesty. He takes the county of Essex, which is divided into two ridings. No municipality is broken. The county is too large for one constituency and it is divided into two. Then he takes the county of Frontenac, although its county

boundaries are not touched. Yet he declares that this is one of the infamous features of the gerrymander of 1882. I do not think he was acquainted with the provisions of that Act, because I do not think he knew what he was talking about, or he would not have talked such rank nonsense. He takes East and West Northumberland, and shows a disparity in the population. Does he know that the county boundaries are not touched in the case of East and West Northumberland? I shall not pursue the subject further in reply to what the hon. gentleman said. I think he has so completely answered himself that it would be idle to take up the time of the House in doing so.

I want, however, to refer to one remark which he made to the effect that the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, in a speech in this House, declared himself to be somewhat in favour of county boundaries. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition made that matter so perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman, if he had not a short memory, ought to have been satisfied. While Sir John Macdonald made that statement, yet in the light of ten years' experience, he saw the error of pursuing a course of that kind. Hon. gentlemen talk about the unit of population, and take exception to the existing law because it does not provide an absolute unit. Nobody pretends that it is possible in the Dominion of Canada to have an absolute unit of population. If not, what is the next reasonable step to be taken? It is that we shall have as near a unit of population as possible, always taking into consideration that some counties are very small and others very large. Hon. gentlemen know that the eastern counties of Ontario are all small and the western counties large, and that it would be utterly impossible to have absolute equality of population, either by maintaining or departing from county boundaries. But while there is a great difficulty in having equality of population where county boundaries are broken, I am sure the House will agree with me that the difficulty is greatly intensified when municipal boundaries are adhered to.

Now, I am going to point out the difference between the attitude of the Conservative party in 1882 and that of the Liberal party to-day. It is a well-known fact that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was imposed by the constitution on the Government of that day. What was the result? I will venture to say that by that measure the Government gave as nearly as possible a fair unit of population, and also the most conveniently-shaped constituencies. They gave no party advantage to the Conservative party, but, on the contrary, they gave a great advantage to the Liberal party in the Redistribution Act of 1892. Now, what was the prime excuse given by the Postmaster General for introducing this Bill? I would like his friends to mark the excuse he gave. This is what the hon. gentleman said:

> It has not been the custom in the Canadian Parliament to make changes in the constituencies except in the session immediately succeeding the decennial census, but it has happened that, ever since confederation, the census and the succeeding redistributions have always taken place while our political adversaries were in power.

In this the hon. gentleman disclosed the whole case, namely, that it has not been customary to make a redistribution except immediately following the taking of the decennial census, but that the Liberal party were not in power during those periods, and now these hon. gentlemen want to seize upon the opportunity, when they are in power, to make redistribution at a time when it is improper to do so. Keeping that in mind, we can intelligently follow out the argument which the hon. gentleman adduced. If in moving the second reading he were able to show, even though redistribution be wholly indefensible at this period, that the Liberal party had been placed at a disadvantage and were not given the representation they were entitled to, he would have established a case of at least hardship, although not a case to warrant the Government in entering upon a rearrangement of the seats at this time. I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact in this regard, because he has been imposed upon. I have a better opinion of him than to suppose that he would make a statement in this House, knowing it to be without foundation, and I think I will be able to show him that he made an egregious error, that he did not compile the figures properly or examine them after they were compiled, but took it for granted that the compilation was correct and strove to make out a case on a statement wholly at variance with the facts. What does the hon. gentleman say:

> Well, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted now to prove a proposition that I advanced a short time ago? Taking the votes cast in the constituencies, the names of which I have read—46 of them in the general election of 1882, 46 in in the general election of 1887, 46 in the general election of 1891, and 43 in the general election of 1896; and, adding together the majorities obtained by the Liberals and Conservatives in all these elections, let us see if we can find out what ought to have been a fair representation of parties in this House.

He proceeds further:

> At the general election of 1882, the 46 constituencies that I refer to gave a Liberal majority at the polls of 8,574. The election returns gave for those 46 seats, 15 Conservatives and 31 Liberal members.
>
> Take those 46 seats, and if the majorities which they gave in the election of 1882 to the Conservatives and Liberals had been in proportion to the votes cast, instead of the Conservative party having had 15 representatives in this House in that Parliament, they would only have had 10, and instead of the Liberals having only had 31 they would have had 36.

I ask the hon. gentleman if, after having seen his speech in print, he still adheres to

that argument because I do not care to mislead him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What I said was in proportion to the majority and not in proportion to the votes cast. If the hon. gentleman's quotation reads in proportion to the votes cast, I am either not reported or not quoted correctly.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made himself definite, because I propose to show by his system of calculation of majorities that he has taken the most absurd means, which, when worked out to a proper conclusion, shows the hon. gentleman to be entirely wrong. I will take the 48 ridings to which the hon. gentleman refers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Forty-six.

Mr. CLANCY. I include West York and West Elgin which are in the same group.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was dealing with the ridings affected by the Gerrymander Act of 1882. I did not take account of any riding that had not been subjected to that legislation and the succeeding legislation of 1892.

Mr. CLANCY. It does not alter the case whether you take 46 or 48. I will take the 48 instead of 46. In the 48 now under consideration, because West York is under consideration and West Elgin as well, the Liberals polled a total vote in 1882 of 78,473 and the Conservatives 72,309. What was the result ? The Liberals elected 32 members on a vote of 78,437 and the Conservatives only 16 on a vote of 72,309. But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied at having elected 32 while the Conservatives elected 16, but concluded that the Liberals should have had 36 and the Conservatives only 12 in these 48 constituencies. Suppose we take it on the basis of the votes cast, what would be the result ? Why, the Liberals would have elected 25 out of the 48 and the Conservatives 23. I will take 16 seats out of that group, namely, Middlesex West, North Wentworth, North Wellington, Peel, South Wentworth, North Grey, South Grey, Bothwell, North Ontario, South Ontario, South Norfolk, West Huron, East Bruce, North Perth, East Middlesex and Grey. Take 16 out of the 48 and work them out on the hon. gentleman's plan. The Liberals polled in these, in 1882, 25,084 and the Conservative 25,691, or a Conservative majority of 607. But what was the result in the election ? The Liberals elected 13 and the Conservative elected three. Let us take it on the majority basis, and what would have been the result ? Instead of the Liberals having 13 and the Conservatives three, the Conservatives were entitled to 11 and the Liberals to five. I ask the hon. gentleman what he has to say to that ? But if you put it on account of the aggregate vote, they are so nearly alike, they would have elected eight members each. But I would go one step further with the calculation for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. Let him take five of these constituencies, North Wentworth, South Wentworth, Peel, East Grey and East Middlesex. The total vote polled by the Conservatives in these five constituencies was 7,767, and by the Liberals 6,952.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Is the hon. gentleman dealing with the election of 1882 ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, I am dealing entirely with that election. The Conservatives had a majority in these five counties of 815; and yet these ridings returned two Conservatives and three Liberals. The total of the Liberal majorities in these constituencies was ninety-four, while the total of the Conservative majorities was 909. And if it were worked out according to the plan of my hon. friend, the Conservatives would have elected their man in every one of these constituencies and the Liberals would have elected none. A more absurd statement than that of the hon. gentleman I never heard. Had I not heard it, I would not have believed that the Postmaster General of Canada would have made himself responsible for such figures as the hon. gentleman has advanced. I do not think that he or any of his friends saw the absurdity covered by his calculation. But this is only a fair sample of what the hon. gentlemen are offering in support of this Bill, for, as they say, undoing the infamous gerrymander of 1882.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CLANCY. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the hon. the Postmaster General's (Mr. Mulock's) effort to show by counting up the majorities, that the Liberal party were entitled to a greater number of members than they were able to return at the general elections of 1882. I wish to be entirely fair with the hon. gentleman, and to show that when I made the statement that he spoke of, the vote cast as well as of the majorities, I was quite correct, I will read what he said. He is thus reported at page 5366 of "Haasard":

> Take those 46 seats, and if the majorities which they gave in the election of 1882 to the Conservatives and Liberals had been in proportion to the votes cast, instead of the Conservative party having had 15 representatives in this House in that Parliament, they would only have had 10, and instead of the Liberals having only had 31 they would have had 36. In other words, while the Liberal party got only 15 seats in Parliament,——

I think there is an error there, and that the hon. gentleman means the Conservatives.

——a fair representation of that party, according to the vote cast,——

So he says "the votes cast" again—

——would have been 26,——

I think the hon. gentleman means thirty-six, which gives a consistent meaning to what the hon. gentleman said before—

——so that the Liberal party was deprived of ten votes on a division in this House.

My contention was that whether the hon. gentleman contended for greater representation on one ground or on the other, he was wrong in either case. But the hon. Minister made his calculation particularly on the majority. I endeavoured to show that, in the forty-eight ridings now under consideration, in the elections of 1882, the Liberals polled 78,473 votes and elected thirty-two members, while the Conservatives, polling only 6,164 votes less, were only able to elect sixteen members. Also I contended that on the votes cast the Liberals should have elected twenty-five out of forty-eight, and the Conservatives twenty-three, while, according to the hon. gentleman's contention, which, I think, he will see now is entirely unfounded, the Liberals should have had thirty-six and the Conservatives only ten—or, as I included forty-eight ridings instead of forty-six, I suppose the conclusion should be that the Conservatives should have had twelve. I pointed out further to the hon. gentleman by way of showing that he has been imposed upon by those who prepared the statement for him, that by taking that plan of determining the representation of the respective parties in this House, and by taking 16 of those ridings—because my hon. friend will agree that if the rule be a correct one it does not matter whether you take 48 ridings or 16 ridings, the result would work out correctly in both cases. Now, take 16 of those ridings; the Liberals polled 25,084 votes, and they elected 13 members; the Conservatives polled 25,691 of the votes cast, and they only elected three members. Then, if we take the other plan proposed by the hon. gentleman, take it on the vote cast, they would have elected eight members each, because there is only a fraction of difference. But if the hon. gentleman's contention was followed out, the Conservatives would have had 11 seats in this House, and the Liberals would only have had five. Then, I go further and take five ridings out of the same group in which the Liberals polled 6,952 votes, and they elected three members; the Conservatives polled 7,767 votes, and they only elected two. Now, on the popular vote polled, the Liberals should have only elected two, and the Conservatives would have elected three. But we will take the hon. gentleman's plan—and this is entirely in favour of the Conservatives—in that case there would have been no Liberals elected, and five Conservatives would have been elected, according to the hon. gentleman. I think, Mr. Speaker, I need not pursue that argument any further. I think hon. gentlemen on that side of the House must see the unfairness, I say the entire absurdity, without characterizing it by any stronger terms, of the argument of the hon. gentleman attempting to show that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 had done an injustice to the Liberal party.

I am going to point out now the bankrupt condition of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were forced to take so extreme, so unworthy, I was going to say a course unsanctioned by common sense and by reason. Now, the hon. gentleman goes further—and that is one of the reasons he gave for introducing this Bill, and I leave it to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House whether the hon. gentleman has made a case on that ground. The hon. gentleman says that the Liberals have been greatly weakened. This is what he says; I am unable to give the page of the "Hansard," but I am quoting him correctly:

They succeeded in weakening a large number of the surrounding ridings, detaching municipalities having Liberal majorities from this, that and the other riding, and grouping those detached municipalities into one riding here and one there, they succeeded in weakening the fair strength of the Liberal party in a large number of ridings, and in that way carried constituencies for the Conservative party which otherwise they never could have carried.

Now, I ask the hon. gentleman if he can tell me one constituency that was weakened. That is a broad statement to make, and I challenge him to put his finger upon one constituency. He has studied this case, he has looked into it well, he was the member who moved the second reading of the Bill. I ask the hon. gentleman to put his finger upon a single case where the Liberals were weakened as a result of that Bill. I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot do it. Now, let me give him some of the results.

Let us hear what the "Globe" has to say. That is a great public journal, the teacher of the Liberal party, and one that I will do it the fairness to say is not disposed to be a false teacher. I think a great public journal cannot afford to be a false teacher. But if the people have had their minds wrongly impressed, if the hon. gentleman has indulged in false utterances, and if the "Globe" has repeated them, then I am sure we shall have to come back to the hon. gentleman who is the author of those false statements. The "Globe" repeated practically what the hon. gentleman has stated in this House, because they believed his statements, they felt sure he would not make a statement that was not justified by facts. This is what the "Globe" says:

The 46 constituencies in Ontario affected by the remarkable gerrymander of 1882 gave a Liberal majority of 8,574 at the general elections held in the same year. According to the relative voting strength of the parties, these constitu-

encies should have returned 10 Conservative members, but the vote of the party was so judiciously distributed by the arrangement that they elected 15. The party representation was 50 per cent higher than was warranted by the party vote. A Liberal vote that should have carried 36 constituencies was so judiciously hived that it carried only 31, so the Government secured a net gain of 10 in a division in the House by their nefarious scheme.

Now, I do not think that that great public journal, if it had not been misled by the hon. gentleman, would have made such a statement, I do not believe any great public newspaper can afford to do that. But let me give the hon. gentleman the result. He says there were many members elected to this House that would not otherwise have been elected had it not been for the Redistribution Bill of 1892. Let me give the hon. gentleman the result of the election in 48 constituencies, 43 they then stood, but five were afterwards added. I need hardly state that in 1882 two Conservative constituencies were wiped out as having too small a representation. One, Niagara, had only a population of something over 3,000, and Cornwall had something over 7,000. These were Conservative constituencies, and they were wiped out by the Conservative party. The province was entitled to four new seats by the increased population under the decennial census of 1881. Well, with the four new seats to which this province was entitled, and the two seats which had been wiped out, the Conservative party had to find six new seats somewhere. Where did they find them ? They gave Toronto one additional seat and they took the 48 ridings now under consideration, for the purpose of getting four new seats. Now, what was the nature of that nefarious Bill, the one that has been described as a blot upon the history of Canada, the one that shackled hundreds of Liberals, the one that legislated Liberals out of office, the one that was a lasting disgrace upon the good name of the country ? Now, let us see what the result was. In the election of 1882, after the redistribution, out of 43 seats, the Conservatives elected 21 and the Liberals 22. Take that same group of counties with the additional five seats, and the Conservatives elected 16 and the Liberals 32. I want to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister to that, because he introduced this Bill, I thought, in rather apologetic terms. The right hon. Prime Minister did not go very far——

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) repeat those figures, as I did not catch them ?

Mr. CLANCY. I stated a moment ago, as my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) will see, that in the constituencies under consideration, which return 48 members now, 43 then, because five new seats were added, the Conservatives got 21 and the Liberals 22. That was before 1882 and before this Bill, that hon. gentlemen opposite have called an infamous Bill, was passed. When the Bill was passed the Liberals elected, in the same group, 32 members and the Conservatives only 16. Will any hon. gentleman say that there was anything more than mere declamation against that Bill ? Will the hon. gentleman who has just now taken his seat, and I am glad to see him at his place, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), say so ? When the hon. gentleman spoke in such heated tones, when he was almost beside himself, when he was declaiming against the infamy of this Bill, will he say that his statements were justified ? I will have to repeat what I said a moment ago for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, because I do not believe he has ever worked it out, and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman would have made such a speech if he had. I believe that he is too high-minded to have made the speech he did if he had known that in 1878, out of 43 constituencies the Liberals elected 22 members and the Conservatives 21 members, and that in the same group in 1882, after the redistribution, the Liberals elected 32 and the Conservatives 16. Will the hon. gentleman say that the hands of the Liberals were tied by that measure ? Take the instances in which constituencies were given an additional representative and we will see that the Liberals won the new seats. The changes were entirely in the interest of the Liberals. Lambton had an additional representative, and the Liberals won that. Middlesex had an additional representative, and the Liberals won that. Ontario had an additional representative, and the Liberals won that. There was an additional representative given to East Simcoe, and the Liberals won that. Ontario had another additional representative, three instead of two, and the Liberals won that. But that was not all ; it was not all that every additional seat that was made in consequence of the redistribution of 1882 was won by the Liberals, but the fact was that five other seats were so weakened that the Conservatives lost them. We lost one of the Elgins, two of the Greys, one of the Norfolks ; we lost Peel, and we lost one of the Wellingtons. The hon. gentleman who spoke here this afternoon (Mr. McMullen), may thank the Redistribution Bill of 1882 for his seat in this House. The hon. gentleman would not have been sitting here had it not been for the Bill of 1882. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen, in the face of these facts, should have made the statement in this House that the Liberals had been hived and unjustly dealt with. Hon. gentlemen say that that may not have been the intention of the Conservatives. It is not a matter to be settled here what was the intention of the Conservatives. The facts are before the people that the Liberals were the sole gainers and hon. gentlemen, now coming to this House with that as a pretense and an excuse for introducing this Bill, have absolutely no case to justify them, even in

adopting a more moderate course than they are adopting now. Let me deal with some more of the statements of the hon. Postmaster General who introduced this Bill. The hon. gentleman says that there has been no attention paid to the unit of population since the time of confederation. It is a very convenient thing for hon. gentlemen to repudiate their past principles in order to make a case for themselves now. That has always been the contention of the great Liberal party in this House before and after confederation. I do not know whether it ever reached the right hon. Prime Minister's ears, but the cry in Ontario at one time was against French domination in Quebec, and the great fight of the Liberal-Conservative party was against that cry. That was a cry which was a dangerous weapon. It was one that misled men in Ontario, and, unfortunately, I could mention many instances in that connection. The hon. Postmaster General may deny that they always contended for the unit of population, as nearly as possible, but will the hon. gentleman say that it has never been a real factor since confederation? I will call some very responsible and respectable witnesses. We will see what Mr. Mackenzie had to say in 1882 in this House in 1882 in regard to the Redistribution Bill of that year:

> He would not go into the discussion of the measure to-night. Certain amendments would be moved on concurrence, when he would state his views. He would say, however, that the Bill set at defiance the principle of representation by population adopted at the time of the union. It might be said that was adopted with reference to the old provinces only. While that was true, he contended that it was still intended to apply to the different sections. The Bill did not do this.

Mr. CLARKE. Who said that?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Mackenzie said so. I would like to offer another witness, a gentleman who is not in this House now, but who, I believe, had a hand in the preparation of this Bill. I will quote what the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) had to say in this House in 1882 in regard to the Bill:

> I am in favour of representation by population, but I deny that it is the only point to be considered.

It was one of the points to be considered in the mind of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) at that time. I think that most effectively disposes of the contention of the hon. gentleman, so far as the principle of any unit of population being at all to be considered, as showing the conduct or attitude of the Liberal party in this House. Hon. gentlemen have contended for it in the past, and if they have abandoned it now as a matter of convenience they must answer this. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that it is not possible to have a complete unit of population, but he knows equally as well that it is essential, so far as it is possible to do so, to have a fair unit of population in all the constituencies in this province, and in all the other provinces. I am not acquainted with the municipal arrangements of the other provinces, but I know that in Ontario the principle is a very sound one. The contention of hon. gentlemen for county boundaries, I think, most people will say is a mere myth, because, to say that there is any relation between the operation of the municipal organization and this House is idle. We have in Bothwell an experience of that. We have as hon. members know, in Bothwell a portion of Kent and Lambton. Did they ever discover any jar or inconvenience? They were oblivious of the fact of its being outside of the municipal boundaries. Nobody ever knew or contended, not even the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), who was the representative of the riding, for a change. He never was disturbed by it, and, as far as that is concerned, what hon. gentlemen are putting forth is a mere pretense, a bald pretense, and there is absolutely nothing in it. Everybody knows that the voters' lists are sent to the candidates and defeated candidates under the law. This is a law that is strictly obeyed. What is more to be done? Municipal organizations have nothing to do with political organizations, and, therefore, I say it is perfectly idle to set forth that contention. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) spoke of what he called eight Liberal hives, and the hon. gentleman's ingenuity is wonderful in discovering them. Here are five of his eight hives: North Brant, West Bruce, South Huron, North Oxford and South Oxford. Is there a gentleman in this House, even though he comes from the maritime provinces, who does not know that these counties are strongly Liberal even from a county boundary point of view. In 1886, following the redistribution of 1882, and we may take that as a fair expression of the electorate of these counties; in North Brant the Liberals had a majority in the local elections of 657, and in these local elections no municipal county boundaries were interfered with. Yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) says that constituency was made a hive by the Act of 1882. In West Bruce the Liberals had a majority of 347 in the local elections of 1886, in South Huron a majority of 507, in North Oxford a majority of 833, and in South Oxford a majority of 591. How did the Postmaster General ever discover that these five constituencies were made hives by the Redistribution Act of 1882. There are three remaining to make up his eight hives, and one of them is West Elgin. West Elgin had, in 1878, a majority of 112, and there were 291 votes added to that as a result of the redistribution. That is not much of a hive. As to South Middlesex, any one who knows anything of the municipal county of South Middlesex knows it would be utterly impossible to carve a riding out of that county which would not be overwhelmingly Liberal. I

care not whether the Government make the division or whether the judges make it, they cannot help having a division which will give anything but a large Liberal majority. Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) again, where was there a gerrymander as shown by these results? I say that these counties would be Liberal in spite of the intentions of any political party? There is one other of his eight hives remaining, and that is West Ontario, and if the Postmaster General thinks he can make that single case a basis for his denunciations of the Redistribution Act of 1882, he is quite welcome to it. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) must see now, in view of these facts that five of his eight Liberal hives are irrevocably Liberal. Whoever knew one of the Oxfords to return a Conservative? Why, there is from 800 to 1,000 Liberal majority in each riding, and the fact is that very often a Conservative does not run there because he sees he has no chance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) with regard to West Ontario?

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to frankly say that there was a majority of Liberals in West Ontario, not as a result of the redistribution, but in spite of the redistribution. The Liberals seemed to be in there anyway. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) may say to me: Well, you took some townships off the county of York for that constituency. It does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) to complain. I tell him that West Ontario was a Liberal hive, and the others were Liberal hives as well, and they elected the whole three members in the election after the Redistribution Act of 1882. If the hon. gentleman was able to say: You made a Liberal hive in West Ontario——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You know it was that.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says I know it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You know that, if you know anything.

Mr. CLANCY. I tell the Postmaster General what I do know. I tell him that whether West Ontario was made a Liberal hive or not, two other Liberals were made perfectly safe, and were elected in the municipal county of Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was the righteousness of the people.

Mr. CLANCY. It was because the Liberals were there in the municipal divisions, and the Act of 1882 had nothing to do with it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has shown that there is one hive in three constituencies, and he elects the whole three of them. The hon. gentleman succeeded in proving that he has set up a contention which is a little unworthy of a Minister of the Crown.

Let me deal for a moment now with the speech of the Minister of Customs. I always like to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) speak in this House, for he always appears in earnest. However, lately I have had some misgivings as to his sincerity. I never could imagine that any member of this House could pump up such imaginary indignation as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) seemed to. I thought it was impossible that any hon. gentleman could look so honest while defending such a dishonest case. I could not think that an hon. gentleman could speak in such pathetic tones unless he were injured. I could not imagine that any member would take so much pains to be so wrong as the hon. gentleman was all through his speech. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) told us there was wonderful indignation, but I think I have shown the House that that indignation was due to wilful misrepresentations of the facts from one end of the country to the other. These hon. gentlemen opposite talked for the sake of victory, rather than for the sake of truth. I hold that no hon. member can afford to make a misstatement in this House or outside of this House, because there is no better evidence of the weakness of a man's case than when he is obliged to resort to colouring which amounts to a misstatement, in order to mislead the electors. I will not charge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) with that, but if he maliciously and wickedly intended to mislead, he could not have done it more successfully than he did. I acquit him entirely of that, but I will say that I think he was misinformed. Let me read what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said, because in my very scanty vocabulary, I would not be able to invent such splendid sentences, or words so calculated to arouse indignation in the country. I took the trouble to read the speeches of the hon. gentleman in 1882, and I find that his present speeches are nearly, though not quite, so exaggerated as they were then, and in that respect there is some improvement. Here is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) told us during this debate:

There was a great deal of indignation expressed and a great deal of denunciation of the Bill of 1882.

That is true, and the hon. gentleman (Mr Paterson) contributed his share to it.

I can remember how some of the hon. members who were struck at, distinctly and evidently struck at, voiced their indignation. The then member for South Brant had a voice that could be heard, and it was heard denouncing that Bill as iniquitous; the voice of the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) was also heard in strong denunciation. And there was a reason for that. If hon. members who were not present then will take the "Hansard" of 1882 and read the

twenty-two amendments that we moved to the Bill, which recite the iniquities of the measure, I believe that they, like many Conservative members of that day—save and except a few who were lost to all proper feeling of what was due between man and man—will blush when they read and when they understand the nature of that gerrymander.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I wonder the hon. Minister says "hear, hear." I venture to say that even now, with all his acting, a good deal of it bad, he cannot get up an argument let alone a blush. Let me go further and see what the indignation was? He said:

A majority in the Parliament of Canada, elected not upon that issue, used their power in this Chamber, without debate and in dumb silence,——

I wonder if the hon. gentleman will still adhere to that statement, although it is only a few days old.

——to vote down amendment after amendment, and not daring to lift their heads when they understood the iniquities which they supported by their votes.

I ask the hon. gentleman if he adheres to that statement, that there was not a fair and vigorous defence of the measure, but that the 22 amendments were voted down in dumb silence, and that the Bill was so iniquitous that its supporters hung their head in shame and would not stand up to defend it. If the hon. gentleman looks at "Hansard," he will find that the amendments were moved on the third reading of the Bill, and that the discussion all took place before that. He knows that the debate was practically over, and that the amendments were introduced with a very few sentences, some of them with not 20 lines, and that they were all disposed of on the same day, practically without debate. Now, let us see whether that statement be true, that the Bill went through in dumb silence, and that men held down their heads——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said that the 22 amendments were voted down in dumb silence—that men dare not stand up in their places and defend the Bill. Let me read another sentence which I did not read, because I think he went further than that:

The Bill was fought against; 22 amendments were moved, each one reciting an iniquity, and these amendments were voted down in dumb silence—42 yeas and 99 nays; vote after vote, not a word of defence from the Conservative Government supporters who, though they might with downcast heads vote for the gerrymander of 1882, could not for very shame stand up and defend it.

Is that a fair statement to go to the country? I appeal to the hon. gentleman if that represents the facts of the case, because I am now prepared to produce evidence to show that no such state of affairs existed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Read the amendments.

Mr. CLANCY. I will come to the amendments shortly. I find, on reference to "Hansard," that 20 members on the Conservative side made vigorous speeches in defence of the measure: Sir John Macdonald, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Messrs. Rykert, Plumb, Haggart, Rochester, McCarthy, McCallum, Arkell, Shaw, Kirkpatrick, White, Sproule, Farrow, McLellan, Bergin, Boultbee and Orton. Then, turning to the Liberal side, how many spoke? Seventeen on one side, and 20 on the other. I challenge the hon. gentleman to find a single case beyond that. And yet he would have it go to the country that the Bill was so bad that members on the Government side hung their heads in shame, and did not rise in the House and defend their votes by a single word. I have no hesitation in saying that the statement of the hon. gentleman is not worthy of him. Now, the hon. gentleman says there were 22 amendments reciting the iniquities of the Bill. What were they? One was moved by the hon. gentleman himself, and it was to take the village of Port Elgin out of the township of Saugeen and put it into North Bruce.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That was done.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman had influence enough to carry it, and so the iniquity was perpetrated at his own instance. Then, the hon. gentleman tried his hand a second time. He thought he would try Saugeen, but he failed in that. His influence seems to have ended when he got Port Elgin detached from Saugeen and put into North Bruce. That was one of the 22 solemn amendments that recited the iniquities of the legislation. There was another. Mr. Mills moved one, and what was his? It was a vague, colourless motion, relating to no constituency, and having no object or political effect whatever, probably based on some of the theories which that hon. gentleman held then, and no doubt still holds. It was a motion having relation to how the western boundaries of the province of Ontario would be determined by this Bill. Then, he moved another, that five ridings might be made out of Kent, and Bothwell, and Lambton—not preserving county boundaries. Was that reciting one of the iniquities of the Bill? Then, Mr. Blake moved a resolution; what was that? That the returning officers should not be under the control exclusively of the Conservative party. Is there any proposal in this Bill to abandon that? I ask my hon. friend, has he proposed such an amendment now? Mr. Blake moved another resolution; what was that? That the deposit of candi-

dates should be reduced from $200 to $50. That was another burning question set forth in these 22 resolutions. What does the hon. gentleman think of them now? Have they lost their value? What were the other 16? They were simply a multiplication of the same thing. They were padded out so as to express in a dozen resolutions what could be expressed in one. I defy the hon. gentleman to gainsay the fact. I can pick out two or three that are in effect the same, although the townships were mixed in such a way as to make them appear new resolutions. I think I have shown that these resolutions simply propose to restore these townships to the counties from which they were taken. I say that they were unnecessarily multiplied. I shall not trouble the House with reading those resolutions, because I have stated what they were.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The House would be pleased to hear the amendments, I am sure.

Mr. CLANCY. I will read some of the amendments to show that I am absolutely correct. I cannot undertake, for the hon. gentleman's amusement, to read all of them. This is Mr. Mills' resolution:

> That the Bill be recommitted to a committee of the whole House with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the settlements lying eastward of the limit settled by the ward as the westerly boundary of Ontario, and not provided for under the Bill, be embraced for electoral purposes within the electoral district of Algoma, inserted instead thereof.

That is one of the resolutions. Does that emphasize any wrong-doing in the Bill? Is it not a colourless resolution? I would read Mr. Blake's resolution if the hon. gentleman cares, but do not propose to take up the time of the House reading resolutions that were meaningless then and are meaningless now.

The hon. gentleman says that the people declared at the polls for a repeal of the Redistribution Act of 1882. I do not think the hon. gentleman can lay any claim to that himself, but I will give his language:

> The people have declared at the polls that they want this Bill. They have declared themselves in favour of this Bill by a majority of their representatives in this House, and with that declaration of the people the Bill will go to the Senate.

The hon. gentleman went into his own constituency, talked as loudly and earnestly there as he has here, and his own constituency rejected him. His constituents declared by their vote that they did not want the Act repealed. There is no better example, therefore, than the hon. gentleman himself that the people do not desire this measure. With the exception of the Minister of Justice (Senator Mills), the hon. gentleman was loudest in his declamation against the Bill, and his county rejected him. The Minister of Justice went into his own riding, and made similar declamations and met a similar fate. I would like to know then what claim the hon. gentleman has for saying that the people have declared in this measure. His own experience is that they declared against it. No doubt that is the reason why he was defeated, because he is a very estimable gentleman and much respected. The people, however, did not take much stock in his appeal for the repeal of the Redistribution Act of 1882.

The hon. gentleman says: We made a lot of pledges and must fulfil them. What does he say about the pledges:

> They know that the people of this country pronounced for the repeal of the Franchise Act, and the Franchise Act was repealed. And, Sir, we are here to-day carrying out one of our pledges in the platform adopted by the great national Liberal Convention that met in this city in 1893. Almost all of the pledges then made have been carried out. This pledge remains to be fulfilled.

I tell the hon. gentleman that the people will absolve him from that pledge. He may carry it out by a majority of his friends in this House, but it will be the only pledge he ever carried out. Did he carry out his pledge with regard to the Franchise Bill, when he handed over to the provinces the framing of our franchise to suit the exigencies of parties in those provinces? If the hon. gentleman had ever declared such a policy as that with regard to the franchise, he would have been hooted and stood the risk of being pelted. It is a disgrace to the Liberal party that they were driven by their majority to repeal the Franchise Act, but did not have the courage—I will not say they lack the ability, because I do not wish to be offensive—to replace it with anything of their own, but were obliged to resort to the shifty means of leaving our franchise to the mercies of the province. It is a national disgrace that we are to-day without a Dominion franchise. We are now in a position that is humiliating. We have given ourselves up to not only what exists now, but what may happen in the future, over which we have no control. The hon. gentleman says that we may recall the measure. Is not that an unworthy proposition? These gentlemen should have introduced such legislation as they would stand by or repeal, and not leave the provinces to frame our franchise.

Has the plebiscite been a fair redemption? The hon. gentleman says the people expect the Liberal party to redeem their pledges. They know that their pledges are worth nothing. They talk about being bound to redeem their pledges—why? The people care as much about their pledges as the hon. gentlemen themselves. The people know very well that these gentlemen are making no honest attempt to redeem their pledges, but are simply trying to make some pretense of

doing so. Did the hon. gentleman redeem his pledges on the tariff? On the expenditure? On the public debt? Nobody would hold the hon. gentleman to his pledges. In fact, the people are grateful, not for what the Government have done, but for what they have not done. The Ministers stand self-convicted of having made false statements in the country, statements which they should have known to be false; and if they did, they were guilty of canting hypocrisy and not fit to occupy the positions they hold to-day.

The hon. gentleman dealt with the question of equalization. I thought he would have dealt with that in a somewhat fair manner. I am bound to say that he will conclude himself, when he sees the other side of the question, that he was seeking some defence without having any thought of what it would lead to. He declared: You will find greater inequality in the constituencies under the redistribution of 1882 than you will find in the present Bill. That is making comparison with the constituencies framed by the Liberal party in the province of Ontario. Now my hon. friend repudiates his Liberal friends. But he cannot escape the responsibility; he has upheld them over and over again, and his friends have defended them from end to end of this province.

An hon. MEMBER. The right arm of the Dominion Government.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, as my hon. friend suggests, they are spoken of to be the right arm of the Dominion Government. Whether they have done right or wrong, I am not now considering; but what I say is that the only way to make a fair comparison is to take the constituencies confined in the county boundaries by the Liberal party in the province, and to take them as they would be, as confined to county boundaries under this Bill.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). As divided by the judges?

Mr. CLANCY. That has nothing to do with it. No matter by whom they are divided these inequalities will arise. Now, the hon. gentleman points out 22 ridings to show inequalities in the population: Brockville, South Leeds, Cardwell, North Wellington, East Wellington, West Durham, East Durham, Frontenac, South Grenville, Dundas, North Leeds and Grenville, Carleton, Lincoln, Addington, West Middlesex, East Middlesex, East Northumberland, West Northumberland, Peel, West York, East Peterborough and West Peterborough. Now, if the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair would he have selected these eastern counties that he knows are small, ranging from 13,000 in Frontenac up to 30,000? Twelve of these constituencies are precisely the same for the Dominion as for the local House, and never were changed, the reason being perfectly obvious—that they were too small and could not be rearranged. But the hon. gentleman selects these for the purpose of showing that there was inequality in the redistribution, not that he proposes to remedy it in these cases. But he has gone over the whole province to make the selection that will best fit his argument. The hon. gentleman knows that the judges or anybody else could not equalize the population in these eastern counties without departing from county boundaries. I appeal to the hon. gentleman if he thinks that a fair mode of comparison. Take these 22 counties and make a comparison with those under the redistribution of seats for the local House. The Postmaster General stated that while the unit of population was a little over 20,900, there should be some little elasticity and the unit might be counted as from 19,000 to 22,000. Make the comparison on that basis. Of the 22 ridings that the hon. Minister of Customs has selected as the worst examples—going outside of the 48 constituencies now under consideration, and many of these 22 being, as I say, incapable of being equalized—we find that there are five of them within the unit of population for the Dominion and only four for the local; there are 12 below the unit of population for the Dominion and 13 for the local; above the unit of population there are five for each. But take the 48 ridings affected by the Bill, coming down to a practical dealing with this measure. Compare these 48 ridings for the Dominion as they stand under the Redistribution Bill of 1882 with the constituencies covering the same ground in the province of Ontario for provincial purposes. Those coming within the unit of population number 19 for the Dominion and only 10 for the province: below the unit there are only 10 for the Dominion and 12 for the province; while above the unit there are 19 for the Dominion and 23 for the Ontario legislature. Now, I am not going to ascribe what the hon. gentleman ascribed even to his friends—a willingness to be unfair—but I will point out that, being hampered by county boundaries, it is not as easy to equalize the population as it would be if the county boundaries have not to be considered.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) say that the judges would make these unfair divisions?

Mr. CLANCY. I say it is impossible for the judges to approach as near the unit of population when they are confined to county boundaries as they could if county boundaries were not to be considered. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show the contrary. It is not the question what the judges will do, but what it is possible for any one to do under the circumstances. So I say that hon. gentlemen opposite may well repudiate every doctrine they have ever preached in the past as to unit of population, because the course they are taking deprives them for ever of the means of defend-

ing it. Now, I come to the constituency in which the hon. gentleman himself resides and which he long represented. I have said from the outset that hon. gentlemen opposite are not in a position to declaim against any measure on the unit of population. I think I can show that the hon. gentleman has not been quite unselfish in this matter. he has not been so courageous as the hon gentleman for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would have Liberal members to be. He has taken a course that is not a very creditable one to him and to the hon. gentleman who is credited with having framed this Bill—I mean the Minister of Justice. Now, we have adopted the same franchise as that for the Ontario legislature, so we shall have the same number of votes in a constituency for the Dominion as for the local, if the boundaries are the same. And the population must be the same of course. The hon. gentleman's own county of South Brant has a population of 32,217, and not over 36,000, as the hon. gentleman said.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Either the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is wrong or I am. Read the figures for the several townships.

Mr. CLANCY. I will send over the figures to the hon. gentleman. When the Indians were disfranchised in Ontario, a certain township in his own county was left out entirely. The hon. gentleman knows that it was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he does not know that the township of Tuscarora is not included for the local? I tell him that that township is not included either in North or South Brant.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But the population is there.

Mr. CLANCY. But I speak of the voters.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has just been speaking of population.

Mr. CLANCY. Why, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) might as well go into his barnyard to count his cows as to count the Indians, who have no votes, in order to swell the figures of population. I am astounded that the hon. gentleman should resort——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What about the children—would you leave them out?

Mr. CLANCY. Children of whom?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of the white people—they have no votes.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly that that is not fair; he has no right to count the Indians. If the hon. gentleman had allowed the Indians to retain their votes he might count them. But he helped to disfranchise that part of his constituents, and now he wants to count them for purposes of population. If his constituency had 50,000 people, he would not be so anxious to count them. What does this contrivance—I was going to say this job—arranged between the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice effect? I will send him these figures to show that Tuscarora is not included in the riding for the local legislature, because the Indians have not votes any more than the cattle or the horses have.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, this is a question as to the population of municipal counties, as ascertained by the census of 1891. The hon. gentleman says that under the municipal census of the county of Brant in 1891, the population is returned as 32,000. I say, no. It is returned in this official document—I speak subject to correction, but every one may see it—at over 36,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that I did not count Indians.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But the census does, and you are appealing to the census.

Mr. CLANCY. Let us go a little further. Let him show that the township of Tuscarora is included in those figures. Let the hon. gentleman foot up the figures and see whether there are more than 32,217. The hon. gentleman knows that while the population is put in there, if he foots up the figures, he will find that there is a township excluded, that its population is not there. When we count on representation by population, who are we counting? Are we counting people living upon the other side of the line? Are we counting persons who have no votes, who are disfranchised? If we mean anything by county population, we mean the voting strength of the county.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are numbers of white people in those townships that do not vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, so much the worse for the hon. gentleman, who has disfranchised a portion of them by this Bill.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was your law that did it. Your franchise law disfranchised more than the present Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. It enfranchised the Indians, and the hon. gentleman has undone that. After disfranchising them, what does he do? He wanted to pad out a little his own county, and he can only do it by counting a class of people that had no votes. He says now that the county of Brant ought to have two representatives. Let us see how he dealt with Kent—because I think he and the Minister of Justice sat down to frame this Bill. Brant has a voting population of 32,217, excluding the Indians. They are not

included, because they have not votes ; they are just so many sticks, as far as this is concerned. Kent has a population of 58,019 votes. The hon. gentleman proposed to give Kent three representatives, with 19,000 each; afterwards he proposed to give Brant two representatives, with 16,000 each. But he took that back, and what has he done ? He still retains Brant, with 16,000 votes for each member, and he gives Kent two members, with 29,000 each. I tell the hon. gentleman that Kent is infinitely better entitlued to 19,000 than the hon. gentleman is to 16,000. But they receded from that position and what was the hon. gentleman's excuse ? That the newspapers had discussed it, and thought that Toronto ought to have an additional seat ; that while he did not see any need for it himself, as the people were living in a small area and could be easily brought together, still, as it had been declared by some of the Conservative newspapers that Toronto ought to have an additional member, the hon. gentleman was gracious enough to yield. I ask how much sincerity there was in that. The hon. gentleman perhaps thought that, with the aid of the team that has been going from one constituency to another, under the lead of Capt. Sullivan, he could capture some of the seats in Toronto. Thinking possibly that he could not carry Bothwell, that was snuffed out. I am not complaining of that. I should not attempt to discuss this question on so narrow a ground as to urge my own case as a reason against this Bill. I put it on different ground, and I say that the hon. gentleman was not fair. What was the attitude of the Minister of Justice at the time that this Bill was before the House ? Let me read one of the speeches made when this motion of indignation was before the House:

> If the hon. gentleman were to take the township of Harwich and village of Blenheim from Kent as it now stands, there would still remain 20,572 of a population within the limits of that county. The eastern division of Kent might be formed with a population of nearly 20,000, and within the limits of Kent and Bothwell an electoral division might be formed containing a population of 22,000, which would be a very much more equal division than that which the hon. gentleman has made, and which would not interfere with the existing divisions.

Where was the trouble about municipal organizations there ? This is one of the resolutions of indignation the hon. gentleman referred to ; this is the resolution the Minister of Justice moved on that occasion. I want to show the consistency of the hon. gentleman then and now ; I want to show that the Minister of Justice was bound to retain Bothwell, that he was not inclined to return to county boundaries on that occasion, and he proposed a different course to save himself, while he proposes another course now. I say that is not creditable to the hon. gentleman. Now, what does he say in this resolution :

> The municipal counties of Kent and Lambton comprise the electoral districts of Kent, Lambton and Bothwell, with a population of 106,344, making, for five members, an average of 21,268 per member.

That is the resolution of the hon. gentleman in 1882, and it goes further :

> That the electoral district of Lambton comprises 42,616, and may be properly divided into two ridings.
>
> That the electoral district of Kent comprises 36,626, and may, by the restoration from Bothwell of some of the municipalities of Kent, be divided into two ridings of about 21,000 each, leaving Bothwell with about 21,000.

He goes further :

> That the proposed Bill needlessly disarranges the existing organization for Kent and Bothwell, takes from Kent and adds to Bothwell, Chatham and Wallaceburg, takes from Bothwell and adds to West Elgin Orford, Howard and Ridgetown, and takes from Bothwell to add to West Middlesex Euphemia.
>
> That the said Bill be recommitted to a committee of the whole House with instructions that they have power to amend the provisions for the representation of Kent, Lambton and Bothwell in Parliament inserted instead thereof.

What is the position of the hon. gentleman after a statement like that has been made? I say it shows—I was going to say, manifest dishonesty, but I will use a milder term, and say that the hon. gentleman was either insincere then or he is insincere now.

I have only one more phase of the question to deal with, and that is with regard to the hon. gentleman's conduct in relation to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). The hon. gentleman complains that there was great iniquity in North Bruce. I am going to read this as a last instalment of the hon. gentleman's indignation on this occasion. It is a little bit long, but it is worth repeating and putting on "Hansard." The more we repeat the hon. gentleman's indignation, the better it is for us in this country. So I propose, with the permission of the House, to read what the hon. gentleman had to say about mangling and strangling at that time. It was something dreadful to contemplate. Let us see what the hon. gentleman's language was. I thought I had here what the hon. gentleman said in regard to the township of Oakland, but the hon. gentleman stated in the most explicit terms, and he repeated it more than once, that the township of Oakland had been taken out of the county of Brant and put in a county twelve miles away, or in other words, that it was detached from the county of Brant and attached to the county of Oxford, twelve miles away. This is almost the precise statement of the hon. gentleman, and if he denies it, I will refer to "Hansard." The hon. gentleman made that statement and it has gone to the country on the wings of his own words for the purpose of making it appear that the Conservatives were guilty of taking a township twelve miles apart

from the county to which it belonged and attaching it to another county for the purpose of carrying out what he calls the infamous Gerrymander Bill. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is a fair interpretation of his words?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) want me to say?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, I think the hon. gentleman will say that it is.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is perfectly at liberty to read what I said. I said that they took this little three-cornered township of Oakland, which squared out the county of Brant, away from that county, that it is twelve miles across the township of Burford, which lies between the township of Oakland and the county in which this township was put; I said that the township of Burford and this three-cornered township of Oakland were detached from South Brant; that one of the amendments I moved was, as far as I can remember now, that the township of Oakland, that was almost within sound of the bells of Brantford, should be taken back from South Oxford in which it had been put and attached to the riding of South Brant, and yet it was voted down in dumb silence.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, the hon. gentleman has modified his statement, but I am going to read to him what he said. He says if Burford had not been taken and if Oakland had not been attached to that, it would have been twelve miles. That is not the statement the hon. gentleman made. I am going to read it, and perhaps he has not corrected it even in the revised "Hansard." He may have wanted to say one thing to go to the country in the newspapers and another thing to this House, and he may have eliminated it from the "Hansard." I do not say he did, but it is greatly to his discredit if he has not eliminated it. I will read to him:

There was the little township of Oakland, a three-cornered township that squared out the county of Brant,——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That should be the township of Brant.

Mr. CLANCY—

——and that was 12 miles from the nearest point of the county into which they put it.

Twelve miles from the nearest point of the county in which they put it. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with stating that, but he was so wilful that he repeated it. Let me show what he said further on that subject:

The township of Burford they took out of South Brant and joined it to South Oxford. This little township of Oaklands was 12 miles from the riding into which it was put.

Twelve miles from the riding into which it was put. I will read the balance, because he may say that I am not doing him justice. He might have corrected it even by inference afterwards, but I will show that he did not do that.

It was almost within sound of the bells of Brantford city, the main town of the riding, and the main town of the riding into which it was put was 50 miles away. On the third reading of that Bill I rose and recited these facts, and said that I wanted to ask a question of the gentleman who had charge of this Bill. I wanted him to look me in the eyes, but he sat with bowed head, and dared not raise his eyes.

Dared not raise his eyes, Mr. Speaker. I say such an exclamation is unworthy of that hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is true.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman deliberately conveyed that apparent fact to the country that that township was taken twelve miles away for the purpose of gaining a party advantage, and that it was put in another county twelve miles away.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. From the county.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the township of Burford belongs more properly to Oxford than to Brant. I dare him to dispute that. If he does I will bring the "Hansard" of 1882, and quote to him a statement in which he declared that it does. Yet while that is the case, while it belongs more properly to Oxford, the hon. gentleman declares that it is twelve miles away.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is it not that far from Oxford?

Mr. CLANCY. It is not that far from the electoral district of Oxford; it is just as much in Oxford as any other county. It is no more away from Oxford than one electoral district of Ottawa is away from the other. In regard to West Bruce, the pretense of this Bill is that it is desirable to return to county boundaries. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why he submits the case of West Bruce? I say that it is to strike a blow at the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill), as the worthy representative of one of the ridings there. The hon. gentleman talks about taking a township away twelve miles, which is at variance with the facts, but what does he do? He is the only hon. gentleman that ever proposed so infamous a proceeding as to take the village of Port Elgin and put it into another riding. I say that nobody, either in or outside of this House was guilty of making the proposal that the hon. gentleman has made, namely, that Port Elgin, which is entirely surrounded by the township of Saugeen, should be carried into another riding. He is attempting to strike an unfair blow

at the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I care not whether it be the judges or the Liberal party that do it, but I must say that I would not trust the Liberal party if they were going about it. Let us take the four townships of West Bruce. Any change that the hon. gentleman could make would not make the arrangement fairer than it is to-day, but he might do what the legislature did, zig-zag across the county.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We do not do it at all; the judges do it.

Mr. CLANCY. Why should the hon. gentleman propose to go to Bruce? Will the hon. gentleman say that, as far as the constituencies are cut out now under the Redistribution Bill of 1882, that they are not as fair as they could be made under the judges or any one else? Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) say that the ridings are any more irregularly shaped than they are under the Ontario Act of 1885?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If they are, how does he make out that my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is struck at? If they are as fair as they could be, and the judges are sent to make a division, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) deliberately say that judges of the Supreme Court will do an unfair thing, and if they do not, how is my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) struck at?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell my hon. friend. What I am now arguing is that there was no excuse whatever for interfering with Bruce. And if the Government had any hope in the matter, it was that the judges might make a mistake and change the constituency from what it is now. I am not reflecting on the judges, but I want to know why the Government have interfered with Bruce, since the county boundaries are not touched there. The Minister of Customs is the chief offender himself, and he has given no excuse. He is guilty of the grossest infamy, if infamy it be, that stands to the credit of any public man in Canada, for it was he who succeeded in taking the little village of Port Elgin from the township of Saugeen and hitching it on to North Bruce. He is the only one who ever proposed such an absurdity, and yet he speaks about the absurdity of the Bill of 1882.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The whole Conservative party were guilty of that infamy, if it be an infamy.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) wants to shelter himself behind what the Conservative party assented to, but he was the inventor of the evil, and he was the one who succeeded in getting it done. Are we to understand that the Minister (Mr. Paterson) played a role of insincerity then.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. I ask him, is that what we are to understand.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do you want an answer?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman can make his answer later on.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I will take the acts of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) and not his words. We know what he did in that case, and no explanation can make it any different. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to discuss this Bill without any heat, and without, I hope, being offensive in any way. I think I have been able to show that the Bill of 1882 was not a menace to the Liberal party, that it fairly equalized constituencies and that it gave the Liberal party a decided advantage in the councils of the country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says no; but I venture to say if a man stood at a street corner in Ottawa and declared that two and three made six, he would get some people to believe him, and he would just be about as right as the hon. gentleman (Mr Paterson) is in that statement. I challenge him to point out one single case where the Liberals did not win every new seat that was made. I challenge him to deny the fact that the Liberals elected five more members, in addition to the five they gained by the Redistribution Bill of 1882, as a natural consequence of weakening Conservative ridings.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then what is your objection to our changing that state of affairs?

Mr. CLANCY. My objection is that this is not the proper time to pass such a Bill as this, and that even if the Liberal party had a substantial grievance, they had no right to remedy it at this time. Even if they had a real grievance, and not a grievance that exists only in loud words and misrepresentations, they have no right to redistribute constituencies at this juncture. If they could show that the Redistribution Act of 1882 did not give a fair representation to the Liberals, they might have some show of reason, but no justification for introducing such a Bill at this date. I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) now and here, to point to one single Liberal who lost his seat as a consequence of the Redistribution Bill of 1882. Will the hon. gentleman answer me that question?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I speak subject to correction, but I think one of the effects of that Bill, that was deplored by right-thinking men in all parts of the Dominion, was that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), who sits in front of me, was legislated out of his seat, and was out of the House for a year. I also think,

but subject to correction, that my friend John Gillis lost his seat in consequence of that Bill. Am I right in that?

Mr. CLANCY. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has pointed to many of these gerrymandered ridings and said they were carried by the Liberals. It is true; and let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) take this comfort out of that fact: That the reason the Liberals were elected under the conditions in which they were placed by this Act of 1882, was that in these counties a certain number of high-minded Conservatives said that the Bill was so infamous they would not stand it, and so they cast their vote for the Liberal members. I myself had to be elected by Conservative votes. I had a strong Reform riding, and the Reformers were put in the minority, but decent Conservatives were indignant at the Bill and they voted for me. Nevertheless, the hands of the Liberals were tied; Burford was thrown into Oxford. The election of these Liberals proves that there is a sense of justice in the minds of the people of this country, and that no matter what their past political feelings may be, they will punish iniquity when it is perpetrated in this House.

Mr. CLANCY. Now you are making another speech. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) says that the Conservatives elected him because they were in a fit of indignation against the Bill, but let me ask him what became of this fit of indignation when he last appealed to his constituents? He told us that he appealed to his constituents last time, on this very question, and, therefore, he was defeated on this question. It is easy for him to talk about moral consequences, but let us appeal to the hard facts, and the hard facts are against the Minister of Customs. He tells us that the Conservatives voted for the Liberals to rebuke the Conservative Government because the Redistribution Bill of 1882 was so bad; but, at all events, we have the fact that the Conservatives rebuked the hon. gentleman in the end, for denouncing the Bill of 1882.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes. The hon. gentleman was rejected in his own constituency.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Just let me say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CLANCY. I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to reply, if he promises not to make a speech.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman asked for some instances of what had been accomplished by the Gerrymander Act, and I pointed to the defeat of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. CLANCY. What constituency was the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) legislated out of as a result of the Bill of 1882?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Centre Huron, if you want to know. Centre Huron was destroyed and wiped out of constituencies for having elected me.

Mr. COCHRANE. Served them right.

Mr. CLANCY. And what does the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) now deliberately assent to at the Council Board? He deliberately proposes to wipe out Bothwell because it has elected me.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Serves you right.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) decides that he will inflict the same penalty on me that he imagines was inflicted on him. Well, he can wipe out Bothwell, and if it were in the interests of the country I would not object. But what happened in Huron? The Conservatives in 1878 elected one in Huron, and they elected precisely the same in 1882. Where is the hon. gentleman's complaint. Did the county of Huron elect any different members as the result of the Bill of 1882? No, it elected the same. I again ask the hon. gentleman to find a case where it affected any Liberal member. He may get up and talk in generalities, but that is all he can do. There is nothing so difficult to prevail against as one who is arguing an absurdity. You can reach the man who has something of a case, but the man who has no case is absolutely helpless. That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, what is my objection to the Bill? Hon. gentlemen have no right to enter on legislation of this kind, without reference to whether there is or is not a grievance. The only excuse hon. gentlemen offer is the state of things following on the redistribution of 1882. We are proposing by this legislation to do what? To set an example that was never set by Canada before, namely, that we are to have a tussle to overhaul the constituencies whenever we get a chance. I am not going to discuss what the effect of the measure is. The objection to it is that whenever a party come into power, they may, without reference to the decennial census, have a redistribution of seats. What would be the effect if hon. gentlemen were defeated at the polls, of which there does not seem to be much doubt? Would not the Conservative party have as much foundation as the Liberal party have now for saying: You legislated us out of office, and we are going to put the constituencies back again where they were?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. By the judges.

Mr. CLANCY. It does not matter who does it. The tribunal before which the matter goes does not affect the principle. It is the very fact of hon. gentlemen opposite undertaking it at all which would justify the Conservative party in taking the same course if they thought proper. It means that the Parliament of Canada has adopted a precedent for rearranging the whole system of constituencies at any time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. By the judges.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the House will not commit itself to such a course. I hope that hon. members from other provinces of this Dominion will not commit Canada to such an example. What follows? It may be pleaded that this was sanctioned by a majority of this House; but I put the question on that highest ground—not how it affects me or any one else in this House; but on the ground that it brings about a state of political demoralization in this country that never existed before. I think I may appeal to Liberal members to hesitate before they commit this House to a proposition so vicious in principle. I am not going to argue the constitutional question. I am going to leave that to the legal members of this House. The hon. leader of the Opposition made a strong argument in regard to the right of the Parliament of Canada to enter on legislation of this kind, which no hon. gentleman on that side of the House has attempted to answer. Hon. gentlemen on that side who are able to discuss the constitutional question have up to this minute failed to make even a reference to that argument. They have passed it by, because they have no case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are waiting to deal with that when the legal gentlemen on the other side take the responsibility of stating that the Bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. CLANCY. I may be pardoned if I put this proposition to the lawyers of the House. They may or may not argue that it is within the power of the Parliament of Canada to make a redistribution of seats now if it thinks proper. I shall not discuss that; but I am going to discuss the wisdom of doing so as a matter of public policy. I will put it to the lawyer who sits behind the hon. gentleman, one of the able men in his profesion. That hon. gentleman will not say that it is beyond the power of this Parliament to expropriate private property and devote it to public uses without giving a farthing of compensation to the owner. It is not necessary to discuss what the powers of this Parliament are. I discuss the wisdom and the fairness of the proposition, and I appeal to the lawyers as well as to the laymen. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have occupied more time than I intended at the outset. I have attempted to show that hon. gentlemen opposite have no case, no grievance, and I hope that this Parliament will reject the Bill.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Clancy) has sent forth two challenges. First, he has dared the Liberals to point out a case in which the gerrymander or rearrangement of 1882 has injuriously affected or defeated a Liberal member. Then he has closed with another, stated in terms similar to those used by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He has stated that the leader of the Opposition has dealt with the question of the unconstitutionality of the measure before the House, and has demonstrated it so completely that no hon. member on the Liberal side of the House has even attempted an answer. Well, I will venture an answer. I do it, of course, with some hesitation, because I recognize that the age and position and intelligence of the hon. leader of the Opposition entitle any statement that comes from his lips to be received with due consideration. Now, Sir, I start with this proposition, if it be true, that we have no power in this House to legislate along the line proposed in this Bill, this discussion may just as well close, and close immediately. So that it becomes us, in the first place, to ascertain precisely where we stand upon the constitutional question. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition states his argument on page 5395 of the unrevised "Hansard":

> It has always been recognized that the only time such a measure should be dealt with by the Parliament of Canada was after the decennial census. Section 51 of the British North America Act says:
>
> "On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority and in such a manner and at such a time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides."
>
> There is an absolute direction that this measure shall take place after the decennial census, and then to show in the most emphatic manner that then and then only could such a measure be dealt with, it is said in section 92, in reference to the exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures:
>
> "In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the class of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say: 'The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of lieutenant-governor.'"
>
> The British North America Act is not contented with stating that the only time provided for a redistribution Act is after the decennial census; not satisfied with that, you have on the face of the same Act, a broad distinction drawn between the Dominion of Canada and the various provinces by saying that the provinces can pass a Bill of this kind at any time. It would be difficult to find anything more conclusive as to that.

That is the argument of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and these are the reasons

upon which that argument is based. Let us try and understand exactly where we are on this question. I turn to section 51 of the British North America Act. It reads in this way:

51. On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:—

(1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of 65 members.

(2) There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number 65 bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained).

3. In the computation of the number of members for a province a fractional part, not exceeding one-half, of the old number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the old number.

4. On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the provinces is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

(5) Such readjustment shall not take effect until the determination of the then existing Parliament.

52. The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this Act is not thereby disturbed.

What is the meaning of all this? Different interpretations may be given by lay members of the House, but it seems to me, from my limited knowledge of the interpretation of statutes, that the Act means exactly what it says, and nothing more. It proposes to deal with the relative voting powers of the several provinces. It lays down that Quebec, when it came into confederation, had 65 of a voting power, Ontario, 82; Nova Scotia, 19 and New Brunswick 15. It lays down the rules that are to govern after each census is taken. The population of the provinces will increase. After each census there shall be a readjustment of the voting power of the several provinces. The Act does not attempt to deal with any other question except simply that of determining how many members shall come from Quebec, how many from Ontario, how many from New Brunswick, and how many from Nova Scotia; in other words, what the relative voting powers of these provinces shall be in the federal legislature. That is what the section means, and that is all it means. I think now I will be able to show the leader of the Opposition that the opinion he has expressed upon this section of the Act and upon the measure before the House is different from that which he held at the time of confederation. I look back at the discussions that took place prior to confederation, and I find there a resolution to which the hon. leader of the Opposition gave his assent, and it is this:

That the local legislature of each province may, from time to time, alter the electoral districts of the provinces for the purposes of representation in the House of Commons and distribute the number of representatives to which the province is entitled, in any manner such legislature may think fit.

What is the meaning of that resolution? I find it was afterwards concurred in at a meeting of the delegates, but nevertheless, it was subsequently dropped out of the Confederation Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why?

Mr. BELL (East Prince). I will endeavour to show the reason why. It is simply because, in the opinion of the delegates, on maturer consideration, it was not deemed advisable that the rearrangement of the constituencies should be left with the local legislatures, and they were right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). But what I specially refer to this resolution for is this: I want to point out that this identical question of the rearrangement of the constituencies within the particular provinces was submitted specifically to the consideration of the delegates, separate and apart from the question as to the relative voting power of the several provinces in confederation. I wish to emphasize that at confederation Sir Charles Tupper recognized and acted upon these distinctions—that the question now before the House was specifically called to the attention of the leader of the Opposition, and he proposed to deal with it, in the first place, by relegating that power to the local legislature. Afterwards he changed his mind,——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL (East Prince)—as he had a right to do, and gave it where it belonged, to the Federal Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). The argument, then, stands in this way, that if you look at the wording of sections 51 and 52 of the British North America Act, and then look at the resolution I have referred to, both lead to the inevitable conclusion that the Dominion Parliament, by section 51, only intended to deal with the question of the relative voting power of the several provinces in this legislature, and never intended to deal with the other distinct question as to the redistribution of the seats in a particular province. The question still arises: What power has this Parliament to deal with the measure

now before the House—the power to legislate upon it is conferred by several sections. Section 18 of the British North America Act, as amended by 38-39 Vic., 38, reads as follows :—

> The privileges, immunities and powers to be held, enjoyed and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are, from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that any Act of the Parliament of Canada defining such privileges, immunities and powers shall not confer any privileges, immunities or powers exceeding those at the passage of such Act held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.

That is to say, the powers of Parliament to deal with this question are absolute, unless it is specially prevented from legislating upon it by the provisions of the British North America Act ; and we saw a moment ago that the provisions of that Act do not apply to or prevent this legislation. Now, let me read the latter part of my hon. friend's argument again :

> It is said in section 92, in reference to the exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures :
> "In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the class of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say : 'The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of lieutenant-governor.'"

His argument is this : that because the British North America Act has specifically stated that the local legislatures have the power to deal with this question at any time and under all circumstances, and is silent upon the point with regard to the Federal legislature, it is to be inferred that the power was never conferred or intended to be conferred upon the Federal legislature. To my mind, the argument only proves the intense eagerness with which the hon. gentleman has been reaching out and groping around to find within the four corners of the constitution some shadow of argument upon which to base his case. What is the necessity of specifically stating that this Parliament has power to deal with this question when the power is given among the general powers conferred by the Act. Another argument is advanced by our Liberal friends——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell, East Prince) whether he understands the word "powers" in section 18 of the British North America Act refers to and includes legislative powers ?

Mr. BELL (East Prince). I think it might include legislative powers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the hon. gentleman aware of any authority for that contention ?

Mr. BELL (Prince East, P.E.I.)

Mr. BELL (East Prince). No, but the wording at first sight seems large enough to include legislative powers. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) puts any other construction, it seems to me the onus is thrown upon him to prove his contention.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would only suggest to my hon. friend that if that argument is correct, it would be a simple way to confer wide powers on the Parliament of Canada and would have rendered other sections of the Act entirely unnecessary.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). I admit to my hon. friend, candidly, that, so far as legislation is concerned, the powers must be conveyed by this or other sections of the Confederation Act. However, I was going to say that my friends of the Liberal party present an argument something in this form : They urge that the Conservative party legislated along the lines on which we are now legislating, that they passed similar statutes to this and under similar conditions, and therefore this Act must necessarily be constitutional. Now, for myself, I do not quite see the validity of that argument ; I do not think that the conclusion is fairly reached from the premises. It is obvious that the Conservative party may have thought that they had the power to legislate, and yet they may have been wrong in that conclusion. Neither the exercise of the power by them nor any concurrence on the part of the House would give jurisdiction. It is a question which does not depend upon the fact that legislation has taken place or even upon the fact that both sides of this House have concurred in that legislation. All that the argument amounts to is this : That if the Conservative party have legislated under similar conditions, along the same line, then, when we propose to legislate along that line, the mouths of our opponents are closed. Now, what has been done by the Conservative party along this line ? I am not speaking of the Acts passed after the decennial census ; I leave these out of consideration ; they are considered to be manifestly within the power of this Parliament. But I speak now of cases that have occurred in the intervening time. Take, for instance, the Act of 1895. By that Act the boundaries of Berthier and Joliette were essentially changed. The township of Courcelles and the north-east part of the township of Joliette were detached from the county of Berthier and annexed to Joliette. Now, here are two important changes, first, detaching two townships from one constituency, and next, adding two townships to another constituency. The question naturally arises, had the Conservative party power by the Act of 1895 to make these changes? Our Conservative friends say : Of course we had. Then it is a fair argument to say : If you had the power in 1895 to detach or attach two townships, we have the

same power in 1899 to detach or attach fifty townships.

But the argument goes further. By the Act of 1892, Provencher, in Manitoba, was composed of certain towns and rural municipalities; by the Act of 1893 the rural municipality of Hanover was added. By the Act of 1892 the electoral district of Ronville comprised certain villages and parishes; by the Act of 1893 the parish of Notre Dame de Bonsecours was added. By the Act of 1892 the electoral district of Bagot was constituted; by the Act of 1893 the parish of St. Liboire was added. By the Act of 1892 Richelieu was constituted; by the Act of 1893 the town of Sorel was added. The Act of 1892 did not constitute the electoral district of St. Hyacinthe; the Act of 1893 constituted that district, and we find that it was made up of the city of St. Hyacinthe and certain parishes. The Act of 1892 constituted Nipissing; the Act of 1893 changed its composition and introduced a number of new materials. The Act of 1892 constituted Hochelaga; the Act of 1893 gave it a different make-up.

Now, had the legislature power in 1893 to make all these changes? It has been argued by my hon. friends opposite that these changes were made for the purpose of correcting clerical errors. If so, there was not much responsibility to be placed upon the clerks that these gentlemen had at that time. The only intelligent ground upon which it can be excused is that it was intended to correct certain errors, certain defects of geographical knowledge in the minds of the gentlemen who framed the Bill, and that it was done for the purpose of correcting mistakes. If that be a valid ground—I do not say that it is; I say that it is not—but if it be a valid ground, then we have the right in this House to go back and to correct what Dalton McCarthy called the "gross mistake" created by the Conservative party in the gerrymander of 1882.

Another objection is urged by our Conservative friends to this measure. They say we are tinkering with the bounds of the constituencies. They do not object on the ground that the legislature has no power; they object on the ground of policy of expediency. They say that the boundaries of electoral districts ought to be defined and settled, and when once settled, they should be permanent, and never be disturbed, except it may be for the purpose of giving additional representation, and then changed only as little as possible. Now, I say to my Conservative friends I am perfectly in accord with them in that sentiment. I do not believe in tinkering with the bounds of constituencies. I say more, it was one of the gravest complaints we had against the Conservative party in the past that they had been constantly tinkering with the boundaries of constituencies. Our opponents will please remember that this is the very first time that the Liberal party of Canada have made an effort to arrange the boundaries of districts in the past thirty-two years. It will be time enough, after we have been in power fifteen years or more, and when we shall have been guilty of the tinkering that has characterized the legislation of our hon. friends opposite, then it will be time enough to charge us with the crime of tinkering with the constituencies.

My hon. friend who took his seat a few moments ago (Mr. Clancy), referred to this measure as a gerrymander. All the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side, have denounced it as a gerrymander. Well, I want to tell my hon. friends that they are mistaken in the features of a gerrymander. Let me paint the main features of a genuine gerrymander, a gerrymander that may be classed A1 at Lloyds, in order that these hon. gentlemen may be able to distinguish its lineaments when they see it, and may be able to avoid it, and if they think fit to denounce it. For the purposes of my illustration, I will assume that I have the power and the will to gerrymander the province of Ontario, for the purpose of stealing four or five seats that naturally belong to hon. gentlemen opposite. In what way will I go about the business? Why, Sir, I will take, as the basis of my operations, the election returns of the year 1896. First, I will take the counties which are to have a representation of two or more members. What will I do with these? I will divide them, not by judges, not by independent means, but by the heelers of my party. I will hive the Conservatives in one portion of the county in order to carry the other one or more constituencies. But I would do more. I would look around and endeavour to find out the Grit hives. Perhaps my eye might light upon North Oxford with its majority of 1,801, or South Oxford with its majority of 750, or South Middlesex with its majority of 740, or North Wentworth with its majority of 1,121, or Russell with its majority of 1,603, or East Peterborough with its majority of 615, or West Ontario with its majority of 739, or Lincoln and Niagara with its majority of 432, or Algoma with its majority of 1,827, or West Bruce with its majority of 488, or West Elgin with its majority of 726, or West Lambton with its majority of 1,158. What would I do with these Grit hives? I would scatter them—scatter them to the four winds—scatter them where they would be of the most benefit for the purpose of assisting my friends or weakening my opponents. Then I would look around to see if I could find where the Tory hives were. It might be difficult to find them because it might have been contrary to the policy of these hon. gentlemen to create hives, but my eye might light upon South Leeds with 488 of a majority, or North Hastings with 743, or East Grey with 852, or Glengarry with 784. What would I do with the Conservative hives?

Mr. CLARKE. You might introduce minority representation there.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). No, I would preserve them. I would not only preserve them carefully, but I would add to them. If I found them 500 strong I would leave them with a thousand strong because I would know that every vote added to them would weaken other constituencies. Then I would look around to see where the weak Tory constituencies were. Perhaps my eye would light on Addington with a majority of 87, or Bothwell with a majority of 59, or North Bruce with its majority of 31, or West Northumberland with its majority of 70, or North Ontario with its majority of 1, or East York with its majority of 3. What would I do with these majorities? I would weaken them, and if possible, wipe them out. If possible I would create adverse majorities in their place. I would then look around for weak Liberal districts and perhaps my eye would light upon South Grey, which my genial friend (Mr. Landerkin) represents.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Gerrymandered in 1882.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). Yes; or East Lambton with its majority of 40, or North Leeds and Grenville with its majority of 9, or North Renfrew with its majority of 63, or North Ontario with its majority of 62. What would I do with these weak constituencies? I would encourage them; I would strengthen them; I would enable them to more successfully carry the liberal standard to victory at the next election. These would be the main and distinctive features of my gerrymander Bill. First, I would take certain counties and hive the Conservatives; then I would take the Grit hives and scatter them, the Tory hives and nurture them, the weak Conservative constituencies, wipe out the majorities, the weak Liberal constituencies and add to them. But I must be prepared to go farther; I must be prepared to uphold my measure in the House of Commons. I must be prepared to come here and defend it by strong arguments. I would take my stand, in the first place, upon my honesty—upon my good intentions; I would boldly declare to this House that it was not my intention to do any injury to any man, or to any constituency, and that, if an injury was done, it was not the result of design, but of accident. I would go farther. I would contend that my sole object in arranging the constituencies upon this principle was for the purpose of equalizing representation. Then, when some hon. gentlemen opposite would raise the question and reply: Look at the result of your equalisation; you have eight constituencies with only 13,000, and eight more with 26,000 of a population; how do you defend your equalization with such a result? My answer would be: Every rule is subject to exceptions, and it takes exceptions to prove the rule. That argument ought to be conclusive. I would go farther. I would take the ground that it is impossible, in the nature of things to create a gerrymander. You cannot do it. Why? Because there is not sufficient fixity in human nature; there is not sufficient continuity in political sentiment to enable a gerrymander to be created. You might try to arrange your constituency to-day, but you will not be able to say that it will remain fixed. Therefore, it is not possible to create a gerrymander. But, if I found these arguments were not as potent and convincing as they should be, I would turn around and say: You call this a gerrymander, do you? If it be a gerrymander, I am prepared to support it on the ground that it is expedient in the interest of this country that the Liberal party should be perpetuated in power. Why, what has taken place in the past? Here we have been eighteen long years waiting for the dawn of prosperity, but the dawn never came. We saw the effect of the National Policy was to exile our population and paralyze our commerce. But now there is the dawn of prosperity in Canada, the day that has not yet reached the noontide of its splendour. If you call this a gerrymander, can you not see it is justified in view of the best interests of this country. I would say to these hon. gentlemen: Why you are lacking in the instincts of government. Why should you be permitted to govern this country? I would say more: You call this a gerrymander, do you, but wait till the next redistribution, when I shall apply the principles of my measure, not only to the province of Ontario, but to the province of Quebec and throughout Canada. You howl now, but wait until you hear the howl when you find that you have been legislated out of power for all future time.

Now, that being the argument upon which I would propose to justify my conduct in this House, I can easily understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) would rise in indignation and denounce me as an infamous tyrant who had abused the power of a majority to crush the minority. I can readily understand how the hon. gentleman would denounce in strong language and with a flush of indignation on his brow, such an iniquitous measure as that which I have supposed to be perpetrated. But let him look back at the year 1882, and he will find there a measure which bears all the characteristics of the gerrymander I have described, and upon which his indignation may find legitimate vent. Why, Sir, is it possible that these gentlemen opposite propounded a gerrymander in the year 1882, based on such principles. Look at it and see. Is it true that they hived the Grits in certain portions of a county, in order to carry the other ridings? What have we to say about the constituency of the independent member (Mr. McNeill) for North Bruce? In

1882 his majority was eighty-eight, but Saugeen, with a Liberal majority of 161, had been detached at his instance from North Bruce and added to West Bruce, otherwise the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) would have been defeated by 73.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell), but may I make a remark?

Mr. BELL (East Prince). I would prefer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) to wait until I get through.

Mr. CLANCY. I can only speak with his permission, and if he will not allow me I cannot.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). When I have had as much experience in debate as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), I will not be disturbed by his interruption.

Mr. CLANCY. I simply wanted to set the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) right.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Set yourself right first.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). Let me further illustrate how these gentlemen opposite hived the Grits in 1882. In 1878 West Ontario had a Liberal majority of 583, North Brant 723, South Oxford 680, North Oxford 1,165, South Middlesex 581, West Bruce, 956, and West Elgin a Liberal majority of 463. What did the Conservatives do with these constituencies? They added Liberals to them wherever it was possible and then abandoned them to their fate. The result was that in the elections after the gerrymander, West Ontario had increased its Liberal majority to 739, North Brant increased its Liberal majority to 951, South Oxford increased its Liberal majority to 750, North Oxford to 1,801, South Middlesex to 740. West Bruce had 892 majority, and West Elgin 726. Now, then, how did they manage about the Tory constituencies? It was a very hard matter to find them, but nevertheless wherever they existed, they scattered them. And you will find this peculiarity, that the largest average majority left to a Tory constituency was from 300 to 350—just about enough to carry the constituency surely, and no more. Was all that the result of accident or was it premeditation? As to the weak Liberal constituencies, the Gerrymander Act of 1882 weakened them still more. On the other hand, they strengthened the weak Tory constituencies. Look what was done in the case of Carleton. There were two townships taken from that county and added to North Lanark to strengthen the latter. Was that accident or was it design? Is it not true that Carleton was a strong Conservative county—carried in the elections of 1882 by 500 or 600 majority, and therefore it could well afford to lose a few of the strong Conservative townships.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the Liberals suffer by that?

Mr. BELL (East Prince). Yes, and I will show you how. These Conservative townships, as I say, were taken from Carleton and added to North Lanark. While in 1878 there was a Liberal member from North Lanark, in 1882, by virtue of this gerrymander, Mr. Jamieson a Conservative, was returned. Does the hon. gentleman want any better instance of where a Liberal member was politically assassinated by that Act? It is true that in a great many instances the action of the Tory Government in 1882 failed in its purpose, but that was no fault of theirs—the intention was there all the same. South Ontario, with a majority of 206 in 1878, was weakened by 198, and Bothwell, with its majority of 285 in 1878, was also weakened. I call the special attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) to this. We find that if we take the additions to Bothwell and the detachments from it, 345 good Liberal voters were lost to that constituency, and an adverse Conservative majority was created, with the result that Hawkins, a Conservative, was elected in 1882 by sixteen majority.

Mr. CLANCY. No, he was not.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). He was afterwards turned out, but he was elected in that year, according to the official returns, by sixteen.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). More than that. Other changes took place in Bothwell in 1892. In consequence of that what do we find? Why, that my hon. friend's (Mr. Clancy's) majority in 1896 was eighty-seven votes.

Mr. CLANCY. And against an adverse majority before of 550.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). How was that majority created for him? The secret of it lies in the fact that 445 Liberal votes had been taken from that riding; and this gentleman now sits in this House by virtue of and thanks to the gerrymanders that were enacted in 1882 and in 1892; and yet my hon. friend has the cheek——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). The presumption, I will then say, to sit in this House and challenge Liberal members to point out one instance in which a Liberal member for any constituency was politically assassinated or materially injured.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the hon. gentleman is strong enough and fair enough to allow me to set him right.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). The hon. gentleman can do that at the close of my remarks.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, the hon. gentleman is not fair.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). I want to go further along this line. We will take North

Ontario. It had a Liberal majority in 1878 of 54; it was weakened by 260, with the intention of carrying the constituency, and we find that subsequently, in 1896, it was carried by the Conservatives by a majority of 1. North Bruce had a majority of 156 in 1878; it was weakened by 493—weakened partly by the detachment of the township of Saugeen to the extent of 161, with the result that in 1882 it was carried by my Conservative friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) by 88 majority. North York had 16 majority in 1878 for the Liberals; it was weakened by 184; but, owing to the personal influence of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), it was carried by him with a majority of 109. South Brant, with a Liberal majority of 198 in 1878, was weakened by 241, and afterwards carried by the Conservatives. North Norfolk, with a Liberal majority of 144 in 1878, was weakened to the extent of 94; but the weakening did not have the effect contemplated. South Perth, with a majority of 77 in 1878, was weakened by 205, and was ultimately, I believe, captured by the Conservatives. These are only some of the examples which I might give. I think they prove that the Conservative party gerrymandered along the lines that I have indicated. First, they took the counties that had a representation of two or three or more members, and they hived the Grits in one constituency for the purpose of carrying the others. Then they took the Grit hives and added to them, and left them to themselves. Then they took the Conservative hives, and scattered them where they would be of the greatest service to the surrounding constituencies. They strengthened the weak Conservative constituencies. They took the weak Liberal constituencies and weakened them still further—in some cases taking away the Liberal majority and creating an adverse majority in its place. These are the main characteristics of the gerrymander which these hon. gentlemen enacted in 1882. And how did they support the proposition in this House? How did they argue it? First, they said they had the same power to deal with the constituencies that they had to deal with the tariff—that they had the right to adjust both in any way they saw fit. They declared that they did not intend to create a gerrymander at all, and that if any injury resulted to any individual, it was the result, not of design, but of accident. They said to the Liberals: "In the very nature of things it is impossible to create a gerrymander; if we create one to-day, to-morrow you cannot rely on the insistence or fixity of it. When they found that the Liberals were not convinced by these arguments, what did they then say? They argued exactly along the lines adopted by the leader of the Opposition in this debate, viz.: that it was in the interest of the country that the gerrymander should be successfully perpetrated. Why, Sir, the Liberal party in this country had no right to exist. If it unfortunately were allowed to have the control of the government of Canada, it would place the country under commercial subjection to the United States.

Mr. MILLS. They would have done so if they had carried out their promises.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). If you put the Liberals in power, you will apply the axe to the root of the great National Policy, and destroy it. Put the Liberals in power and the great Canadian Pacific Railway that is running across this continent is going to stop short at the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. MILLS. They tried their best to stop it.

Mr. BELL (East Prince). These were the arguments the hon. gentlemen used to support their measure. But not satisfied with that, the leader of their party, Sir John A. Macdonald himself, at a banquet given to the Hon. Mr. Taillon, in Montreal, in the year 1889, as reported by the papers, made this statement:

> He would live long enough to direct the redistribution of the counties after the census of 1891, and that it would make the Grits howl worse than in 1882.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder, when insult has been added to injury, that the Liberal party of this country registered a vow that at the very first opportunity that offered, the iniquitous gerrymander of 1882 should be repealed? It is no wonder this measure is now before the House. It is not before its time.

Now, Sir, a word with regard to the measure itself. There are three main distinctive characteristics of the Bill. The first is what I have already indicated, namely, a determination upon the part of the Liberal party to remedy the iniquity by the gerrymander of 1882; the next is that the Liberal party propose to return to the system of municipal county boundaries; and the third is that where a county is entitled to two or more representatives, the division of that county will be made, not as heretofore, by the heelers of the party, but by judges of the Supreme Court.

To my mind, there is no one of those three features to which our hon. friends opposite ought reasonably to object. What about the first of them? I want to ask hon. friends opposite this question. Suppose you put yourselves in our place, what would you do under the circumstances? Suppose you had been treated as we were would you be satisfied merely with the introduction of a measure, just and equitable, such as this is, or be prepared to go further? I am perfectly satisfied that my hon. friends opposite would go a great deal further.

I think this is a measure which the Conservative party, as a general rule, will fav-

our. So far as the honest and independent Conservatives in this country are concerned—and there are many of them outside of this House—I believe a majority will be found to approve of the step now being taken.

I look back to the year 1892, and I find that Mr. Dickey, then in this House, a Conservative who occupied a high position in the confidence of his party, expressed himself as follows:

> The Act of 1882 does not commend itself strongly to my judgment. Looking at it through the vista of years, it seems to me a very objectionable measure.

Did not Mr. Dickey express the feelings of tens of thousands of Conservatives in this country, when he said it was a very objectionable measure? Then, I find Mr. Dalton McCarthy thus expressing himself in 1892:

> Perhaps it will be said that I was as deep a sinner as any of those in 1882. My hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) says I was a bigger sinner. I can only reply that if so, I, at all events, have the merit of not persisting in my iniquity. I am not going to apologize for my conduct in 1882, or do more than say I fully realize at present that, in every sense, party and political, that act was a gross mistake.

That was the statement of a statesman whose memory is yet held in the highest possible esteem by both parties in this country, and I believe that there are tens of thousands of good Conservatives throughout Canada who would say, in the language of Mr. McCarthy, that this Act of 1882 was a gross mistake. Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that both Liberals and Conservatives in this country will hail this enactment as a measure of righteousness and justice.

The other features of the Bill have been discussed to such an extent already that I shall not now enlarge upon them. I desire merely to point out that if we look at the British North America Act, we will find that it was not the intention of the fathers of Confederation to do more than create counties and ridings of counties. It does not say or mean ridings made up of different counties, but ridings of one county. It means that if there is a county with sufficient population, that county should be divided into ridings. That was the view held by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1872. Of course, it was not the view held by him in 1882—not because he had grown riper in experience, but because he was then carried away by the lust of power. The arguments that were advanced in 1872 by Sir John A. Macdonald have never been answered or attempted to be answered. They are simply to the effect that the county boundaries have always been regarded by the people as something sacred, and that ought not to be disturbed. He points out that wherever these county boundaries have been disturbed, dissatisfaction has always resulted. That has been the experience both in England and here, so that the experiments on both sides of the Atlantic indicate that any attempt to ignore county boundaries would result in complete failure.

The other argument advanced was that the country representatives in this House are men who naturally graduate, and ought to graduate, from the township and county councils. No doubt, the very best men in the county go into the county council, and there they become thoroughly acquainted with the people and identified with their wants, interests and necessities. If you change that, if you cut up county boundaries, the result will be, that the member will not know his constituents or their wants or necessities, and will have to begin at the bottom of the ladder and become acquainted with the people and their necessities over again.

In addition to these arguments, there is another I desire to impress upon my hon. friends opposite. This proposition of county boundaries is one which Conservatives ought to be delighted to accept. What is the Liberal party proposing to do? They are introducing a measure to tie up their hands in the matter of county boundaries, so as to make a future gerrymander of the constituencies absolutely impossible. You may gerrymander to some extent within a particular county; but in laying down the principle of maintaining county boundaries, the Liberal party is proposing in a most essential respect to tie its hands in the approaching contest that is coming on a year or two hence. I say, therefore, that the Conservative party ought to be delighted with the chance of accepting the measure, and ought to congratulate themselves that it has been proposed and introduced by the Government. Why, if you have not a restriction to county boundaries, what then? There is only one other thing practically possible, and that is you will have your constituencies arranged by the heelers of the party and by them alone. I appeal to my hon. friends opposite to say, is that a condition of things that it is desirable to have perpetuated? There was a time when we had no such thing as a Civil Service Act in Canada—when the spoils belonged to the victor. But the good sense of the people—Liberals and Conservatives alike—put upon the statute-book a law which virtually tied the hands of both parties. That was a measure for the benefit of both parties in this country. And that is what I say with reference to the measure now before the House. It proposes to say that county boundaries shall not be infringed—it proposes to tie the hands of the Liberal party, which introduces the measure. The Conservatives ought to be the first to rejoice at the introduction of the measure and accept its provisions as something not only in the interest of the Liberal party, but in the interest as well of the Conservative party.

The other feature I wish to refer to for

a moment is that which proposes to leave to the judges the division of the counties. How have the counties been divided hitherto. They have been divided, by the members, divided by the workers and advisers of the party. The proposition is to change all that, to say that there shall be no more dividing of the counties in that way, but to hand over that duty into the hands of independent judges to divide the counties into ridings, where there are two, three or more representatives to be elected. Now, Sir, this is a proposition which, especially our Conservative friends, ought to rejoice to see introduced and ought to hasten to accept. Why, supposing that does not take place, what then ? We should have to divide the counties as heretofore after consulting the members, after consulting the heelers of the party. The Liberal party might have brought in a measure to divide the counties, keeping the matter in their own hands. Is there any question in the minds of hon. members in this House as to which is the better mode of procedure ? I think that members on both sides will come to the conclusion that this feature is one that is just and equitable, aye, and generous, on the part of the Liberals, and that it ought to be accepted without hesitation by hon. members opposite.

Now, these are the main features of the Bill. Another kind of Bill altogether might have been introduced. The Liberal party might have introduced a Bill based on the principles of the gerrymander of 1882. They might have taken a leaf out of the book of hon. gentlemen opposite. They might have been prompted by instincts of revenge. If so the mouths of our opponents would be shut. But the Liberals have not been prompted or inspired by revenge. They chose to introduce a Bill the principle features of which are such as to recommend themselves by their honesty, justice and generosity to members on both sides of this House.

Mr. JOHN ROSS ROBERTSON (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I did not hesitate to speak, as an humble adherent of the Conservative party, against the Redistribution Act of 1882. I denounced that measure to the full limit of my power as a newspaper man. The Redistribution Act of 1882 was wrong—that was my opinion in 1882 and that is my opinion this minute. From a party stand-point, the gerrymander of 1882 was unnecessary. The Conservatives were then strong enough to win without such unfair tactics. The gerrymander of 1882 was a mistake from the country's standpoint, because it looked like an attempt on the part of the Government to load the dice. I do not believe that any party should play the game of politics with loaded dice. And let me say here that I have just as much respect for the Government that first loads the dice and then throws those loaded dice on its own account as I have for a Government that first loads the dice and then calls in a commission of judges to throw those dice on its behalf. I was saying that the gerrymander of 1882 did not work out to the lasting advantage of the Conservative party—and I think I can make that statement good. For example, North and Centre Wellington were arranged under the Act of 1882 to return Conservatives. These two constituencies are represented by Liberals in this House, and South Wellington, which was untouched in 1882, is represented here by a Conservative. Middlesex County was carved so as to return three Conservatives and one Liberal. Middlesex returned three Liberals and one Conservative. South Perth was divided so as to give two or three hundred majority for the Conservative candidate for this House. It is represented here by a Liberal. South Perth was divided so as to give a Liberal majority of 300 for the local House, and it is represented at Toronto by a Conservative. North and South Ontario were constituted for the Dominion so as to return two Conservatives, and it was divided for the local House so as to return two Liberals. The Government has two followers in this House from North and South Ontario, and at the last provincial elections the supposed Liberal strongholds of North and South Ontario both went Conservative. Grey County was gerrymandered so as to return three Conservatives to this House, and two Liberals and one Conservative to the local House. Grey County is represented by two Liberals and one Conservative in this House, and by three Conservatives in the local House. Huron County was gerrymandered to return two Conservatives to this House. Not a Conservative from Huron County sits in this Chamber. The same county was gerrymandered to return three Liberals to the local House, and at the last general election the Conservatives carried two of the three Huron seats, although West Huron was subsequently regained by the Government.

To illustrate my argument I have taken two of three Wellingtons, and all the seats in Middlesex, Perth, Ontario, Grey and Huron counties. The returns from this group of counties will show the political value of the gerrymander to the Conservative party. These counties were divided in 1882 so as to return fourteen Conservative and two Liberals ; these same counties are represented in this Parliament by thirteen Liberals and three Conservatives. The gerrymander which was to give the Conservatives thirteen seats out of sixteen has done its worst, and the Liberals have thirteen seats and the Conservatives have only three seats in sixteen of the gerrymandered districts. That is how the gerrymander worked for the benefit of the Conservative party.

In view of these figures, the Government could well have afforded to go back to the country which supported them in Opposition, and not attempt to cure the old gerry-

mander by the perpetration of a new gerrymander which is born out of due season. I have been greatly impressed during the course of this argument with the spectacle of the whole Liberal party and the Liberal press struggling in a spasm of admiration for the judiciary of our country. Liberal opinion has not always run this way. I have a dim recollection that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a few words to say about one member of the judiciary in Canada, I think his name was Tuck, of New Brunswick. The right hon. the First Minister will remember how away back in 1892 his chief organ roared against the highest judges in the land. The Supreme Court itself did not escape the censure of the Liberal party when the appeal from Mr. Hargraft of West Northumberland was struck off the list without a hearing. Then was there not a judge in London, Elliott, I think, was his name; who came in for some slight attention on the part of the Liberal leaders in this House? And the two judges of the High Court of Justice of Ontario who tried the election petition against my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) were denounced as partisans by the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, I am not here to quarrel with what the hon. gentlemen or their newspaper friends have said about the judges in the past. Speaking for myself, I am free to say that in Ontario at least there is a tendency to unduly exalt our judiciary. There are no finer men on top of the earth than some of the judges of the High Court of Justice of Ontario, and some of the members of the judiciary are just ordinary material. It goes without saying that all our judges are honest. Honest men are surely not so scarce in Canada that we have to make a fuss over honesty, which should be taken for granted in the case of every judge under the British flag. As to the impartiality of our judges in political cases I do not care to speak. I will just read the words of Mr. James R. Stratton, a distinguished Liberal and a member of the Ontario legislature—and a prospective Minister as an hon. member beside me suggests. He has been on the hunt for that for a great many moons. In the debate on the Constable Bill, as reported in the "Mail," of August 9th, 1898, he said:

> What the Attorney General is asking us to do, said Mr. Stratton, is to provide for cases where the decision of a possibly partisan, narrow-minded trial judge might construe the law of the land different to what it was intended and to prevent long and tedious delays in appeal.

In the "Globe," of the 9th of August, 1898, Mr. Stratton is reported on this question, as follows:—

> But the learned judges took a lofty stand. They say they have no regard for the expense this province might be put to, and they must have a few days fishing. Nero fiddled while Rome burnt, and the judges go fishing while the Opposition is trying to rob a great many of the electors of the province of their franchise. The law is not intended to rob constables of their votes.

I find that the hon. gentleman opposite, even the leaders of the Government, are not wholly free from Mr. Stratton's distrust of the judiciary of Ontario. Any judge is good enough to carve the country to suit them. But still they retain the power to nominate the judges who will suit them best. They could have left the judges to name three of themselves to do this work, just as the judges always choose two of their number to try each election petition; or, better still, they could have left the division of the counties to the Ontario Court of Appeal and then the members of this special tribunal would not have been discredited by the suspicion of having been chosen with reference to their probable usefulness to the Government. The Government rebukes the Opposition, for its unwillingness to trust the judges who have been Liberals, but it reserves power in such a way as to show its unwillingness to trust judges who have been Conservatives. First, the Government shows that it is not willing to trust any judge by reserving power to name three judges who will do its work, and the Government is afraid to trust even these three judges because it further provides that a majority of two can carve up a district irrespective of a protest from a dissenting judge. They profess to trust any member of the judiciary, and they are afraid to abide by the unanimous action of their own nominees. It only requires the united verdict of 12 men to send a horse thief to jail; and yet these hon. gentlemen will allow a man to be excluded from this Parliament by the verdict of two out of three judges. I was going to say that since the Government has acquired such a profound respect for the entire judiciary that it would be a graceful act on the part of the Senate to relieve the hon. gentlemen opposite of all responsibility in this matter, and nominate the three judges who would be far above the suspicion of favouring the Liberal party.

But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will not be amended. I want to see this Bill annihilated, and I am prepared to justify any constitutional means which will protect the people I represent from a contemptible attack on the sacred right of representation by population in this House. The hon. gentlemen talk about Sir John A. Macdonald—and as I said, I am not going to justify the redistribution of 1882—which I regarded and do still regard as one of the great mistakes of his career. It was charged against Sir John A. Macdonald that he hived the Grits in constituencies like West Ontario and South Middlesex. In those two consituencies Sir John hived a Liberal population of 37,598 and gave them two members, or a member for 19,000 people. The right hon. gentleman the First Minister, hives over 40,000 people from East and West York in the city of Toronto, and gives them only one

member. The hon. the First Minister excused this act by saying that in every place where there are representative institutions, rural municipalities are given more representation than cities, because many members living in cities represent rural constituencies. I suppose the right hon. the First Minister will recognize the United States as a country blessed with representative institutions, and he could not mean to tell this House that the rural population has greater representation in the House of Representatives than the city population for the reason he names, that is to say, because members representing rural constituencies, live in cities. The hon. the First Minister was long enough in Washington to know that this reason would not apply there, because of the requirement that no candidate is eligible for Congress—I mean the lower branch—who does not reside in the district that he aspires to represent.

The hon. the First Minister was in error as regards the United States, and he is in error as regards England, which I suppose he will admit is a country working under free institutions. The over-representation of Ireland is one of the conditions established by the Act of Union; but even in Ireland there is no discrimination against city population. South Belfast with 8,917 electors has one member, and the rural district of South Mayo with 9,696 electors, has only one member. St. Patrick's division of Dublin city has a member for 7,998 electors, and the rural district of Mid-Tipperary has a member for 7,632 electors. There are bitter complaints that one vote in Ireland has as much weight at Westminster as two or three votes in England. In England the principle of representation by population is more or less closely followed, and I would give a few figures which will show the right hon. the First Minister that he is in error in supposing that England is governed by the principle which he has improvised for the sake of disfranchising the city of Toronto.

The Bethnal Green division in London, England, has a member for 8,043 electors, and the rural division of Enfield, Middlesex, with 15,464 electors, has only one member. Central Hackney, a division of London with 8,707 electors has only one member, and the Harrow division of Middlesex with 17,387 electors, has only one member. In Scotland, the right hon. the First Minister will look in vain for his favourite principle of denying a great city the right of representation by population. The Aberdeen City division has a member for 9,788 electors, and the rural division of East Aberdeen has 12,142 electors and only one member. Edinburgh West, with 8,677 electors, has only one member, and East Lancashire, with 15,030 electors, has only one member. I do not argue that there are no inequalities in England, but I do insist that these inequalities are equal as between city and country districts, and that in England there is no general tendency to give rural populations more representation in Parliament than city populations. Elections to the British House of Commons are not run on the one-man-one-vote principle. There might be some force in the theory of the First Minister, if he retained the old system of allowing people to vote wherever they could get on the list. I grant you that under that system there might be some pretext for depriving Toronto of representation by population. When a man could vote wherever he was on the list, then Toronto could decide the result in a good many constituencies. I remember reading a speech in which Lord Salisbury assured the Liberal Opposition that when they got down to one-man-one-vote, they would have to come down to one-vote-one-value; that is to say, that under the one-man-one-vote system every vote must have the same weight in Parliament. This Government has introduced the one-man-one-vote system in Canada, but the companion principle of one-vote-one-value has yet to come. I can tell the hon. the First Minister that he can only cite one precedent for the disfranchisement of the city population of Toronto. He poses as a British statesman, but he cannot find the act of a British statesman which would serve as a model for his attack on the rights of the people of Toronto. He will have to go down to the Southern States, and there, among the leaders of the shot-gun democracy, he will find the statesmen who treat the negro population of the South as he has treated the Canadian people in the city of Toronto. Toronto holds one-tenth of the Ontario population; Toronto population is measured at census time, and Ontario secures representation as compared with Quebec, partly on the strength of the Toronto population. Toronto population is counted for the purpose of increasing Ontario representation in this House. They use Toronto population to secure more members from Ontario, and then ignore Toronto's population in choosing constituencies which shall elect those members. The Democrats down South count the negroes at census time for the purpose of securing representation in Congress, and then keep the negro population away from the polls with shotguns. Toronto's population is counted at census time to give Ontario representation in this House, and then the right hon. First Minister ignores the principle of representation by population in a redistribution scheme which is less noisy, but not less deadly, than the Southern shot-gun of the double-barrel pattern. It would not be so bad, if the hon. First Minister fairly applied his double standards for the representation of rural populations and city populations. This measure gives some cities representation according to the rural standard, and sets up a so-called city standard for the special purpose of disfranchising Toronto. The cities in Ontario outside of Toronto—London, Ottawa, Hamilton and Kingston—which are directly

represented in this House, have a population of 126,058. Thus a city population of 126,058 is represented in this House by 6 members, and a city population of 174,414 in Toronto is represented in this House by 5 members. There is a member of Parliament for every 21,010 of city population outside of Toronto, and a member of Parliament for every 36,465 of city population inside of Toronto. And still the right hon. First Minister suggested that Toronto was represented according to the principle governing the representation of city population generally. I am forgetting the argument of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor), who rose and asserted that Toronto was the home of Messrs. Edgar, Mulock, Campbell, Osler, McCarthy, Bertram, Wallace, McLean, Clarke and Robertson. He might also have said Mr. Craig, of East Durham. Woodbridge happens to be the post office address of Mr. Wallace. Toronto Junction is the home of Mr. Campbell. Toronto, then, with 174,414 people is told not to ask for its right to representation by population, because that city is the post office address of eight or nine members of Parliament. But Windsor, with 10,322 population, is the post office address of two members of Parliament. It will be just as reasonable to argue that the 31,523 people in North Essex should be disfranchised because the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) lives in Windsor, as to argue that the citizens of Toronto should be deprived of representation in this House because a few representatives of outside constituencies live in that city. According to the standard which the hon. member for North Essex applies to Toronto, his good city of Windsor, with two resident members, and only 10,322 population, is the most over-represented town in the Dominion. Toronto would need to be the post office address of 40 members of Parliament before it would have the representation which Windsor now enjoys, according to the theory of the hon. member for North Essex. I was surprised to hear the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), whom I was glad to see in his place this afternoon, echo the argument which the hon. member for North Essex urged against the city of Toronto. I have heard no proposal to disfranchise the city populations of 19,267 in Kingston because that city is also the home of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And how about Ottawa? Ottawa—and all these figures I am quoting are from the census returns of 1891, except my estimate of 40,000 for the added portions of Toronto—has a member for every 18,634 of city population, and yet Ottawa is the post office address of more members of Parliament than Toronto. The hon. member for North Essex, with the endorsation of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, insisted that Toronto wanted the earth and the fullness thereof. So far as I am concerned, I stand here as one of the representatives of the chief city of Ontario, to insist that the city population of Toronto should be represented according to the standard which applies to the city populations of Ontario and the other provinces. I would be ashamed to ask for the setting up of a special standard to unfairly enfranchise my fellow citizens, and I am here in my place to enter my solemn protest against the setting up of this special standard to unfairly disfranchise my fellow citizens. The citizens of Toronto who were in a position to directly control the representation of six constituencies, and indirectly decide the result in 12 or fifteen outside constituencies, have been reduced to the control of five seats. At the time of the last redistribution I protested that four seats did not give just representation to the people in East, West and Centre Toronto. The defenders of the last Government pointed out that there were hundreds of Toronto citizens who voted in outside constituencies. I could not deny that fact as an excuse for giving Toronto the benefit of representation by population. There is no such excuse now. This Government, in its wisdom, has applied the one-man-one-vote principle to Ontario. I approve of that principle, but when you get down to one-man-one-vote, you have no right to say that one vote in this constituency shall have the same representation that is given to two or three in that constituency. The city of Montreal, not counting Maisonneuve and Hochelaga, has a member for every 36,539 people. Toronto under this Bill will have a member for every 34,878 people. The difference seems to be in favour of Toronto as against Montreal, but Montreal is not working on the one-man-one-vote principle. The citizens of Montreal can vote wherever their names are on the list, and, therefore, there is still some excuse for denying them the right of representation by population. I do not want to use these figures unfairly; I have a telegram to-day from a friend of mine in Montreal which states:

> In Quebec a man can vote in every division in which his name is on the electoral list; for instance, it is stated that Senator Ogilvie, who is a large property-owner in various parts of the Island of Montreal and neighbouring country, has voted as often as twelve times in one day, as, of course, he had a perfect right to do.

I have counted the population of the five constituencies of Montreal in with the population of the ten leading cities of the Dominion, except Toronto. There are 509,694 people in the cities of St. John, Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Hamilton, London, Winnipeg and Victoria. These cities elect twenty members to this House, or a member to every 25,490 people. Toronto is asked to be thankful for a member for every 34,878 people. Outside of Toronto it takes

25,490 of a city population to elect a member of Parliament; and inside of Toronto, it takes 34,878 people to elect a member to this House. The discrimination against Toronto averages, in round numbers, about 10,000 for each of the five seats, and this Bill disfranchises nearly 50,000 people, who are denied the right to representation according to the standards which govern the representation of city populations outside of Toronto. I would not ask one member more than Toronto is entitled to, and I will not support any Bill which gives Toronto even one member less than the city should have if it enjoyed the rights granted other city populations.

The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who thinks that Toronto should not have representation according to population because a few members of Parlament have their homes in that city, should ask: How many outside members of Parliament have their homes in the city of Montreal? The right hon. the first Minister thinks it is right that there should be only one member of Parliament for every 34,878 Canadians in the city of Toronto; but he also thinks it right that there should be a member of Parliament for every 21,030 Canadians in the city population of Quebec. Quebec, with a city population of 63,090, has three members—Toronto, with a city population of 174,414, has five members of Parliament. It takes nearly 35,000 Canadians in the city population of Toronto to elect a member to this Parliament, while 21,000 Canadians in the city population of Quebec can do the same work. Mr. Speaker, I can rest my case on these figures. The right hon. the Prime Minister refuses the right of representation by population to Toronto because members of Parliament live in the city: but he allows Montreal and Quebec, yes, and every other city in the country, to be more generously represented, although most of these cities are the homes of not a few outside members of Parliament. The right hon. the First Minister may be proud of his work. I wish him joy of it. The right hon. gentleman is ready to apply one principle for the disfranchisement of Toronto—of Canadians in Toronto—and another principle for the enfranchisement of Liberals in Montreal, Quebec and other places.

If I understand the sentiment of the people of Toronto, they do not expect me to beg for favours from this Government. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has the power in his hands to do as he pleases. Toronto, I can tell him, is not to be bribed by the hope of favour from this Government—nor bullied by the injustice of this Bill. I repeat, that so far as this Bill applies to Toronto, the First Minister has revealed an unfair spirit. I know that it is useless to appeal to the majority in this House; but I trust that there is a majority elsewhere which will protect the rights of the disfranchised Canadians in the city of Toronto.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

I have been trying to speak in defence of what I conceive to be the rights of the people of my native city, and in the few words I have yet to say, I want to refer to the most dangerous aspect of this Bill. I am not justifying the redistribution schemes nor the gerrymanders of the past. The principle of representation by population was supposed to be the basis of these schemes. The hope of securing party advantage may have been the motive for these schemes. The Tories are said to have gerrymandered the country in the name of representation by population. The Liberals are going to gerrymander the country in the name of respect for county boundaries. I know that "gerrymander" is a strong word and an unpopular word on the other side of the House; but, in the name of heaven, what name can you give to this Bill, which is a first step, and a long step, towards the establishment of a system which will enable the minority of the people of Ontario to elect a majority of the members for Ontario? Where did this principle of respect for county boundaries get its sanctity? Surely the British North America Act, with its provision for a redistribution after every decennial census, contemplates representation by population. The enforcement of the one-man one vote principle in Ontario implies representation by population. Every man, woman and child in Ontario is counted for the purpose of giving the people representation in this House. As between the provinces, representation by population is the rule; and where is the justice in this idea of representation by counties as between parts of the same province? The Conservatives have incidentally violated the principle of representation by population, but this Liberal Government has put that principle to open shame. The Conservatives may have ignored the principle for party advantage, but this Government has boldly abolished that principle. The Conservatives had the excuse that they did not accept the idea of one-man-one-vote, and should, therefore, not be called upon to apply the principle of one-vote-one-value, or in other words, representation by population. The principle of representation by population is a national principle. The so-called principle of respect for county boundaries is not a principle at all. It is a dodge to be used where it can help the Government, and dropped before it can hurt the Government. This Bill tears down a national standard of representation and sets up a local standard. Respect for county boundaries is the shibboleth of the Government, and when it gets west of Lake Superior, where will it find the county boundaries to respect? I understand that there are no counties in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and in British Columbia, I am told that the counties are very roomy—as big as eastern provinces. We all believe that Canada is a nation, and it follows, therefore, that this House is a national Parliament. The principle upon which represen-

tation in this Parliament is based should be equally applicable to every province. You cannot apply the principle of respect for county boundaries in every province, because there are not counties in every province. This Bill is evil because it exalts the policy of respect for county boundaries above the principle of representation by population. The Parliament is not representative of counties; it is supposed to be representative of the people. It is not an assemblage of county delegates, but a governing, a sovereign body, deriving its powers from the people. I oppose this Bill as a Gerrymander in the worst sense of the word. Carried to its logical conclusion, the principle of this Bill —but it has no principle—will enable a minority of the people of Ontario to elect a majority of Ontario members of this House; and gerrymander is the only word to describe a measure of that character. I oppose this Bill because I think it is unnecessary, and because it may stand as a precedent to encourage every other party to juggle with the constituencies as soon as it takes office. I regret that I was not in the House when the hon. leader of the Opposition alluded to the part that the hon. member for West York had in placing the Opposition on the treasury benches. I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition when he speaks of what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) did to bring the Opposition into power. I know that the hon. member for West York acted on principle. His principles in that matter were and are my principles. If he had to do it over again, I am sure he would give up office rather than desert his principles; and if I were a candidate, I would follow him again as I did before. I think that the Government is trying to run the hon. member for West York out of Parliament. He does not hold a gerrymandered seat. I understand that the bounds of his constituency have not been disturbed for fifty years. Of course, the First Minister will say, in the words of Brutus. "Not that he loved Cæsar less, but that he loved Rome more." His excuse will be, not that he loves the Grand Sovereign less, but that he loves his new sacred white elephant, municipal boundaries, more. The hon. the First Minister is able to leave Conservative parts of the city of Ottawa in the county of Carleton for the sake of helping his Liberal friends; and he is taking Conservative parts of the city of Toronto out of East and West York for the sake of hurting his enemies. I am not afraid that the hon. gentleman will be able to make any division of West York that will put Clarke Wallace out of his seat. The old idea of treating free Canadians as if they were the chattels of either party is dying out. The people of the suburbs of Toronto are neither Grits nor Tories when they are brought face to face with a cowardly attack on any public man. The spirit of independence and fair-play, which is outraged by this Bill, will take care of the hon. member for West York, no matter how the constituency may be divided. The present Government, Mr. Speaker, may be a very clever organization, but it seems to suffer from a chronic lack of time. Whenever there is a proposal for the country's benefit, this Government is too busy. It is too busy to declare a policy which would permit a man to spend his own money in building a railway. It is too busy to pass a Copyright Act, which would give employment to thousands of Canadians. It is too busy to deal with the question of an insolvency law. It is too busy to frame a policy of justice between the farmers and elevator men in the west. It is too busy to try to create machinery to regulate the railways. Why, I am told by an ardent prohibitionist that it is too busy even to pass a prohibitory law. In fact, when anything is to be done for the country's sake, this Government has not a minute to spare; but when anything is to be done for the party's sake, it has oceans of time. This Government is prepared to spend months upon an unnecessary gerrymander, which proposes to guarantee votes to the party; and it is not prepared to spend minutes upon measures which would give profit to the country. It is a pity that this Government does not look to the party for its pay. The Government forgets that there is a country except on pay-day, when it draws its salary from the country and keeps right on working for the party.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, we always have a reasonable anticipation, when our friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) speaks, that we shall have the pleasure of listening to a few epigrammatic sayings. He always tries to tell us something interesting in a very short way. We have heard sometimes of men speaking through their hat, but to-night we on this side of the House have had the opportunity of seeing a gentleman reading through his hat. Some of the arguments which the hon. gentleman has advanced as reasons why this Bill should be opposed are not at all satisfactory to those who do not expect a man to talk through his hat. One of the reasons he gave us was that Toronto is being unjustly treated. If the hon. gentleman had raised his voice in protest against the law that has governed the country for the past twenty years, we might have believed to-night that he was sincere; but the very conditions which he deplores with such vehement language to-night, have continued in this country for the past seventeen years in a more intensified form than this Bill is intended to perpetuate, because East Toronto, during the last nine years, has had one representative for 43,564, while the new Bill proposes that the hon. gentleman shall represent only about 36,000 people. Now, it strikes me that if the magnificent ora-

tory which we have heard to-night had manifested itself in a newspaper in Toronto about nine years ago——

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. It did.

Mr. HEYD—it would have been much more valuable than the speech which we have heard to-night.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. It did, nearly twenty years ago.

Mr. HEYD. It did manifest itself, but not in so emphatic a way—not with the desire of embarrassing the powers that then were, so much as the intention is to embarrass the powers that be now. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has expressed his opinion of the Gerrymander Bill of 1882 by saying that it was a bad Bill; but I am sorry he did not use the same emphasis some seventeen years ago that he used here to-night. If there is one thing that the people of Canada like, whether they find it in politicians or not, it is consistency; and when we have certain opinions of our own which we think should be put in the form of law, we would like to have them expressed some fifteen or sixteen years ago as well as to-night. Now, what my hon. friend takes so much exception to is that Toronto is not properly represented. You would think, from hearing the hon. gentleman speak, that Toronto was the hub of the Dominion of Canada, that the sun rises and sets in the city of Toronto, and that this House, in everything it does, should consider Toronto first, last and always. While I have the very highest regard for the gentlemen who represent Toronto in this House, they are all animated apparently with the same desire to advance the interests of Toronto, no matter how; and they generally unite, whatever their political convictions may be, in promoting those interests. With our knowledge of the representatives from that burg, if it were to have more than five, we do not know what they might convert this Parliament of ours into. I do not say that it is not now represented by very intelligent and very earnest men, who are doing the best they can for this country; but the attack on the present Government because they are trying to give Toronto one representative for 36,000 by the hon. gentleman, who was satisfied in past years with having one for 43,000, is rather far-fetched on his part. He opposes the Bill, he says, because it is unnecessary. It is always unnecessary to redress a grievance, in the opinion of the man who has brought about the grievance. He never needs anything redressed; but the poor victim who has been suffering from his misconduct, wants redress. The object is not to redress the grievances of persons who have brought about this trouble, but to give to those who have been suffering under it during the last eighteen years, redress at last. That is why I am supporting this Bill.

But I do not want to weary the House with too long a discussion of what my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) has said. I wish to allude very briefly to what fell from the lips of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I do not know exactly what spirit animates a man who can imagine a condition of affairs which he has no reasonable assurance of having existed. When a man attacks as villains two men who have not yet had an opportunity of defending themselves before the courts, and introduces their names into this House for the purpose of casting an aspersion upon the character of a very worthy member of this House, he does something which I, at least, politician though I am, would hardly stoop to. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) branded Captain Sullivan and Mr. Hewitt as felons, which he had no right to do, because they have not had the opportunity, up to the present, of vindicating their character. One gentleman whom I know well denies positively the truth of the accusation—but first to brand them as felons and then associate them with my hon. friend who sits at my left (Mr. Paterson)——

Mr. WALLACE. The judges branded them in that way before I did.

Mr. HEYD. No, they did not.

Mr. WALLACE. They did.

Mr. HEYD. These men have the right to appear before the Speaker and vindicate their character. They have the right to deny these charges, and probably they will be able to disprove them. We have no right in this Parliament to brand Captain Sullivan or Mr. Hewitt as felons on the testimony produced up to the present. They have not had the opportunity of defending themselves before a proper tribunal. When these men are convicted it will be time enough to brand them as felons, but do not associate them with the Minister of Customs in the hope of creating the impression that he is a felon too. I have heard that they were not in the city at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Captain Sullivan was in the city. More than that, I asked another member of the House, who has known him intimately for years, to come with me, and we saw Captain Sullivan in the reading room. From that room he disappeared, but I cannot tell what other room he disappeared into.

Mr. HEYD. If he was in the reading room, the statement was that the Minister of Customs, Captain Sullivan and Mr. Hewitt, concocted and helped along this Gerrymander Bill. The Minister of Customs says he does not know Captain Sullivan, and Hewitt was not in the city of Ottawa at all, so that disposes of that statement.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What about the man who made the statement?

Mr. HEYD. What degree of belief can you attach to the statements of a man who deliberately would make a charge like that, without the slightest foundation and with the idea of injuring the character of an honourable and respectable man. If there was a shadow of justification for the charge, I would say that the hon. gentleman had been misled, but in this particular instance he does not appear to have a shred to build on, and when he was told by the Minister of Customs: I do not know Captain Sullivan and had not seen Hewitt, he should have frankly and decently accepted that statement. But he did not. He took it back, but in such a way that he only intensified the manner in which he made the first charge. Had I made such a statement on a foundation so flimsy, I would have begged the hon. gentleman's pardon honestly, and said I took it back, and would not try to squeeze out of an apology that was honestly due.

Mr. WALLACE. Take back what?

Mr. HEYD. That the Minister of Customs and Hewitt and Captain Sullivan conspired together and assisted in framing this Redistribution Bill, when the hon. gentleman ought to have known that the Minister did not know Sullivan, and that Mr. Hewitt was not here.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not the statement I made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was it?

Mr. WALLACE. It was that these two distinguished citizens were in the city here. The Minister of Customs made the statement, in his speech, that the ward heelers and manipulators from all the ridings of Ontario came here in 1882 and manipulated what he called the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. I said that, so far as my knowledge went, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Mr. Aikens were the two gentlemen who had charge of the Bill and were promoting it for the province of Ontario, and I repudiated the statement that there were heelers connected with them, and said that they were honest and upright men. Then addressing myself to the Minister who made the charge, I said that two distinguished citizens of his party were here in Ottawa at the time the Gerrymander Bill of 1890 was being prepared, and I asked if the hon. Minister was one of those men who had charge of that, because if he was, then probably he was in collusion with those two citizens I have mentioned.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The "Hansard" will show what you said.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and I do not take back what I said, like the Minister of Customs did to-night in the case of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. HEYD. If the hon. gentleman simply intended to convey the impression he is trying to make out, I certainly was deceived. But a statement of that kind would not have caused our friends opposite to thump their desks so vigorously as they did. These gentlemen became demonstrative because they thought the hon. member was charging that the Minister of Customs had hobnobbed with Captain Sullivan and Mr. Hewitt for no good purpose. The impression which the hon. gentleman left on the mind of his hearers was that there was crookedness between Hewitt and Sullivan and the Minister of Customs, and he did not take back his statement in the way he should and remove that impression. However, I am not going to run foul of the hon. gentleman. If he thinks that is fair politics, I have nothing more to say. I was not sent here from South Brant to make an attack on the personal character of any man. I have never done it, and do not propose to do it now.

The question before us is one of considerable importance because there are grave principles involved in it. We have before us the duty of redressing the wrong enacted some seventeen years ago, and the question arises how can we best do it. Those of us familiar with the difficulties that beset the Government in 1881, when a redistribution Act was imperatively demanded, can easily suggest what scheme this Government might have adopted to make such an Act effective. They might have adopted the numerical principle, and divide the population of each province by the number of representatives they were entitled to, the electoral unit being 20,908. That would have been attended with grave difficulties I am free to confess, but it has been urged to-night, that that was the principle followed by the late Government. Is that true? According to the census of 1881, 20,908 is the electoral unit and each 20,908 people are entitled to a representative. Was that the principle that guided the late Government in establishing constituencies as they did? We find that in Ontario there were 12 constituencies that were 4,000 each short of the electoral unit, and they are represented by nine Conservatives and three Liberals. In Nova Scotia four constituencies have from 5,000 to 10,000 less than the electoral unit. In New Brunswick there are four constituencies with from 5,000 to 14,000 less than the electoral unit. Take Restigouche—I do not desire to say a word against its representative (Mr. McAllister), nor do I select it in order to asperse him in any way—but it happens to be a constituency that in 1881 only had 6,651 people, and yet it elected a representative. So you see that the electoral unit was not taken as the basis of representation.

A great deal of fault has been found with the fact that in the present Bill there are a great many constituencies that have more than the electoral unit. But that is not peculiar to the present Bill, because that ex-

isted in 1881 and 1891 and was never charged against the Bills as being a particular act of injustice.

We have heard a great deal to-night from the member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), who finds fault with the fact that in Toronto it takes some 40,000 to do exactly what it takes 20,000 people to do in the rural constituencies of Ontario. What does he say when he finds out that it takes 41,000 in Westmoreland to do what 8,308 in Restigouche can do—5 to 1, or West York, 41,851 —5 to 1; or Algoma, 41,856—5 to 1; or East Toronto, 43,564—5 to 1? A man in the county that our hon. friend (Mr. McAlister) comes from counts for as much as five men from any of these other constituencies. Yet, not one man on the other side has lifted his voice against this terrible iniquity which they charge is in the Bill. Now, if they have lived through 19 years with this condition of affairs they can live for two or three years longer under an Act by which this difference is not intensified but is somewhat lessened. That is the condition of affairs existing now; and why people should take so much offence at the intentions of the Government when they have borne with the horrible evil so long, I cannot fairly comprehend. But there is another plan that might have been taken, and that is, confining themselves to county boundaries. The fact that we are here to-night trying to put through the Bill is the best evidence that the Government of the day did not confine themselves to county boundaries. There are two plans, either of which they might have adopted—either to maintain the county boundaries or to assimilate the constituencies to a unit of population as fairly as they could. That would be a hard task. It was easier and more necessary to make what might be called a political geography and change the constituencies according to that than to try to arrange them according to an electoral unit or according to county boundaries. I do not intend to go over the province of Ontario to show that the idea of political advantage was at the bottom of the Redistribution Bill of 1882, and that of 1892, but I do so that they advanced the interest of one political party. If the Government of that day had started with the idea to do right, it would not have mattered whether they had adopted the idea of an electoral unit or the idea of the county boundaries or any other plan. But we on this side believe that the animating principle was to advance the interests of the Government then existing and to do injury to their political opponents; and we believe that still, and we have heard no argument—at least I have heard no argument—to convince me that anything else was in the mind of the Government. Reference has often been made to South Brant to-night, because South Brant is a historical constituency in this country. I regret to find some members of this House so ill-informed as to the number of people who live in South Brant. I heard an hon. gentleman say that the people who live in Tuscarora were not counted in the population. They were counted in the population when the electoral lists of 1881 were prepared; they were counted in 1891. It is said they had a right to be counted in 1891 because they had votes, while now they have no votes. But they were counted in 1881 when they had no votes. So that the whole argument, as well as the personal discussion that took place between the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) only showed that the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) was wrong, and that the Indians had been counted in.

Mr. CLANCY. That makes it all the worse.

Mr. HEYD. But it does not make the hon. gentleman's statement any truer. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to justify their statements when they are false by saying it is good they are no worse. That is no argument. A gentleman who represents an Ontario constituency should tell the facts in a matter of this kind, especially when he challenges the accuracy of another gentleman's statement. He should be sure of his facts or say nothing. Nothing can be clearer than that the people of Tuscarora were counted when the lists were made in 1881.

Now, take the county of Brant about which so much has been said. I have satisfied myself that the intentions of the late Government in dealing with South Brant were not honourable, and from that I infer that the same applies throughout the length and breadth of the country. In 1867, the constituency of South Brant was represented by the late Hon. E. B. Wood. For over 20 years both North and South Brant had had representatives in the Parliament of this country. In 1872, Mr. Wm. Paterson was elected over Sir Francis Hincks by a majority of 262, after one of the most strongly contested political campaigns we ever fought in this country. In 1878, Mr. Paterson was elected by 198. In 1881 the census was taken and what was the result of that census? Let us divest ourselves of all political ideas, if we can for a short time, and let us look at the figures as practical men would do who are not animated by a desire to get an advantage over a political rival. South Brant had a population of 21,975. Brant is divided by the river running east and west. That portion of it north of the river is North Brant and that south is South Brant, and that is the way the constituencies have been for municipal purposes for the last 50 years; that is the way it has been for provincial purposes since confederation, and for years before. Now, the electoral unit was 20,908. South Brant, with its 21,975, was just as close to the unit as it was possible for a constituency to be. It was difficult to find anywhere a constituency closer to the elec-

toral unit than South Brant. It might naturally have been expected that the Government would say: South Brant has been organized for municipal purposes in its present form for 40 years, and it is as close to the electoral unit as we can make it; therefore, we had better leave it alone. It is true that North Brant had not enough population to entitle it to a representative, for it had only 11,894. The only thing the Government would have been justified in doing was to add to North Brant in order to bring it up to the electoral unit. But what did they do? Instead of quietly attaching a little to North Brant to bring it up to the standard, they took a piece of Oxford and added it to North Brant, and they took a piece from Wentworth and added it also, constituting North Brant out of three counties. We have the right to look at it critically to see what was the motive in it. North Brant was a strong Liberal constituency. They could increase their majority as they might deem it necessary. But in South Brant, as constituted by the Act, there was the town of Paris and the township of Onondaga, which voted Tory and could increase the Tory majority if it was necessary; but being so greatly outnumbered by the Liberals throughout the rural part of the riding, the voting strength of Onondaga and Paris was never brought out. But Paris and Onondaga were taken out of North Brant, for they could do the Government no good there. Beverley was added to North Brant, and another portion from Oxford, making it a Grit hive in the true sense of the word. In 1887 the majority was 1,174; in 1892 it was 1,114; in 1896 it was 1,117—and they could have made it more if necessary. I do not go into further particulars, because North Brant is not even mentioned in our "Parliamentary Companion," whether through typographical error or because they did not want to show how much the Grits were hived, I do not know. But this is what I want to object to, that while South Brant had a population of 21,000, they added Paris, with 3,173, and Onondaga with 1,739 more. Why did they do that? Because these places were the only two in North Brant that gave Conservative majorities, and as the intention was to hive the Grits there by adding Beverley on the one hand and Ancaster on the west end, they might as well take the Tory sections out and attach them to South Brant, and that is what they did. With what result? According to the census of 1881 South Brant had a population of 21,947. But Mr. Paterson had a majority of 198, and all it was necessary to do was to put about 200 Tory votes into South Brant, and they had some hopes of defeating my hon. friend, and that is just what they did do. They did not need to take 5,000 people out of North Brant and put them into South Brant, because to do that they would have to take 5,000 people out of South Brant and put them into South Oxford—they had to take people that for 40 years had been doing their business in the city of Brantford, and carrying on their municipal affairs in county work and township work, and put them into a strange county with whom they had no business arrangements, with whom they have no political interests, and what for? In order to take 225 Grit votes out of South Brant and put them into South Oxford. They had already 500 or 600, or 700 more than they knew what to do with. Now by taking that 225 votes out of South Brant, and taking Paris and Onondaga out of North Brant and putting them into South Brant, it gave the Conservatives a majority of 43. That is the position of affairs, and when our friends examine that they must come to the conclusion that the intention of the people who had carved the constituency was to defeat the men who had represented it for so many years in this House. All they had to do was to take off 198, and they gained their purpose.

Now, what was the object? They desired to get rid of Mr. Paterson. He has been a thorn in the sides of our friends opposite, much as they admire him personally. It is a singular thing how you can like a man personally and how you can differ from him politically. I see opposite a lot of men that I think a great deal of, but when it comes down to politics they appear to me to be the crookedest lot of men I ever saw. In the ordinary private relations of life I regard it as an honour to be associated with them. Politics are a curious thing when it leads men to do such things as they did in the Redistribution Bill of 1882, with the idea of killing Paterson. What harm had he ever done them? He had been trying to represent South Brant to the best of his ability, and all that time he did it to the satisfaction of his people. But he had to be got rid of, to be legislated out of existence, and when they could not do that by the Redistribution Bill, they tacked on the Indians. They thought that the Indians, being the wards of the Government, and having some 600 votes, could be easily coerced, and they expected to kill Paterson that way. They also tacked on the Franchise Bill. Gentlemen on the other side know that that was designed all for the purpose of killing Paterson. Now, we, in South Brant, have got the notion into our heads that Brant was gerrymandered for the purpose of injuring the Liberal party, and that was quite manifest, because all the Conservative party felt quite jubilant. They denied having anything to do with it; they would not be guilty of such nefarious work. But it was done—I do not say it was done by Mr. Aikens, or Sir Mackenzie Bowell. I do not know how it was done, but, whoever did it, did it very skilfully. The statement was made to-day, and a challenge was thrown across the House to show one con-

stituency that had been injured by the gerrymander. I can show you one, South Brant, because Mr. Paterson would have been elected in 1896, in the old constituency, as it existed in 1882, by a majority of 400 votes, and he was killed by the votes that were tacked on by the gerrymander of 1882 and that of 1892.

Mr. BERGERON. He was elected twice after that.

Mr. HEYD. He might have been, but the very men that were added to his constituency, when it came to a final trial, were able to put him out. The city of Paris, the township of Onondaga and Tuscarora defeated Mr. Paterson, and Paris, Onondaga and Tuscarora were added to South Brant for the purpose of doing it, and they succeeded. In 1896, had the old township of Burford and Oakland been left in the South Riding, and Paris, Onondaga and Tuscarora been left off, Mr. Paterson would have been elected by 400 votes. So there is a clear case where the gerrymander of 1882 and 1892 defeated a candidate, and we have solved the problem of who struck Billy Paterson.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). And we have got South Brant under a good honest election, and a good man to represent it.

Mr. HEYD. Now, Mr. Hewitt is a nice fellow, there is not a man on the other side of the House that would not like to be acquainted with him. He is a gentleman who has been maligned here and elsewhere, but he will have an opportunity of re-establishing himself in the confidence of the people who know him. Now, what is all this fuss about? You would think from the complaints that have been made in this House and from the editorials that have been written, that the Government is going to perpetrate one of the greatest wrongs that it is possible to perpetrate upon a free people. We have heard the acts of our friends characterized in language that is most excruciating. We have heard it said that it is a cruel wrong, that we were exulting with fiendish glee. But what are we exulting over? For simply restoring the conditions that existed in 1881, that is all we are trying to do. We are not trying to do any harm. We are not appointing revising barristers. We are not cutting up constituencies ourselves, we are leaving that for the judges to do, whom I do not need to defend here—although I think our hon. friend from the city of Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) went about as close to attacking them as any man could that admires the judiciary of our country. We simply call upon the judges to redress a wrong that was done in 1882, and we are told that we are doing a grievous wrong to the people. What people? The people are not grumbling at all. It is the politicians in this House who have unjustly gained their seats owing to that wrong that was perpetrated then, that are making all this noise. You take the receiver of stolen goods to the police court and make him disgorge, and he thinks the process is all wrong, and so it is with the men that have held stolen seats for the past 20 years and who are now asked to disgorge. I suppose if you put a man behind the bars of the penitentiary, he will condemn the laws of the land, he does not like these things. Neither do these men that have stolen these constituencies and who have enjoyed the benefits for twenty years. I would like to see a move made in order to make them restore their ill-gotten gains and give back these goods that have been stolen from the people. That is all this Bill is trying to do. The only fault I have to find with the Government as a politician is that they do not go further, though, as an honest man, I think they have gone far enough. But it takes a good deal to be an honest man under such provocation as the Grit party have had to endure for the last eighteen years. If we gave you fellows a dose of your own medicine, would not you squirm? If we attempted to do it behind revising barristers, men of our own appointment, men against whom there was no appeal, after we have got the power to do it, would not you groan? If we attempted to use you now as you used us for eighteen years, we would hear a wailing and gnashing of teeth, and a weeping throughout the length and breadth of this country that would surprise the people. But we do not propose to do that, all we propose to do is to do what is right. We simply want to go back to the conditions of 1881, and ask the judges in whom we have all confidence, to divide up these constituencies in order to do justice to the people.

A great many people said when our friends wiped out the old Franchise Bill last year that we made a great mistake. As a politician I say we did make a mistake, as a politician I would put the screws on you fellows. But as an honest man, I think the Government did right. But I would like to give you just one dose of that electoral list under returning officers appointed as they might be, scientifically appointed, just to give you one dose of the medicine you have been giving us for the past eighteen years. Then you would wonder how we have stood it so long. But we are only going to do justice, and we are simply asking the judges of the land to do what you ought to have done some nineteen years ago.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who is in charge of this Bill, to be in his place to-morrow, if he can conveniently do so, as I shall have something to say to him.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th July, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PURCHASE OF LAND FROM AUGUSTE LANGEVIN.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

What disposition has been made of the vote of $1,000 authorized in 1898 to purchase certain land from Auguste Langevin (dit Bergevin), Supply Bill No. 174, page 24?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The land has been purchased and $1,000 paid therefor.

Mr. BERGERON. To whom, that is what I want to know?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have just given the answer furnished to me, but I will get that information and give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to know to whom the money has been paid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman did not ask his question in such a way that the officer who has charge of that would have understood it, but I will see if I can get the information for the hon. gentleman.

EXTENSION OF LOBSTER FISHING SEASON.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

1. In granting extension of lobster fishing season to 31st July, for sections between West Point and Carleton Head, in Northumberland Straits, has any consideration been given to section between Cape Bear and Charlottetown?
2. If not, why not, the condition in regard to lobster fishing being the same in both sections?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The extension recommended for the lobster fishing season this year has been confined to those localities recommended by the Lobster Commission for an extension.

POSTMASTER AT HUMBERSTONE.

Mr. McCLEARY asked:

1. How long was James O. Rose postmaster of Humberstone?
2. Were any charges made against him during his term of office?
3. If so, what were they, and were such charges inquired into, by whom and with what result?
4. What was the nature of the report made by the commissioner who held the inquiry?
5. Was Mr. Rose continued in his position after such inquiry had been made; if so, how long?
6. Has he been dismissed?
7. If so, did he receive notice from the department of such, and what was the date of same?
8. What was the date of his dismissal?
9. What reason can be given for his dismissal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. From the 1st of October, 1881, to the 1st of December, 1898. The answer to the other questions is as follows:—Certain charges of mismanagement of the office and political partisanship against the postmaster were made and inquired into by the inspector. The report was dated the 17th of September, 1897, but no action was taken thereon. In the month of November, 1898, complaint was made to the department that the postmaster was engaged as a general merchant, and that the post office was in his store, and that it was not fair to the other merchants of the place that he should have the advantage which the post office gave him over others in the same line of business; accordingly the office was transferred to a person who was not engaged in any business in competition with any others in the same place.

I. C. R.—EXPENDITURE ON ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), whether his attention has been called to the question I asked the day before yesterday respecting the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, then, I would ask the hon. gentleman if he will kindly look up "Hansard," and let me know to-morrow.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say, as I see the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in his place, that the reply he gave me—and if necessary, I will put myself in order—on the third reading of the Dominion Lands Amendment Act was unsatisfactory, taken in connection with the fact that in all other things we have been promised in the North-west Territories, we have

been disappointed. The hon. Minister told us that nothing will be done in regard to what is a vital question at this moment in the North-west Territories, namely, the settlement of the seed grain indebtedness and the seed grain liens. The hon. Minister told us, when he took charge of his department, that he would insist on having a free hand, and there can be little doubt that he has had a free hand. Three sessions have passed away since the hon. gentleman took charge of that department, and an important question like that is not settled, an important question like the elevator question is not settled, and, more than all, the promises that were made to us respecting relief, as regards implements, have not been kept. The North-west Territories and Manitoba feel that the hon. Minister has treated them badly in all these things. All these things have been treated with "to-morrow" or "next session," and there is naturally a great sense of disappointment and a sense of disappointment that has been expressed, Mr. Speaker, by the leading paper in the North-west Territories on the Government side, regarding one of these important questions. To crown all, on a vast tract of these territories still remains a cloud of obloquy that there is no intention, apparently, of having cleared away. Although we are into the dog days there is sufficient time yet before this session closes, if the hon. Minister wishes to direct his attention to some of these matters, such, for instance, as the seed grain question, to accomplish something. If the hon. Minister will direct his attention to this matter alone something may still be done through a brief Bill that could be passed rapidly through all its stages to confer an inestimable boon upon the Territories.

Now, Sir, it is not merely that, but as I say, and as the newspapers there feel, over what amounts to a vast kingdom belonging to Canada there is a cloud unremoved, and yesterday in the "Star" is published a cablegram giving the leading article from the London "Times" on this question. After some complimentary reference to the Prime Minister, the London "Times" says:

> We have less hesitation in expressing regret at the rather serious mistake which the Canadian Government seem to have committed within the last few days.
>
> On Wednesday Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, son of the well-known Dominion statesman, who is now one of the few surviving fathers of confederation, brought very grave charges of incompetence, neglect and corruption against certain officials employed in the Yukon district.
>
> The charges are not new so far as their general features are concerned.
>
> Nearly a year ago our special correspondent in the Klondike declared that they were widely made and believed in by the population on the spot, natives and Americans alike.
>
> We were told that the officials were accused not merely of incapacity but of a pecuniary corruption.
>
> The facts stated by our correspondent, from her personal observation, were sufficient to prove that at least the administration was suspiciously bad, and that a searching investigation by competent and impartial commissioners was required.
>
> A commissioner of high reputation was appointed, but, whatever his other qualifications, he can hardly be said to have possessed the judicial experience desirable for such a post.
>
> Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who held the offices of Attorney General and Minister of Justice in the late Gavernment, repeated these accusations in the House, and alleged that Mr. Sifton, the present Minister of the Interior, was personally responsible.
>
> He moved for an inquiry and a Royal Commission, and offered his own unpaid services as Crown prosecutor. We do not say that the charges are true, still less that any of the individuals named by Sir Hibbert are guilty; but it certainly seems regrettable that a matter so serious should have been treated by the Laurier Government as a strictly party question.
>
> The Minister of the Interior fell back on Mr. Ogilvie's report, which is still incomplete, and that it was the duty of the Cabinet not to resign their political responsibility to a commission of judges.
>
> There is, perhaps, something to be said for this position from a purely constitutional standpoint, but the Government would have been better advised had they shown a deeper sense of the serious character of the charge and the necessity of meeting it.

The right hon. the Prime Minister will remember that some twenty-six years ago a similar state of things took place. The newspapers, first of Canada, were filled with strong and vehement charges against the Government of that day, and the London "Times" led the press of England and the press of the continent in making observations almost on all-fours with those which I have had the honour of reading to the House. I need not remind the Prime Minister that to have a paper like the London "Times" bringing this matter thus before the world, calls not merely into question the honour of the Government, but the honour of Canada. What occurred at the time I have referred to? When the member for Shefford, Hon. Mr. Huntingdon, first made his charges, immediately the Prime Minister of the day moved for a committee, and when the work of that committee, for reasons I need not go into, was unsatisfactory, then Lord Dufferin, the Governor General, had a commission of judges appointed in order to inquire into the charges. Remember that the charges which were made at that time against the Government were charges of taking money from a public contractor who had succeeded in getting a public contract, and that that money had gone into electioneering expenses. They were not as serious as the charges which have been flung broadcast in the present instance, and which are that this domain, an entire kingdom, a mighty wealthy district, in fact, a northern Golconda, that the administration of it has been sown with corruption, and that

money—money of the citizens of Canada—has been improperly taken and placed in the pockets of people who were violating the trusts reposed in them, and abusing the privileges they had. I will read to the House part of the observations made by Lord Dufferin on the 13th of August, 1873:

Under these circumstances I have concluded, on the advice of my Ministers, and even if I differed from them as to the policy of such a course, which I do not, it is a point upon which I should be disposed to accept their recommendations to issue a Royal Commission of inquiry to three gentlemen of such legal standing, character and authority as will command the confidence of the public, by virtue of the powers conferred upon me by the Act Vict. 31, chap. 38. On the other hand, I have determined, in proroguing Parliament, to announce to the members of both Houses my intention of their assembling immediately the commission in question shall have concluded their labours. By these means an opportunity will be afforded for preliminary expurgation of these unhappy matters before a tribunal competent to take evidence on oath. Ample opportunities will be given to the members of the more distant provinces to make their preparations, in view of an autumnal session, and within two months or ten weeks from this date a full Parliament of Canada will take supreme and final cognizance of the case now pending between my Ministers and their accusers.

And, Sir, the view that was stated some time ago by the Victoria "Times," a Liberal newspaper, holds good to-day:

In the opinion of the "Times," the course which the Government should take is quite clear. All charges should be thoroughly investigated, and by a commission having the confidence of the country. The Government and not the Opposition, must take the lead in prosecuting such an investigation. If officials have done wrong, they should be exposed and punished, it matters not what their politics or by whom appointed. Now that direct charges have been formulated on the floor of Parliament by a prominent member of the House, nothing short of an exhaustive inquiry by a non-partisan commission will properly meet the situation. The investigation by Mr. Ogilvie may be good enough in its way—his findings may be absolutely fair and just, and cover the whole ground; but partisan politicians, who think more of making a point against the Government than of reforming abuses, will not accept them as final. An investigation that does not silence criticism has failed in its object.

Now, Sir, I had expected, when the Government voted down the resolution a few days ago calling for an inquiry, that ere this we should have heard that steps had been taken to have such an inquiry as Lord Dufferin obtained some 26 years ago; and I saw in one of the papers—I think it was the Montreal "Star"—a call made on the Governor General for a Royal Commission, whether the Ministry wished it or not. In that connection I want to read one or two sentences written by Mr. Goldwin Smith in 1873, which voiced the sentiments of a vast number of the people of Canada. He wrote as follows:—

But the doctrine that the sovereign can do no wrong, which we all loyally accept as applied to the acts of Her Majesty, is applicable to the acts of Her Majesty alone. All her officers, from the Prime Minister of the Empire downwards, and governors of colonies among the rest, are responsible for their use of their powers, amenable to the censorship of public opinion, and in the last resort liable to removal from their offices for maladministration.

He is arguing that the Governor General was responsible to the Empire, to the home Government, and to the people of this country, for seeing that charges in nature like those that have been made now for more than a year against the administration of my hon. friend in the Yukon district, should not be slurred over. Again, he says:

We hold that it was a case in which the Governor General might most properly have put to his Ministers the very simple question which the published evidence suggested, and in default of a perfectly satisfactory answer have told them that he could no longer incur the responsibility of retaining them as the advisers of the Crown. Such, we incline to believe, would have been the decision of men of the character of Pitt, Castlereagh, Canning, Wellington, Grey or Peel. This is not a trial for larceny or an action of ejectment. It is a moral not a legal, question. It is a question whether, in view of certain disclosures, the persons now in power are morally fit to remain heads of the nation and advisers of the Crown. Lord Melville, on the strength of far less damaging disclosures, was removed from office and struck off the Privy Council before the commencement of the judicial impeachment which, through the leniency of the court, ended in his acquittal.

Here is another sentence, and I commend it especially to the Prime Minister:

Of the two modes of inquiry, a committee of the House of Commons and a Royal Commission, we avow our decided preference for the latter, supposing that it can be invested with sufficient powers, and provided that it be appointed "with the full consent of Parliament," to use the words of Mr. Gladstone with reference to the Royal Commission recently appointed to inquire into the subject brought before the legislature by Mr. Plimsoll.

And again:

Another obvious condition is that, in any case affecting the personal conduct of Ministers, the commissioners shall be nominated, not by the accused, but by the Governor General himself, with such disinterested advice as he may be able to obtain. If the legal action of Privy Councillors in this or any other matter is required, there are Privy Councillors who are not Ministers.

And so on. The whole trend of the argument of that powerful paper, written by a publicist who, at that time, had an unimpaired prestige, and who has always had an almost unequalled power of expressing his ideas, is towards establishing a doctrine that compels the Government under the present circumstances to advise the Governor General to issue a Royal Commission; and, if they fail to do it, that morally compels the

Governor General of Canada to insist that a Royal Commission shall be issued. These are matters which affect closely the portion of the country whence I come. The first are minor matters, from one point of view, compared with the last subject which I have brought before the House; but they are subjects which touch the North-west closely; and in regard to them, there is still a locus penitentiæ for my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and I would urge on him to redeem his pledges to the North-west while still there is time in this very Parliament; and I would urge on the Government to see that steps are taken so that this dark cloud which rests on a vast portion of those Territories shall not grow blacker, but that means shall be taken to pierce it, to discover what has caused it, and to punish any persons who may be culpable. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the motion which has just been moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is an unwarranted abuse of the privileges of this House. It is a well-known rule of parliamentary government that the motion to adjourn the House should not be resorted to except to bring to the attention of the House some matter of pressing or urgent necessity. If something suddenly occurs to which the attention of Parliament should be called, the motion to adjourn is a proper means of effecting that object. But when a matter has been debated in the House for a long time, as this one has been, and when there is no urgency at the moment, to move the adjournment of the House when we are engaged in an important debate is, I repeat, an unwarranted abuse of the privileges of the House. I may say to my hon. friend, though I would not be lacking in courtesy to any one, that I would not have risen to reply to those remarks, in which he brought up matters which occurred 26 years ago, and which have no relevancy, but for the fact that he cited the opinion of the London "Times"; and I may, perhaps, give to the London "Times" some attention which I would not have given to my hon. friend under different circumstances. The "Times" is a paper which carries great weight and respectability to whatever it says; but we are all familiar with the fact that this is not the first time that the "Times" has been the victim of a hoax. Some few years ago the "Times" was the victim of a very cruel hoax at the hands of a perjurer named Richard Pigott, when it did not hesitate to associate the name of Mr. Parnell with crime in Ireland. There was not the slightest foundation for the accusations then made by the "Times" against Mr. Parnell, who was able to vindicate his character most successfully. All I have to say to my hon. friend on the present occasion is that we have another Richard Pigott, another slanderer in the land, and that the "Times" has once more been made the victim of a hoax, written by somebody from this side of the ocean. The debate on the motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was concluded on Thursday last, and the editorial in the "Times" appeared yesterday. It was physically impossible that the editor of the "Times" could have had before him the text of the debate that took place in this House when he wrote that article, and, therefore, it was based upon insufficient evidence or on no reliable evidence. When the facts have been placed before the English public, I am not without hope that the "Times" itself will have to recast its judgment on this matter. My hon. friend says that there is a dark cloud on the country, and that we should do something to dissipate it. We have nothing to do at the present time but to let events take care of themselves. Let events go on. This has already largely dissipated the dark cloud. The motion has not even been fully debated, the vote had not been taken, when the dark cloud had been pretty well dissipated, when the suspicion which was sought to be cast on the Minister of the Interior, when all these charges of corruption set forth in the article of the "Times," had been disproved and dispelled.

If anything would show the extreme, the unpardonable levity with which those charges were brought against the Government, it would be an article which we read to-day, not in a Government organ, not in a Liberal paper, but in the Montreal "Gazette." An infamous accusation was made against Judge Dugas. This accusation we refused to submit to a commission of judges. We knew, as did all those who have had dealings with Judge Dugas in the past, his probity and high character, and would not credit any accusation against him unless based on something more than a mere motion, unaccompanied by evidence of any kind. Well, what do we see in the Montreal "Gazette" to-day? We find the editor of the Klondike "Nugget" defending Judge Dugas, and thus there is another cloud removed from the gaze of my hon. friend. Here is what the "Gazette" says:

Vancouver, B.C., July 4.—A. F. George, editor of the "Klondike Nugget," who arrived in Vancouver with the Heywood-Trotter party of Yukoners, was seen last evening and talked freely of things in the far north. He said: "The story of Sir Hibbert Tupper's late attack upon Judge Dugas, of the Supreme Bench of the Yukon, is all news to us, and has shocked us immeasurably. I, myself, as editor of the 'Nugget,' have, as you know, been very active in the agitation in the Yukon for fair regulations and honest administration, but I want to say right here, if you will allow me, that the judge's record up there is above reproach or even the breath of suspicion. He has earned the admiration, respect and esteem of every man with whom he has been thrown in contact. Sir Hibbert has been badly misled in this case, and the Yukoners,

in whose interests the agitation has supposedly been maintained, will be much exercised to learn of the attack upon a man whom they have come to regard as the one strong arm between them and wrong. Since Judge Dugas's incumbency, the alien population of the Yukon has acquired an immense respect for British law and its courts, while the Canadians point to him proudly as a sample of what manner of men Canada can furnish when in a favourable mood. I talk strongly on this matter, for a great injustice has been done, and I can verify everything I say from the returning Yukoners, who will now be arriving at Vancouver every few days since we have pioneered the way. By the way, I am surprised that others have not come out this way before, for it is time saved to all eastern points, as well as by connecting with trains to Seattle."

Now, what a mistake would we not have made, had we agreed to accept the motion moved by the hon. member for Pictou ? We would have consented to an inquiry into the conduct of a man who receives the certificate of character from one who was most active in the agitation regarding the administration of the Yukon. The cloud is, therefore, dissipated upon this point, and my hon. friend need not have any anxiety with regard to the other points, for I venture to say, the more light is thrown on the subject, the more rapidly will the clouds roll away.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I have already said on another occasion. We have ordered an inquiry into the charges made upon the Yukon administration. Possibly, wrong has been done in the Yukon, and we have no intention of shielding any one. We have ordered on inquiry, which we hope will prove thorough. We have only received part of the report of the commissioner, and another part is now on its way. Again, I repeat, if the inquiry we have ordered is not sufficient, another one will be ordered, so as to have every item probed to the bottom, and every delinquent punished, if delinquents there are.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). The House will have listened with a good deal of surprise to the statements of the right hon. First Minister. I challenge in the outset his statement that my hon. friend the member for West Assiniboia abused his privilege of making this motion on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman says that it is an abuse of the privilege which a member has, on the Orders of the Day being called, to make a motion for the adjournment of the House, unless for the purpose of bringing up something of grave importance that cannot possibly wait. I will undertake to say that those who will search the parliamentary records, will find that the right hon. gentleman himself has again and again moved, under similar circumstances, the adjournment, and without half the grounds that my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had on this occasion. I had no knowledge whatever that my hon. friend was going to bring the matter he did before the House. I had not received the slightest intimation that it was to be brought up to-day, nor was I at all prepared for it; but when the right hon. gentleman says that this motion is an abuse of privilege, he is bound to produce his authority, and I will not only meet whatever authority he may bring, but will give a dozen instances in which the right hon. gentleman himself took advantage of this privilege. The right hon. gentleman has abused to a ten times greater extent the privilege of making a motion to adjourn, which is given to members in order to deal with any subject that is of importance, in their judgment. The subject does not necessarily require to be important. So long as the hon. member believes, in his own judgment, that it is his duty to submit his views on any question, the forms of the House provide that, on a motion to adjourn, he can do so.

Why does the right hon. gentleman exhibit so much heat on this occasion ? Why does he propound a rule that has no existence in the government of this House ? It is because he is extremely tender at the present moment, because he occupies a very extraordinary position on this question. He speaks in contemptuous terms of the "Times" newspaper. He says that its editor has been the subject of a hoax, because, as this debate only concluded a few days ago, it is impossible he can have been correctly informed of what took place. Does the hon. gentleman forget that this subject was brought to the notice of the House by the speech from the hon. member for Pictou and the long discussion which followed, and which weeks ago has been in the hands of the "Times" newspaper ? I do not wonder that the right hon. gentleman shrinks from the attack of his friend the "Times" newspaper. Everybody knows that it is part of the policy of that great organ of public opinion to give the Government of the day all the support and assistance it can properly give it, and the right hon. gentleman knows that never was there a party more indebted than the Government and party now in office to the London "Times" for the strong support which again and again they have received from that great organ of public opinion. The hon. gentleman knows that nothing but the strongest possible circumstances could impel the London "Times," as matters now stand, to attack him, and to attack the Government of which he is the head; that nothing but an overwhelming sense of the public importance of such an act, nothing but the strongest possible conviction on the part of that great organ of public opinion that the Government had forgotten what was due to themselves when they voted down a motion for an independ-

ent judicial inquiry into the facts that have rendered Canada notorious throughout the civilized world, could have induced them to publish such an article. Now, Sir, what information had the "Times"? They had before them the fact that, weeks ago, when challenged, when these matters were discussed and ventilated in this House, the Government—aye, and the Government supporters—refused to support a motion for a thorough investigation, but gave it the go-by, by moving an amendment stating that they were satisfied with the commission that had been issued. But that was qualified by the Government and the Government's supporters, stating that if the present investigation was not satisfactory, they would insist upon a commission, they would require such an independent—I will not say judicial, but it carries that with it—such an independent commission of inquiry as would satisfy in the fullest and most complete manner the necessities of this case. But has that been done? Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman knows, and no doubt the "Times" newspaper, with its sources of information, knows, that this very commissioner was dependent upon the Government, this man who is connected by close ties of relationship with the gentleman who is primarily responsible for the administration of the Yukon—this dependent relative of the Minister of the Interior—has himself declared that the commission with which he is entrusted is altogether insufficient. The Government had it in the very evidence published and placed in the hands of this House, this declaration by their own commissioner regretting the fact that his hands are so tied that he is unable to give that complete examination to the subject that is required, and the statement made by the commissioner himself that he has applied to the Government to enlarge his powers so as to enable him to do his duty. And yet, what does the right hon. gentleman do? Challenged as no Government in this country or any other country ever was challenged, they shrank from the challenge to have an independent judicial investigation. They could have an investigation by judges appointed by themselves, and selected by themselves, but known as men of standing and independent character. Challenged to have the conduct of several Ministers, but especially that of the Minister of the interior, who is charged with such gross incapacity and neglect and corruption on the part, at all events, of the improperly selected and badly qualified officials that he had sent into that country—they evaded that challenge by the declaration before this House and before this country, that if the present investigation was not found sufficient they would have an independent and satisfactory investigation made. And now I say that the Government, in refusing to implement that undertaking, have pleaded guilty to the indictment. That is the position in which they stand. They themselves declared that if the investigation was not found to be a complete and sufficient means of vindicating the character and reputation of this Government and the officials against charges of wrong-doing, they would see to it that means were provided of fastening crimes on those who were criminal and punishing them; that they would satisfy the country; that, to use the words of the right hon. gentleman himself, they would probe this matter to the bottom and let the full light of day in upon it. But have they done so? No, Sir. Challenged, I say, in the face of this Parliament, in the face of this country, challenged by an hon. member of this House, whose standing, position and character are second to those of no man who ever sat in this Parliament——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, Sir, that no man who ever sat in this House of Parliament has a brighter or more undimmed record than the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). And, when this blatant challenge was flung across the House, that, if anybody would take the responsibility of making a charge, that charge would be fully investigated, that hon. gentleman, having attained the standing and position in this House, this country, this Empire, which he has—for where is the man who has had more flattering communications from the present Chief Justice of England and the Attorney General of England, gentlemen on opposite sides of politics congratulating him on the distinction which the Crown has conferred upon him?—accepted this challenge of these hon. gentlemen, and said: I place at stake my position in this House; give me a judicial commission, select the judges yourself, and I will give my own time without the slightest remuneration, I will give my time and attention to establish the truth of these charges. That challenge flung down by the First Minister, was repeated in blatant terms by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). But when the challenge was taken up, these hon. gentlemen, overwhelmed with the mass of testimony that they knew could be adduced from many sources in this country, from hundreds of men of the highest character and the highest standing that would abundantly prove every charge that has been brought against these gentlemen, resorted to mere sophistry. They met this acceptance of their challenge with one of the most childish sophistries that any member of Parliament ever ventured to use in this House. "Why," they said, "who ever heard of a Minister being put on trial before judges." That was the ground taken by the hon. Minister of the

Interior, who shrank—naturally and properly shrank, knowing what he knew would be the result—from that investigation by an independent commission. And that was then taken up and echoed by the First Minister, who backed up his colleague, backed up the man who was assailed. Charged as not a man in this House has ever been charged before, the Minister of the Interior was backed up by the First Minister stating that it was inconsistent with British parliamentary practice to put the Government of a country on trial before judges. Nobody pretended to suggest such a thing. The Government were not to be put upon their trial before judges. But what was proposed was in accordance with the precedents of this House and of Parliament, again and again repeated—and that was that when a charge, a grave charge, was brought, an independent judicial commission was appointed to investigate; not to deal with the case, not to punish, not to turn the Minister out of office, but to ascertain the facts, to report those facts to Parliament, and let the Parliament deal with them. And yet there was the evasion, an evasion that could only spring from conscious guilt, that was resorted to by the Minister of the Interior, backed up by the First Minister, who found he could in that way obtain the cheers of hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, and who seem to be unwilling to part with gentlemen on the front benches, as they feared they would have to do if this commission was allowed.

Now, Sir, what have we to-day? When members of this House ventured to refer to Mr. George, the editor of the "Nugget" as a person who was acquainted with the facts and who had come from the Yukon, who had given certain information not only to the press there but to members of Parliament here, he was met with a peal of derision. The editor of the "Nugget," indeed! This is the style of man, this Yankee renegade, this is the style of person that you expect us to pay attention to and to give credence to. Why, the story was at once started that he had asked for $8,000 from the Conservative party for the purpose of maintaining him in his position to give evidence. So far as I am aware, no man connected with the Conservative party ever showed the slightest indication of having been approached. I am not aware that such a proposition was ever made, but if it was made it was treated with contempt. Not a single dollar was ever contributed, directly or indirectly, by the Conservative party or any member connected with it, so far as I am aware, in connection with the matter. But when gentlemen came here and over their own signatures made statements to members of Parliament which they had previously made in the strongest terms in the public press of the country, we felt it was sufficient justification to bring that matter to the notice of the House. Now, all that the hon. gentleman wants to clear Judge Dugas and to cover the Opposition with confusion in relation to these charges, is this magnificent evidence he has got of Mr. George, editor of the "Nugget." Why, Sir, three months ago he was a low Yankee speculator who was looking for somebody to buy him. Now he reappears on the scene, and having found there was no Conservatives prepared to invest a dollar in him, directly or indirectly, he comes as a champion of the great king of the Klondike, Mr. Alexander McDonald. I leave the hon. gentleman to infer what his inspiration is.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who bought him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not say he has been bought, but I say that hon. gentlemen opposite said that he was a purchasable commodity, hon. gentlemen opposite discredited anything he could say on the ground that he was a purchasable commodity; and if that be so, is it at all unlikely that, having met with no purchaser on the Conservative side, the king of the Klondike might possibly be induced, in a matter in which he was attacked and his right questioned to a great property that was handed over, one of the most important charges—I say is it at all unlikely that he may have been led to see himself in a somewhat different light? But when did he arrive in Vancouver? Has he the facts before him? Does he know what the member for Pictou said in reference to Judge Dugas? There is no proof of that. But there is proof that the right hon. gentleman, unable to defend himself, unable to defend his Government, and especially unable to defend the Minister of the Interior, found it was easier to defend the judges of the Supreme Court than the men sitting on the Treasury benches. That was the position. The hon. gentleman knows that Judge Dugas was never assailed as a judge. Had he been so assailed, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has given proof to the House of its being a perfectly right and legitimate thing for the highest judge in the Empire to be attacked on the floor of the House of Commons and driven out of office, as was the case with one of the most brilliant Lord Chancellors that ever occupied the woolsack in England.

Now, Sir, the first plea of my hon. friend was: You cannot appoint a commission of judges to sit in trial upon the case. Granted, but you can, if you are not afraid of obtaining independent testimony, secure any men holding high and responsible positions, holding the independent position of judges of the Supreme and higher courts of Canada, to take the evidence and to put that evidence in the hands of Parliament as their report of what they have ascertained to be the facts, and let Parliament deal with the Government. So away goes the first story. Then away goes the second, when my hon.

friend from Westmoreland shows that when Lord Westbury was Lord Chancellor, one of the most brilliant men that ever sat on the woolsack, and when he was accused of favouring his relations, accused of partiality, accused as Lord High Chancellor of England of conduct that was not becoming in a judge, and which laid him open to attack. the House of Commons took that up, and Lord Palmerston, who I presume knew as much of constitutional and parliamentary government as the right hon. gentleman does, not only allowed the attack to be made upon the Lord Chancellor of England, but allowed a resolution condemning his action to be carried, calling upon him to resign his seat. So away goes the second story. Judge Dugas, the moment he took an official position outside of his judicial character altogether, that of a member of the North-west Council, is as open to attack as the right hon. gentleman or any other man in this House. If that were not so, what would happen ? If you wanted to screen a judge from public censure and public examination of his acts in this House, you would only have to appoint him a member of the executive council, and no man in this House could say a word or move an indictment of him. Sir, that is not the doctrine of Parliament, that is not British parliamentary doctrine, that is not the practice of the Imperial Government, nor of any country where parliamentary government exists. You have chosen to take Judge Dugas out of his position as a judge, and to charge him with official duties which render him as much amenable to censure in this House, if he should deserve it, as the humblest individual in the whole country. Therefore, your second defence falls to the ground, is swept aside as a mere cobweb, brought here for the purpose of protecting gentlemen who have no argument, who are unable to justify their position, or to protect themselves from that parliamentary inquiry that is demanded in this Canada of ours, if any inquiry was ever demanded in the history of any other country. Well, Sir, what next ? We had a Minister of the Interior, that admirable Minister of the Interior who the hon. gentleman turned round and declared had endeared himself to the hearts of every Liberal by the assaults of his opponents. Well. Sir, do hon. gentlemen behind the Ministers take the ground that any crime may be committed by a gentleman on the front benches, and that he is to be taken to their bosoms as an admirable Minister the moment he is attacked for improper conduct by the Opposition in this House ?

Mr. GIBSON. Because the charges were not true.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I tell the hon. member for Lincoln that it is because he knew the charges were true, it is because the hon. gentlemen knew that their Government was gone if they granted this inquiry. It was on that ground that the London "Times" is compelled to declare that they have been badly advised when they refused an independent inquiry, demanded as every intelligent man in the British realm knows it is, that knows anything of these circumstances. The hon. gentleman brought up the question of Mr. Parnell's trial. Well, what took place ? The "Times," he says, was misled. So it was ; I admit that, but the fact that the "Times" was misled did not prevent an inquiry. When Mr. Parnell, that great man, who so long held such undisputed sway in Ireland, was attacked and assailed by the London "Times," he was not such a coward as to shelter himself behind a miserable pretext and not to immediately challenge an investigation on the floor of the Parliament of the country. The reason was that Mr. Parnell was not guilty. Therein lies the difference. Parnell could afford to challenge inquiry, because, in his conscious innocence, he knew that he was prepared to meet his opponents in open court, in the face of day, and with the strongest and ablest defence that could be adduced by anybody standing his trial. Do you mean to say that if these hon. gentlemen had felt that they were in that position, they would not have had a judicial commission now appointed and now charged with the duty of investigating this subject and probing it to the bottom ? Hon. gentlemen have not heard the last of this. The London "Times," the Great Thunderer, is weak and impotent compared with the voice of the independent electorate of Canada. These hon. gentlemen, willingly or unwillingly, will have to stand at the bar of public opinion to be tried in the light of the evidence such as has already been produced and such as will be enough, and is enough, to carry conviction, and unmistakable conviction, to the heart and conscience of every independent elector in this country who reads the evidence that is already produced. Notwithstanding the declaration of the gentlemen and the friends behind them, that if the commission was not found to be able to deal with the matter, a commission entrusted to a dependent relative of one who is connected with this transaction, to a gentleman closely connected with him, they will appoint an independent commission, the time has come when we are able to adduce evidence, and the gentleman entrusted with the commission, deplores the fact, that he is not in a position to do justice to this great question. He has reported to the Government, and he has asked the Government to so enlarge his powers, or provide for such an independent investigation, as would meet the case. I do not intend to go into the conduct of that investigation further than to say : How can hon. gentlemen opposite require more and higher and stronger testimony, as to the absolute necessity of their vindication and the vindication of the fair fame of Canada, than that which is present-

ed to them by their own officer when they charged him with a duty that he is unable to perform, when the facts, already brought out, brand the strongest asseverations of the hon. Minister of the Interior, the right hon. Prime Minister, and other hon. gentlemen who took part in this discussion, as unwarranted, and when they stand in the position that their own commissioner has declared, and the fact has been shown, that he cannot do justice to the subject? Yet, where is the commission? The commission is asked for, not by the Liberal party in the House of Commons, but by every independent Conservative that sits on the floor of the House of Commons, strengthened and aided and supported by three hon. gentlemen who would not permit their names and characters and reputations to be dragged in the dirt, as they must be, at the heels of the Government who have pleaded guilty. I say that the Government stand in this position to-day, that you have no alternative. You are on the horns of this dilemma; you must now at once appoint that independent judicial commission and give Canada the means of clearing her reputation from the foulest stigma, that by the maladministration of public affairs, has besmirched the fair fame of Canada, or be held by every independent elector of this country, guilty of everything that has been charged against you. That is the position, and I leave it for hon. gentlemen to choose whichever horn of the dilemma they please.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying indeed to the House, and, I am sure, to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to find that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) comes to the rescue of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). The first hon. member on the Opposition side of the House that has said a word in favour of the hon. member for Pictou is the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. member who brought up this motion (Mr. Davin) never said a word in reference to that hon. gentleman, and in that debate in which the hon. member for Pictou spoke 22 hours, in which he presented all the fiction that he could possibly collect, only 29 members of the Conservative party would demean themselves to vote for the resolution he moved. Where was the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when that hon. gentleman brought in his charges? Where was the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) when the hon. gentleman brought in his charges and when the division bell rang? These hon. gentlemen thought too much of their reputations to come and vote for a scurrilous lot of accusations such as those made by the hon. member for Pictou. Talk about combinations in the House; we have them—the Tupper and Tupper combination. It is the only combination on that side. When I heard the hon. leader of the Opposition speaking to-day in defence of the hon. member for Pictou, and when no other hon. member of the House attempted to do it, I thought it was much to be regretted that no other hon. gentleman was so poor as to do him reverence. The hon. member for Pictou made his second speech and ran away again. Where is he to-day? He is not in the House. He turned away from the frown of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. If the great Thunderer only knew that, after his 22 hours of speaking, on the Opposition side of the House, only 29 hon. members would so demean themselves as to support the statements that were made in the resolution and which were proved to be false before they were submitted to the House, it would not have much confidence in what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would not have said anything on the present occasion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen may laugh. They are laughing at their own shame, but they will be held responsible when the day of judgment comes. I would not have spoken, but for the statement made by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that members of the Conservative party deserted the impeachment that was made against certain Ministers of the Crown on that occasion. As one of the members of that party, I desire to say that I did not desert the party, nor did I desert the impeachment that was made on that occasion, because I believe it is right. I believe that it was one of the strongest indictments, or impeachments, ever made against Ministers of the Crown during my 21 years of parliamentary experience.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you not vote?

Mr. SPROULE. I believed that it would be impossible for any Governor General, or for his advisers, entrusted with the public administration of affairs, to ignore an impeachment of that kind. I did not think it possible that the debate could be closed so early as it was, or that it could be brought to an end by the hon. Minister of the Interior and his friends inside of the time that the division was reached. I thought there would be plenty of time, as I believed the debate would be considered of such importance that it would take two or three days at least, and I intended to speak on it. That was the reason for my being absent when the division was taken. I hold that any member in this House who rises to defend the Minister of the Interior or the Government in refusing to issue that independent commission, which would report to Parliament, is condoning offences which are regarded as most destructive of

the fair reputation of Canada. I, for one, did not consider that the Government would dare to refuse that commission, or would dare to vote it down. What is the nature of the impeachment? It is an impeachment that has few parallels even in the long history of the British Parliament, as to the enormity of the offences charged. The impeachment involves four responsible Ministers of the Crown. It is to the effect that the first of them was not only involved in it through the conduct of his own officials, but that he was involved in it indirectly by his own conduct as well. If that evidence which is already taken, holds good for anything, the allegation is made there that the late partners of the Minister were trafficking in dredging leases, in which, according to the statement of his own partner to another whom he endeavoured to get interested in it, the Minister of the Interior and the Gold Commissioner are interested in this case, although for obvious reasons their names cannot appear. If that allegation holds good, and we have nothing to prove to the contrary, then I say that the Minister is directly interested in the charges himself. And, with that charge hanging over his Ministers, the Prime Minister should not hold them in their positions one day, unless they clear themselves at the earliest possible moment. Did they make an attempt to clear themselves? Did they allow an independent commission to be appointed? No. It is a matter of surprise to me, and will ever be a matter of surprise to me, that the Governor General should retain these men as his responsible advisers with that dark cloud hanging over them, and without an effort being made on their part to clear themselves. I believe that if Lord Dufferin was here, they would not remain his advisers one week, and I am justified in that statement by the language of Lord Dufferin read to the House to-day with reference to the Pacific scandal.

Is it to be wondered at that we should feel some alarm at the condition of affairs now existing in Canada when the Government are obliged to call to their rescue the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), whose son is one charged, or, if not charged, at least connected with it in such a way—not to his discredit, because there is nothing said against him—but showing that he is indirectly an interested party. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) comes to their rescue to-day and tries to bolster up one of the most rotten acts of a rotten Government. I regarded that motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) as a motion of great importance, and to my mind it was so important that I believed the debate could not possibly be ended in such a short time. I thought it would be followed up by one of the most vigorous debates that ever took place in this Parliament, and, believing that I would have ample time before the debate closed to speak in favour of it and to vote in favour of it, I was unfortunately accidentally absent when the vote was taken. I can tell the House that I would gladly have voted for the motion of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and spoken in favour of it, had I been present. I cannot understand, and the country cannot understand, why the Ministers voted that motion down, if they were not afraid to meet the charges hanging over their heads. Surely, if there was nothing to be kept in the dark, they would themselves seek the earliest inquiry by a respectable, and responsible, and independent tribunal. In view of their action in voting that down, they stand to-day condemned before public opinion as being afraid to meet these charges. Their conduct justifies all the suspicion that either the London "Times" or any other respectable newspaper can entertain with regard to them. The conduct of the Government justifies the suspicion and belief that the administration of their officials in the Yukon was rotten from beginning to end, that these officials were men of incapacity, men of no integrity, men of no honour, men unsuited for the duties which the Minister of the Interior appointed them to discharge. In my judgment, when the time comes, the voice of the country will speak out with no uncertain sound in condemnation of the conduct of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the House with regard to that question. Sir, the last of this is not heard to-day in this House nor in the country. When the time comes that the electorate can express their verdict upon it, it will be a sorrowful day in the history of the career as politicians of these gentlemen opposite. When that day comes, they will be convicted and condemned by the people of Canada for their conduct in refusing to allow a proper inquiry into their maladministration of the Yukon.

Mr. HAGGART. I thank the hon. member from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) for the opportunity which he has afforded me in putting my opinion on record with reference to the motion of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I held the same opinion as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that there would be no vote that evening upon the question, and to put myself right before the country and before my constituents, I wish to say that I certainly should have supported and voted for the motion of the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in support of his motion, and I listened with a good deal of attention to the defence made by the Minister of the Interior, and, before this session closes, I shall take the opportunity of bringing before the House some of the statements made in reference to that matter. I intended on that occasion to give my reasons for not

being here when the vote was taken, but I none the less thank the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) for giving me the opportunity of stating that I cordially approve of the motion of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The House will no doubt accept the statement of the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Sproule and Mr. Haggart) as to how they would have voted, but they themselves will not find fault with us if we entertain the opinion that on that occasion they did not display as much zeal to record their votes as they have on other occasions. I shall not enter upon a general discussion of this question, because as has been well said by the Prime Minister, the bringing of the matter up in this form is somewhat of an abuse of the rules of Parliament. The leader of the Opposition has very strongly disputed that position, but without quoting any direct authorities to prove it, I think the common sense of hon. gentlemen should teach them that the proceeding is somewhat irregular. When a question has been debated in the House at great length, fully and exhaustively, on a substantive motion, after notice, for the purpose of bringing the question before the House, it seems to me that it would be in accordance with the judgment of almost any hon. member to say that it was not a reasonable or desirable proceeding to spring that question on the House again. No possible object could be served by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House repeating the speeches they made the other day, nor in my hon. friends on this side repeating what they said, because that is what a debate, if it took place to-day, would resolve itself into. I think the only possible purpose that could be served by raising a discussion to-day would be simply to cause a repetition of the positions taken by both sides of the House in the former debate. I do not imagine that my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) thinks that after a question of this kind has been thoroughly and exhaustively discussed in the Canadian House of Commons, and after the members of the Government have carefully and deliberately considered the question and taken a position upon it, we are going suddenly to turn round and reverse that position because an English newspaper, on what must necessarily have been a telegraphic summary of what took place, not necessarily correct, we have no means of knowing whether it was correct or not—expresses a contrary opinion. I have no desire to minimize the importance or weight of the position the "Times" newspaper occupies, and justly occupies, throughout the British Empire; but I must say most emphatically that it is not a function of the "Times" newspaper to decide the policy of this Government, especially without that full and accurate knowledge which is necessary to form an intelligent opinion. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends on the other side of the House will follow the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the intimation which he has expressed, that the distinguished personage who now occupies the position of the representative of Her Majesty in this country, is not capable of properly performing the functions of his office. If I understood the statement of the hon. member for East Grey, it was to the effect that if Lord Dufferin had occupied the position, a different and in his judgment, a more proper course would have been taken. I apprehend that this House will not approve of that suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and I fancy that the hon. gentleman himself, after consideration, will not repeat the statement which intimates that there has been anything in the conduct of His Excellency to warrant any reflection on the part of any hon. member of this House.

That which has called me to my feet more particularly is a certain phase of this question which appears constantly and regularly whenever it is discussed by any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House or in any part of the press which supports them. It is this. It will be noticeable that in all these discussions there is a vein of insinuation which seems to take it for granted that some personal charge has been made against some member of this Government; and a deliberate and determined attempt is made to create the impression that although charges have been made, an investigation of those charges has been refused. That is the attempt which has been made, and it is being made to-day. The hon. gentleman who brought this matter before the House read a precedent, but it was a precedent in a case where the most grave and scandalous charges of malfeasance in office and personal corruption were made against members of a government. The memory of the hon. gentleman is short, for it is within the memory of this House that the other day when I reached that point of the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I said: "If the hon. gentleman has any charge of that kind to make, let him make it, and we will have an investigation within 15 minutes." I repeat that statement to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By a committee of this House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I say I made that statement when the hon. member for Pictou was in the House. Sir, I cannot keep that hon. member here; it is quite impossible for me to keep him here; it is not my business to keep him here; and if there is no person on the other side of the House who is prepared to vouch for him or carry on his proceedings, his proceedings must go by default.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not my fault nor the fault of the Government. I then and there challenged him, as I had challenged the hon. leader of the Opposition when this question came up before, to make any charge of any kind reflecting on me personally or in the discharge of my duty, and I said that it would be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections within 15 minutes after the charge was made. That was the challenge I made, and I repeat it now. As I pointed out when discussing the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou, we have a studied attempt to create the impression on the minds of the members of this House, and upon people who read that resolution in the country, that a personal charge has been made when it has not been made. I brought that matter to a point by then and there challenging the hon. gentleman to make a charge, and I challenge him and his party to make it now ; and I say that if they want an investigation, they will get it, and get it in the least possible time ; and I apprehend that the result of the investigation will not be satisfactory to them. I call attention to that in order to emphasize the fact that these gentlemen do not discuss this question fairly. Whenever they make charges against officials, they mix them with insinuations against the Government. I repeat that if any charges can be made against the Government or any member of the Government, which implicate us in improper conduct of any kind, we will send the charge to an investigating committee without any delay whatever, and every possible facility will be given for the production of papers and witnesses, and everything will be done to make the investigation as thorough and complete as possible. I am unable to understand on what ground the suggestion has been made that a charge has been made against this Government or against any member of it and an investigation refused. I repudiate that suggestion. We stand prepared to investigate any charge that may be made. But the hon. gentleman has failed to take up that challenge, and I venture to say that he will endeavour to get away from it by a side wind, as has been done ever since this question was first raised.

The hon. leader of the Opposition referred to the course which had been taken by the hon. member for Pictou in staking his reputation upon the statements which were contained in his resolution, and in offering to resign his seat and politically to efface himself as a public man if he did not substantiate his statements. Sir, I marvel at the audacity of the hon. gentleman, if anything the hon. gentleman could say would surprise me or any other member of this House. The hon. member for Pictou solemnly produced his resolution, made there statement after statement, and said he would prove those statements or politically efface himself ; and here in this Chamber I proved conclusively that he had falsified the record. So that he stands convicted now of having failed to carry out the pledge he made, because if he had been prepared to carry out his pledge in good faith, he would have resigned there and then.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House laugh. I do not wonder that they laugh. I felt inclined to laugh too, when the hon. gentleman made that statement. They take it as a joke that we should consider that the hon. member for Pictou was serious when he made the proposition that he would resign. It was shown to be a joke, because when the question came up, and statement after statement which he made was shown to be false, did he have any idea of resigning or implementing the pledge which he had solemnly made to this House? Why, Sir, he did just what hon. gentlemen opposite have done ; he treated it as a joke, and if we had had an investigation, and the hon. gentleman had failed, as he would have, to make out a single substantial charge, would he then have been any more likely to resign ? Not in the least. We would have had him laughing and treating the whole matter as a joke, just as he does now. I can hardly conceive that the hon. leader of the Opposition is serious in the suggestion that this Government is taking a wrong position when it says that such statements as were made in certain portions of the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou should not be referred for investigation to a commission of judges. Is it possible that the hon. gentleman takes the position, or that any member of the House would take the position, that a charge of neglect or delay or of maladministration in the Government of the country. should be referred to a commission of judges to investigate and report. Why, it is the function of Parliament to do that. No member of any Government that respected itself, that has the least conception of the principles of the constitution under which we live would ever think of allowing a proceeding of that kind to be taken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the charge is made that a certain person, be he simply a member of Parliament or of the Government as well, did a certain thing which is alleged to be a dishonest or corrupt act, it is for Parliament to decide whether they will send that to a committee or to a judge. But no such statement has been made with regard to any member of the Government. The charges made were purely political and not personal, and I venture to say that no member of the House would suggest that political

attacks should be referred to a commission of judges for adjudication or report.

My principal object in rising was to point out again the attempt constantly made in this question to confuse the issue, and lead the public to believe that hon. gentlemen on the other side have made personal charges against members of the Government. I say they have not done so, and when they are prepared to do so, an investigation will follow in short order.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). If I had any doubt as to the propriety of the course I have taken in bringing this matter before the House, it would have evaporated the moment I heard my right hon. friend, because until I heard him speak here to-day it could never have occurred to me that the Government had determined to take the course it seems now they have decided to adopt. Of course, I saw in that debate, to which I can only refer in a very casual manner, that the Minister of the Interior seemed to think that all he had to do was to defend the actions of his subordinates, no matter how black the crimes with which they were charged, but there was a note in my right hon. friend's speech that led me to hope that the Government was fully alive to its duty. But after the speech of the right hon. gentleman to-day, I am perfectly convinced that it was the duty of any member, who feels on this matter as I do, to take the course I did in order to bring before the House the weighty article of a great journal like the "Times," and also inform the people what is the position taken by the Government in this matter. My right hon. friend began by saying that I have abused the privilege of making a motion to adjourn on the Orders of the Day being called. Does he forget that in 1891, shortly after Sir John Macdonald's death, he, under circumstances that were at that time thought wanton, moved the adjournment of the House when the Orders of the Day were called, in order to discuss the ministerial prospects of the Conservative party. And surely, when charges are made of such importance that an echo, such as that in the "Times," comes all the way across the Atlantic, that is a justification for the course I have taken. What was the defence of my right hon. friend? He resorted to the kind of defence which the Minister of the Interior nearly always makes, and which, though very clever, is but the defence of a special pleader. The Minister of the Interior thinks that if he can take the exact wording of any given charge, without having regard to the gravamen of the charge, he can get a favourable verdict. I can assure him that the conscience of the people will not be satisfied in this way.

Let me call attention to the main defence made by the right hon. First Minister. He read to us an interview with the editor of the "Nugget," in which the editor declares that no charge can be made against Judge Dugas, and the right hon. gentleman says that settles the matter. Surely I need not tell the Prime Minister, who is a lawyer, that a charge made against Judge Dugas may be provable before a commission though the greater editor of the "Nugget" tells a man in an hotel parlour, that he has a high opinion of Judge Dugas. All that the interview which the Prime Minister read with such elan and eclat proves is that Judge Dugas stands high in the estimation of the editor of the "Nugget." But a short time ago the Minister of the Interior and the whole Government stood low in the opinion of that same editor. Then, however, the editor of the "Nugget" was a person of no account, but now, when he comes forward in defence of Judge Dugas, he is a person of the greatest consequence, and his chance conversation dispels a charge made under the solemn circumstances in which that charge and others were made by the hon. member for Pictou.

Let me say with reference to my hon. friend from Pictou, who is not here to-day, that we heard a kind of ring in some of the sentences that fell from my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, as though there might be some fear in the breast of the hon. member for Pictou. Whatever any mortal man might imagine of the hon. member for Pictou, there is one thing that would never be attributed to him, and that is timidity. If there is a man in this House with moral courage, that does not know a quiver or a flaw, it is the hon. member for Pictou. I doubt if there was ever a man, not even his distinguished father, more ready to give or take fight than that same gentleman. The idea that because his business may call him to the Pacific coast, there is any fear in him, is perfectly absurd. Let me say, with reference to the language that fell from the hon. member for South Grey (Dr. Landerkin) that if, in the late debate, I did not refer to the hon. member for Pictou in the same language as did the hon. leader of the Opposition, it was because I felt, as I feel now, that it was wholly unnecessary; there is not a man in the House who does not know that what the leader of the Opposition says of the member for Pictou is true. He has been long in this House, and we know him intimately. We have met him in private and in debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite have crossed swords with him, and his public, just as his private, reputation stands absolutely without a stain. He wears on his breast the honours of his sovereign, as does the Prime Minister. He has served in great departments of government, he has been a long time a member of this House, and he says before the whole world, I make these fifty or sixty charges, and if I cannot prove them I will stand disgraced before Canada, and resign my seat and de-

clare my incapacity of ever holding office again. He put his position in the scale, and the Minister of the Interior met him in a way which was too clever by half. Well, the Minister said, his seat is not secure, because he happens to be living now on the Pacific coast. But I happen to know from the conctituents of the hon. member for Pictou that if he wishes to go back to that constituency, although he lives on the Pacific coast, he can carry it again beyond a doubt. And the idea of the Minister of the Interior saying there was not much of a gage when the member for Pictou said he would be ready to surrender his chances of again holding office, that that chance looked remote. Mr. Speaker, I remember well, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister remembers well, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) remembers well, that in the spring of 1878 there was not a bosom on the Treasury benches that did not grow with perfect confidence that when the elections came on they would sweep the country. You could not speak to a Reformer—and I knew many of them—but believed that the Conservatives were not in it, that they had no chance whatever. And there were some Conservatives who were foolish enough and wanting enough in insight to share that opinion. And, Sir, a lady that was loved and honoured, not only by Reformers but by Conservatives as well, and whose memory—she has now passed away—like :

> The action of the just
> Smells sweet and blossoms in the dust,

actually arranged for a ball to celebrate the anticipated triumph. But that triumph never came, and the invitations had to be cancelled. And, absit omen, I may tell the right hon. gentleman, and I may tell the Minister of the Interior, that there could be no clearer prognostic of defeat than the confidence in the bosom of those hon. gentlemen and—in a few of their followers—the bigheadedness. The heads of some of these hon. gentlemen, I am sure, have taxed the hatter; many of them are swelling so that, if they go on growing, they will require to be hooped. Now, the hon. gentleman read and attached great importance to what was said by the editor of the "Nugget." Here is a man whose words I am going to read, who was up there, who observed what was going on with the eye of a friend :

> For myself, I did not believe the Government knew anything of the dirt here, even if it really existed as charged, though many good friends have indignantly declared to me that it is their business to know. Since I have reached Dawson I have almost been forced to a like conclusion, and have no hesitation in declaring that if they do not take strong and speedy steps to end the orgie that is in progress here they will not only have become partners in the dirt themselves, but shall have permitted the continuance of a system which must result in very great financial and moral injury to the Dominion. I have been here now for two weeks, and have been noting and inquiring on every hand, and though I cannot yet give you facts and figures, I have seen enough to convince myself that it is worse even than the mind of an honest man can conceive. That the mining laws are being set aside on a colossal scale is beyond all question, and that barefaced bribery is the rule of the day is equally certain. But why go on? I have already told you it was high time to draw this letter to a close. And, doubtless, you have heard of the seamy side of Dawson from a number of other sources. Believe me, you can accept all you hear in that line—no matter how extravagant—as within the bounds of probability.

That is signed by R. C. Miller, and is to the editor of his own paper, the Pembroke "Observer." And where is he to-day? His voice is silenced by $1,500 a year. Now, the right hon. gentleman said of the "Times," that it had been hoaxed. But that idea has already been dispelled by the leader of the Opposition, who has referred to the fact that almost identically the same charges a month before had gone across the Atlantic. And, remember what the "Times" itself says. It says there is nothing new in the charges, and that its own correspondent had brought, generally, the same charges. So, these are not accusations made up by the hon. member for Pictou that the "Times" says should be investigated, but they are the charges made by Miss Shaw, the Klondike correspondent of the "Times." The right hon. gentleman said that the "Times" has been hoaxed as it was in the case of Mr. Parnell. But what did Parnell himself do? He demanded an inquiry, because he felt confident that he would come out of that inquiry as he did. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not want an inquiry; I do not know why. But I will not probe that too close. It is a very clever thing to take up one or two items in the charges, to take up some characteristic of the form of charges and to deal with that. But the charges themselves are numerous; and surely we are not to be told, the country is not to be told that there is no charge against the Government, that it would be nothing that the Government should take notice of, if it could be proved, that men in the employ of the Government, that trusted appointees of the Minister of the Interior, had used their official positions to feather their own nests or to rob the public. Look at the sort of charges made :

> That the Crown prosecutor, F. C. Wade, declined to act in the enforcement of the laws, ordinances and regulations of the North-west Territories.

Who first made that charge? The hon. member for Pictou? No, Sir. But one of the leaders of the Liberal party in the North-west, Mr. Bulyea. He was up there to enforce the laws of the North-west Territories in that portion of the North-west Territories; and he went to Mr. Wade, who was practically in the position of Crown prosecutor, and Mr. Wade refused to act for him. Mr.

Bulyea had to remain there. He went to one of the lawyers and asked him to act for him, and the lawyer said: I am afraid of Wade. So that Wade not only refused to act for Mr. Bulyea, but his name terrorized lawyers, so that Mr. Bulyea could get no lawyer until a lawyer came up from Victoria, and then his views were carried out. Take charges like these:

That the acting Dominion Lands agent, registrar, clerk of the court, Crown prosecutor, has accepted retainers, fees for remuneration to procure or for procuring, or attempting or promising to procure, grants or title or possession of Dominion lands and mining claim.

That an officer of the Government was guilty of blackmailing persons engaged in the sale of spirituous liquors and keeping of gambling saloons.

That Mr. Wade, while holding the position of registrar of lands, clerk of the court and Crown attorney, was financially and personally interested in the disposal of lands known as the water front.

Why, Sir, the Minister of the Interior knows well that Mr. Wade declared that he had broken the law, and broken it with the authority of the Minister of the Interior. Suppose that can be established, is that not a thing that should be inquired into? Should we not know whether Mr. Wade went to the Minister of the Interior and said to him: I am in the employ of the Interior Department, and I am in the employ of the Department of Justice—and McGregor the same—shall we take up mining claims? Should we not know whether the Minister of the Interior said: Yes, take up as many mining claims as you like. And should we not know whether the raid on Monte Christo Island, held by McGregor, actually had over it the absolving banner of the Minister of the Interior? Should we not know that? Are we to be told, for instance, because there was some slight error in taking one or two items out of the return of 1883, or because the typewriter made a mistake of "6," instead of "8," that charges of this kind are not to be inquired into, and that the public must go on doubting whether to believe that the Department of the Interior is officered by corrupt men or not? I may tell the Prime Minister that the high and lofty position taken by him of calling the "Times" a hoaxed organ, and the high and lofty position taken by the Minister of the Interior, who says the Government are not going to be directed by the "Times"—will that satisfy the country? Does the "Times" pretend to direct them? All the "Times" presumes to do is to play the part of critic. It criticised the Government, and says the Government is wrong in refusing an inquiry that will have the confidence of the Canadian people.

The Minister of the Interior said that he would not rise only for this, that there is a vein of insinuation running through the speeches and the articles in newspapers on this article. He knows well there is not. Is there any vein of insinuation in any speech I have made on this subject? Is there any vein of insinuation in any charges I have read here? The hon. gentleman, surely, is not going to take the position that, no matter what infamies an officer of his department may commit, he has no concern with it. If it be true that the Yukon is honeycombed with corruption and blackmail, that the employees of the public are an army of bandits, and he contends that that is no concern of his because a charge is not made that he himself is one of the banditti, Sir, I do not think that is a position that the people of Canada will allow any Government to take up. We will hold the Minister of any department responsible for what is done by the officers of that department, and if the officers of that department are all bad and all corrupt, and if the officers of that department in any quarter of it seem systematically to act oppressively to the people, then is that not a concern of the hon. gentleman? He knows that in his legal studies he found a maxim, "noscitur a sociis"; you know a man by the company he keeps. Surely, the people of Canada, if they are to be allowed to remain under the idea that all these officers, men like Wade, men like McGregor, men like the Walsh brothers, behaved badly up there, and that they are friends and confidants of the Minister of the Interior, how can they hold him guiltless? I think, when charges of a grave kind are made, the hon. gentleman will find that he is making a mistake, and the Prime Minister will find that this Government is making a mistake, if they take the view that the charges are of such a nature that they need not be answered, and need not be probed into, and need not be dealt with in such a manner that the people of Canada will feel that their outraged conscience has been satisfied. I have in my hand a letter from a man in a high position. I will show it to any one that likes to look at it. If I do not read the letter, it is because of a laudatory personal reference in it to myself. This gentleman gives his address in Paris, and he says that if there be any satisfactory inquiry, he will be ready to go before it, and will be ready to bring numbers of his friends to prove these very charges that have been referred to here as if they were of no consequence whatever. Sir, I do not regret, but, on the contrary, I am glad, that I brought this matter up. I thought it was better that I should bring it forward as a private member on his own responsibility, without communicating with any one. I thought that was the best thing to do, because it will show that there was no idea of making a concerted attack upon the Government, but that the sole object was to bring before this Parliament the serious position of things, when charges of this sort have been made, and a paper of the standing of the London

"Times" declares the Government of Canada has made a great mistake in refusing an inquiry.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I now rise upon a question of order. I stated a moment ago that the motion of the hon. gentleman was an abuse of the privileges of this House; and I stated that the well-understood principle of parliamentary government in this matter was, that a motion to adjourn should not be made unless to call the attention of Parliament to a matter of great urgency and public importance. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition challenged me to bring authority on this point. I have the authority in my hand. English procedure in this respect is more severe than ours. The principle was well laid down before the year 1882; the rule was then made more severe by an amendment to the rules of the House. Now, this is what May says, on page 240 of "Parliamentary Practice":

According to past usage, it was in the power of two members to move and second a motion for the adjournment of the House, rising for that purpose either whilst questions to members were being put or at any moment before the commencement of public business, and to raise thereon a general debate.

Experience impressed upon the House the necessity of placing upon that power some restrictions. Accordingly, in 1882, standing order No. 17 was passed, and the following procedure and practice have been founded thereon. A motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of raising a debate may only be made when all the questions to members upon the notice paper have been disposed of, and before the commencement of public business. The member who desires to make such motion, having previously delivered to the Speaker a notice in writing of the definite matter of urgent public importance which is to be discussed, rises in his place and asks leave to move for that purpose the adjournment of the House.

Well, our rule does not require this; it has not been amended, as the British rule has been amended. I call attention to these words, "a matter of urgent public importance." On page 241 May goes on to say:

A motion under standing order No. 17 must be restricted to a single specific matter of recent occurrence; and as the matter to be discussed must be of an urgent nature, no notice should be given of an intention to resort to the motion on a future occasion.

A matter submitted to the House in pursuance of this standing order, which fails to obtain the requisite support, cannot, during the same session, be again brought forward in the same manner; nor can more than one such motion for adjournment be made during the same sitting of the House. Though the responsibility of bringing forward a matter, as a matter of urgency, rests with the member who desires to exercise the right given by the standing order, still there must be some colour of urgency in the proposal; and the Speaker has declined to submit a motion for adjournment to the House because, in his opinion, the subject to be brought forward was not a "definite matter of urgent public importance."

Of course the Speaker has not this power with us, but the rule is the same, and a motion to adjourn the House should not be made unless it be to call the attention of the House to some matter of urgent public importance. The reason is obvious. The Order paper gives notice to Parliament, and to every hon. member, of the matters that are to be brought before the House, and if there is a matter of urgent public importance that has to be brought up, of course, it is quite allowable that such a matter may be brought up, but, otherwise, the business of the House should not be interrupted. Take the case of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He brought in a motion that it was quite within his power to bring again if he so chose, but the constitutional method of bringing that matter forward was to bring it up when the House was moved into Committee of Supply. Upon the House being moved into Committee of Supply, it would be open to him to make the motion that he made to-day, but every hon. gentleman must agree with me that the hon. gentleman had no warrant to make this motion, because it was not a matter of urgent public importance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that my right hon. friend quite misunderstood me. I did not challenge him to produce an authority from the British House of Commons for the position that he took, that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) was abusing his privilege in making this motion. I had reference entirely to the rules of this Parliament, and I said that, if my right hon. friend would adduce an authority for his statement, that this was an abuse of parliamentary privilege on the part of the hon. member, I would undertake to produce a dozen instances in which my right hon. friend had himself committed that abuse of parliamentary privilege. While the right hon. gentleman has shown that, in the British House of Commons they have guarded this privilege by greater restrictions than exist here, he has not said anything to indicate that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) was at all abusing his privilege. In fact, if we had the practice of the House of Commons of Great Britain, instead of our own, all that would be necessary for the hon. member for West Assiniboia would be to inform Mr. Speaker of the subject that he intended to bring up. It would be a very difficult thing for any hon. gentleman, on either side of the House, to bring up a more urgent public matter than that which has been discussed on the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has referred to me as having been guilty of an abuse of this

privilege. I am not conscious of it. I do not remember that I ever moved the adjournment of the House, except once, after the death of the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, to call the attention of the House to the new Government that had been formed. I was obliged to move that motion because the Government did not offer me an opportunity of bringing the matter up on going into Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to call attention to the fact that the course that the right hon. gentleman took on that occasion is remarked as an exception to the English rule in Bourinot's "Parliamentary Practice." This work says that motions for the adjournment of the House:

——are not unfrequently proposed in the Canadian Commons with the view of bringing before it some question in which a member is immediately interested, and which he believes should be explained by himself with as little delay as possible. Consequently we find they have been sometimes made for the purpose of giving a positive denial to certain charges made against members. In 1878 a member brought to the notice of the House, on such a motion, that certain Dominion officials were taking part in the provincial elections in Quebec. In 1891 Mr. Laurier initiated in this way a long debate on the formation and policy of the new Administration, formed on the death of Sir John Macdonald, Premier of the Ministry, consequently dissolved ipso facto.

I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) might very well contend that the matter which he brought up was of the same public importance as the matter which the right hon. gentleman brought up on that occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking to the question, referred to the Canadian "Parliamentary Practice." The rule that was quoted by the right hon. leader of the Government is not exactly the same as that which governs our conduct in this House, as outlined by Dr. Bourinot, who says:

Motions for the adjournment of the House or of the debate are generally made in the Canadian Houses in the course of a discussion, in order to give an opportunity to members who have already spoken to speak again, or to make certain explanations which, otherwise, they might not be able to make. Substantive motions for the adjournment of the House ought to be reserved for occasions when it is necessary to discuss questions of gravity.

It says "ought." It does not say "they are."

They are not unfrequently proposed in the Canadian Commons with the view of bringing before it some question in which a member is immediately interested, and which he believes should be explained by himself with as little delay as possible. Consequently we find that they have been sometimes made for the purpose of giving a positive denial to certain charges made against members.

Showing plainly that this has been often resorted to for the purpose of allowing private members to go into explanations of matters of special importance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps the House will not accept my view of the question, but, nevertheless, I may be allowed to express my opinion. As the motion for the adjournment of the House has been disposed of, there is, properly speaking, no point of order raised now, because there will be no use in me declaring that the motion, so disposed of, was in or out of order. I find in Bourinot, page 415, the following case, where, probably, such a motion as the one which was brought up to-day, would not be absolutely in order:

But even this practice, which is liable to abuse, has its limitations. No member will be permitted, on such a motion, to discuss an order of the day or a notice of motion on the paper, or a motion which was dropped owing to a count-out or what has taken place in a former debate.

This question, as I understand it, has already been discussed before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I mean the Yukon charges.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the "Times" article, and it has not been discussed before.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not say that the motion was entirely out of order, but certainly these motions should not be brought up except in very special cases.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) a question. In answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), the hon. Postmaster General stated that he had seen fit to dispense with the services of the postmaster of Humberstone, Ont., owing to the fact that the post office was carried on in the premises owned by the then postmaster, where he conducted a general business. I beg to ask the hon. Postmaster General if orders have been issued by his department stating that, in respect of every post office conducted in a general store, the postmaster's services must be dispensed with; if such orders have been circulated amongst the postmasters throughout the Dominion, and if the services of a postmaster will be dispensed with, whom I can name, who carries on a general business in the same place as the post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), I beg to say, as to his first question, that no instructions, such as he indicates, have been issued. As to the second question, every case has to be considered upon its own merits.

THE WEST HURON AND BROCKVILLE ELECTIONS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would wish to inform the right hon. the leader of the Government that when motions are called tomorrow, I will move :

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery be ordered to attend at the opening of this House on the following day with all poll-books, voters' lists and all other papers, letters, documents and memoranda which may have been transmitted to him by the respective returning officers, or which may otherwise be in his possession relating to the last election for the electoral district of Brockville, and to the last election for the electoral district of the west riding of the county of Huron.

I will do that for the purpose of following that motion up, if it should pass, by a further motion that these documents shall be read and be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for the purpose of inquiring into and investigating the conduct of the respective returning officers, and of the several deputy returning officers at and in connection with each of the said elections ; with power to send for persons and papers and records and to report thereon with all convenient speed. I thought it was desirable, if it is in order, to bring the matter up in this way, and to give the Government notice of the motion. I do so accordingly.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a return brought down on the 23rd of this month, in answer to an order of the House, with reference to correspondence between parties at Grand Narrows and others and the Department of Railways on the subject of leasing a piece of land. I notice the Minister of Railways is not here, but I will continue my reference. I find the papers are not complete. I find a letter addressed to the engineer at Moncton by the General Manager, dated the 26th of October, 1897, which appears to be the first document among these papers, and it proceeds to say :

Dear Sir,—At Grand Narrows allow a man named McNeill, under lease, to erect a building on the railway property alongside the platform, &c.

There is no correspondence previous to that among the papers, and I am aware there was communication between the applicants for the property and others for them and the Minister of Railways, and also by other parties on behalf of the applicant, among whom was the hon. the Premier of Nova Scotia. There is none of that correspondence here which took place previous to the date I mentioned. In further evidence of that there is a letter of the applicant dated December 31st, 1897, saying that he made "application to the Government over two years before that date for a piece of land, &c." This application is not among the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day, I call the attention of the Postmaster General to Return 105-D, in which I asked for correspondence in re the quality of postcards. I am not sure whether the word "correspondence" would cover resolutions of boards of trade, but I think it would. I meant it for that at least, and I would like the Postmaster General to supplement the return by some resolutions of the boards of trade transmitted to the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would think that any expression of opinion would be covered by that order. But the hon. gentleman may not be aware of what I learned in the department—I think, speaking from memory, that this order had to do with postcards printed under the contract made by the present Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was a misapprehension. The late contractor furnished some postcards that were probably issued during the regime of the present Government, and it may be that these resolutions had to do with postcards printed under the old contract.

Mr. FOSTER. When they are brought down, we will see.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They would not in themselves indicate that.

SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 169) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1899, and the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Bill considered in committee, read the third time, and passed.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of (Mr. Mulock) for the second reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. ALEX. McNEILL (North Bruce). Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible in the observations which I have to make to the House in reference to this

matter. In view of the very full discussion which the measure has had, I probably would not have said anything on the subject, had it not been for certain observations which were made in reference to myself and my own constituency by the hon. gentleman who has charge of this measure. Before saying anything on the question immediately before the House, I should like to make one observation in reference to a remark that fell from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) last night. I do not very often take notice of what falls from that hon. member; but this observation I do not feel that I should allow to go without comment. After having described the Redistribution Bill of 1882 as a monstrous and disgraceful measure, the hon. member thought fit to say that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was a very fit instrument to carry out a measure of that kind. I just wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Mackenzie Bowell is, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the people of Canada, and in the opinion of the fair-minded men, the respectable men, of the Liberal party, as honourable and straightforward a man as is to be found in public life in Canada, or in the public life of any other country to-day; and I do not feel inclined to allow an observation of that kind, even coming from such a source as it did, to pass unchallenged in this House.

With regard to the measure we are about to discuss, we are met, Mr. Speaker, on the very threshold by the fact that it is a new departure. This is the first occasion on which any party in Canada has set about a delimitation of the constituencies and a redistribution of seats immediately before, in place of after, the decennial census. This is not merely a measure for the delimitation of some constituencies, but it is also a measure for the redistribution of the representation. It creates new constituencies, it gives additional members to constituencies, and it abolishes some constituencies that now exist. I say this is an absolutely new departure. Attempts have been made, by reference to measures which have been introduced from time to time, to show that something of this kind has been done previously, at a time not contemplated by the constitution; but, as was shown conclusively, I think, in the most lucid and able statement in reference to that matter—if I may presume to say so—which was made by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), all those measures which were referred to, as explained, at all events, by those who introduced them at the time, were measures for the purpose of explaining ambiguities or correcting clerical errors in measures which had been passed at the time recognized by the constitution. If any of those measures went any degree further than the hon. members who had charge of them at the time explained that they did—though I am not prepared to say that they did go further—the changes they made were insignificant; whereas this is a great measure of change, an absolutely new departure.

Now, I think it is admitted on all sides that the constitution contemplates, so far as the provinces are concerned, that the redistribution shall be made on a basis of population, and that it shall only be made when measures have been taken to discover what the population is. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this measure says that the Liberal party have always agreed that, as between provinces, the representation should be based upon population; but he says they have never admitted that that principle applies to counties or to constituencies. Now, the very basis of our representative system is population. Every election which takes place for a member of this House is based upon the principle that those who represent the greater number, and not those who represent the less number, shall have seats in this Chamber. That is the very root of our representative system—representation by population. I want to know on what principle you say that the province with the larger population shall have a greater representation in this House than the smaller province, and refuse to say that the county with the larger population shall have greater representation in this House than the county with the smaller population. There is no distinction. If the contention be right as regards the one, it is right as regards the other. The basis upon which the redistribution of seats, as between province and province, is effected under the constitution is the basis of population; and, in so far as the hon. gentleman asks the House to agree to a measure for a delimitation of constituencies and a redistribution of seats in the dark, so far as this essential element of population is concerned, he asks the House to do something which is absolutely inconsistent with the principles which lie at the basis of the constitution of this country. The hon. gentleman, I say, asks this to be done in the dark. He says the judges are to exclude every ray of light with regard to change of population. He says they are not to take into consideration the population of to-day at all. They are to do justice, he says. He carries justice in his right hand with regard to this measure, and the judges are to do justice as to the condition of things to-day without knowing what the population of to-day is. They are to shut their eyes to any information which they may have as to the population of to-day, and they are to deal with this matter on the basis of the population of 1891. Was there ever a more preposterous proposition? If the hon. gentleman were consistent, he would say that they should go back to 1881, and deal with the matter on the basis of the population then, when this iniquity of which he complains was perpetrated. But to say that they are to go back and take the population of 1891, and shut their eyes to the many

changes which have taken place in population since that time, seems to me to be absolutely contrary to common sense, as well as a violation of the meaning and intent of the constitution. Now, the hon. gentleman has not only violated the principle which lies at the basis of population—and I am not speaking of technical points at all—but he asks us to accept a new principle, which is utterly bad and mischievous. I say that the principle which he asked us to introduce, namely, that any Government or any party in power which believes that the arrangement of the constituencies, for the time being, is not sufficiently satisfactory to it, shall have leave, whenever it pleases, to tear the constituencies to pieces, is a principle which, if you accept it by establishing this precedent, can only be viewed with dismay by any one who has at heart the welfare of our democratic institutions. If you can tear constituencies to pieces to-day because some friends of the Government in western Ontario are not satisfied with the arrangement of the constituencies in that section, you can tear them to pieces to-morrow in any other section because some other friends of the Government are not satisfied with their arrangement.

Mr. BERGERON. You can rearrange them every year.

Mr. McNEILL. As my hon. friend says you can go on rearranging them every year. Every year the party in power may tear to pieces the constituencies and rearrange them to suit themselves. What would be the result? If one party does this, the other party will do it, and the result will be that while we have the opportunity given to us, by the interval of ten years between these rearrangements, of allowing the vexations and the heart-burnings which are produced by legislation of this kind to be forgotten and all the bitter feelings to be assuaged, if you, on the other hand, allow this rearrangement to go on constantly, you will produce such a feeling of irritation and bad blood between the two sides of the House that we shall have a condition of things with reference to this matter much worse than has ever obtained in Canada before.

Nothing could be more mischievous. The measure of 1892, was, in the main, a moderate measure. I do not think that any one on the other side will venture to say anything else. It showed that the Government of the day were ready to accept moderate counsels, and I am free to admit that, in so far as this measure recognizes the establishment of an impartial tribunal, it is a step in the right direction. But while admitting this, I am sorry to see that the hands of the tribunal are tied, as they are by this measure, and of course I cannot fail to recognize the many cruelties and injustices that it sanctions. In so far as it does recognize the principle of an impartial tribunal, it is a step in the right direction. But all that has been done by those on both sides of the House who urged moderation and who have caused this advance to be taken in the right direction, will be lost and undone if the root principle of this measure is accepted, namely, that any party in power can, whenever they think that the constituencies are not sufficiently favourably arranged to suit themselves, set to work to alter the constituencies when and how they please. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I will call attention to this fact, that while hon. gentlemen opposite claim by this measure to redress the grievances that were inflicted in 1881 or 1882, they are interfering with two constituencies, the constituencies of East and West York, which were certainly not gerrymandered in 1882 and to which, therefore, that plea cannot apply.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). East York was.

Mr. McNEILL. East York was not, so far as I know.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A part of East York was.

Mr. McNEILL. West York was not anyhow, and that constituency is deliberately interfered with, although the hon. gentleman says his object was simply to redress the grievances that were inflicted in 1882.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. member for West York desires his riding to be left as it is, putting into Toronto what belongs to Toronto, it seemed fit when parts of the county were taken away——

Mr. WALLACE. Why was not that principle recognized in Ottawa city?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am addressing myself to my hon. friend from North Bruce. When we had to interfere with any county at all, it was thought wise and fair to leave the whole county to the judges; but if a fairer proposition is submitted, it will receive every consideration.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that when it was necessary to interfere with the county it was right to leave it to the judges. But I say it was not necessary to interfere with that county at all. The hon. gentleman has deliberately assailed the constituency of the hon. member for West York without a shadow of an excuse that I can see. That constituency is now as it has been for the last forty or fifty years. It may be that at some time or other a change should be made, but the hon. gentleman has to show some special reason for a change being made at present. It is only because of some special reason that he can even pretend to justify bringing in the measure at all. What is the urgent reason for interfering with the constituencies of West York and East York? I take it that the urgent reason is that the

country shall be deprived of the services of two of the most useful members of this House, and that gentlemen who would be prepared to vote for the Yukon Railway deal or the Drummond Railway deal or to burk the Yukon inquiry, shall be substituted in their place. That, I presume, is the reason for that interference. Then these gentlemen say that they promised to introduce a measure of this kind, and we have been told, over and over again, that the people have called on them to introduce this measure and are in favour of it. Will these gentlemen say that they pledged themselves to their constituents that they would introduce a measure of this kind just before the taking of the census instead of just after it? I do not think so. I do not think that any such statement was ever made. If they made a pledge, it would be understood by those whom they addressed as meaning that they would do this thing at the time when it ought to be done. I just wish to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that his original proposal would have deprived some 35,000 or 40,000 people of those constituencies of East and West York of their franchise by putting them into the city of Toronto, where their franchise would be practically valueless, so far as giving effect to their political inclinations is concerned. I think there is another reason why one member, at all events, of the Government should have held his hand and should have refused to allow a measure of this kind to be introduced at the present time. I mean the Minister of Justice. I think it was, to say the least of it, a very unchivalrous thing to have a measure of this kind introduced at the present time in order to strike down the gentleman who defeated him fairly in his constituency in a fair contest at the last election.

Now, I will just say a word with regard to what, I may say, was an unexpected, and, I venture to think, an unprovoked attack that was made upon me the other day by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) who has charge of this measure. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that for seventeen years consecutively I have had the honour of a seat in this House. The hon. gentleman is very angry at that. And he cannot avoid having a fling, in passing, at what he is pleased to designate as the "great orations" which I have embalmed upon "Hansard." Mr. Speaker, the phraseology is, perhaps, a little peculiar, but, no doubt, the sneer, is well deserved. I do not hope, I do not presume, to emulate, Mr. Speaker, those graceful and eloquent periods with which the hon. gentleman is wont to ravish our senses and set our hearts aglow. But I will venture to say—and I hope I am not guilty of an impropriety in saying it—that during these seventeen years I have not been distinguished in this House for want of fairness to my political opponents. And, out of it—would it be ungenerous if I were to remind the hon. gentleman that the very last occasion before this Parliament met, when I attempted, in my humble and ineffectual way, to address a public audience, was on the occasion when I travelled from Wiarton to Toronto in order to bear public testimony to what I considered the service the hon. gentleman had done for the country in reference to Imperial penny postage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) allow me?——

Mr. McNEILL. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) would not wish to interrupt me. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. gentleman desires to be specially unfair to me. I think it is merely that the kindly courtesy and genial good nature with which the hon. gentleman has made us, perhaps, too familiar in this House has been overborne for the moment by that fine sense of justice for which he is so distinguished, and which has induced him, constrained him, forced him, to introduce this measure at this unseemly time and has constrained him to redress an inequality in the distribution of population in the county of Bruce made in 1882, which his own figures show to have been redressed by the course of events in 1892. That sense of justice also has constrained the hon. gentleman to describe as a gerrymander the detaching from the north riding of Bruce of a village situated five miles away from it, embedded in the territory of the west riding, unapproachable except through the west riding of that county. Therefore, I say, I do not suppose it is any desire on the part of the hon. gentleman to be unfair to me. I suppose it was the same sense of justice which compelled the hon. gentleman, when I said that I would be satisfied to have any of the judges come into the county of Bruce and say whether it was fairly divided for Dominion electoral purposes, to say that I could make a virtue of necessity. The hon. gentleman knows what my position in reference to this question has been. But I suppose there are members of this House now present who do not know; and I shall therefore, I am afraid, be obliged to ask the indulgence of the House while I read from the official report what my position in reference to this matter has been. After saying that if it were left to members on either side of the House to make these divisions, we never could arrive at a conclusion as to what was fair or not fair, because one side would declare to be a fair division what another side would consider unfair, I said:

I think we require to get a tribunal which is independent of politics; we want a tribunal which will take this matter up and deal with it in such a manner that both the public and members of this House will have confidence in its decision. I was not in the House when the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) dealt with this

matter, but he told me afterwards what he had said with respect to it. I had some conversation with him, in which I suggested the appointment of a commission composed of our judges; but he was opposed to that suggestion, and brought forward a very forcible and strong objection, namely, that as our judges have so much political work thrown on them at present, a danger would arise if more work were thrown upon them lest, however fairly they might discharge their duties, they might be discredited in the eyes of the public. That is undoubtedly a grave and serious objection, but whether it is sufficiently grave and serious to overweigh the objection to any other scheme that may be proposed, I am not prepared to say. Johnson was in the habit of saying that objection might be taken to a vacuum and a plenum, but one or other must be true. It is not sufficient to take objection, but it must be shown that there is more serious objection to one proposal than to another proposal submitted. But if it be that we are afraid to trust our judges, or that we are afraid of discrediting them, then let us secure the services of judges from some other part of the Empire, who would not be in any way under suspicion in the minds of the people in regard to this matter.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, that being my position, and the hon. gentleman knowing that to be my position, thought it was worthy of an honourable opponent to throw the taunt across the floor of the House—when I said I would be satisfied with any of our judges—that I could make a virtue of necessity. I think that the hon. gentleman's sense of what is just is, perhaps, not exactly what would commend itself to the people of this country.

Now, the hon. gentleman has accused me of gerrymandering the north riding of Bruce in 1892, inasmuch as I asked that the village of Port Elgin should be detached from North Bruce and left in the riding to which it belonged. The hon. gentleman has charge of this measure, he is a Minister of the Crown, he is responsible for the measure—and I want to ask him on his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown and as the Minister who has charge of this measure, which is referred to in the Speech put into the mouth of His Excellency at the opening of Parliament, whether he is prepared now to rise in his place and tell this Parliament that it was improper at that time to take the village of Port Elgin out of the north riding of Bruce, to detach it from the north riding of Bruce and leave it in the west riding, in which it was situated.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). If the hon. gentleman refers to my speech, I ask him how he could consistently press for the return of Port Elgin in the township of Saugeen on the ground that it was separated from North Bruce by a portion of Saugeen, when, at the same time, he supported a similar condition of affairs in the case of North Bruce, namely, the separation of East and West Flamborough from the south part of the north riding of the county of Wentworth and Brant? There is an inconsistency. If the hon. gentleman was consistent—that was my argument—he would not have supported or permitted to remain upon the statute-book a similar condition of affairs in regard to the other riding.

Mr. McNEILL. Now, I want to ask the hon. gentleman to answer my question. He said that I had gerrymandered the north riding of Bruce by asking that the village of Port Elgin be detached from it and left in the riding of West Bruce to which it belongs. I am not talking of Wentworth, we will deal with Wentworth when we come to it. But I am dealing with the charge the hon. gentleman brought against me in his speech. He said nothing about Wentworth till I rose and explained about Port Elgin. He charged me with having gerrymandered North Bruce by asking that the village of Port Elgin be taken out of it. I want to ask him now—he is a lawyer and understands this very well—whether he is prepared to rise in his place and say that it was improper to take Port Elgin out of North Bruce and leave it in West Bruce?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say that I do not believe the hon. gentleman removed Port Elgin from North Bruce to South Bruce for the purpose of equalizing population because——

Mr. McNEILL. That is not an answer to my question at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, the hon. gentleman may finish his speech, and I will answer him.

Mr. McNEILL. No, I ask the hon. gentleman now if he dare rise in the House and say, on his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, that he considers it was improper to take Port Elgin out of North Bruce and leave it in West Bruce?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman give us his reasons for taking it out, and I will explain what——

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is afraid to answer the question. I will give the hon. gentleman now another opportunity, perhaps he may be a little more courageous. I will ask the hon. gentleman whether he is prepared to rise in his place and say that it was not eminently right and proper to take that village out of the north riding?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish my sentence, then I will answer him. I think that in 1882, it was improper to have removed the township of Saugeen, which includes Port Elgin, from North Bruce. The population of North Bruce was already below the unit, and the removal of Saugeen reduced it from about 20,000 to 18,000; and

its addition to West Bruce increased the disproportion, giving West Bruce nearly 6,000 of a population greater than North Bruce. I believe it was stated in the House at that time; I believe Mr. Blake charged that the hon. gentleman had something to do with that suggestion—I am not aware whether it was true or not.

Mr. McNEILL. That is quite true; I stated so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then the hon. gentleman is responsible for the gerrymander of North Bruce by the Act of 1882, that reduced from 20,000 to 18,000 the population of North Bruce, and increased the disproportion between the adjoining ridings. I think that the township, including the town, should have gone into North Bruce. For ten years the difference existed. The hon. gentleman having obtained a seat in Parliament, in 1891, after his majority fell to 31, he pressed and secured the return of Port Elgin to West Bruce. I think it was improper to have detached a portion of a municipality such as Port Elgin from West Bruce. But the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that it was done; and it was followed by a motion by the hon. member then representing South Brant, at present Minister of Customs, that the whole township of Saugeen, including the village, should be made part of North Bruce. But that was not permitted, and it was the Government majority of the day that prevented Saugeen, with the village of Port Elgin in it, being made part of North Bruce. That should not have happened, a portion of the municipality in that way should not have been separated from the county and attached to North Bruce. But the hon. gentleman's party violated that principle in several cases, in the case of North Wentworth and Brant, notably. In the case of North Ontario they detached Scugog and made it necessary for the people of Scugog, in order to vote, to travel through another riding. The point I am making against the hon. gentleman is that he was wrong in the case of North Bruce, and he had redress, but he did not see any wrong in the case of North Wentworth and Brant, nor of North Ontario. I say if he was acting from conviction and principle all round, he would have administered the same measure of justice to these other ridings that he insisted upon securing for his own.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say before six o'clock, that the hon. gentleman has not attempted to answer the question I put to him. I shall repeat it after six, to see if he has found new courage after dinner.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to elicit from my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mulock) an answer to a very simple and straightforward question. I asked the hon. gentleman whether he was prepared to rise in his place in this House, and, on his responsibility as Minister of the Crown in charge of this measure, say that it was not eminently right and proper that the village of Port Elgin should have been detached from the north riding of Bruce in 1892 and declared to belong to the west riding of Bruce, in which it is situated. I asked the hon. gentleman to answer that question; I gave him an opportunity to do so. The question could have been answered in one or two words. The hon. gentleman made a speech on the subject; I did not interrupt him, but I allowed him to finish it. In that speech the hon. gentleman did not venture to say that it was not eminently just and right that the village of Port Elgin should be detached from the north riding of Bruce. The hon. gentleman did not venture, on his responsibility as a Minister, to say that it was not eminently right and just to do this, although he did charge me with gerrymandering the riding, or being a party to the gerrymandering of the riding, when I asked that Port Elgin should be declared to belong to the constituency in which it is situated. Now, I want to ask the hon. gentleman another question, because it would seem that there is some confusion in his mind or in mine. I want to ask him whether he withdraws the charge that I was guilty of being a participator in a gerrymander in 1892, when I asked that the village of Port Elgin should be detached from the north riding of Bruce and declared to belong to the west riding of Bruce, in which it is situated. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he says now that I was guilty of being a participator in a gerrymander, when I asked that that should be done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would prefer it, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) would make his own speech, but, since he desires me to give my view on the point, I will do so. I myself am of the opinion that no riding should be broken up into parts, with pieces of other ridings intervening, and that it is proper that all portions of the riding should be in contact. That is my view, and I think the hon. gentleman

would have been perfectly justified in detaching Port Elgin from North Bruce, if, at the same time, he had insisted upon applying that same principle of restoring to other ridings territory removed in departure of that view. What I am complaining of in this case is, that he is inconsistent, inasmuch as, when he saw an abuse which injured him, he had it redressed, but he did not see an abuse when it injured the Liberal party, and so he supported a measure which redressed the abuse in his own case, and at the same time created an abuse against the Liberal party in the case of North Wentworth and Brant.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman withdraws the charge of gerrymandering. The hon. gentleman says that it was an abuse which I was having redressed, and if it was an abuse I was having redressed, he cannot say that it was a gerrymander. Let us have that clearly understood. The hon. gentleman has changed his ground entirely.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. McNEILL. He withdraws the charge of gerrymandering, and he now says I was guilty of inconsistency. I want it clearly understood by the House and by the country that the hon. gentleman, having from his place in this House charged me with having gerrymandered the north riding of Bruce in 1892——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And in 1882.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not speaking of 1882; I am coming to 1882. The hon. gentleman should not interrupt me in that way. He is too old a parliamentarian not to know that it is an improper interruption. The hon. gentleman, having charged me with gerrymandering the riding in 1892, now withdraws that charge.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not withdraw it.

Mr. McNEILL. He does not withdraw it? He says that I corrected what was improper at that time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman——

Mr. McNEILL. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to interrupt; I have given him every latitude. He has made his speeches here without interruption. He has distinctly stated that I corrected an abuse, and, though he says that I corrected that abuse, he is not prepared to say that he withdraws the charge of gerrymandering. Does the hon. gentleman say that one can be correcting an abuse and gerrymandering at the same time? He refuses to withdraw the charge of gerrymandering, although he says I was correcting an abuse. The hon. gentleman cannot impose upon the good sense of this House and of the country in that way. The hon. gentleman stands here convicted of having brought a charge against me which he cannot substantiate, and which he is practically obliged to withdraw. Not being able to substantiate the charge that I was guilty of something which was improper and unworthy, he now says that at the very moment I was doing this thing, I was correcting an abuse.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And creating one, too.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says I was creating an abuse in North Bruce.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In North Wentworth.

Mr. McNEILL. There was an abuse in North Bruce. That is at the time I was having the village of Port Elgin withdrawn from North Bruce. I think it is unworthy, when we find a mistake brought to the knowledge of the hon. gentleman in regard to a colleague who has sat with him in this House for seventeen years, that he will not, like a man, get up and say: I was mistaken; I am sorry I was mistaken; I am sorry I brought such a charge; I admit that the hon. gentleman was correcting an abuse, and I withdraw the charge. The hon. gentleman will not do that in words, although he has admitted the fact. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he could not venture to say in this House that it was not eminently right and proper that the village of Port Elgin should be withdrawn from the north riding of Bruce at that time, because he knows that if he did say so, he would say that he approved of the village of Port Elgin being left in the north riding of Bruce, when his own colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, described it as an evidence of an iniquitous gerrymander to leave it there. In 1892, when this matter was up in the House, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that it was an iniquitous gerrymander to put the village of Port Elgin into the north riding of Bruce. I should like to know if the village of Port Elgin gave a majority of eighty-eight in my favour, what the hon. gentleman would have said about it? I venture to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) and those beside him, would have pointed to it as the most flagrant instance of gerrymander in the Dominion of Canada; and the hon. gentleman would have made the welkin ring with his denunciations of the gerrymander which was being perpetrated and continued in the north riding of Bruce, because the village of Port Elgin was there. But because the village of Port Elgin gives a Reform majority, and gives, therefore, a better chance to the Reform candidate in the north riding of Bruce, the hon. gentleman is prepared to reprove

me for not leaving the village of Port Elgin in the north riding of Bruce.

Mr. TOLMIE. Would the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) allow me to ask him a question? If it can be proven to you that the west riding of Bruce has 2,000 more population than the north riding, would you have any objection to putting Port Elgin back in your riding?

Mr. McNEILL. I most certainly would have an objection to arranging population by going into another constituency and picking up a village five miles away.

Mr. TOLMIE. Why did you not raise that objection before?

Mr. McNEILL. I was not in the House when it was done in 1882.

Mr. TOLMIE. Oh, you were not.

Mr. McNEILL. No, and I could not raise the objection. The question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tolmie) is a good example of the view which is held by his friends in this House in regard to this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tolmie) thinks it is perfectly right to go away five miles into another constituency, and pick out a village there to balance the population, and give a majority in favour of the Reform candidate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) allow me to ask him a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking now, and the hon. gentleman can ask me the question later on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want to ask——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot have all these interruptions. I must apologize to the House for taking up so much of its time on a mere personal matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not only complaining of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) having accused me of gerrymandering the riding at that time—a charge which he has now been obliged to withdraw; and he has been afraid to rise in his place and say that what I did at that time was anything else than eminently right, and proper—I am not only complaining of that, but I am complaining that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) said that I not only gerrymandered the riding, but that I did it in a hypocritical manner, and I object to that a great deal more than to his statement that I gerrymandered the riding, bad as is the first charge. Here is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) says about me:

He was afraid to face the music again with that majority of only 30, and something else had to be done. Saugeen could not be detached, but there was a municipality that had been showing up badly so far as the hon. gentleman was concerned. There was the little town of Port Elgin, which, in the year 1891, had given a Liberal majority of 88, it was in my hon. friend's constituency. Now, if Port Elgin could by hook or by crook be detached from North Bruce it might save the hon. gentleman once more; and then, in 1892, for the first time, he argued about the importance of equalizing the population, and to that end he detaches the small village of Port Elgin from North Bruce and puts it into West Bruce, because at that time North Bruce had become slightly more populous than West Bruce.

There is not only the imputation, but the distinct charge made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock), that when I asked that the village of Port Elgin should remain in the constituency to which it belongs, I pretended that I was doing so merely in order to equalize the population. What are the facts? I will ask the indulgence of the House while I read what I said at that time, and the House can then judge as between me and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock):

Before passing away altogether from this matter I would like to make one remark with regard to this village of Port Elgin, of which we have heard so much, and which my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) seemed to think it was such an improper thing to interfere with. That, I do think, is another example of how hard it is for men who are influenced by party considerations to take a fair view of any political question. The facts with regard to the village of Port Elgin are these: Port Elgin is in the township of Saugeen, and is miles away from the north riding of Bruce, entirely surrounded by foreign territory, and the riding of North Bruce has the larger population of the two ridings. I quite admit—and I do not conceal the matter for a moment—that I am very glad to get rid of Port Elgin, very largely because there is a majority against me there.

Was that pretending that I was doing this simply in order to equalize population, or was not it frankly stating to the House what my views were:

I ask my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who is a fair-minded man, whether it is right and proper that I should be forced to go five miles out of my constituency into a foreign territory and take a village belonging to my friend from the west riding of Bruce to give a majority of 88 against me? I do not think it is fair, and I think that any hon. gentleman who argues in favour of Port Elgin being left in North Bruce is arguing in favour of a gerrymander.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Read the next line.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall:

Mr. LAURIER. Let us wipe out all the blemishes of the Act of 1882.

Mr. McNEILL. We will do it by degrees.

That is the statement I made to the House at the time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) accused me of having pretended here that I asked the village of Port Elgin to be removed from the north riding of Bruce merely upon the ground of equalization of population. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) think that is fair? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) think that that is worthy? Does the hon. gentleman think it is a fair thing for him to hold up a colleague of his in this House to the odium of the House and odium of the country under circumstances such as these? There is the statement that I made to the House, and there is the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock), and I will leave it to the House and to the country to decide which is the ingenuous and which is the disingenuous statement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has spoken of Wentworth in this connection. With regard to Wentworth, when the hon. gentleman says that the redistribution of that county was parallel with the leaving of the village of Port Elgin in the west riding of Bruce, he makes a statement which is not borne out by the facts. There was no breach of continuity of the riding in the case of Wentworth. It is quite true, as I understand, one had to follow a roundabout way to go from one part of the riding to the other; but there was no breach of continuity. In the case of Port Elgin, there is an absolute breach of continuity. It is entirely surrounded by foreign territory, and it is impossible to get to the village at all without passing through territory not belonging to the riding. Therefore, the two cases are not parallel. I am not prepared to say that there were no blemishes in the Act of 1892, but I do say that the Act of 1892 was on the whole a moderate measure and a great step in advance. And as such I supported it. I do not think any hon. member who was in the House at the time, and whose opinion is worth anything, will deny that it was a moderate measure.

The hon. gentleman speaks about the Act of 1882. He says there was a terrible gerrymander in the county of Bruce in 1882. Now, I wish very much that the hon. gentleman would try, when he is making statements in this House, to be a little more accurate as to his facts. The hon. gentleman told us that in 1881 the north riding of Bruce had a population of 20,700 odd, and that the southern township was the township of Saugeen. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I called his attention to the fact at the time, but he seemed to be so anxious to make out a case against me and against the Conservative party, that he would not accept the correction I made at the time. The population of North Bruce was not 20,700 odd, but it was nearly 25,000 in 1881; and in stating that the township of Saugeen was the southern township of the constituency, the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken. The township of Bruce was the southern township. Now, the fact with regard to the county of Bruce at that time was this. It consisted of two ridings; and because the province of Ontario had increased in population and was entitled to additional representation, the county of Bruce, which had increased in population more than any other county in Ontario, was entitled to one of those additional members. For that reason, there had to be three ridings made out of the two ridings, and in order to do that it was necessary to take a portion of each of the other ridings to form a third riding. The hon. gentleman entirely misled the House—I do not mean to say that he did so wilfully—as to the condition of things at that time. He led the House to believe that without making any change in the old north riding of Bruce the population would have been fairly divided, although, as I have pointed out, the population of North Bruce was not as he supposed 20,700, but almost 25,000. Now, when the two ridings had to be divided, the question arose as to what the division should be. I do not deny for a moment that it would have been competent to divide the county at that time into three ridings, and to have left the township of Saugeen in the north riding of Bruce, and that by doing so you would at the moment have balanced the population better than it was balanced by the division that was made; and it is quite fair to argue—I do not find any fault with that—that the township of Saugeen ought to have been left in the north riding. I wish to say, as the hon. gentleman asked me the question, I answered it at the time; but I wish to say here again, from my place, that I was one of those who were responsible for advising that the township of Saugeen should not be left in the north riding at that time, but should be placed in the west riding. I wish to say further that in making that recommendation I was partly swayed by considerations of a political and party nature. As long as these matters are left in the hands of the two parties, each party will be swayed less or more by political considerations; and if two possible divisions, fairly good divisions, can be made, the party in power will always select the division which suits its own party interest best, and if in doing that it does not do anything that is unjust, it is entitled to do it as long as the matter is left in the hands of the parties. I do not think it should be left in the hands of the parties at all. I think it should be taken out of the hands of the parties; I have always said so since I have had the honour of a seat in this House; but I say that every one who knew anything about the condition of the county of Bruce at that time knew that if the township of Saugeen had been left in the north riding, although it would have equalized the population for the moment, it would have necessitated another division of the county at the very next taking of the census, and I think

it is fair to say that these things should be done as seldom as possible, and not as often as possible. The northern part of the county was increasing rapidly in population, and every one knew that if an equality were provided at the moment it could not continue ; and what did the result prove ? Was that a just contention or not ? The result proved that at the very next census, the north riding, from which the township of Saugeen had been taken, was the more populous riding of the two. It had increased from over 18,000 to over 22,000, while the west riding had decreased from over 24,000 to over 20,000. Therefore, the result proved that the contention that was made at that time was a fair contention, and that the division of the county which was made was a fair division, so far as distribution of population is concerned.

The hon. gentleman desires to have a shy at the county of Bruce in this Bill of his. He has dragged that county in, although it is not one in which any of the ridings are outside of the county lines. They are within the county lines, but the hon. gentleman has dragged it in, in order that he may have an opportunity of altering the county divisions. I do not know whether he had anything to do with the leaving of it to the judges or not, but, at all events, it has to be left to three judges of the Superior Court of Ontario ; and for my part I am perfectly satisfied that the matter should be left to any three independent men, and we can get no better independent men than are to be found on the judicial bench. After what has passed in this House, for my part, I would prefer that the matter should be left to three independent men, and that they should have the opportunity of deciding whether the division which is made to-day in the county of Bruce is a fair or an unfair one for elections to this House. So far as I am able to judge, no fairer division can possibly be made. So far as I am able to judge, whether you take the question of the geographical distribution, and the shape of the riding and their compactness, or the question of population, you cannot make a better or a fairer distribution than that which exists to-day. The hon. gentleman seems to think that because the old north riding of Bruce was more strongly Reform than the new, after a third riding had been formed in that county, that is some proof that injustice has been done. And my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Paterson) spoke the other day of my opponent, Mr. Gillies, having been sacrificed by the change. Now, my hon. friend knows perfectly well that the result of the change was this, that at the next election there were two Reformers elected and one Conservative in the county, and he also knows that the west riding of Bruce was there for Mr. Gillies, if he had chosen to take it, and if his friends had desired that he should have it. The west riding of Bruce was there, two of his strongest townships were in that riding, and if my hon. friend had been so anxious about the fate of Mr. Gillies, why did he not exert himself to have Mr. Gillies nominated for the west riding, where he would have been sure of election ? But my hon. friend's plan was a different one. It was to strengthen, if possible, the new north riding of Bruce, to endeavour to make it as much Reform as possible, and in place of using his influence to obtain a nomination for the gentleman whose defeat he so much deplored the other night, in place of trying to get that gentleman nominated in the constituency in which he would have been sure of election, he tried to increase the chances of the Reform candidate in the north riding by adding to it the village of Port Elgin. Had the sympathy of my hon. friend been as sincere as his voice was loud and pathetic, he would have endeavoured to find a seat in the west riding of Bruce for Mr. Gillies.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the result of the various elections in the north riding of Bruce. I am not going to weary the House by going through the particulars of what the hon. gentleman said. But I may just say this with regard to the first election. The hon. gentleman said that if the township of Saugeen had been in the north riding of Bruce, my majority would have been entirely wiped out. He said that the township of Bruce had given a majority of 101, and that my majority was 88. That is to say, that there would have been a majority of 13, which he said was almost equal to the majority I obtained. It just shows how far my hon. friend's party feeling will carry him when he actually said on the floor of the House that 13 is almost equal to 88. With regard to the election of 1891, I think it would have been, perhaps, fair for him to have mentioned to members of the House who were not here at that time, a fact of which he was very cognizant, namely, that in the middle of the electoral campaign, I met with an accident, which very nearly proved fatal, and that his friends canvassed the constituency on the ground that there was no use in any man voting for McNeill because he was dying anyhow. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware of the fact of my having met with an accident. Every one who was in the House at the time knew it, because I was unfortunately obliged to use crutches during the whole of that long session, which lasted six months. My hon. friend behind the Postmaster General was not here that session, but the Postmaster General was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I am really not conscious of that.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend does not, perhaps, remember, but it is a fact, nevertheless, that I was going about on crutches during the whole session of six months, which, unfortunately, my hon. friend did not happen to observe. I may mention also to my hon. friend, who, perhaps, is not aware

of the fact, that I was served with a protest on the very day I left my bed, by his friends at that time. I may mention, with regard to that election, something which the hon. gentleman does not know, and that is, that owing to family matters, which I will not refer to, I was quite unable to attend to the revision of the voters' lists on that occasion. I thought there would be another revision of the lists, and I felt it my duty to write to Sir John Macdonald that I considered it quite impossible, under the circumstances, to carry the north riding. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the fact that my political opponents claimed to have 300 majority on the lists, I carried the riding, and in spite of the fact that I was incapacitated from taking part in the elections owing to the causes to which I have already referred. So that I do not think the hon. gentleman can make very much of the fact that my majority was reduced on that occasion. Then, the hon. gentleman spoke of the last occasion on which I contested the riding. He did not mention to the House, as I think in candour he ought to have, that there were three candidates in the field, and that the third candidate polled about a thousand votes. He was a Patron and a P.P.A. and a McCarthyite, and I do not know what else, but he took a great many of my votes, at all events ; and I think I would not be going too far if I said that it was the opinion of many of those best informed in the riding, that if that gentleman had not been placed in the field and kept in the field, there would have been no contest in North Bruce on that occasion. So much for what the hon. gentleman has said regarding elections.

I have to apologize to the House for having taken up so much of its time with reference to matters purely personal. I will only repeat what I have already said, that I oppose this Bill on the ground that it is a new departure, and a very dangerous departure, for which there is no precedent, and which, in my judgment, will lead to confusion and mischief of the gravest kind in this country, should it become law. I think that the hon. gentleman has brought forward no sufficient reason for the acceptance by the House of the measure which he has in charge. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) showed in the most conclusive way last evening that the grievances of which the hon. gentleman complains, which he says he wishes to redress by this Bill, if they ever existed, certainly do not exist to-day. So, the hon. gentleman is left without an excuse for bringing forward this measure at this unexampled and, I venture to say, unseemly time.

Mr. PETER MACDONALD (East Huron). I rise to take part in this discussion with mingled feelings of regret and pleasure—of regret that the opportunity to repeal the Redistribution Act of 1882 did not come before, of pleasure to know that the time has arrived and we are now in a position to remove what I consider to be one of the most iniquitous Acts ever passed by the Parliament of Canada. It was placed on the statute-book with the design and for the purpose of gaining in the country an undue advantage for the party then in power. That party came into power with a great flourish of trumpets. They established in 1879 the National Policy, which was to be the panacea for all the country's ills. The country did become more prosperous in 1880 and 1881. But on the eve of the elections which were to take place in 1882, that very party which boasted so much of the National Policy, was afraid to meet the electors of this country on the merits and virtues of that policy. They met in solemn conclave, with their leader at their head—the able leader that they had at that time—and they devised a Redistribution or Gerrymander Bill to be brought in for the purpose of cutting, and carving, and shaping into grotesque figures the constituencies of the province of Ontario, so as to allow the Conservative party to legislate into the House supporters of the Government of that day. We were told yesterday that the Minister of Customs had two men assisting him to get up the Bill now before the House. There was no need of assistance, because the principles underlying this Bill are quite plain. We are just doing what we said we would do when power came into our hands. We opposed the principle of breaking up the counties in 1882. We opposed it in 1872, and Sir John Macdonald and the whole Conservative party agreed with the Liberal party in that year, that the breaking up of the county boundaries was contrary to sound principle in reference to this matter. Sir John Macdonald, in a speech he made on the introduction of the Redistribution Bill of 1872, pointed this out emphatically, and said he was opposed to breaking through the county boundaries for the purpose of forming any electoral divisions. He gave many strong, solid and substantial arguments in favour of the position he took on that occasion. Every Conservative who supported Sir John Macdonald at that time, and who expressed himself, declared in favour of his leader's views upon this subject. And Hon. Edward Blake, speaking for the Liberal party at that time, expressed his concurrence with the views put forth by Sir John Macdonald in reference to this point. Both parties agreed that even considerations of population were a secondary matter, and that, as far as possible, county boundaries should be maintained. Now, in 1882, when the Conservative party had made up its mind to gerrymander the constituencies, the principles advocated in 1872 were egregiously violated. The leader of the party was the same man as in 1872, and many of the same men were behind him. And there had been no change in the principle. If it was a good principle

in 1872, it was not less a good principle in 1882. Now, in 1882 the Liberals fought that gerrymander with all the ability and all the energy characteristic of them in every war for good laws. They declared that if they ever got the opportunity, if the people of this country returned them to power, they would make it a point to repeal that law and to undo that wrong, as far as lay in their power. In every election since 1882 this has been before the public. We presented to the public on every platform on which we spoke, the injustice of the law, by which no less than 50 constituencies were cut and carved to suit the exigencies of the political party in power for the ostensible reason that they wished to find room for six additional members and to equalize the population. Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, as well as I can tell you, and those hon. gentlemen who have paid attention to the matter know, that population was not equalized by the law of 1882, that that argument was not vindicated by that law. The equalization of population was not even as well carried out under that Gerrymander Bill of 1882 as it could have been without interfering with county boundaries. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) last night stated that the Liberal party went back on representation by population altogether. I am satisfied that that hon. gentleman has not studied the figures of population for the several electoral divisions. If he had, he would have concluded that there was a wider difference between the larger and smaller electoral divisions under this Bill of 1882 than there ever was before.

I have stated that it was the intent and purpose of the Conservative party at that time in introducing this Bill to gain a political advantage. One of their ablest members, a gentleman who stood high in the ranks of the party in 1882, one whose ability has not been equalled in the Conservative party, probably, for twenty years, a gentleman who remained in the Conservative party for many years afterwards, stated in this House, in my own hearing, and in the hearing of many of those present, that what was done in 1882, with his assistance and with the assistance of other members of the Conservative party, was a gross blunder. He said: After ten years' experience, and looking upon this question from a political stand-point, I am forced to the conclusion that the Conservative party committed a gross blunder when they forced that law through Parliament and placed it on the statute-books of this country. Now, when an eminent man of their party, after viewing the question from every stand-point, makes such a statement, a man who was consulted and helped to carry that law through—when such a man makes such an acknowledgment before the entire country, in the open Parliament of Canada, we must attach considerable importance to it. Now, I can show that the action of the party in connection with this matter was designed. Instead of calling in two men, as it has been said—wrongfully said—that the Minister of Customs had done, to assist in preparing this Bill, the leader of the Conservative party called in the whole party to assist in the gerrymander of 1882. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) shakes his head. I know whereof I speak, and I will give him an instance which will convince him, as well as any other person who is open to conviction, that the instructions came from the various counties and electoral divisions to assist Sir John Macdonald in making up the Bill brought before this House in 1882.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said the whole Conservative party. I was a member of the Conservative party, and I was a member of Parliament, and I was never consulted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I mean those they thought worth while to consult, and if he did not happen to be one of those, he can't blame me for it. Now, I take my own county. In the first draft of the Bill that received its first reading, my county was divided into three ridings, south, centre and north, certain groups of townships being in each. The party in the county of Huron saw that the division was not going to gerrymander the county, which had a Liberal majority of over 800, and they were bound to get two out of the three seats. Circulars were sent out broadcast to different parts of the county, and the ringleaders of the party held a large convention in the town of Wingham in April, 1882, and they divided the county entirely different from the division in the Bill, they divided it into south, east and west. Now, let me tell you how things stood when the division was made. According to the election returns of 1878, the only basis of information that these men had, they made East Huron, which I now represent, have 89 of a Conservative majority, and they made West Huron, which is now represented by our hon. friend from that riding (Mr. Holmes), have a Conservative majority of 105, as based upon the election returns of 1878. In the south riding they hived the Grits, and gave them a majority of over 800, according to the election returns of 1878. Now, here were two Liberal-Conservative constituencies hewn out of a county which was largely Reform. But how did they reason after they did this? They said: There is North Middlesex, which, in 1878, only gave a majority to Tim Coughlin of eight, we must come to his support. Now here is South Huron, they said, with a Liberal majority of 800, and there is the town of Exeter with a Conservative majority, according to the last returns, of 115. We will take Exeter out and send it away 15 miles, and

make it part of North Middlesex. And so they took Tim Coughlin out of his trouble, and he came back in 1882 with 109 of a majority instead of eight as he formerly had.

Now, let us go to the adjoining county which was affected by the gerrymander, we will take the county of Perth. I think my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) referred to Perth, and to Mr. Trow who represented it. I want here to show the fallacy of the argument which the hon. gentleman used last night when he said it was Mr. Trow's own friends that defeated him. Now, Mr. Trow represented South Perth for a number of years. The Liberal-Conservative party said: If we can take South Easthope which gave a majority of 193 to Mr. Trow in 1878—if we can take that away from him and add to it the township of Osborne, one of the townships of the county of Huron which gave a majority of 60 against Mr. Trow in 1882, we will be sure to defeat him. Well, in 1882 Mr. Trow ran for South Perth and carried it by a larger majority than he had before. Then our friends opposite say: Don't you see that the gerrymander Act did not affect Mr. Trow, and, therefore, it was an innocent thing. Is that correct reasoning? Would a subtraction of 193 Liberal votes in his constituency and an addition of 60 Conservative votes help to elect Mr. Trow? I trow not. Mr. Trow was elected partly on account of his popularity in his riding, secondly on account of the policy that he advocated, but thirdly and principally, by a large number of Conservatives, who had become disgusted by the action of the Conservative party in gerrymandering the county as they did, refusing to vote, and some of them voting for the Liberal candidate. After that was settled, just take North Perth and see what they did. They said: Now, there is North Perth, Mr. Hesson's majority is gradually lessening, he will probably be defeated this time, and how can we serve him best? We will take from him, they said, North Easthope, which gave the Liberal candidate at the previous election a majority of no less than 309, and we will put that into North Oxford. Now North Oxford gave a majority to Mr. Thomas Oliver in 1878, of 903. There were 193 votes taken away from South Perth to assist Mr. Oliver to carry that constituency at the next general election. There were 309 votes now taken from North Perth and given to Thomas Oliver, which gave him 503 votes altogether. Now, they said to Mr. Hesson: We have made you safe, more than safe; we have taken 303 votes that were polled against you at the last election, and now you can afford to lose a little north of the county of Perth. Don't you know that North Wellington is not very safe? Now, since we took away 303 Liberal votes from you, just allow us to take 68 Conservative votes and give them to Mr. McMullen in the form of the township of Wallace. Then Wallace was taken from the north of Perth and added to North Wellington, and at the next general election gave 116 against Mr. McMullen, the present member for North Wellington. Now was it the 116 votes that enabled Mr. McMullen to carry the north riding? Was it by reason of the gerrymander, or in spite of the gerrymander? Everybody knows that in spite of the gerrymander Mr. McMullen carried North Wellington.

Now, in regard to population, did they equalize population? Did any Conservative ever hear any argument in favour of the gerrymander of 1882 other than it would equalize population? Not a single argument has ever been adduced, not even the hon. member for West York has adduced any argument in favour of that gerrymander other than it was supposed to equalize the population of the different electoral divisions. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to give a single argument in favour of breaking up the 50 different constituencies for the purpose of attaining that object. Well, was the object attained? Let me give you a few figures to show that it was not. Take these 14 ridings, and remember that I have excluded the cities, because if included, the comparison would be more in favour of the contention that I am making. East Elgin, North Essex, South Grey, East Grey, Kent, East Middlesex, North Perth, Russell, North Simcoe, East Simcoe, Welland, North Wellington, Centre Wellington, South Wellington. These all possess a population of 365,825. Now, you will see that 14 members represent a population of that number, making for each member 26,345, or 18 per cent above the unit of representation which in Ontario was 22,481. Now take another group of 14 where, we will suppose, the population was to be equalized. Brockville, Frontenac, South Grenville, North Leeds and Grenville, Monck, West Peterborough, North Wentworth, South Wentworth, Peel, Lennox, Cardwell, West Hastings, South Lanark, East Hastings. These fourteen electoral divisions contain a population of 218,965, or an average population of 15,625 for each of the fourteen members returned. On the one hand you have 26,345 for each member, and on the other hand only 15,625, or more than 10,000 of a difference. Is that an equalization of population? Will a single member of the House say that there has been an equalization of population when you have 150,000 more people in the larger fourteen electoral divisions than in the smaller, or in the one case 18 per cent below the unity of population and in the other 43 per cent above it? If the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) were here to night, he would not be able to answer these figures. But there is a worse condition in Lower Canada. I am not going to deal with the gerrymander in that part of the country, but take the group composing the ten following divisions:—Jacques Cartier, Argenteuil, Laval, Montmagny, Napierville, Sou-

anges, Three Rivers, Vaudreuil, Montmorency and Chambly. These ten divisions contain a population of 118,542 or 11,854 for each member. Take another group, containing the following divisions:—Champlain, Beauce, Lévis, Richmond and Wolfe, Nicolet, Ottawa County, Rimouski, Temiscouata, Hochelaga and Portneuf. These divisions have a population of 313,729, or an average for each member of 31,372. In one case each member represents three times as many people as in the other, and this is under the present Gerrymander Bill. Will any hon. member venture to say that that measure was successful in equalizing the population? The only argument adduced in support of the Bill of 1882? Can a better condition of matters be obtained by the retention of county boundaries? I think so. I went carefully over the counties of Ontario, and it entailed a good deal of work. I divided these counties, irrespective of party politics, and found that I could make a more equitable division as to population by the retention of county boundaries than obtains under the present law. If that is true, which it is, I hold that we can go back to county boundaries with perfect justice and retain the standard of population upon a more equitable basis than that which we now possess. I find that, under the present law, there are twelve electoral divisions under 16,000 population. Under the division, which I have made, there would be none under 16,000. I find that there are fifteen electoral divisions under 18,000 population. Under the division which I have made there would be ten under 18,000. I find that there are thirty-one electoral divisions under 20,000. Under the division which I have made, there would be only thirteen. Under the present law there are thirty-three electoral districts with a population of over 23,000. Under the division which I have made there would be only sixteen electoral divisions with a population of over 23,000. Under the present law there are eighteen electoral divisions with a population of over 25,000. Under my division there would only be eight divisions with a population of over 25,000 retaining county boundaries in every case. There is another reason for the retention of county boundaries. There are nineteen counties in Ontario which require no division at all, the county being entitled to but one member, and, therefore, the opportunity of gerrymandering these would not exist. No gerrymanderer's hand could touch these counties, because the boundaries are of a permanent character. They could not be touched by any party that might happen to be in power. There are fourteen counties which only require one division. You cannot gerrymander such counties without everybody seeing it, and therefore the power to gerrymander these fourteen counties would be reduced to minimum. There are ten counties which require two or more divisions, and therefore in those only can the hand of the gerrymanderer be successfully used. By retaining county boundaries it would be impossible, every time we had to change the Redistribution Act of this country, after the decennial census, that the hand of the gerrymanderer could interfere with the majorities, because county boundaries would become permanent, and these local affairs in which the people are all engaged would be put on a permanent basis in the various counties. There is another point I wish to bring out strongly, and I would be glad if any hon. gentleman who answers me would give an explanation of the figures which I am about to present, if the reason which I propose to give is not in accordance with his views. It was said last night by some hon. members, that the previous gerrymanders did not affect the Conservative party beneficially as a whole, and there were various reasons advanced by various speakers, in support of that contention. Hon. gentlemen took groups of counties, here and there, and compared the majorities, but this comparison of majorities must lead to wrong conclusions. We are agreed that we must compare the whole vote of the province. I have, therefore, taken the trouble to go over the whole vote of the province of Ontario after the election held in 1891. I also took the returns as corrected by the by-elections, a number of which followed the general elections. I found that there was, in Ontario, 186,000 Conservative votes polled, in round numbers, and 182,000 Liberal votes polled. It will be admitted by everybody that ten Conservatives should have as much power and influence at the polls as ten Liberals, or that 100 of one party should have as much power and influence at the polls as 100 of the other, or 1,000, or 100,000. Is that not a sound doctrine to advance? If it is, let me proceed to my argument. If the argument is sound, 182,000 voters should return within one member of the number returned by 186,000 votes. Adding 186,000 and 182,000 gives you a total of 368,000 votes polled altogether in the province of Ontario. There were ninety-two members elected, which made 4,000 votes as the average for each member. It will be admitted that every 4,000 Liberal voters should have the same power and influence at the polls as every 4,000 Conservative voters. But did they? Let us see how we stood in this House? We had thirty-three members representing the Liberal party after the election of 1891, and we had fifty-nine Conservative members representing the Conservative party, or, in other words, we had thirty-three members representing 182,000 votes, and fifty-nine members representing 186,000 votes. How did that disparity come in? Did it come in by chance? Not at all. It came in by the action of the gerry-

mander in hiving large numbers of Liberals together in different electoral divisions, thus nullifying and neutralizing the power which they otherwise would have had of expressing themselves at the polls. For every 3,150 votes polled by the Conservatives they obtained a member to represent them in this House, but it required 5,550 votes to be polled by the Liberals to elect a Liberal member to represent them in this House. Can that be explained upon any other ground than that the influence of the Liberal party was neutralized as it was in South Huron and in North Oxford? Here were 500 electors who had no influence in North Oxford, whose influence would have been felt if they had been allowed to remain in South or North Perth, and if they had not been put in a constituency where there was a Liberal majority of 903. The whole thing was wrong from beginning to end, and need you wonder that, at the first opportunity which is presented we are going to undo the wrong, as far as we can, that was perpetrated in 1882 against the Liberals of this country. I want to draw the attention of the House to a few other things and I am done. What are we going to accomplish? What are the results of the Bill that we are now repealing? I feel glad that I have had the opportunity of giving it a last kick, as it withdraws its slimy coils from the statute-books of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That is all right. I have proven those facts. It rendered null and void a fair expression of public opinion, and I challenge any person to controvert that statement. It failed to secure a fair representation of the population in the electoral divisions. I have shown that by the figures taken from the returns. It has disregarded geographical compactness, because it has cut and carved and shaped into grotesque figures, fifty of the electoral divisions of this province for the purpose of securing room for six Conservative members. It has rendered stability impossible, by disregarding any permanent lines. We had nineteen counties that could not be touched, fourteen that only required one division, and, therefore, there is a stability in connection with our county lines that cannot be obtained under the existing Act. It has neutralized the power of the Liberal party at the polls. Did I not show you that, when I proved that it takes 5,500 Liberal votes to get a member, and only 3,150 Conservative votes. It was unconstitutional in spirit. I do not know whether it was unconstitutional in fact or not, but certainly it was unconstitutional in spirit, because it robbed the people of a sacred trust, and a sacred right and privilege, when it nullified the power that the constitution purported to give the people. It enabled the Conservative party to legislate into this House their own political friends. Did it not do that? Will the hon. gentleman who shakes his head, be kind enough to explain on any other ground, how fifty-nine members came into this House on the same vote as thirty-three members, unless they were foisted in by this Act. Instead of being elected by the free and independent electors of this country, they were legislated into the Parliament of Canada to assist the Conservative party who put this iniquitous Bill on the statute-book. It ignored the community of interests and destroyed those that did exist. You all know that there is a community of interest which grows up in counties. The people of a county meet as jurors, as county councillors, they meet in a hundred ways, and this community of interest has been broken up by this law, and one part of a county put in one direction and the other part of a county put in another direction, as I have pointed out.

Now, what does the Bill which we are now considering propose to give us? This Bill proposes to restore the county boundaries, and make something permanent in the boundaries of electoral divisions. It preserves the community of interests. It enables the people of a county to meet together on all occasions for the purpose of considering these interests that grow up amongst them, and it enables the people to become acquainted with each other. As Sir John Macdonald said: Young men who have the ability to represent their constituencies in Parliament, may commence by going to the township council, and then to the county council, where they become acquainted with the reeves, and in the process of time they may develop into politicians and wish to be elected to this House. Sir John Macdonald told us that when a county is broken up, that acquaintance between them is also broken up.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is the result of this Bill, and if it is so desirable, why does not the hon. gentleman carry it out all over the province? Why does the Government allow eastern Ontario, where the county boundaries are broken up, to remain broken up?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). We have commenced at this present time to go as far as we deem necessary. We have commenced the work that we will complete, probably in 1902. We will be in power in 1902, and after the census are taken, we will complete the work we have commenced, and try and undo all the evil done by the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. This Bill secures to a very great extent the permanency of the electoral divisions. Gerrymanders will be reduced to a minimum. It will secure a fair expression of public opinion on all matters brought before the people, and it has been admitted by those who spoke that the principles un-

derlying the Bill are good. A large number have expressed themselves in favour of maintaining county boundaries, and several speakers have acknowledged that the proposal to submit the subdivisions to a committee of judges is of the very best character. If we wished to take advantage of the Liberal-Conservative party, as they took advantage of the Liberals in 1882, could we not sit down and gerrymander, and cut, and carve, and give ourselves an advantage which nothing could overcome at the approaching election. But, Sir, we are willing to do what we all said was right and just. We have come here with fifty-five majority, and can carry anything we wish, but we propose to be fair. We say we will restore the county boundaries which we have said we would restore, and after we go that far, we hand the whole matter over to a commission of judges, who are above suspicion, and above the influence of political parties, and we say to them: Go to work and make the subdivisions in the interests of the country, and not in the interests of party. If we had taken the opposite course, we could gain the advantage that the Liberal-Conservative party gained in 1882, but we are above that. The Liberals are ready to stay out of power unless they are sent here by the fair and independent vote of the electorate of this country. Every Liberal who comes here as a supporter of the Government and as a supporter of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) comes here with the consent, and by the votes of those who gave him their confidence, and he does not wish to come in any other way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have one or two more points to refer to. The leader of the Opposition always uses strong language, and in this case he hurled some very strong epithets against the Bill. I wish him, or any other of his friends, to try and justify the words he used. He told us the Bill was grossly unfair. In what respect? Does it not return to the old condition that existed from confederation up to 1882, the condition of retaining the county boundaries, and in favour of which Sir John Macdonald made such an eloquent speech in 1872. Is it unfair because it does that? Is it grossly unfair because it leaves the subdivisions to the judges of the land? The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) said that this was an infamous Act and a monstrous Act, and an outrage upon the electorate, but not one of his supporters who spoke dared attempt to prove that. Does it outrage the electorate by restoring county boundaries, and by leaving the subdivision to the judges? If it does not outrage the electorate, how can it be called an outrage against the electorate? Does it not equalize population as well as the old Bill? I have shown that it does that better than the old Bill, notwithstanding what the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) said last night. I challenge him to prove that the Bill of 1882 made a more equal division of the population than the Bill of 1872. I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) to prove that this Bill is a violation of the principles of representation by population. He complained bitterly of the Liberal party for not giving Toronto a greater representation. Does not this Bill give Toronto a greater representation than any other Bill you ever had? It makes a more equitable distribution of the population of the city of Toronto than the Bill of 1882. To prove this, I will show you what the distribution of the constituencies of Toronto under that Bill was. West Toronto had 22,983; Centre Toronto had 24,867, and East Toronto had 38,565—not a very fair distribution of the population. There were three members given to the city of Toronto at that time, which gave a population of 28,805 for each. Now, come forward with me 10 years, when Toronto received an additional member under the Redistribution Bill of Sir John Thompson. Sir John Thompson was a fair man, and he sought to do the very best he could for the city of Toronto in 1892. He increased the membership for that city by one. The population of Toronto had increased from 86.000 in 1882 to 144,023 in 1892, so that by Sir John Thompson's redistribution Toronto received a representative for every 36,006. That is what the two Conservative redistribution Bills gave to Toronto. Now, we propose to give that city five members. We did propose to base that representation on the population of 1891, on which basis Toronto would have a member for every 28,804, or 8,000 less for each member than in 1892.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask my hon. friend if he overlooks the fact that by this Bill there is over 30,000 being added to the population from the county of York?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Well, we will take the present population of about 180,000, which would give a basis for each of the five members of 36,000. Sir John Thompson in 1892 made the basis 36,006, and you did not blame him. You did not cry aloud in the various papers belonging to the party. You made no fuss at that time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Dumb as oysters.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). But now, when the Liberal party are giving you the same representation by population which you received under Sir John Thompson's redistribution in 1892, you blame us.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman now kindly give us the figures for the county of York?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have separated the city of Toronto wholly and entirely. As I said before, every constituency that has a community of interests should be separated from others that are different; that is a fundamental principle in making

electoral divisions. A farming community should not be allied with a city community, because the community of interest among the farmers is wholly and entirely different, and no man can represent the two at the same time because they are opposed.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman has no objection, however, it would be interesting to have the figures regarding the county of York put beside those which he has given of the city of Toronto.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have not the figures of the county of York. I am answering the argument made by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) last night, when he claimed that Toronto was not sufficiently represented; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is drawing a red herring across the trail in order to avoid a rebuttal of the argument of the hon. member for East Toronto. Another thing said by the hon. member for East Toronto last night was that when we on this side of the House said that many members living in the city of Toronto and representing other constituencies would look after the interests of the city, we might as well say that they would look after the interests of this city because their post office addresses were here. I expected a sounder argument from the hon. gentleman than that. Although our post office addresses are here, our interests are not here, whereas the interests of a large number of gentlemen who live in Toronto and represent other constituencies are in Toronto. They are manufacturers, money lenders, or are engaged in various kinds of business in that city. As Toronto prospers they prosper; consequently, their interest becomes identified with the interest of Toronto to some extent, and, therefore, to my mind Toronto is better represented in Parliament than any other division in the entire country. We have four able-bodied men—and I speak literally when I say that—from the city of Toronto. Three are sitting on the opposite side; one I am glad to say is sitting behind me, and probably two or three more will do so after the next election. We have four members from the city of Toronto—Mr. Clarke, Mr. Bertram, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Osler. These gentlemen are specified by the electorate to come here and look after their interests. But in addition, we have Mr. Mulock, whose interests are more largely in the city of Toronto than in North York, and who, while not neglecting North York, will certainly look after the interests of Toronto. Then we have Mr. Maclean, whose whole interests I believe are centered in the city of Toronto, although he represents East York, and he will certainly look after his interests in the city of Toronto. Then we have our honoured and highly respected Speaker, who presides with such dignity over us, and who to-day represents a rural constituency, but whose business interests are in Toronto. Then we have the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who represents that constituency well; but that does not prevent him also representing the interests of Toronto, which I am sure he will stand by when necessary. Then we have Mr. Craig, who I understand has gone to live in the city of Toronto, and who will look after its interests. Toronto has a right to claim a proper recognition.

An hon. MEMBER. It wants the earth.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend says it wants the earth. It has already a good deal of it. In addition to these hon. members, Toronto is very largely represented in the other House. We have senators there who will look after the bad Bills of the House of Commons, as they call them, and give them the six months' hoist sometimes, especially if the interests of Toronto are involved. There are Senator Allan, Senator O'Donohue, Senator Cox, Senator Reesor, and Senator Aikens, all from Toronto. There are fourteen able-bodied men representing the interests of Toronto, and still these hon. gentlemen will get up and declaim against this Bill on the ground that Toronto is not fairly represented on the floor of Parliament. Do you want two or three more citizens of Toronto down here to look after its interests? I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if Toronto sends men down here who will give a righteous support to a righteous Government in dealing with the affairs of this country upon broad and statesmanlike principles, they will get more for Toronto through the application of those principles than they can by opposing a Government that seeks to do the best it can for the interests of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. That is the principle.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And remember, Toronto is awake; Toronto is on the tip-toe to shake off men like the hon. member for East Toronto, who makes short speeches of fifteen minutes, taking seven and a half minutes to condemn the Conservative party, and seven and a half minutes to condemn the Liberal party, and, when he has condemned both parties and shown that they cannot do anything, he sits down without suggesting anything himself. I have remarked his speeches, short and concise as they are, as if he had them by heart. I never heard from the hon. gentleman any suggestion as to what he would do on any public question, if he were elected to lead either party in this country. I believe in a man finding fault and criticising the actions of any Government or party which he does not approve, but if he is capable of criticism, he ought to be capable of giving some solution of the questions he is discussing. I have never yet heard, however, a solution enunciated by the hon. member. I have never heard from him anything but a con-

demnation of either party, just as the whim takes him, when he rises to address the House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Macdonald) has certainly been kind to the House in this respect, that he has not treated us to one of the ordinary four-hour speeches peculiar to him. But if he has not given us a lengthy statement this time, he has still given us the old elements which have always characterized his speeches, namely, sanctimoniousness of expression and righteous contempt and disgust for everything not truly pious and eminently holy. In that particular line, he has always posed and excelled, while at the same time professing an amount of humility that would make Uriah Heep blush; and, were the Pharisee standing near by when the hon. gentleman was declaiming about the vices and wrong-doings of others, he would have at once given up his place to the hon. member for South Huron. The chief burden of his plaint was a vehement denunciation of the so-called Gerrymander Act of 1882. While he did not adduce any particular argument or show that it was very bad, he did at least one thing, and that was to denounce in the most unsparing language the Act itself and those connected with it. It is not to be wondered at that the hon. gentleman should denounce a gerrymander, because he comes from a county where gerrymanders are laughed to scorn, as being puny and pigmy efforts to throttle political opponents. It is not to be wondered at that he should look upon an ordinary gerrymander with scorn, because he represents part of a county where the hon. gentleman and his friends pride themselves on the fact that, instead of resorting to gerrymanders, they are township throttlers. In that county they never attempt to kill a political opponent in the ordinary Christian style of annexing him to another riding, but they go up and down, from one township to another, in order to change political limits. They are not content to divide people who have lived in counties for years, side by side, but the people who actually live in the townships.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Not in my riding.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman at once seeks cover with the pharasaical excuse that it is not in his own particular riding, but just across the road. It is really wonderful to see how the hon. gentleman is willing to run away from the wrong-doing that has been practised in his own county of Huron. Take a glance at the map, showing how that county is divided by the local House, and what do you see? We see exactly an example of what this hon. gentleman would, in his vindictiveness and spleen, apply to the Conservative party all over the province, if he had his own sweet will; that is, he would go in—if the hon. Minister of Customs will pardon my resorting to his language—and tear assunder, throw to the winds, hurl to pieces, and batter to atoms, all semblance of townships, towns and villages; and I must apologize to the Minister of Customs for not being able to deliver in the tone of voice which distinguishes him, the choice selections I have taken from his vocabulary. What did they do in the county of Huron? Finding it utterly impossible to divide the county, having regard to boundary lines and keeping the townships and villages intact, so that they could secure supporters, what did these truly pious gentlemen do in that riding? They took the township of Hullet and placed part of it in the riding of West Huron, and it is worth while noticing that the hon. gentleman, with the assistance of Capt. Sullivan and the rest of the machine, secured a majority of one in that riding for Mr. Garrow, the Liberal candidate. The way they got that majority of one was by taking half the township of Hullet, which gave 44 of a Liberal majority. Had they not split the township of Hullet in half, the Liberals would not have secured that riding, and a Conservative would have been elected.

Then, they came to the riding of South Huron in the local House. They found that the Conservatives had been beaten by about 20 of a majority, and they took from the riding of South Huron a large portion of the township of Goderich, which gave a Conservative majority of 120 odd. Had that Conservative majority of 120, which was placed in West Huron and taken from South Huron, been left, as it should have been, in the south riding, the result would have been that a Conservative would have carried that riding, too, and there would have been two ridings in Huron Conservative, whereas today only one is represented by a Conservative at the local House.

Yet this hon. gentleman mourns and deplores political immorality, when he lives in a county where the grossest outrages have been committed, where municipalities were torn apart in order that party gains might be effected. All through the speech of the hon. gentleman, as through every speech he has ever made, there is an amount of hypocritical cant and pharasaical indignation that can only be equalled by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

This Bill is before the people in the guise of what? As announced by the hon. Postmaster General, it is not a Bill for the apportionment fairly of all these constituencies in the Dominion. There is no principle in it, as I think I shall be able to show, but it is, as stated by the Postmaster General, and other gentlemen on that side who followed him, a Bill simply intended to deal out vindictiveness to political opponents and attempt to destroy them. Where does the great Liberal party stand on the question to-day

before the House ? Every one of them who addressed this House, justified the action of the Government on the ground that it is a redemption of their pledges. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say that the whole country is laughing at this great party in its attempt to redeem its pledges. Talk of the Government party trying to redeem its pledges. Why, they have issued postage stamps which they will not redeem to-day. The Postmaster General actually went about the country, hawking postage stamps, and sold them to an unsuspecting public, and, when to-day you go to his department and ask for cash, they actually refuse to redeem the stamps. Worse than that, they will not give you in exchange for the larger ones smaller stamps that might be useful. And this party that cannot even redeem a postage stamp stands up and roars about redeeming its pledges. This only makes themselves absurd in the eyes of fair-minded and right thinking men. But they are doing one thing and the Premier, no doubt, will claim credit for it—they are breaking the principles which are hardly cold upon their lips, declared when a Bill of this kind was before Parliament to be dealt with. On that occasion what did we hear from the present Premier. That hon. gentleman, then the leader of the Opposition, did not stand up in his place and ask to have the matter referred to the judges of the country, but he moved this resolution :—

That all the words after "That" in the said motion be omitted, and the following be inserted instead thereof :—"That Bill No. 76, an Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be referred to a conference or committee to be composed of both political parties, to agree upon the lines or principles on which a redistribution Bill should be drawn."

The right hon. gentleman had not then the power to carry out that resolution, not having a majority in the House. But to-day when he has a majority and can carry the declaration of that resolution into effect, not a word is heard about it ; and the right hon. gentleman then so anxious to be fair to everybody that he wished to have the Government of Sir John Thompson have a conference between the two political parties, forgets that he made that pledge or rather took that stand, and to-day, is perfectly oblivious to his action some ten years ago.

Well, Sir, the next great question that is involved in this, outside and apart from dealing out vindictiveness and spleen to political opponents, is the question of the constitutionality of the Act. All I can say on that score is that the law has always been looked upon as common sense, and no man ever anticipated that every year the political party that happened to have a majority in this House would come down and rearrange the constituencies with a view to party needs and party benefits.

And the present Premier himself, in 1892, made a statement on that ground clearly showing that his present position is not tenable. Speaking in the same debate he said :—

The periodical redistribution of seats in this House is a standing order of our constitution. It is not a matter as to which the Government are free to act, which they can repudiate or which they can accept ; if it were so, it would be open to each party to deal with it in a manner best suited to its own interests, in the conception which both parties hold of their own rights. But it is not such a matter. The Government, in introducing this Bill, are simply carrying out an organic disposition of constitutional law, and we submit that it would be a monstrous consequence if, when the Government are carrying out an organic disposition of the constitutional law, they were to carry it out in such a way as to steal an advantage over their opponents.

So that idea was accepted, and has always been accepted, that the only and proper time to make a readjustment of the constituencies is after the decennial census. But these hon. gentlemen no longer take the ground that they are within their legal rights but, as announced by the Postmaster General and echoed by the hon. gentleman who has last spoke in plain English they intend to take every means to endeavour to get even with their political opponents. That being the merits of the case, they must recognize that they are on a par with the Government of the province of Ontario, they are endeavouring to throttle their political opponents and are throwing to the winds all ideas of fair play or constitutional rights and privileges. Now, the hon. gentlemen prate largely of county boundaries. I am free to say that it is desirable to observe as far as possible, the existing county boundaries ; but we cannot be bound by county boundaries at all times, by reason of the fact that the counties are of such sizes and shapes that the principle is not always applicable. It never can have been anticipated that we should be bound down to that principle for all time. Hon. gentlemen opposite all agree that up to the year 1882 there was a popular and fair distribution of the constituencies of the province of Ontario. If that is the case, why do not they revert to it? Why do not they accept the constituencies which then existed ? Why blot out Bothwell, Cardwell and Monck—for all these existed prior to 1882. The real reason is that these hon. gentlemen see in the signs of the times warning that they must begin to put their house in order. That is the reason why they are blotting out Cardwell and Bothwell. Monck, I may say, was dealt with in the redistribution of 1892. And among the chief declaimers in support of this Bill is the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who is to be greatly benefited by it. Of all men who have secured a seat in this House by misrepre-

sentation,—if that is a parliamentary phrase—before the electors, I will be bound to say, and I am in the judgment of the House, none is more noteworthy than the hon. member for North Wellington. Knowing the closeness of his constituency, he is afraid to go back to that riding; so on bended knee he is obliged to beg the Government to cut out this riding of Cardwell as it exists to-day. And what is the result? The cutting out of Cardwell will remove from the hon. member for North Wellington two townships which at the present time give him a great deal of concern. He will be pleased to lose the townships Amaranths, which goes into the new county of Dufferin, and Wallace, which goes back into Perth. By these means the hon. member, who is afraid to meet his constituency, will be relieved of an adverse majority of three hundred odd. This, on the very face of it, shows the insincerity of the hon. gentlemen, when they whine about the return to the state of affairs as they existed before 1882; because if they did return to that state of affairs, Cardwell would continue to exist as it does to-day.

Now the hon. gentlemen are taking great credit to themselves for the fact that they are not going to carve the constituencies. Well, I am free to admit, and I have no doubt other hon. gentlemen will agree with me, we must all feel much safer in the hands of the judges of the Superior Court than we should in the hands of some of the Judge Jeffreys who sit on the other side. We find at least this consolation in the Bill. But here is the trouble with the judges—that they are not allowed to exercise the power of rearranging the constituencies fairly having regard to the geographical position and having regard to the population. Take the case, for instance, of the county of Simcoe. There is a county with a population of some 82,000. There should be 27,000 in each riding. And yet, I will be bound to say, the judges will rearrange it in such a manner as that Simcoe will have 23,000; East Simcoe 31,000 and North Simcoe 28,000. It is utterly impossible, owing to the way in which the townships lie alongside each other, that there should be any other arrangement of these three constituencies in this county than the one I have given. For that reason, I protest against the Government introducing and passing the Bill in its present shape, for the county of Simcoe is entitled fairly to have four members instead of three. But these hon. gentlemen hope that, custom being the law of the land, they may get some party advantage in cutting up the townships. As I understand it, there are to be no particular instructions given to the judges. For that reason they may accept the principle which has been accepted in arranging constituencies for the local legislature—they may cut up townships. And if that is done, I say it is worse than the present arrangement. Now one question which has been dealt with is the question of population, as well as this other question of county boundaries. If these hon. gentlemen are going to contend for principle at all, why do they not as they have been repeatedly asked, apply the principle to the whole province of Ontario of the preservation of county boundaries.

Why, right in the county of North Leeds, the representative of that constituency lives in the town of Smith's Falls, and if county boundaries were observed he would be swept into the next riding, and politically dead; and that is the reason why, in that county they break county boundaries. And so you can go through different portions of eastern Ontario, and you will find that these gentlemen have studiously avoided the application of the principle of county boundaries because it would be a death-blow to some of their political friends. They talk about principle in the Bill. Let the ordinary citizen of Ontario listen to their declarations about principle, and then look at their performances. Look also at the question of population and the absurdities that result. Take the case of Brant, which has been so much discussed in the House. There are to be two ridings, which will have, if they are equally divided in point of population, about 16,000 people. Now, my hon. friend, after disfranchising the Indians and preventing them from voting, asks to have them brought into the computation. But, for the sake of argument, I will accept his own statement that there are 36,000 people in the county of Brant. Now, what follows? The county of Brant will be divided into two ridings, and the city of Brantford—I am within the mark when I make the statement—has over 15,000 people. So, there is a riding with 18,000 people, 15,000 of whom live in a city. So that, in effect, you are giving a representative to a city with a population of 15,000, plus 3,000 who may belong to an agricultural section. I suppose the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) will stand up and object to that law, because, before he sat down, he protested against cities and agricultural districts being coupled together. Now, they are going to apply the argument to the city of Toronto, and they say the people of that city shall not have the same representation as rural people; and yet here is a constituency that, with the exception of 3,000 people, is made up of the city of Brantford in its entirety.

Now, take the riding of Algoma, which to-day has a population of over 50,000 people, which is increasing every year by reason of the great mining industry that is being developed there, yet that riding is only entitled to one member. I need not go into the reasons, but I could tell the House very well why these hon. gentlemen do not wish to see Algoma divided into two ridings. But here is the absurdity in a

Redistribution Bill of giving 50,000 people in Algoma only one representative, while the county of Albert, which is represented by a gentleman supporting the Government, with a population of less than 11,000, has a representative. Go through the province of Quebec, and what do you find? You find the small county of Verchères has a population of 12,200, Vaudreuil less than 11,000, Soulanges less than 10,000, Jacques Cartier under 14,000, Montmagny some 15,000, and so on. Then, take another riding represented by a supporter of the Government, Victoria in New Brunswick, that has a population of only 12,400. Now, let it be plainly understood that this Bill has no regard whatever for population, that the Government say frankly that in the province of New Brunswick 9,000 or 10,000 people shall have a representative, while the district of Algoma, with 50,000, shall have only a solitary representative. To go a little further and to make the absurdity even greater, we find that because Brant is looked upon as a Liberal riding, and although it has a population of only 36,000, of which 15,000 live in a city, it is entitled to a representative, while I have pointed out that the people of Toronto, whose political predilections are otherwise, are only entitled to one member for each 40,000. The hon. gentleman cannot help throwing off the mask, they cannot help confessing that this Bill is not a Bill for a fair and adequate representation of the people, that it is not a Bill that even dreams of giving fairness to political opponents; but it is, as the Postmaster General stated fairly the other day to the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), a Bill simply brought in to gain a party advantage over their political opponents.

Once again I want to refer to the old ridings of Cardwell and Monk. If these gentlemen wish to be honest in their declaration as to a return to the condition of affairs that existed before 1882, they have it in their power to-day, by virtue of their majority, to go back to Monck, to go back to Bothwell, and to go back to Cardwell. But I point out that a return to Cardwell means the political death of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and probably the political death of the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple). If they go back to the old riding of Monck, then it means that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) will have a closer fight than he otherwise would. It means more than that. Welland is a constituency that has existed for thirty odd years, and Welland, with over 30,000 people, is only to have one member, while Brant, almost abutting on it, because it is Liberal, with a little more population, is to have two members.

Well, a great ado is made about the judges. On that question, I have only to say that it would have been a great deal more manly if these hon. gentlemen had come down to the House, as Mr. Hardy and Sir Oliver Mowat did in their Redistribution Bills, and submit their figures and take the full responsibility for the measure. Then, the party would have known just what the Bill was going to do, because the session will have passed when this Bill is completed. I join in every word that was said last night by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) about the judges participating in this work. It is to be regretted that the judges are to be dragged into what will be actual politics. I am free to believe that there is not a gentleman occupying a place on the Superior Court bench of the province of Ontario who will not fairly endeavour to carry out the redistribution of representation. But when these gentlemen are so hampered, when they are so corralled, when they are only given certain premises to work upon, it is virtually impossible for them to make a fair redistribution of the province as a whole.

Now, Sir, what do hon. gentlemen hope to gain by this Bill? They have been challenged from this side of the House to show the unfairness of the Bill of 1882. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) yesterday pointed out the fact that of all the constituencies affected by the Bill of 1882, the hon. gentlemen opposite did not lose one seat by that arrangement, but, on the contrary, they gained by it. Well, I have only this to say in conclusion, that if this Bill is placed before the public on the plea of its being the redemption of a pledge to secure a fair representation, it is far from being so, because they are not bringing about a fair representation even of the western part of the province of Ontario, much less the whole province. They are not redistributing the seats of the House of Commons, as the Bill states, either on the ground of principle or upon the ground of population. If the Bill becomes law it will become an act to aid and assist some party friends of the hon. gentlemen who are to-day sorely in need of assistance, and it is for this very reason that, although the hon. gentlemen have to-day in this House a majority at their back, they are afraid to face their opponents fairly and squarely where they to-day have a majority and where already they have the endorsation of the people.

Mr. GEORGE LANDERKIN (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon this question before the motion is put. In the discussion that has taken place a good deal has been said in defence of the Bill passed in 1882, and, also, in defence of the Bill passed in 1891. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) pronounced the Bill of 1882 a good Bill, and said it was fair and just. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) said that the Bill of

1882 was a bad Bill, that he condemned it at the time and was very much opposed to it then. The hon. members for East Toronto and West York are not a united party on this question, although the hon. member for East Toronto praised the hon. member for West York because he had defeated the old Government. I think if there is anything in the history of the hon. member for West York that will entitle him to the commendation of the people of this country and of future generations, it is the fact that he contributed to their downfall. I think he is to be commended and I hope that posterity will remember the hon. gentleman for having done this great service in his public career. The hon. member for East Toronto said that it was a bad Bill that was passed in 1882, that it was an unfair Bill. Still, he condemns the Government because they want to remove something that is bad from the history of this country. I do not understand the position which the hon. member takes in this connection, when he says that a Bill is bad. I have the idea that it is the duty of the Government to remove that which is bad from the history of this country as far as it is in their power. Now then, it does appear to me that we scarcely ever hear, in this session, anything said about broken pledges. During the first session that we met after the general elections, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), day after day, spoke against the Government for breaking their pledges because they had not enacted everything that was laid down in the platform of the Liberal party, in the first session. Now, we hear nothing about broken pledges, for, session after session, the Government are redeeming every pledge that was made and every plank that was placed in the platform of the Liberal party. Consequently, hon. gentlemen on the other side have not a single word to say in regard to that. It is to be noticed that when the Government are attempting to redeem the pledges that they made, they are meeting with the most strenuous opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, which would indicate that they do not desire that the Government should redeem their pledges. It appears to me that the Government would meet with their approval if they did not redeem their pledges, and, in this connection, it is very desirable and it is very proper that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) should introduce this Bill, because, at the great national convention held in 1893 in the city of Ottawa, that hon. gentleman introduced the resolution stating that the Liberal party, if returned to power, would remove this iniquity from the statutes of the land. He is showing, by his introduction of this measure, that he is bound to redeem this pledge. Now, Sir, I have an idea that the principle, laid down by the Government, is a correct principle. I believe it is a wrong thing to disturb county boundaries.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will tell you why, if you will listen. What I have to say may not be right, but I have my opinion on that subject. The people live in localities throughout the country; the first idea of the children and the young people is that they are living in a school section. Every school section belongs to a city or a rural municipality. They go from the school section to the township, or the village, or the city, as the case may be, as they grow up, and increased in knowledge, and they look upon them as their home. Whenever a change is made in the township, or when a township is removed from the county in which they were born, they look upon it as an outrage upon the family circle. The township is identified with the county; they go from the schools to the township councils, from the township to the county councils, from the county councils to the provinces, from the provinces to the Dominion, and step by step the people are identified with these successive stages in their progress and learn the first lessons of loyalty to their country from the institutions of the municipality, from the schools, the local councils, the local parliaments, and the House of Commons, until they become imbued with the feeling that the township is their home, that it belongs to the county and that their homes are part and parcel of it. Their highways are concerned in the administration. The administration of justice is concerned; the work of the county councils is identified with the county and they pass along from the township to the county, and it is worse than body-snatching to take a township from the county to which it belongs and place it in another county for the purpose of electing some one to Parliament that you may desire to have elected. This is the intention of the gerrymander, and I say, it is prejudicial to the development of national life. It is unworthy of a political party to take a township out of a county and place it in another county so as to disadvantage their opponents. It is not fair play. It has been the custom in England of the commissioners appointed to act in these matters to be instructed never to violate county boundaries in the divisions that they are about to submit to the House of Commons. That is one reason why I am opposed to the law that exists to-day. I am opposed to it because there was no fair play in it. I think parties should manifest fair play, one to another, and I think, when I show you the changes that were made under the Bills of 1882 and 1891, the House will agree with me that fair play was not the guiding star of the party that enacted that legislation, and that it was not intended to give fair play to their opponents as it was their duty to have done. The hon. member for West York said that the Government were afraid to face the people. In the thirty-eight or forty by-elections, that took place since the

last general elections, every riding declared in support of the Administration with the exception of two. Only two constituencies out of thirty-eight or forty were favourable to the Opposition, or, at least, the Opposition only held two seats which they had held previous to the by-elections. Now, I think this shows to the hon. gentleman, or should show him that the Government are not afraid of the people, but that, on the other hand, the Opposition are afraid of the people and are afraid to appear before them in divisions formed on principles of fair play and upon county limits. I have here a list, which I will give to the House, of the changes that were made under that Act, and, I think, it will be found to be accurate on the whole. The House will observe and the people of the country will see that the Government are not introducing this measure one bit too soon. I propose to show the changes made in the electoral divisions in Ontario by the Redistribution Act of 1882 which divisions are affected by the Redistribution Bill. I will give the name of the electoral division, the population in 1881, the population after the passing of this Bill, the nature of the changes, the population of the divisions transferred in 1882 as per the census of 1881, and also the votes cast in the elections of 1878:

CHANGES made in boundaries of Electoral Divisions in Ontario by the Redistribution Act of 1882, which Divisions are affected by Redistribution Bill of 1899.

Name of Electoral Division affected.	Population in 1880-81.	Population after passing of Act.	Nature of Change.	Populations of Divisions transferred in 1882, as per Census of 1881; also votes cast in Election of 1878.
Kent	36,626	29,194	Chatham and Wallaceburg village eliminated and annexed to Bothwell.	Chatham (pop. 5036) (L. 286) (C. 468). Wallaceburg village (pop.—) (L. 78) (C. 79).
Lambton East		21,725	Lambton divided into East and West.	(Pop. 31904) (L. 2707) (C. 2561).
" West		20,891		
Huron South	23,393	21,991	Stephen and Exeter eliminated and annexed to North Middlesex. Usborne eliminated and annexed to South Perth. Goderich and Clinton annexed to West Huron	Stephen (pop. 4349) (L. 352) (C. 279). Exeter (pop.—) (L. 92) (C. 207). Usborne (pop. 3831) (L. 270) (C. 272). Goderich (pop. 3615) (L. 229) (C. 360). Clinton (pop. 2016) (L. 189) (C. 184).
Huron East		21,720	Howick, Turnberry, Morris, Wingham town, Blythe village and Wroxeter village taken from North Huron. Brussels village taken from North and Centre Huron. Grey taken from Centre Huron.	Howick (pop. 5417) (L. 290) (C. 481). Turnberry (pop. 3201) (L. 235) (C. 209). Morris (pop. 3952) (L. 270) (C. 294). Wingham (pop. —) (L. 111) (C. 151). Blythe (pop. —) (L. 46) (C. 66). Wroxeter village (pop. —) (L. 46) (C. 32). Brussels village (pop. —) (L. 109) (C. 94). Grey (pop. 3855) (L. 300) (C. 309).
Huron West		23,512	Wawanosh East and West and Ashfield taken from North Huron. Colborne and Goderich town taken from Huron Centre. Goderich and Clinton town taken from South Huron.	Wawanosh East (pop. 2651) (L. 218) (C. 155). Wawanosh West (pop. 2748) (L. 213) (C. 164). Ashfield (pop. 3893) (L. 299) (C. 321). Colborne (pop. 2429) (L. 158) (C. 171). Goderich town (pop. 3954) (L. 242) (C. 315). Goderich (pop. 3615) (L. 229) (C. 360) Clinton town (pop. 2016) (L. 189) (C. 184).
Bruce North	24,471	18,645	Bruce and Saugeen eliminated and annexed to West Bruce.	Bruce (pop. 3764) (L. 484) (C. 165). Saugeen (pop. 2579) (L. 239) (C. 71).
Bruce East		22,355	Formed of following taken from South Bruce: Culross, Greenock, Brant, Carrick, Walkerton to'n and Teeswater village.	Culross (pop. 3639) (L. 242) (C. 239). Greenock (pop. 2981) (L. 211) (C. 333). Brant (pop. 5994) (L. 304) (C. 429). Carrick (pop. 5005) (L. 305) (C. 483). Walkerton town) (pop. —) (L. 102). (C. 233). Teeswater village (pop. —) (L. 71) (C. 40).
Bruce West		24,218	Saugeen and Bruce taken from North Bruce, ballance from South Bruce.	Bruce (pop. 3764) (L. 484) (C. 165). Saugeen (pop. 2579) (L. 239) (C. 71).

CHANGES made in Boundaries of Electoral Divisions in Ontario &c.—*Continued.*

Name of Electoral Division affected.	Population in 1880-81.	Population after passing of Act.	Nature of Change.	Population of Divisions transferred in 1882, as per Census of 1881; also votes cast in Election of 1878.
Wellington N...	25,825	26,024	Amaranth & East Luther taken from Dufferin. Part of Palmerston and Wallace taken from North Perth. Shelburne village eliminated and annexed to East Grey. Maryborough eliminated and annexed to Wellington Centre.	Amaranth (pop. 2914) (L. 172) (C. 342). E. Luther (pop. 1673) (L. 111) (C. 130). Part Palmerston (pop. ——) (L. 64) (C. 84). Wallace (pop. 3581) (L. 242) (C. 306). Shelburne village (pop. ——) (Not given). Maryborough (pop. 4418) (L. 279) (C. 315).
Wellington C...	22,265	26,816	Maryborough annexed, taken from North Wellington. East Garafraxa and Orangeville taken from Dufferin.	Maryborough (pop. 4418) (L. 279) (C. 315). Orangeville (pop. 2847) (L. 150) (T. 257). E. Garafraxa (pop. 2635) (L. 137) (T. 311).
Perth South....	20,778	21,608	Usborne annexed from South Huron. Easthope South eliminated and annexed to North Oxford.	Usborne (pop. 3331) (L. 270) (C. 272.) Easthope South (pop. 2275) (L. 273) (C. 80). In 1896) (L. 256) (C. 467).
Perth North....	34,743	26,538	Palmerston town and Wallace eliminated and annexed to North Wellington. Easthope North eliminated and annexed to North Oxford.	Palmerston Town (pop. —) (L. 64) (C. 84). Wallace (pop. 3581) (L. 243) (C. 306). Easthope North (pop. 2998) (L. 479) (C. 90).
Middlesex East..	30,600	25,107	South Dorchester and Springfield village added from East Elgin. Westminster eliminated and added to South Middlesex.	South Dorchester (pop. 2071) (L. 187) (C. 181). Springfield village (not given). Westminster (pop. 6386) (L. 735) (C. 497).
Middlesex West.	21,496	19,491	Adelaide added from North Middlesex. Euphemia added from Bothwell. Delaware and Caradoc eliminated and annexed to South Middlesex.	Adelaide (pop. 2909) (L. 259) (C. 164). Euphemia (pop. 2390) (L. 184) (C. 210). Delaware (pop. 2523) (L. 182) (C. 170). Caradoc (pop. 5065) (L. 432) (C. 371).
Middlesex North	21,239	21,268	Stephen, Exeter village added from South Huron. Adelaide eliminated and annexed to West Middlesex. Lobo eliminated and annexed to South Middlesex.	Stephen (pop. 4349) (L. 352) (C. 279). Exeter (pop. —) (L. 92) (C. 207). Adelaide (pop. 2909) (L. 259) (C. 164). Lobo (pop. 3474) (L. 384) (C. 133).
Middlesex South.....	.....	18,888	Formed of Westminster from East Middlesex; Delaware and Caradoc from West Middlesex and Lobo from North Middlesex.	Westminster (pop. 6386) (L. 735) (C. 497). Delaware (pop. 2523) (L. 182) (C. 170). Caradoc (pop. 5065) (L. 432) (C. 371). Lobo (pop. 3474) (L. 384) (C. 133).
Elgin East.....	28,147	25,748	South Dorchester and Springfield eliminated and annexed to East Middlesex.	South Dorchester (pop. 2071) (L. 187) C. 181). Springfield village (not given). South Dorchester in 1896 (L. 173) (C. 150). Springfield village in 1896 (L. 65) (C. 33).
Elgin West.....	14,214	23,480	Orford, Howard and Ridgetown village added from Bothwell.	Orford (pop. 3113) (L. 400) (C. 167). Howard (pop. 4512) (L. 359) (C. 313) Ridgetown Village (pop. —) (L. 85. (C. 43).
Oxford South...	24,798	24,778	Buford and Oakland added from South Brant. Tilsonburg and Durham eliminated and added to North Norfolk.	Buford (pop. 5543) (L. 471) (C. 340). Oakland (pop. 1104) (L. 130) (C. 36). Tilsonburg (pop. —) (L. 112) (C. 158). Durham (pop. 5838) (L. 293) (C. 354).

CHANGES made in Boundaries of Electoral Divisions in Ontario, &c.—*Continued.*

Name of Electoral Division affected.	Population in 1880-81.	Population after passing of Act.	Nature of Change.	Population of Divisions transferred in 1882, as per Census of 1881; also votes cast in Election of 1878.
Oxford North...	25,361	24,390	Easthope South added from South Perth. Easthope North added from North Perth. Blenheim eliminated and added to North Brant.	Easthope South (pop. 2275) (L. 273) (C. 80). Easthope North (pop. 2998) (L. 379) (C. 90). Blenheim (pop. 6398) (L. 405) (C. 185).
Norfolk South..	16,374	19,019	Simcoe town added from North Norfolk.	Simcoe town (pop. 1856) (L. 138) (C. 232).
Norfolk North..	17,153	20,933	Durham and part of Tilsonburg town added from South Oxford. Simcoe town eliminated and added to South Norfolk.	Durham (pop. 5838) (L. 298) (C. 354). Tilsonburg town (pop. —) (L. 112) (C. 158). Simcoe town (pop. 1856) (L. 138) (C. 232).
Brant South	21,975	20,482	Onondaga and Paris town added from North Brant. Buford and Oakland eliminated and annexed to South Oxford.	Onondaga (pop. 1924) (L. 109) (C. 149). Paris town (pop. 2640) (L. 203) (C. 179). Buford (pop. 5543) (L. 471) (C. 340). Oakland (pop. 1104) (L. 130) (C. 36).
Brant North....	11,894	17,645	Ancaster added from S. Wentworth, Blenheim added from North Oxford and Onondaga and Paris town eliminated and added to South Brant.	Ancaster (pop. 5005) (L. 484) (C. 213). Blenheim (pop. 6398) (L. 405) (C. 185). Onondaga (pop. 1924) (L. 109) (C. 149). Paris town (pop. 2640) (L. 203) (C. 179).
Haldimand....	18,619	17,660	South Cayuga eliminated and annexed to Monck.	South Cayuga (pop. 972) (L. 78) (C. 76).
Lincoln and Niagara.	26,408	23,300	Grimsby and Grimsby village eliminated and annexed to South Wentworth.	Grimsby (pop. —) (L. 280) (C. 216). Grimsby village (pop. —) (L. 51) (C. 55).
Wentworth S....	14,993	15,539	Grimsby and Grimsby village added from Lincoln. Caistor added from Monck. Ancaster eliminated and added to North Brant.	Grimsby (pop. —) (L. 280) (C. 216). Grimsby village (pop. —) (L. 51) (C. 55). Caistor (pop. 2166) (L. 199) (C. 165). Ancaster (pop. 5005) (L. 480) (C. 213).
Grey South.....	21,127	25,703	Artemisia added from East Grey.	Artemisia (pop. 3484) (L. 151) (C. 304).
Grey East.....	29,177	25,334	Part Shelburne village added from North Wellington. Artemisia eliminated and added to South Grey.	Part Shelburne village (pop. not given). Artemisia (pop. 3480) (L. 151) (C. 304).
Dufferin	.....	.....	.....	Formed in 1874; not given a member.
Simcoe South...	26,891	22,721	Gwillimbury West and Bradford village eliminated and annexed to North York.	Gwillimbury West (pop. 3036) (L. 87) (C. 155). Bradford village (pop. 1130) (L. 41) (C. 44).
Simcoe North...	49,238	26,120	Tiny, Penetanguishene, Tay, Midland village, Medonte, Oro, Orillia, Matchedash and Orillia town eliminated and annexed to East Simcoe	Tiny (pop. 3214) (L. 195) (C. 161). Penetanguishene (pop. —) (L. 30) (C. 30). Tay (pop. 1629) (L. 118) (C. 180). Midland village (not given). Medonte (pop. 2541) (L. 198) (C. 225). Oro (pop. 4364) (L. 265) (C. 425). Orillia and Matchedash (pop. 1894) (L. 185) (C. 202). Orillia town (pop. 1322) (L. 153) (C. 157).
Simcoe East.....	.....	27,185	Formed by above mentioned places from North Simcoe and the following from Muskoka:—Muskoka, Wood, Medora, Monck and Gravenhurst village.	As given above in North Simcoe, &c:—Muskoka (pop. 482) (L. 70) (C. 11). Wood (not given). Medora (pop. —) (L. 45) (C. 15). Monck (pop. 535) (L. 48) (C. 35). Gravenhurst (pop. —) (L. 74) (C. 12).

CHANGES made in Boundaries of Electoral Divisions in Ontario, &c.—*Concluded.*

Name of Electoral Division Affected.	Population in 1880-81.	Population after passing of Act.	Nature of Change.	Population of Divisions transferred in 1882; as per Census of 1881; also Votes cast in Election of 1878.
York North.....	24,961	21,730	Gwillimbury West added from South Simcoe; Brantford village added from South Simcoe; Whitchurch, Newmarket town, Stouffville village eliminated and annexed to West Ontario.	Gwillimbury West (pop. 3036) (L. 87) (C. 155). Bradford village (pop. 1130) (L. 41) (C. 44). Whitchurch (pop. 5014) (L. 367) (C. 284). Newmarket town (pop. 1760) (L. 160) (C. 152). Stouffville village (pop. —) (L. 46) (C. 20).
York East.....	23,719	22,853	Stouffville village eliminated and annexed to West Ontario.	Stouffville village (pop. —(L. 46) (C. 20).
Ontario South...	13,495	20,244	Reach and Port Perry added from North Ontario.	Reach (pop. 6809) (L. 339) (C. 425). Port Perry (pop. —) (L. 150) (C. 122).
Ontario North...	28,434	21,281	Morrison, Ryde, Draper, Oakley, McCaulay, Bracebridge village, Ridout and MacLean added from Muskoka. Reach and Port Perry village eliminated and annexed to South Ontario. Uxbridge township and village eliminated and annexed to West Ontario.	Morrison (pop. 601) (L. 42) (C. 38). Draper & Oakley (pop. —) (L. 40) (C. 60). McCaulay (pop. 868) (L. 50) (C. 63). Bracebridge Village (pop. —) (L. 45) (C. 26). Ridout (not given). MacLean (pop. 238) (L. 34) (C. 26). Reach (pop. 6809) (L. 339) (C. 425). Port Perry Village (pop. —) (L. 150) (C. 122). Uxbridge Tp. (pop. 4762) (L. 438) (C. 219). Uxbridge village (pop. — (L. 188) (C. 98).
Ontario West. .	.....	20,189	Formed of Uxbridge township and village taken from North Ontario, Whitchurch and Newmarket town from North York, Stouffville village from East and North York, Pickering from South Ontario.	Uxbridge tp. (pop. 4762) (L. 438) (C. 219). Uxbridge village (L. 188) (C. 98). Whitchurch (pop. 5014) (L. 367) (C. 284). Newmarket town (pop. 1760) (L. 160) (C. 152). Stouffville (pop. —) (L. 46) (C. 20). Pickering (pop. 7375) (L. 669) (C. 529).
Muskoka and Parry Sound.	27,204	17,636	Muskoka, Wood, Medora, Monck and Gravenhurst village eliminated and annexed to East Simcoe. Morrison, Ryde, Draper, Oakley, McCaulay, Bracebridge, MacLean and Ridout eliminated and annexed to North Ontario.	Muskoka (pop. 482) (L. 70) (C. 11). Wood (not given). Medora (pop. —) (L. 45) (C. 15). Monck (pop. 535) (L. 48) (C. 35). Gravenhurst village (pop. —) (L. 74) (C. 12). Morrison (pop. 601) (L. 42) (C. 38). (Ryde—). Draper and Oakley (pop. —) (L. 40) (C. 60). McCaulay (pop. 868) (L. 50) (C. 63). Bracebridge village (pop. —) (L. 45) (C. 26). MacLean (pop. 238) (L. 30) (C. 26). Ridout (not given).
Bothwell..	27,102	22,477	Chatham and Wallaceburg village added from Kent. Oxford, Howard and Ridgetown eliminated and annexed to West Elgin. Euphemia eliminated and annexed to West Middlesex.	Chatham (pop. 5036) (L. 286) (C. 463). Wallaceburg village (pop. —) (L. 78) (C. 79). Oxford (pop. 3113) (L. 460) (C. 167). Howard (pop. 4512) (L. 359) (C. 313). Ridgetown village (pop. —) (L. 85) (C. 43). Euphemia (pop. 2390) (L. 184) (C. 214).
Cardwell..	.....	16,770	.....	
Toronto, 1891...	....	.....	Put St. Andrew's and St. Mark's in West York, which gave Conservative majority 255.	
" 1891...	....	.....	Put St. Paul's and St. Mathew's in East York, which gave Conservative majority 261.	

Now, these were the changes made at that time, and I propose to analyze them for a moment. Take the county of Simcoe. That is a county with a large population, and it had three members given to it. In that county which was large enough to have three representatives, they took West Gwillimbury and the village of Brantford out of the old historic county of Simcoe and put them into North York. They took Adjala and Mono out of the other side and put them into Cardwell, and in order to compensate for that change they took five townships out of Muskoka and put them into Simcoe. If you look at the vote given you will see that the change with regard to Gwillimbury and Brantford, was made to defeat the Postmaster General in North York, and it was done also to make Cardwell a strong Conservative constituency. It was done for no other purpose. The boundaries of the grand old county of Simcoe were changed at the west side, at the east side, and at the north side. Of course, when they took a township from the south-east corner of the county, they had to add some townships at the north-east side from the county of Muskoka; and then Ajala and Mono were added to Cardwell. If you take the county of Bruce, you find that in the Bill of 1882, Saugeen and Bruce were taken from North Bruce to which they belonged and were added to West Bruce, and the village of Port Elgin was left in North Bruce, although it was five miles from North Bruce, and the people of that village had to pass over the township of Saugeen in order to reach the constituency to which it was attached. It was said this was done for the purpose of equalizing the population. It was done for no such purpose at all. It was done for the purpose of defeating John Gillies, and it succeeded in doing that. In Grey, the township of Artemesia was taken from the centre of East Grey and was added to South Grey, because it gave a Conservative majority of 150 or 200. One township was left at the lower end of East Grey, and the people of that township, in order to go to the other part of the constituency, had to pass through the township of Artemesia. This was not done altogether for the purpose of strengthening the Liberal party in East Grey, but purely for the purpose of defeating the Liberals in South Grey. It was not needed for the purpose of equalizing the population; for Proton, which was at the lower end of the county could have been added just as well, but it did not suit to do that, because Proton would have given a Liberal majority; but the district of East Grey was very largely Conservative, and they could have afforded to add the township of Proton.

If you examine the statement which I have given to the House, you will find that all these changes were made purely for the purpose of getting a party advantage, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen if it is not a duty on the part of this Government to correct this injustice, and to restore county boundaries, and thus cultivate that spirit of loyalty and devotion which the people of this country should have towards their townships, their counties, their cities, their towns, and their villages. In the great city of Toronto, wards were thrown into adjoining constituencies for political purposes, and the harmony and unity of that city was destroyed for the purpose of gaining a poor, contemptible party advantage. When partyism runs so far and so wide and so wild, it should be checked, and the gentlemen who represent the city of Toronto should be the first to support this Government in removing this iniquity, and uniting that great city again. I am surprised that all the members for the city of Toronto do not support this Bill. This Government has dealt with the city of Toronto in a manner that no other Government has ever done. It has given that city more members than it had before, and it should show gratitude to this Government for having done it that justice which was denied to it before. It cannot be possible that the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) in opposing the Bill, is moved by fear that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) will move up to East Toronto and give him trouble there. Is it that which raises his indignation? There were certain omissions in the hon. gentleman's speech last night which were very noticeable to the House. He did not say a word about Wm. Mackenzie or Dan Mann, nor did he mention Van Horne. When he made these omissions, I thought it was because he was afraid that those powers might combine to assist the hon. member for East York to take East Toronto from him. Well, the hon. gentleman might move further. We do not know what divisions the judges may make. Leaving that work to the judges is the honourable British practice, and I understood that the hon. gentleman was devoted to Great Britain and the Empire. The sincerest form of admiration for Great Britain is imitation of what she does, and the hon. gentleman should be willing to follow the example set in England and preserve the county boundaries. The hon. gentleman said another thing last night to which I might refer. He spoke about the representation in the city of London. He did not tell us how many members there were for the city of London, but he led us to believe that there was a member for a very small population. The city of London proper has only two members; but in the whole city, with the boroughs around it, there are 5.000,000 people with 62 members. The hon. gentleman, being quite a mathematician, can soon find out what the unit of population for a member in London is. He will find that the unit there is about 73.000, while in the rural parts of England it is

about 55,000, a difference of nearly 20,000. So that he should not complain if this Government is following the example set by Great Britain herself, and is giving representation in keeping with that which is given in the city of London and in England. Then, I did think that the hon. member for East Toronto said what he should not have said about the judges. I do not think he should have held up the judges as he did, because if there is a feature of this Bill that I like it is this feature, that the Government have discarded the party advantage which they might have had under this Bill, and have handed over to the judges the formation of the ridings in the different counties, in keeping with the convenience, the welfare and the population of those ridings. They have divested themselves of all partyism, and have left the judges to do justice between the contending parties in this country. There is something magnanimous about this step, and I do not wonder at the Opposition being surprised at the Government taking such a step. After laying down the principle that county boundaries shall be maintained, they leave the judges to divide the counties in accordance with fair-play and justice and the convenience of the people generally. This is something that should appeal to Britons, because this is what was done at the last revision in England. There they appointed a commission, which brought in a report, and that report was adopted by the House, and the counties were not disturbed in a single instance, though many boroughs were removed. The work was left to a commission of judges, just as the Government are doing here.

The Government have approached this question in a statesmanlike spirit, which should commend itself to the people. They are giving it to the judges to decide—something that was never done under the late Administration. They are taking a new course; they are not asking for any advantages, but are asking that the opponents of the Government shall be on the same footing as themselves. They do not ask the judges to take a township out of one county and put it in another for the purpose of gaining a party advantage. But they let the judges decide, and they have confidence in the judges. In all the years this side of the House was in Opposition, there never was heard a word from us in disparagement of the judiciary. I have to congratulate the Government on the course they have taken, and also for having carried out the pledges to which they were committed by the great convention that was held at Ottawa. The Government have redeemed their pledges, and now I believe this is the last plank in their platform that has to be carried. They have repealed the Superannuation Act and the Franchise Act, and given a plebiscite to the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, that is one of the things to which they had committed themselves. They have reformed the tariff, and also given the preferential clause, which lowers the duty 25 per cent. Their pledges they are redeeming one by one to such an extent that hon. gentlemen opposite can no longer speak of broken pledges.

I think that this measure should go through. The hon. gentleman says it is unusual to introduce Bills of this kind at this time. Well, the late Sir John Macdonald, two years before the census was taken in 1859, readjusted the constituencies in Upper and Lower Canada. That is a precedent in addition to those already cited by the Government. I hope that this measure will pass, because it will remove from the people an Act everybody believes is bad and which most of the members, if they spoke with the same degree of sincerity as the hon. member for East Toronto did, would be willing the Government should replace by an Act based on the principles of justice and fair-play to both parties, and allow the decision to be given by the judges.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not have had any remarks to make with regard to this Bill, were it not for some of the observations made yesterday on the other side of the House with respect to the constitutional aspect, and I desire very briefly to say a few words on that point. Before doing so, I would say to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that I think the country will hardly be so fully satisfied as he is that the Government have maintained all their pledges. The last vestige of protection has not yet been destroyed, I believe, and I also think some few pledges made, first and last, by nearly every member of the present Government throughout the country, with regard to economy, have not been quite fulfilled in their entirety. There are also a few people who have something to say about the question of prohibition. In fact, some suggest that, whereas formerly the Liberal party were in favour of prohibition as it is in Maine, and free trade as it is in England, they now seem to be going in for prohibition as it is in England, and free trade as it is in Maine.

With respect to the county boundaries, the hon. gentleman laid a great deal of stress on the Imperial example, which he invites us to follow. I venture to bring to his attention that throughout the British North America Act, where it touches this matter, I see every reference and stress laid upon representation by population, but do not see any particular reference to or stress laid upon county boundaries. Therefore, if we are to follow the intention of this Act, we shall devote our attention entirely to preserving in provinces, as well as between provinces, the principle and practice of representation by population.

The remarks with which I desire princi-

pally to deal are those which were made by the hon. member for East Prince. P.E.I. (Mr. Bell), who undertook, on behalf of the Government, to answer the constitutional argument which had been so ably presented by the leader of the Opposition. Some time had elapsed since that argument was made to this House, and I wondered why no attempt was made to answer it. The Government, seeing that it was necessary to make some answer, put forward my hon. friend from East Prince to enlighten the House and to show that the argument of the leader of the Opposition is fallacious and incorrect. Now, the hon. member proceeded to deal with that argument in this way. He said that section 51, which was referred to by the hon. leader of the Opposition, had nothing at all to do with the matter under discussion, but that the point was entirely dealt with and controlled by section 18 of the British North America Act. I do not wish to do any injustice to the hon. gentleman, and shall quote what he said :

Now, there is another phase of this argument. I find that the question still arises : What power has this Parliament to deal with this question ? That question is still to be answered. I find that section 18 of the British North America Act, as amended by 38-39 Vic., chap. 38, reads as follows :—

Then, the hon. gentleman read the section, as amended, and went on to say :

The powers of this Parliament to deal with this question are as absolute as words could make them. There is no denying the point that there is absolute powers vested in this Parliament to deal with the question, unless it is specially prevented from legislating upon it by the provisions of the British North America Act.

I could hardly believe the hon. gentleman to be serious, and later on I asked this question, after he had reiterated that statement:

May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he understands that the word "powers" in section 18 of the British North America Act refers to and includes legislative powers ?

He said :

Yes, it includes legislative powers.

Then, some further discussion took place between us, which I need not quote. Therefore, the position of the Government, as put forward by the hon. member for East Prince, is that they depend upon section 18 of the British North America Act for the constitutionality of this measure. Well, now, let us look at section 18. That section, as amended, and quoted by my hon. friend, is as follows :

The privileges, immunities and powers to be held, enjoyed and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are, from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that any Act of the Parliament of Canada defining such privileges, immunities and powers shall not confer any privileges, immunities or powers exceeding those at the passage of such Act held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.

Now, there are so many answers to the absolutely indefensible position that the hon. gentleman took that it is difficult to know where to begin with them. In the first place, the powers shall be "such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada"—well, if there was any possible argument in the construction of my hon. friend, the first answer to it would be that the powers have not been defined by the Parliament of Canada. Of course, as against the ridiculous position which my hon. friend and the Government are obliged to take in this connection there is the fact that no human being would ever suppose the Imperial Parliament intended to give to the Parliament of Canada such general powers of legislation as the Parliament of Canada might define for itself. There is the further point—which would indicate that he had not read the section—that the powers are to be such as are enjoyed "by the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland." The Commons House of Parliament has no power of itself to legislate. My hon. friend surely recollects that, and when it is stated to him he would, I think, at once withdraw from the position he has taken on behalf of the Government. The powers referred to in this section are not legislative powers. No one ever supposed that they were legislative powers. I have heard this section discussed in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and also in the Privy Council in the case of Thomas vs. Haliburton, reported in the Privy Council as Fielding vs. Thomas, and no counsel and no judge ever suggested that there could be any construction placed upon this section such as my hon. friend has seen fit to place upon it. But if my hon. friend desires an authority, I can produce one which has been highly lauded in this House. I refer to Mr. Clement, who is now the legal adviser of the Executive Council of the Yukon. Members of the Government have told us about his great abilities, and I, for one, stood up in this House and said that I recognized the fact that though, as I believed, he had not an extensive practice at the bar, he had certainly written a most excellent text book on the Canadian constitution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He has had a large practice too.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not dispute that. I believe he is a very able man. But he dealt with this section 18, and with the word "powers," upon which my hon. friend relies——

Mr. BELL (East Prince). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) allow me a word of explanation. I put a fair construction on section 18, but I did not insist on it. But there

are other sections conferring legislative power on this Parliament. Section 91, for instance, gives power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. What such laws are to be is largely in the discretion of Parliament. This measure could be authorized, for instance, under section 91.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman bases it on sections 91 and 92, he will find he is as far astray as in basing it on section 18. I am not dealing with what the hon. gentleman had in his mind, but with his language—which I have quoted—in his speech and in answer to a direct question put by me. I asked him if he thought that section 18 included legislative powers and he answered as directly as a man could that he thought it did include legislative powers. Now, when the hon. gentleman interrupted me—and I may say that I extended to him a courtesy which he did not see fit to extend to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) last evening, and I thought that it was unfair that he did not do so—I was about to quote the language of Mr. W. H. P. Clement, which I think no lawyer in this House on either side will dispute. He says, dealing with section 18 and the word "powers," which is the word upon which my hon. friend bases his argument:

> The reference is, of course, to powers other than legislative; as, for example, the power to compel the attendance of witnesses and to procure the production of papers, which may be described as inquisitorial and punitive powers in aid of intelligent legislation.

If the hon. gentleman desires further authority, I can refer him to another text book written by Mr. Lefroy, which has been rightly characterized by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in this House, as, perhaps, the ablest book that has been written on the Canadian constitution. At page 749, it will be seen that Mr. Lefroy treats the word "powers" as meaning the same thing as stated by Mr. Clement—that is, that it refers to powers other than legislative. And, as a matter of fact, for the reasons I have stated, it could not refer to anything else, because the reference is to the powers possessed, not by the Imperial Parliament, but by the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain. Why, Sir, if the argument of my hon. friend which has been put forward as the constitutional basis of this Bill, stated the real construction of this statute, the result would probably be that the Parliament of Canada would possess all the powers that the Imperial Parliament possesses. As suggested by an hon. member on this side of the House last evening, this Parliament might proceed to pass a Bill granting Home Rule to Ireland or a Bill extending the doctrine of protection to England and giving us a real preference, which we do not possess under the present tariff policy of the Government. But I think my hon. friend, on reflection, will come to the conclusion that he did not base this power, if it exists in this House at all, on the right section of the British North America Act, when he saw fit to base it on section 18.

Now, it does not follow, because my hon. friend is evidently wrong in regard to that argument, and the Government are evidently wrong in putting him forward, to make that argument on their behalf, that the power does not exist; and I, for one, should be disposed to say that if it exists at all it must exist under section 40 of the British North America Act, under which it is provided:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall, for the purposes of election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts as follows:—

And it states what they are. One would naturally say: Here is a provision that the electoral districts in the province shall be so and so until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides—therefore, the Parliament of Canada has the right to otherwise provide. Exactly that construction has been applied to section 41, where the same language is used:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces relative to the following matters, or any of them (naming certain matters), shall continue to be as they are at present.

Well, if this section 40 does give the power, the question remains whether it must not be construed with the section to which the leader of the Opposition has referred, namely, section 51 of the Act, and upon which he based so able an argument. The matter is one that is not free from doubt, but I think there is a great deal to be said, independently of authority altogether, for the view which the leader of the Opposition put forward. In the first place, there is the undoubted authority of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition who has had so great a parliamentary experience in dealing with the construction of statutes for so many years, and his authority is a strong argument in itself. But further than that, you have this to consider. You are, under section 51, to increase or to decrease the number of members of Parliament for the different provinces after each decennial census. Now, that section does not say, in the first place, that the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted as between themselves; it says the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted. And you might well say that the Imperial Parliament, in dealing with section 40, were looking forward to the provision made in section 51, and for this reason, that there is no occasion for interfering with the boundaries of the electoral ridings in any province until you have occasion to increase or decrease

the number of members in such province. That is the reason why I say you should read section 40 in connection with section 51, because there can be no occasion, so far as I can see, for altering the boundaries of electoral districts within the provinces until you come to an occasion after the decennial census, when you are either to increase or decrease the number of members for that province. I think that is a good reason for suggesting that these two sections should be read together. When you look at section 40 and afterwards at section 51, you find that, when you are redistributing as between the provinces the number of members for each province, you shall also take occasion at the same time to deal with the electoral districts in each province, and if the occasion has arisen by reason of the census to increase or decrease the number of members for each province, you shall at that time alter the boundaries of the electoral districts in that province as may be necessary. At all events, whether that is a sound rule of construction, it is certainly common sense, because every argument which can be urged in this matter points to the desirability of not interfering year after year, as one party or the other comes into power, with the electoral districts in the different provinces for party purposes. The argument from common sense and from expediency points entirely to the view that a party should not exercise any such power, that no such power should be given to it under the circumstances, and, therefore, if you find any grounds whatever for reading that construction into the language of the constitution, you should by all means adopt it, and both parties should be at one on that point. I think both parties have been at one on that point. I will point out that as far back as 1882 this matter was incidentally referred to in the House by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, who at that time was conducting a running conversational debate with the Hon. Edward Blake. Mr. Blake did not in the slightest degree dissent from Sir John A. Macdonald's view. The Bill respecting the township of Tuckersmith is referred to in Sir John Bourinot's work, page 473; he instances that Bill as one which the Senate threw out. It was a Bill which altered the electoral divisions of a county, and was introduced in 1874, and not on the occasion of a redistribution after a decennial census. Sir John A. Macdonald, in the presence of the Hon. Edward Blake, in dealing with that in 1882, used this language:

> Legal power is right, but the expediency of exercising that power is a different affair. The only matter in which the House of Lords cannot interfere is the Supply Bill. We know that when the Senate threw out the Tuckersmith Bill the hon. gentleman did not deny the constitutional right of that House to interfere in the matter,—

And this is the language to which I direct the attention of the House:

> ——and they interfered rightly and well on that occasion, because they prevented a breach of the British North America Act by so doing.

Now, Mr. Blake spoke immediately after Sir John A. Macdonald, the debate for a time was a conversational debate; he spoke two or three times, as reported on that same page, and he did not dissent at all from the views Sir John A. Macdonald then laid down.

I well remember that in the debate of 1896, when the late Dalton McCarthy, a gentleman whose memory is very much respected in this House, and whose legal attainments are particularly respected by members of the legal profession—I recollect that he was dealing with the statute relating to a Governor General's warrant, and although he was supporting the views which was being argued by gentlemen on the other side of the House, he frankly stated that his impression of the statute which was then in question had been the view that was advocated by gentlemen on this side of the House. He said that Sir Oliver Mowat, a very eminent jurist, had given an opinion to the contrary; and while he did not propose to give up his opinion to any man, nevertheless, he said, any one who would get up in the House and venture to say that Sir Oliver Mowat's view was absolutely incorrect, would be a rash man. And so I say that when Sir John A. Macdonald has stated in explicit terms that the Senate of Canada interfered rightly and well on that occasion because they prevented a breach of the British North America Act by so doing, he stated as directly as could be the view which I am now presenting to the House, the view which has been so ably advanced in this House by the leader of the Opposition as the correct view. And I say that when the Hon. Edward Blake, in speaking two or three times immediately afterwards, did not dissent from that view, we must understand that he assented to it; and if there had been the slightest ground for Mr. Blake's dissent from that view, we would have had his dissent, for the reason that he was criticising the Senate at that time, and it would have been his object as a matter of argument to show that Sir John A. Macdonald, in stating the right of the Senate on that occasion, had stated something which was not constitutionally correct. If any such argument had existed in the mind of Mr. Blake at that time, he was the last man to forget it, and the fact that he did not use it leads me to believe that he assented entirely to the view which Sir John A. Macdonald then laid down.

Now, look at the question of expediency. While there may be a division of opinion between hon. gentlemen in this House on the constitutional question, I for one fail to see any grounds on which there can be any dispute on the point of expediency. What occasion can there possibly be, or ought there possibly to be, for dealing with

a matter of this kind, except after a decennial census. When the population of each province is ascertained, at each decennial census, you may find that the population of the province remains the same, or has not so increased, or decreased, that there is any change in the number of its representatives. In such a case there is no occasion to alter the boundaries of the electoral divisions. Of course, you may have the extremely improbable event that the population has moved within the boundaries of the province, so as to make a change necessary. But I do not think that is a matter of probability or that the idea was present to the framers of this Act. Then you have the case where the representation has increased or decreased so as to alter the number of representatives to which a province is entitled. You deal with that once and for all for the next ten years. You deal with that on the basis of the population within the province just as you deal with the representation of the provinces as between themselves, on the same basis. The matter is settled, and should be settled, to all intents and purposes, for the next ten years. I hope we shall not have the spectacle of one party after another coming into power and seeking to benefit themselves on the eve of an election, or, as in this case, on the eve of a census, by making such a change in the electoral boundaries of the provinces as will inure to the advantage of the political party that happens to be in power at the moment. Is that or is it not common sense, and is it or is it not the right way to interpret the constitution? That is the way that it has been interpreted for the last thirty-two years, or, at all events, since 1882, when Sir John Macdonald, in the presence of Mr. Blake, laid down this principle. Why should we depart from it now? Is it not a sound and healthy rule? Is there any reason or any justification for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, endeavouring to pass this act on the possible eve of a dissolution, and certainly on the eve of the census, for the possibility of any small party advantage that may inure to some half dozen or dozen hon. members of this House? I think I can appeal with some confidence to the right hon. leader of the Government on this point, because it is a matter that affects more than the Liberal party. In the future you may find the very same thing done in 1902, or 1903, or 1904, or 1905, by the Conservative party. I should deplore that such a thing should be done by the Conservative party. I should deplore that the Conservative or the Liberal party should lay down this principle and act upon this rule, that whenever a party comes into power and is not satisfied with the distribution which has been made after the last decennial census, it should immediately seek to gain an advantage by an act of this kind. Particularly should I deprecate an act of this kind on the eve of a census.

Before passing from that point, I would like to make this suggestion, that usages of this kind may well become engrafted upon the British North America Act, and may acquire, imperceptibly and gradually, the force of law. The right hon. gentleman knows well that the constitution is not confined within the four corners of the British North America Act. I can give him very good authority for that if needs be, and authority that, I think, he will not dispute. He knows very well that in England they do not have a written constitution as we have, but nevertheless they have a bill of rights and some statutes which, to a certain extent, form the written portion of the constitution. Taswell Langmead, in his history of the progress of the constitution since the revolution, says:

> As might be expected in a living organism, the constitution has not remained stationary during a period of nearly two centuries. But its greatest changes have been brought about not by legislative enactment. Whilst the legal code has remained substantially unaltered, there has grown up by its side a purely unwritten and conventional code, which, firmly established as a part of the constitution, though still unknown to law, has so completely modified the practical working of the legal code as to form a present constitution which would be scarcely recognisable, except in its fundamental principles by the authors of the Bill of Rights.

The same language has been used in regard to the American constitution, which is a written constitution like our own. Prof. Bryce, in his book on the American Commonwealth, uses this language, quoting from a very eminent constitutional lawyer:

> Thus the American constitution has necessarily changed as the nation has changed, has changed in the spirit with which men regard it, and therefore in its own spirit. To use the words of the eminent constitutional lawyer whom I have more than once quoted: "We may think," says Judge Cooley, "that we have the constitution all before us;——

That is, in its written terms.

> ——but for practical purposes the constitution is that which the Government in its several departments, and the people in the performance of their duties as citizens, recognize and respect as such; and nothing else is."

So then, in Canada, where we have a written constitution, as they have in the United States, we must not expect to find the constitution entirely within the walls of the statute. In the very nature of things, in the growth of this country, the constitution, written though it may be, will grow just as the American constitution has grown, and this is one of the things, it seems to me, that has grown with it, namely, that the power conferred upon Parliament by the British North America Act to

deal with the boundaries of electoral districts in the several provinces, shall be exercised only at the time pointed out in section 51, that is to say, at the time when the representation of the provinces as between themselves, is dealt with.

Of course, I need not point out to my hon. friend the leader of the Government that there is a difference between the legal power to do this and the matter of its constitutionality, using the word constitution in the broad sense in which I have endeavoured to explain it just now. For example, as was pointed out by my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell), in a debate in the session of 1896, in regard to Governor General's warrants, there are a great many things which the executive of the country even have the legal power to do, but the doing of which would probably bring about the indictment of the Ministers for high treason. I will read a portion of the selection to which he referred, and then I will read a sentence or two more which he did not then read. For example, Bagehot says:

> But this is nothing to what the Queen can by law do without consulting Parliament. Not to mention other things, she could disband the army (by law she cannot engage more than a certain number of men, but she is not obliged to engage any men); she could dismiss all the officers from the General commander-in-chief downwards; she could dismiss all the sailors too; she could sell off all our ships of war and all our naval stores; she could make a peace by the sacrifice of Cornwall, and begin a war for the conquest of Brittany. She could make every citizen of the United Kingdom, male or female, a peer; she could make every parish in the United Kingdom a "university"; she could dismiss most of the civil servants; she could pardon all offenders. In a word, the Queen could, by prerogative, upset all the action of civil government within the Government, could disgrace the nation by a bad war or peace, and could, by disbanding our forces, whether land or sea, leave us defenceless against foreign nations. Why do we not fear that she would do this, or any approach to it?

He explains the reason why, which the hon. gentleman did not read, and which I will read in a moment. I may mention that the English Parliament could do a great many things also. It could pass an Act to pension members of Parliament; it could pass an Act continuing its existence for twenty years or as long as the hon. member would live. The provincial parliaments could do the same thing, as far as I understand, but they do not do these things, and therefore, the right hon. leader of the Government, in looking at this Act, must not look simply at the legal power, but he must look at the question of the constitution in the broad aspect which I have endeavoured to place before the House. What does Bagehot say further with respect to the quotation I have just read from. He says a Minister dare not advise the Crown to so act:

> Because there are two checks—one ancient and coarse, the other modern and delicate. The first is the check of impeachment. Any Minister who advised the Queen so to use her prerogative as to endanger the safety of the realm, might be impeached for high treason, and would be so.

Nevertheless, the Queen, strictly speaking, has a right to do these things; but any Minister who advises her to adopt such a course, would, as this learned text-writer says, be probably impeached for high treason.

I have not attempted to deal with the details of this Bill; I have endeavoured solely to place before the House, as briefly as I could, my view on the doubt which exists as to the legal power to pass this Act; and next, the point—it seems to me an unanswerable point—that whether or not there is a legal power to pass this Bill, yet the spirit of the constitution, in the broad sense that I have endeavoured to express to the House, will not sanction the passage of such a measure. On this ground, and on the ground of expediency—which I think is perhaps the strongest ground of all—I again submit to the right hon. Prime Minister that this is not a Bill which at this stage, almost at the end of this Parliament, and on the eve of a census which will bring about the proper time for dealing with a measure of this kind—I submit that this is not a Bill which this House ought now be asked to pass, and that the right hon. gentleman, upon more mature reflection, may see fit, I hope, to concur in that conclusion.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Halifax). I have listened with a great deal of interest to my learned and hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Borden), because I knew that if there was anything that could be urged in support of the strange contention made by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), it would be discovered by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). But I listened to the hon. gentleman very attentively and patiently without discovering that he deemed it prudent to back up his leader on the constitutional point which that gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) raised. Having heard the leader of the Opposition approach this question in the manner he did, and having seen him left alone in his contention, I was reminded of a discourse I once heard delivered by the late lamented Benjamin Butler, when he was giving his reminiscences from his early experiences as a practitioner somewhere in the state of Massachusetts. He told us that he was confronted with the difficulty of desiring to get a question reviewed by the court in which there did not seem to be very much merit. He was very diffident about pressing the matter upon the attention of the learned judge, and, he said, he went to a practitioner who was afterwards chief justice of Massachusetts, and subsequently judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, and asked him if he would kindly make an application to the judge to have the point reserved. "No," said Mr. Gray, "I will do nothing of the

kind. I have a reputation to lose, and I am not going to stake it on such a flimsy proposition." "Well," said Mr. Butler, "I have no reputation to lose, and I intend to take that point and have the benefit of it." I am inclined to think, Sir, that the legal luminaries of the Opposition, having a reputation to lose, were unwilling to stake their reputation upon the contention that there was anything in the faintest degree unconstitutional in the proposal which is now before the House. But, Sir, I do think it was not generous of them to allow their honoured and revered leader—a gentleman whom we all in this House sincerely admire—to put forward a contention which not a single man of them, I venture to say, will back up on his reputation as a lawyer. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has dealt with the question, as presented by the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Bell) but he has taken good care to entirely steer clear of all the strong points that were made by that learned gentleman. The hon. member (Mr. Bell) pointed out, with perfect logical precision and emphasis, that the provisions of the British North America Act in reference to redistribution have relation, not to any redistribution as among the various electoral districts of any given province, but that the whole stress of that provision of the British North America Act is laid upon redistribution as among the various provinces of the Dominion. That was the strong argument of the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, and the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Borden) made not a single passing reference to it, but took up some little side issue which was thrown in merely as a make-weight to an argument, which in itself needed no such make-weight at all. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) had considered the matter further, he probably would not have used that make-weight in his argument at all, because it was not necessary in support of the forceful and learned contention which he made to this House. It was that which the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Borden) laid hold of. That is, of course, a plausible method, and an ordinary method, but it is not a method which in the slightest degree is going to influence or bewilder this House.

What is the constitutional position of this Parliament, under the provisions of the British North America Act, with reference to redistribution? Every one knows that, in so far as the powers of this Parliament are concerned, we may well say we have an unwritten constitution. A large part of the powers which can be exercised by this Parliament, do not need to be set down in any categorical terms in the statute. Every one knows that when you are seeking for the powers of provincial legislatures, you have to find some express provision in the British North America Act granting those powers, but every one knows, as well, the converse of that proposition—and none better than my learned friend from Halifax—that the powers of this Dominion Parliament are plenary, and that it has power to do anything which cannot be done by the provincial legislatures, unless it comes within an express prohibition in the constitutional Act, or a prohibition contained in some other Imperial statute. This Parliament, therefore, is invested with abundant authority, and the idea of any one with a reputation to lose, saying that this Parliament cannot from time to time, as, in its wisdom, it may deem necessary, readjust the representation of the various electoral districts in any given province of this Dominion, is a monstrous absurdity. Perhaps I should not use such strong language; it is not necessary to use strong language, and I will, therefore, content myself by saying that I do not believe there is to be found a lawyer in this House, or in this Dominion, who will undertake to seriously state that there is anything unconstitutional or anything illegal in this Parliament from time to time readjusting the representation of the people in any particular province of the Dominion. No lawyer has in this Dominion put forward any contention against the power of this Parliament to do so, and no lawyer on either side of the House will stake his reputation on such a proposition. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) had an opportunity of doing so, if he wished. He refrained from doing so, although I think it was his duty to give the House the benefit of his real opinion on the subject. To-night in this House he was not a lawyer with a fee in his pocket, whose tongue and whose lips were his client's, and who was bound to conceal, possibly, in the interest of his clients, what his real opinion about this question was. The hon. and learned gentleman is not practising in a court of law this evening; he is putting forward his bona fide opinions in the Parliament of his country, and he is bound to give us his real honest opinion about the legal and constitutional question involved in the discussion before the House. I do not know whether he has done so or not—I am almost certain he has not done so. I should think less of his ability and standing as a professional man than I do, if I had to come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) was putting forward his genuine opinion, when suggesting that this Parliament has not a perfect and absolutely constitutional power to pass this Act, if they see fit to do so, and that the question is, as I think he felt inclined to admit, simply a question of expediency, whether it be right or wrong, wise or unwise, to pass the statute which this House of Commons is now called upon to assent to. Now, what are the provisions of the British North America Act to which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island called attention? I really think that one should hard-

ly be asked to argue in this House a matter which is so absolutely elementary and indubitable as the proposition which I am endeavouring to establish. The first section of the British North America Act bearing indirectly on the question is section 8 which provides:

In the general census of the population of Canada, which is hereby required to be taken in the year 1871, and in every tenth year hereafter, the respective populations of the four provinces shall be distinguished.

This is one indication from which you might almost forecast what the purpose of that decennial census was. It is the populations of the respective provinces that are to be distinguished, in order that the distribution of the membership in this Parliament may be readjusted from time to time in accordance with the changes which have taken place in those populations. From that we could make a very shrewd and intelligent guess, if we had nothing further to go upon, but it would be only a guess. Then, we find the provision in section 37 to the proportion of membership in this House of Commons:

The House of Commons shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of 181 members,—

Which has since been increased——

of whom 82 shall be elected for Ontario, 65 for Quebec, 19 for Nova Scotia, and 15 for New Brunswick.

The ratio which these figures bear to the respective populations of the various provinces has to be maintained in any readjustment of seats made for this Parliament, the province of Quebec still retaining its 65 members; or, if you choose, you may increase that number, so long as the proportion among the various provinces is duly maintained.

Then comes the section to which my hon. friend referred, and which I will read—section 51:

On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:—

The representation "of the four provinces" shall be readjusted. There is not a single word as to the different counties or the different electoral districts within the province. You can give the additional representation to which a province may be entitled in any way you please. You can give it all to one city or town or to one rural community if you choose. There is no constitutional limit imposed in that respect. The only constitutional limit is that you must preserve the representation by population as between the various provinces of the Dominion. Now, I am not presenting anything to the House which was not presented by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) undertook to answer, but in answer to which he made not the slightest impression, except to raise a little side issue which was not relevant to the discussion at all.

Quebec shall have the fixed number of 65 members; there shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number 65 bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained).

Not electoral districts, counties, or cities, but provinces and only provinces, were in the mind of the statesmen who drafted and of the Imperial Parliament which passed that act——

In the computation of the number of members for a province, a fractional part not exceeding one-half of the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number.

Province again, you see—not counties or districts, or cities——

On any readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards; such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament.

That is the provision in regard to the readjustment of the membership of this House among the various provinces of the Dominion. That imposes a duty upon this Parliament, but it does not say a single word by way of diminution of the powers of this Parliament as they would have undoubtedly existed even if that section had never been passed. It does not say that this Parliament shall not have the same power as to any particular province that the Imperial Parliament has to readjust representation in the United Kingdom from time to time. It does not say one word to establish any constitutional limitation whatever, except that the representation of the various provinces shall remain stationary from one decennial period to another, and shall then be readjusted according to the results of the decennial census. Then, as if to make the matter more abundantly clear, section 52 provides:

The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this Act is not thereby disturbed.

Now, that is all the direct legislation you can find, so far as I know, bearing upon

this subject at all. Would any lawyer say that anything stated there for the purpose of compelling you to have a fair and adequate proportional representation as among the various provinces, and for seeing that that representation shall be readjusted from time to time according to the changes of the populations of the provinces as indicated by the decennial census, could be held, directly or remotely, or by any implication whatever to take away the power of this Parliament, from time to time, as it might deem it expedient, to readjust the representation in any particular province, so long as it did not violate that section 51 and disturb the proportionate representation of the various provinces of the Dominion? I do not believe there is a lawyer in this country, who has any reputation to lose, and I am sure there is no lawyer in this House, whether he has a reputation to lose or not, who will put himself on record as saying that there is any such limitation as was suggested by the hon. and learned leader of the Opposition in opening this discussion.

Then, of course, so far as precedents and authorities are concerned, this House has repeatedly recognized the principle for which I am contending. The right hon. gentleman who leads the House referred to two occasions when this was done—not immediately upon the completion of a census—in 1895 and in 1893. Looking at the statute, chapter 9 of 1893, which I think was referred to by the leader of the Government, you will find a long section occupying nearly two pages substituting for the description of the electoral district of Nipissing, as given in the Act for the Readjustment of the Representation, a new section describing another electoral district of Nipissing. I have not compared the two sections, but I venture to say that they do not both describe the same territory in different words but involve a change in the constituency. But I confess I have not made the comparison.

If you go over the ten sections of that Bill, some of which are unimportant, and merely clerical changes, as the leader of the Opposition has said, you will find that no less than three make distinct changes in the representation as fixed by the Redistribution Act of 1892. The districts of Rouville and St. Hyacinthe were both changed, and you will find at least three distinct changes, every one of which would be illegal and unconstitutional if the proposition stated by the leader of the Opposition were sound in law. But everybody knows they were perfectly legal and constitutional, or they would not have been adopted by that Parliament. In 1895 you have another Act, the effect of which the hon. leader of the Opposition sought to minimize by saying it was only to correct a merely clerical error. One section was, in fact, only to correct a clerical error that had been made in the Act to readjust representation in the House of Commons. But here is a section which reads:

> That the township of Thurlow and the north-east township of Joliette are hereby detached from the county of Berthier and annexed to the county of Joliette for the purpose of representation in the House of Commons.

I am not well enough acquainted with the geography of Quebec to know just what effect that would have, but reading plain English it does seem that it makes a change in the representation of the ridings that the section relates to, and that must have been an illegal and unconstitutional Act if this Parliament cannot, at any other period than that of the decennial census, readjust the representation of the people in this House. I am simply repeating what was said, and said with great emphasis, propriety and convincing clearness by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Bell). Previously to either of these acts there was an Act of Parliament in 1868, exactly of the same character, entitled an Act to annex a portion of the seigneury of Belair to the county of Quebec and another to the county of Portneuf. Surely these are Acts which, under the contention of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) would be unconstitutional, if done at any other time than immediately following the taking of the decennial census. There certainly cannot be anything in that contention. The question is reduced of course, as my hon. friend has practically admitted to a question of expediency, propriety and wisdom, and we are prepared to argue it on those grounds. Every hon. member on this side has argued it on that basis.

Now, surely if a wrong has been done it is right to correct it, and if you are going to correct a wrong done the right time to do it is at the first convenient opportunity. There is never any more suitable time for undoing a wrong than the present time. Let us for the purpose of argument suppose that this Bill is as "infamous a gerrymander" as some hon. gentlemen opposite say it is, although I notice that their adjectives are not quite in so superlative a degree as on some occasions. They do not lay as much emphasis and stress on those strong adjectives as they have done with regard to other measures. I notice a degree of weakness in their adjectives as compared with those they usually make use of—except on the part of two hon. gentlemen who have, I suppose, pronounced their valedictory as the gladiators of old did in the "morituri te salutant." I trust, however, that those were not valedictory addresses and that we shall see these gentlemen here for many a Parliament to come. I hope they will be longer here than some persons anticipate. But, as I was about to say, let us suppose this measure is as infamous as it is sometimes described, and let us suppose that instead of

being passed in 1899 that it were being passed four or five years earlier. Suppose the Liberal party had been returned to power eight or nine years ago and had then passed this Act assuming it to be of the character attributed to it by hon. gentlemen opposite, does my hon. friend say, assuming this to be an infamous, unjust and oppressive Act which does not give a fair representation to the various districts throughout the Dominion, would any hon. gentleman opposite say that one of the very first acts of hon. gentlemen opposite, should they have been in such a suppositious case returned to power would not be to undo immediately the moment they could get the political power to do so the infamous, unjust, improper Act which had been passed, as I have been supposing, in 1892 or 1893, so that at the next election the remedy would be immediately operative. Suppose an "infamous gerrymander Bill" were passed by any Government midway between two decennial periods, shortly after the decennial census had been taken, would it not be the bounden duty of the Government returned to power. which had opposed the infamous Government, which had put that infamous gerrymander Bill through, to repeal that Act and place those constituencies back in the position in which they were before and readjust them in such a way that at the very next election the people would be properly represented in the various provinces. My hon. friend says no, they would have to leave that wrong unredressed for eight or nine long years and perhaps have two or three elections held in the meantime with these constituencies gerrymandered. According to his contention the constitution of this country which is supposed to be a miracle of wisdom is such a botch and bungle that we would have to leave a wrong like this unredressed and leave the constituencies misrepresented perhaps through two elections until the decennial period had arrived and a Redistribution Act could be passed. That is the logical and obvious conclusion to which my hon. friend's argument leads him and to which the argument of the leader of the Opposition leads. That conclusion is monstrous. It can never be conceived that this is the wisdom embodied in the British North America Act, in the preparation of which so many bright geniuses and strong intellects were employed and which received the careful consideration of some of the best minds in the Imperial Parliament. I say again, as my hon. friend has virtually conceded, that the question is not a constitutional or a legal question at all, but simply as to whether it is wise, just, reasonable and proper that such an Act shall be passed. And on those issues of the wisdom, the reasonableness, the justice and the propriety of it we on this side are prepared to challenge the vote of the House and the public opinion of the country. My hon. friend asks: If you do not accept my proposition what result do you bring yourself to? That parties may for purely partisan purposes readjust the constituencies every time a new Government is returned to power. Well, there are many things, as my hon. friend has quoted, that can legally be done that never will be done in this world.

Mr. CLANCY. And this is one.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that this which the hon. member for Halifax mentions is one. I take it that the hon. gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. CLANCY. I refer to this Bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. These things that the hon. member for Halifax says can be done under the reading of the British North America Act, that a readjustment can be made at other times than after the decennial census, will not be done; and the guarantee is that no Government will undertake to bring forward a Bill to readjust the constituencies, except to cure some manifest evil and except, as in the present case, when the Government knows well, as these hon. gentlemen opposite know well, that the general tenor and main purpose of the Bill have the strong endorsement of the people. Your guarantee against legislative improprieties like that are not in printer's ink or in written provisions; but they are in the hearts of the people and in the common sense of the country. That is the best guarantee you could have, for no Government will outrage the feelings of this country by repeatedly perpetrating a gerrymander. It has been done once, this Government proposes to undo it; but it will never be the practice prevailing in this country as it never has been. It has been resorted to only in desperate emergencies, as it was only once before, in 1882, and there is no danger of it becoming the practice with reference to the representation of the people in this House.

Now, I think I have exhausted all that I have to say with reference to the so-called constitutional question, which turns out to be not a constitutional question even on the authority of my hon. and learned friend. If it were not so late I should have liked to deal at some length with two other questions of principle which have been suggested in reference to this Bill, one being the question of representation by population and the other the alleged under-representation of the cities, especially the great city of Toronto. Now, to a certain extent and up to a certain limit, it is a proper principle that even apart from any interprovincial relations of the various provinces, the various sections of each province should be represented in this House, measurably speaking, according to population. To what extent is that principle a controlling one? I think the best way to answer that question is to ascertain what was the action with respect to it of the fathers of confederation, the founders of the union. Of course, it would not be fair to

judge of that by the anomalies existing at the time of confederation, because the expedient then adopted was intended merely to meet an emergency and to exist only until a proper readjustment could take place; but I desire to consider how they used the opportunity presented to them after the first decennial census in 1871. It would be a very tedious thing to go through the figures which would show the representation of the various portions of the Dominion at that time, and, at this late hour, I would not weary the House with those details. But I may give some of the salient features presented by these figures, which will show how this idea of representation by population was then carried out. Beginning with the province of Ontario, there were four electoral districts having a population of over 30,000, that is, between 30,000 and 40,000; and there were four electoral districts having a population under 10,000: There were thirty-four constituencies having a population between 20,000 and 30,000, and forty-four having a population between 10,000 and 20,000. Consider whether that carries out the principle of representation by population with the strict and severe arithmetical exactness which is now being pressed upon us by some controversalists in this debate—an idea the fallacy of which was properly exposed by Mr. Gladstone in his great speech on the last Redistribution Bill in England. In the first group of four constituencies there were North Simcoe, with a population of over 33,000; Essex, over 32,000; Bothwell, over 31,000, and South Bruce, over 31,000, the average of the group being 32,435 people represented by one member. Then you had another group side by side with these: Cornwall, with a population of over 7,000; Algoma, over 7,000; Muskoka, nearly 7,000, and Niagara, 3,693. That is to say, you had a second group with an average population of 6,186, as against the first group, with an average of 32,435. Is that representation by population? Was it not an anomaly and a gross injustice that North Simcoe and Essex and Bothwell and South Bruce should have an average of 32,435 represented by only one member, and that another group should have a member for each 6,186? I do not say, for my part, that there was anything wrong about it. I think it is altogether probable that there were good reasons for it. Certainly, in the most striking case, that of Niagara, there were reasons why it should be left as it was. It was an old historic settlement, with a long record of representation and a continuous municipal life—a community whose representation, as Sir John Macdonald said, in the course of the debate, properly should be left undisturbed. To leave it as it stood was to preserve the county and municipal organization. But here, I repeat, you have one group of counties in which the people had five times the representation of the other group, and the highest on the list had ten times the representation of the lowest. That is not representation by population, which is the fetish of these hon. gentlemen now—though it never was their fetish before, and certainly not when the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald logically said that it involved the doctrine of universal suffrage—which, I suppose, was to him the abomination of desolation.

The unit of population in Ontario at that time was 18,420. But you have one county with a population of 33,000 and over, almost double the unit; and you have one county with less than one-fourth of the population it should possess on that basis. You have a group of four counties, and rural counties at that, averaging nearly twice as large as they should be, and a group of four having one-third of what they should contain on the basis of the unit. There are various other anomalies, which I shall not mention, in Ontario, and the province of Quebec presents the same features as adjusted by the Redistribution Act of 1872. I will not pause to refer to these, but will come to the province of Nova Scotia. I do that for the purpose of introducing the opinion of an hon. member whose opinion should be received with great weight in this House, upon another question of principle, which I shall not discuss at length, but with a single reference to which, as the hour is so late, I will conclude my remarks. In the province of Nova Scotia, we have the county of Halifax, in 1872, with a population of 56,963, having only two members, while the county of Pictou, with only 32,114 of a population, have also two members, the same as the county of Halifax, with its 57,000. Then, we have the county of Cape Breton, with a population of 26,454, also with two members. Now, mark that; the population of Halifax was 56,963, the half of which would be 28,481; that is to say, you had 28,481 people in Halifax electing one member, and you had by that readjustment, made in 1872, 26,434 people, more than 2,000 less than half the population of Halifax, electing two members. Now, that was not right on the basis of representation by population. But I am not going to say there was not good reason even for that anomaly.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Was not that on the basis of representation by population? Why were these three counties selected to receive two members?

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, if it is according to the basis of representation by population that Halifax, with 56,963, should elect exactly the same number of members as Cape Breton, with less than half that number, and if that readjustment was made upon that basis then I must admit that you can get any quantity of representation by population in the Bill you passed in 1882.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Would the hon. gentleman assign three members to each of these counties?

Mr. RUSSELL. You had already two members in Halifax, you had already two members in Pictou. In Cape Breton, before the readjustment, you had only one. East Halifax might very properly have said: Give us an independent representation; add one member to the two members that the city and county of Halifax have; we have twice the population that Cape Breton has, why give Cape Breton, with 26,000, two members and say that Halifax, with more than twice that population, shall still have only two? Why not give the new member to the county of Halifax, with its immensely large area, with its 150 miles in length from east to west, with a large rural population, with a fine agricultural district—why not give that odd member which you have to spare to the county of Halifax instead of giving it to Cape Breton, which has already one member to 26,450 of a population, while Halifax has only two for more than twice the number? That would have been a reasonable request. That suggestion was made when that Bill was under discussion, and I will show you how the suggestion was met. It was not met in the way the hon. member for Pictou would meet it, it was not met by any sophistical suggestion that it was really representation by population to say that fifty or sixty thousand persons should elect just as many representatives as twenty or thirty thousand. That never suggested itself to any intellect in this House. There was no intellect here then so brilliant as to discover that it was representation by population to give 26,000 people two members in Cape Breton, and to give 56,000 people only two members in Halifax. That is a peculiar arithmetical discovery which my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has the sole and absolute right of appropriation, and no human being will ever dispute his property in it. This is what was said:

> Mr. Powers said that the county to which it was proposed to give an additional member, the county of Cape Breton, had only 26,000, and would, therefore, have one representative to 13,000 people, while the county of Halifax was to have but one representative to 28,000.

My hon. friend says that is representation by population, of course.

> He therefore moved in amendment that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole, with instructions to so amend the same as to provide that one of the additional members allotted to Nova Scotia should be assigned to Halifax.

Now, the hon. gentleman who sits opposite did not then revel in the title of knight or baronet, or anything of that kind; he was plain Dr. Tupper, and he said:

> He would say for the information of the House that in the course which had been pursued, so far as Nova Scotia was concerned, the Government had followed the practice which had been universally favoured in that province. It had never been the practice to give to the city and county of Halifax representation in proportion to population.

You see the hon. gentleman took an altogether different view of the matter from that of the hon. member for Pictou, who was not in the House then. Politically speaking, I think he was in short clothes at that time. Had he been here, he would have told his leader that that was an entire mistake, that it was really representation by population. But the present leader of the Opposition did not take that view. He said:

> It had never been the practice to give to the city and county of Halifax representation in proportion to population for the sufficient reason that in that province it had been conceded that the wealth and influence of the metropolitan constituency was such as to influence other constituencies throughout the province.

"That the wealth and influence of the metropolitan city," of any large city, "was such as to influence other constituencies throughout the province." I do not say that that is not a good reason, that the wealth and power of a great city like Toronto, for instance, is such as to influence other constituencies throughout the province of Ontario, and such as to secure to it adequate representation, even without a technical arithmetical conformity to a numerically exact representation by population. We know that Toronto is very influentially represented here, I will not say over-represented, as I am sometimes tempted to think when I hear the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) speaking in tones of righteous indignation, ringing with almost the fervour and majesty of a Hebrew prophet, that hon. gentleman who always assumes a tone of unapproachable righteousness when he rises to address this House, and had almost made me one of his disciples, until I found him the other day misstating the facts in reference to popular representation in England and in the cities throughout the United Kingdom. The leader of the Opposition in this House fully recognized at that time that a great metropolitan constituency like Halifax influenced other constituencies throughout the province, and therefore he conceded that a city did not need to have the same numerical representation in this House as a rural constituency or a small town. The same thing is true of the city of Toronto, the same thing is true of the city of Montreal, the same thing is true of any large and influential centre of wealth and population. The same thing was true of the city of London, as was pointed out by Gladstone in 1866, in his speech on the Redistribution Bill of that day. I would refer to this at greater length if there were time, but I will only say in conclusion that I wish simply to draw the attention of the House, and particularly of the leader

of the Opposition, to this fact, that when that Bill for the readjustment of representation was presented in this House in 1872, and the claim was made that Halifax ought to have a larger representation on the basis of representation by population, the hon. gentleman argued with great force, as I have quoted from the report, that cities, by virtue of the exceptional circumstances to which he referred, did not need to have the same numerical representation that was accorded to rural constituencies. The hour is so late that I will not elaborate that principle, but will content myself with reserving to a later occasion any further observations I have to make upon the question.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). For only a short time, at this late hour of the night, I wish to direct attention to one statement made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Russell). He said that unless there was a strong and justifiable reason for it, no Government would ever attempt as I understood him, between the times that the census was taken, to interfere with the representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. RUSSELL. I made one qualification—except under a desperate emergency, and that occurred in 1882.

Mr. SPROULE. If that allegation be correct, what justification can my hon. friend offer for interfering with it now, because the information given by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and several other members has shown clearly and distinctly, that in the redistribution of 1882 there was no material change in the members elected between the new and the old arrangement of constituencies, and that, under the redistribution of 1892, there were very few constituencies touched, and there was no material change made then? If that be the case, how can the hon. gentleman contend that there is such an urgent need for this measure on the ground that the readjustment which was made on these occasions. was so very great? I am quite sure that he has no evidence to show that there was any urgent need for the measure which is now before the House. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said that the principle of county boundaries is a correct one, and he pinned his faith to it. He said, in addition, that he and his hon. friends laid down the principle as a party in their resolution in 1893, and that they are now carrying out the obligations which they undertook to the electorate then, by introducing this measure, which was based on the principle of county boundaries. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that the Bill violates county boundaries, because the number of constituencies where that principle is violated, to which the present measure does not apply, is greater than the number of constituencies to which they have applied the principle of county boundaries.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) allow me to ask him a question which I have asked of a great many hon. members: What are the constituencies in Ontario in regard to which the principle of county boundaries is disregarded by this Bill?

Mr. SPROULE. I can give the hon. gentleman a few, but I cannot give them all. Carleton is one. North Leeds and Grenville is another; Renfrew is another; Ottawa is another; Addington is another, and there are some others. There are several counties where the county boundary is not the boundary of the constituency, which have not been touched by this Bill, and there are counties which are changed by this Bill in accordance with the principle of adhering to county boundaries. Therefore, I say that if that is correct, and I am sure it cannot be disputed successfully, the contention of the hon. member for South Grey and several other members, that the principle of county boundaries is a correct one, loses its force by reason of the fact that the principle has been violated, because they have not acted upon the principle which they have laid down themselves. We are justified in looking for some other cause than a desire to carry out that principle, in connection with the measure. I took up the resolution, which I have here, that the hon. member for South Grey referred to, passed by the Liberal party in 1893, when he said: We laid down our platform, and we are redeeming every pledge in it, in every particular word and letter. This was one of the pledges laid down in that platform:

> That by the gerrymander Act, the electoral divisions for the return of members to the House of Commons have been so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant. To put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair expenenent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

The hon. member for South Grey says: We have carried it out to the letter. Yet there are some counties where that principle is violated, and they have not touched them by this Bill, and there are other counties where they have remedied the grievance, if grievance it is. What becomes of the contention of the hon. member for South Grey? In the first place, if it be a sound principle, they have not carried it out, and they have not redeemed the pledge, which says:

And that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

I say that they have neither redeemed the pledge nor carried out that principle, if principle it is. Then, the principle of the division of the district by the judges is a correct principle, says the hon. member for South Grey, and other hon. gentlemen as well. I take up the Bill to ascertain if that principle is carried out. If it is a sound principle, you would expect to find it carried out in the Bill, but I find that the judges are only called in to divide constituencies in western Ontario, and in the city of Ottawa in eastern Ontario it is abandoned, while in respect to counties in eastern Ontario, where there are two or more members, the judges are not called in to make a division. I say that if the principle be a correct one, hon. gentlemen should recognize that principle, which has been presented as a reason for asking the support of the House for this measure. If it is contended that, in fairness to the people in dividing the constituencies, the judges should be called in, one would expect to find the principle applied in all cases. When I take the number of counties dealt with in this Bill, in respect to which judges are called in, and compare it with those in respect to which the judges are not called in, the constituencies into which they are not called, are more numerous than the others. What, then, becomes of that principle and of that contention? That is a principle that is not observed, but is flagrantly violated by the Bill which we have before us at the present time. Yet this is one of the strong grounds upon which they ask us to support this measure. Then, it is said that their division of the representation according to population is fair. We contend that ever since confederation the principle of representation by population, as far as it could be carried out, has been carried out by the Conservative party under their redistribution. There is no one who will make a comparison between the populations of the constituencies before the census of 1871 and the redistributions that have been made in 1872, in 1882 and in 1892, but must come to that conclusion. In the readjustment of the constituencies the effort to keep as near the unit of population as possible was always observed. Going over the Redistribution Act, I find that to be the case. The hon. member who sat down a short time ago, said that the representation of Toronto is not the same, according to its population, as the representation of other parts of the country: He said: We have applied the principle which was said to be applied in the city of Halifax, that the influence and intelligence of the city, or the constituency, should be taken into account in the representation, and that is the reason why the city of Toronto, with its 200,000 population, is only to have five members, each of whom will represent 40,000, while in other constituencies a member will represent 17,000 or 18,000. The justification he gives for it is, that the intelligence and wealth of the city shall be taken into account. Did they take that into account when fixing the representation of Hamilton, or Ottawa, or London. Not a bit of it. Hamilton has about 50,000 population, and has two representatives making the unit of representation about 25,000, or practically the same as all through the province. Ottawa, with about 50,000 population has two representatives, and the intelligence and wealth of Ottawa count for nothing, but they must count for a great deal in the city of Toronto which is only allowed one representative for about 40,000 people. I am reminded that the city of Brantford has one representative for 18,000 people, and I suppose that is because the Minister of Customs comes from there, and, therefore, the intelligence and wealth of that city count for nothing. These gentlemen opposite tell us that they are doing better for Toronto than the Conservative did, because previously it had only four members. That is not the fact. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) took in part of the city of Toronto, and was practically a representative of that city. That made five members. Is it not also a fact that the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) had a portion of the city of Toronto and was representing that city. Sir, I contend that the city of Toronto was better represented under the old Act than it will be under the new, even with the recent proposal to give it an additional representative under this Bill. They have taken away portions of the city from East and West York, and they are doing no more justice to Toronto than under the old law. Again these gentlemen opposite tell us that this Act ought to be passed, because it is intended to remedy a wrong and to carry out a principle. It has been abundantly proved by several hon. members that there was no wrong to remedy. If the rearrangement of the constituencies in 1882 and 1892 had the effect of enabling a smaller number of Conservatives to return more members than a larger number of Liberals, then that claim might be well founded. But we all know that after the Redistribution Act of 1882, in every constituency where it was claimed that the change was intended to elect a Conservative, a Conservative was not elected. The representation so far as the party divisions went, was very much the same after the elections of 1882 as it was before, notwithstanding the Redistribution Act of 1882.

There has been a great deal said about this Bill being in violation of the constitution, and after the able and logical speech of the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Borden) it would perhaps be out of place for even a lawyer much less a layman to give an opinion upon that phase of the question. But every man has his opinion whether it be

worth little or much, and I propose to give a few reasons why I believe it is unconstitutional to pass this law at this time. Section 51 of the British North America Act, says :

On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner and at such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules.

We are told from the other side of the House, that this only applied to the four provinces, and, therefore, because it did not apply to what is now the whole confederation, it does not apply in the present case. Well, the answer to that is simple. These four provinces were all there was of confederation then, and this Confederation Act was designed and intended to provide for all confederation. There is no other provision in the British North America Act specifying that redistribution shall take place at some other time, and in view of that, I am justified in the conclusion that it was never intended that redistribution should take place at any other time than after a decennial census. We are told by these gentlemen opposite that there is no clause in the British North America Act which says that you shall not redistribute. Well, it does not require a special prohibitory clause to make the prohibition effective. When we incorporate a company we say they shall hold their annual meeting on such a date, but we do not say they shall not hold it at any other date. And if the reasoning advanced by these gentlemen opposite is sound with reference to the British North America Act ; that because there is no express injunction, you may do it at any other date, it would apply to any other Act of Parliament as well. Therefore, although it is expressly laid down that the annual meeting of a company shall be held at a certain date in the month of September, if this contention were good, it might be held on any other day of the year. I hold that if a law specifies that a certain thing shall be done it carries with it the assumption that the converse of that shall not be done. That is, an interpretation of the law which has been followed in this House in regard to several Acts of Parliament, and there is no good reason why it should not be held good with respect to the British North America Act. Although the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) cited every clause of the British North America Act that he thought might help his argument, he has not been able to quote a single clause that confers on this Parliament the right to redistribute the seats now. If I go beyond the British North America Act and look at the resolutions on which that Act was based, I think I can find the intention of the fathers of the confederation to put that power in the hands of Parliament, only after each decennial census. With regard to the local legislatures the right was intended to be allowed at any time, and we have it in the following language in these resolutions :—

Until the official census of 1871 has been made up there shall be no change in the number of representatives from the several divisions.

Following that we find this resolution :

Immediately after the completion of the census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the representation from each section in the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of population.

And for the purpose of that redistribution, it lays down the principle that Quebec having always 65 members, the population of Quebec shall be divided by the number of 65, and that shall be the basis of representation by population, or in other words, the unit of representation which shall prevail in other portions of the country. Now, if we look to see what powers are given to the provinces, we find that the resolution does not say that it shall be done only after each decennial census ; but it says :

The legislature of each province shall divide such province into the proper number of constituencies, and define the boundaries of each of them. The local legislature of each province may from time to time alter the electoral districts for the purpose of representation in such local legislature, and distribute the representatives to which the province is entitled in such local legislature in any manner such local legislature may see fit.

It is laid down that the Parliament of Canada shall do it after the census is taken, but it is not provided that it shall be done at any other time ; whereas the local legislature may do it from time to time ; and I say that was the intention of the fathers of Confederation when they adopted these resolutions which are embodied in the British North America Act, and on which we have been acting from that time to the present. Therefore when it is specially provided that the local legislature may from time to time alter the electoral districts, and it is not provided that the Parliament of Canada shall from time to time alter them, but after each census is taken, we are justified in coming to the conclusion that when it is done at any other time, it is done in open violation of the constitution under which we are acting.

Now, we are told that this is a fair Redistribution Bill. I have given my reasons for believing that it is not. If the principle of division by the judges is the correct one, I have shown that that principle has not been carried out in this Bill. Hon. gentlemen say : "We do not change the constituencies ; we only put certain municipalities within the boundaries of the counties to which they belong, and then assign to the judges the duty of dividing the counties." Do they carry out that provision in the province of Quebec ? Not a bit of it. They themselves change eleven constituencies in that province taking a portion

of one constituency and attaching it to another—an open violation of the very principle which they advance in support of the Bill. If the division by the judges is the correct principle where a county or a city is to have more than one representative, why do they not call in the judges to subdivide the counties in Prince Edward Island which are to have two representatives? If I can show that the exceptions to the rule are more numerous than the instances which establish the rule, then the rule is of no value whatever; and that is the case with this Bill. Hon. gentlemen do not call in the judges with respect to the counties of eastern Ontario nor maintain the county boundaries: nor do they in Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. They only do so in western Ontario, where any division that may be made at all is likely to inure to the political benefit of the hon. gentlemen who are introducing this Bill. Why do they not carry out that principle in Leeds and Grenville? Because, if they do so, the hon. member (Mr. Frost) would no longer sit in this House. Let them come into Russell, and carry it out there, and the representative of that county who supports them would not be likely to be in the succeeding Parliament. If the principle is sound, they have violated it by not applying it all over the country.

The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said that the redistribution of 1891 did not make the unit of representation nearer than it was before, and he cited the county of Grey as an instance of that. I thought the hon. member could not have looked up the population of the constituency, or, he would not have cited what he did. I find that the population of East Grey in 1891 was 26,000, the population of North Grey 26,000, and the population of South Grey 23,000. But at the time, when the change was made, the population of East Grey was nearly 8,000 larger than the population of South Grey, and 4,000 was taken from East Grey and added to South Grey, which made the populations of both very near the same. If an instance were required to show that in the change then made the principle of representation by population was carried out, no better instance could have been cited than the change which was made in South Grey. The hon. gentleman said that the Government had taken the township of Artemesia out of the centre of the county. It is true, it is in the centre of the county going from north to south: but it is more allied to the south riding than to the north or the east: and when they did that they equalized the population in the three ridings, and they are more nearly the same now than they ever were before.

I do not intend to continue this discussion longer, because I think that enough has been said to justify the conclusion that this Act is unnecessary at this time, and that it is an open violation of the constitution under which we are acting; and I shall be very much surprised if the other Chamber of the Parliament of Canada does not throw out this Bill on that very ground. I regard it as one of the important duties of the Senate, above all others, to safeguard the rights of the people by seeing that the principles of the constitution are fairly carried out; and I believe that the members of that Chamber understand quite as well as we do the object of this Bill. The hon. Postmaster General himself said it was for the purpose of strengthening the political party. He said they had been weakened in 1881, and now they were going to right that wrong by strengthening the party, and giving them the power to have more members elected to this House than they can in the circumstances that exist to-day. By that very Act they discredit the intelligence and integrity of the electorate who returned them to office. The people returned a majority to represent the reform party and yet the reform party are carrying out, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) contends, every one of their promises, they dare not go back to the constituencies that elected them. That is a standing acknowledgment that they dare not trust the electorate but are compelled to resort to some device to be again returned, and that device is the Redistribution Bill now before us.

We have asked on what principle will the judges act. Looking over the Bill, we can find no information as to the principle on which they will conduct their revision. It reads:

> 2. The letters patent appointing the commissioners hall direct them, in making the divisions, to consider the distribution of population according to the latest census of Canada, the public convenience, and such divisions as appear to them best calculated to do substantial justice.

The hon. Postmaster General was asked for information. He was asked whether the judges would hold open court and allow people to submit their representation to them, but the Postmaster General could give no information. We are left utterly in the dark and can only arrive at a conclusion as to what is intended to be done by what has been done already. What has been done has been done unfairly, and we can only come to the natural conclusion that the intention is to endeavour, under the shelter of the judges, to act unfairly. I am sorry that these hon. gentlemen are calling on the judges to do a very unfair, I was going to say a very dirty piece of work. I regret that they are imposing such duties upon the judges. I am not prepared to take the stand which these hon. gentlemen did in 1885 when it was proposed to appoint the judges revising barristers. I am not going to say, as these hon. gentlemen did, that the judges will act as partisans, because I am bound to assume that they will act fairly. But we

know that there is a good deal of human nature in man, and we know the political record of some of the men who have been put on the bench, and are justified in coming to the conclusion that if it is in the power of these men, without violating any great principle, to serve their political friends, they will do it. Then it is provided that the decision of two judges out of the three will be sufficient. What is to be the composition of the court? In all human probability one man will be selected who, previous to his elevation to the bench, was a Tory, and the two others will be judges who, in politics, were Reformers. The decision of these two will be final. No doubt the Government will endeavour by some means or other to lay down principles for the guidance of the judges which will inure to their benefit, or endeavour to give them inspiration as to how they wish the divisions to be made, and, as far as possible, influence them on these lines. I am afraid that that is the desire and intention of these hon. gentlemen, because they refused to give any information with regard to the principles which the judges shall follow in dividing the constituencies. I consider myself in duty bound to vote against this measure, which, I think, was introduced for no other than a political purpose, notwitstanding any allegations to the contrary. I consider that it is an open violation of the constitution and am bound to vote against it, and even if passed by the subservient majority behind the Government, I shall be very much surprised if it is not thrown out by the Senate.

Mr. H. BOSTOCK (Yale and Cariboo). The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) referred to the Act of 1892 as being a fair one, based on a sound principle. As far as British Columbia is concerned, I do not think that the redistribution made under that Act was in any way fair. At the time Sir John Thompson introduced that Act of 1892, he gave the figures of population in the constituencies, as he proposed to divide them, and these figures, taken from his speech at that time, show that he contemplated that the district of Yale and Cariboo—the new district he proposed to create—would have a population of 20,500; that the district of New Westminster, to which he proposed to give two members, would have a population of 42,226; that the district of Vancouver would have a population of 18,229; and the district of Victoria, with two representatives, a population of 18,538. A great deal was said by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken with regard to this question of representation by population, and I think in this respect the province of British Columbia and its constituencies were not fairly dealt with, especially the constituency I have the honour to represent. Because we find that even then the calculation was that my constituency had a population of 20,500, and the constituency of Victoria, 18,538. Yet the constituency of Yale and Cariboo was left with but one representative and the constituency of Victoria was left its two representatives. If we go further and look at the area contained in these two constituencies, we find that the area of Yale and Cariboo is something like 214,000 square miles, and that of Victoria about 71 square miles. Therefore, the duty of representing a constituency of the size of Yale and Cariboo is one that becomes exceedingly hard on any one member, and, therefore, I think that in making the redistribution that was made under the Act of 1892, the province of British Columbia was not fairly dealt with. Certainly, if a member had to be taken away from one constituency in order to give another member to the New Westminster constituency—as it was considered necessary at that time and as I think it was necessary—what should have been done would have been to take away one of the members from Victoria and give it to this New Westminster constituency. Then, we should have had something like a fair division. Of course, at that time it was absolutely impossible to add to the representation of British Columbia, because the population of the province had not sufficiently increased to allow an increase in the representation. But I think at that time more care should have been taken in considering the development of the country. I propose to show by statistics that this constituency of Yale and Cariboo has increased in importance to such an extent since that time that it is deserving of consideration. Of course, we have no figures of population which bring us down later than the year 1891; but I think I have shown, by the figures above quoted, that the constituencies, as then divided up, were not fairly divided on this basis of population. If we take the development that has gone on in my constituency since that time, we find that a great injustice will be done to the people of Yale and Cariboo, if it is left as it is to-day, with only one member in this House representing the whole constituency. The constituency is of such extensive size, and the attention and consideration that must be given to the interests of the people of a constituency of that kind, are so great, that I do not hesitate to confess that it is utterly impossible for one man to even pretend to look after such a constituency as it should be looked after. Since the Redistribution Act of 1892 was brought into force, no less than ten towns in the constituency of Yale and Cariboo have been incorporated. Most of these towns were hardly in existence at the time this Act was passed. Yet to-day, for instance, the town of Rossland has a population of about 5,000 or 6,000, and Nelson about the same. A number of these other towns that have been incorporated within the last few years, are increasing so fast that they will soon catch up to these two towns that I have already mentioned. In addition to these, we have also

a large number of other places that have been founded and that show signs of developing very fast. I do not wish, at this late hour, to detain this House by going too fully into this matter; but when you have a district opening up and developing as this part of British Columbia is doing, with the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the Columbia and Western and the other lines coming in from the United States to the south, and when you have the mining development that is going on all through the Kootenay and the southern part of Yale district, the need for change in the representation becomes pressing. In addition to the towns I have already referred to, within the course of the next two years a number of other towns will grow up, and the people will quite naturally consider that they are entitled to more representation in this House than they have at the present time. The people of that district naturally think that such a part of the country as Kootenay, which is developing so fast, which has done so much to draw attention not only of the greater part of the Dominion, but also of the rest of the world, to our resources, should have greater consideration than a town like Victoria, which, although it shows steady growth, is not developing to anything like the same extent as is the Kootenay country. I should much like to see some means devised to deal with this matter and put it in such a way that people of my constituency, and especially in the Kootenay part of the country, might hope, before very long, to have greater representation in this House. To show the development which has been going on all over that part of the country, I think I cannot do better than quote some of the returns from that district of the different departments since 1896. I find that the Post Office Department shows a very large increase of revenue in my constituency between the years 1896 and 1898. In 1896 the total postal revenue of my constituency amounted to $43,667. Taking the same constituency for 1898, we find the total postal revenue for the year was $98,059. And all through we see that this revenue shows a steady increase. There has been a large number of offices opened in that time, and, of course, if that growth continues, the revenue goes on increasing. When we take the returns of the customs and inland revenue, I think we can show that the growth of that country has been very considerable. I find that in the year 1891 the revenue from the customs in what was known as the Kootenay district amounted to $21,399. The revenue that was collected in the rest of the constituency amounted to $7,418. Now, I find that at the time this Act of 1892 was under discussion, no reference was made to the development that was then going on in the Kootenay country, and attention was not drawn to the fact that the Kootenay country ought to be considered when the House was dealing with the question of representation. Mr. Mara, who was member for Yale at that time, in discussing this question, said:

> It is to be regretted that Cariboo, one of the oldest districts in the province of British Columbia, and one that has probably contributed more revenue to the province than any other, is to be merged into another district; but as Cariboo has decreased in population and New Westminster has increased enormously, and as we have to deal with the population as we find it to-day, I am afraid there is no help for Cariboo, but that it must lose its representative.

I think that at that time he should have drawn attention to the development of the Kootenay, and to the fact that the population of this constituency, Yale and Cariboo, was larger than that of the constituency of Victoria, and that the disparity in area was so great that the constituency of Yale and Cariboo was much more entitled to two members than Victoria. To show the development that has been going on in that country since then, I will mention that the customs revenue for the Kootenay country in 1895-96 amounted to $249,971, whilst the revenue for the Yale and Cariboo portion amounted to only $10,954. In 1897-98 the revenue from Kootenay amounted to $360,957. Then, the inland revenue shows possibly a greater advance in the Kootenay country, because, while in 1895-96 it amounted to $36,346, in 1897-98 it had increased to $91,049. These few figures, I think, will show that a greater development, possibly, is going on in that part of the country than in almost any other portion of the Dominion. I also think the population is increasing in an equal ratio. I find that at the last provincial election there were, in the district of Cariboo, Lillooet and Yale 3,350 votes polled, which was slightly more than the total vote, 3,303, polled in Yale and Cariboo at the time of the Dominion election. The vote polled in Kootenay at the last provincial election was 4,107, These figures show that there has been a very large increase in the electorate of that part of the country, and I think we are justified in assuming that the population of Yale and Cariboo is to-day somewhere between 55,000 and 60,000 at the very least. That is a large increase in population, but when we take into consideration the large area of this constituency, you will see how difficult it is for a large population of that kind spread over so great an area, to be properly represented in this House by one member or even by two. I would like to see something done, if possible, to give a better representation, especially to the people of the Kootenay part of the country, because I feel they would not be fairly dealt with if they are left to be represented in this House by only one member. The probabilities are

that by the next census the population of this constituency will be somewhere about 75,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the few figures I have given to the House will show that a condition of things exists in this constituency of Yale and Cariboo which should not be allowed to continue any longer, and that some arrangement ought to be made whereby a better representation can be given to this constituency.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am pleased that the hon. member who has just taken his seat has set the example of the western representatives entering into this discussion, for now I can follow in the same direction without any apology to the House. Although the province of Manitoba has not been affected by this Bill, still I desire to enter my protest against its adoption by this House, first, because I consider it is contrary to the provisions of the British North America Act to pass such a Bill at any time other than immediately after taking a decennial census; and, secondly, even though it were perfectly constitutional, I think it is uncalled for at the present time. It seems to me passing strange that though the Government make a pretense of adopting county boundaries as the lines of demarkation between constituencies, they are putting this principle into operation in only a portion of the country, simply in those districts where they think it will result beneficially to their own party, and ignoring it in those districts where they imagine that it will result disastrously to the interest of their party candidates. There is therefore no uniform principle prevailing in this measure except that one paramount principle of party advantage. What has become of their great cry of representation by population that we heard so much about in years gone by? That was their stock-in-trade when the former Redistribution Bills were up for discussion in this House. But an analysis of the Bill now before the House discloses a gross infraction of that principle; apparently not the slightest heed has been paid to it, and what was formerly looked on as the great foundation principle on which the whole superstructure of a redistribution should be constructed, has been ruthlessly shattered at the hands of its former champions. I would ask, has it also been silently laid to rest in that grave of discarded policies, repudiated pledges and broken promises to be left unwept and unhonoured and unsung. Surely a principle that was considered to be of such vital importance a few years ago, should be equally as important to-day. We are, therefore, compelled to look below the surface to find the motives that prompted the Government to introduce this measure at this time, in opposition to their repeated declarations of the past, and it does not require much probing to locate the cause.

Is it not a palpable sign of weakness, nay cowardice, for a political party so numerically strong in this House, with times prosperous throughout the country which is bound to be of great assistance to any Government entrenched as they claim they are in the confidence of the electorate, with all those advantages, and still resorting to the unprecedented course of changing the boundaries of the constituencies, not for the purpose of giving increased representation to the country, for that they admit cannot be done except after a decennial census, but for the purpose, as has already been pointed out, of packing the jury in anticipation of their trial when next they appeal to the people? And what is the pretended reason given for the unusual proceeding. The right hon. Prime Minister has said, the Postmaster General has re-echoed it, and the lesser lights who have spoken on the subject have all followed suit in declaring it is for the purpose of rectifying an injustice that had been done their party by the Redistribution Bill of 1882. Now, admitting for the sake of argument that in some few instances, an apparent advantage had been taken of their party by the Act passed by the Conservative Government. Can it be denied that the so-called advantage was taken only at the proper time laid down by the constitution for the redistribution of seats to give increased representation to the people, and not as in this case just before holding a general election. In 1901 a new census will have to be taken, the increased population will demand increased representation; why, therefore, does not the Government wait until the ordinary time to introduce such a measure? Why have a readjustment of the constituencies now to be followed in less than three years with another readjustment? Why go back eight years to the census of 1891, and make the population of that time the basis of a redistribution Bill, when we are within a year and a half of the time for taking another census? In this new country where our population is increasing by thousands year after year, how nonsensical it is to adopt such a course. We do not have to seek far to find the reason. Notwithstanding their pretense of confidence in their tenure of office, in spite of their professions of ability to retain their hold in the Treasury benches, notwithstanding the satisfaction that they claim exists with their administration, they fear the honest verdict of the electors and particularly of the province of Ontario, and hence we have the attempt made under the guise of adopting county boundaries to fix the constituencies in the interests of the Liberal party by putting that principle into effect only where they see a chance of making doubtful seats more safe and gaining a few others from their opponents.

Representation by population, so far as that can be carried out, having due regard to identity of interests, is in my opinion of far greater consequence in the redistribution of seats than the mere adhering to county boundaries, and to say that it is right and

proper for a Conservative to represent from 30,000 to 40,000 of a population, while on the other hand a Liberal, in a neighbouring constituency, represents but 16,000 or 17,000 people, is to set at defiance the past contentions of the Liberal party and to perpetrate a gross injustice, not only on the Conservative party, but on the electors generally. It is simply an impossibility to pay any attention to representation by population and adhere strictly to county boundaries, and under those circumstances it is of far more consequence that the people should be represented rather than the territory. Members of this House are not sent here to represent so many square miles of territory, but so many people, and even where a county is large enough to require two or more representatives it is impossible to have equality of population without dividing the townships, and this would be much more reprehensible than dividing the counties. To be sure we have had the very bad precedent set us by Sir Oliver Mowat, who, when Premier of Ontario, in that notorious gerrymander of his, which in comparison the redistribution of 1882, pales into insignificance, and who did not content himself with dividing counties only, but townships and villages. So that if this is prohibited you are bound to have one constituency in the same county with considerably larger population than another.

And as for calling in the judges to run this line of demarkation between constituencies within the same county, the whole proceeding is simply a farce calculated to delude and deceive the electors by a pretended sense of fairness. If the Government were anxious and desirous of seeing a fair and equable distribution of seats, if they were animated solely and wholly in the interests of fair-play, if it were their main object to undo an injustice that had been done them in the Bill of 1882, why not have removed the whole affair beyond the realm of politics and relegated to the judiciary the entire redistribution of the constituencies to deal with as in their judgment seemeth best, and not merely confine ther operations to running a dividing line within the limits of a county to give more than one member. The best proof in my opinion that this measure is mainly intended for party advantage, is the fact that they would not trust the judges to deal with the entire matter, a policy that would have commended itself to all parties if done at the proper time, but have merely alloted to them the nominal duties of running this dividing line and thus using the judiciary as a cloak for their own questionable actions. Possibly the explanation for not doing so is to be found in this: had the judges been requested to undertake the task they would have said, come to us at the proper time, and we will do so, but as for doing so now, it is contrary to the British North America Act, and we cannot be a party to doing an unconstitutional act. And again by leaving everything in the hands of the judges their avowed purpose to down the Tories would not have been carried out to their satisfaction.

For a party that has always laid claim to superior virtue in public life, raising their voices against anything savouring of a partisan character in the legislation enacted by their opponents, denouncing the old Franchise Act and the Redistribution Bill passed during a Conservative regime, not only on the grounds of expense, but also because of their supposed partisanship, it is rather a curious commentary on their past professions to study the nature of the Franchise Act adopted by this Parliament last session, and the present Redistribution Bill the Government are forcing on Parliament at this time. With those two measures embodying the most vicious principles which formerly met with the condemnation of the great and only party of purists, they, no doubt, imagine they will have the Tories sufficiently at their mercy to ensure for themselves another lease of power, and what matters it to them if principles are trampled uder foot so long as they are in the enjoyment of the emoluments of office. Look at the unworkable character of their Franchise Act; they broke the law in regard to that Act, during the first year of its existence, by refusing to have the lists printed, the reason given being because of the expense involved, but that was the great objection made against the old Franchise Act. The difference between the two parties is this, whereas, when the Conservative Government desired to do away with the printing of the lists during any particular year, they came to Parliament and obtained the necessary authority, but our present autocratic legislators put themselves up as being superior to Parliament and ignored the expressed wish of Parliament, without deigning to ask for this authority. And what has been the result? We have seen the important constituency of the city of Winnipeg left without a representative during a whole parliamentary session because there was no list on which to take a vote. The lists that have been prepared in that province within the last two months by the provincial government, and on which members will be elected, from that province to this House, have been prepared under the provisions of the notorious and partisan Franchise Act that every person has heard so much about, notwithstanding this Government promised to use their influence with the provincial premiers to make their Acts more in accordance with right and justice. The sunny ways evidently had not much effect with Mr. Greenway, if called into action at all, and when during the session of 1898 of the Manitoba legislature Mr. Greenway promised Mr. Roblin, leader of the Opposition in the House, if he would lay over some amendments he proposed making to the Election Act, that he, the Premier, would himself amend the Act at another session which would be held prior to an election. What has been the result? Another session was called last March, after

being in session a month or so it was adjourned ostensibly to allow the members to look after their spring work ; in the interim legislation clerks were appointed and new lists prepared under the old order of things, and evidences are coming to light where scores of doubtful names have been added by the Grit party after the closing of the lists, 103 such names having been added in Greenway's own constituency. This is the manner in which Liberal premiers keep their word, and those are the lists upon which members from that province are elected to the House of Commons. Not satisfied, however, with the advantage they have obtained by their Franchise Act, to cap the climax, this Government now introduces its running mate as a sequel to take still more advantage on their opponents ; this Gerrymander Bill almost as obnoxious, if that were possible, as its fellow the Franchise Act.

Why, Sir, it is simply amazing when you come to review the legislation enacted by this Government since their accession to power in 1896, to find that in almost every instance the great underlying principles of those measures which they championed when on this side of the House have been ignominiously abandoned since coming into power, and the loudest and most enthusiastic advocates of those principles in the past are now the most docile and abject apologists for their abandonment.

Time-serving politicians is, Sir, too complimentary a term to apply to those hon. gentlemen ; self-seeking politicians, whose specialty is humbug, is a more appropriate application. As the leader of the Opposition has truly said, and has challenged successful contradiction, no precedent for such an unusual and unconstitutional proceeding can be cited where such a measure has ever been introduced into the Parliament of Canada and been crystallized into law in the history of our country. It remains for our present constitution wreckers to trample under foot the traditions of the past, to ignore precedents, to disregard the intent and purpose of the British North America Act, and under the pretense of rectifying a wrong do the very thing they accused their opponents of having done. And still we hear them declaiming against wrong-doing, unfairness, and partisanship, as if those terms are not synonymous with modern Grit rule. Why, Sir, they are past masters in those devious and questionable methods by which they obtained power in the first place, and now are trying to retain power, that they have it. It comes with very bad grace from the members of the Liberal party to accuse their opponents of dishonest political methods after the recent revelations in the courts, particularly in the counties of Huron, West Elgin and South Ontario. Evidently the Minister of Justice, for, I believe, it is to him the credit is due for being the architect of this wonderful production, is not nearly so big a man as some of his admirers would have us believe. Smarting under his defeat at the hands of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), he must needs vent his petty spite against that hon. gentleman by wiping out his constituency. Why, Sir, instead of harbouring ill-feeling against the member for Bothwell, I consider he owes him a debt of gratitude, for is it not a fact that he owes his present position in the Senate to that hon. gentleman ? Does any one for a moment suppose that had the Minister of Justice been elected to this House in 1896, the constituency of Bothwell would be wiped out by this Bill ? Oh, no ; that would have been one of the seats where county boundaries would not apply. It is rather small politics and unworthy of a Minister of the Crown to try and legislate his successful opponent out of the House, a gentleman who reflects credit on his constituents, and does honour to their sound judgment in selecting him as their representative, but possibly the hon. Minister has reckoned without his host. The hon. members for East York (Mr. Maclean), and West York (Mr. Wallace), also seem to have been selected for special treatment at the hands of the Government, and most likely in those cases the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) was the advisory committee. Being a Toronto man himself, and failing to convert that city from Conservatism, the next best thing he imagines he can do is to gerrymander the Yorks so as to benefit his party by taking away a large Conservative vote and adding it to the city.

It seems very strange that the Government after glancing over the whole province and sizing up the situation, have decided to put into operation the county boundary system only in those cases where they feel sure the net result will be to the advantage of the Liberal party and deeming the principle of no consequence whatever where its adoption would likely result in increased Conservative representation. How they can defend this Bill on the grounds of its fairness passes my comprehension. Had they boldly come out and candidly admitted that this measure, after having given it a careful study, is their best production from a party standpoint, and designed, as it is designed, mainly for the purpose of assisting their party, they, at least, would be free from the imputation of hypocrisy and political dishonesty that they have convicted themselves of. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, this Bill does not affect the province of Manitoba, and I will not debate it at greater length, but I object to it, not only because of its unconstitutionality, but also because it is entirely unwarranted at this particular time.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I would not dare to address this House, were it not that I feel it incumbent upon me to do so, from the fact that this question interested the hon. member for North Simcoe who preceded me. The principle adopted

by the Government in this Bill is the principle of county limits, having regard to representation by population in so far as that is practicable. Hon members on both sides of the House have discussed this question at length, and I do not propose, and would not have proposed even if the time were not so short, to discuss it at any length. On the second reading of the Bill I understand that the discussion should be limited to a discussion of the principle involved in the Bill, only referring to details so far as that is necessary in order to discuss the principle. What have we before us at the present time? I submit that there are only three questions that should be dealt with at this time. First, have the Government power to legislate in this way? Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have argued that this Bill is not constitutional. Hon. gentlemen on the Government side have argued that it is constitutional, and they have cited cases wherein hon. gentlemen opposite have changed the representation at other times than after a decennial census. If that be so, no man can deny that a precedent exists for the alteration of the constituencies at a time other than that. Whether that precedent is right or wrong, is another question. I am perfectly free to admit that two wrongs do not make a right; but, looking at the question from the standpoint that it is constitutional, and assuming that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they acted as they did, acted constitutionally, and that hon. gentlemen on this side, through the Department of Justice, have declared that this Bill is constitutional, it would be a rash thing on my part to declare that it is not constitutional. I assume that it is constitutional, and leave it to some older members to settle that question. And, if it is not constitutional, there is a means of having it declared ultra vires of this Parliament. A question in which I am more interested is the question whether or not the Government have a right to introduce this measure, and whether this House should pass it, assuming that it has the power. We are told that there is no necessity for it. Now, I say without fear that I herald with delight a Bill which embodies, even partially, the principle to which I have referred. A Government coming into power should endeavour to fulfil its pledges—pledges which, I believe, were forced upon them by the independent movements which existed in this country. In 1891 the Association of Patrons of Industry for Ontario, which formed no small element in the last election, at any rate in the province of Ontario, adopted the following plank in their platform:—

> Conformity of electoral districts to county boundaries as constituted for municipal purposes, as far as the principle of representation by population will allow.

Then, the other movement, which was led by my late lamented uncle, adopted a similar plank in its platform, and he moved a resolution in this House in 1892 to the same effect. His plank was:

> To require in the readjustment of the constituencies that the distribution of seats shall as far as practicable be based on equality of population, county and city boundaries being taken as the natural limits of electoral districts, with equitable divisions thereof where the population entitles the city or county to two or more representatives.

I point that out for this reason. The late hon. member for North Simcoe argued then, and I argue now, that this was, and is, the proper basis for the representation of Ontario. In this respect I agree with the contention of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), when he says that Toronto has not sufficient representation. In his speech on that occasion, the late member for North Simcoe—I quote from "Hansard," volume 2, 1892—said that, in his estimation, Toronto should have nine or ten members, and I congratulate the hon. gentleman who now represents Toronto, for the way in which they are espousing her interests. On that occasion, in 1892, the three representatives of Toronto, Messrs. Denison, Cockburn and Coatsworth, who were then representatives of that large city, all declared that the city should not be bound by county limits, and should not, therefore, have the increased representation asked for by the hon. member for North Simcoe. Upon that occasion these hon. gentlemen did not see fit to support him. Now the hon. members for Toronto complain, as I do, that Toronto has not that representation to which it is entitled, but that point can be dealt with more at length in committee.

By this Bill the county I come from is not given sufficient representation. We have there a population of over 83,000, and I think we are entitled, upon the numerical basis, to at least four members, but that also is something that should not be debated here. We are here discussing whether it is proper to confine constituencies to county lines, and it will be a matter for us to discuss when the Bill is in committee whether or not it would be advisable to increase the representation of that county as well as of the city of Toronto, and also of any other county.

The next and all important question, if these two other propositions are answered in the affirmative, is, have the Government adopted the principles as enunciated in these planks in the platforms I have read, and whether this House should adopt them as a principle to be acted upon? What is the converse principle suggested by hon. members on either one side or the other. It is, if I did understand the hon. gentleman who last spoke, representation by population. No one can contend that the last Redistribution Bill, and the one preceding it, which I also agree with the

hon. member for East Toronto, was a disgrace to the party that introduced it——

Mr. BERGERON. By whom was it framed?

Mr. McCARTHY. By the Conservative party.

Mr. BERGERON. By Mr. Dalton McCarthy, member for Simcoe.

Mr. McCARTHY. The late member for Simcoe is, I deeply regret to say, not here, but, speaking for him, I deny that, so far as the Act of 1891 is concrened.

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of the Act of 1882.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment while I refer te "Hansard." The hon. member for Beauharnois will find in Vol. 2 of "Hansard" of 1892, that Mr. McCarthy said he did have a finger in the pie in the matter of the Redistribution Bill of 1882, and was prepared to take the responsibilty for his share of that disgraceful Act, and would accept whatever punishment the country saw fit to mete out to him for it, and you will find that the country did not mete out to him very grave punishment, judging by the result of the last election, (perhaps his repentance may have accounted for that); but the fact still remains, in my opinion, and apparently in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, if we are to believe what they say in regard to the Bill of Sir Oliver Mowat, that the Bill of 1882 was also wrong, because if you put the two Bills side by side, they are almost identical. Perhaps that of Sir Oliver Mowat goes further and is more stringent in its effect, but the intention of each was the same, so far as the attempt goes, no matter what the actual result was. Both were intended to accomplish the same purpose, and for that reason both these Bills should never have been introduced in any Parliament.

Assuming that representation by population is the ideal of some hon. gentlemen you cannot say that the Bill of 1882 carried that out, if you compare the constituencies You have, for instance, the following large constituencies:

Algoma	41,856
Kent	31,434
Russell	31,643
Simcoe North	28,203
East York	35,148
Essex North	31,523
Muskoka	26,515
Simcoe East	35,801
Toronto	144,023
West York	41,857

Compare these with the smaller constituencies:

North Brant	16,993
Cardwell	15,382
Frontenac	13,445
Haldimand	16,307
Lennox	14,900
Peterboro' West	15,808
Brockville	15,853
Durham West	15,374
Grenville South	12,929
Leeds and Grenville	13,521
Monck	15,315

Nobody can say that the man who drafted that Bill drafted it for the purpose of an idealistic representation by population. If representation by population is your ideal, wipe out all your lines and limits and make a block of counties with the unit of 20,908 in each. Then you would have an ideal representation by population, which might perhaps be the best system, but which, in my judgment, is not the best. We have grown up in this country as in England—and I am proud to say we are great worshippers of British institutions—with county lines paramount, and with the idea that county representation and feeling and pride should be engendered in the people. Then, county lines being paramount, subsidiary to that should be representation, so far as practicable, by population. That is the theory on which I am prepared to support this Bill. I asked the question of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to night: What had been the effect of this present Bill on those eastern Ontario constituencies? To which he replied county lines had been disregarded. And therefore, I desire to put myself in this position with regard to this Bill. I am going to vote for the second reading on the ground that it carries out the theory of county limits. But if in committee I find that that has not been carried out, and if any hon. member is able to suggest an amendment to the Bill which will better solidify a constituency so far as county lines are concerned, he may count on my support, whatever that may be worth.

I would call attention to this point. I have some great doubt as to whether the constituencies of Bothwell and Cardwell should be wiped out. Those are constituencies which have been counties since confederation, although not for judicial purposes. There interests have been created by that great length of time, and it may be thought advisable that the constituencies should not be wiped out. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Stubbs), I think, will agree with me, and would desire to protect himself in that way; but if in committee the county of Cardwell can be protected in accordance with the views that I have endeavoured to express, we would, I think, consider ourselves free to support any such arrangement.

There is only one other point remaining. Why should not the Government introduce this measure. It seems to me most reasonable and fair that when a party has perhaps been forced by the views of the independents, which element is, as I have said, extremely strong in the province of

Ontario, to pronounce these principles as just, that they should at once introduce a Bill embodying that principle, if they desire support in that province from persons believing in those principles. The Government have adopted them in this Bill, perhaps not so far as they should have done but I herald with delight something that lays down some principle on which we can act in the future, and if it appears to be a good principle, we will have some stability with regard to the distribution of seats. Hitherto it cannot be said that any principle was acted upon. Whether the gerrymander worked out with the effect expected or did not, has nothing to do with the consideration of this question. The Bills of 1882 and 1892 were intended to cut some hon. members out of their seats and did not; that makes no difference, but if county limits as the paramount idea and representation by population as a subsidiary is the best, as against the principle of representation by population pure and simple, I think that the Government is to be commended, in so far as it has gone, at all events, and to that extent I am prepared to support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. POWELL (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made no remark to call for any special reference from myself, except one. He commenced with a reference to the late member for the county of Simcoe, whose demise we all regret. But I think it is time that this hon. gentleman rose above what I might call, to coin a pharase, necropolitan politics. So far as his reference to the late lamented member for Simcoe is concerned, strange to say that gentleman, if he is any authority for the present member, if the present member respects the virtue and ability of the deceased, gave the House, as a result of his handiwork, the Redistribution Act of 1882. That that hon. gentleman framed and had the main part in passing through this House the Redistribution Act succeeding the census of 1881.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) allow me to ask him a question? As I understand it, he was not in the House at the time he speaks. Will he give me the name of his informant, for what he says has been denied?

Mr. POWELL. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) gave us the information in the book that he himself read when he quoted the late hon. gentleman as stating that he took upon his shoulders all the ignominy attached to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him, I would say that when he quotes he should quote correctly. The statement that I quoted as made by the late Mr. McCarthy was that he accepted all the ignominy that he was entitled to.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. POWELL. I can inform the hon. gentleman that there are those within the walls of this room who know that there was no division of honour in respect to that matter, but that the late hon. member for North Simcoe had the complete monopoly. The hon. junior member for Halifax challenges the legal members of the Opposition to come to the support of the leader of the Opposition in his contention that the Bill before the House is unconstitutional. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) went so far as to extend to the leader of the Opposition his sympathy and gave the House an expression of his great regret that there was no one versed in law, upon this side of the House who had taken compassion upon the leader of the Opposition and seen to it that his views on constitutional law were in accord with the most advanced authorities. I listened with a good deal of attention to the hon. member for Halifax and I am using no word of hackneyed conventionality, but I am speaking the words of truth and soberness when I say that when that hon. gentleman rose my views were completely antagonistic to those expressed by the leader of the Opposition, and before he sat down he worked a marvellous conversion in my mind. Before proceeding to discuss the constitutional point I may say that the leader of the Opposition requires no sympathy. The gentleman who formulates opinions on constitutional law that are shown to be backed up by the authority that attached to the name of Sir John Macdonald need not ask for the sympathy of even the junior member for Halifax. If there is one man more than another in the political history of this country whose opinions on every point of constitutional law and practice were authoritative, he was the late lamented father of this confederation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) however, might well have reserved his sympathy for the leader of the Government. That right hon. gentleman when he made his speech in this House respecting the Bill now before us gave his reasons for thinking the Bill was constitutional. He did not enter upon any elaborate discussion of constitutional principles, he placed himself solely upon two or three precedents which he quoted but in which he was shown by the leader of the Opposition to be completely at sea. However, Sir, supposing the contention of the leader of the Opposition was correct, supposing for one moment that this Bill is completely unconstitutional, does not the hon. leader of the Government know that nobody entrusted with power can be said to be functus officio so long as that power is not completely executed. If it is executed in mistake, that is a case where incomplete execution of the power was made. In respect to case cited by the hon. gentleman, it was a case which the House was not well informed at the time, and blundered and the Act of parliament, a rectification of what the House had done, or rather a completion

of what the House had undertaken to do but failed to do.

I stated that the member for Halifax had wrought a change in my own views as to the constitutionality of this Bill, and I shall proceed to show the House the manner in which my conversion, as I may call it, was brought about. If hon. gentlemen will look into this matter they will find that there are three sections of the British North America Act which apply. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) introduced a fourth section, which, however, the hon. junior member for Halifax eliminates from the discussion by saying that it has nothing to do with the case, and then proceeds to damn the hon. member for East Prince with faint praise by attributing an argument to him that he never made, and then congratulating him upon it. These three sections are sections 40, 51 and 91. The process of reasoning is rather close and I would ask the careful attention of hon. gentlemen, and I would ask the House to bear with me in what may be a dry discussion, for every construction of the meaning of the statute is necessarily a dry discussion. Section 40 says:

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts as follows:—

That section has been cited by hon. gentlemen opposite who have discussed this matter as being conclusive, if that section stood alone I should say that it was conclusive. But it does not stand alone. Arrangements existing under this section were to stand until the Parliament of Canada otherwise determines or enacts. These words "otherwise provides" are given full scope to by section 51. If we turn to section 51, we shall find that provision is made in accordance with which this Parliament of Canada can otherwise provide; and section 40 unquestionably contemplates the procedure under section 51. That disposes of section 40. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that by virtue of the powers inherent in this Federal Parliament which are conveyed by section 91 in general terms, we have the power to deal with this matter. Now, I will read section 91:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to resist the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared, that notwithstanding anything in this Act, the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:

Then follows the list of subjects of jurisdiction that are expressly and by enumeration given to the Parliament of Canada. Now, my argument is, notwithstanding the general words of that section, it is qualified by every section outside of section 91 which applies to a specific subject that might be covered by section 91. These sections must stand together—sections 51 and 91 and section 51 governs. I might cite several cases of the Privy Council of constitutional matters referred to them in which they have given decisions in support of this construction. I might cite also the principles of statutory interpretation which are well known to the legal gentlemen of this House. If section 91 is general, section 51 specific, section 51 cannot be overridden by the general words of 91, the principle of statutory construction which applies being that general words will not control specific words. A specific enactment must be taken as being an exception to a general enactment, a specific clause to a general clause. I come to section 51, which hon. gentlemen opposite say refers simply to interprovincial readjustment. Now, mark you, if section 51 refers exclusively to the interprovincial readjustment of representation, how easy a thing it would have been to have said so in short terms, how easily could the British Parliament have said: The representation for the provinces of this Dominion shall be on the basis of population, allowing 65 members for the province of Quebec. That is all; those few words would have completed the enactment and made every necessary provision. But this section not only refers to interprovincial readjustment, but it also necessarily implies, as much so as if it was stated in express terms, redistribution as well. I will read it:

On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules.

Now, what is the necessity of this long and elaborate legislation, if all that was sought to compass was a declaration that the representation from the different provinces shall be according to the ratio their population bears to the population of Quebec, which is to have 65 members? But here is something elaborate. And it must be remembered that if this section deals with and provides for distribution, it must be looked to exclusively for the mode of procedure. It is not a legislative declaration as to the relative representation in this House alone, for it provides for a distribution necessarily. Parliament provides an authority—and that authority may be itself, I admit—to make the distribution "in such manner and from such time, &c." It is to lay down the principles that are to determine the distribution. Now, I call the attention of the House particularly to the words "shall be readjusted by such authority." We will say that it authorizes the issu-

ing of a commission—and such a course is in contemplation—by such authority. If the commission was appointed to-day, would not hon. gentlemen in this House say that, after the commission had been appointed under that section and had done its work, the statutory power was spent, if the work was completely done? If the power was completely executed, that must end the power which must last until the work is renewed after the next decennial census. This is rather a bold statement, considering the weight of legal authority on the other side of the House; I assure you that I feel considerable comfort in being backed in this matter by the opinion of such an able constitutional jurist as Sir John A. Macdonald. Now, I wish to call the attention of the legal gentlemen of this House particularly to these words. In one place it says, with respect to one thing, "from such time"; in the same clause it says, "from time to time" in respect to another thing. These expressions must mean "once," and "as often as Parliament sees fit," respectively. "The representation is to be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time," that is, once, and until the statute after the next census. Parliament is to provide the method by which this authority is to act and to make such provision from time to time, as often as is necessary. The readjustment is from a certain time. But the powers of this Parliament, say, to constitute a commission, to lay down regulations, so to speak, which shall guide the commission, are to be exercised as often as this Parliament sees fit to exercise them. It may change them from session to session, or change them during the session, and that is the significance of the words "from time to time." The execution of the power by the authority entrusted with it, is not "from time to time," but until the requirements of the section, that is, until the next decennial census, calls for its exercise again. I arrived at this conclusion, as I said, this evening, and while I speak positively, on reconsideration my opinions might change again; but at present I feel somewhat like the Hon. Joseph Howe, the celebrated statesman in Nova Scotia, who was taxed on one occasion with changing his opinions. "Well, gentlemen," he said, "if it is any satisfaction to you to twit me with a change of opinion, all I can say is, that there are no opinions for which I entertain so little respect as my discarded opinions."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Perhaps that may come yet.

Mr. POWELL. If this argument be correct, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is unconstitutional. But suppose that the Bill is perfectly constitutional, then I ask: Why is it before the House? I tell the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government, that when he stated, in his speech in support of this Bill, that the trend of public opinion in British-speaking countries, and especially in England, was, that urban constituencies should not be as fully represented as rural constituencies, he is entirely in error, so far as England is concerned. I tell him that in England, from the day the Reform Bill was placed upon the statute-book in 1882, down to the last Reform Bill in 1885, there has been a gradual evolution in legislation towards the cardinal democratic principle, one vote, one power. I do not say that movement has reached its end, but the movement is well defined. Let me give a few facts. In 1832 the hon. gentleman would have been in a perfect paradise, had he lived in England. What has taken place there? Even before the conquest, but largely after the conquest, there had grown up in England certain little municipalities, 'imperia in imperio,' so to speak, upon which depend both the genesis and perpetuation of the principles of British liberty. These little communities, boroughs, had existed for hundreds and hundreds of years. The Act of 1832, instead of recognizing their existence and continuing their dignity, actually struck out of existence a large number of them. I do not remember how many were wiped out in that way, but it is immaterial to my argument. In addition the Act took fifty of these boroughs, these independent municipalities with their glorious histories, with the attachment on the part of the people to their local government which could not be broken, and united them to counties and created new constituencies. The Act divided counties, ignoring the sanctity of county boundaries, and created separate constituencies. In addition to that the Act created four new boroughs in London and gave them representation. In 1868, when the Conservative Reform Bill was passed what was the trend of popular opinion and legislative action as evidenced by it? The Act took one member from each of thirty-five small boroughs; it allowed no borough to have representation that had less than 10,000 inhabitants. There is a recognition, at least, of the principle of representation by population not carried out, it is true, to a very radical extent, but still recognized as a principle. But, nevertheless, in order to give three representatives instead of two, as previously, they subdivided several of the counties and created new constituencies, regardless of the sanctity of the county boundaries. We come down to the Act of 1885, which wiped out seventy-nine of the small boroughs entirely and united them to counties. What does the right hon. Prime Minister say to this action on the part of the British Parliament, or to its maintaining county divisions or its maintaining borough divisions. That Parliament united them just as the Conservatives did in New Brunswick when they united Sunbury and Queen's and as they did in different parts of Ontario.

The Act disfranchised two boroughs altogether, but that was on account of corruption, and I need not refer particularly to them. It wiped out one hundred and thirty-two seats which were divided among the counties and towns. When the right hon. Prime Minister says that this principle of rural as against urban representation prevails in England, I point out these facts to him proving that he is entirely in error. The right hon. gentleman has only to refer to the Bill of 1885, which gave London a representation of 61 members, including the old city of London and the contiguous municipalities, and the other parts that came within Greater London. With an electoral unit of 50,000, that would make the population of London over 3,000,000, while the population was only a little over 4,000,000, so that the discrepancy was small. Liverpool had nine; Birmingham, seven; Manchester, six; Bristol, six; and so on; I need not go over them all. I shall bring my remarks to a head on that score by quoting from an eminent man in his line, Mr. J. Lowes Dickinson, a Fellow of the University of Cambridge, upon the general trend in England of popular opinion towards the principles of democracy as evidenced in legislation. In the United States, from the time of Thomas Jefferson, who, on this continent, may be said to be the father of democracy, when he put in the Declaration of Independence that all men are born equal, to the present time the advance has been towards his ideal. After narrating the history of what I may call the evolution of the principle, Mr. Dickinson says:

> The member for a constituency is no longer conceived as the spokesman for a particular district.

How does the right hon. gentleman's theory accord with that?

> He is regarded as the trustee of a certain definite amount of political power,——

How does it accord with that?

> ——determined by the measure of a certain definite population.

How does it accord with that?

> The process of redistribution has been, like that of the extension of the franchise, a transition half reluctant and half unconscious to the democratic principles.

I shall not enter into any criticism in detail of this measure. When an hon. gentleman or a Government brings forward a Bill like this which seeks to make a change in what is one of the most fundamental matters in the parliamentary government of the country, that hon. gentleman or that Government should set forth some necessity for it. What reason has he brought forward? The right hon. gentleman has given us several pretexts, but I would like to know what is his reason. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when they look at the pretext, will ask whether that be the reason, and they will come to the conclusion that the reason is a political reason, and not the reason contained in the statement that was given to the House. What principle underlies his Bill, I would ask, which would commend it to any independent body. Suppose the hon. gentleman were arguing this matter before a board of judicial men? What would be put forward to these judges upon which he could ask for judgment in his favour? He says we want county boundaries, but the rule that he attempts to lay down is more honoured in its breach than in its observance. The hon. gentleman's rule reminds me very much of a coloured preacher who was the possessor of the hallucination that the millenium had arrived and that Satan was bound for a thousand years. "Beware my friends, notwithstanding the fact that he has been chained, he may catch you, and you and you," said he, pointing to different persons in his audience. One of his dusky hearers said, "Why, massa, the old fellow might as well be loose." In respect to this observance of county boundaries it is violated in so many cases that the rule may be considered as non-existent. There are three things that the hon. gentleman might have as underlying principles—county boundaries, representation by population and the restoration of constituencies to their former conditions. As to population which is a cardinal principle of advanced liberalism in England, has the hon. gentleman based his Bill upon it. He has not. He proposes to make enactments in entire disregard of population, and of the electoral unit. Does he restore constituencies to their former condition? No; only those constituencies from which the hon. gentleman hopes to have some aid at the next general elections are restored. These are all the things that might have been expected as underlying principles of the Bill. There is no principle in it. It is based upon no principle but political gain; it seeks to compass no honest principle. The statement which is made is simply a pretext and the real reason is to obtain some political advantage at the next general elections. In respect to what the Conservatives did in 1882 I will say that there was a large number of new members in Ontario and some new members in Nova Scotia, and it was necessary to make provision for them that there should be some readjustment of the constituencies. Whatever arrangement was made fault would be found by hon. gentlemen opposite. If Conservatives made an arrangement looking to their own political aggrandizement, they did wrong. I for one, regret that at that time the means contemplated by the constitution in section 51 were not resorted to, and that an independent body with authority to divide the provinces into constituencies and to allocate the representatives to them was not constituted. The redistribution of seats should be a matter above politics. It is a

matter that should be taken in hand by the leaders of both parties so as to have an absolutely fair non-partisan division of the electorate. Mr. Speaker, I will say no more except this : That in view of the authority of Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was justified in making the statement he did that this Bill is absolutely unconstitutional ; and so far as I can see—giving full importance and full force to every section of the British North America Act—nothwithstanding any arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is unconstitutional.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, as it is the intention to close the debate and have a divison to-night, I shall not at this very late hour occupy the time of the House for more than a few minutes. The duty that would ordinarily devolve on a member representing a Toronto constituency, has been so efficiently discharged by my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), and he has so forcibly presented the disabilities under which Toronto will labour if this Act becomes law, that little is left for me to say. But, Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to refute as far as I can some of the criticisms which hon. gentlemen opposite have directed against my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson). The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) was particularly severe on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) and he accused him of speaking a certain number of minutes on behalf of the Government and then a certain number of minutes on behalf of the Opposition. He declared that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) never made any suggestions in this House that were particularly valuable. I can tell the hon. gentleman from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that the hon. member from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) since he has occupied a seat in this House has always been able to give a reason for the views he holds, and he has never hesitated to express his opinion by casting his vote on one side or the other as by him was deemed right. I was more particularly struck with the closing remarks of the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Macdonald) when speaking of the political views which are held by the great majority of the people of Toronto. He declared that it was the duty of the representatives of Toronto to support this Bill because it gave greater justice to Toronto than was formerly given, and he told us that if the citizens of Toronto had greater confidence in the administration and sent members here to support their legislation, the city would probably get a larger representation in this House than it was now getting. Are we not justified in concluding from that statement, that, as has been pointed out again and again, the sole object of hon. gentlemen opposite in introducing this measure at this stage of the life of this Parliament, is to secure a party advantage for themselves ?

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). Permit me to correct my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) in the statement he has made. He alleges that I said that if the city of Toronto sent representatives here to support the Government, that city would receive greater favours at the hands of the Government. I did not say that. I said that if the city of Toronto was looking to its own interests it would send members here to support this Government, which takes a statesmanlike view of all the affairs of the country, and therefore that Toronto would receive greater benefit than she does at the present time.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know that the explanation just made by the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) is any better than the statement which he tries to explain. I am in the judgment of the House when I say, that the sum and substance of his argument was, that if the city of Toronto expressed more frequently its confidence in the Liberal party and Government, it might look for greater favours from the Government than it now receives. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Toronto have long memories, and they can look back upon the treatment which their city received from hon. gentlemen opposite and their political friends and supporters. They are not unmindful of the fact that that city has been dealt with by friends of hon. gentlemen in the province of Ontario, as unfairly and unjustly as it was possible for them to treat it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) suggests that we should support this Bill because of the measure of justice it metes out to Toronto, but surely he must have forgotten that the Bill as first introduced by the Prime Minister contained no provision for additional representation in that city. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) did not express any disapprobation with regard to the great injustice which was intended to be perpetrated. I have no hesitation in saying, that if it were not for the universal condemnation which that particular feature of the measure met with from hon. members on this side of the House—and to their credit be it said, from many hon. members on the other side of the House—the tardy half measure of justice which is being done to the city of Toronto by increasing its members from four to five would not have been accorded. In order to demonstrate, if demonstration is necessary, that the object of this Bill is purely political, one has only to look at the way in which the Bill affects the city of Toronto and the county of York taken together. When the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) was speaking as to the representation of the city of Toronto, I invited him to give some figures with respect to the representation which the county of

York would receive under this Bill, but he apparently could not comply with the request. As at present constituted the county of York, with its three ridings has a population of about 97,000. By the present Bill the population of the county of York is being reduced from 97,000 to about 62,000, but notwithstanding that, the Government do not propose to reduce the representation of the county of York in this House. Why is that done? If the Government had acted fairly, when they reduced the population of the county of York by one-third, they would have reduced the representation of that county in this House by one-third, but they knew the result would have been disastrous to them. If instead of continuing to give it three members they had given the county two members with a population of 60,000, making the unit of representation the same as in the city of Toronto, the Government would not have had a ghost of a show to elect either one of the two members for the county of York. But, after depriving the county of one-third of its population, they still give it three members in the hope that they may succeed in depriving of their seats the hon. gentlemen from West York (Mr. Wallace) and from East York (Mr. Maclean). That is one of the iniquities of the Bill which is apparent to all; that is one of the features of this Bill that is worthy of condemnation. The hon. gentleman from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) also thought that justice was being done to Toronto by this Bill. He went so far as to say that in previous redistributions, wards of the city of Toronto had been taken and attached to some of the ridings of York, for the purpose of giving unfair representation in this House. The hon gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) must have been misinformed because no ward of the city of Toronto has ever been added to any of the ridings of the county of York for such a purpose. What has happened was this: As additions have been made from time to time, under the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, of certain municipalities in the county of York to the city, these added portions while entering the city municipally, have been left in the county for parliamentary purposes, where they had been from time immemorial. They have not been taken into the city of Toronto for the purpose of representation in this House. They remain where they have always been; but the intention of hon. gentlemen, when they took these additional wards into the city of Toronto for the purpose of representation in this House, was not to recognize that the population of the city of Toronto had been increased by that action by nearly 40,000, because they proposed to give it no additional representation, but to gain an advantage in the county of York, and we do not thank hon. gentlemen opposite particularly, because they have been forced by the unanimous opinion practically of the province of Ontario to do this act of simple justice to the city of Toronto. The Postmaster General, in moving the second reading of this Bill, made the statement that the practice had not prevailed in Canada in the past to give as full representation to the cities as to the more sparsely-settled districts of this country. I make bold to say that an examination of the facts in connection with the representation of urban constituencies will not sustain the statement of the Postmaster General. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) last night pointed out, and gave sufficient reasons I think to demonstrate, that the Postmaster General's statement was, to say the least, inaccurate. What has been the unit of representation of the various cities in the Dominion? Not counting the city of Toronto, the population of the cities of the Dominion amounts to 481,095; they have 19 representatives, and the unit of representation is 25,321. If the Bill which the hon. gentleman introduced into this House had not been amended in the particular in which it has, by giving Toronto an additional member, the population of Toronto would have been 174,414, and the unit of representation 43,604; but, notwithstanding, a discrimination has been practised and is stil being practised against the city of Toronto. Even with this additional member for Toronto, the unit of representation is 34,883. In view of these facts the representatives of the city of Toronto in this House would not be doing their duty, no matter on which side they hold their seats, if they did not rise and enter a protest against this discrimination, which cannot be justified, against the Queen City of the west. While I do not say that the other cities should not have the representation which they have in this House, I do say that if they are entitled to that representation, the city of Toronto is entitled to equal representation in proporion to its population. The four cities of the province of Ontario—Ottawa, Kingston, London and Hamilton—are represented in this House by six members, and their total population, according to the census of 1891 is 131,270, so that the unit of representation is 21,878, which is about the unit of representation of the constituencies generally.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman is giving the population of the other cities from the census of 1891, and he is calculating the population of Toronto as it stands at the present time.

Mr. CLARKE. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has given me by his interruption an opportunity of emphasizing a fact which I might otherwise have forgotten, that in giving the populations of the different cities, I have taken the census of 1891, and I have also taken the census of 1891 in giving the population of the city of Toronto.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The city of Toronto in 1891 had a population of 144,000. Now it has about 171,000, into which the hon. gentleman divides the representation which makes the unit 34,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Without meaning to be disrespectful to the hon. gentleman, I certainly would not have taken up so much time in referring to misstatements which he made but that I thought he was familiar with the population of the different cities of this province and of the Dominion. I can only assure the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken as to the figures he gives of the population of the city of Toronto. I am giving the populations of the cities of Ontario as they are found in the census of 1891. The city of Toronto, as it is to be constituted by this Bill, including the wards taken from East and West York, according to the census of 1891, has a population of 174,414. We are asked to be satisfied with five members for a population of 175,000, while the other four cities of Ontario which I have named, with a population of 131,000, have six members. I appeal to the hon. gentleman's sense of fair-play, that when he next makes a speech with regard to the representation of cities in this House, he will do justice to the city of Toronto. I have refrained from saying what the probable population of the city of Toronto is now. Might's Directory estimates the population comprised under this Act, to have been on the 1st of January last no less than 235,000. If there were a desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to do simple justice to the city of Toronto, in view of the enormous increase which has taken place in the population of that city during the past five or six years, they would have given it the same unit of representation in this House that other cities of the Dominion possess.

The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) spoke in the highest terms of the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. He quoted him as an authority with regard to the redistribution Bill of 1892. He cited his action as one which might be followed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House today; and he made use of arguments presented by that hon. gentleman in 1892 with respect to the unfairness of some provisions of the Redistribution Bill of 1882. Will the House bear with me while I quote some of the statements made by the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy respecting the representation of cities in this country and in the old country? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) said of my hon. friend from East Toronto that he had less confidence in him because he had not stated correctly what the practice was in regard to the representation of urban constituencies in the Imperial Parliament. The late Dalton McCarthy, speaking in this House on the 7th of June, 1892, made reference to urban representation as follows:—

There is, I believe, a general impression prevailing that cities are not represented on the same basis as counties. That is a mistake. The unit for counties and the unit for cities are practically identical. The population of all cities is added up, and the total is divided by the unit of 53,700, and the result is that the cities as a whole are represented just as the counties are.

He further said:

Taking the cities as a whole, they secure, according to their population, as many representatives as the counties; that is what I want to impress on the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for East Toronto quoted any statements that misled the hon. member for Halifax, I am sure that he erred in good company, and that the figures he presented to this House were figures which he believed might be thoroughly relied upon. Hon. gentlemen opposite are asking us to support this Bill in view of the additional representative being given to the city of Toronto. Let me draw their attention to the fact that the course which they have pursued in their dealings with Toronto for the past ten or fifteen years does not justify the representatives of that city giving them any confidence or help. The city of Toronto was represented in the Ontario legislature since confederation by two members, but the population increased so largely that in 1885 Sir Oliver Mowat was compelled to give it an additional representative. But, contrary to every principle of justice and fair-play, he united the two constituencies, which had been distinct and separate from confederation up to 1885, and, while he gave the people of Toronto, as one constituency, an additional representative in the legislative assembly of Ontario, he took good care to provide that, while Toronto should return three members, each elector should only have the opportunity of recording two votes. So that, when they could not influence the voters of Toronto in any other way, these hon. gentlemen did not hesitate to introduce the principe of minority representation, which had been tried in the old land and abandoned because found impracticable and unworkable.

The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) asks us to support this Bill because it is based on principles which prevail in the old land. I may say to the hon. gentleman and also to those who take an interest, as most of us do, in the affairs of the old country, that there is a serious agitation there with regard to representation in the House of Commons. It has been the subject of animated discussion in the old land, but, notwithstanding the pressing importance of that question and the keen public interest which is being aroused to the anomalies that now exist in the representation of the people, the impropriety is generally recognized of having any redistribution of seats in he Imperial Parliament until after the next cen-

sus is taken. So far as I have been able to judge from the arguments presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, I am unable to come to any other conclusion than that the sole object of this Bill is political and party advantage. The hon. member for Simcoe quoted the opinion which the right hon. leader of the Government expressed, when leader of the Opposition, on the 31st May, 1892. I think I may requote that opinion to advantage, as showing the attitude of the right hon. gentleman, some seven or eight years ago, on this question of redistribution:

> The periodical redistribution of seats in this House is a standing order of our constitution. It is not a matter as to which the Government are free to act, which they can repudiate, or which they can accept; if it were so, it would be open to each party to deal with it in a manner best suited to its own interests, in the conception which both parties hold of their own rights. But it is not such a matter.

I have only to say, further, that the right hon. gentleman, in introducing and pushing through this Bill, is establishing a very bad precedent for the future. It is one that may be taken advantage of to stifle, for a time at any rate, the voice of the people and commit an injustice to political opponents. If this measure is persisted in, the people will recognize more clearly than at present that political advantage, and not principle, is the mainspring which has actuated the presentation and forcing through of this Bill, and political parties will not be slow in the days to come to take advantage of the precedent thus established to secure party gain. We are asked to support this measure because it has a provision that the judges shall sub-divide the constituencies. Did the right hon. gentleman always entertain the view that it is wise to delegate the power of Parliament, as to the formation of constituencies, to the judges. I do not think that the position which the right hon. gentleman takes now is in accord with the position he took formerly. I notice that in the "Hansard" of 1892, vol. 2, page 3126, he is reported as saying:

> In some quarters the suggestion has been made that the duty of redistribution should be referred to a commission of judges specially appointed; in other words, that Parliament shall divest itself of its powers in this most important particular. Sir, I am bound to say at once that this is a proposition which my friends and I would not favour upon this or any other subject. I am bound to say that we would not entrust to any this duty and privilege, which belongs to Parliament. Moreover, this proposition implies a singular want of confidence in parliamentary institutions. It implies that in a matter of this kind the majority would never be able to rise above the low temptations of strengthening themselves at the expense of their opponents. I am sorry to say there is some ground for such a conclusion; but, on the other hand, I am happy to say also that the mother land affords an example where the majority composed, I am still more satisfied to say, of the Liberal party, showed itself equal to the highest conception of equity and justice upon such an occasion; and the majority in this country are charged with having on similar occasions abused their power, still the conclusion to which I and my hon. friends have come is, not that Parliament should on that account deprive itself of its power, not that a sound principle should be departed from, but rather that we should appeal to the majority to rise to a nobler conception of their duty, and do in this country what the majority, composed of the Liberal party, did in Great Britain. On this side we are not disposed, even with this glaring abuse of the powers and majority, to come to the conclusion that Parliament should divest itself of its rights and privileges. We stand by the principle that the inherent power of Parliament must on all occasions be exercised by Parliament itself.

To-day, within a few years after the right hon. gentleman gave expression to those views we are asked to sustain the opposite view and vote for the passage of his Bill because he has in a measure called in the judges to assist him in this uncalled for and unworthy act. Further on he said:

> Moreover, I may say that if a majority of Parliament cannot be trusted to do justice in a matter of this kind, to refer the matter to a commission would be begging the question and not solving it, because what would happen? If the majority of Parliament could not be trusted to do justice in such a case, the commission would be appointed by the same men who, according to that, could not be trusted to do right. The commissioners would be stamped with their own image, swayed by their own spirit, and no greater justice could be expected from the commissioners than from the body that appointed them.

Yet we are asked to hold up our hands in admiration and praise of the Government for providing for the selection of three judges the decisions of two of whom shall be final, to redistribute within certain limits constituencies in portions of the province of Ontario. The right hon. gentleman concluded by saying:

> What we propose is that this measure of redistribution should be framed by a committee appointed in the same manner as the standing committees of this House.

That was the view then entertained by the right hon. leader of the Government. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite or on this side whether, now that the right hon. First Minister has the advantage and opportunity of giving effect to the view he believed was sound in 1892, he should not take the Opposition into his confidence in the preparation of this measure and ask hon. gentlemen on this side to assist a committee on that side to make a fair redistribution Bill if such a measure be necessary?

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) also placed himself on record at the same time in support of the position taken by the right hon. gentleman.

So much for the position which these hon. gentlemen now take on having judges called in to subdivide the constituencies which

they had already shaped out in their own interests. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing the redistribution Bill of 1892, laid great stress upon the principle that there should be no double constituency, no constituency sending two members to this House. The hon. Postmaster General, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said:

> The Bill restores the county lines to the province of Prince Edward Island. That island is entitled to five members, and the counties have, until very lately, been represented each by two. A change was made. Portions of one county were detached and given to another, and the number of members reduced from six to five. It is now proposed to restore to each county those portions that necessarily belong to it, and to give representation accordingly—one to King's, which has the smallest population, and two each to the other counties, whose population exceeds that of King's.

That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite propose to give effect to the views which were enunciated by their leader when in Opposition, and which were never challengde by any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. The present Minister of Justice, who was then an important member of this House and the gentleman who spoke most frequently on constitutional questions on behalf of the Opposition during the time when hon. gentlemen sat on this side, in discussing the Redistribution Bill of 1892, said:

> There is another point which is important, and it is that there should be single constituencies. It is not proper to have two constituencies united into one. In the first place, it is extremely inconvenient. In the case of a by-election in this city, why should a candidate be called upon to ask the suffrages practically of two constituencies in order to obtain a seat in Parliament. The same may be said of Pictou, Halifax and Hamilton, as well as of Ottawa. All these constituencies ought to be divided, and in no case should there be two representatives for the same constituency.

And the lat hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) expressed his concurrence in that view:

> I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the principle of double constituencies is one that ought not to be increased, but, so far as possible, it ought to be put an end to. I quite agree that the constituencies ought to be single in every point of view.

That was the opinion entertained regarding double constituencies then. In making a redistribution have they acted on that principle? What have they done in regard to such constituencies as Hamilton, Ottawa, Pictou County, the city and county of Halifax and the constituencies of Prince Edward Island? They have ignored the principle they professed to believe in, and they have done so because they hoped to gain political advantage, to make political capital by so doing. Why not divide the city of Hamilton? That is one constituency represented by two members on the floor of this House. If the rule is a good one that no constituency shall send two members to this House, why should Hamilton and Ottawa be allowed to send two? Why is it that of all these constituencies in Ontario sending two members only one is done away with, and that one West Toronto? It is fair to infer that the reason is that it would be utterly impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite or for the judges to subdivide Ottawa or Hamilton so as to make capital for the Government. If they subdivided them, what is almost a certainty, would become a certainty, and they would lose both seats in both cities; and so they swallow their principles, and leave every double-member constituency intact except one—the constituency of West Toronto. And that act of justice and fair-play and discrimination as far as the city of Toronto is concerned, I presume, in the opinion of the hon. member for East Huron is an additional reason why hon. gentlemen on this side should support this measure.

I have but a few words more to say. As I understand it, there are 51 constituencies in Ontario affected by this Bill, the constituencies westward of and including the county of Ontario. These are represented in this House by 31 Liberals and 20 Conservatives. These constituencies are as they were framed and made by the redistribution Acts of 1882 and 1892. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in addressing the House threw a challenge to hon. members opposite which not one of them has yet accepted, to show wherein political advantage was gained by gentlemen on this side by the Redistribution Bill of 1882. Whether that challenge is accepted or not, I draw the attention of the House to these facts—that in the 51 constituencies affected by this Bill there is a population of 1,254,554. The unit of representation is 24,600. The 31 Liberals who occupy seats in this House representing constituencies in this group represent an average population of 22,186, while the 20 Conservatives represent no less than 28,338 on the average. The unit of representation so far as these 51 constituencies are concerned, is exceeded by nearly 4,000 in the case of the Conservatives, while in the case of the Liberals it falls short by about 2,500 on the average.

Now, take the whole province of Ontario, and what do we find. We find that the constituencies supporting the Government in Ontario number 52, and have a population of 1,157,992. The unit of representation for these constituencies is 22,269. And in the case of these 52 constituencies, the unit of representation is 1,640 less than the unit of representation for constituencies represented by Ontario Conservatives in this House. Whether the law of 1882 or the law of 1892 acted injuriously or not, the fact remains that, so far as the representation is concerned in this House, if you take it over the whole province of Ontario or that portion

of it affected by this Bill, the unit of representation for those who represent the Conservative party in this House is nearly 2,000 higher than for the constituencies of hon. gentlemen who occupy seats on the other side.

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman will have to bear with me, and I am sure he will afford me a few minutes longer, because—and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker—I do not often trouble the House, and I did not know until a few hours ago that this debate would close to-night. Another principle that hon. gentlemen opposite advocated was that we should restore municipal county boundaries. I need not dwell on that at greater length than to say that these hon. gentleman have restored the municipal boundaries where they found it to be to their political advantage, and where they found no political advantage they left those boundaries severely alone, and as fixed by the Acts of 1882 and of 1892. If hon. gentlemen will look at the constituencies affected by this Bill, they will find that the 59 constituencies from Ontario county westward contain a population of 1,467,360. The unit of representation in these 59 constituencies is 24,870. Of the 59, 37 are represented by Liberals, the unit of representation for their constituencies being 23,061; while the 22 Conservatives who make up the contingent of the party from the part of the province of Ontario affected by this gerrymander represent an average of 27,912 souls. Now, I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that while the portion of the province of Ontario affected by this gerrymander, has constituencies averaging 24,870, they have left that part of the province religiously alone, so far as county boundaries are concerned, where the unit of representation is less than 20,000. They were continually complaining that the eastern portion of this province was over-represented, and declaring for additional representation for the western part of the province. They made distinctions, and drew attention to the fact that there were a number of small constituencies in Eastern Ontario that might be amalgamated, and additional seats found for the western part of the province, which was thought to be increasing more rapidly in population and was entitled to a larger representation. But what have they done in this Bill? Have they carried into effect the views they expressed time and again when they occupied seats on this side? Have they taken away any of the representation of constituencies east of the county of Ontario? Not at all. They have left them alone. The Minister of Justice pointed out, referring to volume 1 of the Census of 1891, that it was only necessary to look at the Census to see that the portion of the province lying west of the city of Toronto was under-represented, and the portion lying to the east, between the Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers, and the eastern portion of Lake Ontario was over-represented. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) also drew attention to this fact, and pointed out that it was unfair to the people of Ontario that this section of the province should be over represented, while the western part was under-represented; and suggestions were made as to how this over representation could be done away with in the eastern portions of the province. But, Sir, notwithstanding the opportunity now presented to these hon. gentlemen to do justice to the western portion of Ontario, they have left these eastern constituencies just as they were. The reason is not hard to find. When they were contending so loudly for additional representation in the western part of Ontario they had only three or four followers from that part of the province east of the county of Ontario, while the Conservative party had 28 representatives. That was the reason that they advocated a readjustment of the representation of eastern Ontario. But since that time they have increased their representation in this House from the counties east of the county of Ontario from 4 to 15. They have now 15 representatives while their political opponents have 18. Previously their political opponents had 28 and they had 3 or 4. Because they have been successful in the elections of 1896, because they succeeded in capturing 10 or 12 seats in eastern Ontario, they have abandoned every profession, every principle, they have ignored altogether the over representation in this part of the province, which still continues; and I repeat, the reason they have taken that course is because they find that if they adopted the municipal boundaries in those counties in the eastern part of this province, they would make no gain. As a matter of fact they would make some losses, as the return of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite from the eastern part of the province to the Legislative Assembly clearly shows. So we are justified in concluding that they are prepared to abandon every principle of representation that they advocated while they occupied seats on this side of the House, if by so doing in this Redistribution Bill they can make some political advantage for themselves. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said that they had fulfilled practically every pledge they had made to the electors prior to 1896. If they believed in representation by population they have not attempted to put that principle in force in this Bill. If they believed that the eastern part of Ontario was over represented and that the western part was under represented, they have not attempted in any thing they have done in this Bill to give the western portion of the province that representation to which it is entitled. They have acted in

this matter as they have acted in respect of every other feature of their policy since they came into office ; they have sought, we must admit, a party advantage before endeavouring to carry out those high strung principles of political morality which they gave expression to when they occupied seats on this side of the House. Sir, I claim that in view of the utterances of the right hon. Premier he is not justified in bringing this Bill before the House now. The only justification that he can present to the House and to the country for so doing is that he is afraid to make another appeal to the constituencies of this province to which he appealed in 1896, because he must feel that the policy and actions of the government have fallen so far short of their professions that when another opportunity presents itself to the electors, they will not hesitate to express their disapproval of the course of the hon. gentleman and of those who are associated with him.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I crave the indulgence of the House for only a few minutes. I rise to speak on the legal question that has been raised by the leader of the Opposition. In the early part of this debate, I asked him if he thought these two Acts, one that I cited myself, and one that was cited immediately afterwards by another hon. gentleman, were unconstitutional. The hon. gentleman did not answer then, but later on in his argument, instead of answering that question, he admitted that these Statutes were perfectly constitutional, but that they were made to correct a clerical error. To-night we have had from the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) conclusive evidence that these were not merely clerical errors but they were important acts changing the boundaries of electoral divisions in this province. So that argument stands as it was put to the leader of the Opposition. But what have we got now as a presentation of this legal question ? We have got from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) a presentation of it, and he admits himself that he is in doubt as to whether this Act is constitutional. He says that he is not convinced, but that the best reading that he can give of it leads him to think it is constitutional. Then he calls to his support the opinion of Sir John A. Macdonald as to the constitutionality of it. Then we have the presentation of the case by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). He says that until almost a minute or two before he rose to speak he was firmly convinced that this Act was constitutional, but he says that the speech of the hon. junior member for Halifax convinced him that the leader of the Opposition was right. In fact the instantaneous conversion of Saul on his way to Damascus was not to be compared with the suddenness of the conversion of the hon. member for Westmoreland. And still he tells us that we can have no assurance that he will not change his opinion back again before this Bill passes the House. Now I submit that the arguments that have been adduced show that this Act is constitutional. It was stated by way of answer to the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) that he invoked the aid of section 8 to show that there was authority in this House to pass this Act. But both gentlemen admit that section 47 is ample in itself to give authority. And the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) says that section 91 also adds to that. I do not think that section 91 has very much to do with it, but supposing that it has, then it only makes the case so much the stronger. Now, section 91 is from his stand-point the most important section. It says :

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the class of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces ; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared, &c., &c. :

Now, if these sections together, or either one of them, give the power, then the power exists subject to some limitations, if there are any limitations in any section of the Act that will prevent this Bill being passed. Now the section that pretends to limit that power for any purpose whatever in section 51, and any one who will read it in connection with the subsections if he is not convinced that there is no limitation to this legislation, as it is proposed to be passed now, then, I will say, that I cannot read plain English in a matter of this kind. It seems to be clear that there is no limitation as to a matter of this kind, but that it is mandatory in its character upon this Parliament as to what after every decennial census, they are to do in reference to the adjustment of the representation as between the different provinces. Now, then the argument is said to be supported by the opinion of the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald that this Bill is unconstitutional and it is said that he gave that opinion in reference to the Tuckersmith Bill. He only gave that opinion incidentally. When the Senate threw out the Tuckersmith Bill he incidentally remarked that it was a good thing that the Senate had done so because that prevented this House from passing an unconstitutional Act. That Tuckersmith Bill was passed by this House, of which Sir John Macdonald was a member. There were, in the House, plenty of men of great legal ability, yet the constitutional question was never raised, and, if it was never raised in respect to the Tuckersmith Bill and in respect to these other two Bills referred to, I ask this House, as a matter of judicial fairness, to come to the conclusion, whether the right view to take as a legal matter

of this question is the opinion expressed by this House in the passing of this Tuckersmith Bill, or the incidental or casual remark, made by Sir John Macdonald, that he is said to have made in reference to the Senate not passing the Bill because it was unconstitutional.

Mr. RICHARD TYRWHITT (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this late hour and at this late stage of the debate to delay the House more than a moment or two, but, my chief object, in raising, is to join with my colleague from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in protesting against the injustice done to that county by having only three members allotted to it with a population approaching 90,000, whereas, York County adjoining, with a population of 60,000, has the same number of representatives. Now, Sir, any references I may make to the début in the political arena of my colleague from the North Riding of Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who is the friend of a lifetime, I make more in sorrow than in anger. I have watched that hon. gentleman's career, and during his election which resulted in his return to this House, he studiously attempted to represent both political parties. He, on almost every occasion, represented himself as being a member of both political parties, and now, Sir, in the debate in this House to-night, he has announced that he proposes to vote for the second reading of the Bill, at the same time reserving to himself the right of opposing it later. I suppose that is a right which will be conceded to all of us, but, it appears to me, being rather an old-fashioned Conservative, that it would have been much more honest for him, posing as a Conservative in his riding, to have joined with the Opposition in opposing a measure which is introduced to the detriment of the political party to which he professes to belong. A good deal of time has been occupied by the legal members of this House in discussing the constitutionality of this measure. For my own part, possibly from my want of knowledge, it appears to me that the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of the Bill (Mr. Mulock), never claimed for the Bill that it was constitutional, but he referred to the fact that the Redistribution Act of 1882 had worked to the detriment of the political party of which he was a member. He said that his Bill proposed to undo what was done in 1882. In the whole of that hon. gentleman's speech I do not think that he claimed any virtues for the particular Bill now before the House. He simply claimed that it was in the interest of his party. That hon. gentleman alluded to my hon. friend for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and another, on this side of the House, as holding their seats by the gerrymander of 1882. But, Sir, being a constituent of that hon. gentleman, and knowing how his elections have been carried, I can say to this House that he owes his presence here to the tactics of such men as Captain Sullivan and to gentlemen whom we have heard so much of lately. I think it ill-becomes that hon. gentleman to assign such a reason for the presence in this House of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and the hon. member for North Bruce. I have already said that I only intended to delay the House for a moment or two. I am as anxious as any hon. gentleman that the division should be taken, and I only rose to protest against the injustice done to my riding. A great deal has been said, and well said, by hon. members on this side of the House, in opposition to the Bill, and I can only say that I heartily concur in everything that has been said against the measure.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OSLER. I do not believe that there should be any "oh, oh" on that side of the House because, I do not think I was ever accused, whatever my other faults may be, of making long speeches. I do not believe there is anything in the world more tedious than making long speeches unless it be listening to them. But, I cannot record my vote on this Bill silently. I must give, shortly, expression to my feelings as to the Bill itself. It is the one egg that the Government have proposed to hatch out of all their election promises. They have kept the egg under them so long, that I do not think it should produce a very healthy chicken. I do not think it will be a chicken that will bring much of value even should this Bill pass. I am not capable of judging as to the constitutionality of the Bill and do not propose to touch upon that. But I think I am capable of arriving at an opinion as to whether it is a fair and proper Bill. I can only arrive at the conclusion that it is not a fair Bill; it is a Bill brought in at this late date, simply and solely, for party purposes. It is purely a party Bill from beginning to end. As my hon. colleague from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), has said, the right hon. Prime Minister had swallowed every principle and profession that he had when he was in Opposition on this very question.

This Bill is brought in as a party measure, and in order to secure for the Liberals a party advantage. The great injustice done to the city of Toronto has been already referred to, and I shall not dwell on it at this late hour. The country will easily see that this Bill is not a Bill which lives up to the professions and principles which the Liberals announced before they attained power. It is not a Bill of representation by population, it is not a Bill of county boundaries, it is not a Bill of single seats; it is purely and simply a Bill to help the Liberal party. Here is the most important measure of the session brought on in midsummer, forced through the House, and after two days' discussion,

we are called upon to vote at half-past three in the morning. It is not fair to the Opposition that we should be forced to vote on it, after such meagre discussion. But the gentlemen who lead the Government have found that their followers are being discredited in the western part of Ontario, and so they had to resort to what is called the "Machine." They and the provincial Government are partners in what is called the "machine." I am new in politics and I did not know until to-day that the machine was a threshing machine under the joint partnership of the two Governments, which they sent with men around the country pretending to thresh for the farmers, but really for the purpose of bribing the voters. The days of this machine is now ended, and the Dominion Government find that the government of Ontario which they called their right arm is of no more use to them. The joint ownership of the two Governments in that machine will soon disappear, and this Government knows that full well. They know that the days of the Ontario Government, the days of the Prime Minister of Ontario, whom the right hon. the First Minister called his right arm, are numbered, and that he can no longer count on his support. They are now trying at this late hour, and at this late date in the session, to force through this Bill to give them some advantage to compensate them for the loss they will sustain by the discredit and the defeat of the Hardy Government. I do not believe this Bill will do them one iota of good. I believe that they are so discredited in Ontario, that no Gerrymander Bill will prevent the people from casting them out of power.

Mr. BERTRAM. So much has been said in relation to the representation of the city of Toronto, that I do not feel inclined to cast my vote without giving utterance to the idea, that I as a representative of the city of Toronto have come to a different conclusion from the other gentlemen representing that city. I desire to tell them that with five members allotted to the city of Toronto, as this Bill proposes, that city will have a larger representation under a Liberal Government than it ever had under a Conservative Government. During all the years of power of the Conservative party, they neglected the city of Toronto, and it is now left for a Liberal Government to give it a larger and a fairer representation. I did not feel satisfied that only four members should be allotted to the city of Toronto, because I believed that when 35,000 of a population was brought in from the county of York, the representation of the city should be increased. The Government have increased the representation of that city and have done us an act of justice. I believe most of the citizens of Toronto will agree with me, that the city representation should be confined to the city of Toronto and that the county of York should be kept separate. At this lat hour I shall not detain the House, but I cannot help remarking that the two hon. gentlemen from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke and Mr. Osler) never make a speech in that city without painting in glowing terms how soon the Conservative party will come back to power. They do not seem to be able to make a speech in this House without bringing that same idea uppermost, but I can tell them, that there are no signs of it anywhere. I am glad to think that the Liberal party is giving the city of Toronto better representation in this House than it ever received from the Conservatives. The Conservative party represented by the hon. gentlemen from West Toronto, are under the impression that they own that city, politically, but they will soon find they are mistaken in that respect. They had a hard struggle to retain the seat for both of these gentlemen, and when the time comes they will have to fight hard for all the seats in that city. They think that the Liberals are weak in Toronto, but the Liberals will give an account of themselves in that city, and when the elections come around these gentlemen may be considerably surprised.

House divided on the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Landerkin,
Bazinet,	Lang,
Beausoleil,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bell (Prince, East),	Legris,
Bertram,	Livingston,
Blair,	Macdonald (Huron),
Borden (King's),	McCarthy,
Bostock,	McClure,
Bourassa,	McGregor,
Bourbonnais,	McHugh,
Brown,	McIsaac,
Bruneau,	McLellan,
Burnett,	McMillan,
Campbell,	Malouin,
Carroll,	Marcil,
Casey,	Martineau,
Champagne,	Maxwell,
Copp,	Meigs,
Dechene,	Mignault,
Demers,	Morrison,
Desmarais,	Mulock,
Dobell,	Parmalee,
Edwards,	Paterson,
Erb,	Pettet,
Ethier,	Préfontaine,
Featherston,	Rinfret,
Fielding,	Russell,
Fisher,	Savard,
Flint,	Semple,
Fraser (Lambton),	Sifton,
Frost,	Somerville,
Gauthier,	Stenson,
Gauvreau,	Stubbs,
Harwood,	Sutherland,
Heyd,	Talbot,
Holmes,	Tolmie, and
Johnston,	Tucker.—77.
Joly de Lotbinière, (Sir Henri),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bell (Pictou),	McAlister,
Bennett,	McCleary,
Bergeron,	McDougall,
Borden (Halifax),	McInerney,
Broder,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Carscallen,	McNeill,
Clancy,	Marcotte,
Clarke,	Martin,
Cochrane,	Mills,
Davin,	Moore,
Dugas,	Morin,
Earle,	Osler,
Foster,	Prior,
Ganong,	Robertson,
Guillet,	Roche,
Haggart,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hodgins,	Taylor,
Kaulbach,	Wallace, and
Kloepfer,	Wilson.—41.
Macdonald (King's),	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Rutherford,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Christie,	Roddick,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Snetsinger,	Seagram,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cowan,	Montague,
Britton,	Cargill,
Penny,	Quinn,
Gibson,	Corby,
Ellis,	Powell,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Ratz,	Ingram,
Logan,	MacLaren,
McLennan (Inverness),	Gillies,
Calvert,	Hughes,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Godbout,	Ives,
Macdonell,	Pope,
Madore,	Monk,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Scriver,	Bell (Addington),
Comstock,	Reid,
Fortin,	Chauvin,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Hurley,	Craig,
Mackie,	Ferguson,
Guité,	LaRivière,
Bethune,	Hale,
Davis,	Robinson,
Belcourt,	Kendry,
McMullen,	Blanchard,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Poupore,
McGugan,	Beattie,
Wood,	Gilmour.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to call attention to the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) have not voted.

An hon. MEMBER. The pairs are recorded.

Mr. QUINN. I beg to say that I am paired with the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Penny). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am paired with the hon. member for Hamilton. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does my hon. friend propose to go on with to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. The same order.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.40 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th June, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—CONTRACT FOR CLOTHING.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Who supplied the clothing for the Royal Military College at Kingston previously to the present firm, and was it by tender and contract, and for what length of time?

Who now supplies the clothing for this institution; were tenders called for, and if so, was the contract given to the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). This is a matter which is under the control of the College itself. As soon as I saw the notice of the question I asked for the information to be sent from the College, but I have not received it yet. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let the question stand.

MEMBERS' MILEAGE ALLOWANCE.

Mr. MAXWELL (by Mr. Morrison) asked:

How many members represent the county of Pictou, N.S., in this House? What are their names in full? What is their place of residence?

What is the mileage paid to each member, and the difference in amount, if any?

What is the authority for changing the amount paid to each for the session of 1898?

Has any authority been given to the Government to pay any further amount to either of the members other than the regular mileage allowed between them previous to the session of 1898?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The members representing the county of Pictou, I need hardly say, are those whose names are well known, and given in the

books: Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, and Mr. Adam C. Bell. The matter of mileage paid to members of this House is not in any way under the control of the Government. It is authorized by statute, and members are entitled to draw mileage from the place of their residence, as declared by themselves. Mr. Bell is resident at New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou, and his travelling allowance amounts to $171.40; Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper gives his residence as the city of Victoria, B.C., and he has received travelling allowance to the amount of $573.20.

MR. MARTIN JEROME, OF MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. Is Mr. Martin Jerome an employee of the Interior Department in the province of Manitoba as forest ranger or in any other capacity?
2. If so, is he the same gentleman who is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Carillon in the ensuing elections in that province?
2. Will his services be continued by the Government while he is engaged in party politics?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The officer who has charge of this matter has not been able to call my attention to this question until a few moments ago. In order to answer it, some information will have to be procured from Manitoba, as we have not got it in the department. Mr. Martin Jerome is in the employ of the department. As to whether he is a candidate or not we have not any information, but I will get the information and answer the question as soon as possible.

BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to the matter which I mentioned to the leader of the Government yesterday, I now desire to make a few remarks in explanation of the motion which I then stated to the House I would make. The motion which I propose is, that the papers, poll-books, records and documents of every kind relating to the Brockville and West Huron elections, and in the possession of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, may be laid upon the Table of the House, and for that purpose that he may be summoned to appear and bring them, so that they may be read. That motion is one which has been made at various times in this House, it being brought up as a matter of privilege the last time in 1892, when Mr. Lister, then a member, made a similar motion in connection with the London election. I shall make this motion for the purpose of following it up with another motion, to the effect that these papers, when produced by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and laid upon the Table, may be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to inquire into and investigate the conduct of returning officers and deputy returning officers in the Brockville and West Huron elections, for the purpose of reporting thereon, and that the committee be given all usual powers in such cases.

The objection may possibly be made, inasmuch as Parliament has relegated to another tribunal—the courts of justice—matters connected with the holding of seats in this House, and which are dealt with by the Controverted Elections Act, that it is not proper that such a motion as this should be made. In anticipation of that, I have taken occasion to look at the authorities which have been laid down by eminent constitutional lawyers, some of whom are not now in the House, and some of whom are in the House, and I find there is no difficulty whatever on that score, so far as the question has been dealt with by lawyers in this House and by the authority of the Speakers of this House. In 1875 the Hon. Mr. Blake used this language, reported at page 808, "Hansard":

> He would be sorry to believe that the House had been deprived by the passing of the Controverted Elections Act of its power over returning officers and deputy returning officers, of its power to investigate complaints made against them and to punish them for improper conduct.

Sir John Macdonald used language of the same character, reported on the same page:

> He was glad that the hon. member did not propose to ask the House to consider the point raised in the petition: that the election case was before another tribunal. At the same time, it was not to be supposed that the House had abandoned its right to control, censure and, if need be, punish returning and deputy returning officers.

In 1887 a similar question came before this House in connection with the Queen's County, N.B., election, and matters connected with the practice and procedure of the House in such cases were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and a number of legal gentlemen of very high standing on that committee whose opinions were entitled to very great authority, made a report. After that report had been received, Mr. Dunn, the returning officer, was called before the Bar of the House, and counsel appearing on his behalf raised distinctly and explicitly the question of the jurisdiction of the House. Sir John Thompson, then Mr. Thompson, Mr. Weldon, and Sir Louis Davies all gave expressions of opinion on the subject. Sir John Thompson, in answer to the argument which had been addressed to the House by counsel, said:

> Notwithstanding the general operation of the principle that a man ought not to be punished twice for the same offence, it is a well-recognized principle that the enactment of various penalties sometimes has merely the effect of establishing cumulative penalties against the offender, and not substitutive penalties. The effect of that would be, in this instance, that a

returning officer who offended against a provision of the Elections Act, would be, in the first instance, liable to the public for the wrong done to the public by indictment, or by any other suitable procedure, for an offence against the Elections Act, and he would, in addition to that, be liable for the pecuniary penalties which the Act declares may be recovered by any individual aggrieved, and notwithstanding the establishment of those penalties he might still be liable at the hands of Parliament for contempt committed against its privileges. I might illustrate my view of this question by changing for a moment the offence for which the person at the Bar is charged, by supposing it was a case of libel, in order to give an illustration more familiar to the House. Assuming that you, Mr. Speaker, or any individual member of this House acting as such, had been libelled, it would be quite clear that the offender would be liable, first, to criminal prosecution for libel ; second, to a civil suit, at the instance of the person aggrieved ; and, third, the offender could be summoned for contempt against the privileges of this House. Under these circumstances, I, as one member of this House, entertain this view : that this House should persevere in the question proposed ; and I only presume to express these opinions now because it may be convenient on both sides of the House, according as questions of law arise, that those conversant with such questions should express their opinions, and, consequently, lead the House more clearly to a decision.

The very case suggested by Sir John Thompson on that occasion did afterwards arise in connection with the provincial legislature of Nova Scotia—a case in which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had the good fortune or the ill-fortune to be a defendant. That was the case known in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia as Thomas vs. Haliburton, and in the Privy Council as Fielding vs. Thomas. In that case a person outside of the House circulated an alleged libel against the present Speaker of the House, the Hon. F. A. Lawrence. He was summoned before the Bar of the House, and was reprimanded. He failed to obey an order of the House and was arrested under the Speaker's warrant issued upon a resolution of the House. He was discharged from custody under a habeas corpus, and then brought an action against all the members of the legislature who had voted for the resolution. After a full discussion, the majority of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia gave judgment in his favour, which was reversed by the Privy Council. That was the very case suggested by Sir John Thompson. Here was a man who had committed an offence for which he probably could have been indicted under the criminal law of Canada. It was suggested that the provincial legislature could not punish for this offence, which was a criminal offence ; but the Privy Council held, as Sir John Thompson pointed out it would no doubt be held, that Parliament, in dealing with a matter of this kind, is not punishing a criminal offence, but a breach of its own privileges, or a contempt against itself. To illustrate that in another way, a court has power to punish for contempt of court even though the act of contempt would amount to a criminal offence. In such case the court might or might not see fit to pursue the remedy for contempt and punish in that way.

Then, Mr. Weldon of St. John, whose memory we all very much respect, and who was a very eminent constitutional lawyer, presented the same view. He said :

We are not trying Mr. Dunn at the Bar for penalties, but he is here simply for the purpose of interrogating him with respect to matters connected with the privileges of this House, and I fail to see that by the statute respecting election trials this House has divested itself of its ancient rights and privileges in that respect. While the judges are entrusted with the power of trying election petitions, a power conferred on them by Parliament, Parliament has not divested itself of the right to investigate into any subject. We find, not only by the cases referred to before the Committee on Elections, which are on the Journals of the House, but we are also aware that in many cases to which the learned counsel has alluded, the House of Commons of England has investigated election matters ever since the Election Act came into force. The person at the Bar is not being cited on any criminal charge. That is a fallacy on the part of the counsel.

Then a little further on the hon. gentleman continued with these very significant words:

In this case Mr. Dunn stands here as a witness, as a servant and officer of this House, for the purpose of offering explanations to this House for its information with respect, not merely to what took place in that particular election, but with regard to the public policy of retaining and maintaining in its efficiency, and in purity, honesty and uprightness, the election law of the land. It is not, therefore, a matter of this particular election, simply, but it is a matter affecting the public at large and the rights of the people, and, therefore, it seems to me that when it is put forth that this person is standing here subject to penalties, or that there is a second charge for a particular offence, I maintain that he does not stand charged with any offence, but that under the direction of the House he is brought to its Bar to give explanations as to his conduct.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) took the same ground on that occasion. He said :

The other point the learned counsel suggested was, that because certain penalties attached to an act of malfeasance on the part of a returning officer he may be punished for that act in the courts of the land, and that, therefore, Parliament should not try his action at all here, is an argument which I think is unfounded, and for this reason : The penalties which the law prescribes for any act of misfeasance on the part of its officers, are penalties which are payable to any person who is individually damaged, and they can only be recovered by the person who alleged that he suffers that damage. If the gentleman who, we think, ought to have been returned in place of Mr. Baird, brought an action, it would be necessary for him first to institute a suit before the judges of the court, and only after we have a declaration by that court of his right to be returned could he maintain an action

for damages. That action is one personal and peculiar to himself ; it does not affect the rights of the people, and it does not in any sense affect the privileges of the House, and, therefore, so far as Mr. Dunn is concerned, if Mr. Dunn was liable to damages at all, at any time, those damages cannot be recovered against him now, because the time for filing a petition has expired. I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind as to the jurisdiction of the House.

Though the hon. gentleman did not, like Sir John Thompson and Mr. Weldon, deal with the effect of the creation of the supposed offence into a criminal offence, nevertheless the line of argument he adopted, and rightly adopted on that occasion, leads exactly to the same conclusion. I deduce, therefore, from these authorities this proposition, that it is perfectly competent to this House to refer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for inquiry and investigation the conduct of its officers, both deputy returning officers and returning officers. Not only is it the right of the House to do that, but inasmuch as the purity of elections is a matter in which this House is particularly interested, inasmuch as it is one of the privileges of this House that its officers should conduct elections in accordance with the law and should not be guilty of any fraudulent conduct or corruption, it is not only the right of the House but its duty, when a prima facie case is made out for investigation, to at once pass the resolution referring the matter to the select standing committee appointed for the purpose of investigation and inquiry in such cases. And I venture to say that in this case I can bring to the attention of the House some facts which would indicate that it is the duty, as well as the right, of the House to make such an investigation.

In the first place, with regard to the election for the west riding of the county of Huron, in that case the election was held if I remember correctly, on the 21st February, 1899, and the result was that Mr Robert McLean, Conservative, and Mr Robert Holmes, Liberal, having been nominoted as candidates, Mr. Holmes was declared elected by a majority of 140. In the electoral district of West Huron, in the town of Goderich, poll No. 3, the ballots were counted at the close of the polls, and it was found that the number cast for Robert McLean was forty, and for the sitting member seventy-two. Declarations under the Evidence Act have been made with respect to that polling district, which I have not here in my possession, but which can be produced, as I am instructed, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and which have all the force and solemnity of an oath, and which, if they are untrue, would render those making them liable to the same penalty as if they had committed perjury. Electors have made declaration to the number of between fifty and sixty, that they deposited their ballots for Mr. Robert McLean, and of these ballots, numbering fifty to sixty, only forty were found in the polling-box at the close of the poll. It may be possible, of course, that the deputy returning officer can show that that occurred through no fault of his, but when we find that between fifty and sixty ballots were cast for a particular candidate at that poll, and that only forty of those appeared at the close of the polls, it certainly is a case which calls for some inquiry or investigation at the hands of this House, to ascertain what became of the ten or fifteen ballots which were, or should have been, deposited by the returning officer in the ballot-box, and were not found in that box at the close of the polls. Another curious circumstance in connection with that particular polling subdivision is one as to which I have a declaration under the Evidence Act. It is this :

Dominion of Canada,
North-west Territories.

In the matter of the election of a Member for the West Riding of the County of Huron to serve in the House of Commons.

I, Robert W. Clark, formerly of the town of Goderich, in the county of Huron, but now of the town of Calgary, in the province of Alberta, engineer, do solemnly declare that I acted as one of the agents at polling subdivision No. 3, at the said town of Goderich, for Robert McLean, a candidate at the election held for the west riding of the county of Huron on the 21st day of February last. That James Farr, of the said town of Goderich, was the deputy returning officer at the said election at the said polling subdivision. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the said 21st day of February, while standing near the door leading to the polling booth in the town hall, I noticed a ballot with the counterfoil detached on the floor. I picked it up and saw that it was properly marked for the said Robert McLean.

Up to this, probably the statement of Mr. Clark is perfectly neutral, but what follows is a significant thing and a thing which gives colour to the suspicion that these ten or fifteen ballots which were missing out of that office, were missing with the collusion of that returning officer, because what do we find he did :

I held it out in my hand and asked the said James Farr what that meant ; he quickly took it out of my hand, tore it into pieces and threw them on the floor.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

ROBERT W. CLARK.

Declared before me at the city of Calgary, in the district of Alberta, this third day of May, A.D. 1899.

JAMES A. LOUGHEED,
A Notary Public for the N.W.T.

The pieces of this ballot, which were torn up by the deputy returning officer for some reason he did not see fit to explain, and which, it seems to me, can only have one

meaning, were picked up and have been preserved, and are now in the possession of a member of this House, who will speak later on this question if necessary.

As regards another polling division, polling subdivision No. 4, in the township of Colborne, Mr. Donald Cummings was the deputy returning officer. I do not know, although at one time I did make some inquiry, whether he resides in that constituency or was brought in from outside. At all events, at the close of that poll, it was found that thirty ballots were marked for Mr. Robert McLean, the Conservative candidate, and that is the number which was returned by this deputy returning officer to the returning officer, as the number deposited. I have now in my hand the solemn declaration made under the Canada Evidence Act of 1843, of forty-three men, who swear that at that election they were electors, and deposited, each of them, a ballot in favour of Mr. Robert McLean, the Conservative candidate. Forty-three men say that they handed in forty-three ballots to the deputy returning officer at that polling subdivision, for the purpose of being deposited in the polling-box, yet when the polling-box was opened at the close of the polls, only thirty of those ballots, so marked, were found. Is it possible to say that this could have occurred without the direct intervention of the deputy returning officer? Is it proper that this House should allow itself to be placed at defiance by a deputy returning officer in this way? Is it right that this House shall, under circumstances of that kind, hold its hand and decide that this matter shall not be subjected to the very fullest investigation? It is absolutely necessary, in the interests of this House, in the interests of the good name of Parliament, in the interests of public credit and the good name of Canada, that a circumstance such as this should be investigated to the very end, and I think the proper course to be taken is to refer it to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that this is a matter which should be dealt with by election petition. But suppose it is not, by some arrangement made between the two candidates or the two political parties, is that any reason why this Parliament, having these disgraceful facts brought to its attention, should fail to take the very last step in its power of investigating the conduct of the man who had forty-three ballots placed in his hand, and who, at the close of the polls, opens the box which presumably was in his possession, and under his control in the intervening time, and only produces thirty ballots? What became of the forty-three ballots? Is that not a proper question for this House, through the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to put to that man and demand from him an explanation that will be satisfactory, not only to this House, not only to gentlemen on the other side, and to gentlemen on this side, but to the country itself? This is a matter on which there should be no politics; it is a question of the dignity of the House, of the privileges of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite are strong enough in this House to deal with a matter of this kind from the standpoint of the dignity and privileges of Parliament. Surely they do not want it to be heralded from one end of the country to the other that deputy returning officers who, to all intents and purposes, are officers of this House, may be guilty of conduct of that kind. I will read one of these declarations—they are all couched in the same form—that hon. gentlemen may see what these men have declared:

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Ontario,
County of Huron.

To wit:

In the matter of the election of a Member for the West Riding of the County of Huron to serve in the House of Commons.

I, James McWhinney, of the township of Colborne, in the county of Huron, yeoman, do solemnly declare that I was on the 21st day of February, 1899, a duly qualified elector, and voted on that day at polling subdivision No. 4, township of Colborne, for Robert McLean, one of the candidates at the said election.

That I properly marked a ballot on the white circular space opposite to the name of the said Robert McLean, and before leaving the said polling place handed the same so marked to Donald Cummings, the deputy returning officer.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sigd.) JAMES McWHINNEY.

Declared before me, at the township of Colborne, in the county of Huron, this 30th day of March, A.D., 1899.

(Sgd.) M. O. JOHNSON,
A Commissioner, &c.

There are forty-two other declarations in precisely the same terms. And these ballots so handed to the deputy returning officer for the purpose of being deposited in the box failed to materialize to the extent of thirteen when the box was opened at night. I observe a smile passing over the countenance of the right hon. gentleman and those of some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I suppose that smile is due to the fact that they are pleased with the effective working of the machine.

Now, in the case of Brockville, I have in my possession a report of an investigation made in regard to certain matters concerning the deputy returning officer of that election. I state that it can be established, as I believe, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that ballots of exactly the same character in every respect as the official ballots—in fact official ballots—were in

plentiful use in the hands of the workers for the Liberal party in that constituency. I have now in my possession a ballot which was picked up in the street. It was found by a boy who saw a man throw it away. It was picked up and brought to two gentlemen, who placed their initials upon it. It has been compared with the official ballots which were used and found to have the same marking upon it, the same little defects, the same little irregularities as the official ballots. We also find on this ballot a cross neatly marked opposite the name of Mr. Comstock. It is supposed that, for some reason or other, it had been secured but was not used; some other ballot was used in its place, or the person for whom it was designed did not see fit to use it. We also find that another ballot, duly marked, was presented by a Liberal worker to a voter in the constituency, who was asked to vote by depositing that ballot, and who did not see fit to do so, but placed the ballot in the hands of gentlemen who are prepared to produce it before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Perhaps I had better make my statement on that point a little more explicit and give the circumstances a little more in detail. I forgot to say that certain gentlemen in that constituency came to this voter after the ballot had been handed to him and desired very much to get it back, and, as I understand, offered a very considerable sum of money to get it back; but the voter did not see fit to give it back, but retained it and placed it in the hands of the gentlemen to whom I have first referred. I say, Sir, it can also be established, as I believe from the report of the investigation which has been made, and which I hold in my hand, that official ballots were in the hands of the Liberal workers in about every polling division in that constituency, and were used. And I say further that in polling district No. 4, Elizabethtown, a large number of ballots marked for Comstock in identically the same way and so folded that the upper part of the cross would be visible to the deputy returning officer, were found in the ballot box at the close of the day. Now, it is a somewhat suspicious circumstance, to say the least of it, that you find a large number of ballots folded and marked exactly the same way, and so folded and marked that it was easy for the deputy returning officer to ascertain exactly for whom the voter voted. I say that points to collusion between the deputy returning officer and those who are working for the Liberal candidate. It can be shown, as I believe, that the deputy returning officer of No. 1, east ward, Brockville, refused to destroy the counterfoils of the ballots and insisted on keeping them in his pocket. He also kept putting his hands in his pocket when parties went into the compartment to vote. He was asked by the scrutineer, Mr. W. W. Richardson, to destroy the counterfoils as directed by the Act. This he refused to do. Mr. Richardson says that he is satisfied that the deputy returning officer substituted a ballot for one given by a Conservative voter. When the ballots were counted at the recount, two that were marked for Mr. Comstock were rejected by the judge, owing to the fact that there were some distinguishing marks on the backs of them made by the deputy returning officer. It appears from the report of this investigation that the deputy returning officer at No. 3, Kitley, Mr. W. D. Livingston, was seen conferring with a Liberal worker with a ballot in his possession; and that is a circumstance that requires some explanation.

I say, further, that another deputy returning officer, the one for No. 2, Elizabethtown, also was guilty of a very grave irregularity in connection with this election. He was Mr. J. B. Truesdel. This man refused to seal the ballot-box, and has since said that he would be damned if he would give them satisfaction for doing so. He was asked by Mr. Foster to seal the ballot-box, in accordance with the provisions of the law, and he distinctly refused to do so. Now, there was either a motive or there was not a motive on that occasion. Judging this circumstance and the other circumstances I have mentioned in the light of a certain document which I propose to read, hon. gentlemen will see the significance of some of these things. I also understand—I do not see the statement before me at this moment—that one of the deputy returning officers at Brockville—I desire to be corrected, if I am wrong—was an accountant in the employ of Mr. Comstock, the sitting member, who was a candidate at that election. If this was so, it is a circumstance which does not reflect credit on the returning officer who appointed him. Now, what do all these things mean? I propose to read a document to this House which I think will throw a little light upon the meaning of some of these facts and circumstances which I have brought to the attention of the House. It has been stated that there is an organization in the province of Ontario, known popularly as the "machine." It is said to be the joint property of the Liberal party, working in Dominion elections, and the Liberal party working in local elections. Its true inwardness, I believe, has never been brought to the full light of day, so far as Dominion elections are concerned. But in a recent election proceeding relating to a local election in the province of Ontario, there has been a confession made, a very frank, but perhaps not a very full, confession, which throws a remarkable light upon the circumstances which I have brought to the attention of the House. Now, this confession, or document, to which I refer is signed by Mr. D. McNish, who was the successful Liberal candidate at the by-election in West Elgin for the local legislature of Ontario, and I will read it:

St. Thomas, June 26th, 1899.

Messrs. Crothers & Price, Barristers, &c., St. Thomas.

Dear Sirs,—We beg to advise you that Mr. McNish has discussed at length with his solicitors the charges contained in the petition which has been filed against his return as member of the legislative assembly of Ontario for West Elgin, and that they have to a considerable extent investigated the charges contained therein and other matters which have come to their knowledge in connection with the election. And the subscribers hereto make the following statements and admissions respecting the same :—

1. That a large number of persons were specially sent into the constituency by men working on behalf of the Liberal party for the express purpose of taking part on Mr. McNish's behalf in the election held January 12th, 1899, and we believe that fraudulent and corrupt means were used by some of such persons to secure his election.

Well, does not this shed some light on the possible means which may have been taken to cause the disappearance of 13 ballots in the one case and 10 to 15 ballots in the other case, in the west riding of Huron ?

2. That several of the said persons illegally and without authority acted as deputy returning officers at the said election, and in at least three cases so acted in the names of reputable local men, having, under assumed names, been introduced to the returning officer by local agents of Mr. McNish.

Now, it is proper that the House should investigate this matter, for the reason that it may turn out that the gentlemen whom I have named, and who purported to be deputy returning officers in West Huron and in Brockville, may not have been deputy returning officers at all, and that these gentlemen, when they come before the House, will say : I was not deputy returning officer at that election ; I was a hundred miles away. My name was used, it is true, but one of those gentlemen sent into this constituency by persons working on behalf of the Liberal party, was really the person who acted as deputy returning officer in my name at this election. So, it is right and proper, in the interests not only of the House, but of these deputy returning officers themselves, that some such inquiry should be made.

3. That in many of the polling subdivisions of the riding there were grave irregularities connected with the return of the ballot-boxes and their contents, the voting, and the counting of the ballots thereat.

Precisely similar circumstances to those I have referred to, showing that there was grave irregularity or something worse, where 13 ballots in one case, and 10 to 15 in the other, marked properly for the Conservative candidate, disappeared altogether between the time they were handed to the deputy returning officer and the time the ballots were counted.

4. That there were large numbers of persons brought into the riding for the express purpose of personating legitimate voters, and assisted by some of Mr. McNish's local supporters such persons did personate qualified voters in voting for Mr. McNish.

5. That the declared number of votes for Mr. McNish largely exceeded the number of bona fide votes cast for him.

Precisely the same state of affairs as here, where ballots disappeared and others are substituted for them, bringing this case exactly in the category of the confession of Mr. McNish, for the declared number of votes for Mr. Holmes at that election largely exceeded, must have largely exceeded—because we are probably only on the fringe of this thing—the number of bona fide votes cast for him.

6. That a large number of ballots cast for Mr. MacDiarmid were in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated, whereby the result of the election was rendered doubtful, and that in this connection the voting at Shedden and Middlemarch, and in the several divisions in St. Thomas where said strangers so acted as deputy returning officers, merits special mention.

So here a number of ballots, cast for Mr. Holmes or Mr. McLean on that occasion. were in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated, whereby the result of the election was rendered doubtful ; that is to say, the number of votes for Mr. McLean in one polling district was reduced by 13 ballots, and in another subdivision by 10 to 15 ; and can we doubt that it was done in the same nefarious and corrupt manner which is referred to in this confession of Mr. McNish ? If there is any other explanation, I would like hon. gentlemen on the other side to suggest what it can be. There can be no other explanation. Forty-three ballots are given to the deputy returning officer, and only 30 are found at the close of the poll. I say we have a right to believe, no reasonable person can avoid believing, that exactly the same statement may be made of this as was made there, that these returns were manipulated in a nefarious and corrupt manner, and that, as a result, the Conservative candidate was deprived of the votes to which he was legitimately entitled.

7. That there are good reasons to believe that there are many specific and well-authenticated cases where agents of Mr. McNish concealed at their homes some of those strangers, who there paid large sums of money to electors to induce them to vote for him.

8. That Mr. McNish will forthwith deliver to the Speaker of the legislative assembly his resignation as a member thereof for the said electoral district.

That confession was read in court, and evidence was given substantiating the facts therein referred to, so far as they were necessary to void the election, and the election was voided. And I suppose that, if similar facts were brought out before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the two Liberal gentlemen who represent these consti-

tuencies, would, no doubt, see fit to take the course which Mr. McNish saw fit to adopt, and send in their resignations to Mr. Speaker, so that proper elections might be held in these two constituencies.

Mr. BERGERON. They will not do that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am only suggesting that that would be a proper course to adopt. Now, I think, I have made out a fair case to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I have made good my proposition, in the first place, that this is a matter which affects the honour and the dignity of the House, that it is a matter in respect to which the House has not been deprived of its jurisdiction by any legislation; that it is the right and duty of the House to inquire into the conduct of its officers or its deputy returning officers wherever facts and circumstances of this kind are brought to the attention of the House. In the next place, I think, I have set out and substantiated by evidence, in the presence of the hon. members of this House, facts and circumstances which indicate that the same persons must have been at work in the constituencies of West Huron and Brockville as were admittedly at work in the constituency of West Elgin. Can any person, who weighs the circumstances and the facts that I have brought to the attention of the House, and who reads that confession, doubt that the work, in one case, was done by exactly the same persons, and in exactly the same manner as in the other? After what was done I venture to think that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will find this a hard case to justify through the country if they see fit to vote down a proper inquiry into the conduct of the officers of this House who acted in connection with these two elections. In addition to all the facts and circumstances mentioned in this House, the last straw of all was the telegram which was produced in evidence at the trial of the case from a gentleman who has been by turns the candidate of the Liberal party in Ontario, and by turns an officer of that party in Ontario, and who is now an officeholder of this Government. I know men in my own constituency who were dismissed from office without the opportunity of an investigation at all simply because they asked a civil question of the Liberal candidate during the election campaign in which I had the honour to be a candidate. Without any opportunity given of showing that they were not offensive partisans, but simply because of the fact that the only part they took in the election at all was attending a political meeting and asking a question, they were dismissed without a single opportunity being given to them to say a word in their own defence and they even had to come here and beg for the refund of the money that they had paid to the superannuation fund. Here is a gentleman who has been, by turns, a candidate and an officeholder and who is now an officeholder, who sends to the successful candidate at this election a telegram:

Please hug the machine for me.

On the day on which he hears of the result.

Mr. SPROULE. What is his name?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The gentleman's name, I believe, is Mr. W. T. R. Preston.

Mr. BERGERON. And he gets a salary of $4,000 a year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He sent this telegram, which Mr. McNish stated he did not know the meaning of. We are bound to accept Mr. McNish's statement that he did not know the meaning of it, but I venture to say that no hon. gentleman will get up in this House and say that he does not know the meaning of such a telegram as that. If he does he will be about the only person in Canada who does not know the meaning of it. What does Mr. Preston mean by that telegram? He means that this machine had accomplished the dirty work; he means that the election had been won by means of these device; I, an officer of the Government, but not an offensive partisan, drawing a large salary deem it my right and my duty to send to you a telegram congratulating you on the successful issue of the campaign of corruption. This is the gentleman who retains the confidence of this Government, the gentleman who has been by turns the party organizer and an officeholder of the Liberal Government in Ontario and who is now an officeholder of this Government. In view of all the authorities I have quoted, in view of the facts which I have brought to the attention of the House, I desire, and I do so with a great deal of confidence, that the motion will not be opposed, to move:

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do attend at the opening of the House, to-morrow, with all the poll-books, voters' lists, and all other letters, documents and memoranda which have been transmitted to him by the respective returning officers, or which may otherwise be in his possession relating to the last election for the electoral district of Brockville, and to the last election for the electoral district of the west riding of the county of Huron, respectively.

If the motion passes I desire to follow it up with a further motion to which I referred yesterday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has brought to the attention of the House one of the most important questions which can engage its attention. We have always held, in years past, and we are prepared to hold now, of course, that the purity of elections must be guarded at all costs and all hazards. It was our duty while we were sitting on the other

side of the House, on more than one occasion, to bring delinquencies which had taken place in elections to the attention of the House, as to which, we thought, that the House, possibly in its action, did not always do itself the justice which it should have done. The question which has been brought up by the hon. gentleman involves one of facts. It refers to two elections, the Brockville election and the West Huron election. With regard to the West Huron election I am free to say, at once, that having heard the statement that the hon. gentleman has made, and which I understand he is prepared to substantiate upon his standing as a member of this House, he has made a prima facie case which, I say, without any hesitation, must go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. With regard to the Brockville election I must say that, in my estimation, the case which he has made out is very, very weak, if indeed he has made a case at all. But such is the sanctity of the ballot, such is the sanctity of the rights of the people which they must exercise, whenever they are called upon at the polls, that though, in my opinion, speaking here in behalf of the Government, the case made out in regard to Brockville is more than weak, still the Government will not offer any objection to the case also being referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I do not believe that I should say one single word more. I have accomplished all that is required from the Government on this occasion. Let me, however, make one remark. The hon. gentleman is a leading counsel; he has gained in this House a position which does him credit and honour. He concluded his speech by expressing the hope and the strong confidence that his motion would not be opposed. He was right in that assumption. But if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) harboured no doubt in his mind, might I ask him why he spoke at length and with such heat, and why he went on the assumption that this motion would be denied by this side of the House. Why did he assume, because we happened to smile—it was a small matter to refer to—that we were smiling at what he said, or at the position he took. Sir, it may be that in the Brockville and Huron elections there were officers who were overzealous as partisans, and I take it that a prima facie case has been made there, but the matter will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I leave it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to determine if partisanship will not be found also amongst the members of the committee from that side of the House. I leave him to decide whether the tone he has adopted was the judicial tone he should have adopted in a matter of this kind. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question which can to better advantage occupy the time of this House, than that we should guard and watch carefully over the rights of the people at the polls.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. If wrong has been done in these elections nobody ought to be shielded. If any one has contravened the law, it is fair and right that this should be investigated, and that we should know now henceforth and for ever, that the will of the people must be expressed as the people wish to express it, however severe the consequences may be on one side or the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I congratulate the Prime Minister upon the decision at which he has arrived, and, indeed, I feel that no other course was open to him. I must say that I listened attentively to the statement made by the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and I failed to discover in it any of that heat or partisanship which the Prime Minister has spoken of. The right hon. gentleman is anxious to know why the mover of this motion should have fortified his demand for a reference of this case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, by quoting so many authorities. The right hon. gentleman's memory is very short if he is at a loss to know why any Conservative member, bringing forward a question which attacks the position of any person connected with the other side of the House, does not feel that the time has come when he must fortify his motion with all the authorities it is possible to quote. My right hon. friend knows perfectly well that a motion very recently made in the most formal and solemn manner from this side of the House—touching on very much the same character of question, the question of corruption—was rejected by gentlemen opposite. I am glad that the right hon. gentleman appears to realize his position, in the light of events that are transpiring, in the light of the circumstances attending the West Elgin election, where have been brought to light these frightful election frauds that have been the staple commodity of gentlemen opposite for years in carrying elections, these indecent attempts, almost open and undisguised, at corrupting the electors of this country, of carrying elections by gigantic bribery, both public and private. I say, I am glad the right hon. gentleman feels that the time has come when it would be more than hardihood on the part of him and his friends to refuse to investigate such a case as has been put thus succinctly before the House. The time has arrived in the history of Canada when every man, be he Liberal or Conservative, who has regard for the purity of elections, who has regard for obtaining the independent judgment of the electorate, should find it necessary to put down this gigantic corruption that has for years been stalking and rioting throughout this land,

and has finally culminated in one of the most frightful exposures of electoral fraud and rascality that has ever been witnessed, and which has been carried on under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite for a long period. They boast of carrying by-elections, and how did they carry them? Did they carry them by honourable and just means? No. They carried them by the influence of the operations of this same machine invented and manipulated by W. T. R. Preston, an officer of this Goevrnment, an officer on the other side of the Atlantic, drawing a high salary from this Government, for the reason that I believe they felt it necessary to get him out of the country when these electoral frauds were being exposed. I ask the right hon. gentleman if this W. T. R. Preston is not to be recalled? I ask him if this man is still to be retained as a representative in Great Britain of the Government of Canada, in face of the evidence concerning him given by a man of high standing in the Liberal party, a candidate that by fraudulent means was elected, as he himself admitted, as a Liberal representative. I ask has a cable been sent telling Mr. Preston that he is a disgraced man, that his appointment is cancelled, and that he shall not draw another dollar of public money out of the treasury of Canada? If the right hon. gentleman has not done that he has failed in his duty. Mr. McNish has published a telegram sent to him from Mr. Preston, "Hug the machine for me." The machine! That odious and gigantic instrument of corruption organized by the Liberal party in this country, which has given the election after election in the province of Ontario, and other sections of Canada. I tell the right hon. the Prime Minister that from the hour Mr. Preston openly avowed the paternity of the "machine," every subsequent hour he remains an officer of the Government, is an hour which fixes indelible disgrace upon the Government of this country. My right hon. friend will find that the time has come when this matter has assumed a character that no Government dare, without forfeiting the respect of the public, resist the efforts that must be vigorously made to uproot this avowed and hideous evil, which destroys everything like free and independent government in this country. I see before me the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), whose prophetic eye saw all this years ago. Let me read what he said on the floor of this House, and let me point to the fact that his prophecy has now been realized by the party of which he is a component member. In 1882, that hon. gentleman, on the floor of this House, said:

> I am sorry to have to say so, but every honest member here, if he would speak the truth as he knows the facts to exist, must admit that I am stating a most lamentable but at the same time a most certain truth when I say that as regards the 215 constituencies of this Dominion, with the exception of a very small percentage, the balance of power under our system is practically placed in the hands of the most corrupt section of the community.

What more did he say? Why, Sir, he pointed out what a Government in power could do; but it remained for hon. gentlemen opposite to come into power to be able to illustrate and give the evidence of the prophetic wisdom of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said:

> I make this statement advisedly, as I make it with very great regret; but it is so, that to all the intents and purposes the only practical difficulty which stands in the way of a party possessing the reins of power, and having at their disposal sufficient sums of money, is simply the difficulty of bringing these corrupt means into direct and actual contact with the great masses of the electors. Were that mechanical difficulty, as I might almost call it, overcome.——

And Preston has overcome it. He has made a machine to bring these corrupt influences into actual contact, as the hon. gentleman stated, with the corrupt masses, who hold the balance of power in this country, in such a way as to enable any Government, with the public patronage and with millions of public money at their disposal, to fortify themselves in the way that has been attempted again and again; and hon. gentlemen opposite have the means of commanding, indirectly, through these same corrupt influences, gigantic contributions of money for those corrupt purposes. Well, the hon. gentleman says:

> Were that mechanical difficulty, as I might almost call it, overcome, then I have no doubt whatever that the Opposition in this country would be practically exterminated at any general election that might take place.

What did the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) say? He boasted on the platform in Ontario that by the operation of these influences, which they were able to bring to bear in a general election to-morrow, the Opposition could not return five members in Quebec; and he went on to state that by a Redistribution Bill that the Government of which he was a member were going to bring in, they would wipe out the Conservative party in the province of Ontario. And I draw the attention of my prophetic friend, who after this will be recognized as a man possessing the most profound prophetic attainments, to the fact that he was able to forecast, not what existed then, but what would exist when a Liberal Government reached the Treasury benches. He said:

> It is a danger which we know is continually increasing. It has increased, it is increasing, and most assuredly it should be diminished; and it is the necessity of obtaining the requisite funds to carry out that process of corruption that has been at the basis of all these infamous rascalities, which were in part revealed by the investigations

of last session, and which have brought into existence the reptile fund, the details of which are being daily and hourly displayed to the people of Canada.

The hon. gentleman had only to look ahead for a short period when, as he declared, all he required was to be on the Treasury benches, with the machinery which Mr. Preston, the officer of this Government, has invented and has carried out in the most effective manner, and which has been used all through the province of Ontario. These hon. gentlemen boast of having carried by-elections. I say it is to their utter discredit that they have ventured to use the corrupt influences which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that any Government once in power could invent the mechanical means of using—the machinery, as Preston has invented it, by which they could perpetrate a gerrymander on the constituencies, and completely wipe out and destroy any Opposition in this country. That attempt has been made, but fortunately has not succeeded; for the future has hope for every man who values electoral purity and wishes to see a fair and intelligent judgment given by the electorate of Canada. These parties, possessing this reptile fund, which they have been enabled to obtain in an indirect manner out of the treasury of Canada, have had the daring to go on, encouraged step by step by the results of their efforts, until they have reached a pitch of such open and shameless profligacy and prostitution of everything like honest electoral proceeding, as to awaken and touch the conscience of every man in this country who is not associated with those corrupt influences. That is the position, and it is fortunate that the hour has come when Mr. Hardy's Government is tottering on the brink of its fall. It cannot stand; it is impossible. Awakened as the public conscience of the great province of Ontario is to-day, it is impossible not to expect the downfall of a government that has been living and fattening upon these corrupt influences. That government is, in the first place, based upon an infamous Redistribution Act passed by Sir Oliver Mowat—a gerrymander so disgraceful that even the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) repudiated it. He said that two blacks did not make a white; and he admitted that Mowat's Redistribution Bill was as black as a negro.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. member to confine himself in some reasonable degree to the motion before the House, because I am perfectly clear that gerrymanders or redistribution Bills are not within the purview of this motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you rule, Mr. Speaker, that I am not to give evidence in support of a motion of this kind—evidences of open, palpable corruption, with which this country is ringing from end to end—I submit to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish my ruling to be misinterpreted by anybody. This motion relates to bringing the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before this House to-morrow, to produce the papers connected with the Brockville and the West Huron elections, and there must certainly be some limit to a debate on that particular motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask you if you ruled that my hon. friend behind me was out of order when he fortified his motion and showed its necessity by reading the confession of Mr. McNish in the West Elgin election case?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member wishes my view on that point. It struck me at the time that it was not very relevant to this motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that your mind is of that kind——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—that you see no relevancy——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to get into an altercation with any hon. member, and I do not wish the ruling that I was asked to give just now by the hon. member controverted. My rulings may be right or they may be wrong, but they are the best I can give.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not controverting your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I am expressing my regret that the debate should be limited by a ruling of that character. If, on one of the most important occasion that this House has ever had to deal with——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) laughs. Nero laughed when Rome was burning, and I have no doubt it was the same idiotic laughter that presaged Nero's coming doom. This House stands face to face with one of the most important questions that ever any free Parliament in any free country has had to deal with, and that is the question how is the hydra-headed monster of corruption, by means of which hon. gentlemen opposite are able to carry elections, to be put down? The time has come when the public conscience is aroused, when the staunchest newspapers sustaining hon. gentlemen opposite are compelled to come to the front and declare that every honest man, Liberal or Conservative, must join hands in putting down this corruption that has obtained such powerful influence as to startle every intelligent and honest elector in this country.

People, without regard to party, must join hands and take the most effective means of wiping out this giant disgrace that threatens to enthral our liberty, this octopus that threatens to paralyze with its tentacles the electorate of this country and destroy that wholesome honest public opinion upon which the existence and character of every free Parliament depends. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), with a wonderful prophetic power which I did not think he possessed, has shown what can be done by a Government provided they have the means of doing it. He has pointed out how and why it is that everything like free and independent action on the part of the Opposition can be completely paralyzed by a combination of the Government, with all the great resources in their hands, and the machinery necessary to bring the corrupter and corrupting influences in contact with those who are susceptible of corruption. If there ever was a time in the history of the country, it is now, when every man should be free to express his sentiments in the most unrestrained manner and endeavour to arouse public opinion to the absolute necessity that now presents itself of stamping out this system of organized corruption.

The Franchise Bill has been passed—I wonder may I be permitted to refer to that? And what is the result? It is that day after day we are having publicly disclosed the disgraceful efforts of the local authorities to prevent proper preparation of the lists. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not satisfied until they had handed over the elections of members of this Parliamnt to laws made and passed where we have no power, influence or control. They have handed over this control to the local legislatures which, being influenced by their friends and supporters, they find they can use to break down and prevent everything like a free and independent action of the electors, by means of the grossest frauds in the preparation of the lists—lists that to-day may be used for local elections but to-morrow may be used for the elections to members of this House. I do not intend to further take up time than to say I rejoice in the hon. gentleman's recognition of the fact that in the face of aroused public indignation with reference to these gigantic electoral frauds, it is not possible to resist such a motion, but that he must at once allow evidence to be produced to show that the elections, both in Brockville and West Huron, were stolen by the machine.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This House, at various times, has beheld very curious spectacles, I myself, in my thirty-six years' experience in the Canadian Parliament, have seen a good many curious spectacles, but the spectacle of the senior member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) rising in his place to condemn and expose corruption is one of those which I did not hope to live to see. I forget exactly under what circumstances Carlyle made use of the phrase—and I am open to correction if I misquote it—but I think this is one of those spectacles which that sage of Scotland would, if he were here, have declared to be one to make the angels and the very jackasses weep. There is an old proverb, and a good one, that the greater the sinner the greater the saint. What a superlative degree of holiness may we then shortly expect from the leader of the Opposition if, indeed, his conversion and future repentance bear any proportion to the acts of which, in former days, he himself and his colleagues were in the habit of being guilty. The hon. gentleman attributes to me prophetic powers, but he misinterpreted my words. I was not speaking from prophetic power but from my own experience and knowledge of the doings of himself and his colleagues, beginning in 1873, or at least first publicly revealed to the people of Canada in 1873, under circumstances which are tolerably familiar to all students of Canadian history, and going on prospering, under the able guidance of the hon. gentleman until—was it in 1891 or 1892—this House, or a former House, was presented with the spectacle of detailed statements and detailed evidence, showing how about a quarter a million of money had been expended by a colleague of the hon. gentleman in debauching some fifteen or twenty constituencies in the province of Quebec. We had the dates and the whole amounts given. I think it is idle and foolish to go on with incrimination which might, if I were so pleased, last from now to to-morrow morning, as to the doings of these hon. gentlemen. I am prefectly content that our acts shall be compared with theirs, whenever and on any occasions they choose to challenge comparison. With respect to this motion, I beg to call attention to the fact that if the elections of West Huron and Brockville were obtained by improper means, it was in the power of hon. gentlemen opposite or their supporters to have contested those elections and impeached the proceedings in the courts. They did not choose to do it, for reasons best known to themselves. Peradventure because there are such things as cross-petitions, and it has been known before now that gentlemen who went for wool returned very much shorn from the election courts. In the present instance, what are the Liberal party doing? Are they attempting to shirk inquiry, to delay, to take any objection? I do not think the course pursued by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), was, in all respects, in consonance with the position he holds as one of the very judges in the Committee on Elections and Privileges to which this case has been referred. I think it would have become him far better had he

made a simple statement of the case and on its merits asked what he would have unquestionably have obtained at once, a full and complete reference of this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I fully subscribe to the doctrine that, even if you do not choose to go to the courts, this House has not divested itself, and should not divest itself, of control over its own officers. Sir, the Government invite investigation. Let hon. gentlemen opposite, in the case of the Yukon or anything else, dare to make their charges, dare to come forward, with what they are willing to prove--not lurk behind miserable, anonymous accusations, behind letters, the names of whose writers they dare not give, not quibble and equivocate, not bring forward charges which they are not able to prove, which were exposed as falsehoods, if I read "Hansard" aright, on the floor of this House—let them make themselves responsible, as you did, Mr. Speaker, on one occasion, as my friend the present Judge Lister did on another occasion, and as many other hon. members supporting the present Government did, when they were on the other side of the House; let them make themselves responsible for the charges, let them state their evidence and what they can prove, and they shall have their committee, they shall have their inquiry, they shall have their investigation, with full powers to bring forward their witnesses and their evidence—and we shall see what they will make of it.

Mr. GEORGE E. CASEY (West Elgin). It would be unbecoming for me to follow the bad precedent set by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), by prejudging the Brockville or the West Huron case either one way or the other. Therefore, I shall not say, whether my opinion is, that there is guilt or innocence there. But I have a few remarks to offer on the course taken by the leader of the Opposition and a few others about the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and whose name has been brought into this discussion. I, like my hon. friend the veteran Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) had never expected to see what I have seen to-day. The leader of the Opposition talks about open, shameless profligacy and prostitution in political affairs stalking and rioting through the land. Well, Sir, we have seen these things stalking for many and many a year. If it shall appear, as the result of a judicial investigation or otherwise, that our party contained any of these stalkers, let us bear the blame; but certainly, it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) or his associates to blow froth and fury about in the manner he has done to-day. If there has been political prostitution, Mr. Speaker, let not the reformed prostitute talk about the virtue of others.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no evidence that he has reformed.

Mr. CASEY. But there is a pretense of reform. The hon. leader of the Opposition was evidently loaded up the wrong way on this occasion. He expected that this motion would be refused, and he was loaded up with a red-hot denunciation of the Government for refusing an inquiry of this kind. And, when the whole thing fell flat, and he found the Government were not afraid to have these documents brought before us and to inquire into the case, what had he to fall back upon? As I say, he blew froth and fury throughout this Chamber in a manner which does infinite credit to his physical powers at his time of life—whether it does equal credit to the preservation of his mental faculties, I leave it to members of this House to judge. A more extraordinary or ridiculously injudicious speech than that of the hon. gentleman has never been made on the floor of this House or put on record in "Hansard." He wondered that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House laughed while he was speaking. He even went so far as to garble history—tells us that Nero laughed while Rome was burning. We always understood that Nero played the fiddle while that conflagration was in progress. But our laughter was not caused by this conflagration which is supposed to be raging in the constituency, but it was due to pure joyousness of heart, downright infantile amusement at the spectacle presented by the hon. gentleman who was then entertaining the House. It would be impossible for the most stony-hearted, the most stolid and stupid creature imaginable, not to be amused when such an exhibition was in progress.

I shall perhaps be wandering from the strict limits of the motion, but certainly not beyond the ground over which the discussion has ranged, if I say a few words in regard to the election in West Elgin. That has been the subject of a great many speeches, editorials, jokes, and what not. We have had our share of that sort of fun with our friends on the other side in old times, and we do not object to anything in the way of fair criticism or good-humoured talk on these subjects. But the people of West Elgin and the Reform party of Ontario generally are not going to lie under the imputation that they are corrupt or have been corrupted. What is the charge in this case—the confession, if you choose to put it so, made in this case? It is, that a certain gang of outside parties came into the riding of West Elgin at the last local election and conducted a side campaign of their own, apart altogether from the campaign conducted by the candidate and his local organization, and conducted this campaign in such a manner that the member for West

Elgin, when he discovered what had been done, nominally on his behalf, took the open and honest course——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY—the open, honest, straightforward course of saying: As soon as my attention was called to the facts, I felt it my duty to disclaim all right to this seat and to facilitate as much as possible the voiding of the election, in order that we may have a new, and free, and true test of the people's feelings. I had the honour of supporting Mr. McNish in that election, and I wish to say that I shall feel it doubly an honour, on account of the manly course he has taken on this occasion, to support him in the next election. And I do not need a gift of prophecy to say that, on the purest election that can be held under any circumstances in any riding, Mr. McNish will reap the reward of his honesty, his undoubted, unchallenged honesty, in this matter, by coming back at the head of a very substantial majority. We do not need to defend Mr. McNish in this respect, because he was not attacked by the petition, except in regard to his supposed connection with the irregular appointment of returning officers. His explanation of the matter—which I need not go into—is admitted to be satisfactory by all parties, and he comes out clear and clean of any suspicion cast by his opponents in the riding, who were aware of the fact. As to the people of West Elgin, we are told two contradictory stories. The first is, that corruption stalked, unblushing, gigantic, and generally in a Tuppefesque way, throughout the riding, and that everybody was debauched with public money, with the reptile fund which was created by gigantic contributions.

The hon. gentleman must have been thinking of the days of the Pacific scandal when he used that phrase, that the people were debauched with this money. That is one story, that the people were corrupt or corruptible. Then, the other story is—and it is the only story in support of which an iota of proof has been offered before the courts—the other story is that this outside gang, finding that the people of that county could not be corrupted, set to work to get in a number of experts to stuff the ballot-boxes. The two stories are inconsistent. If a few experts were smuggled in by a gang of irresponsible men, not known to the local organization, not authorized by the candidate, if these men stuffed ballot-boxes, let them be ferreted out and punished, whoever they may be, whether Preston, or further back, I do not care where it hits—the people of that county demand that whoever instigated these fraudulent acts should be punished. But to charge the electors of West Elgin with being corruptible or corrupt in this case, is to say what has no foundation in fact, no foundation in any of the charges made or established before the courts.

A great deal is made of the fact that Mr. Preston is now an officer of the Dominion Government in Europe. Well, Sir, I do not think it is any disgrace to a Federal Minister to whom a former active worker in local affairs was recommended as a fit person for a public office, that he should, without knowing all we know now about that man, put him in that office. I have no doubt that the Minister's course towards Mr. Preston in the future will depend upon his matured opinion as to how far he is or is not guilty of the charges now laid against him. I do not presume to charge Mr. Preston, or anybody else, ex-cathedra in this matter. All I have to say from my own experience of the riding of West Elgin at the local election, where I was present for a few weeks, is, that if Preston and the machine had not been there, Mr. McNish would have been equally elected, and probably by quite as good a majority; for the presence of an organization of that kind, suspected whether rightly or wrongly, of being corrupt, did more to injure than to benefit the candidate at that election. The leader of the Opposition makes a great outcry, uses very Tupperesque language, to put it briefly, about this machine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. An hon. gentleman calls for order, but the phrase has been consecrated by long usage in this House. It has been admitted that the adjectives "Tupperism" and "Tupperesque," having been long used in this House, are in order in describing certain kinds of language and certain kinds of statements in this House. I say that the hon. gentleman used very Tupperesque language about this machine, as if it was an invention of the Liberal party, as if it was something contrived by them. If there is such a thing as a machine, if that machine means what gentlemen opposite say it means, a corrupt machine, where was the model of that machine patented? Whence came the experts who operated it in London, the experts who operated it in Manitoba, the experts who operated it in other places I could name, long before there was any talk of such a thing as a Grit machine existing? If there is any corrupt machine organized, any hurtful weapon of that sort in the possession of the Liberal party, where do they get it? I do not say that if our people copied Tory methods in this matter it is any excuse for them; I only say that the inventors, the patentees of this machine, have not the right to throw stones at us for using it. The most they could do would be to apply to the courts to decree that they should have a royalty upon the use of that machine. If the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, is inclined to take that ground, to go before the courts and claim a royalty, I do not think anybody would dispute his claim to be the original patentee.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I desire to congratulate the leader of the Government for his honesty, for his frankness, and for his patriotic conduct when he says that purity of elections must be guaranteed at all cost. It is one of the healthy signs of the time, that at last some person arises amongst the party who believes that in the interests of the country it is important that we should have purity at elections. I congratulate the hon. leader of the Government and his friends that they have awakened to the importance of accepting this resolution. But I was somewhat surprised at the right hon. gentleman complaining that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) should have assumed that this motion would be voted down. Why did he assume that it would be voted down? Because every motion which has been made in this House during the present session, and during other sessions, having for its aim to bring out information that we thought desirable to bring out in the interests of the country to secure a more honest administration of public affairs, has been voted down. Last night we heard an hon. member opposite say: With fifty-five majority at our back, we are prepared to carry through any motion that we desire to carry through this House, notwithstanding the Opposition. Therefore, I say we were justified in assuming that this motion would be voted down, especially in view of the fact that only a few days ago one of the strongest indictments I ever heard, one of the strongest impeachments I ever heard against a Minister of the Crown, was voted down in this House, although it was made by a gentleman of eminence and of long experience, a gentleman of sterling integrity, who was for a long time an honoured Minister of the Crown himself. When he made those direct charges, and when hon. members opposite voted them down, I say we were justified in assuming that this motion also would be voted down.

Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the Government invited investigations. Why did they not do so in the case of the Yukon scandal? One day the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) invited an investigation, and when one was proposed he skulked behind his subservient majority and asked them to vote it down. They are bold when there is no danger in the air, but when danger looms up, then they fall back upon their majority, and prevent any inquiry which would bring out damaging facts. Then, the hon. member spoke of something in the past, insinuating corruption. The information given to the House by the leader of the Opposition with regard to which the Minister of Trade and Commerce had made a prediction. He foreshadowed what might be done by the party in power with all the means at their disposal, with a heavy expenditure of money, patronage to dispense, and a large majority of supporters behind them, and in a few years hence he, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, was in a position to carry out and accomplish what he had foreshadowed. He was able, with his friends, to accomplish it by the organization of that machine, which has been so effectually working in the interest of that party, and of which we have heard so much from various parts of the country. It seems to me most appropriate that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) should come to the rescue of his friends on this occasion, because the very stamping-ground, where the machine was able to do its most effective work and where the representative of the party, who, I assume, to be a man of fair and honest convictions, was obliged to sign a paper acknowledging the disgrace of the party, was the county which that hon. gentleman represents. The hon. member for West Elgin says that he was in that constituency and took part in the campaign. I have no doubt about that whatever; I have no doubt that he was cheek by jowl with Sim. Hewitt, with D. F. Macdonald, of Parry Sound, who has been operating for the party for the past seventeen or eighteen years to my own personal knowledge, in by-elections in various parts of the country; with Capt. Sullivan, and others. Having taken part with these men in this election, and being the representative of that constituency in the Dominion, is it possible that the hon. gentleman did not know what was taking place in that constituency? It is utterly impossible to believe that, when he was there taking part in the election, he did not know that the same members of this machine, who had so effectually operated in the by-elections for a number of years past, in the interest of the Liberal party, were there doing their nefarious work, as they had done it in other places. At the head of the machine was Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who has been the successful organizer of the party for so many years past, and whom they found it convenient to send out of the country at the time his presence was most desired to bring out information which would not have been creditable to the Government, but which might have been valuable to the country and to the courts. All these men were to be found there. I saw Mungovan in Brockville a short time ago. We know that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the other evening, said that he did not know Sim Hewitt, of Brantford.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I did not.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was Hewitt that was under consideration. I understood the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to say that the hon. Minister had said that he did not know a man brought up in his own city.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I just happened to catch that remark, but other-

wise it might not have been answered. I did not say anything like that. Of course, I know Hewitt. I said I knew him, but I said that I had not seen him in Ottawa and did not know that he had been in Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he did not know him, but if he admits that he does know him, and if he is acquainted with him, that makes it all the worse, because he comes from Brantford, where he was schooled at the feet of Gamaliel for so many years. He was in North Grey when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was a candidate there, and when the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) was also there.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And you were there, too.

Mr. SPROULE. Hewitt admits that he was there with these hon. gentlemen, and he boasted of the effective work that he had done for them. They were cognizant of his operations there and yet the hon. gentleman got up a short time ago and endeavoured to leave the impression in the House that he was not conversant with the campaign work that was carried on there. The hon. member for West Elgin says that the two stories were inconsistent—the one that these same men were in West Elgin personally and that they were bribing in South Ontario as well. We have disclosures which have proven that the two proceedings were going on at the same time. Look at South Ontario, where votes were bought for from $2 to $5, and this Hewitt was one of the very men who was in West Elgin assisting to carry out the work of the machine. He was in South Ontario, in West Elgin, in West Huron and in all these constituencies, and yet the hon. gentleman did not know it. The hon. member says that it is not reasonable to suppose that both of these operations were going on at one and the same time. The disclosures we have bring us to the definite conclusion that they were. It is beyond any question ; it is a matter as to which we have evidence that they were going on at the same time, and the Reform party were profiting by their operations. The hon. member for West Elgin says that, if there is any such thing as a machine, hon. gentlemen representing the Opposition ought to know it, and then he speaks about London. I wonder that he is not ashamed to mention the constituency of London, with its history of bacchanalianism and pig's feet and beer, after the practices that took place in London on the part of the friends of the hon. gentleman and the dodges which were resorted to. The hon. member for West Elgin spoke as if there were no such thing as the machine. We had the inventor and the organizer of the machine, the man who originated and manipulated the machine, Mr. Preston, telegraphing to Mr. McNish, after the machine had succeeded in putting him in power :

Hug the machine for me.

It showed what that gentleman thought was due the machine from the party when they were carried to the extent that they had, to acknowledge their gratitude for what the machine had done for them in such an emergency as that. He might have sent the same telegram to Mr. Dryden in South Ontario, to West Huron, to North Grey, and many other constituencies. He could, with equal appropriateness, have sent it to the Hon. Minister of Customs, who has represented North Grey for several years in this House. When we took the trouble to investigate that election what did we find ? We have in our possession to-day nearly 200 affidavits made by men who received money in that election to vote for the hon. gentleman who is now sitting in this House, and that work was done by the same men who manipulated the campaign for the party in other constituencies. Cap Sullivan and Sim Hewitt were there. Hewitt says that he was there, that he conversed with the hon. Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs. He told them how successfully he had operated there, that, when he met an Orangeman, he was an Orangeman, that when he met a Catholic, he was a Catholic ; in fact, he was all things to all men, so that he might influence public opinion in the interest of the great Reform party in this way. In the face of the fact that we had, and still have, in our possession, about 200 affidavits from men who received money at the time, the hon. Minister of Customs has represented that riding ever since, I say to his shame and the shame of his party.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do you say that he told me that which you said ?

Mr. SPROULE. I say that he told this.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do you say that he told me ?

Mr. SPROULE. I distinctly say that what I said, as I understand it, is that he told others that he had conversed with the hon. gentleman and told him how he had succeeded in doing so much in his favour in reference to these men. That is my statement.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You do not say that he told me that.

Mr. SPROULE. I say he told others, who gave the information to us. That is my information. I believe it comes from reliable sources, and I would not be surprised to find that the hon. gentleman knew all about it. He and the Postmaster General were there with him in that election. It is interesting to find that even

now, somewhat late in life, the Liberal party admits that we should have honest elections. Only the other night the Minister of the Interior said, that the fair fame of Canada had never suffered at the hands of the Reform party.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order. My hon. friend is referring to a past debate.

Mr. SPROULE. I am referring to a statement made by a Minister in this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to the fact that he is referring to a previous debate, and in that he is out of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I be permitted to inquire if any one can patent an ordinary expression so as to prevent its being repeated? The fact that a phrase was used by a member in this House surely does not prevent any one else from using it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) stated that the Minister of the Interior in a debate the other day, made use of certain expressions, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) was proceeding to build an argument upon that. The hon. gentleman has no right to build an argument on what was said in another debate.

Mr. SPROULE. All right; every one in this House knows what the statement of the Minister of the Interior was. Let me ask, in the face of what we know of the Baie de Chaleurs transaction, in the face of what we know of Pacaud and of the Mercier gang that corrupted the province of Quebec until the Lieutenant-Governor was obliged to dismiss them; in the face of the revelations in West Elgin and South Ontario, and what is transpiring to-day in Manitoba, can the right hon. gentleman lay his hand on his heart and truly say, that the fair fame of Canada has not suffered in the hands of the Liberals.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has no right to refer to what was said some days ago in another debate, and to proceed to cause a discussion on that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. When the Reform party leave the impression upon this country that they are the emblems of purity, I have a right to point to the accumulating knowledge we have, that that statement is not true, and I am justified in speaking of the pleasure which the country feels, that the Liberal party has at last awakened to the necessity for condemning these corrupt practices. I have the right to congratulate the leader of the Government and his friends, that after being asleep so long when all this bribery and corruption has been going on, they have awakened to the fact that it is in the interests of the country, and in the interests of the moral status of the Liberal party, that these things should be inquired into. For years past the moral sense of the community has been shocked by the revelations of corruption by the Liberal machine, and honest men, Liberal and Conservative, now desire that an end should be put to it. I tell the country and the House, that the same men, the same gang, the same machine has been operating in the interests of the Reform party for years back. I remember that in the Algoma election a few years ago, the same Mr. Macdonald who was helping to work the machine in West Elgin, went into that county, collected the Indians in a house, brought them to the booths to record their votes, and then took them back to the same house, stripped them of the clothes they had on, and put these same clothes on the squaws and took them back to poll their votes also. All that came out, and to his own shame he admitted, he gloried in it, because he thought he had done a smart thing and by that means elected a Liberal representative. Again, I found this man in the Manitoulin Islands when I took part in that election of 1882. Everywhere there was the same machine and the same gang helping to return the Liberal candidate. We found them operating the machine in East and West Algoma and the Parry Sound district. Then in the North Grey election we found the same men cheek by jowl with the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). We found the same machine doing its nefarious work there, and doing it so successfully as to return the Liberal candidate. I was in the election in North Grey, and I never saw such bacchanalian corruption as revelled there. It may be asked, why did we not bring it out in the election court. We were prevented because the petition was sawed off and the opportunity was denied us, or otherwise we would have published to the world some operations which would have reflected lasting discredit on hon. gentlemen opposite. After they left North Grey we find the same crowd in North Wellington: "Cap. Sullivan, Sim. Hewitt, D. F. McDonald, W. T. R. Preston, the organizer and the manipulator of the machine. Then they tried to elect a Minister in South Ontario, and succeeded, and next we found them in West Elgin, and the day after that election the Toronto "Globe" pointed out: There is an honest expression of public opinion by the people at the polls; there is a justification for the existence of the Hardy Government. That, Sir, is the way that the manipulations of that nefarious machine were commended by the organ of the Liberal party. They elected a Minister in South Ontario, but he had to step down and out, and he said he did not know anything about it. There was that blissful innocence and blindness about him which is

the characteristic of those who have been elected by the machine. Mr. McNish was also innocent, but he gave certificates of character to the deputy returning officer, of the men who were brought in to corrupt the constituency, and he told the returning officers these were fit and proper parties to do the work. Yes, they were fit and proper parties to do the nefarious work of ballot stuffing and personating, and the other crimes known to the Reform party machine. The gang was in South Perth and in Brockville. And to such an extent did they carry on their work, that one of their own men in Brockville, I think a Mr. Manhart, who was appointed returning officer, when approached by some of the machine members, replied: No, I have been an honest man up to the present, I desire to see a fair election.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). A true Grit.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, there was one honest Grit there, and there are many of them in the country, but the regret is that the bad element in the Grit party dominates. There are many honest Grits in Canada who desire to see an honest expression of public opinion, but unfortunately the bad element is so powerful that it dominates the party, and so corruption runs riot. This deputy returning officer in Brockville said to the machine: If you want to do your dirty work bring in one of your own men to do it, for I will not, and he stepped out of the position, and they were obliged to replace him by a man who would do the dirty work. In that election ballots were found lying in the streets. Who supplied those ballots? Some people think it was the Brockville "Recorder." I think there is very little doubt that it was. At any rate, those ballots were printed for that constituency as they were for West Elgin, and they were used for the purpose of identifying the parties who voted for the Reform candidate. Mr. McNish admits that it is a fact, a regretful fact, that prominent Reformers in the riding sheltered these men in their houses, while they were paying out money in purchasing votes. So they did in Brockville. We knew they were there. I was in that election, and it was common knowledge that these men were for days and weeks in that riding, doing their nefarious work; and the hon. member for Brockville sits in this House by virtue of the nefarious work. Yet we are told that that election was the rebuke of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for making his charges; we are told that that was the answer of the honest electors of Brockville. How was that answer obtained? By the most dishonest means that could be devised by any party in this country. It was the same in South Brant, I am told; the same men were there. I have no doubt that Simeon Hewitt was there, for he has been a very apt scholar for many years under the tuition of that great teacher, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Paterson). They were there, and did their work, and no doubt did it successfully.

Now, who are the parties implicated in all these scandals? They are the same crowd of men. They are officials of the local government, joined with officials of the Dominion Government, and they jointly work the Reform machine. W. T. R. Preston, the organizer of the party, is drawing his $2,000 or $3,000 a year to-day as immigration agent in England. Whenever you endeavour to bring these people into court, they cannot be found. They are sent out of the country by the party. Why was Preston sent out of he country? There are many who are uncharitable enough to believe that he was sent out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), so that his evidence would not be available in that election trial. Others are in the wild west of Algoma, and cannot be found. Capt. Sullivan goes up there, and you cannot find him with a search warrant and half a dozen constables, when an election trial is going on. Simeon Hewitt is there, too, and cannot be found. D. F. McDonald is away also, after he has done his nefarious work. These men are all employees of the local government or the Dominion Government, both Reform governments. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) asks me why is it called the machine. I will tell you what one of his friends told me. He said: "It is because we have been so successful in threshing our opponents." This machine is not a modern device. Although it is not patented, and no model of it can be found in the Department of Agriculture, it has been none the less successful; and no man can endeavour to get up another just like it. There is no danger of any one attempting to infringe on the patent.

It may be said that this is a matter for the election courts. I have said over and over again, and I repeat it, desiring to give the utmost publicity which my voice can give to the statement, that I have always regretted the custom that has obtained of late years, of pairing off these election petitions. It tends to the demoralization of the country and the disgrace of both political parties. I have always claimed that when a petition is filed, it must be filed on the sworn evidence of some person, that he believes that corruption extensively prevailed in the constituency; and I assume that the man who takes that affidavit is not a pejurer, but that he has such information in his possession as to justify the belief, if not the actual knowledge, that corruption extensively prevailed, as was the case when the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Paterson) was elected. It was sworn in that election petition. We had the affidavits in our possession at the time. When that was the case, that election petition should have been

fought out to the bitter end. If there is no evidence of corruption, the petition should never be filed at all; but if there is evidence that corruption extensively prevailed, that fact should be laid bare to the world. In either case the country would benefit by the result. If the election was an honest election, the member would hold the seat to which he was entitled; if it was a corrupt election, the country would see the degradation to which the party was sunk. The system of pairing off these election petitions which has been carried on for many years in this country, is, to my mind, a disgraceful one, tending to the demoralization of the two political parties and of the electorate of this country; and the sooner we are aroused to the importance of the situation, and the sooner we stop that practice, the better it will be for the country and for the credit of both parties. The Conservative party have been endeavouring to stop this practice. Only last winter a Bill was introduced in the legislative assembly at Toronto by Mr. Whitney for the purpose of punishing bribery that was known to prevail extensively, but it was voted down by Mr. Hardy, Mr. G. W. Ross, and their friends, who knew that the machine was operating in their interest. They dare not allow a law to be passed to punish those men for their nefarious operations. It was voted down by their servile majority, just as the majority in this House the other night voted down the proposition to lay before the world the scandalous transactions and the maladministration of the present Government in the Yukon. I say, the sooner we have a stringent election law, and the stronger we make the penalties upon those who are disposed to violate that law, the better for the political health of the country. What does the country desire? An honest, unbiased and unpurchased expression of public opinion as between the two political parties. Can it be got to-day? As the machine has been operating, I say it is not possible; and if public men, with these facts before their eyes, condone them, and do not undertake to punish the guilty parties, or make a law to punish them, the electorate cannot be blamed, because they are no lower in the scale of demoralization than the representatives of the people themselves. There is no other conclusion we can come to than this, that if members of Parliament condone it, we cannot blame the electorate if they become a purchasable and corrupt commodity. We are setting a bad example to the people to follow our example and do what they otherwise would not have done. Public sentiment desires that we should have an honest expression of public opinion, and with that end in view we should endeavour to show the country that there is not to-day an honest expression of public opinion. I, therefore, support this motion most cordially. I am glad to see that the right hon. leader of the Government has accepted it, and the evidence cannot be brought down a moment too soon in the interests of honest public opinion. You cannot stop these nefarious proceedings a moment too soon, and if we can succeed in doing so, even to a limited extent, we will have done a great good, because we will have taken a step forward in the direction of obtaining an honest and fair expression of public sentiment in every election, whether to a provincial or Dominion Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 126) respecting representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. Mulock.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the right hon. Prime Minister to have said that he would inform the House who the judges would be and the instructions that would be given them.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to do so at this moment, but will keep the inquiry of my hon. friend in mind.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not understand why the Government have provided that the city of Toronto shall be divided by the judges, and not have provided that the city of Ottawa shall be so divided. The same principle applies in both cases. If it is a correct principle with regard to Toronto, it ought to be equally correct with regard to Hamilton and Ottawa.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend cannot be ignorant of the motives which have impelled the Government to deal with the one question and not the other. There is some force in the objection laid down by my hon. friend, but, as I stated, when introducing this Bill, we are not undertaking at this moment to deal with all the objectionable features of the Acts of 1882 and 1892, but only with their most salient features. If this Bill has any fault, it is simply that it has not gone far enough. It might have gone further, but realizing that we were not dealing with this matter immediately after the taking of the census, when redistribution has to be made, we determined that we should not disturb the existing conditions of things except in so far as is absolutely necessary to do away with some of the more glaring objections. Whilst there can be no doubt as to our jurisdiction, I do not hesitate to declare that we ought to be very chary in the exercise of it, and should restrict ourselves to exercising it only in so far as is absolutely necessary to correct an injustice. The hon. leader of the Opposition,

while strongly contending that Parliament had not jurisdiction to deal with this matter except immediately after the taking of the census, was obliged to admit that we had at other periods jurisdiction to correct clerical errors in the redistribution of seats. It does not matter whether it is a clerical error or a gross error; if we have jurisdiction at all, we have jurisdiction to correct the one as well as the other. The hon. gentleman himself contended that we had power to correct an error. As I say, it does not matter whether the error is slight or gross, if we have power in the one case we have it in the other. The hon. gentleman said a few days ago that his party, when in office, were justified in amending the Redistribution Act of 1892 in order to correct a clerical error. I take the ground that we have the same power to correct an egregious error as we have to correct a small error. If we have power to correct a purely clerical error, it is equally in our power and it is equally incumbent upon us to correct an egregious error. We do not undertake to do anything more than that. If we were redistributing the representation after a decennial census, we would be ready to consider his objection and deal with it. But having taken the ground that we are doing no more than to correct the most salient injustices in the Redistribution Acts of 1882 and 1892, we do not propose to go any further at present than is absolutely necessary, and, therefore, we leave many things which, perhaps, might be subject of consideration and amendment under other circumstances.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not propose to go over the discussion which has taken place on the second reading. I merely rise for the purpose of saying that although I desire to pay great respect to the statements just made by my right hon. friend, of course I do not at all agree with him that the right—because it is a question of right and not a question of power—to correct a verbal error or inaccuracy that is absolutely necessary in order to carry out the law, at all implies the right to pass a Redistribution Bill. I think that is pressing the argument altogether too far. But having discussed that matter, I do not propose to go over it again, nor do I propose to move, and I hope no gentleman on this side of the House will move, any amendments to this Bill. The Bill is, in my opinion, a violation of the constitution of the country according to which no Redistribution Bill can be passed except after a decennial census. Holding that view, I do not propose in any way to interfere or to take the responsibility of moving any amendment. But if I were to do so, I would not propose to separate Ottawa into two constituencies, nor to separate the city and county of Halifax into two constituencies. There is an obvious convenience in having cities like Ottawa and Halifax joined as a unit in electing two members. In Ottawa, as every person is aware, and the same may be said of the city and county of Halifax, the population is divided mainly into two religions, and the practice is to name a gentleman belonging to the Roman Catholic faith and a gentleman belonging to the Protestant faith by each one of the two parties; and in that way the electors have a better opportunity of making a choice than they otherwise would. For this reason I do not propose any amendment changing that system, because I think it is much more convenient for both parties to bring forward candidates of each religion. That argument is especially strong in the city of Ottawa where the people are divided into two races as well as two religions, and the present arrangement avoids a good deal of inconvenience that would arise from a division of the city into two constituencies.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the First Minister to say that the object of this Bill was to correct an injustice, and that the way to correct that injustice was to observe county boundaries where they were not observed before. But the Minister has shown that that was not his aim; if it was, he would have corrected county boundaries in every constituency in eastern as well as in western Ontario. He would not have done so in Grey and violated the same principle in Carleton; he would have corrected the boundaries in Lanark as well as in Bruce. Now, if the hon. gentleman's object was to correct this injustice, why does he not do so in one part of the country as well as in another part? Then he allows the city of Toronto to be subdivided by judges, but not in Ottawa and Halifax. Now, there may be a good deal in what the leader of the Opposition says, that there are special circumstances or conditions in cities like Ottawa, Hamilton and Halifax which might justify a departure from the rule. That may be the case, and I am not going to argue it. But it seemed to me that, the principle being applied in Toronto, we might with propriety say that it should apply in the other cities. However, if the exceptional situation justifies the departure, I have nothing to say with regard to it. But what the hon. gentleman said does not apply to the case which has been pointed out—their efforts to correct what they are pleased to call injustice and irregularities in the west, while nothing is done in the east.

Mr. CLANCY. The committee must be a good deal struck with the observation of the right hon. First Minister. He recites the case of the effort made in 1893 to correct clerical errors as a justification for this Bill. But, I would like to be clear upon the point. The legislation of 1893 was intended to do anything which Parliament had intended to do in a previous Bill,

but, through an inadvertance, had failed to do.

The PRIME MINISTER. With the power or not?

Mr. CLANCY. For the purposes of what I am saying, I will assume that it was with the power. The object was to carry out the original intention of Parliament. But now the right hon. gentleman is introducing legislation to overturn the will of Parliament, as expressed in 1882. These are precisely opposite cases, as it seems to me. I rise merely to have the point made clear, because it seems to me that if the hon. gentleman's contention in one case is sound it cannot be sound in the other.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is right in saying that we proceed from different motives. I agree that in 1893, when the Government introduced amendments to the Act of a previous year their intention was to complete the work of the previous year, which, in their opinion, they had left incomplete. We now move to amend the Act just as they moved to amend it. Their intention was to complete their work, while our intention is to correct their work. That is all the difference. The intention is different, but the result is the same, so far as the power of this Parliament is concerned. We want to amend the Act, just as they wanted to amend the Act. They amended it for one motive, we amend it for a different motive. They amended it because they thought —I am bound to assume that their intention was to serve good purposes—that it was necessary to correct an error made by them at that time.

Mr. CLANCY. But this that the hon. gentleman intends to amend was not an error; it was the deliberate intention of Parliament. There might be a want of wisdom in it, but no hon. gentleman can argue—and be consistent—that an Act deliberately passed by the Parliament of Canada was an error in the sense in which the right hon. gentleman now uses the word. The hon. gentleman cites a precedent of a Bill intended to correct clerical errors. But would that be fairly quoted as a precedent for altering the deliberate intention of Parliament? It seems to me that the two cases are as far as the poles asunder.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps I might meet the views of the hon. gentleman if I were to say we are moved to correct the unwisdom of the Act of 1882.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad that the right hon. gentleman is coming to my views. I hope he will go further and withdraw this Bill, and so correct the unwisdom of introducing it. I am not going to prolong this debate; I do not see any advantage in repeating what has been said in this House. But I have this to say—that hon. gentlemen opposite have been unable, up to this time, whatever they may be able to do hereafter, to show one reason growing out of the actual operation of the Redistribution Bill of 1882 and the results of it, for introducing this Bill. They have not showed that any hon. gentleman in this House was unfairly dealt with under the Redistribution Act of 1882.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is gratifying for me to find what I expected occurring. I said that when this Bill was discussed that it would be found so fair that no objection could be offered to it. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) said that the Bill is unconstitutional. But every one knows that he is alone in that conclusion. Even the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) while arguing in support of his leader, said that for the present he was of the opinion that it was unconstitutional, but guarded himself by saying that his opinion might be different the next day, or words to that effect. No one now takes the ground that the Bill is not within the constitutional powers of this Parliament to deal with. And now that every one is agreeing that it is a perfectly fair Bill, the result is very gratifying indeed. Even hon. gentlemen who said that they would fight it for days and days, now find that it is what it was designed to be, a perfectly honest Bill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) says that there is no reason given for changing the redistribution of 1882. He has been told time and time again, but I repeat it now, that gross injustices were inflicted at that time, that member after member of the Liberal party was deliberately struck at and their ridings were made into Conservative ridings by Act of this Parliament. This Bill strikes at no one. In 1882 the party workers were called in to give counsel to determine what townships should be taken out of this riding or put into that, perpetrating an infamous gerrymander. But in the Bill now introduced, as hon. gentlemen can see, there is no effort at a gerrymander, there is no need to call in party workers or even to consult with members of this House. The House divests itself of the power to deal with the matter in detail and leaves it wholly in the hands of the judges. So, the constitutionality of the Bill is acknowledged. As has been said, no lawyer who valued his reputation would say that this Bill is unconstitutional. If hon. gentlemen are seeking relief from some other place——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS—by some other means than by combatting the Bill on its merits, that is another matter. But let it be understood that the Bill is con-

stitutional, and that, so far as its provisions are concerned, no fault can be found with it.

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

After Recess.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved:

That in subsection (e) the word "four" be struck out and be replaced by the word "five"; that in subsection (g), after the word "Elgin" the word "Kent" be inserted, and that the word "Kent," after the word "of," in subsection (h), be struck out.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the clause is adopted, I would like to say a few words in reference to the representation of Simcoe. As shown by the census returns of 1891 the population of Simcoe proper amounts to about 82,000 souls, and it must be remembered that a large portion of the county has been increasing in population to a very considerable extent since the last decennial census. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the map of Simcoe it will be seen that the present arrangement of dealing with North Simcoe is such, that according to the last census there is a population of 28,203 in such riding, and that after taking into account Muskoka which will be, if this Bill goes into effect, taken from the east riding of Simcoe, that riding, according to the last census will have 31,381. Then having reference to what may be termed the south riding, or the southern portion of the county of Simcoe, after deducting from that the township of Mulmur which will, under the Bill, go into the county of Dufferin, and adding thereto the township of Adjala, which will be taken from Cardwell, the population of South Simcoe proper, as I may call it, would be 23,143. The judges in arranging the county of Simcoe into three ridings will take first for the south riding the townships of Tossoronto, West Gwillimbury, Essa, Innisfil, Adjala, Tecumseth and the villages and towns included in these townships which will give a population of 23,143. North Simcoe, as it exists to-day, would have a population of 28,203, and taking the riding of East Simcoe, as it to-day stands, minus the portions that will go into the district of Muskoka, the population would be 31,381. By reference to the map it will be seen that some portion of North Simcoe would be added to South Simcoe if equalization of population were sought; it would be necessary to add to South Simcoe the town of Barrie in order to bring up the population. The result would be that South Simcoe, plus Barrie, would have a population of about 29,000. The town of Barrie, however has always been in the north riding of Simcoe, and I assume, that the judges, in making the division, would be very much averse to taking from the riding of North Simcoe a town which has been situated in that riding, I was going to say, almost from time immemorial, at least, since the formation of the riding. Then, if recourse were had to taking the township of Nottawasaga, and adding that to South Simcoe, it would result in adding to the 23,143 population in South Simcoe no less than 6,000 people from Nottawasaga. But another trouble would confront the judges, and that is that in Nottawasaga township are included the towns of Collingwood and Stayner, which would give a population of about 6,500 souls. The position then would be, if Nottawasaga were added to South Simcoe, that Collingwood and Stayner, which are both in Nottawasaga would stand, by this act, to be taken distinctly out of the township in which they are now situated. Referring to East Simcoe with its population of 31,381 a reference to the figures will show that the township of Tay had in 1891 a population of 4,714 souls. It is a comparatively new township, and, owing to the fact that it includes some villages which have been increasing very considerably, I have no doubt that the population of Tay to-day is much nearer 6,000 than 5,000. Then Midland is returned in the census of 1891 as having a population of 2,088, a town which now has considerably over 3,000 of a population, and which, owing to certain local circumstances, bids fair, in the next few years to grow considerably. The result is, therefore, if reference were had to the present population, that the riding of East Simcoe, being divided upon these lines, would have a population of not only 31,381, but a population of about 33,000 or 34,000. It is manifestly unfair that a riding should be so constituted that would have 34,000 of a population while, in the adjoining county of York, the ridings will have a population of only 21,000 souls, and in many other counties, which I might enumerate in Ontario, the population will amount to 14,000 or 15,000, while East Simcoe will have 34,000. To take from the present riding of East Simcoe the township of Tiny would increase the population of North Simcoe to upwards of 33,000, while East Simcoe would have a population of about 30,000, both of which, I submit, would be abnormally large representations as compared with other ridings, and having reference to the fact that there are many portions of East Simcoe in which the population is increasing vastly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). What would be the unit of population if the riding were divided evenly?

Mr. BENNETT. About 82,000 is the total population of the three ridings, but the trouble is that, while South Simcoe, having regard to its natural limits, has a population of 23,000, the townships which are adjacent to it in the north riding are so large

and include such large towns—I refer particularly to the township of Nottawasaga—that South Simcoe would be a very large riding with a population of almost 30,000. In this dilemma I submit that it is the duty of the Government to make the Bill as perfect as possible, and the only thing to be done, under the circumstances, is to endeavour to bring out something like a fair proportion of population, and that can only be attained by bringing into effect in that county four representatives as against three representatives. That, of course, will result in the displacement of another riding in some other portion of the province. I have no doubt that the judges, being only permitted to assign three members, will, of necessity, have in the riding of East Simcoe over 34,000 of a population, and that must be emphasized by this fact that it includes towns that are to-day growing rapidly and also that there is in the riding a considerable portion of new farming land which results in the increase of population in the agricultural districts from year to year. I may mention, in this connection, that the county of Simcoe, for the purposes of the Ontario legislature, has practically four representatives, and it would be following upon the lines of the representation in the Ontario House if four representatives were given to the county in the Dominion Parliament rather than three as at present. I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that, if the present arrangement is carried out and only three representatives are assigned to Simcoe, it must result in this, that if any regard is to be paid to geographical appearances South Simcoe will have a population of 23,000, North Simcoe a population of 28,000, and having regard to the present population, East Simcoe will have very close to 34,000, if not more than 34,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not by the census of 1891.

Mr. BENNETT. East Simcoe by the census of 1891 has 31,380, but that census gives Midland a population of only 2,088, when I know, as a matter of fact, it has over 3,000 to-day. Penetanguishene has 2,110 in the census of 1891, and I know it is considerably over 2,500 now. So with the town of Orillia, which has a growing population. I submit that if you want to make the Bill anyway fair, the county of Simcoe should have four members instead of three. That would make the unit of population in each riding something like what it is in other parts of the province.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Does the hon. gentleman suggest where this seat for Simcoe should come from?

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps one of the Yorks could be knocked out, or Brant, or Durham. If I find the complaint, it is for the Government to find the remedy. South Simcoe, under this Bill, will have only about 23,000, while East Simcoe will have upwards of 34,000, and to my mind there is no defence for that. Why does not the Government give Simcoe four members as it would be fair to do?

Mr. CLANCY. Is the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) going to make two little hives with about 16,000 population each in Brant, while he allows only two members for Kent, representing a population of 29,000 each? Kent is much more entitled to three than Brant is to two. In Kent you would have three ridings with over 18,000 each, but yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) proposes to fix a hive for himself in Brant and to do an injustice to Kent county. I may tell him also that Kent county is growing far more rapidly than Brant. What has the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) to say to that injustice? Perhaps he has protested to the Ministers and failed, but anyway, I hope it is not by his consent that this injustice is perpetrated on the county of which he is so estimable a member. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) going to sit silent and allow this injustice to be perpetrated on his electors? Will he allow the Minister of Customs to make two little constituencies in Brant, with far below the unit of population, and not say a word for his own county? The Minister of Customs told us the other night that Brant was sacred, because it was constituted before confederation. If there is any common sense at all in that argument, then why touch Cardwell, and why touch Bothwell, which are in the same position as Brant? I tell the Minister of Customs that that is no defence for his conduct. He is helping to manipulate this Bill, and he is pretending to return to county boundaries, but he first takes care that he will have two little hives of his own, while he cuts down the representation that fairly belongs to other counties. Essex is much better entitled to three members than Brant is to two, and so is Lambton. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) gave as an excuse: Oh, we did not touch Norfolk. Is that a manly defence? Should he shelter himself behind that single constituency? I will be surprised if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) does not sit silent there in his seat, because it is much better he should be silent than expose himself to the ridicule of attempt to defend the course he has taken.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I do not know that I should allow the hon. gentleman to taunt me with silence, when we are discussing as to whether this Bill is a fair one or not. He seems to have a particular objection to Brant having two members. Whether it is because one of the Brants is my old constituency and my home for many years, I cannot tell, but I trust

that such a consideration does not prompt him to vent his ill-will against a county that does not deserve it. Surely he will admit that the people of Brant have equal rights with the others ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman seems to think, more.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, not more. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has stated that under the census of 1891, which is to determine in this matter, the largest Simcoe riding would have 31,000 population. I grant that is over the unit, but you cannot have an exact population in each riding. Under the present Act, which wholly disregards county boundaries, and under which there is far greater liberty to approach equality in population, greater divergencies exist than are found in this Bill. When the hon. gentleman appeals for another member for the county of Simcoe, of which the largest riding has only 31,000, another 28,000, and another 23,000, does he argue that the county of Brant, which has nearly 37,000, should have one member taken from it and given to Simcoe, although it has 5,000 more than the largest riding in the county of Simcoe ? I would ask him, further, if it is thought that any one of those counties to which two members are allotted, is not entitled to them, and that one member should be taken away, in common fairness and common honesty ; would you not take the member from that county which has the smallest population ? If you do that, you would not take a member from Brant, but you would take one from Norfolk, which has 5,000 souls less than Brant.

Mr. CLARKE. Not by the census.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, by the census of 1891. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), a useful member, who has been one of the Ministers of the Crown, has himself said that if that riding were divided, there was no doubt that the north riding would be a strong Liberal constituency, while the south riding would be a doubtful constituency. That was his estimate of the political feeling of that county. If that be so, it follows inevitably, that if you took away one of the members from Norfolk, and gave the county one member, you would make an absolutely safe seat for a Liberal and take away the seat of the present member for South Norfolk, a seat which he has won time and again. But the Bill leaves that gentleman in the same position that he now occupies. To show the exceeding fairness of this Bill, take the county of Wentworth, the population of which, I think, is within 1,000 of that of Norfolk, and a county which has almost from confederation returned two Liberal members, and two seats might have been given to that county, and two Liberals elected ; and one Liberal seat might be given to Norfolk and the Conservative shut out ; and this might have been done without wrenching. But this Bill recognizes the fact that Wentworth is less in population than Norfolk, though only slightly so, and, therefore, it gives Wentworth only one member and Norfolk two. So that, if hon. gentlemen want to take a seat away from any one of the counties having two members at present, they must, in common fairness, take that seat from the county which has the least population.

Mr. CLARKE. What does the hon. Minister reckon the population of the county of Brant to be, by the census of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is nearly 37,000. I have not the exact figures.

Mr. CLARKE. The reason I asked the hon. Minister is, that I have in my hand the return of the general elections of the province of Ontario which took place in 1898, and it gives the population of the north riding of Brant as 11,406, and that of the south riding as 21,811, making for the county, 33,217.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman will read the Bill carefully on that point, he will find that the judges, in availing themselves of information, are required to take, not the returns of elections of members to the legislative assembly, but the Dominion census, taken by Dominion officers ; and if the hon. gentleman will take the Dominion census, he will find that the population is nearly 37,000.

Mr. CLARKE. The figures I have given purport to be from the last census.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then, they are not correct in that particular. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says there are some Indians dwelling in South Brant, and he is going to take out the Indian population, because they have not votes. Well, there are a great many white men in all the different constituencies who have not votes, or who did not have votes under the Franchise Act passed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that these Indians and white men are not to be taken into account, and are not to be represented in this House ? Does not the man who represents a county, represent all the souls in that county ?

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think the hon. member would intentionally mislead the committee. I am sure he will agree with me, that the voting population counted in the province of Ontario is precisely the voting population that will be counted in Dominion elections, because hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted the provincial franchise. Now, I will give the hon. gentleman the population of the county of Brant, according to the census of 1891, and, in order to be perfectly

fair, I will give the details of both ridings. North Brant has the township of Brantford with 3,693, the township of South Dumfries with 3,137, the township of Onondaga with 1,432, and the town of Paris with 3,094, making in all 11,406. South Brant has the city of Brantford with 12,753, the township of Brantford—which seems to be divided—with 3,261, the township of Burford with 4,939, and the township of Oakland with 858. There are no other townships. Tuscarora is not included. I care not how many Indians there may be in there, they are not counted under the system the hon. gentleman has laid down, and it is idle to pretend that the hon. gentleman has 36,000. What has he, according to the Ontario rule ? He has 32,217, not one more nor less, and it seems an astounding thing to see an hon. gentleman here attempting to defend the position on a ground that is wholly indefensible.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you making this speech for me ?

Mr. CLANCY. I am making it for myself, and I hope also for the benefit of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. gentleman talks of the judges, but the judges are not to take the returns of members to the legislative assembly of Ontario, but the Dominion census, according to the Dominion census tables, and you cannot begin to distinguish as between the one and the other. The hon. gentleman supposes that the judges are to go into every county and ascertain how many white men are going to be excluded from voting because they have not the proper qualifications. But you go by population. When the census was made in 1881, Tuscarora was counted just the same, and on that basis, when each 20,000 had a member given it by the Government then in power, if the hon. gentleman had taken the Indians out then, he would only have left the population between 16,000 and 17,000, just the same as now. It never entered the heads of that Government to take the argument of the hon. gentleman, but even if they had, there would be 33,000 according to himself, or 3,000 more than in the county of Norfolk ; and if you take a member from any county, you must take him from the county that has the least. Will the hon. gentleman move an amendment that a member be taken from Norfolk and given to some other county ?

Mr. CLANCY. I tell the hon. gentleman that there are two questions that may be considered. Norfolk has one riding of 15,006, and another of 16,692, and Wentworth has two ridings with even less. Is he prepared to wipe out Wentworth as well as Norfolk, because Wentworth is smaller than Norfolk ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Wentworth is wiped out.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. It has two members.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is only one member for Wentworth. The hon. gentleman must study the Bill. There is a very small difference between the populations of Wentworth and Norfolk, and if we had given the two members to Wentworth, the Liberals would have two members here, whereas, if we gave one to Norfolk alone, we would have a Liberal there. Norfolk has a little more population than Wentworth, and we said that since it has a little more population, we will give it two members, though by doing that probably Mr. Tisdale will be returned to this House again, and we gave one member less to Wentworth, though by giving two we would have secured the return of two Liberal members. If he proposes anything in that line he must go to the county that has the least population, and take a member from Norfolk before he can take it from Brant. Therefore, the strictures of hon. gentlemen opposite, as if I personally were fixing up a constituency, are utterly unfounded. The whole aim of the Bill is founded on absolute justice as far as we can understand it. We return to county bounds, and these bounds have not been made by the Liberal party. They were, in most cases, made years before confederation, we had nothing to do with the framing of them, and would simply say representation shall be confined within the municipal bounds created, not by this Act or Government, but forty or fifty years ago. How could there be anything more fair ? Where there is a county only entitled to one member by population, as near as you can arrive at it, that county shall have one member, and you do not require to call in the services of a judge in that case, because there is nothing to do. But there are other counties entitled by population to two members, and others entitled to three members, and where there are counties which have to be divided so as to give them two members or three members, this Government does not undertake to do the dividing, although we have forty or fifty of a majority at our back, and are in a position to put through any kind of Act, if we were actuated by the same feeling as actuated hon. gentlemen opposite, and could stoop so low as to follow their example. But we said, no, we will have a Bill which will prevent any gerrymander. When any county is to be divided, we will hand it over to three of the highest judges in the land to make the division, and when the division is made, we will not reserve the right even to review the decision, but will accept it as final.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you do that in eastern Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What argument is that with reference to this Bill ? It has been pointed out that we are

simply repealing some of the gross features of the Gerrymander Act, and carrying out what the people at the last election told us to do, and carrying it out in such a way that there is not a fair-minded man who can say we are not doing right. One of these hon. gentlemen ventured to say the other day that party partisans had been brought here to help to frame this Bill. What would have been the use of bringing any one here to advise us ? When they talk about heelers being consulted, and having the management of the business, they are simply implying that term to three of the highest judges in the land, for the whole control is absolutely in their hands. I recognize that there are discrepancies or differences in the populations of the different ridings. I confess that the county of Brant, having two members given to it, each member will not represent as many souls as are represented by gentlemen elected by some other constituencies. But that is inevitable, as has been pointed out, time and again, even in the Gerrymander Bill of 1882, where no attention was paid to county boundaries, but where a township was taken out of certain ridings and put into others, changing the whole map of Ontario, there are more discrepancies in population than in the Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. Why do you talk so much, why not let it go ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend from Bothwell asked me to explain, and I am giving the explanation. Just on that point, let me say to the hon. member for Toronto, who sits over there and who made a very moderate speech last night in reference to this matter, to which I listened with interest and attention, and who thought as did other members from Toronto, that in giving five members to that city we were not doing it justice, because each member would represent, on an average, 36,000 souls, that while that is more than a member from any of the rural constituencies will represent, yet, as was pointed out by the hon. leader of the Opposition, as well as by members on this side, if large commercial centres like Toronto and Montreal have not been given the representation their population would entitle them to, it is because they have a power and influence that carry weight independent of any representation. As I pointed out, when speaking the other day, if a question comes up here which affects the interests of Toronto, the able reporters for the Toronto papers who sit in the Gallery, and who are so thoroughly posted on every question, flash the news to their press. The announcement appears in the morning papers, and if there is anything by which the interests of the city are jeopardized and representations are to be made to the Government, they do not need to depend on their representatives in this House alone. The board of trade can be summoned within an hour, if need be ; the city council can be convened, and deputations of prominent citizens can be sent to present their case. In rural constituencies the case is far different. They cannot be reached in that way, nor can they act in that way. The hon. gentleman talks of injustice to Toronto, but I want to say that this Bill gives Toronto greater justice than it ever had before.

Mr. CLARKE. Explain that, please.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Under this Bill there would be one member in this House for every 36,000 people, supposing you are able to get an even division; whereas now there is one member for 43,000 people. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) represents 43,000, and he complains and says he will oppose this Bill because it involves an injustice. It is true, the Bill does not give Toronto a representative for every 22,000 people, but comes 7,000 nearer to it than does the present law.

Mr. CLARKE. What population does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bertram) from Toronto who supports the Minister, represent—the hon. member for Centre Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Centre Toronto is much less. But, taking the population of Toronto at 180,000, as it is by the census of 1891—counting in those who come in from the county of York—there would be a representative for every 36,000 of people, whereas the hon. gentleman, who finds such grievous fault, represents at present 43,000. If it does not give the hon. gentleman all that he wants, why should he not be glad that it does go in the direction he desires ? The hon. gentleman talks about the county of York. The county of York, apart from the city of Toronto, will be entitled to three representatives. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman, and ask him to take note of it, that what raised the indignation in 1882 among the Liberals of this House—indignation that burns in my breast as I talk about it—was, that the Bill was directly aimed at this man, that man, and the other. By their voting strength, the Government of that day tried to assassinate politically member after member on the Liberal side. Alexander Mackenzie was struck at, Charlton was struck at, G. W. Ross was struck at, Gillies was struck at, Sir Richard Cartwright was legislated out of the House. Others were in the same way deliberately aimed at. Tory papers came out, gloating over the fact that the voices of Mackenzie, Mills and Paterson would be heard no more in legislative halls. The Bill was designed to politically assassinate the opponents of the Government. And, when we entered the contest, some of us, it was in a Conservative riding, and, if we won, it was only through the votes of decent Conservatives, who said: This is too infamous ; we cannot support it. That is the answer I give to my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy), who says that Liberals came back after the election of 1882. It

was not because the attempt was not made to politically assassinate them, but because they found enough Conservatives to repudiate the act of their leader. But time passed on, and that feeling died away, and a number of these seats, which were held by the force of that righteous indignation, have been lost to the Liberal party. And the Bill that is now before the House—and I am glad and proud, as a member of a Liberal Government and of the party, to say it—does not strike at any member of the Opposition.

Mr. BENNETT. You wipe out Bothwell.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But this is not a blow aimed at the present member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), for his present constituency, Bothwell, will be found in Kent, where the hon. gentleman can run.

Mr. CLARKE. What about York ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Let us look at this in a fair-minded way, let us talk coolly about it. I suppose that West Ontario, represented by the hon. Speaker, is a Liberal riding. And that is wiped out. South Middlesex, I suppose, hon. gentlemen will say, is a fairly safe Liberal constituency. And that is wiped out.

Mr. HENDERSON. How do you know ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I know by the Bill. Cardwell, for which sits a gentleman (Mr. Stubbs) who has given a fair support to the Liberal party of this House, is wiped out.

And the hon. gentleman will see that these things are not done with a view to striking at an individual, but to carry out the principle of maintaining the county boundaries. What the vicissitudes may be, when the divisions are made by the judges, I cannot tell; no one can tell. Some say the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) will be injured. Yet another gentleman tells us that the divisions of the county of Bruce are absolutely fair. If they are absolutely fair, I venture to say that no three judges of the Superior Court will change them to make them unfair; and, if they do not, the hon. gentleman is just where he was. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) spoke of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) as a lamb being led to the slaughter. Does he mean to say that the hon. member for West York is injured by this Bill ?

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In judging of the probable effects of the Bill of 1882, when it was under discussion, we took the figures of the previous election. I do not see how otherwise we can judge of the probable effects of this Bill. I have here the figures of returns of the last election in West York. I find that half of St. Paul's and St. Stephen's ward and York township are grouped together, and I could not tell what proportion of the vote was cast in the wards and what proportion in the township. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), when speaking, said that under this Bill about half his constituency would be put into Toronto. The hon. gentleman represents something over 41,000 now. So, I have assumed that half the vote I have referred to was cast in the wards of Toronto, and half in the west riding of York, as it will be under this Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the hon. gentleman referring to the figures of the election of 1896?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely, the hon. gentleman would not quote that election as showing the voting strength of the parties.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why not ?

Mr. CLARKE. Because no Liberal candidate ran in 1896.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am glad to hear that statement, that no Liberal candidate ran, because, I think, he uses the figures of the "Mail," that counts every vote that was cast for the member for West York as a Conservative vote.

Mr. CLARKE. Give us the figures now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They count his 4,000 votes as Conservative votes. But he had two opponents, he had a Liberal Patron running against him and a Conservative as well. Let him take the combined strength of his two opponents, and he will see how he stands. Take now the portion that goes into Toronto, and he will still have one-half his constituency to appeal to, if he sees fit to stand for one of the ridings of West Toronto. I daresay my good friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is loyal enough to his chief to let him run in one of those constituencies. Taking his last election as a basis, he would start with 1,544 of a majority. Yet he is in danger, they say. Now, suppose he is left in West York, when the city portion is taken out, what is the result ? He will start in West York with 1,784 of a majority; yet they speak of him as being hardly dealt with, and he speaks as if it was dangerous for him to run there. These are his majorities over two candidates with their combined strength. The hon. gentleman says there was no Liberal candidate there, and so they count all the votes cast for them as Conservative votes when they make up their Conservative majority. With the exception of the member for East York, I have not heard any one say that they were in danger from this Bill. I have not been able to go into the figures very closely for East York, but I know that the member sitting for East York, representing that large

portion of the city for years, if he desires it, can try to share the representation with the hon. gentleman if he runs. Now, that constituency will be large enough for two. Therefore, they cannot point to one man that is struck at under this Bill. It is an absolutely fair Bill in contrast to their Bill. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) the other night found fault with me because I said, when we were protesting against the Bill of 1882, that we were voted down on amendment after amendment by the majority which sat here in dumb silence, twenty-two amendments, as the "Hansard" will prove. No defence was made of the Bill, when those twenty-two amendments were moved, and there was not a word out of their mouths in its defence, although every resolution enunciated an iniquity that was perpetrated under it, they dared not defend it. Let me read you one as a sample, and then contrast the operations of this Bill with that. The hon. member for South Brant at that time, whom I very well knew, made a motion. Before doing it, he recited the reasons that actuated him in moving it:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to get the attention of the chairman of the committee which was charged with the preparation of this Bill, and I shall be obliged to him if he will indicate his consciousness by looking at me. I see he keeps his head down.

I said they voted it with their heads cast down, and when that appeal was made to him, and I called upon him to lift his eyes and face the man he was striking at, his head was down still:

I think we have a right, if we cannot have any attention, at least to have an explanation of the arrangements made in South Brant and South Oxford. I desire to ask, whoever is in charge of the Government at this moment, if it was a principle of equalization of the population that was the basis of this change, and if that was not the principle, I think I have a right to know, and the House has a right to know, under what principle it was made? They took from South Brant two townships, and they annexed them to the riding of South Oxford. Now, I do not lay much stress with regard to the case of Burford, from a geographical point of view, though there was no necessity of disturbing that riding at all, as it had the proper number of inhabitants; but let me point out to you that in taking the township of Oakland from South Brant and adding it to South Oxford, you are taking a population of 939 from a riding which is only a little over 20,000 and attaching it to a riding which has a population of nearly 25,000.

They were boasting that their principle was the principle of equalization, and they took this township out of a riding that had 20,000, and put it into another riding that had 25,000:

The township of Oakland does not belong geographically to the south riding of Oxford at all, for if it had not been attached to Burford on one side, which you are now attaching to South Oxford, Oakland would be 12 miles away at its nearest point from the county of Oxford, and as the township is three-cornered—the result of the change is to leave that county anything but symmetrical. This township comes within eight miles of the city of Brantford, a county town, where its inhabitants do all their business, and the town of Ingersoll, which is the main town in South Oxford, to which it is now attached, will be something like 40 or 50 miles distant, I move:

"That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the township of Oakland shall form part of the electoral district of the south riding of the county of Brant."

That was my resolution. They proposed as the fundamental principle of their Bill to equalize population.

Mr. CLANCY. What other Liberals spoke on that resolution and defended the hon. gentleman?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did I need any Liberal to defend me? Was it not so manifest that even a Conservative, having the least sense of shame in him, would have supported my amendment? Does the hon. gentleman see no fairness in that proposition? They were sitting there legislating professedly on the principle of equalizing population, and yet taking a township with a population of 939 from a riding that had only a little more than 20,000, and putting it into one that had nearly 25,000. Would they not have put it back if they had had shame enough to do so? But they had not. Had they done so, it would still have left South Brant with less population than the riding into which they put it. I will read on:

Mr. PATERSON. I want an answer to my question.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Surely, after so pointed and repeated a request, an answer should be given.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there no hon. gentleman on the other side with sufficient spirit to answer?

No answer, but in dumb silence they voted down the proposition with their ninety-nine to forty-two. And so on with every one of the twenty-two amendments moved here, each of them reciting an iniquity like the one I have pointed out. Not a word in defence of their Bill. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) stands up here, that hon. gentleman who professes to be a fair-minded man, and to do his duty as an independent man, and he says: I want the Bill framed in that spirit, and not a Bill that will allow the independent judges of this land to determine the boundaries of the counties. Now, I think I have answered the hon. member for Bothwell. He may repeat his question again and again, parrot-like; he may talk about Brant again and again, parrot-like. He wants to take away from some counties that have two members under this Bill and give it to some other county. Why, then, let him, in all fairness, commence at

counties that have a smaller population, and when he does that, he cannot begin with the county of Brant, even if he wishes to do that ridiculous thing which he speaks about, of excluding some thousands of Indian population there, simply because he claims that under the electoral franchise in the province of Ontario they have not a vote. They can get a vote if they are qualified, just the same as the white man can if qualified, and there are a great many white men in that riding under the Franchise Bill of hon. gentlemen who had no vote either. Does he propose to have the judges go and determine all the men in that riding that have no vote in order to ascertain that. To make such a statement is to show how ridiculous it would appear in that sense. I admit that there are inequalities, and that there must necessarily be inequalities, but, when they disregarded county boundaries in Ontario altogether, and were at liberty to go anywhere in the province where there was an opportunity to nearly equalize the population if they wished to do it honestly, the result is found in this Act that we seek to repeal, and which contains greater discrepancies than will be found in this Bill which we ask the House to adopt.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I do not think that it is necessary that, if the hon. gentleman has a good case, to import so must heat and energy into it.

Mr. CLARKE. White heat.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Some of the old indignation.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has the old indignation of eighteen years ago. I would have thought that time would have taught him a lesson in eighteen years. The figure he cut eighteen years ago was ridiculous. The hon. gentleman has had eighteen years of experience, which has shown the untruth of every statement he made then. The hon. gentleman knows that the Liberal party were not injured. It has been demonstrated beyond a doubt that there was——

Mr. GIBSON. The intention was the same.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says the intention was the same. If people had to depend upon his intentions they would indeed be very unreliable.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that my conduct in this House, or out of it, is just as reliable, and will compare with that of the hon. gentleman. He need not speak of reliability. I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that he has no right to say that I am not reliable.

Mr. CLANCY. I waited for your ruling, Mr. Chairman; I was not aware that there were so many tender-hearted gentlemen here. These hon. gentlemen are very sensitive; I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen are so sensitive. They have a lot of unredeemed pledges.

Mr. GIBSON. They are better than unredeemed notes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I think the insinuation which has been thrown across the floor of the House is altogether out of order; it is not courteous.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) mention the point of order.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is a simple matter, but I think it is a slur that should not be thrown across the floor of the House from one member to another. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) said that unredeemed pledges were better than unredeemed notes, making an insinuation that he had no right to make.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) wanted to impute something dishonourable to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) or some other hon. member of the committee? If so, I would ask him to withdraw the expression.

Mr. GIBSON. No, Mr. Chairman, I asked for your ruling when the hon. gentleman accused me of being unreliable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do I understand the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) to charge some hon. members with not paying their notes or something of that kind? If so, I suppose the hon. gentleman will withdraw it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) can speak for himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BERGERON. The Chair has spoken.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking to the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Landerkin) has a right to speak, but I put the question to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and I would like the hon. member for Lincoln to answer the question I have put.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not refer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He said that we had a great many unredeemed pledges, and I said that

unredeemed pledges were better than unredeemed notes.

Mr. BERGERON. What does that mean?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) did not cast any imputation upon anybody.

Mr. GIBSON. I did not insinuate anything against anybody.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was a general principle that he was applying.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) might have made an unworthy insinuation, I would not be disposed to be too particular with that hon. gentleman. I think he could do me quite as much service by making an insinuation of that kind as by praising me. The fact is that I would rather prefer the former to the latter. Anything unfavourable that the hon. gentleman could say of me I would regard as a good certificate of character, and, therefore, I shall not discuss the insinuations that he makes. To come now to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) who was so earnest and who spoke of twenty-two resolutions, each of which cited an iniquity, will the hon. gentleman turn to "Hansard," which is before him, and pick out of these six resolutions that had absolutely nothing to do with that measure? Yet the hon. gentleman has repeated that statement, and I venture to say that he will not rise now and repeat it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I despair of convincing the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Hon. gentlemen can get "Hansard" and read it for themselves.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman read a part of it, but he will not read the rest. The hon. gentleman's statements stand entirely unfounded to-day, yet he repeats them and calls in question the name of a great man, and says that he held his head down in solemn silence and that he would not raise his head because of shame. I tell the hon. gentleman that that is not a worthy thing to say, and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman could, with as much propriety, or manliness, say that there has not been a word said in favour of or against this Bill during this whole debate. There would be equally as much consistency in one statement as in the other.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am able to look you in the eye.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he has repeated here a statement—I wish to be perfectly parliamentary—but I will say that it is utterly destitute of a single element of that necessary ingredient which would characterize it as having the slightest mark of truth in it. The hon. gentleman says that no one was injured. I would like to know why he goes to Bruce if there is no one injured. He goes to Bruce because he hopes to injure the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). It is not a matter of county boundaries at all with him; he will pass that over. I do not know but that the hon. gentleman will even undertake that, because there is nothing too great for the hon. gentleman to undertake in the way of making a statement. He seems to have become beside himself, and not to be strictly responsible for all he says. But the object of the Bill is not to help the Conservatives; the object is to injure them, and I will point to one instance, and that is the case of the hon. member for North Bruce. The hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) with great dignity, an hon. gentleman that I have learned to have more than ordinary respect for, he complains that he was legislated out of Huron. Now, I do not claim that the framer of this Bill or the Government is bound to take into consideration how it affects any individual member, myself or anybody else. I do not put it on so narrow a ground, and I do not believe that the promoters of the Bill of 1882 intended to legislate the hon. gentleman out of this Parliament. But may not the explanation be that the electors of Centre Huron wanted one of their own people to represent them. I think I have heard that, and I think it is not very far from the mark. I do not believe that they could get anywhere a gentleman who would so well represent them, but they wanted one of their own, and so the Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) was forced to go to one of those happy places where there was a Grit hive. What would the hon. gentleman do if he had not some Grit hives to fall back on? The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) wails in this House because the Bill of 1882 took a village out of his county, but that might happen under any Redistribution Bill. I repeat that it remains for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) and his friends to make out a single case where a Liberal member lost his seat in any of the group of forty-eight ridings now under consideration, as the result of the legislation of 1882. Hon. gentlemen opposite may talk as much as they like about this township and that township being changed, but their talk is all idle unless they can point out that a Liberal member was injured by the change that was made. They have failed to do that and they are utterly unable to do it.

Mr. WM. McCLEARY (Welland). I have a question to propound to the Ministers about this Bill, and I should like an answer to it. This Bill appears before the House in the name of the Postmaster General (Mr.

Mulock) and I am glad the Government have been able to find within their ranks a gentleman so well qualified to take charge of such a measure as this. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), however, seems to do most of the talking, and probably he will be able to give me the information I am looking for. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said in the early part of his remarks that this Bill was based upon absolute justice, that it was intended to remove a great wrong that had been perpetrated upon the Liberal party. If he will look at subsection (b) of this Bill, he will find that the county I have the honour to represent is among the list of the gerrymandered constituencies. The old county of Welland, one of the oldest if not the oldest counties in the province of Ontario, one of the first settled counties in the Dominion of Canada, has ever since confederation, both in the provincial and federal elections, had the same electoral boundaries. For more than thirty-two years the people of Welland have been voting within the same boundaries of their riding, and it has never been touched by gerrymander or fixed up to suit party purposes, until now. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) has in this Bill added on to Welland, two large municipalities that were never connected with it for electoral purposes since confederation, and he and his friends have done that in order, if possible, to drive its Conservative representative out of Parliament, and to elect a Liberal follower of theirs in his place. They take from Lincoln county, the township of Pelham with a Liberal majority of from 250 to 300, and sometimes more, and they place that in Welland. They take the township of Wainfleet which in the last local election the Liberals carried by a majority of one, and they also put that in Welland county. By placing Pelham in Welland, they try to make Welland a Liberal hive, and secure a seat for one of their own friends. I trust the Minister of Customs will not leave the Chamber, because he is the man who has been talking about the absolute justice of this Bill, and I want to show him the small amount of justice he is giving to Welland. Now, according to the last census, Welland had a population of 25,000, and if the census were taken to-day it would be nearly 30,000, and will the Minister (Mr. Paterson) tell me where is the absolute justice in adding 6,000 population to that county, and giving it only one member? Can the hon. gentleman point out the first mark of justice in interfering with a county that has existed on present lines since confederation, and in fixing up the population of that county until it is nearly as great as the county of Brant to which he gives two members? What justice is there there? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was standing by county boundaries, all through the province, there might be a shadow of an excuse for that, but it would only be a shadow.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We stand by county boundaries in this Bill, do we not?

Mr. McCLEARY. And this Bill is to suit the nefarious purpose of the men who are trying to legislate Conservatives out of Parliament. It is not intended to render justice. The Minister of Customs falls back upon this Bill for an answer, but if he is going to maintain county boundaries why does he not maintain them throughout all Ontario. The county of Welland has a population that is growing year by year. When the census was taken, the population of that county was over 25,000, and with the townships of Pelham and Wainfleet added, we shall have 6,000 more. Where, I ask, will the hon. gentleman find one single spark of justice in the treatment of that county? On the contrary, is it not a low, mean thing to try to strike down a political opponent by the action contemplated in this Bill? I would like to ask what vindication there can be of this attempt to place the Conservative party in the county of Welland under this yoke of trying to overcome the adverse majority of 300 which will be added to it by this Bill.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman seems to speak as if Welland were a lost county to him by being put again within its municipal bounds. If that is so, I assure him I did not know it. That county is dealt with in the same way as other counties in this Bill: it is put within its municipal bounds, which is the proper thing to do. What the political effects of that will be, I cannot tell. If there be the iniquity in it which the hon. gentleman says there is, but which I do not admit, then the hon. gentleman can take this comfort, that he will not be damaged thereby, if his experience is the same as mine; for when the iniquity was done to me in 1882 of making a county that was safe Reform, into a Conservative county, there were enough respectable Conservatives in that county to give me a majority; and if there be the iniquity in this Bill which the hon. gentleman talks about, he need not be afraid. But Welland has been treated just the same as the other counties, and I can honestly tell the hon. gentleman that what he has just said is the first intimation of how the county might go politically.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I am sure the Minister of Customs did not mean that the committee should infer, from his closing expressions, that this Bill had restored the county boundaries throughout the province of Ontario. Is it not the height of folly, in view of the facts, for hon. gentlemen opposite to iterate and reiterate that the leading principle of this Bill is, that it restores the county boundaries in the province of Ontario? An examination of the Bill itself will demonstrate that there is not a particle of truth

in that statement, and I am sure that no political capital can be made by the repetition by hon. gentlemen opposite of a stale falsehood. The county boundaries in eastern Ontario have not been touched by this Bill. The county boundaries east of the county of Ontario have been allowed to remain as they were under the Acts of 1882 and 1892; and why will the hon. Minister of Customs and other hon. gentlemen opposite persist in saying that they have restored the old county boundary lines? They have only done so, as has been pointed out again and again, where a political advantage was hoped to be gained by the change. In the eastern part of this province, which they have declared over and over again was over-represented, they have not made a change, and the reason is obvious. They have recently, since 1896, made a substantial gain in that part of the province, and, following the old adage, they have decided to leave well enough alone. Hon. gentlemen have asked what counties have not had their boundaries restored. There are the counties of Russell, Carleton, Lanark, Frontenac, Addington, Renfrew, Peterborough, Grenville, Leeds. Every one of these counties were altered by previous Acts, and they have not had their municipal boundaries restored. They were conveniently overlooked, because that would best serve the party interests. This Bill is fearfully and wonderfully constructed. I was almost persuaded by the force of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Customs that justice was done by the Bill to the city of Toronto, but unfortunately the facts and figures are against him. The hon. gentleman mentioned the counties of Wentworth, Brant and Norfolk. If I took the figures of the hon. gentleman correctly, he said that the county of Wentworth had a population of 28,142, the county of Norfolk a population of 31,778, and the county of Brant a population of 33,217——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not right.

Mr. CLARKE. These are the figures of the returns by the Clerk of the legislative assembly of Ontario of the elections of 1898.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not what is before the judges. They are to take the Dominion census.

Mr. CLARKE. These figures are taken from the Dominion census. To give an idea of the justice meted out to the constituencies by this Bill, I may state that the total population of these three counties, if my figures are correct, amounts to 93,137 souls, who are to be represented by five members in this House, while the city of Toronto, with a population more than double the population of these three counties, is only to be represented by five members in this House. Surely, when the Government knew of the existing condition of things with regard to the city of Toronto, they should have been actuated by a desire to do that city scant justice. If they had given us even cold justice, they would have accorded us a larger representation. But that was farthest from their thoughts. The county in which the hon. Minister of Customs resides, and which he represented, has a population of 33,217, according to my figures, and about 36,000, according the Minister's figures; and in that county a member represents 16,600 people, while the adjoining county of Wentworth, with 28,142 people, is only to have one representative. Upon what principle of justice or fair-play are the people of Brant, numbering 33,000 souls, to have two representatives in this House, while the adjoining county of Wentworth, aggregating 28,000 souls, is only to have one representative? What is there, after all, in this idea of adhering so closely to municipal or county boundaries, when, as a result of adherence to that principle, such gross inequalities of representation are perpetrated? If the hon. gentleman refers to the old redistribution law, he will ascertain that the unit of population in the various counties was much more in accord with the general unit for the province than is the case under this Bill. By what right can he say that two members should be given to the county of Norfolk, with 31,000 population, while the city of Toronto is given only one member for each 36,000; or by what reason can he say that Brant is given two representatives for 33,000 souls, while the adjoining county of Wentworth is given only one representative for 28,000, and the great district of Algoma, a province in itself, which ought to have representation at least according to the unit of representation for the province, has only one representative for over 40,000 souls? These inequalities are permitted in this Bill, notwithstanding the fact, which I have pointed out, that one of the principal complaints which hon. gentlemen made in reference to the Redistribution Bill of 1892 was, that the eastern section of this province was over-represented. Now, let me draw attention to what my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who, I regret, is not in his seat, had to say with respect to this question of representation by population. He said:

> The hon. member for Simcoe advocated that Toronto should have its full share of representation. I do not for a moment challenge that statement. I think it is quite right that it should.

My hon. friend from North Wellington was referring to the late member for Simcoe, Mr. Dalton McCarthy.

> It is utterly futile to grant people the exercise of the franchise if you do not, at the same time, grant them the right to the full exercise of that franchise, so they will be properly represented in this House. There is no justification for giving one man in one constituency two and a half or three times as much voting power as

you give another man in another constituency. For instance, take the riding of East Simcoe, where you have a population of 35,000, and then take the riding of Frontenac, with a population of something like 13,000. The man who exercises the franchise in Frontenac has virtually two and a half times the voting power of the man who votes in East Simcoe. The less the population in a riding, the greater power has each voter in sending men here. That is unjust. I cannot understand on what principle ridings far below the unit should have the same franchise as those whose population is far above it.

Then, to clinch that argument and condemn the Government of the day for not doing justice by equalizing the populations represented in this House from the various constituencies of the province, he quoted from a letter of the late Right Hon. John Bright to a friend :

> The franchise itself gives no real power unless accompanied by the right on the part of all the possessors of it to elect something like an equal number of representatives. I could easily frame a Bill which would give universal suffrage in its widest sense, and which would affirm more strongly than ever the supremacy of the English oligarchy over the English people. If your great city, with its great constituency, is only to send two men to Parliament, while an equal population and property in some other part of the Kingdom is to send twenty men to Parliament, then I say your franchise is of little avail.

Then, the hon. member for North Wellington concluded as follows :—

> Now, I hold that if we are to place the entire electorate of this Dominion on an equal footing —and that should be the intention of the Bill— the constituencies should be readjusted so as to give, as nearly as possible, the same number of electors to each constituency.

Hon. gentlemen when in Opposition approved of those views. Why do they not now, when the opportunity is offered by the introduction of this Bill, give effect to the views they then believed to be sound and give us representation according to population ? It must be patent to the people of this country that this measure of redistribution, affecting only one-half of the counties of Ontario, and those the counties that are under-represented, as compared with the counties of eastern Ontario, is so framed because hon. gentlemen hope to gain party advantage out of the western counties ; whereas they know, from the experience of their friends in the local elections of March, 1898, that they have nothing to hope for from a restoration of the old county boundaries in the eastern part of the province. That is the reason they have abandoned their principles with regard to the redistribution of the counties in eastern Ontario. It is because, judging by the elections of members to the legislative assembly, which took place in March, 1898, they have nothing to hope from a readjustment of the county bounds in the eastern part of the province.

Let me go back to the representation of the city of Toronto and the county of York. The population of the county of York, as represented at present, is 97,289. The ridings are made up as follows :—

East riding	35,148
North riding (represented by the hon. Postmaster General).....	20,284
West riding	41,857
Total.....	97,289

The desire to restore county boundaries prompted hon. gentlemen opposite to take from this population of 97,289, nearly 35,000 souls and add them to the city of Toronto. The unit of representation in the county of York is one for every 32,500 now, and while they have reduced the population by nearly 35,000, they still send three members from the county of York to this House. Why ? Because they hope, by talking about half of the population from East York and more than one-half from West York, party advantage will be gained. But it does them no credit ; their intention is not a laudable one, and I hope they will gain no political advantage. If it were a fair and wise thing to reduce the unit of population in the county of York from 32,000 to 21,000, might we not, in all honesty and fair play, ask the hon. Minister and those associated with him, to give us reasonable representation in the city of Toronto according to population ? What right have hon. gentlemen opposite to ask us to give them credit for an additional representative to the city of Toronto, when they have added 36,000 to the population ? Under the present Bill, taking the wards of Toronto represented now in this House, there is a member for every 36,005. In the past there was a member for each 36,000. We have nothing, then, to thank the Government for under this arrangement. In the redistribution of the constituencies we had a right to expect that when other constituencies in Ontario had their unit of representation fixed at one member for 23,000, simple justice would have been done to Toronto, and it would have been given at least two or three additional members.

I have looked over the provisions of this Bill carefully, and there is nothing to be found in it, from one corner to the other, in my humble judgment, except the desire, which permeates every line, to gain political advantage. They will not be successful in their object. Their object will be defeated by the electorate when an opportunity is given the electorate to express their opinion on this measure.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). I was unavoidably absent yesterday, to my great regret, when the debate on the second reading of this measure took place, and the vote was recorded. I did intend to say something when the discussion was going on, had I been here, but I would not now say anything, if it were not for the continued references to the system of gerrymandering or hiving constituencies in the past. How

is it you never hear any reference to this gerrymandering or hiving with regard to the cities? I claim that it is an insult to our agricultural population to say that such a township is a Grit hive and such another one a Conservative hive. It amounts to saying that the electors in those constituencies have no intelligence of their own. Any public speaker who would address an agricultural audience along that line ought to have his expressions of opinion resented in the strongest language. The rural constituencies may have been run on that line some years ago, but that day has passed; and when political men come before these constituencies now, they have to give a reason for the faith that is in them, and show that they know they are addressing men of intelligence, capable of forming an independent judgment of their own. They need no longer indulge in the old played-out shibboleths, as for instance: I am proud to come before the independent electors of this county, the bone and sinew of the country, whose fathers were Conservatives in the past, and who, no doubt, will follow in the footsteps of their forefathers. In fact, one would imagine that the electors in these constituencies never think or judge for themselves at all. That this style of thing is quickly dying out is due a great deal to the Patron movement that was started in 1891. The plank in the Patron platform dealing with this matter is:

> Conformity of electoral districts to county boundaries as constituted for municipal purposes, as far as the principles of representation by population will allow.

The fact that that was in the platform is sufficient to show that there was a grievance to be remedied. It was felt all through the country that a grievous wrong existed. I never heard the matter talked over in a Patron lodge or on a public platform. It was taken as a matter of course that there was a wrong and Grits and Tories alike wished to see that wrong set right.

A great deal has been said about the cities not being fairly represented in this House. For my part, I feel that they have had more than their share of representation. I feel, and I am confident that the people in the rural districts generally agree with me, that the cities have run this country in times past, while the rural constituencies have very little to say. The cities have their boards of trade, their manufacturers' associations, their bankers' associations, their loan companies' asociations, their labour unions—and the voices of all these have been unanimous in anything affecting the interest of the city, for there is no politics in a board of trade, a manufacturers' association or any of these others. Whatever is in the interest of the city is maintained by them all. It has been ably shown by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that the cities also have the press which is at the beck and call of these various associations and voices their sentiments and wishes, giving them a means of expressing themselves which the rural districts cannot have. Another fact which makes the representation unfair to the independent agricultural class is our system of almost universal suffrage—and I never believed in universal suffrage, much less in this iniquitous registration system that has been established in the cities in Ontario. I do not speak from the Conservative stand-point only. I have heard not only Conservatives criticise this system, but I have heard Reformers also declare themselves against it and say it should be done away with. One representative of a city told me that the effect of the registration system was that they had to pay the men to register and then buy their votes after they had registered. Is it fair that the votes of such a class should be of equal weight with those of an equal number of members of the agricultural class, men having from $10,000 to $20,000 made by their own labour and saved by their own economy? And should the city to-day with so large a proportion of this class of voters have an equal representation in Parliament with the agricultural class? It is not fair or just. I think the cities are exceptionally well represented, in fact, they are doubly represented. Two members ought to be enough for the city of Toronto, with all its other means of forming and expressing public sentiment—its many associations and its great press. But Toronto gets five members. Many to whom I have spoken have criticised the Bill on the ground that too much representation is being given to Toronto. I have been told that the city of Toronto has six or eight residents who are members of this House and four who are Senators. These gentlemen, even those of them who represent agricultural constituencies, may be expected to speak for the city for they cannot have the same interest in or the same fellow-feeling for the farmers as if they lived amongst them. Objection has been taken to arranging our representation on the basis of the census of 1891, on the ground that there have been great changes in population since that time. I am very sorry to say that the change that has taken place is that the rural constituencies are not so populous as they were, while the city population has grown. It is worthy of reflection that under the great system of protection of which we have heard so much, the cities have grown and the country has gone down. I feel perfectly justified in supporting a Bill which proposes to rearrange the constituencies so as to maintain the county boundaries, and I only regret that I was not here last night to record my vote along that line. But enough has not been done in recognizing the rights of the rural constituencies to representation. I believe that before the rearrangement which will take place after

the next census public sentiment will have so strongly expressed itself that in the Redistribution Bill of 1902 fairer representation will be given to the rural constituencies.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). Last night my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) brought forward what struck me, in view of the circumstances, as a strange argument. He was dealing with the argument that it was inexpedient to set an example of tearing up the constituencies at the will of the party in power, that if that were done, as in this case, at a time different from the time it had generally been considered proper, that is after taking the decennial census, there was danger that this would be considered a precedent for such actions, and he said: We must leave that to the conscience of the people and of the people's representatives; we may feel perfectly safe in doing so, because, unless a great emergency arises, no party would be guilty of such an iniquity. Well, I just wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this very thing which my hon. friend said could not be done is being done at this moment. It has been established without a shadow of contradiction so far as I heard, that, at the present moment, whatever may have been the case in 1882, the Liberal party are not suffering from any disability in regard to representation. On the contrary, they are to-day in a majority in this House although they have a minority of the popular vote. So the very thing is being done at this moment which my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) said it was impossible to suppose that any party or Government would do. The argument has been unanswered that we are establishing a dangerous and mischievous precedent if this becomes law. I wish to make a remark with regard to the character of this Bill itself. My hon. friends on the other side of the House object to giving city populations as great a representation as rural populations, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is one of the hon. gentlemen who is in charge of this measure and who is specially responsible for it. I must consider that he is so, for two reasons: First, because he is one of the Ministers representing the province that is dealt with, and, secondly, because he has been, perhaps, the principal spokesman. Now, the hon. gentleman himself, when this Bill becomes law, will live in a constituency having a population of somewhere about 16,000 souls, perhaps a little more, speaking of the white population who are entitled to vote. Now, will the hon. gentleman tell me what the population of the city of Brantford is?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The census of 1891 showed 12,000, it is a great deal more now.

Mr. McNEILL. Then, my hon. friend is going to give a representative to that number, including that large urban population, while to Algoma, containing 40,000 of a rural population——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 33,000, by the census.

Mr. McNEILL. The population has increased enormously in Algoma; I think it is at least 40,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Nearer 50,000 now.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to know how my hon. friend reconciles that with the principle he has laid down in reference to urban and rural constituencies. In the constituency which he will represent, he is allowing one urban voter to count for as much as two and a half voters in a rural constituency. Now, if there be any constituency in the province of Ontario which ought to have two representatives it is Algoma. It is very difficult for any one member of this House to represent so great a district as that. But my hon. friend gives to his own county, which contains a population of 33,000, including a large urban constituency, two members, and he refuses to give more than one to Algoma. I wonder if any one can say that is consistent with the principle he has laid down.

Now, I want to ask my hon. friend how it is, under the principle of this Bill, that he interferes with the county of Bruce? I am not asking that the county of Bruce should not be dealt with; let there be no misapprehension about that. My hon. friend from Halifax referred to me yesterday as having made my valedictory address in this House. I can assure my hon. friends opposite that there was nothing of that nature in the address. I think that the action of the hon. gentlemen in regard to the county of Bruce has very much strengthened me in that county, because the people will understand that the hon. gentlemen opposite have gone deliberately out of their way to strike at me in that county. They profess that they are only dealing with counties whose constituencies are not contained within county boundaries; this is a county in which all the constituencies are contained within county boundaries, and yet they are dealing with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are doing it because the riding was gerrymandered in 1882.

Mr. McNEILL. There were other counties gerrymandered in 1882 which they have not dealt with. But they say that the principle upon which they are going is the restoration of county boundaries, and that the reason why they are dealing with these counties is to restore county boundaries. But they include Bruce, which is the only county altogether within county boundaries included in this Bill. As I say, I do not ask the hon. gentlemen at all to make any change, let it go as it is. For my part, I should be very glad to have three independent men go there and say whether it is fairly

divided. Now, my hon. friend says they are dealing with the county of Bruce because it was gerrymandered in 1882. I dealt with that question last night, and showed that it was not gerrymandered in 1882. I showed that the division under that Act of 1882 was a just and a right one. My hon. friend says that in 1882 there was a distribution of the population made that was not an equitable one. What is the situation of to-day? The situation is that in 1892, by the natural course of events, that unequal distribution which he complains of, was remedied, and, therefore, the only gerrymander, if it can be so called, of which he complains, was remedied in 1892. Then why does he interfere with the county of Bruce? There is no allegation, there can be no allegation, that anything was done in 1882 with the county of Bruce that could be described as unfair, except that the township of Saugeen was placed in the west riding instead of being left in the north riding.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Was not that unfair?

Mr. McNEILL. That is the only thing that can be alleged as being unfair, and the only reason it is alleged to be unfair is that the distribution of population was not equal at that time. That distribution of population is equal now; in fact, the north riding of Bruce is more populous than either of the other ridings now, therefore, that injustice has been remedied by the natural course of events. If any evidence is required to show how utterly indefensible this Bill is it is found by a reference to what has taken place in Bruce where this injustice that they complain of has already been remedied. I wish to say one word more with regard to placing Saugeen in the west riding of Bruce, and to this point I wish to direct the attention of my right hon. friend. What I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to is this, that he will find, that the placing of the township of Saugeen in the west riding was geographically the proper course to pursue. The lake townships were left in the west; the eastern townships were left in the east, and the northern townships were left in the north; so that a natural division was made. Saugeen is the last of the lake townships which is south of the peninsula of Bruce, and it naturally fell into the west riding on that account. Therefore, there is no possibility of alleging any kind of impropriety, unless it was the impropriety of making the population of the north riding smaller than the population of the west riding. The reason alleged at that time, and I think it was a sound and justifiable reason, was, that the north riding was known to consist largely of unsettled lands, which were rapidly filling up, and it was known to everybody that if the population was left for the moment equal, at the very next redistribution which occurred there must be another tearing up in Bruce. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) can explain to the House why it is, under these circumstances, that the county of Bruce, whose constituencies are wholly within county lines, has been included in this Bill?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I do not want to take up the time of the committee. It is only out of courtesy to the members of the committee, and, I may say, to the hon. member for North Bruce, who always speaks in a courteous manner, that I offer these observations. If that hon. gentleman is under the impression that, in what was done, there was any design that he was struck at personally, I think he may divest himself of that. The committee will remember that the hon. gentleman alluded to an argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), to the effect that Bills of this kind should only be introduced when there was urgent need, and he thinks that there is no urgent need now. There is urgent need for this Bill. I think, if the hon. gentleman will recall the past, he will admit that. Could there be any more urgent request for the passage of a Bill of this kind than when the people at the polls have expressly voted upon that question. That was one of the questions, and a leading question, and when the party that had professed to stand upon a platform in which one of the principal planks was the introduction of a Bill like this, when that party succeeded in carrying the country and are in the House, the Ministry and the members of that party are bound to introduce that Bill. There is a mandate from the people: we have been sent here expressly, amongst other things, by the people, to introduce this Bill. If we failed to introduce this Bill, we should be liable to the charge that hon. gentlemen, without justification, have hurled at us, that we have broken our pledges. But when we have introduced this Bill and implemented this pledge, they try to prevent us from carrying it out. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) must admit the urgency of this measure, when the people of Canada, and notably the people of Ontario, say that one of the cardinal planks in the platform of the Liberal party is the introduction of a Bill looking to the repeal of the evil that was done in 1882. Being sent here for the purpose, this Bill is introduced, and that portion of the county of Bruce for which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) sits, being one of the worst gerrymandered counties under the Act of 1882, comes under the operation of this measure. As the right hon. Prime Minister says, without going all over the country and attempting to do everything, we are rectifying the grosser abuses in obedience to the mandate of the people, and Bruce has come in under this head. The hon. gentleman has referred to me as the hon. member for Brant. Of course, he

knows that there was an unfortunate slip, and that I am not the member for that riding now, which I represented for so many years.

Mr. McNEILL. I apologize to my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was only a slip. I can hardly say that I was defeated, because, if so, the gentleman who defeated me would be in possession of the seat, but I see that there is a good Liberal sitting for Brant. Therefore, I could not say that the seat was lost, although meanwhile it does not fall to myself. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) made the point that there was no mandate because I was rejected by the people. Did they reject me for a Conservative? If a Conservative had carried the riding, he would be sitting here for that riding now.

Mr. BERGERON. The machine was at work since.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. For him?

Mr. BERGERON. Against him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The courts cannot take away a seat from the representative to whom it belongs. If the people pronounced for a Conservative, where is he? He is not here. The hon. gentleman who was elected by hundreds of a majority to represent that county, stands by this plank. I am here from another county, and I stood upon the same platform. Therefore, although there was a little slip there, the fact that I am here for another county shows that the people want this measure. The urgent mandate of the people cannot be disregarded; it has no right to be disregarded. We have received a mandate to repeal the gerrymander of 1882, and one of the worst features of that gerrymander was in the county of Bruce. One of the amendments that was moved and that was voted down in dumb silence, had reference to the county of Bruce. Mr. Gillies, one of the members for Bruce, which county gave over 600 of a Liberal majority, if I remember aright, until that Bill was passed, moved in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Bruce comprises a population of 64,774 souls, or an average for three ridings of 21,591.

That the said Bill detaches from the north riding of Bruce so large a population as to reduce North Bruce to 18,645, giving West Bruce 24,218, and South Bruce 22,355.

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the boundaries of the proposed three ridings of Bruce.

You can see how they violated the principle that he said was a sacred principle, and when the hon. member moved that and expected that he might get an answer, not a soul answered him. But what was the political effect of it at the time, as described by the gentleman himself. If that township of Saugeen, in which was the village of Port Elgin, had been placed in the north riding of Bruce, then the north riding and the west riding of Bruce would have been nearly equal in population; and if they did not put the township of Saugeen and Port Elgin into North Bruce instead of West Bruce, which would have nearly equalized the population, John Gillies would have to start in the political race with 160 Conservative majority against him. You would think that was tying a man's hands enough, but in spite of all fairness and all decency—I am not accusing the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill), for he was not in the House—they took this township of Saugeen, with 200 or 300 Liberal majority, out of North Bruce, and they put it into West Bruce, that was already a Liberal hive, so that it gave a Liberal majority of 1,100, I think. Mr. Gillies himself moved against that in the House, but it was voted down in silence. In face of that, we having received a mandate from the people that we should rectify these evils, I ask my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) how could we pass the county of Bruce. I think it is possible that in the course of time, in 1901, circumstances may have changed with reference to the population, and I am not prepared to say how the question will look after the census of 1901, as to the contiguity of the townships and the other matters that no doubt fair-minded judges will take into consideration. I will not acknowledge or deny the statement of hon. gentlemen that they are fair divisions now. But, I say, that if as at present constituted, they are fair boundaries with reference to population and contiguity, fair-minded judges will so decide, and no harm will be done. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) say that he has no fear that the judges will make other than fair and equitable divisions.

Mr. McNEILL. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That being the case, there is no grievance there. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the urgency of this Bill is that the people of the country returned the Government to power to pass it, and I say that in this branch of the legislature—and in the Parliament of Canada, too—it is our bounden duty to give effect to the will of the people. If at any time the will of the people changes, and they should return gentlemen opposite to power, to repeal this law, or any other that affects the representation of the people in this House, it will be the bounden duty of these gentlemen to do it provided it is in the constitution. I tell these gentlemen further, that if they introduce such a Bill as we have introduced this Bill, and if they determine that the

divisions within county limits shall be fixed by three judges of the Superior Court, they will not find any Liberal in the Dominion of Canada to object to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Gentlemen opposite seem inclined to ask me questions in reference to this Bill, and in all courtesy I desire to answer them. They apparently think I had something particular to do with it, but the fact is I had very little to do with it. They seem to fasten on the point that Brant is getting two members, that Brant is Liberal, and they forget that there is another gentleman representing Brant more ably than I could, for I am not representing it now, and have no personal object in the Bill. Brant is a Liberal County, and if there be such a majority of Liberals that you cannot divide Brant in any shape which will not give two Liberal members, why should not the people of Brant send to this House the men they want? What injustice can there be in that? I grant you there is an inequality of population, but there is an inequality of population in this Bill we are now repealing, and in a greater degree than there is between Brant and one of the Torontos, which has been instanced. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) himself told us that in the Postmaster General's constituency the population was 20,000, and that the population of West York was 41,000. With this additional representation given to Toronto each member would represent about 36,000 with the added population.

Mr. WALLACE. According to the last estimate, 47,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not with five members. 181,000 divided by five would be 36,000. The amendment before the Chair is to give five members. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) can see that this is approaching the equality which he wants. Let me see the position which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) takes as representing Toronto. Hamilton is the county town of Wentworth, so to speak, and the interests of the people of Wentworth are in Hamilton. Toronto is the centre of York County, and the farmers of York trade there and the public buildings are there, and their interests, the hon. gentleman admits, are identified in a large measure with Toronto. At the present time, under the existing law, which we are seeking to repeal, the city of Toronto, with the county of York—and he admits they are closely identified together—has seven members, and we have now on the Table an amendment that proposes to give these constituencies eight members. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is voting against it, and if not voting against it, he is not supporting it. To be consistent the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) ought to hail this Bill with pleasure. For him to endeavour to destroy this Bill is to destroy our attempt to give the city of Toronto and the county of York one more member than they have at the present time. If the hon. gentleman defeats this Bill, he takes the position that he thinks the city of Toronto and the county of York are over-represented. I leave it with him to determine that point, but I point out to him that, at all events, we are seeking to do justice as far as the city of Toronto and the county of York are concerned.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) has put words in my mouth which I did not use when he said that I declared that the interests of the city of Toronto and the county of York are identical. But be that as it may, I am prepared to accept the statement. He charges me with not doing my duty to the city of Toronto, because I am objecting to this Bill. I am objecting to this Bill, Mr. Chairman, not because it gives Toronto an additional representative, but because it does not give Toronto the representation it is entitled to. That is the reason I am objecting to it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are giving one more member.

Mr. BERGERON. And you are putting in 45,000 more population.

Mr. CLARKE. The statement of the Minister (Mr. Paterson) will not be accepted by any hon. member on either side of the House who looks into the situation. The population of the county of York as at present represented in this House is 97,000, and the population of Toronto as at present represented is about 145,000. The hon. gentleman, who says that the interests of the city and county are identical, is taking 35,000 from the population of the county of York, reducing it to 62,000, and while he continues to give the county a member for each 21,000 of population, he has the hardihood to say that it is fair that that city should have only one representative for 36,000. If he believes that the interests of the city and county are identical, why does he not give the same measure of representation to the city as to the county? He has reduced the unit of representation of that part of the city and county represented by the three Yorks from 32,000 to 21,000, while he has not reduced the unit of representation of the city of Toronto by one; and yet he claims that this measure is doing justice to the city of Toronto and the county of York at the same time. It cannot be doing justice to both, because there is such an inequality in the representation of these two parts, which the hon. gentleman admits are practically one constituency. If he desires to do justice to the city of Toronto, surely we

might ask him to give us eight representatives instead of five. Then he would be giving the same unit of representation to the city of Toronto as to the county of York.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it all.

Mr. CLARKE. We are only asking for representation by population, and if we do not, we shall be judged by our constituents when an opportunity is given to them of expressing an opinion on our conduct. How can the hon. Minister of Customs stand up in this House and justify giving to his own city of Brantford a representative for 18,000 souls, and say that he is doing justice by giving the city of Toronto a representative for 36,000 ? I do not object to the city of Brantford, or the cities of Ottawa, Kingston or Hamilton being represented as they are in this House ; but hon. gentlemen opposite cannot expect to be supported in the city of Toronto if they persist in singling that city out and dealing with it as unjustly as they are doing under this Bill. Would there be any injustice, when they were reducing the population of the county of York by nearly 40,000, if at the same time they reduced the representation of that county by one member, or from three to two ? With its present population of 97,000 and three members, its unit of population is about 32,000, and when the county is gerrymandered as proposed, its population will be reduced to 62,000, so that with two representatives its unit of population would be 31,000? But the reason why that county is still being given three representatives for a population of 62,000, is that hon. gentlemen hope to defeat the members for East York and West York (Mr. Maclean and Mr. Wallace); whereas if they gave the county of York two representatives instead of three, both seats would undoubtedly go to the Opposition. The hon. gentlemen are not doing the city of Toronto any favour by giving it five members, for they are leaving the unit of representation practically as it is now—at 36.000. The hon. gentleman is not stating the case fairly by saying that the Government are doing us justice. If they are doing us justice, they are doing the county of York more than justice ; and in objecting to this clause of the Bill and asking for additional representation for the city of Toronto under these circumstances, we are only doing our duty as representatives of the people of that city.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) a moment ago made a special appeal to me. He wanted to know what was the reason why the county of Bruce was introduced into this Bill, since its county boundaries had not been interfered with by the Act which we are proposing to amend. The inquiry is a fair one, and my hon. friend is entitled to an answer. We are proposing in this Bill to affirm the principle of county boundaries ; but that is not the only principle we are proposing to affirm. We also propose to affirm the principle that when a county is so large that it must be divided, the division shall be made by judicial authority and not by the whim or fancy or selfish interest of interested parties. The Representation Act of 1882, so far as the county of Bruce was concerned, did not violate the principle of county boundaries ; but it violated the other principle by dividing the county in an unfair manner. My hon. friend admitted that himself.

Mr. McNEILL. Oh, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I think he said that taking away the township of Saugeen was unfair.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my right hon. friend pardon me ? I did not state that. What I endeavoured to express to my right hon. friend was this, that it was fair to argue that the township of Saugeen might have been left in the north riding of Bruce at that time, because by leaving it there it would have better equalized the population at the moment ; but I said I thought it was perfectly fair to place that township in the west riding for two reasons : first, because it belonged to the west riding geographically, and, secondly, although at the moment it might cause an inequality of population, yet every one knew that the north riding was increasing in population so rapidly that unless the township of Saugeen were placed in the north riding, at the very next census there must be another interference with boundaries in the county of Bruce, and I thought those two reasons were a sufficient justification for what had been done.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think there is much correction in the statement I made, because my hon. friend says it might have been fair to argue that the township of Saugeen might have been left in the north riding, and that it was unfair to put the township in the west riding. But my hon. friend says that Providence has corrected that iniquity by increasing the population of the north riding. It may be that Providence has done it ; but it would not be quite right or prudent to rely on Providence to correct the iniquities of hon. gentlemen opposite. Although it may be presumption to say that we help Providence in this matter, still it might be as well not to rely on Providence in that respect, but to try to correct by legislation the state of things which my hon. friend says might be held from one point of view to be unfair. I can only re-echo what was said by the Minister of Customs. With regard to my hon. friend himself, there is no intention at all to reach him or anybody else by this Bill. If the county of Bruce is to be represented by a Tory, and the hon. gentleman told us it was sure to be, I confess candidly I would rather have my hon. friend represent it than any other Tory I know of. I do not know that I would say

the same of my hon. friend from West York, but although he is the Toryist of the Tories, if there is to be a Tory in this House from that constituency, I do not know but that I would just as soon have him as anybody else. The object we have in view is not to strike at anybody, but to follow out a principle which we think ought to be observed, not only on this but on all future occasions.

Coming to the statement of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that the Government cannot expect any gratitude from that city on account of this Bill, because we are doing justice to Toronto, I might retort by a similar compliment. He told us that we have left Toronto practically as it is. Well, in that case hon. gentlemen opposite did not do justice to Toronto by their gerrymander Act. Yet, that did not prevent the city of Toronto from electing my hon. friend who is a Conservative. Therefore, if we do not do any better than our predecessors, we do not expect Toronto to treat us any more unfairly than it did the late Government, which likewise failed in doing it justice, according to the hon. gentleman. Up to 1883, the city of Toronto was represented by three members. In 1892 it was given four members. According to the position taken by the hon. member for Toronto, the representation given that city by the Act of 1892 was altogether inadequate. At present, we treat it just as it was treated in 1892. I have repeated again and again that we cannot undertake to cure all the evils that were perpetrated by the Act of 1892, but I will not put the case upon that ground. I must say, candidly and fairly, to my hon. friend, that I still adhere to the view that we cannot, under present circumstances, give the same representation, according to population, to urban as to rural constituencies. If we were to do that, we would have in this country of sparse population, counties which would be equal in extent to kingdoms or empires. If we were to give eight or nine members to Toronto, we would have to add together three or four or five counties, already too large for the convenience of any man who has to represent them. We have to take into consideration the physical conditions of the country. If the hon. gentleman will apply his sense of justice to the case, he must agree with me that to Toronto and Montreal, and the other large centres of population, we must give a less representation, according to population, than to the immense tracts of country where the population is scarce. This seems to me a proposition my hon. friend cannot controvert. What do we do by this Bill? We take about 30,000 from West York, and put them in Toronto, and give Toronto an additional member. That is not an injustice. The 30,000 which we take from the county of West York, and which now elects my hon. friend from West York, will elect another member, and those left in York will continue, I suppose, to elect the hon. gentleman. Is there anything unfair or unjust in that? If we were free to give as many members to a province as we would wish, there would be something in my hon. friend's argument, but he knows that we are not. In the present condition, Ontario cannot have more or less that ninety-two members, and we must find places to put them in. Under the circumstances, I think, therefore, we have done what was possible to give satisfaction, though to give even-handed justice in a matter of this kind is absolutely impossible. I do not think we can do much in improving the Bill. Take what my hon. friend said with regard to Brant and Algoma. He says that we give two members to Brant and only one to Algoma. But if we give two to Algoma we can only give one to Brant, and which is the one that ought to have the two. There is only one argument which might militate in favour of giving two to Algoma, and that is, that it has an increasing population, and probably after the next census, Algoma will have to have two members, and some other constituency, perhaps Brant, will have to lose one. Bearing in mind this consideration, you cannot find any injustice in this measure, though you may find some fault.

Mr. McNEILL. I have to thank my right hon. friend for his courteous reply to the question I asked him. And I have to say to him that I am a little surprised at some of the remarks he has made, and especially one of them. My right hon. friend says that Providence stepped in on behalf of the north riding of Bruce and raised its population to the point at which it ought to be in order to equalize population. He admits that that has been done by Providence, but he says it does not do to leave the matter altogether in the hands of Providence. Now, Providence has done the work, and my right hon. friend seems to think he can do something better than Providence.

The PRIME MINISTER. Help thyself and Heaven will help thee.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend does not know the intention of Providence may be, but he admits that Providence has redressed the grievance. If it has, where is the grievance to-day? That is exactly the answer I made to the hon. member for Brant. He said that there had been an impropriety done, but that that grievance had been redressed. I denied that there had been an impropriety. I say that the course of events was exactly what we said it would be, and it proved that what we did was right and fair at the time. My hon. friend replied by reading the resolution of Mr. Gillies, asking that the township of Saugeen should be placed in the north riding. What answer was that to the contention I put forth? We all know perfectly well that at that time the Reform party contended that the township of Saugeen should be left in the north riding, but by repeating that contention, how

did my hon. friend refute my argument? My argument is, that at the present moment there is no argument assignable for interfering with the county of Bruce. My right hon. friend, in the very courteous answer he made me, admitted as much, because he said that Providence had redressed the grievance. I do think, if he will forgive me for saying so, that he has not met the difficulty at all. The position is just as I put it and as the right hon. gentleman admits it to be—that this Bill is introduced to remedy a grievance in the county of Bruce, which grievance Providence has already redressed. I confess that that is beyond my comprehension, and would be glad if my hon. friend would explain. He said he had a mandate from the people to pass this measure, that his friends in the country had declared that they would enact a law of this kind. Does he say that he has a mandate to pass a measure of this kind eighteen months before the census?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly. If the hon. gentleman asks me, I will tell him that every Liberal representative and every person who voted for the party understood that at the first opportunity after they got into power the Government would introduce this Bill. It is one of the planks of the platform.

Mr. McNEILL. No doubt, they understood that it would be introduced at the first opportunity, but by that they understood the first proper opportunity. But the hon. gentleman can hardly force an argument of that kind upon the committee unless he is prepared to show that he explained to the people what he meant by introducing the Bill at the first opportunity. No one had the right to suppose, and I do not think any one did suppose, he was going to violate every precedent set up in this country for thirty years, unless he expressly explained that that was his intention. The hon. gentleman says that the people are in favour of this Bill. Does the hon. gentlemen say that the people are in favour of a Bill which had never been laid before them? The hon. gentleman will remember that Mr. Gladstone got a majority of the people of the United Kingdom some time ago on the question of Home Rule, but, when he brought down his nefarious measure of Home Rule, and afterwards went back to the people, the people having learned what his measure was, defeated him by the most overwhelming majority known to any person now alive in the United Kingdom. Now, I have merely to repeat what I have already said: I asked my right hon. friend to tell me on what ground he was interfering with the county of Bruce, and his answer was, that something was done in the county of Bruce in 1882, which he thinks should not have been done, as the population was not equalized. The population has been equalized now, and so his excuse for interfering with the county of Bruce is, that an inequality existed in 1882 which does not exist now—a strange excuse!

Mr. BEATTIE. We have heard a good deal about Bruce, Brantford and Toronto, but we have not yet heard anything about the city of London, which I have the honour to represent, and which has more reason to be dissatisfied with this Bill than any constituency in the province of Ontario, and perhaps than any constituency in the Dominion of Canada. Before confederation, the city of London had the same boundary as it has to-day. What is proposed by the present Bill? A piece is to be taken out of East Middlesex, and another piece of South Middlesex, by which the population will be increased to about 40,000, and still we are to be allowed only one member. That I consider most unjust. I have a memorandum here of the population of three other ridings: Leeds and Grenville, 13,200; Frontenac, 13,300, and West Durham, 13,500. These, all taken together, would hardly make more than the city of London, included in the present Bill. Why not amalgamate two of those counties, and give London one more member? I do not intend to speak at any length. I do not think that anything I can say would make the Government change their minds at this time of day. But I take it as a great compliment that the Government think I am capable of representing the large constituency I shall have under this Bill, larger, probably, than that represented by any other member of this House.

Mr. McCLEARY. The Minister of Customs gave me a very unsatisfactory answer to a question I asked him, and I am going to appeal to the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Minister of Customs sends me off on a missionary tour to convert three hundred Grits, consoling me with the remark that he was compelled to convert that many Tories that had been gerrymandered into his riding some twenty years gone by. I have made two trips of that kind in the county of Welland, and I am not asking for any more. It was quite satisfactory to me to be able to take an adverse majority of between two hundred and three hundred and turn it over into a Conservative majority of somewhere in the neighbourhood of 200. But I do not care to get 300 or 400 Grits in addition. The question I asked of the Minister of Customs was this: On what principle of justice—because he says this is a Bill based upon justice—does this Bill interfere with the old county of Welland, which since confederation had included within its electoral bounds the townships of Bertie, Crowland, Humberstone, Stamford, Thorold and Willoughby, and the villages of Chippewa, Clifton, Fort Erie, Thorold and Welland?

Why, they could bring into it two municipalities with over 6,000 people that never voted in it, that were never connected with it for electoral purposes in any way. On what principle of justice can that be accounted for if it was not, as I said before, to give an unfair advantage to the Liberal party? Now, it will not do to say, as the Minister of Customs has said, that they told the people they were going to restore the county boundaries, and they are doing it now to redeem their pledges. Goodness knows that they told the people a whole lot of things that they were going to do, and they have not done them. As a matter of fact they never told the people that they would use their strength to gerrymander the province in their own interest, I don't believe they ever said they would do that. They may have said that they would do away with what they called the old Franchise Bill, and everybody understood that if they came into power they would do so. Now, I want to know on what principle of justice the county of Welland should have a population of 6,000 people added to it. which has already, if a census were taken to-day, 28,000 or 30,000.

Mr. BERGERON. This Bill has been introduced by the Prime Minister, and as neither the Minister of Customs nor the Postmaster General will give an answer to my hon. friend from Welland, perhaps, the right hon. gentleman will do so. I imagine also that the man who could best answer the question is the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer is in the Bill. The county of Welland is made an electoral district as constituted for municipal purposes.

Mr. GIBSON. As the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) says that perhaps I would be in a better position to answer the member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) than the Minister of Customs, I may be allowed to say a word upon this matter. Of all the silly questions the member for Welland has asked across the floor of this House, I never heard anything like this in my life. I have this to say to the hon. member for Welland. Since confederation, the township of Pelham has been in the county of Welland, and is in the county of Welland to-day. His friends saw fit some years ago to create the county of Monck, and Pelham was made a part and parcel of it. His friends in 1892 saw fit to wipe out Monck, and they gave the township of Pelham to me. I am not whining because I am going to lose 300 Grit votes, but my hon. friend is whining because he is going to receive 300 Grit votes. Now, the condition of things is this, and the member for Welland ought to be manly enough and decent enough to inform the House that the township of Pelham, for legislative purposes, is in the county of Monck; the township of Pelham, for judicial and municipal purposes, is now and always has been in the county of Welland; and the township of Pelham, for Dominion purposes, is in the county of Lincoln. Now, is there such another case in the whole Dominion of Canada that one township for different purposes is in three counties? When that township was put into the county of Lincoln, I felt in going over to meet these people that they were being imposed upon, in being put into the county of Lincoln. That township belongs to the county of Welland, and no man in this House knows that better than the hon. gentleman from Welland. But he wants to throw a straw across the floor of the House by saying that he wants to know why. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he will stand up in this House and say that the township of Pelham, for judicial and municipal purposes, is not in the county of Welland, and that an exception is being made in this case to all the others. I fancy the member for Beauharnois will probably give me credit for having something to do with this matter. I want to say to the committee that I never saw that Bill until I borrowed it from the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). So far as I am personally concerned, the loss is on my side, because I am going to lose 300 Liberal supporters. But remember what led up to all this. In 1882 the county of Lincoln, which I now have the honour to represent, was represented in this House by Mr. J. C. Rykert. Mr. Rykert found that the county was slipping from under his feet, and he asked that the townships of Caistor and Grimsby, which have always belonged to the county of Lincoln, should be put into Wentworth, and that was done, so that he might have an easy and larger majority, because both of these townships were Liberal. I am sorry the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is not here, because, perhaps, he could give some explanation why the township of Pelham and Gainsboro' were put into Lincoln; and, perhaps, the member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) could tell something about those changes that have been made. They were made in the interest of these two gentlemen, because in dividing up the county of Monck, which was represented in this House by a gentleman who now occupies the position of collector of customs at Niagara Falls, the Tory townships were taken care of by the member for Haldimand and the member for Norfolk, and the two Liberal townships were put into my riding. Why? To keep a certain gentleman out of this House, as I understood the matter. But the effect was to keep the member for Haldimand and the member for Norfolk solid in the ridings they represented. I am satisfied to lose the 300 majority that the township of Pelham gives me, and give back the county of Lincoln as it existed and does exist to-day for judicial and municipal purposes. I am willing to

take my chances, and if there are any gentlemen in this House who have a right to squeal over the loss of 300 votes, I am one of them. But before the townships of Pelham and Gainsborough had been added to the county of Lincoln I had an adverse Conservative majority of 487 to commence my parliamentary career with. I came back to this House after the by-election, with a majority of 200 above my majority in the first election. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take my chances. I want to say that to no member in this House or out of it did I ever suggest directly or indirectly either to take the township of Pelham out of Lincoln or to put any other township into Lincoln. I was satisfied that the Government, knowing the feelings of the Liberal party throughout Canada, would restore the county boundaries according to the promises made by the Liberal party in convention assembled in this city in 1893.

Mr. McCLEARY. When I point out a few facts to the committee, my hon. friend from Lincoln will not appear such a manly man as he tries to make himself out to be. He speaks as if he is willing to lose his 300 Liberal votes with a heroism that is worthy of his race. He says that he is ready to face the county deprived of these 300 Liberal votes. If he wanted to be manly and fair why does he not say that by this Bill there is being added to him within 11 votes of the majority he got from the township of Pelham at the last election ?

Mr. GIBSON. Give me the numbers, please.

Mr. McCLEARY. The township of Caistor and the two Grimsbys will give you a majority that is within eleven of that which you got in Pelham.

Mr. GIBSON. Not by 150.

Mr. McCLEARY. That shows how manly the hon. gentleman is. The hon. gentleman said that I shoud have been decent enough to have said certain things that I did not say regarding Welland. I am not going to say a word in reference to the propriety of my conduct in this House. I try to conduct myself in a manner that is becoming to a representative of the people in this Parliament. When I am looking for a lesson in decency and propriety, I shall not go to the hon. member for Lincoln for it. What I stated was this : That the electoral riding of Welland consisted of the townships I mentioned under the Confederation Act, and I said that the townships of Pelham and Wainfleet were never connected with it for electoral purposes since confederation. I never said that they were not there for municipal purposes.

Mr. GIBSON. You never said they were?

Mr. McCLEARY. Everybody who knows anything about the history of the country, knows that.

Mr. GIBSON. No, everybody does not.

Mr. McCLEARY. If they do not they ought to know it. The hon. gentleman has not been fair enough to state that Pelham and Wainfleet to-day are not in Welland for the local legislature, but they are in Monck. That is a constituency that was made up at the time of confederation, and these two municipalities went into Monck. I have nothing to say regarding the gerrymander of 1892, although the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) owes his seat in this House to-day to the addition of 300 Liberal votes in Pelham. I do not think he complained much about it at the time they were put in. One sure thing is that if they had not been there in 1896 he would not have been sitting here as a member of Parliament.

Mr. GIBSON. What is that ?

Mr. McCLEARY. I said that but for the gerrymander of 1892——

Mr. COWAN. That is a good name for it ; you have let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. McCLEARY—in 1896 the hon. gentleman could not have been elected. The old riding of Lincoln polled a majority against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson). I have not got an answer, and the hon. member for Lincoln has not said on what principle of justice the old county of Welland has been interfered with in this Bill. Probably the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) knows something about it. He had a great deal to say when he moved the second reading of the Bill, but, apparently, he has been shorn of his powers of speech, but, possibly, he may be able to enlighten us as to why the old county of Welland should be enlarged to the extent that it is going to be by this Bill, unfairly and unjustly.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Mr. Chairman, I do not see the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in his seat. He seems to be about the only defender of this gerrymander. The right hon. First Minister has given a very uncertain defence of this Bill, while the promoter of the Bill, the Postmaster General, is ostentatiously computing figures of the Post Office Department, or reading a novel, or attending to anything except the business that is engaging the attention of the committee. He does not appear to be able to give us any information about the Bill of which he is the father, and in regard to which he promised to furnish us with all kinds of information. The hon. Minister of Customs, who was defending the Bill, did not know anything about it, but he was rehearsing his old speeches of 1882, 1883 and 1884. He even got tired of that, and now we do not see his pleasant and smiling face in the House. I was going to refer to a few figures, and as an hon. gentleman said to me—but I dare not

repeat it in Parliament, because the language would be unparliamentary, and the hon. member who stated it to me would be very properly ruled out of Parliament if I should repeat in the mildest terms the language he used in regard to the hon. Minister of Customs. What did that hon. gentleman say? He said that Bruce had 600 of a clear Liberal majority at the time this gerrymander took place. I have the records of the last previous election, that of 1878, when there were two constituencies in Bruce. Mr. Gillies, Liberal, in North Bruce, got 1,205, and Mr. Sproat, Conservative, 1,549. In South Bruce, Mr. Blake, Liberal, got 2,598 votes, and Mr. Shaw, Conservative, 3,673. Add those figures together and it gives a total of 4,303 Liberal votes and 4,222 Conservative votes, making a Liberal majority of eighty-one. Yet the hon. Minister of Customs gets up in this House and roars like a bull and says, look at this 600 of a Liberal majority. The figures here are eighty-one, and he cannot increase them by one vote. That is a sample of the statements that have been made by the hon. Minister of Customs. About Bruce he would explain, and explain again and again, and he said that poor Gillies was robbed of his constituency. What are the facts about Bruce, anyway? By the census of 1881 there were 39,000 people in South Bruce and 25,000, in round numbers, in North Bruce. The Government recognized that in their Redistribution Bill of 1882, and they made a redistribution which, by the latest census, appears to me to be as close and accurate an adjustment, so as to recognize the principle of representation by population, as could be expected in any county. What are figures? South Bruce, 21,355; West Bruce, 22,377; North Bruce, 20,821—not one of the three a thousand away from the unit of population. That is a remarkably fair division of the county, and yet we are treated to denunciations by the yard, because the Government in the past made that division which the judges cannot in equity change to-day. No wonder the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) demands why the Government should propose to interfere with his constituency. The Minister of Customs referred to the majority I had in the elections of 1896, but every one knows the peculiar circumstances of that, and that it is never likely to be repeated again. I shall be always well satisfied with a majority of a few hundreds in West York, even if you, Mr. Chairman, (Mr. Campbell) should be my opponent. The Minister of Customs talked of my having a 4,000 majority, and, with his invariable inaccuracy, he was quoting figures for the county of York for a portion of the constituency that will be added to the city of Toronto, if this Bill becomes law. He was blundering all through, and I challenge the accuracy of his figures, and can prove he was wrong, if necessary. What are the facts? West York, before 1878, had been a Grit hive for twenty-four years, and whenever there was a square contest between the two party candidates, the Liberals carried the county. It was known to be a Liberal stronghold, but the people got their eyes opened, and greater intelligence was disseminated among them, I have no doubt, and so they came to think that they should not be Liberals any longer. But West York has never been recognized as a Tory constituency, although it was becoming Tory very rapidly, and so the Government proposes now to take almost all the Conservative votes out of it, and make it a Liberal constituency in reality, if they got their way here. The Minister of Customs spoke about my having 4,000 majority. But what were the circumstances? There were two candidates against me, but neither of these got the confidence of any considerable portion of the electorate, and that condition is not likely to arise again, every one knows that it cannot be cited as a fair example for the future, and nobody knows it better than the Minister of Customs. The Government have no excuse for introducing this Bill, which they themselves admit is not perfect, and which violates every great principle, amongst others, the principle of representation by population, which is the true basis of representation. Take each succeeding Redistribution Act, and you will find that the principle of representation by population has been more closely adhered to. We are moving in that direction, although it is true we may not be going fast enough, but still we are continually aiming at the goal. The true principle is that 20,000 people in one locality should have the same rights as 20,000 in another locality. The old system of representation in Great Britain, which gave rise to so many scandals, was based on the principle that 3,000 people in one locality should have a member, and 50,000 in another should have but one member. In England every succeeding measure of redistribution is in the direction of representation by population, but the Bill introduced by this Government is putting the hands on the dial of the clock backwards. It is the old system of recognizing no principle, because sticking to county boundaries is no principle. The provincial government can change county boundaries at their own sweet will, and yet we are asked to fall down and worship this fetish of county boundaries. What is there sacred about county boundaries? The principle of representation by population is the true principle, and the only one that can be justified before the people. I deny that the Government is giving fair-play to the city of Toronto. The ex-mayor (Mr. Clarke) told us to-night that Toronto now has a population of 235,000, but the Government, in this Bill, propose to go back to a condition of affairs

that existed nine years ago. If they were just, their legislation should be up to date. The judges are compelled to ignore existing conditions, as the Government have ignored existing conditions, and they have to shut their eyes to all the progress of Canada in nine years. I protest, as I have protested before, and as the sober sense of this country will continue to protest, against this, the most absurd piece of legislation that was ever proposed to be enacted by any Parliament in this country.

The Minister of Customs, when he was asked the reason for this legislation, said: "It is because we have a mandate from the people, and we have to obey that mandate." Among all the members on that side, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Customs are the two who, in season and out of season, preached against the Gerrymander Bill of 1882. I never heard the First Minister make a speech condemning that measure except in the most casual way; but it was the whole stock-in-trade of these two gentlemen for fifteen or sixteen years. The mandate they got in the last election was to stay at home, both of them. These gentlemen got no mandate in that direction, and they will find it out. These gentlemen came into power, not on their own merits, or by an approval of their own policy, but as I contend on account of the mistakes of the Conservative Government of that day. Now, in these counties, as to which the Minister of Customs has made the strongest statements about the iniquities of the Redistribution Bill, the sound principle of representation by population, which permeates all the measures of the Conservative party, has been recognized. Do this Government attempt to adopt any such principle in this Bill? No; the Postmaster General told us that they would scatter the principle of representation by population to the four winds, and he argued that the Conservative party had not recognized that principle either. I contradict that statement. The Bill of 1882, the wrongs of which the hon. gentleman said he particularly desired to redress, was a marvellous exhibition of justice in that direction. Hon. members opposite have been challenged to point out a single case in which a Grit was defeated by that Bill. The Minister to-night said that John Gillies, in North Bruce, was one; but there was a righteous distribution in that county. In South Bruce, by the census of 1891, there were 21,350; in West Bruce, 22,377, and in North Bruce, 20,871.

Mr. McNEILL. The Bill of 1892 established North Bruce with a population of 22,000 and West Bruce with a population of 20,000 odd.

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking of the redistribution of 1892. There is no justice whatever for any change or submission to the judges in that direction. We do not oppose this or that clause but the whole Bill. It was stated to-night that no lawyer in this House had said it was not constitutional. Well, I listened with interest and attention to the argument last night of the hon. member for Halifax and the whole tenor of that argument was that the Bill is unconstitutional. I have therefore his authority which is a very sound one, because he is recognized as a sound constitutional lawyer in this House. We say this Bill is not required and that it is unconstitutional. We say it violates every principle of fair-play, that it violates a principle upon which representation should take place and that is according to population. What will be the result if unfortunately this Bill should become law. It will set an example to one political party that is apt to be followed either by the opposite political party or the same political party. If by their system of gerrymander hon. gentlemen opposite find they have gained a party advantage, what is to prevent them, should they be fortunate enough to be returned at the next general election, from redistributing the seats again three years later in order to make their return more secure. This Bill is only a flea bite compared to what they would do then, or to quote the words of that distinguished statesman, the Minister of Public Works, "See what we do next year." We are only touching the edges now, but after the next decennial census we will take the whole 91 constituencies and make every one of them, if such a thing could be done, or the majority at any rate Liberal constituencies. We protested against the Bill by our vote last night, and will continue to protest.

Mr. BENNETT. Early in the evening I appealed to the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Customs—the right hon. Prime Minister was not here—to consider the claim of Simcoe to four representatives. I pointed out that it would be an utter impossibility on the part of the judge to so arrange the three constituencies that each one would have a population of 24,000. The hon. Minister of Customs asked me if I could make a suggestion as to where a seat might be dropped in the province so as to allow four to Simcoe. The right hon. First Minister a little while ago advanced the proposition that cities should not have as large a representation according to population as rural districts. I beg then to call his attention to the fact that the city of Kingston has about 19,000 of a population, according to the census and adjoining the county of Frontenac, between 14,000 and 15,000. Here is a case where two constituencies might be united so as to make a fairly reasonably sized constituency. Kingston and Frontenac together would then make a constituency of about 33,000 of a population. The three ridings of East Simcoe have a population respectively of 23,000,

27,000 and 34,000, and having pointed out a fair case of a joining together of two other constituencies and the allotment of four members to Simcoe I would ask consideration to the fairness of that scheme.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I would like to add whatever weight I can to the claim which my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has advanced. I realize the force of what the right hon. First Minister has said, that the number of constituencies in Ontario being fixed at 92 makes it difficult for us to give increased representation to any one in particular. But Simcoe is certainly a very large county, and upon the unit of 21,000 or 22,000 would be entitled to four seats, and I would ask that the Government regard this request for an additional representative for that constituency as a serious one so far as I am concerned. Perhaps the representations of the two other members for North Simcoe, who have referred to me, cannot be treated so seriously. The redistribution of seats is based upon the census which caused the redistribution of 1891 or 1892, and in that case and on that occasion neither of these hon. gentlemen protested or asked for an increase. The hon. member for East Simcoe did ask that his constituency should be reduced in size by requesting that the township of Muskoka should be struck off. Nevertheless every hon. member has a right to change his mind, and if the hon. gentleman thinks now that the late Government did not treat Simcoe as it should, he is justified in asking for proper treatment by this Government, and I would ask the Government to seriously consider that question.

While I am on my feet, I would like to correct a statement that was made with reference to the part which the late member for North Simcoe took in framing the Redistribution Act of 1882, and in so doing I hope I will not be considered as laying myself open to the charge of speaking of necropolitan politics. But the right hon. leader of the Opposition said "hear, hear," to the statement of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), that the late member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was the framer of what he called that iniquitous measure and which I likewise described in similar terms. On page 3786 of vol. 2 of the "Hansard" of 1892, I find that in reply to the charge that he had had a great deal to do with that Bill, he said :

> But I deny and repudiate the charge that I had anything to do with framing the Bill of 1882, except in suggesting the propriety of splitting the riding of North Simcoe, which I then represented, into the present ridings of North and East Simcoe.

I think it ill-became these hon. gentlemen to suggest that the late member for Simcoe was guilty of being the framer of that Bill in view of the fact that in his lifetime he repudiated the charge, and no man dared on that occasion to question the truthfulness of his statement. The two hon. members for the Simcoes are my seniors. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt), a personal friend of mine, has been in this House a long time and has done me the honour to say that he has watched my career. I take this opportunity of telling him and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that if either of them will propose an amendment to the present Bill asking that four representatives be given in the county of Simcoe, I will be pleased to support it.

Mr. SPROULE. Move it yourself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not see that it is incumbent on the junior member of the county to move such a resolution. I state what I think is true and what I think is right. As it is in accordance with the belief of these two members, and as they are the seniors, and as they have first mooted the question, it would be more becoming of them to move the resolution. I desire, if I may be permitted, to say a word on behalf of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Stubbs), who has been called away by telegram owing to illness in his family. I stated that I thought there were grave doubts whether Cardwell should be wiped out. Bothwell stands in the same position, and so I say the same of Bothwell. To-night when the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) referred to my hon. friend from Cardwell having his seat wiped out by this Bill, I heard an hon. member say, "It served him right." Now, if it served the hon. member for Cardwell right, equally it served the hon. member for Bothwell right. These things should be looked at from a purely non-partisan standpoint. If a community of interests has been created since confederation in Cardwell and in Bothwell, sufficient to entitle them to continue their existence as a county, for representation in this House, though not a county for judicial purposes, I would ask the Government to pause at this point before finally deciding to wipe out these constituencies.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) to impute to me the motive that I was not considering this matter seriously. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He is mistaken also in saying that I referred to him in the course of the debate. I did not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I referred to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt.)

Mr. BENNETT. I can assure the hon. gentleman I was quite serious, and so far as indulging in the formality of making a motion, it amounts to this—in the case of Toronto, the suggestion was made that the change should be made and the Government acted upon it. And in the present case, I make the suggestion that the Bill should be amended so as to give four seats to Simcoe.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). I have not hitherto said anything on this Bill. If there is a county in Ontario that had cause to complain of the gerrymander of 1882, that county was Huron ; for it was gerrymandered in the most shameful manner. The redistribution was made entirely for the purpose of gaining party advantages. It was not made here in Ottawa by the Government of the day. A copy of the Bill was sent to Huron, and one meeting was held, but no arrangement was come to. I heard one of the strongest partisans in Huron admit that he was one of the parties who had gerrymandered the county, that he had lived in it all his life and he had put his knowledge to the best advantage for the Conservative party, so that they might secure at least two seats and leave the Reformers only one. They gerrymandered South Huron so as to make it a Liberal hive. They took Usborne out of South Huron and put it into North Perth. Mr. Trow's majority in South Perth was 77. They took North-east Hope, with a Liberal majority of 193, out of South Perth and put it into Middlesex, leaving Mr. Trow with a Conservative majority of 115. But the respectable Conservatives of South Perth were so indignant that at the next election they returned Mr. Trow with a large majority. That was not all. The township of Stephen was taken out of Huron and put into North Middlesex. Then the town of Exeter was taken out of Huron and put into Middlesex. The county of Middlesex, with a population of 58,000 was given four members, whereas Huron with a population of 66,000 was given only three. Three municipalities with a population of 8,608 were taken away from Huron. If justice had been done to the county of Huron at that time, if an extra member was to be given, it should have been given to Huron instead of to Middlesex, because Huron had a population of 8,400 more than Middlesex. Even after the redistribution was made, they took that part of the village of Lucknow that belonged to the county of Huron, with a Reform majority of thirty-nine, and put it into South Bruce, which was then a Reform constituency. So far as population is concerned, the county of Huron before the gerrymander of 1882, was as follows : North riding, population, 21,862 ; centre riding, population, 22,781 ; south riding, population, 21,512. That was just as equal a distribution then as it was possible to make of Huron. In 1882 they put into the north riding 23,512. That was not equalizing the population. In East Huron they put 21,001, and in South Huron 21,991. Now, Sir, one of the reasons why they gerrymandered Centre Huron was that we had one of the ablest statesmen of Canada at that time representing that riding. The gerrymander took place and there was no riding of Centre Huron left. It had had a Reform majority of 231 in the previous election, but it was gerrymandered out of existence. So it is manifest that the Government of that day were striking, as far as possible, at political opponents, to put them out of the political arena, as far as they could. But the county of Huron, although it was gerrymandered, returned two Conservatives for one election. The indignation of the respectable Conservatives was such that in North Huron which the Government thought they had made perfectly safe, they returned a Reform member for one election. In West Huron it was the same, the respectable Conservatives felt indignant that such gerrymandering should take place, because only a few of the heelers had taken occasion to gerrymander the county.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Government have no mandate from the people to press this Bill through Parliament. There was a large organization in Ontario in the last election known as the Patrons. There were among them Conservatives and Reformers, and they unanimously called for a redistribution of the ridings. This is the first opportunity the Government has had to press forward this Bill. If the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite are correct, and as soon as an appeal is made to the people, the people will turn the Government out of place and power ; there will be no other opportunity. Then, hon. gentlemen would turn round and tell the Government that they had not fulfilled their promises to the people by doing away with the gerrymander of the ridings. I hold that the Government was pledged in 1893, in the city of Ottawa, in the platform then laid down. The Patrons also asked for a redistribution, and in this instance the Government are only fulfilling their pledges to the people. I may mention that, before I came down to the present session, a good many Conservatives in the county of Huron asked me if there was to be a Redistribution Bill introduced this session. Many respectable Conservatives expressed a strong wish that such a measure should be introduced, and said it was the duty of the Government to do so, in order to fulfil the promises that they had made.

Now, it has been said that the county of Huron is the county of gerrymanders, and that the Mowat Government made the most shameful gerrymander there that ever was made in the province of Ontario. Let me say that the redistribution made by the Mowat Government in the county of Huron was one of the most equal arrangements that it was possible to make. The only thing they did was to cut the township of Hullett in two, and the township of Goderich in two, and to-day Huron is one of the most compact ridings possible. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said the other night that if the municipality had not been divided, Mr. Garrow would have been defeated in West Huron, because he had only one of a majority outside the township of Hullett, in the west end, which gave him 40 of a majority. But the hon. gentleman did not mention the township of Goderich, as part of which was

taken from the south riding and put in the west riding, and which gave 75 Conservative majority that Mr. Garrow had to face. I hold that the division made by the Mowat Government was one of the most just that could possibly be made. So far as population was concerned, there was 26,248 in the east riding, 26,478 in the south, and 25,234 in the west. Now take the number of electors. There were 5,559 in the south, 6,190 in the east, and 6,290 in the west. So, whether you take it by population or by the number of voters, it was not possible to make a more equal distribution. I hold that even if the municipalities had not been divided, the Conservatives, according to the vote that had been cast, never would have had an extra member in the county of Huron.

The gerrymander that took place in 1882 was one of the most disgraceful that was ever made, and that of 1892 was along the same lines, and only carried out to a fuller extent the gerrymander of 1882. Let me read the opinion of the late lamented member for Simcoe, Mr. Dalton McCarthy :

> It could not be defended upon the ground of the equalization of population, nor on the ground of preserving county boundaries, and it could not be defended on the ground of justice. The redistribution did not secure equality of population, it ignored community of interests, it disregarded geographical compactness, and rendered stability impossible, and it afforded an opportunity to arrange the districts for party ends.

That was what was done, both in 1882 and 1892. I am glad there is not a single member of the Opposition to-day who has stood up and defended the gerrymander of 1882. I have not heard one say that it was a just measure. All they say is, that there is no necessity for the present redistribution, and that the country is not suffering. In the south riding of Huron I shall not be placed in as strong a position as I am to-day, so this Redistribution Bill will be of no advantage to me. I was put in one of the Grit hives, and justice is only now being done to that riding by this Bill. We will have now 66,000 population, and we only had some 58,000 at the last election ; so that we will have just about the unit of population in the county of Huron. It cannot be said that the bench of judges will make a redistribution for party purposes. Our hon. friends opposite were always supposed to be loyal to the judges, but I have heard a hint by some of them that they think the judges will not do justice. For my part, I have perfect confidence in the judges of the Superior Courts of the Dominion of Canada, that they will not lend themselves to a gerrymander in any shape or form for party purposes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I did not intend to take any part in the discussion this evening, preferring rather to listen to the views of others ; but since my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has desired me to express some views more particularly, I suppose, with regard to his own observations, I will, out of respect to that hon. gentleman, meet his wishes. I am glad to find hon. gentlemen opposite giving evidence of a belief that some principle other than mere party interest should govern the redistribution of representation. Just now they are paying a great deal of homage to the principle of representation by population. The hon. member for West York to-night declared that regard for equality of population was the keystone of the system of representation, and that every change that had taken place in the way of redistribution, under the control of the Conservative party, had been dominated by respect for the principle. Now, I have said that, not since confederation was population regarded by any Government that had to do with redistributing the constituencies, as a dominating principle. Whatever were the principles, certainly the equalization of population was not the controlling one. I am not quarrelling with that doctrine, because I do not recognize it ; it is not recognized in this Bill, and it has not been recognized since Canada has had representative institutions. It has never been recognized in Great Britain that the equalization of population was to prevail over all other considerations. It is not the principle in England to-day ; it never has been the principle where institutions fashioned after those of England existed. I will read, in support of that proposition, an extract from Professor Hearn's "Government of England," page 501 :

> The electoral franchise has never been in England regarded as a purely personal right, and has never been exercised upon exclusively personal qualifications. Our electors have always voted, not because they were men, or even because they were Englishmen ; but because they were freeholders of a particular county, or because they were citizens or burgesses of a particular city or town. Their right is circumscribed by locality. We do not elect our representative as the Athenians elected their Archons, as the French elected their Emperor, and as the Americans elect their President. We do not take the vote of every elector, irrespective of all other electors, for all the members of the House of Commons. According to the method which has at all times been in use with us, each locality undertakes the duty of furnishing to the representative branch of the legislature a specified number of members. Thus our system of representation is the representation not of interests or of opinions, or of population, but of population organized. Hitherto that organization has had chiefly, although not exclusively, a territorial form. In other words, our representative system has been mainly the representation of districts. It regards men not merely as men, but as neighbours. In one sense it is obviously true that a district cannot have other rights than those of the people who inhabit it. But the rights of a district are those of its organized population. Its inhabitants, by virtue of their residence, have, as compared with the inhabitants of other places, separate habits, and inter-

ests, and associations, peculiar views of public affairs, and peculiar sympathies and mode of thought. These distinctive habits and feelings produce a distinctive character. The individuality, the independent life, of each political body is established; and it acquires and desires to express its special shade of feeling and of thought.

Subsequently you find that he proceeds to refer to the subject of population, giving it a subsidiary position in regard to those considerations that should prevail when arranging boundaries. That doctrine has always been respected in Canada, and was respected on the occasion that the hon. member for West York refers to when the rearrangement of the ridings was made in 1882. These hon. gentlemen who, to-day, are worshipping equalization, have had a very late conversion to that doctrine. In 1872 the Conservative Government, then in power, introduced and passed a measure redistributing the ridings. Without going into the details at any length, I would say that in the province of Ontario the population of one riding was 2,941, and that by an ascending scale the population of other constituencies increased until it reached 23,719 in the riding with the highest population. So much for uniformity and the equalization principle in the redistribution of 1872. I take now the redistribution of 1882, to which the hon. member for York refers. The unit of population after the census of 1881 was 20,904, and if you allow a margin of 3,000, counting anything within that as within the unit, and if we say that anything between 19,000 and 22,000 is within the unit, let us see how this sacred principle, that the hon. gentlemen refers to, was respected. The census of 1881 was followed by the Redistribution Bill of 1882, which affected fifty-nine constituencies.

Mr. WALLACE. It affected forty-six constituencies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think my figures are correct, and I make it fifty-nine. In forty-one cases the population was altogether beyond the unit, either too high or too low. In only eighteen of the constituencies, as the result of the redistribution of 1882, was the population between 19,000 and 22,000, allowing the hon. gentleman a margin of 3,000. They seemed to manifest not the slightest regard for the equalization of population. In 1892, when another redistribution took place, instead of having the population of each riding equal, or nearly equal, there were only twenty-two constituencies whose population in any way conformed to the unit of population, while in regard to seventy of them, the unit of population was altogether disregarded. So grossly was the question of the equalization of population disregarded under the Act of 1882, that in one of the constituencies that had been changed there was left a population of only 12,000, while in another constituency there was a population of 29,000. What becomes of this new-born respect for the equalization of population, when we turn to the exact facts? We have the hon. gentleman's unsupported statements, but the record is against them. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), last night, with frankness, gave expression to his action in connection with the attachment or annexation of Saugeen to West Bruce in 1882. He confessed that he had advised the attachment of Saugeen to West Bruce, and to quote his words, said:

I wish to say further that in making that recommendation I was partly swayed by considerations of a political and party nature. As long as these matters are left in the hands of the two parties, each party will be swayed less or more by political considerations; and if two possible divisions, fairly good divisions, can be made, the party in power will always select the division which suits its own party interest best, and if in doing that it does not do anything that is unjust, it is entitled to do it as long as the matter is left in the hands of the parties.

Mr. McNEILL. Just read the next sentence, please.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL.—

I do not think it should be left in the hands of the parties at all.

I am glad the hon. gentleman approves of that part of our Bill, and I thought he would see the whole of the Bill in a fairer light. As an illustration of the principle that cities have not always the ful measure of representation that rural populations have, I may say that, even to-day in England, where the unit of population, according to the last census, is 59,000, there are seven constituencies with a population under 18,000, and there are seven constituencies with a population of over 100,000, each having one representative. So that there is in England a precedent for inequality, but there is a precedent in our own country, and a precedent furnished by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for West York says that whenever they touched a constituency they brought about the equalization of population. Under the Redistribution Act of 1882 they did not rearrange all the constituencies in Quebec, but if they had the power to do so and if they did not do so, they are responsible for the condition in which they left the constituencies, whether they touched them or not. In dealing with Montreal they left East Montreal, with a population of 67,000, represented by one member, and the constituency of Centre Montreal with a population of 25,000. That condition of affairs continued down to 1896, when the population of East Montreal was nearly 100,000, and yet it was represented by only one member in this House until the present Parliament. Yet the hon. gentleman tells us that his party has regard for the principle of representation by population. There can be but one opinion in the country about this Bill, and that is

that it proposes to make restitution to the people, and proposes to restore county boundaries according to the pledge of the Liberal party. At the Liberal Convention in 1893, we passed a resolution pledging the Liberal party on the first available occasion to wipe out that portion of the gerrymander Bill, and that occasion has now arrived. We are redeeming our pledge, not perhaps to the full, but if gentlemen opposite are solicitous to have the whole province of Ontario redistributed now, we will make their suggestions and they will receive the fullest considerations.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you opposed to the present amendment?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am supporting the Bill and I am supporting the amendment, and I hope to convert my hon. friends to do likewise. Since my hon. friend seems anxious, I will not detain him any longer to-night, but, if necessary, I will take part in the discussion on some future occasion. In reply to the observations of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that the Conservatives rearranged the ridings in 1882 with sacred regard to population, and the convenience of the people, I would ask him, does he seriously mean that? Does he honestly believe that North Ontario was cut out to suit the convenience of the people? North Ontario began at the Island of Scugog, several miles down in the south riding; the township of Scugog, separated by several miles from the North riding, to which it was electorally attached, and North Ontario, extending from four miles in width to about ten miles in width and nearly 150 miles in length——

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) wishes to be fair, does he not know that the municipal county of Ontario is precisely the shape he described it now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) does not understand what took place. Permit me to inform him that the redistribution of 1882 added to North Ontario a number of municipalities that are not part of the municipal county of Ontario. How can the hon. gentleman say that North Ontario was composed with regard for geographical shape.

Mr. CLANCY. As nearly as possible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then they must have had a very difficult task of it. In this Bill we strike at the abolition of the eight hives that were created by the Act of 1882, and which ever since have robbed the constituencies of a portion of the electorate that should belong to them, and which have thrown together bodies of electors who had no common interest. There were these forty-odd changes in 1882 to create these hives, and if it involves as many changes to undo that, it is not our fault, but the fault of the previous Government. We have a few counties that are not strong enough in population to admit of more than one representative, and among them is the county of Welland. To accomplish this we have had to propose changes that are adverse to our opponents and also to our friends. We have many friends on this side of the House who are just as seriously prejudiced by this measure as are gentlemen opposite, but we are proceeding upon the principle of justice. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) should welcome this measure, because he has expressed himself as having much appreciation for a leading feature in it. No proposal made to Parliament since the Dominion existed offers better safeguards against the abuse hereafter, than the proposition that the rearangement of constituencies shall no longer be left in the political arena of Parliament, but shall be transferred to an independent tribunal of judges of the Superior Court. That feature alone ought to commend this measure, and I expected that it should have overcome all the other objections of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and secured his hearty approval.

Mr. McNEILL. I came back to the House for the purpose of asking a question from my right hon. friend. May I ask the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether the judges are to be appointed by the Government, or whether they are to be selected by the judges themselves. If the judges are to be appointed by the Government, would my right hon. friend kindly tell us, as he intimated he would, what are the names of the judges to be appointed?

The PRIME MINISTER. The judges are to be appointed by the Government. We have made no selection yet, and I am not prepared at this moment to give the names we intend to ask.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman promised to give the names some time ago.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say I am not prepared to do so this evening. I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Mr. HAGGART. What business will the hon. gentleman take up to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. To-morrow we will take up the same Bill which we have had under consideration to-day; and, as the discussion has been very exhaustive, we hope to finish at an early hour, and then take up Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a. m (Friday).

INDEX.

FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1899.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Beattie, Mr. Thomas, *London.*

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8999 (iii).

Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2005 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2124 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6455 (ii).

Employees Limitation of Working Hours (B. 82) 1°, 2036 (i).

Huron, Ontario Loan and Savings Co. (B. 74) 1°*, 2029 (i)

London Letter Carriers and Street Ry. Transportation, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4483, 4995 (ii).

Ry. Passenger Ticket (Sale) Act Amt. (B. 32) 1°, 895; 2°, m., 1875 (i); in Com., 4323 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9491; in Com., 9833 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6802 (ii).

Rifles, Sale of by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1817 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Post Office, 7348 (iii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 3613 (iii).

Beausoleil, Mr. Cleophas, *Berthier.*

Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 337 (i).

——— 2nd Rep., on M. to conc. (objection) 1071.

——— 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc. (Amt.) 1738; neg. (Y. 40, N. 89) 1752 (i).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Canadian Ry. Fire Insurance Co., Change of Title (B. 140) 1°*, 4259 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5931 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Papers respecting, 4300, 4859 (ii).

Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co. and Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 145) 1°*, 4804 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9610; in Com., 9627 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co's (B. 18) in Com., 2150.

——— (M.) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2284 (i).

Records and Public Buildings, Safety of, Rep. of Commission (M. for copy*) 1878 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 8224 (iii).

Legislation (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5738 (ii).

Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1°*, 6120 (ii).

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*

Grain exported from Can. Ports, Number of Bushels, &c. (Ques.) 3075, 3256 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia: 5457; (Royal Military College) 5464 (ii).

Post Office (mail contracts) 5830 (ii).

Bell, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Sydenham Postmaster, Irregularity in Accounts (Ques.) 6935 (ii).
Vanluven, Peter, *vs.* Dom. Bank, Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (Ques.) 9178 (iii).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1514 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4979 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation by Commissioner, Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1878 (i).
I.C.R., Drawbacks on Freight Charges on N.S. portion since 1898 (M. for Ret.*) 5945 (ii).
——— Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition, B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3739 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4419, 4641 4668 (ii).
——— Newspaper Agencies, Lessees, &c. (Ques.) 1971 (i).
Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read letter in answer to question, 3819 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9193 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7955 (iii).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7649 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9330 (iii).
Return, Inquiry for, 3759 (ii).
——— Crow's Nest Pass Ry., 3314 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5038 (ii). Public Works (contingencies) 7555 (salaries) 7551 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8481 (iii).
Indians (N.S.) 7486; N. W. T. (annuities, &c.) 5698 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Yukon District (hospital grant) 6378 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (uniforms) 7459 (iii).
Trueman, Mr. W. H., Appointment to Rys. and Canals Dept. (Ques.) 4483 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).

Bell, Mr. J. H., *East Prince (P.E.I.)*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i)
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5898 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892), Seduction and Abduction B 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2928 (i).
——— B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for °, 2171 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4540 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7679 (iii).

Bell, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa City, Grant of Money, Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9622 (iii).
Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2150; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2290 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7894 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour and Charlottetown Authorization B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9754 (iii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3132 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8869 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6524 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office 7345 (iii).
Collection of Revenues (Telegraph Lines P.E.I.) 8181 (iii).
Fisheries (salaries of Inspectors) 4022 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 7757; (Wharves, N.S.) 7704 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (uniforms) 7456; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9219; (removal of curves) 7490 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6300 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address, on The, 594 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4983 (ii); in Com., 7641 (iii).
Cars, Official or Private, Number, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 1835 (i).
Civil Service (Dismissal of Officials) Act Amt B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2236 (i).
Collingwood Harbour, Assignment of Contractors (Ques.) 1893 (i).
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O.Cs., 5336 (ii).
County Court Judges, Ont., Retirement, &c., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 1970 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8936 (iii).
Galt Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3824 (ii).
Giant's Tomb Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1834 (i).
Hope Island Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1834 (i); 5486 (ii).
Humberstone Post Office, Charges against Postmaster (remarks) 6594 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4458 (ii).
Judges and Political Preferments (Ques.) 4484 (ii).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4494 (ii).
Midland Harbour, Amount of dues collected (Ques.) 1834 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Miller, Mr. R. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1974 (i).

Moonstone, Ont., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1957 (i).

Orillia Public Buildings, Caretaker, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1957 (i).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9197 (iii).

Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3284 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6106, 6116 (ii).

Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in Windsor *World*, 7223 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3476; on M. for 2°, 6629; in Com., 6763, 6810 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. Deb., 5305.

Saw Logs, Exportation, Prevention by Govt. on Indian Reserves, &c. (Ques.) 1834 (i).

Simcoe Lake, Lowering of Water, Requests, &c., made to Dept. (Ques.) 2192 (i).

——— (remarks) 2248 (i).

Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4226 (ii).

Stikine-Teslin Route, Survey, Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 1885 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 5468 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 8263 (iii).

Canals: Trent (construction) 7300 (iii).

Civil Government: Interior (clerical assistance) 5022 (ii); Justice (salaries) 2068 (i); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Secretary of State (P. Mungovan's salary) 5854 (ii).

Dominion Lands (Chief Inspector's salary) 9014.

Fisheries (Noble Bros.) 4244 (ii); (salaries of Inspectors) 4014, 4045 (ii); Protection Service (repairs, &c.) 5180 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers: Dredging (new plant) 5203.

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8576, 8586 (amt.) 8578 (iii).

Indian Affairs (Ont.) 5669, (ii).

Inspection of Staples (salaries, &c.) 5586 (ii).

Legislation (distribution of Blue Books to Law Associations) 5738, (ii); (voters' lists) 2281 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5120, 5177 (ii).

Militia (arms, equipment, &c.) 9145 (iii); (military stores) 5424 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7613, 7615 (iii); Ont., 7625 (iii); (Patent Office) 5094; Ottawa (electric lighting) 5195 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7690, 7698 (iii). Dredging (plant) 8137 (iii). Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8081 (iii). Wharfs (N.S.) 7698, 7709 (iii); Ont., 7967, 8003 (iii); (Port Colborne) 9255, 9264 (iii); Que., 8136 (iii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7561, 7571, 7585 (iii); Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 5204 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7170.

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Administration, Charges against, par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 8062 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Address, on The, 1197 (i).

Anticosti Island, Pub. Works Inspection Trip, Name of Str., &c. (Ques.) 1880, 2188 (i).

——— Cost of Trip (M. for Rep.*) 2789 (i).

See Pub. Works.

Baie de Chaleurs Ry. Agreement, Contract, Expenses, &c. (M. for Cor., O.Cs., Stmnt.*) 2028.

Beauharnois Canal, Damage to Farm Lands by overflowing (remarks) 4859 (ii).

——— Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5411 (ii).

——— Lock Labourers, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3267 (i).

——— Water Power, Improvement of (Ques.) 1883 (i).

See Valleyfield.

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4844 (ii).

Colpron, Mr. Jos. N., Claims against Govt. for services performed, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).

Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8775 (iii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfred Laurier*) in Com., 9728 (iii).

Coteau Landing, Contract for Dredging, Papers, Letters, &c. (M. for copy *) 2026 (i).

Counterfeit Bills, Circulation, &c. (remarks) 5206 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. Britton) on M. for 2°, 2162 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 8753 (iii).

Dep. Speaker, Delegation of Powers, out of order, 5483, 5491 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8758 (iii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6971 (iii).

Grenville Canal, Toll Collector, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 2532 (i).

Inland Fisheries, Issue of Licenses by Local Govt. (remarks) 2910 (i).

Inland Revenue Act, Violation *re* Seizure of Tobacco (remarks) 10227 (iii).

Insolvency Legislation, Cor. from Boards of Trade (remarks) 4997 (ii).

——— (M. for cor., &c.*) 5944 (ii).

I.C.R., Cars constructed and purchased by Govt., Name of Firm, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3945, 4179 (ii).

——— Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4367, 4374 4405, 4434, 4472, 4622 (ii).

——— Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4449 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Reading Bill clause by clause, 4647 (ii).

——— Tenders for Oil, &c., (M. for Ret.*) 2028.

Langevin, August, Purchase of Land from, &c. (Ques.) 6561 (ii).

McDonald, A. R., Inquiry for Papers respecting Dismissal, &c., 8757 (iii).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4497 (ii).

——— Letter read by P.M.G., Violation of Rules of House, 5006 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6098 (ii).

Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7235 (iii).

Ottawa City, Indemnification, &c., and Govtl. intention to other cities, &c. (Ques.) 6379 (ii).

——— Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9611; in Com., 9629 (iii).

Personal Explanation, par. in *La Patrie*, 1953.

Postal Notes, Lost through Transmission (remarks) 10226 (iii).

Preferential Trade with Great Britain,, on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5381.

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Discussion, &c. (remarks) 9466 (iii).

Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3242 (i).

Pub. Works, Inspection, Expenses of Tour, &c., Name of Str., &c. (Ques.) 1880 (i).

See Anticosti.

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7670 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9688 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners Bill, Injurious Legislation (remarks) 9596 (iii).

——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 9700.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731.

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9315, 9423, 9470, 9494, 9517, 9553; in Com. on Bill, 9771 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3471; in Com., 6803, (ii); 6940, 6947, 6963, 6983 (iii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 9700, 9845 (iii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Protection to Navigation (remarks) 3343 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Further Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9846 (iii).

Soulanges Canal, Amount expended in construction to 1899 (Ques.) 2117 (i).

——— (Secs. 1, 2) Contracts, Advertisements, &c. (M. for Cor., O.C.'s, &c.*) 2028 (i) 9701 (iii).

——— (Secs. 4, 5, 6, 7) Contracts, Advertisements, &c. (M. for Cor., O.C.'s, &c.*) 2028 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Yukon (additional Judge) 10191; (living expenses) 10194; conc., 10217 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 8224; (experimental farms) 8262; (Paris Exhibition) 10142; (year book) 8226 (iii).

Canals: Beauharnois (steel bridge, surveys, &c.) 7450, conc., 10201; Cornwall (enlargement) 7298; Galops (enlargement) 7445; Lachine (enlargement) 7297; Lake St. Louis (deepening) 7298; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 7299; Soulanges (construction) 7295 (iii).

Civil Government: Geological Survey (salaries) 2106; Justice (salaries) 2065 (i); Post Office, 7330; (contingencies) 7358 (iii); Public Works (contingencies) 7554; (salaries) 7536, 7545 (iii); Privy Council (salaries) 2060; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).

Collection of Revenues (letters of credit) 8191; (repairs, &c., to dock) 8179 (iii).

Customs: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8460 (iii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8496; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9030, 9056 (iii).

Indians: Ont. and Que. (Mr. J. B. Brosseau, services, &c.) 10110 (iii); (Que.) 5699 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (restaurant keeper) 10137 (iii); (voters' lists) 2295, 2306 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Can.) 8668; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5414, 5418 (ii); (armouries) 9129; (arms, equipment, &c.) 9145, 9149; (clothing) 7101, 7115, 7119, 9127; (compensation to Octave Oulette) 9128 (iii); (military properties) 5421; (salaries) 5421 (ii); (stores, &c.) 7097 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113; (Wentworth vs. Mathieu, litigation) 10113 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Bear River, removal of old piers) 10161 (iii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 5480; (Dorchester (5478); St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 7366; Yukon mail service) 7360 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7613 (iii); Ont., 7626; (Alexandria Reformatory) 9960; (electric lighting) 9940; (elevator Eastern Block) 9960; Ottawa, (lighting, repairs, &c.) 9989; (repairs, &c.) 7690; (Rideau Hall) 7692; (steel shelving) 9989; (Que.) 7619; Dredging (plant) 8137; Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Salmon River freight shed) 9997; (Wharfs), 7705; (Yarmouth breakwater) 9999; Ont., 7991; (Kaministiquia) 7611; (Toronto Harbour) 10067; Que., 8103; (Beauport wharf) 10039; (Cacouna wharf) 10016; (Cap à L'Aigle wharf) 10017; (Coteau, dredging) 10039; (Gédéon wharf) 10019; (Isle aux Grues, wharf, &c.) 10018; (Kamouraska wharf) 10018; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9964, 9969, 9975; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (Rivière du Lièvre) 10039; (Ste. Anne de Bellevue wharf) 10039; (Ste. Irénée wharf) 10018; (St. Jerome wharf) 10018; (Sabrevois wharf) 10020, conc. (amt.) 10219; St. Lawrence ship

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

channel) 7557, 7579, 7602; Yukon (buildings) 10107; (Lewes and Yukon river improvements) 8192; Telegraph (B.C. and Teslin Lake) 10100 (iii)): (Telegraph lines) 5616, 5624, 5644, (ii); 10095 (trails, roads and bridges) 10091 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7272, 7401, 7416; (A. R. McDonald, dismissal, &c.) 7276, 9168; (dismissal of Bernier) conc. 10204; (increased station accommodation) 9163; (rolling stock) 7434; (St. John elevator) 9163; P. E. I. (removal of curves) 7396 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9067, 9089, 9096; (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Public Works and Private Secretary (Ques.) 1880 (i).

Tuberculosis Inspection in Chicoutimi County, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5097 (ii).

Valleyfield Customs Collector, Charges against, &c., on M. to Com. of Sup., 5501 (ii).

Valleyfield, Lease of Land, &c. (Ques.) 1815 (i).

——— Public Buildings, Erection of (Ques.) 1882 (i).

——— Water Power, Deepening of Bay (Ques.) 1882 (i).

See Beauharnois.

Veldt, Rabbi, Dismissal as Chaplain St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (remarks) 10246 (iii).

Veterans of 1864-65, Issue of Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1853 (i).

Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).

Votes and Proceedings, Typographical errors (remarks) 6120 (ii).

Winding Up Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8781 (iii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 700 (i).

Bertram, Mr. G. H., *Centre Toronto.*

Address, on The, (amt.) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1514; agreed to (Y. 101; N. 48) 1811 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4980 (ii).

Can. Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co. incorp. (B. 106) 1°*, 2529 (i).

Canadian Inland Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 51) 1°*, 1352 (i).

Canadian Power Co., Change of Title (B. 77) 1°*, 2029 (i).

Grain Elevators, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 5500 (ii).

Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of Dom. Bank, Change of Title (B. 100) 1°*, 2409 (i).

Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 974 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6719 (ii).

Bertram, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Trent (construction) 7313 (iii.)

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 1073; 2°*, *m.*, 1947 (i).

Bethune, Mr. J. L., *Victoria, N.S.*

Baddeck, N. S., Erection of Drill Shed (Ques.) 2111 (i).

Militia, 94th Battalion, Increase of Force (Ques. 2111 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia and Defence (annual drill) 5059 (ii).

Quarantine (prevention of tuberculosis among cattle) 8344 (ii).

Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage on M. (Mr. *Mc Dougall*) to adjn., 5403 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Arichat Breakwater, N. S., Repairs, &c., Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ans.) 5485

Babin's Cove Wharf, Arichat, N.S., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 5486 (ii).

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 1843 (i).

Balsam Lake, Removal of Stone Piles (Ans.) 2333 (i).

Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for 3°, 3487 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Lock Labourers, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3268 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 9177 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., N.B., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 1814 (i); 3554, 3824 (ii).

Cars, Official or Private, Number, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 1835 (i).

C. P. R. Act (1881) Powers respecting Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 3315 (i).

C. P. R. and Great North-west Central, Survey of Branch line (Ans.) 2532 (i).

——— Tariff on Hay, Straw, &c., Approval by O.C. (Ans.) 4057 (ii).

——— Powers, &c,, respecting Branch Lines (Ans.) 9309 (iii).

Chambly Canal, Emplymt. of Geo. Peppin by Govt. (Ans.) 3821 (ii).

——— Investigation (Ans.) 3553 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Award of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1853 (i).

Coulombe vs. The Queen, Enforcement of Conviction, &c. (Ans.) 4479 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. and C.P.R., Rates and Tolls, Revision of by Gov. in Council (Ans.) 2331 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6446 (ii).

Descousse Wharf, N.S., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 5486 (ii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2155, 2930 (i); (amt.) wthdn., 3849 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Dredging in Richmond Co., N.S., Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ans.) 5485 (ii).

Drill Hall Vancouver, B.C., Contract, Cost &c. (Ans.) 5487 (ii).

Drummond County Ry., on Inquiry (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for papers, 2697 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2973 (i).

Drummond County Ry. *See* "I.C.R."

Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8758 (iii).

Dunn Avenue, Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Protection to (Ans.) 1858 (i).

Eastern Extension, Claims of N.S. Govt. (Ans.) 3551 (ii).

Elevator at Halifax, Construction and Completion (Ans.) 2332 (i).

General Inspection Act. Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9639 (iii).

Govt. Rys., Working Expenses for May and and June, 1898 (Ans.) 4810 (ii).

Grand River Floods, Govt. Report (remarks) 2536 (i).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3775 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3968.

——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4506 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4196 (ii).

Grenville Canal, Compensation for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 4992 (ii).

——— Maintenance of Roadways on Farms (Ans.) 6049 (ii).

——— letter of Mr. G. S. Conway (Ans.) 6381.

——— Toll Collector, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 2532 (i).

I. C. R., Addition to Workshops at Rivière du Loup (Ans.) 4480-81 (ii).

——— Alba Section, Number of Employes (Ans.) 5310 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Supt. W. A. Dubé, Removal of Headquarters (Ans.) 2533 (i).

——— Blanchette, Mr. Eugène, Reinstatement by Govt. (Ans.) 5859 (ii).

——— Cars built and purchased, Name of Firm, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3553, 3946, 4479 (ii).

——— Contract for Ties, Names of Tenderers (Ans.) 5308 (ii).

——— Delay in furnishing Cars, Complaints, &c. (Ans.) 1853 (i).

——— Demers, Dr., Ry. Bicycle Riding, &c. (Ans.) 5309 (ii).

——— District Supt. Oulette, Suspension, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

——— Employees, Wages, Working hours, &c. (Ans.) 1860, 1974 (i).

——— Employees at Lévis, and Provincial Election, Transfer, &c., Instruction to Mr. Desjardins, &c. (Ans.) 3260 (i).

——— Engine and Car Mileage, &c., (Ans.) 4811.

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital and Revenue (Ans.) 2531 (i).

——— Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133(Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 1949; M. for Com. on Res., 2792; agreed to (Y. 80, N. 38) 2842; in Com. on Res., 2843 (i); 3351, 3700; 1°, m., 3765; 2°, m. 3907, 4152, in Com., 4165; 3°, m., 4733, 4899, 4920, 4925; 3°, agreed to (Y. 91, N. 40) 4965.

——— on Inquiry for Papers, 2249 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2809 (i).

——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*), prop. Res., 3946; in Com. on Res., 4062; (M.) to conc. in Res., 4170; 1°*, 4170; 2° m., 4171; in Com., 4353-76, 4554-4711; 3° agreed to (Y. 91, N. 40) 4967 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9702 (iii).

——— amounts accrued and paid to G.T.R. since July, 1898 (Ans.) 4478 (ii).

——— papers respecting Car Mileage (presented) 4891 (ii).

——— revenue collected, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).

——— Flour Rates and Car Mileage, &c., Papers laid on the Table, 4730 (ii).

——— Fraserville Station Accommodation, Pets. from Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 1974 (i).

——— pets., &c., *re* Disorderly Conduct (Ans.) 2899 (i).

——— Freight carried from 1897-9, Number of tons and receipts (Ans.) 3257 (i).

——— Freight Rates on Flour, 1896-8 (Ans.) 3549 (ii).

——— Gillis, Frank A., Station Agent at Tracadie, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4056 (ii).

——— Gosselin, Mr. F., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3827 (ii).

——— G.T.R. Combined Engine and Car Mileage, Expenditure, &c., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Ret., 5314 (ii).

——— Green Sand Castings, Tenders, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5860 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 1849 (i).

——— Harris, Mr., Agreement with as Traffic Manager (Ans.) 1975 (i).

——— Headquarters at Lévis, Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 3551 (ii).

——— LeBlanc, Mr. A. T., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1964 (i).

——— Locomotive Engineers, Number employed, &c. (Ans.) 9698 (iii).

——— McDonald, Mr. A. R., Dismissal as Supt. (Ans.) 1971 (i), 4812-3; 5098 (ii), 8757 (iii).

——— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7194 (iii).

——— Machinery at Rivière du Loup, Application by Supt. for Additions, &c. (Ans.) 4481 (ii).

——— Michaud, Mr. Eugène, Granting of Ry. Pass, &c. (Ans.) 2904 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Morrison, Mr. Hugh, Riverside, Claim for Damages (Ans.) 5310 (ii).

——— Newspaper Agencies, Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 1971 (i).

——— New Time Table (Ans.) 4781 (ii).

——— Number of Employees, Wages Paid, &c. (Ans.) 2332 (i).

——— Passes issued since Aug., 1896, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1860 (i).

——— Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis Station (Ans.) 4993 (ii).

——— Receipts and Expenditures, Stmnt. of Acts. (remarks) 2791 (i).

——— Removal of Shops from Rivière du Loup to Lévis (Ans.) 2533 (i).

——— Reynolds, Capt., Str. "Mulgrave," Complaints against (Ans.) 5309 (ii).

——— Roberge, Cyrille, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1857 (i).

——— Rolling Stock Expenditure (remarks) 6562 (ii).

——— Running Privileges for C.P.R. between St. John and Halifax (remarks) 2247 (i).

——— Salaries of Employees at Rivière du Loup Workshops (Ans.) 4481 (ii).

——— Snow Shovelling, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1964 (i).

——— Steel Rails, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1814, 2328 (i).

——— Valcouer, Octave, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5309 (ii).

Lachute and St. Andrews Ry. Cor., Contracts, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. *Christie*) for Copies, 4809 (ii).

Lake St. Louis, Removal of Shoals, Representations from Shippers, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (i).

Langevin, August, Purchase of Land from, &c. (Ans.) 6561 (ii).

Lévis, Purchase of Property, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 8468 (iii).

McDonald, A. R., on Inquiry (Mr. *Bergeron*) for papers respecting Dismissal, 8757 (iii).

See I. C. R.

McLaren's Creek, Construction of a Roadway (Ans.) 3257 (i).

McLaughlin, R. J., and Farmers of Lindsay *re* Damages by Floods, &c. (remarks) 4485, 4490, 5002 (ii).

McNeill, Stephen, Beaver Cove, Rental charged by Govt. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).

Military Stores, 8th Hussars, Sale of by I.C.R. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co's B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6094 (ii).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Ministers of the Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5527, 5536 (ii).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co., Correction in Speech 9700 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Personal Explanation, par in Montreal *Star re* Wharf at St. John, 7326 (iii).

——— (Mr. *Prior*) *re* Vote on Kettle River Ry. Bill, 9596 (iii).

Pigeon River Swing Bridge, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2480 (i).

Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3282 (i).

Powers, Mr. Thos., Lease of Govt. land at Lévis, &c. (Ans.) 3259 (i).

P. E. I. Ry. and Murray Harbour (B. 183) 1°*, 8989; in Com., 9753 (iii).

——— straightening Curves at North Wiltshire, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1854 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Tenders for Construction, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2112 (i).

Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 85) 1°, 2108 (i); 2° m., 3503 (ii); in Com., 9731 (iii).

——— Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3870 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 249 (i).

——— Legislation *re* Working Rules (remarks) 5748 (ii).

——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4745 (ii).

——— Regulations, American Standard, Adoption by Can. Rys. (Ans.) 1969 (i).

——— Subsidies (B. 190) in Com. on Res., 9197, 9311-9459, 9467-9594; 1°*, 9597; 2° m., 9758; in Com., 9760, 9815; (M.) to ref. back to Com. of the Whole (amts.) 9894; 3° m., 9893 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6941, 6956, 6974 (iii).

Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

Rosedale Swing Bridge, Expenditure, Amount contributed by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 2333 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. *McDougall*) 4997 (ii) 7772 (iii).

Northern Telegraph Co., and Cor. with Ministers, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5409 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 9310, 9700 (iii).

St. Francis Lake, Channel Improvements (Ans.) 1853 (i).

St. Ours Lock, Dismissal of Supt. Coderre, &c. (Ans.) 3552 (ii).

St. Peter's Canal, Amount expended from 1891 to 1896, &c. (Ans.) 3255 (i).

Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Facilities, Res. of N.W.T. Assembly (Ans.) 3255 (i).

Secord, Mr. T. R., Supt. on Welland Canal, Charges against (Ans.) 1833 (i).

Soulanges Canal, Amount expended in Construction to 1899 (Ans.) 2117 (i).

——— Arbitration, Land Valuators, Appnmts. and Dismissal (Ans.) 2333 (i).

Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3490 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Beauharnois (steel bridge and surveys, &c.) 7450; Chambly (surveying property, &c.) 7454 (iii); (telephone lines) 5783 (ii); Cornwall (enlargement) 7298; (payment to A. P. Ross) 9176 (iii); (repairs to locks) 5784; Farran's Point (enlargement) 5779 (ii); Galops (enlargement) 7299, 7443; Lachine (Atwater Avenue wall) 9173 (iii); (deepening River St. Pierre) 5781 (ii); (enlargement) 7297; (Heney & Borthwick claim) 9173; Lake St. Louis (deepening) 7298; Murray (Landing Station) 7454 (iii); (North Channel) 5779 (ii); Rainy River (lock and dam) 9173; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 7299; Rideau (Kilmarnock Cut) 7454; Soulanges (construction) 7295; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7296; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co.'s claims) 9237; Trent (construction) 7299 (iii); (gratuity to W. Quinn) 5782 (ii); (rebuilding Cowan's Bridge) 9172; (Rosedale Bridge) 7318; Welland (bridges, &c.) 7454 (iii); (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5794; (refund for damages to lock) 5792; (remission of arrears of rental) 5790 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7463 (iii).

Civil Government: Railways and Canals (salaries) 2250 (i); 6383 (ii).

Customs: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8458 (iii); (suspense account, Montreal) 5592 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2296 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (supplies, &c.) 3537 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Liverpool) 8671 (iii).

Militia (stores, &c.) 7096; (Yukon supplies 7046 (iii).

Miscellaneous (International Commission) 5852 (ii).

Post Office (Mail service) 7386 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 5192 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 7763; (Campobello breakwater) 10010; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10011; (Hopewell wharf) 10010; (Main River wharf) 10012; (St. John River and Belleisle wharfs) 10011; (St. Nicholas wharf) 10010; (Shippegan wharf) 10012; N.S. (wharfs), 7737; Que. (Lévis dock, enlargement) 9968; Ont. (Port Colborne) 9292; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8148 (iii).

Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5084 (ii).

Railways: C.P.R. (land damages) 7153; I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii); (A. R. McDonald's dismissal, &c.) 7276 9168; (car couplers) 9171; Miscellaneous (code of rules) 9175; (elevator, Halifax) 9172; (freight rates) 7457; (increased siding accommodation) 9156; (increased station accommodation) 9163; (Indiantown Branch, Mr. Snowball's claim) 9165; (installation of Pintsch gas) 9172; (land damages) 7154; (original construction) 7155; (passenger coach) 9172; (Point Tupper improvement) 9171; (refrigerator cars) 9172 (iii); (rolling stock) 5754 (ii); (rolling stock) 7432, 7461; St. John accommodation) 9164; (St. John elevator) 9163 (iii); (shops at Moncton) 5753 (ii); (telegraph service) 9171; (uniforms) 7456; miscellaneous, 7455; (expenses of Ry. Com. of P.C.) 9175; (Ottawa river) 9176 (iii); (repairs to "Victoria") 5785; (subsidies to Central Ry. Co.) 5789 (ii); P.E.I., 7462 (iii); (Mount Stewart wharf) 5754, 5771 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9211; (removal of curves) 7389 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District: Militia (clothing contract) 9111; Railways (surveys, &c.) 8700 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Con.

Tate's Dry Dock, Montreal, Rent, Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 1832 (i).

Trent Canal, Jordan, Mr. Wm., Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 1977 (i).

——— Land Valuations, Complaints, &c. (Ans.) 5311 (ii).

——— Payments to Mr. F. D. Moore by Govt. (Ans.) 5311 (ii).

——— Payment of Workmen (Ans.) 1977 (i).

——— Purchase of Land for Dam at Nassau (Ans.) 1857 (i).

Trueman, Mr. W. H., Appnmt. to Rys. and Canals Dept. (Ans.) 4483 (ii).

Valleyfield, Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 1815 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W., *King's, N.S.*

Active Militia Force, Resignation of Majors (Ans.) 5488 (ii).

Ammunition, Amount issued to 7th Battalion, London (Ans.) 1957 (i).

Annapolis Public Buildings, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 2701 (i).

Baddeck, N.S., Erection of Drill Shed (Ans.) 2111 (i).

Biggar, J. L., Appnmt. by Govt., Qualifications, &c. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

Bliss, Maj. D. C. F., Positions held under Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3261 (i) 3335, 3552 (ii).

Boston and Alaskan Transportation Co., Contract with Can. Govt. (Ans.) 1829 (i).

Brevet Promotions, Permanent Force, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

Can. Service Medals, Delay in issuing, Board of Claims, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 2699 (i).

——— Recommendation by Militia Dept. Terms &c., (Ans.) 3945 (ii).

See "Gen. Service Medals," &c.

Deadman's Island, Lease, &c., 1640 (i).

——— Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

See "Stanley Park," &c.

Demers, Major, Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 1833 (i).

Dom. Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Fees to Limited Number, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2360 (i).

Domville, Lt.-Col., Charges against (Ans.) 1840, 1845 (i).

——— Leave of Absence from Command of 8th Hussars (Ans.) 2898 (i).

——— par. in St. John *Sun* (Ans.) 2899 (i).

Fredericton Military School, Recommendations for Admission and Instruction &c. (Ans.) 3795.

General Service Medals, Date of Royal Warrant, Govtl. Action, &c. (Ans.) 8630 (iii).

See Can. Service Medals.

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Con.*

Imperial Service and Can. Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2350 (i).

——— MacAuley Point, B.C., on Inquiry for Papers, &c., 5489 (ii).

Lévis Forts, Contract for Cordwood, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3083 (i).

Lévis Military Camp, Qualifications of Officers, Percentage, &c. (Ans.) 8632, 9309 (iii).

McKenzie, Francis, and Instructions at Fredericton Military School (Ans.) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).

Medals, Can. Service, Notice in Can. *Gazette re* Clasps, Ribbons, &c. (Ans.) 3083 (i).

——— Claims allowed by Commission, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 5869 (ii).

——— Regulations respecting (Ans.) 7320 (ii).

See "Can. Service Medals."

Military School, Fredericton, N.B., Admissions for Instruction, Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).

Militia Act Amt., Intention of Govt. (Ans.) 3551 (ii).

——— Age Limits, Service of Lt.-Cols., Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1852 (i).

——— Army Service Corps, Recommendation or Reps. of Maj.-Gen. (Ans.) 9697 (iii).

——— Battalion 94th, Increase of Force (Ans.) 2111 (i).

——— Hussars 8th, N.B., Annual Allowance (Ans.) 3073 (i).

Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Ont. Alliance, Ques. of Privilege, 7322 (iii).

———names of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 4807 (ii).

———Deptl. Rep. (presented) 421 (i).

——— Force, Artillery Instruction in Eng., Examinations, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (i).

——— Force, Officers appointed in 1898, Requirements as to Qualifications (Ans.) 2329 (i).

——— List and Certificates of Qualification (Ans.) 2329 (i).

——— Officers at Lévis Camp, Number passed Qualifying Exams. (Ans.) 8632, 9309 (iii).

——— Regulations *re* French and English Language, Enforcement, &c. (Ans.) 8631 (iii).

——— Permanent Corps, Pension System, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2719 (i).

——— Regulations as to Age Limit for Lt.-Cols., Retirements, &c. (Ans.) 2183 (i).

——— presented to Parlt. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

——— Stores, 8th Hussars, Transfer, Orders from Dept., &c. (Ans.) 2898 (i).

Permanent Force, Appointment, Qualifications, &c. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

Plains of Abraham, Expiry of Lease, Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 1835 (i).

Powers, Mr. Thos., Lease of Govt. Land at Lévis, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3082, 3259 (i).

Quebec Cartridge Factory, Dismissal of Labourers, &c. (Ans.) 2186 (i); 9843 (iii).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Con.*

Regimental Establishments, Lists submitted to Parlt. (Ans.) 3550 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3558 (ii).

Rifle Ranges, B.C., Applications and Pets., &c. (Ans.) 5485 (ii).

Rifles, Sale of by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1817 (i).

Royal Military College Inspection, Regulations, *re* (Ans.) 3796 (ii).

——— Clothing Contract (Ans.) 6722 (ii) 6933 (iii).

Samson, Mr. Pierre, Caretaker at St. Joseph de Lévis Fort, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3082 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2984 Militia and Defence (contingencies) 2266 (i); (clerical assistance) 5012 (ii); (armouries) 9125 (iii); (annual drill) 5060, 5414 (ii); 7062; armament, &c.) 7152 (iii); (arms, &c., accoutrements) 5466 (ii); 9142 (iii); (clothing) 5443 (ii); 7099, 7110, 9126; (compensation to Mrs. F. E. Stewart) 9131; (compensation to Mrs. Maxwell) 9131; (compensation to Octave Oulette) 9127; conc., 10218 (iii); (defence scheme) 5465 (ii); (Esquimalt defence) 7151; (Govt. Cartridge Factory) 7151 (iii); (Hamilton rifle range) 5465 (ii); (litigation expenses) 9127 (iii); (London property) 5465 (ii); (Macauley Point claim) 9141 (iii); (military properties) 5421; (military stores) 5423 (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5451, 7148 (ii); (monuments) 7152; (pay allowance) 7002, 7153; (properties) 7088; (provisions, &c.) 7126; (rifle ranges) 9144 (iii); (rifle range, B.C.), conc., 6389; (Royal Military College) 5464 (ii); 7024; 7140; (stores, &c.) 7091 (iii); (salaries) 2070 (i); 5420 (ii); 7076 (iii); (transport) 5451 (ii); 7130 (iii); (unforeseen expenses) 5857 (ii); (Yukon supplies) 7038 (iii) (contract for supplies) 6321; (transportation, &c.), 6321; (transportation and supplies) 6339-6360 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, (N.S.) 7614; Ont.,) London drill hall) 9961; (Royal Military College) 9960; (St. Catharines drill hall) 9957; (Ottawa military store) 9942.

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7157, 7177, 7179, 7188 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9066, 9092 (iii).

Stanley Park and Deadman's Island, O.C.'s, Cor., &c., between Can. Govt. and B.C. on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 2335 (i).

See "Deadman's Island."

Strathy, Mr. J. A. L., Reinstatement as Lt.-Col. (Ans.) 2329 (i).

Sussex, N.B., Erection of Drill Shed (Ans.) 1857 (i).

Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Issue of Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1848, 1854, 2114 (i).

——— Volunteers organized in Chicago, Eligibility for Medals (Ans.) 2704 (i).

——— of 1885, Issue of Scrip and Medals, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 2701 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3894 (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Con.*
Wolseley Barracks, London, Land purchased, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1840 (i).
Yukon, Freight Transportation, Guarantee by Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 2902 (i).
——— Militia, Strength of Force, Cost of Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 1831 (i).
——— Cost of Transportation, &c. (Ans.) 1842; 1892 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Address, on The, 885, 895 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Peterson, Tate & Co.'s Bond, Payment to Govt. (Ques.) 2481 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3763 (ii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 3313 (i); on M. for 3°, 3486 (ii).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, Notice of M., 6595 (ii).
——— (M.) to place Documents, &c. on Table of Hse. for ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 6723 (ii); 6821 (iii).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Restrictions and Instruction by Govt., as Legal Adviser to Yukon Council (Ques.) 2322 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 2172 (i).
Deadman's Island, Leases, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1816 (i).
Eastern Trust Co's (B. 54) 1°*, 1352 (i).
Elevator at Halifax, Construction and Completion (Ques.) 2332 (i).
Halifax Harbour Lightship and Resolution of Board of Trade (remarks) 8920 (iii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal-Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3408, 3425, 3560, 3747; on M. for 3°, 4951 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4356, 4380, 4399, 4435, 4445, 4562, 4571, 4601, 4689, 4710 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, Documents quoted, must be laid on Table, 4445 (ii).
——— Starr and De Wolfe's Contract, Rep. of Mr. Shanly, C.E. (M. for copy*) 2962 (i).
Newfoundland Regulations *re* Live Bait (remarks) 2194, 2696 (i); 6938 (iii).
Nova Scotia Bank and Jamaica, Issue of Notes Authorization (B. 53) 1°*, 1352 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members abusing Privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6593 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9627 (iii).
Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Elections Fraud) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3249 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7667 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3928 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6650 (ii).
Return, Inquiry for, Newfoundland Regulations *re* purchase of Bait by Canadians, 2696 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2981 (i); Fisheries (contingencies) 5023; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 5014 (ii); Post Office, 7340 (iii); (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5040, 5054 (ii); Privy Council (salaries) 2052 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2298 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: (salaries, &c.) 3526 (ii).
Militia: (compensation to Mrs. Maxwell) 9131 (iii).
Ocean and River Service: (maintenance) 3033; (masters and mates) 3059; (wreck investigations) 3064 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 7616; N.S., 9944; (Halifax Quarantine Station) 5089; (Salmon River freight shed) 9997; Ottawa (electric lighting) 9941 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 7461 (iii).
Tidal Survey, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3521 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3897 (ii).
Winding Up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4316 (ii).
Yukon District, Instructions, &c. to Mr. Ogilvie (M. for Rep.*) 2027 (i).
——— Liquor Permits to Mr. Peters (M. for cor.*) 2027 (i).
——— Liquor Permits, Cor. between Mr. Martin and Min. of Int. (M. for papers*) 2027 (i).
——— Mail Service (1898-99) Efficiency of Contractors, Reps., &c. (M. for cor.) 2705 (i).
——— Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3794 (ii).

Bostock, Mr. H., *Yale and Cariboo.*
B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6893 (iii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2646; on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2938 (i).
Northern Telegraph Co's. Incorp. (B. 7) 1°*, 618 (i).
Pacific Cable between Australia and Can., Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) on prop. Res., 8372 (iii).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7664 (iii).
Railway Act. Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9736 (iii).
——— Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3849 (ii).
——— Passes to Members and Senators (B. 37) 1°*, 1073; 2° m., 2195 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6681 (ii).
Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4236 (ii).

Bostock, Mr. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues (telegraph lines, B. C.) 8188.
Customs (salaries, &c., Yukon) 559) (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8086.

Bourassa, Mr. J. H. N, *Labelle.*
Address, on The, 619 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1932 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1748 (i).
Fairlie, Mr., Dismissal from Rupert's Land Industrial School (Ques.) 2532 (i).
——— (M. for Reps., Cor.*) 2788 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) Order (Ques. of) 4651 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8891 (iii).
Senate and H. of C. Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9846 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8538 (iii).
Public Works: Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10079.
Ville Marie Bank Suspension, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) 8755 (iii).

Britton, Mr. B. M., *Kingston.*
Address, on The, 311 (i).
Business of the Hse, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6280 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7769 (iii).
Calvin Co.'s (B. 9) wthdn., 2897 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1929 (i); in Com., 5920 (ii).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1946 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2526 (i).
——— (1892) Act Amt. (B. 36) 1°*, 974; 2° m., 2160; on Order for 2°, 2527 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 81 (voting machines) 1°, 2035 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1921; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2932 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4197 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4568.
Joint Stock Companies Act Amt. (B. 114) 1°, 2790 (i).
Naval Brigade Reserve, &c., organized by Can. Govt., Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 6048 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 19) 1°*, 700; 2° m., 1862; in Com. (amt.) 1896 (i).

Britton, Mr. B. M.—*Con.*
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 5354 (ii.)
Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 8384.
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8764 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6110 (ii).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7661 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9440, 9494, 9590 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6715 (ii).
Revision of the Statutes, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1881 (i).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2760 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 10144.
Canals—Galops (enlargement) 7449 (iii); Welland (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5796; (refund for damages to lock) 5793 (ii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8572 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Additional Judge in Ont.) 10122 (iii).
Legislation: (stationery supplies) 5737 (ii); (Voters' Lists) 2308 (i).
Militia (arms, equipment, &c.) 9142; (clothing) 7107; (pay, allowance) 7029; (Royal Military College) 7141 (iii).
Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 5808 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Portsmouth Wharf) 10065 (Port Colborne) 9283 Que., 8123; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Montreal Harbour Improvements) 9981 (iii). Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5616 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5081 (ii).
Winding Up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 2°, 1874 (i); in Com., 4317 (ii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Address, on The, 290 (i).
Brockville Election, Name, &c. of Dep. Returning Officer (Ques.) 2322 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7961 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8856 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8309 (iii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7603 (iii).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Ammunition, Amount issued to 7th Battalion, London (Ques.) 1956 (i).
Controverted Elections Act: Registrar's Fees, (remarks) 8348 (iii).

Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1°*, 1949 (i); (M.) for Com., 5042; on M. for Com., 5254 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9441 (iii).
Wolseley Barracks, London, Land purchased, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1840 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Address, on The, 1061 (i).
British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co's (Change of Title)—(B. 57) 1°*, 1431 (i).
Can. Life Insurance Co. (B. 89) wthdn., 4477 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5935 (ii).
Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6875 (iii).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2959 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) 9637, 9644 (iii).
Grain Standards, Legislation *re* Inspection, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3835 (ii).
Meagher, Thos., Seizure by U.S. Authorities, on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Ret., 2751 (i).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. (amt.) 6327, 6337 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9443; in Com. on Bill, 9830 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Quarantine (cattle) 8339 (iii).
Weights and Measures (inspection) 5580 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4986 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9681 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8318
Militia and Defence (military stores) 5434 (ii).
Post Office (Mail Service) 7378 (iii); (postmasters' salaries) 5818 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (Ottawa, electric lighting) 5198 (ii).

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*
Address, on The, 509 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *North Hastings.*
Interior, Minister's Travelling and Living Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1818 (i).
Mint, Govt., Establishment in Can. (Ques.) 2190 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3123 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Address, on The, 152, 159 (i).
Allan SS. Service and Govt. Contract, Names of Vessels sailing from St. John, 1897-8 (Ans.) 3258 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3299 (i).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6743 (ii).
Budget, The, 2571 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3323 (i).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1944 (i).
Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8177.
Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on Order for 2°, 2527 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act. Amt. (B. 182); in Com. on Res., 8939 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 1071.
Gaspé Customs Officer and Election, Charges against (remarks) 10224 (iii).
German Discriminating Duties on Can. Imports (Ans.) 1851 (i).
G.T.R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3777 (ii).
Insurance Rates in Mar. Provs., Advancement in Price (remarks) 8923 (iii).
Loan Companies B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8476 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Mail Service, Contractor's Name, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2113 (i).
Medals, Can. Gen. Service, Design approved by Can. or Imp. Authorities, &c. (Ans.) 3266 (i).
Naturalization Act. Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) Resuming adjd. deb., on M. for 2°, 2527 (i).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8767 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, par. in Montreal *Star*: remarks, 701 (i).
Public Accts. Com., &c., Reduction of Number of Members (remarks) 4347 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9544 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3481 (ii).
SS. Service between W. Indies and S. America Res., 2°, 9597 (iii).
——— SS. Subsidies between St. John, Halifax and London, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 2900 (i).
SUPPLY:
(Res. for Com.) 1813 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 10147 (iii).
Civil Government: Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 2269; Gov.Gen's Sec.'s Office (contingencies) 2265; Privy Council (contingencies) 2265; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 2276; Sec. of State (contingencies) 2269; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2262 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 2280 (i); (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (iii); (voter's lists) 2281 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and S. S. Subventions (Baddeck, &c. and East Bay) 8692; (Can. and S. Africa) 8692; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 8685; (Gaspé Basin and Quebec) 8687; (Grand Manan) 8684; (G.B. and Can.) 8661; (Halifax and Porto Rico) 10158; (Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool) 8672; (Margaree and Cheticamp) 10157; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 10156; (Pictou, &c., and Montague Bridge, &c.) 8686; (Port Mulgrave, &c., and Irish Cove) 8693; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8687; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 8683; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157; (Quebec and Manchester) 8695; (St. John and Minas Basin) 8686; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 8686; (St. John and Digby) 8673; (St. John and Glasgow) 8672; (St. John, Dublin and Belfast) 8672; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies; &c.) 8675; (St. John, Halifax and London) 8673, (Magdalen Island) 8678 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 7374 (iii).
Public Works Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 8108; (Sabrevois wharf) 10025; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9980 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8698 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1860 (i).
U. S. Customs and Can. Vessels, Regulations, &c., *re* entering at American Ports (remarks) 2528 (i).
Veldt, Rabbi, Dismissal as Chaplain St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (remarks) 10246 (iii).
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 1813 (i).
Yukon Administration, Charges against, &c., par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8035 (iii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*
Address, on The, 194 (i).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to ref. Documents, &c., to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6745 (ii).
Can. Ry. Accident Insurance Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 803 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands (B. 24) 1°*, 803; 2° m., 1917, 1922; (M.) to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2139, 2153, 2931, 2949 (i).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4307, 4849 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, 3647 (ii).
G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4505 (ii).
Militia Permanent Corps, Pension System, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2712 (i).
Mint, Govt. Establishment in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3115 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Pouporc*) for Cor., &c., 5360 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 22) 1°*, 803 (i).
Order (Ques. of) 1555 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*
Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) on prop. Res., 8373 (iii).
——— between Vancouver and Australia, Cor. between Imp. and Colonial Govts. (M. for copies*) 1879 (i).
——— Communications, &c. (M. to print papers) 2963 (i).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2044 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Postponement and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4347 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 9443 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3470 (ii).
Royal Military College, Expenditure since Foundation, Regulations, Number of Graduates, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1879 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8728; (illustration stations) 8302, 8330 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8498; (St. Paul de Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9043 (iii).
Public Works: Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5617 (ii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C., *Montmorency.*
Address, on The, 258 (i).
Berthier (en haut) Postmaster and Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2702 (i).
——— Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c. Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1893 (i).
——— Public Works, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).
Bilodeau, Mr. Job., Postmaster at Chambord, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1962 (i).
——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3336 (ii).
Blais, Mr. J. C., Amount paid to by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3545 (ii).
Boivin, Gédéon, Contract for Stone at Rivière La Pipe Wharf. (Ques.) 4061 (ii).
Bourget, P. A., Postmaster at Lévis, Increase of Salary (Ques.) 4059 (ii).
Cattle Inspection for Tuberculosis at Hebertville, Cor. &c., in connection with Appnmt. of Dr. Hall, (M. for Ret.*) 5944 (ii).
——— Cor. between Govt. and Dr. J. A. Duchesne, of Chicoutimi, since June, 1896 (M. for copies*) 5944 (ii).
Chamberland, Mr. F. F., Charges against, Letter from Achille Lebel (Ques.) 1884, 2900 (i).
Chambord Customs Office Salaries, Collections, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).
Chicoutimi, Postmasters Dismissed, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2408 (i).
Clareau, Mr. J. A., Claims for Material for Construction of Chicoutimi or Ste Anne's Wharf (Ques.) 3336 (ii).
Constantin, Dr. Jules, Emplymt. by Govt., Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*

Coulombe v. The Queen, Trial Proceedings, &c. (Ques.) 3946 (ii).

—— Enforcement of Conviction, &c. (Ques.) 4479 (ii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 1073.

Demers, Major, Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 1833 (i).

Donahue, W., Contract for Timber for Dredge at Roberval, &c. (Ques.) 4060 (ii).
See "O'Donaghue, Roberval," &c.

Duchesne, Dr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1887 (i).

—— Complaints *re* Appnmt. of Dr. Hall (Ques.) 3337 (ii).

Dupuis, P. C., Prosecution for selling liquor to Indians (Ques.) 4060 (ii).

Fluhman, Dr., Medical Officer to Indians at Point Bleue, Pets. *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 4060 (ii).

French Canadian Repatriation from U.S. (Ques.) 1844 (i).

Gauthier, Jean, Postmaster at Metabetchouan, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4059 (ii).

Hall, Dr., Appnmt. as Inspector of Cattle at Chicoutimi (Ques.) 3336 (ii).

I.C.R., McDonald, Mr. A. R., Dismissal as Supt. (Ques.) 1971 (i).

—— investigation into charges against, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4812 (ii).

—— suspension and Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4811, 5098 (ii).

—— Michaud, Mr. Eugène, Granting of Ry. Pass &c. (Ques.) 2904 (i).

—— Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis station (Ques.) 4992 (ii).

—— Quebec City Mail Service, Memorials &c., from Board of Trade and City Council (M. for copies*) 1879 (i).

Labreque, Mr. C. O., Emplymt. by Govt. Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1846 (i).

Larouche, Mr. Wm., Postmaster at Lake Bouchette, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1962 (i).

Lebel, Mr. Wenceslas, Customs Official and Revision of Electoral Lists, par. in *Le Soleil* (Ques.) 1888 (i).

Lévis Mail Service, Names of Carriers, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3554 (ii).

Liquor sold to Indians, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).

Man. School Question, Cor. with the Holy Father, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 1822 (i).

Martel, Mr. P., Postmaster at St. Prime, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1964 (i).

Mistassini and Ste. Méthode Storehouses, Construction, &c., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1888 (i).
See "Ste. Méthode."

Murray Bay and Quebec Mail Service, Complaints of Delay, &c. (Ques.) 1960 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*

O'Donahue, Mr. W. T., Caretaker at Roberval, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3335 (ii).
See Donaghue, Roberval, &c.

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2289 (i).

Pednault, Mr. P., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (ii).

Plains of Abraham, Expiry of Lease, Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 1835 (i).

—— (M. for copy*) 2026 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3917; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3985, neg. (Y. 40, N. 80) 3989 (ii.)

Quebec Superior Court, Additional Judges, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1845 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1073, 3253 (i).

Rivière du Loup Wharf, Charges against Mr. Chamberland (Ques.) 1884, 2900 (i).

Rivière La Pipe Wharf, Cost, &c., (Ques.) 1891.

——Peribonka Wharfs, Emplymt. of Labourers, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).

Roberval, Dredging Scows, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1888 (i).

—— Harbour, Dredging, Mr. Donaghue's Contract for Scows, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2028 (i).
See "Donaghue, O'Donaghue."

St. Jerome Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 2182 (i).

St. Joseph d'Alma, Postmaster, Increase in Salary (Ques.) 1847 (i).

St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ques.) 1882 (i).

St. Méthode and Mistassini Wharfs, Construction of Sheds, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2028 (i).

—— (Ques.) 1888 (i).

Senate Reform and the Provinces (Ques.) 1821 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2282, 2290 (i).

Telegraph Lines North Shore of St. Lawrence, Contracts, &c (Ques.) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i); 3336.

Verrault, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3555 (ii).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1744 (i).

Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°*, 700.

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 7769 (iii).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 2) 1°*, 421; 2° m., 1898; in Com., 2525; 3° m., 2911, 2919; agreed to (Y. 68; N. 29) 2930.

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8924 (iii).

Erie and Huron Ry. Co., and Lake Erie and Detroit Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 60) 1°*, 1540 (i).

Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) on prop. Res., 8369 (iii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Preferential Trade with G.B., on prop Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8754, 8755 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8814 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9549 (iii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c. (M.) for Sel. Com., 2755, 2770 (i).
Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3489 (ii).

Chauvin, Mr. L. A., *Terrebonne.*
Address, on The, 504 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries Bill (Ques.) 1852 (i).
——— B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1928 (i); in Com., 5918 (ii).
Gouin, Mr. Lomer, Speech *re* Subsidies to Provs. (Ques.) 1951 (i).
Jésus River, Construction of Fishway, Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) for Copies, 3274 (i).
Montreal and Labelle Mail Service, Appnmt. of Mail Conductor (Ques.) 1966 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7661 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8335.
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8560 (iii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Lachute and St. Andrews Ry., Cor., Contracts, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4808 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8822 (iii).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Address, on The, 541 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Wallaceburg (remarks) 5492 (ii).
Apples, Fraudulent Packing, par. in Toronto *World* on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3754 (ii).
Binder Twine imported in 1899 (Ques.) 8218, 8990 (iii).
——— Sale of by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9931 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7214 (iii).
Bothwell Election, Speech of the Hon. Mr. Mills in the Senate (remarks) 9896 (iii).
Brantford Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1968 (i).
——— Salary, Commission, &c. (Ques.) 8464 (iii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5745 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6281 (ii).
Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2128 (i).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9600 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6444 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8946 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6425 (ii).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2954 (i).
Farran's Point Canal, Tenders for 1897, &c. (M. for copies*) 3873 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9637, 9883 (iii).
Indian Corn, Quantity Imported for Home Consumption, &c. (Ques.) 8217, 8632, 8990 (iii).
Inspection Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. *Penny*) on M. for 2°, 3872 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4443, 4561, 4600; Sen. Amts., 9723 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4448, 4452 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for. 4899 (ii).
Meagher, Thos., Seizure by U.S. Authorities, on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Ret., 2753 (i)
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9609; in Com., 9630 (iii).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2043 (i).
Quebec Cartridge Factory, Employees, Number, &c. (Ques. 9699 (iii).
——— Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 9843 (iii).
Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in Windsor *World*, 7221 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9489; on M. for 2°, 9758; in Com., 9759, 9819; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 9894 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6493; in Com., 6760, 6777, 6906, 6913 (iii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2766 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Alien Labour Law enforcement) 5471; (Exchequer Court) 5474 (ii); (Meagher's claim against U.S.), 10119, 10194; Yukon (living expenses) 10194 (iii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairy commissioner) 8269; (experimental farms) 8237, 8254; (illustration stations) 8283, 8297; (Paris Exhibition) 10140; (year book) 8233 (iii).
Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2988; (salaries) 2092; Finance (salaries) 2091 (i) 5018 (ii); Interior (salaries) 2082 (i); Justice (salaries, &c.) 10119 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Militia and Defence (salaries) 2071; Privy Council (salaries) 2052 (i).
Customs: B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8458; conc., 10212; N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8408 (iii); Yukon (salaries, &c.) 5599 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector, salary) 9009, 9018 (iii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Excise (preventive service) 4789; (salaries of officers) 4787 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8607; (St. Paul des Metis, seed grain, &c) 9045 (iii).

Indians (Ont.) 5689 (ii).

Insurance (general expenses) 7464 (iii).

Justice (Meagher, claim against U. S. Govt.) 10119 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (voter's lists) 2316 (i); 10135 (iii); (stationery supplies) 5734 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5123, 5133 (ii).

Militia (military stores) 5424; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5479 (ii); (annual drill) 7068 (iii); (clothing) 5444 (ii); (pay, allowance) 7027; (salaries) 7075, 7082 (iii); Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6352 (ii); (supplies) 7041 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Dom. and Ont. arbitration) 8702 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2999, 3021 (masters and mates) 3061 (i); 5196 (ii); (removal of obstructions) 3066 (i).

Penitentiaries (Manitoba) 5479; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).

Public Works: Dredging (plant) 5204 (ii); 8144 (iii); Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8079; (Ont.) 7993, 8014 (iii); (Point Pelee wharf) 10068; Wharfs, (N.S.) 7714, 7728; (P.E.I.) 7757 (iii); Miscellaneous (purchase of oil paintings) 8151; (surveys) 8149; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8148 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5614 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle) 8339 (iii); (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5182; (slaughtered hogs, &c.,) 5085 (ii); (tuberculosis, prevention among cattle) 8344 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7172; (car couplers) 9171; (increased siding accommodation) 9161; Indiantown Branch (Mr. Snowball's claim) 9167; Miscellaneous (Ottawa River) 9176 (iii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 5578 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District: Railways (surveys, &c.) 8700 (iii).

See "Administration of Justice," "Customs," "Militia," "Public Works."

Sydenham River, Dredging, Amount expended (Ques.) 3820 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6317 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3885 (ii); 9883 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*

Address, on The, 1463 (amt.) 1499 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, par. in Toronto *Star* (remarks) 2907 (i).

——— Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3084 (i).

B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6864 (iii).

Canadian Emigration to U. S., par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 1895 (i).

Can. Service Medal, Delay in Issue, Board of Claims, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2699 (i).

——— Recommendation by Mil. Dept., Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3945 (ii).

See Gen. Service, Medals, &c.

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8775 (iii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com. (Ques.) 1967 (i).

Customs House, Toronto, Employees, Names, Date of Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Dom. of Can. Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 2029 (i).

Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s (B. 104) 1°*, 2409 (i).

Dunn Avenue, Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Protection to (Ques.) 1857 (i).

General Service Medals, Date of Royal Warrants, Govtl. Action, &c. (Ques.) 8630 (iii).

See "Can. Service, Medals," &c.

Govt. Contracts, Prohibition of Sweating (Ques.) 1975 (i).

——— Number of Contracts awarded, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2961 (i).

G. T. R., Trackmens' Strike, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4539 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Papers *re* Settlement, 4858 (ii).

——— Rumoured Settlement (remarks) 5206 (ii).

Greater Britain Exhibition, Canadian Representation of Mineral Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 1959 (i).

Immigration Agents, Bonuses to (Ques.) 1975, 2191 (i).

Immigrants, Arrival in 1898, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3553 (ii).

——— Inducements to settle in Can., &c. (Ques.) 3076 (i).

Insolvency Legislation (remarks) 3252 (i).

I. C. R., Cars purchased, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 3553 (ii).

——— Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4612, 4639 (ii).

Kingston Penitentiary, Superannuations, &c., since 1899 (Ques.) 6379 (ii).

Medals, Canadian Service, Notice in Can. *Gazette re* Clasps and Ribbons, &c. (Ques.) 3083 (i).

——— Claims allowed by Commission, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 5860 (ii).

——— Design approved by Can. or Imp. Authorities, &c. (Ques.) 3266 (i).

See Can. Service, Gen. Service.

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112, in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6333 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5047; in Com., 5354 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8772 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5096; in Com., 6105, 6117 (ii).

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5384.

Ry. Legislation *re* Working Rules, &c. (remarks) 5748 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Ry. Regulations, American Standard, Adoption by Can. Rys. (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3458, 3484; on M. for 2°, 6702; in Com., 6768, 6782, 6796 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Miscellaneous (Alien Labour Law) 10123 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2980, 2989 (i); N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8408; Ont., 8452 (iii); Post Office (contingencies, Dead Letter Branch) 5069 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8494, 8508, 8563, 8619 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (restaurant-keeper) 10139; (voters' lists) 10136 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay and Quelle River) 10160 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5067; (military stores) 5429; Yukon Force (transportation and supplies 6347 (ii.)
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2991 (i.)
Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5813 (ii)
Public Works: Buildings (astronomical observatory) 9943; Buildings (B.C.) 9939; (lighting, &c.) 7097; (Ont.) 7626, 7629; (elevator, East Block) 9961; Ottawa (military store) 9942; Dredging (plant) 8143; Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 7763; Ont., 7966, 7977, 8003; (Toronto Harbour) 10067; (Port Colborne) 9296, 9301; (P. E. I.) 7757; Que., 8136; (Coteau, dredging) 10039, 10053; (Wharfs, N. S.) 7706, 7730, 7748; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8147; Yukon (telegraph lines) 10094; Telegraph Lines (North Shore St. Lawrence) 8149; Yukon (trails, roads and bridges) 10093 (iii.)
Miscellaneous (National Art Gallery) 8149; (purchase of oil painting) 8159; (statue of Her Maj.) 8159 (iii.)
Railways: P. E. I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5778; (private cars) 5788 (ii.)
Toronto P. O., Appnmts. by Govt., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1981 (i).
——— Appnmts. since 1896 (M. for Ret.) 2905 (i).
Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9854 (iii).
——— Liquor Permits, Cor. between N. W. T. Govt. and Int. Dept. (M. for copies*) 1878 (i).
——— Transportation Cos. employed by Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1958 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland (Ont.).*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5941 (ii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4304, 4311 (ii).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6334 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8772 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9321, 9470 (iii).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2985 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7549 (iii).
Customs: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8453 (iii).
Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector, salary) 9023 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8485, 8495, 8515 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10134 (iii); (stationery supplies) 5735 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5160; (supplies, &c.) 3537 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Can.) 8668 (iii).
Militia: Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6350 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2990, 3024 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Cheezetcook Wharf) 10005; (Malignant Cove Breakwater) 10003; Que., 8129; (Sabrevois Wharf) 10032; (St. Lawrence River Channel) 7562; (Montreal Harbour Improvements) 9978; (Wharfs, N.S.) 7707, 7737 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7415 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5778 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3892 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*
Can. Mining and Metallurgical Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) 1°*, 2790 (i).
Ottawa River Water Power, Lease, Terminations, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2961 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10136 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 9947; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Belliveau Breakwater) 10000; (Trout Cove Breakwater) 10000 (iii).

Costigan, Hon John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O.C.'s, Reps., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Roche*) for Copies, 2406 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 3° m., 2934 (i).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Letter read by P. M. G., on Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 5010 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Change of Attitude towards his Party, 3555, 3647 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9507; in Com. on Bill, 9828 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6952 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Noble Bros.) 4251 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9887 (iii).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*
Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4837 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1932 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6455 (ii).
Meagher, Thos., Seizure by U.S. Authorities, (M. for Ret.) 2742, 2754 (i).
Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in Windsor *World*, 7219 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 97) 1°*, 2247 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, &c., Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 9208 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 5474 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8286 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8477 (iii).
Temperance Act (1864) Amt. (B. 134) 1°, 3874 (ii).
Tobacco Experimental Station, Establishment in Essex Co., (Ques.) 2486 (i).
——— Foreign Leaf, Percentage required under Regulations (Ques.) 2486 (i).
——— Grown in Essex Co., Excise Duties, &c., par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2117 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9886 (iii).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Address, on The, 275 (i).
——— on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1772 (i).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3308 (i).
Budget, The, 2590 (i).
Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7205 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7644 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3326 (i).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1946 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2526; on M. for 3°, 2914 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8940 (iii).
G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3979 (ii).
Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8370 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8864 (iii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2761 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs (salaries) 2093; Inland Revenue (salaries) 2101; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2103; Militia and Defence (salaries) 2071 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 8352 (iii).

Craig, Mr. T. D.—*Con.*
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3896 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir L. H., K.C.M.G., *West Queen's P.E.I.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1598 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement at Toronto, Instructions to Agent (Ans.) 3084 (i).
Annapolis and Digby Basin, Reps. *re* Buoys, &c. (Ans.) 4993 (ii).
——— Buoy Service, Expiration of Mr. McCarthy's Contract for Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 4057 (ii).
Beauharnois Water Power, Improvement of (Ans.) 1883 (i).
See "Valleyfield."
Behring Sea Arbitration, Cost to Govt., &c. (Ans.) 2186 (i).
Berthier (en haut) Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1893 (i).
——— Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).
Bilodeau, Mr. L. P., Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
Brockville Election, Mailing of Voters' Lists, (Ans.) 2482 (i).
——— Ballot Papers, Printing and Distribution (Ans.) 3074 (i).
Brotchies' Ledge Lighthouse, Completion and Operation (Ans.) 2331 (i).
Brown, Barth., Campobello, N.B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4482 (ii).
Canadian Coast, Surveys of Currents, &c. (Ans.) 1824 (i).
Canadian Fishermen and American Fish Trusts, Complaints, *re* and Official Reps. (Ans.) 4993.
Chamberland, Mr. F. F., Charges against, Letter from Achille Lebel, (Ans.) 1884, 2900 (i).
Chemainus, B.C., Pilotage Limits (Ans.) 5312 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5900, 5910, 5921(ii),
Clareau, Mr. J. A., Claims for Materials for Construction, Chicoutimi or Ste. Anne's Wharf (Ans.) 3335 (ii).
Cold Storage for Fish Transportation from Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1978 (i).
——— Preservation of Bait for Fishermen (Ans.) 1978 (i).
Collingwood Harbour, Assignment of Contractors (Ans.) 1893 (i).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9608 (iii).
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. Cs. 5334 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 168) 1°*, 6397 (ii).
——— B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 2162, 2175 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6446 (ii).
Dick, Isaac, Fishery Guardian, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7765 (iii).
Dolphin, Fishery Cruiser, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Dom. Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Entrance Fees to limited number, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2360 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2159 (i).
Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 700 (i).
Fishery Officers, Leeds Co., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1818 (i).
Fourchie Harbour, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2904 (i).
Fraser River (B.C.) Miller's Landing Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2701 (i).
Fraser and Skeena River Fish Hatcheries, Erection by Govt. (Ans.) 4058 (ii).
Gabarus Breakwater, Inspection, &c., by Govt. (Ans.) 2698 (i).
Gallant, W. A., Engineer Point Lepreaux Fog-alarm, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4806 (ii).
Gananoque Public Buildings, Heating, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1881 (i).
Giant's Tomb Lighthouse-keeper, Salary, &c., (Ans.) 1834 (i).
Glass, Jas., Fishery Guardian at Charlotte, N.B. Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4482 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvement, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1881 (i).
Governor Pingree and *J. B. Lowe*, Strs., Registry in Can. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Grey, Robert, Lighthouse-keeper at Entrance Island, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 7319 (iii).
Hope Island Lighthouse-keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1834 (i).
——— Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5487 (ii).
Hudson Straits, Navigability, Cost of Expedition, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. Blair), in Com. on Res., 3408 (ii).
——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 4597, 4639 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4435.
——— Harris, Mr. A. H., Duties, &c., as Traffic Manager (Ans.) 1980 (i).
Inland Fisheries, Issue of Licenses by Local Govt. (remarks) 2910 (i).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt. (Ans.) 1886 (i).
——— Chapel Cove Breakwater, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 2905 (i).
Lenoir, Fishery Overseer, Ret. laid on Table, 4268 (ii).
License Fees for Fishing Traps, Issue of (remarks) 2047 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.*
Lighthouse Service, B.C., Adjustment of Salaries (Ans.) 3821 (ii).
Lobster Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 2319 (i).
——— (remarks) 2249, 2909 (i).
——— Pets. *re* Extension of Fshing Season (Ans.) 6122, 6561 (ii).
——— On M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7681 (iii).
——— Regulations (remarks) 3960 (ii).
——— Seizure of Traps, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) to Com. of Sup., 5505 (ii).
McKeen's Point, Construction of Storm Signals, cost, &c. (Ans.) 3083 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1165 (i).
Midland Harbours, Amt. of Dues collected (Ans.) 1834 (i).
Milltown, N.B., Appnmt. of Fishery Guardian (Ans.) 4482 (ii).
Mistassini and Ste. Méthode Storehouses, Construction, &c., Name of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 1888 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2178 (i).
Naval Brigade Reserve, &c., organized by Can. Govt., Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ans.) 6048 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act. Amt. (B. 137) 1°, 4150; 2° m., 6118 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9597, (iii).
——— B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 1897 (i).
Newfoundland Regulations *re* Live Bait (remarks) 2194, 2696 (i).
——— Regulations *re* Export (remarks) 6938 (iii).
——— Supply of Bait, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9465 (iii).
O'Donahue, Mr. W. T., Caretaker at Roberval, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).
See "Roberval," &c.
Oyster Beds, B.C., Claims of Nanaimo Ry. Co. (Ans.) 3821 (ii).
Pednault, Mr. P., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) in Com., 6878 (ii).
Personal Explanation, par. in Montreal *Star*, 618, 701 (i)
Petit de Grat Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt., Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 1886 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. and Branch Lines, Pets., Res., &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) 2384 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B., Cold Storage and SS. Communication (remarks) 5493 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour and Charlottetown Authorization B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9752 (iii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3142 (i).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2041 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.*

Prohibition Plebiscite, Expenses in Montreal City, Amounts unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 5312 (ii).

——— Poll-books, Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Moore*) for Copies, 2906 (i).

Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2965 (i).

——— Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Fraud) on M. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) to adjn., 3238 (i).

Public Works (Preservation of Public Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7674 (iii).

——— Inspection, Expenses of Tour, Name of Str., &c. (Ans.) 1881 (i).

Quadra, Str., Payment of Crew and Officers (Ans.) 3076 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5930 (ii).

——— B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9692; in Com., 9868 (iii).

Quick, Mr. James, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper, par. in Windsor *World*, 7222 (iii).

Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Rys. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4750 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9767 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 in Com., 6924, 6940, 6963 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co.'s B. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) on Order being called for 2°, 2152, 2°, 2649 (i).

Return, on Inquiry, Newfoundland Regulations *re* purchasing of Bait by Canadians 2696 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3499, 4151 (ii).

——— *re* P.E.I., on Inquiry for, 3878 (ii).

——— (Mr. *Gillies*) 4552 (i).

——— (Mr. *Martin*) 6319 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 10225 (iii).

Richelieu River, Placing of Buoys, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3796 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Wharf, Charges against Mr. Chamberland (Ans.) 1884, 2900 (i).

Rivière la Pipe Wharf, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 1892 (i).

——— and Peribonka Wharfs, Emplymt. of Labourers, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).

Roberval Dredging Scows, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1888 (i).

Safety of Ships (B. 170) 1°, 6929; 2° m., 9598 in Com., 9599 (iii).

Shamrock, Tug, Amount paid John C. Kaine, &c. (Ans.) 5666 (ii).

St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ans.) 1882 (i).

St. Lawrence, North Shore Telegraph Line, Contract for Poles, &c. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).

——— Channel, Protection to Navigation (remarks) 3343 (ii).

See Telegraphs.

Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.*

Skelton *vs.* The Queen, on Inquiry (Mr. *Davin*) for Rep. of Min. of Jus. *re* Release (remarks) 7441, 8171 (iii).

——— on Inquiry (Mr. *Davin*) for Papers, 7770

Soulanges Canal, Contracts, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) for Cor., Notices, &c., 1861 (i).

Steamship Service between P. E. I. and Liverpool, par. in *Examiner*, 3543 (ii).

Steveston, B.C., Tidal Lands, Claims for Leases, &c. (Ans.) 3822 (ii).

——— Applications for Leases, 1892, &c. (Ans.) 4058 (ii).

Stikine-Teslin Route, Survey, Rep. of Engineer (Ans.) 1886 (i).

Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3491 (ii).

Supply (M.) for Com., 3997 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Yukon (additional Judge) 10193 (iii).

Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2931; Finance (contingencies) 2277; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 2276 (i), 5024 (ii); (salaries) 2102; Privy Council (salaries) 2054 (i); Public Works (printing, &c.) 5072 (ii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).

Fisheries (Behring Sea expenses) 5180, 5181 (ii); (cold storage for bait, &c.) 10163 (iii); (dismissal of Capt. Babb) 4256; (gratuity to Com. Wakeham) 5183; (jurisdiction) 4242; (oyster culture) 4241; (Noble Bros.) 4244; (professional services to Mr. Hall) 5183; (salaries of Inspectors) 4013; Protection Service, 4719; (repairs, &c.) 5180 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2278; (voter's lists) 2281, 2292 (i); (Wood, Mr., late M.P., sessional indemnity) 10201 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5116; (gratuities) 5179; (salaries, &c.) 3523 (ii); (Traverse lighthouse) 10162 (iii); conc., 6385 (ii).

Marine Hospitals (care of sick seamen) 4009; (shipwrecked seamen) 4013 (ii).

Miscellaneous (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10169, 10185 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Bear River, removal of old piers) 10162 (iii); (Bird Rock) 6384 (ii); (life-saving rewards) 3064; (maintenance) 2989 (i), 5101 (ii); (masters and mates) 3058 (i); ("Minto" construction) 10161 (iii); (registrations) 3065; (removal of obstructions) 3065; (wreck investigations) 3065 (i).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8083; (Ont.) 7980; (N.S.) 5200 (ii); P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 10007; (Rocky Point breakwater) 10006 (iii); (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 5087 (ii), 7601; (West Point Pier) 10006; Que., 8112, 8121 (Coteau, dredging) 10055; Telegraphs (Chéticamp and Meat Cove) 10072 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5623, 5644 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7169 (iii); P. E. I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5755 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (Toronto Observatory) 5179.

Steamboat Inspection (Dom. Steamers and Fog Alarms) 4240, 4714 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—*Con.*
Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1890, 1891 (i).
See St. Lawrence.
Tidal Survey, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).
——— Can. Waters, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3795 (ii).
——— Stmnt. of Min. as to remarks of Allan SS. Captains, Rep. of Capt. Spain, &c., 3262 (i).
Toronto P. O., Appnmts. since 1896, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Ret., 2906 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Pub. Works and Private Secretary, &c. (Ans.) 1880 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* Licenses, Concessions granted, &c. (Ans.) 2331.
Valleyfield Public Buildings, Erection of (Ans.) 1883 (i).
——— Water Power, Deepening of Bay (Ans.) 1882 (i).
Veldt Rabbi, Dismissal as Chaplain St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (remarks) 10246 (iii).
Victoria, B.C., P. O., Safes, Elevators, &c., Tenders for (Ans.) 1887 (i).
Wharfs Revenue, &c., Stmnt. promised (remarks) 10221 (iii).
Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9853 (iii).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6226 (ii).
——— Letters from Americans *re* Administration (Ans.) 3823 (ii).
——— Messrs. Coste and Lafontaine's Instruction (Ans.) 1893 (i).
——— Skagway and Dawson Telegraph Line, Construction by English Co. (Ans.) 3073 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3887 (ii).
Wood Island, P.E.I., Lightkeeper, Charges against, Rep. of Commissioner, &c. (Ans.) 2327 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies of Cor., &c., 4817 (ii) 10117 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Address, on The, 338 (i).
——— on amt. (Mr. Bertram) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1807 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, (prop. Res.) 5861, 5893 (ii).
Agriculture, Minister of, Travelling and Living Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1825 (i).
Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7206 (iii).
B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6865, 6879 (iii).
Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6280 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5925 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1999 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2125 (i).
Commercial Treaties with British Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8175 (iii).
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896 (M. for O. C.'s,) 5314, 5348 (ii).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9601, 9728 (iii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8932; in Com. on B. 9662 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 4894; in Com., 6404, 6410, 6424; on M. for 3°, 6459 (ii).
Dry Dock Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8757 (iii).
Elevator Restrictions and C. P. R., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 2903 (i).
Galician Settlement at Saltcoats, Commissioner's Investigation (remark) 6935 (ii).
——— Outbreak of Scarlet Fever (remarks) 4895.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9637, 9646, 9651 (iii).
Grain Elevators, N.W.T., par. in Winnipeg *Tribune* (M.) to Com. of Sup., 5494 (ii).
Grain Standards, Legislation *re* Inspection, &c. (prop. Res.) 3829 (ii).
——— Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1910 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmens' Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4536 (ii).
Homestead Law in N.W.T., Interest on Pre-emptions, Memorial from Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 3080 (i).
Inspection (Wheat) Act. Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) on M. for 1°, 5100 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (remarks) 10225 (iii).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4677 (ii).
——— Rolling Stock, Additions to, par. in Moncton *Star*, 6319 (ii).
——— expenditure (remarks) 6562 (ii).
Klondike Official Guide, Preparation by Mr. Ogilvie (Ques.) 1827 (i).
Library of Parliament, Disturbance by Messengers (remarks) 10140, 10221 (iii).
Mail Bags, Contracts between Govt. and Ottawa Supply Co. (Ques.) 2185 (i).
Mining Claims and Homestead Entries by Govt. Officials, O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 1877 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Pouporc*) for Cor., &c., 5370 (ii).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. (B. 79) 1°, 2029 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2179 (i).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 1866 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*

N.W. Mounted Police, Special Constables, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1843 (i).

N.W.T., Abandoned Homesteads, Dewdney District, Cancellation by Govt. (Ques.) 3074 (i).

——— Grant Entry to W. C. Middleton, by Agent at Yorkton (M. for cor., &c.*) 1877 (i).

——— Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c., (M.) 2015, 2023 (i).

——— Seed Grain Indebtedness Security B. 189 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 9465 (iii).

Ocean Freight Rates (M. for cor., reps., &c.) 1861 (i).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9613, 9625; in Com., 9628 (iii).

Ottawa Supply Co. and Contracts with Govt. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).

Personal Explanation, par in Man. *Free Press*, 1952 (i).

——— par. in *United Canada re* Application for Mr. Costigan's seat, 3845 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8763 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5097; on M. for 2°, 6103; in Com., 6107.

Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7874 (iii).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6938 (iii).

Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par. in Newspaper, 9695.

——— (M. to adjn.) 9837 (iii).

——— Letter of Prime Minister to H. H. Kohlsaat (remarks) 10220 (iii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Insertion of remarks in *Hansard* by Min. of Pub. Works, 421 (i).

——— par. in *Daily Patriot*, P.E.I., *re* Sweating Clause, 9594 (iii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9182.

——— Order (Ques. of) 1982.

——— Stenographers' Fees, 9462 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8896 (iii).

——— Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2043 (i).

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7654; in Com., 7674 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 72) 1°, 1952 (i).

——— B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9733 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3859, 3861 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9208, 9337, 9429, 9468, 9486, 9518, 9530; in Com. on Bill, 9792 (iii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 8753, 9595, 9699, 9895, 10116 (iii).

Roads and Road Allowances in Man. B. 175 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 8152 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*

Rowe, Mrs. Elizabeth, Postmistress at Sintulata, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).

Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Facilities, Res. of N.W.T. Assembly (Ques.) 3255 (i).

Scrip issued to Half-breeds, par. in Calgary *Herald*, 7196 (iii).

Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 189 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9847; (amt.) 9848 (iii).

——— Liens, Cancellation, Legislation *re*, Res. from N.W. Council (Ques.) 2903 (i).

Sintulata Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 10118.

Skelton *vs.* The Queen, Inquiry for Rep. of Min. of Jus. *re* release (remarks) 7441 (iii).

——— Rep. of Min. of Jus., 8171 (M.) 8217, 8346 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 7770 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (additional Judge) 10192; (N.W.T.) 10122; Yukon (living expenses) 10193 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8739; (Paris exhibition) 10149 (iii).

Canals (St. Andrew's Rapids) 10156 (iii.)

Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes) 7001 (iii.)

Civil Govt.: Interior (contingencies) 7467; (salaries) 7467: Post Office, 7330; Public Works (contingencies) 7555; (salaries) 7552 (iii).

Collection of Revenues (telegraph lines, N.W.T.) 8183 (iii).

Dominion Lands (Inspectors, agents, &c.,) 7528; (scrip for half-breeds) 7501, 7514; (seed grain) homesteads, &c., N.W.T.) 7525 (iii).

Geological Survey (artesian borings) 7468 (iii).

Government of N.W.T. (schools) 7499 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (amt.) conc., 10218.

Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8484, 8498, 8536, 8562, 8571, 8590, 8656 (iii).

Indians: N.W.T. (annuities, &c.) 5694 (ii); (Industrial schools) 7487, 7493 (iii); Man. and N.W.T., 5691; (implements, &c.) 5716 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10197; (Library, messengers, &c.) 10140; (restaurant keeper) 10137; (voters' lists) 10135 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5172 (ii); (Traverse lighthouse) 10162 (iii).

Militia (pay, allowance) 7018 (iii); Yukon Force (contract for supplies) 6321 (ii).

Miscellaneous (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10179; (roads, &c., Banff, N.W.T.) 7531 (iii).

Post Office (Yukon mail service) 7365 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (improvements, &c.) 9388; (N.S.) 7614; Ottawa, Rideau Hall) 7691; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Shag Harbour) 9999; (Wharfs) 7703; Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10047, 10060; (St. Lawrence River ship channel) 7559, 7574, 7579, 7605; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 8196; (Ottawa) 8147.

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7160.

Yukon Provisional District (salaries, &c.) 8959 (iii).

Wade, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 7442 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*
Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9850 (iii).
——— Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6262 (ii).
——— par. in London *Times* (M. to adjn.) 6562, 6585, 7535 (iii).
——— par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8020 (iii).
——— Bennett Hospital, Matron and Medical Supt., Names, &c. (Ques.) 1979 (i).
——— Bourassa, Mr., Postmaster at Dawson City (Ques.) 1833, 1958 (i).
——— Fawcett, Mr., Dismissal as Gold Commissioner (M. for cor.*) 1878 (i).
——— Lafontaine, Mr. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1958 (i).
——— Militia Force, Mr. Justice Dugas' representations (Ques.) 1842 (i).
——— strength of Force, Cost of Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 1831, 1841 (i).
——— Professional Immorality, Taxes imposed, &c. (Ques.) 1842 (i).
——— Teslin Lake Ry. Route, Rep. of Engineer (M. for Copy*) 2026 (i).
——— Wade, Mr. F. C., Instructions or Permission to stake claims, &c. (M. for Copies*) 1877.

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Address, on The, 422 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5886 (ii).
Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7217 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9919.
B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6883 (iii).
Coal Oil and Free List (prop. Res.) 1982 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 68; N. 30) 2014 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2130 (i).
Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6875 (iii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4847 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9652 (iii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4198 (ii).
Half-breeds, N.W.T., Cor. between Mr. McDowall and Govt., *re* Reserve (Ques.) 2186 (i).
McKay, Thos., Indebtedness to Govt. for Timber Dues, Collection, &c. (Ques.) 2486 (i).
——— Emplymt. by Govt., Salary paid, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (i).
Man. and North-western Ry., Miles Constructed, Land Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2900 (i).
Moody, Inspector of N. W. Mounted Police, Charges against (Ques.) 8219 (iii).

Davis, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert (B. 10) 1°*, 618 (i); (M.) for Com., 3842 (ii).
N.-W. Mounted Police, Barracks at Batoche, Supplies for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (i).
——— Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission (M. for ret.) 3084, 3102 (i).
——— Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2019 (i).
Order, (Ques. of) Irrelevancy of Debate 10076 (iii).
Prince Albert Mounted Police Barracks, Date of Erection, &c. (Ques.) 8467 (iii).
——— Registry Office, Date of Erection, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8468 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9744.
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9393, 9586, 9588 (iii).
Sproule, R. J., Postmaster at Flesherton, Ont., Complaints against (Ques.) 9179 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Dom. Lands (seed grain indebtedness) 9015 (iii).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 8548, 8602; (St. Paul des Metis, seed and grain, &c.) 9041.
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 5692 (ii); (Veterinary surgeons) 10111 (iii).
Miscellaneous (well-boring machine, N.W.T.) 9056.
Public Works: Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 8208 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5650 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c, construction) 9215 (iii).
Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9858 (iii).

Desmarais, Mr. O., *Montreal (St. James).*
Address, on The, 1245 (iii).

Dobell, Hon. R. R., *West Quebec.*
Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3920 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5119, 5124 (i).

Domville, Mr. James, *King's, N.B.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1793 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 7770 (iii).
Domville, Lt.-Col., Charges against (Ques.) 1839.
——— Evidence before Pub. Accts. Com., &c. (Ques.) 1845 (i).
——— Leave of Absence, par. in St John *Su* (Ques.) 2899 (i).
Military College, Kingston, Militia Staff Amount expended from 1867 to 1889 (M. ret.*) 2029 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 135) 1°, 4055 (ii).
Militia, 8th Hussars, N.B., Annual Allowanc (Ques.) 3072 (i).
——— Stores, Sale of by I.C.R. (Ques.) 1858 (i).
——— Transfer, Orders from Dept., &c. (Ques.) 2897 (i).

Domville, Mr. James—*Con.*
N.W.T. Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3099 (i).
Parker, Mr. Charles H., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Mail and Empire re* Yukon Charges, 1167 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8647 (iii).
Pub. Accts. Com., 3rd Report of Com., on M. to conc., 4148 (ii).
Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Rys., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4757 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9509 (iii.)
St. John Battalion, 8th Hussars, Charges against Commanding Officer, Reps. *re* Investigation, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2026 (i.)
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8482 (iii).
Militia (arms, equipment, &c.) 9151 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7985.
Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation at St. John) 7257 (iii).
Sussex, N. B., Erection of Drill Shed (Ques.) 1857 (i).
Yukon Administration, Charges against, par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8064 (iii).
——— Council, Names, Appnmt, &c. (Ques.) 1832 (i).
——— Miners' Rights to cut Timber, &c. (Ques.) 1836 (i).
——— Officials, Appnmts. by Govt., Names, &c. (Ques.) 1832 (i).
——— Steamboat Owners, Permits to cut Timber, &c. (Ques.) 1836 (i).
——— Timber Regulations, Issue of Permits, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1836 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia,*.
Grain Seed Indebtedness in Man. and N. W. T. Securities (B. 16) 1°*, 618 (i).
——— Trade in Man. and N. W. T. Regulation (B. 15) 1°*, 618 (i); 2° *m.*, 1901; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2195 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4189 (ii).
North-west Territories, Expenditure on Capital Account (M. for ret.*) 1878 (ii).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c. on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2024 (i).
Yukon Liquor Permits, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1843 (i).

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*
Crow's Nest Pass Commission, French Translation of Rep. (Ques.) 1852 (i).
Experimental Farm, Establishment in St. Jacques (Ques.) 2110 (i).
I. C. R., Deniers, Dr., Ry. Bicycle Riding, &c. (Ques.) 5308 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. L. E.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Labelle, Mr. L. V., Emplymt. by Govt., (Ques.) 1887 (i).
——— Valcouer, Octave, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5309 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) Reading Bill in both Languages, 4649 (ii); 8744 (iii).
Pariseau, Mr. C. D., Postmaster at St. Esprit, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1962 (i).
Public Buildings, Ottawa, Tower Clock and Post Office Clock Lighting, Change of Method, &c. (Ques.) 6381 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8305.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10038 (iii).
Tobacco, Canadian and Foreign, Excise Duty paid since 1898, Number of Employees, &c (Ques.) 3075 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 1949 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 3150 (i).
Sudbury and Wahnapitae Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 2899 (i).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B. C.*
SUPPLY:
Canals (Wharfs, &c.) 5798 (ii).
Indians: B. C. (reserve commission) 5727 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5067; (clothing) 5443; (military stores) 5424 (ii); (pay, &c.) 7037 (iii); Yukon Force (supplies) 6323, 6342-60 (ii); 7037, 7057 (iii).
Post Office: Yukon District (mail service) 6364 (ii).
Public Works: Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5606, 5630 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9917 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4978 (ii).
——— B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7644 (iii).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1540 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Cor., &c., 5368 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8643 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9879 (iii).
Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1540 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8493 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7988 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5644, 5661.
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John City, N.B.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3764 (ii).
B.C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6897 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4982 (ii).
Canadian Northern Railway Co's (B. 151) 1°*, 5096 (ii).
Canned Goods Act Amt. (B. 125) 1°*, 3335 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 4338 (ii).
Coal Oil; on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1996 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6447 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1744 (i).
———4th Rep. (presented) 2529 (i).
Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8474; in Com. on Bill, 8762 (iii).
Excise, Inspection of Sealed Food Packages, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 2705 (i).
Imperial Service and Can. Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2349 (i).
Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3124 (i).
Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. 10 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com., 3842 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9613 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6104, 6114 (ii).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7664 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3922 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9591 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126(Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6949 (iii).
Safety of Ships B. 170 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 9599 (iii).
SS. Subsidies between St. John, Halifax and London, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 2900 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (protection service) 4720 (ii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8554 (iii).
Legislation (stationery supplies) 5733 (ii).
Public Works: Dredging (plant) 8142; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7997 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2992, 3012
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7164, 7179; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9221 iii).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *South Perth.*
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6317 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 5808 (ii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Criminal Code (Execution of Death Sentence) (B. 80) 1°, 2032 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4665
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8314 (iii).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Cattle Inspection, Montreal, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 10115 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8742 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8605 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S., *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1640 (i).
Annapolis Co., Port George Harbour, Pier, &c. (Ans.) 7532 (iii).
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Lanlerkin*) in Com., 7575 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, and Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (Ans.) 1883, 2481 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 1165, 2180 (i).
Banking Act Amt. (B. 127) 1°, 3497; in Com., 3763 (ii).
Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4840 (ii).
Benevolent Societies incorp. (B. 87) 1°, 2109 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel (prop. Res.) 4150; (M.) for Com. on Res., 4967; in Com., 4989 (ii).
——— (B. 161) 1°*, 5744 (ii); in Com., 7638 (iii).
Budget Speech and Estimates (remarks) 1952 (i).
——— (date of delivery) remarks, 2249 (i).
——— Financial Statement, 2410 (i).
Burns, Mr., Priv. Sec. Min. of Fin., Appnmt. to Permanent Force (Ans.) 8469 (iii).
Business of the Hse. *re* Estimates, 2025 (i).
——— (remarks) 9177 (iii).
Can. Permanent and Western Can. Mortgage Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com, 4846 (ii).
Central Railway, Cor., &c., in Dept., on Inquiries for, 5667 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. Bill (Ans.) 1956 (i).
Clarke vs. The Queen, Claims against Govt., on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 5752 (ii).
Clark, H. W., Services as Engineer on Dredge "Canada" (Ans.) 8630 (iii).
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1998 (i).
——— on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2126 (i).
Colborne and Maitland Ports, Harbour Improvements, Reps., &c. (remarks) 8633 (iii).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. *Montague*) for Reps. of Engineers, &c., 7771 (iii).
See Port Colborne.
Combinations in Restraint of Trade Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1945 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8173 (iii).
Companies Act Amt. (B. 160) in Com., 8774 (iii).
Counterfeit Bills, Circulation, &c. (remarks) 5206 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6446 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res. 8924; 1°*, 8947; in Com., 9676 (iii).
Dep. Speaker's Delegation of Powers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5483 (ii).
Dom. and Ont. Accounts, Indebtedness of Dom., 1898 (Ans.) 3545 (ii).
Drill Hall, Vancouver, Contract for Construction, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6122 (ii); 7765 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction (B. 177) prop. Res., 6123 (ii) 8472; in Com on Res., 8473 (iii); 1°* of B., 8474; in Com., 8757 (iii).
Dry Dock, Victoria, B.C., Pets. *re* Reduction of Charges, &c. (Ans.) 7766 (iii).
Estate Duty, Cor. incomplete (remarks) 8221 (iii).
Estimates, Year ending 1900 (presented) 2026 (i).
——— Suppl. (Ans.) 4147 (ii).
——— ending 1899 (presented) 4857 (ii).
——— Suppl. 1900 (remarks) 6459 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7242, 7442 (iii).
——— ending 1900 (presented) 7638 (iii).
——— Further (presented) 9835 (iii).
Esquimalt (B.C.) Dry Dock, Reduction, &c., Rates, Pets. against, &c. (Ans.) 6122 (ii).
Financial Situation (reply) to Mr. Foster, 10246.
Friendly Society Insurance, Govt's. Policy *re* Legislation (remarks) 3342 (ii).
Govt. Property, B.C., Lease, &c., Cor. respecting (Ans.) 8466 (iii).
Halifax Harbour Lightship and Resolutions of Board of Trade (remarks) 8921 (iii).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co's B. 74 (Mr. *Beattie*) in Com., 4846 (ii).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 86) 1°, 2108 (i); 2° m., 3504 (ii); M. for Com., 6391; in Com., 6391 (ii) 7091 (iii).
——— Rates, Mar. Provs., Advancement in Price (remarks) 8922 (iii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3734; on M. for 1°, 3769 (ii).
——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4125; in Com., on Bill 4597, 4635, 4705, 4711 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) reading Bill in both languages, 4649 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4446 (ii).
Iron Doors for Public Buildings, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 4273 (ii).
Loan Companies (B. 164) 1°*, 6120; 2° m., 6391; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 6391 (ii); in Com., 8475 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Members (Pictou) Mileage Allowance (Ans.) 6722 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2026 (i) 7638 (iii.)
Mint, Govt., Establishment in Can. (Ans.) 2190 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3111 (i).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6336 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 179) 1°, 8752; in Com., 9880 (iii).
Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Mins. of Crown on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5562, 5563, 5567 (ii).
North Shore Ry., Payment to Quebec Govt. by legislation of 1884 (Ans.) 3080 (i).
Ont. Provincial Debt. Reduction of Interest (Ans.) 3074 (i).
Order (Ques. of) wthdw. the word "impertinent," 5607 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization (B. 187) in Com. on Res., 9186; 2° m., 9609; in Com. (amt.) 9626 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Tower Clock, Change in Mode of Lighting, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6121 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor and Inventor (Ans.) 6381 (ii).
Petroleum Refineries, License Fees (prop. Res.) 3647 (ii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, Contract, &c. (remarks) 9310 (iii).
Port Maitland Harbour, on Inquiry (Mr. *Montague*) for Reps., &c., 9185 (iii).
See Colborne.
Prince Albert Mounted Police Barracks, Date of Erection, &c. (Ans.) 8467 (iii).
——— Registry Office, Date of Erection, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8468 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9181 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Royal Commission, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1885 (i).
——— Plebiscite, Amount paid and Balance due (Ans.) 5859 (ii).
——— Bagot Co., Unpaid Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1967 (i).
Pub. Accounts Committee, Meeting (remarks) 2604 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3940 (ii).
——— (B. 178) 1°, 8751; 2° m., 9683; in Com., 9868 (iii).
——— Amount expended and Loans advanced by Govt. (Ans.) 5309 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies in Pub. Accounts, 1898, Sums paid to Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 3267 (i).
——— Resolutions (remarks) 8633, 8922 (iii).
——— B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 8914; in Com. on Res., 9444; in Com. on Bill, 9768, 9778 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6941, 6979 (iii).
Returns, Incomplete (remarks) 9836 (iii).
Ste. Geneviève, Land Damages, &c., Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 6934 (iii).
St. Louis Lake, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8219 (iii).
Senate and H. of C. Act Amt. (B. 191) 1°, 9696; 2° m., 9845; in Com., 9846 (iii).
Subsidies. *See* Rys.
SUPPLY:
(M.) for Com., 2047, 2250 (i), 4171, 6281, 6462 (ii); 7001, 7675, 7773, 8172, 8221, 10118 (iii).
On M. (Mr. *Foster*) that Com. rise, 5481 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8730 (iii).
Canals: Lachine (Heney & Borthwick's claims) 10153; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan's claim) 10152 (iii); Welland (remission of arrears for rental) 5792 (ii).
Charges of Management (agents' salaries) 5012; (printing Dom. notes) 5012 (ii) 7002 (iii).
Civil Government: Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 2086; Customs (contingencies) 2981; Finance (salaries) 2090 (i) 5016 (ii); Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 2047 (i); High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 8749 (iii); Inland Rev. (clerical assistance) 5015 (ii); Interior (salaries) 2078 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (salaries) 2083 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 7554 (iii); (printing, &c.) 5072; (printing, stationery, &c.) 5085 (ii); (salaries) 7536, 7547 (iii); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 2077; Privy Council (salaries) 2051 (i); Railways (salaries) conc., 6382 (ii); Sec. of State (Mungovan, P., salary, &c.) 2076 (i), 5019, 5853 (ii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).
Collection of Revenues (letters of credit) 8191 (iii); (Public Works Agency, B.C.) 8190; (repairs to docks, &c.) 8178; St. Lawrence (telegraph and cable) 8181; Slides and Booms (salaries, &c.) 8178; Telegraph Lines, (B.C.) 8184; (N.W.T.) 8183; (Pelee Islands) 8188; (P.E.I.) 8180 (iii).
Customs: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8459; N.S., 8405; conc., 10208 (iii).
Excise (commissions on stamps) 4795 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (Saw's Pit, wharf) 9997 (iii); (Hantsport wharf) 5198 (ii); (Jordan Bay) 9998; (Newellton wharf) 9998; (Salmon River, freight shed) 9996 (iii); (Ont.) 5203; Dredging (new plant) 5203; (Mar. Provs.) 5201 (ii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8599 (iii).
Indians: (B.C.) 5709 (iii); (St. Régis lockup) 5711 (ii).
Insurance (general expenses) 7463 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (iii); (voters' lists) 2298 (i) 10130 (Wood, Mr., late M. P., sessional indemnity) 10201; Senate (Senator Sanford's sessional indemnity) 10196 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (supplies, &c.) 3535, 3538 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Porto Rico) 10158; (Magdalen Islands) 8682 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5067 (ii); (compensation to Mrs. Maxwell) 9133 (iii); (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5458 (ii); (pay, &c.) 7035; (properties, &c.) 7089; (Royal Military College) 7026; (stores, &c.) 7095 (iii); Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6352 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 8705 (iii); (claim for translation of Liquor Traffic Rep.) 5851 (ii); (*Canada Gazette*) 8703; (classification of old records) 8702; (Dom. and Ont. arbitration) 8702; (election under Can. Temp. Act) 10111; (extra clerks, &c.) 8705 (iii); (International Commission) 5852 (ii); (printing) 5850 (ii) 8703 (iii); (Printing Bureau Plant) 8703 (iii); (professional services, Mr. C. J. R. Bethune) 5471 (ii); (publication of documents of Mining Institute) 8702; (Rand's English-Micmac Dictionary) 10112; (Regulation Code for railways) 10155; (Royal Society grant) 8706 (iii); (West Indies Relief fund) 5852; Yukon District (hospital grant) 6378 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston, investigation) 5073 (ii).
Pensions (Fenian raid) 8750 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (B.C.) 9988; Experimental Farm, 7688; (N.B.) 7616; (N.S.) 7613, 7615, 9943 9945 (iii); (Halifax Quarantine Station) 5089 (ii); N.W.T. (improvements, &c.) 9988; (Rossland building) 9988; (Ont.) 7622; (Alexandria Reformatory) 9960; (Astronomical Observatory) 9943; (Sarnia Post office) 9962; (Toronto Post office) 9958; (Windsor Drill Hall) 9962 (iii); Ottawa (Electric Lighting) 5183 (ii) 9939 (iii); Conc., 6386 (ii); (Elevator, East Block) 9960; (Langevin Block) 9938; (Lighting, Repairing, &c.) 9989; (Military Store) 9942 (iii); (Patent Office, photographic establishment) 5091 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7689; (repairing, &c. East and West Blocks) 9957; (rewiring Library) 9956; (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9958; (Rideau Hall) 7692; Ottawa (steel shelving) 9989 (iii); (Western Deptl. Block) 5089 (ii); (furnishing &c. 9959; Que., 7619 (iii); (repairs, &c.) 5090 (ii); (Victoriaville P.O.) 9954; Dredging (Mar. Provs. and B.C.) 10070; (plant) 8137; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8085; (generally) 8102; (Man.) 8077; N.B. (Black Brook wharf) 10014; (Campobello breakwater) 10010; (Campbellton wharf) 10013; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10012; (Main River wharf) 10012; N.W.T., 8084; N.S. (Berlin protection works) 10001; (Brooklyn wharf) 10003; (Bruléwharf) 10003; (Chezzetcook wharf) 10004; (Clifton wharf) 9991; (Gabarus breakwater) 9991; (Gunning Cove wharf) 9991; (Harbourville wharf) 10002; L'Ardoise breakwater) 9991; (Lockeport breakwater) 9991; (Malignant Cove breakwater) 10003; (Parker's Cove wharf) 10001; (Parrsboro' dredging) 10003; Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9993; (Ragged Island wharf) 9991; (Seymour Point wharf) 9991; (Shag Harbour wharf) 9998; (Tatamagouche) 10003; (Town Point wharf) 9999; (Victoria county wharfs) 9991; (wharfs) 7699; (Wolfville harbour) 10002; (Yarmouth breakwater) 9990; (Young's Landing wharf) 9997; Ont., 8012, 7966-8019; (Kaministiquia) 7611; (Otonabee improvements) 10065; (Point Pelee wharf) 10068; (Portsmouth wharf) 10065; (Port Colborne) 9250; (Providence Bay wharf) 10068; P.E.I., 7751; (Cardigan pier) 10010; Que., 8103; (Beauport wharf) 10039; (Cacouna wharf) 10017; (Carleton pier) 10014; (Coteau, dredging) 10039; (Isle aux Grues wharf, &c.) 10018; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Lévis dock, enlargement) 9987; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9964; (New

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (Rivière du Lièvre) 10039; (Sabrevois wharf) 10020; (Ste. Anne de Bellevue wharf) 10039; (St. Gédéon wharf) 10019; (St. Irénée wharf) 10018; (St. Jérôme wharf) 10018; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5086 (ii) 7557, 7579, 7589, 9986 (iii); Miscellaneous (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's statute) 8150; (National Art Gallery) 8149; (purchase of oil paintings) 8150; (Statue of Her Maj.) 8150; (surveys) 8149; Roads and Bridges, N.W.T., 10070: (Edmonton bridge) 8196 (iii); (Ottawa) 5204 (ii) 8147; Que. (Portage du Fort) 10071; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice District) 10070; Telegraph Lines (Anticosti Island) 10072; (B.C. and Teslin Lake) 10099; (Cheticamp and Meat Cove) 10072; (North Shore St. Lawrence) 8149; Yukon District, 10107; (Edmonton trail) 10109; (Lewes and Yukon river improvements) 8192 (iii); (telegraph lines, letter of instructions to Mr. Charleson, read) 5653; (telegraph lines) 5604, 5612, 5653 (ii) 10093; (trails, roads and bridges) 10087 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7162, 7171, 7245, 7259 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5762, 5777 (ii); (repairs to Gov. Gen.'s Car "Victoria") 8751 (iii).

Supply (B. 169) 1°*, 6464 2°*, in Com., 3°*, 6596 (ii).

——— (B. 192) 1°, 2°, 3°*, 10246 (iii).

Tobacco Grown in Essex Co., Excise Duties, &c., par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2118 (i).

Travelling Expenses, &c., of Fin. Minister and Private Secretary (Ans.) 1880 (i).

——— Foster, Hon. Geo. E., ex-Fin. Min. (Ans.) 1885 (i).

——— Tupper, Sir Charles, ex-Minister and High Commissioner, &c. (Ans.) 1885 (i).

Vanluven, Peter, vs. Dom. Bank, Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (Ans.) 9178 (iii).

Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, &c., on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5390 (ii).

——— Order (Ques. of) Member (Sir *Charles Tupper*) asked to wthdrw. Statement, 5394 (ii).

Ville Marie Bank Suspension, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) 8756, 9066 (iii).

Ways and Means, The Budget (Financial Stmnt.) 2410 (i).

——— (Res. for Com.) 6463 (ii); 10225 (iii).

Wharfs and Piers in different Provs., Number constructed, Maintenance, &c., 1867 to 1899 (Ans.) 5861 (ii).

Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 163) 1°*, 6120 (ii); in Com. 8780 (iii).

Yukon Administration, &c., par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup. 8046 (iii).

——— Telegraph Line, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 6047, 6120 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A., *Brome.*

Address, on The, 1432 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1352 (i).

——— Minister's Travelling and Living Expenses (Ans.) 1825 (i).

Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3755 (ii).

Archives, Canadian, Rep. (presented) 4061 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4842 (ii).

Belœil Public Works, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3828 (ii).

Bubonic Plague and Quarantine of Pacific Steamers at B. C. (remarks) 5989 (ii).

Cattle Inspection, Montreal, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 10115 (iii).

Duchesne, Dr. J. A., Complaints against Dr. Hall (Ans.) 3336 (ii).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1888 (i).

Experimental Farm Establishment in St. Jacques (Ans.) 2110 (i).

——— Rep. (presented) 3070 (i).

Hall, Dr., Appnmt. as Inspector of Cattle at Chicoutimi (Ans.) 3336 (ii).

Illustration Stations, Fruits, Cereals, &c., Govt. Action (Ans.) 2110 (i).

Labelle, Mr. L. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1887 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9882 (iii).

Paris Exposition, Can. Commissioners, Space, &c. (Ans.) 1829 (i).

Plebiscite, Speech of Min. of Agriculture at Ottawa Convention (Ans.) 1826 (i).

Poultry Feeding Experiments, Govt. Action (Ans.) 2110 (i).

Spraying Fruit Trees, Govt. Action (Ans.) 2111.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (agricultural societies) 8237; (archives) 8224; (cold storage) 8706; (dairy branch) 8268; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 8337 (iii); (experimental farms) 5073 (ii) 8249; (farm bulletins, printing, &c.) 8264; (general statistics) 8236; (illustration stations) 8280, 8320, 8745 (iii); (N.W.T. exhibition) 5074; (Omaha exhibition) 5074 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 10140 (iii); (Patent office, library) 5074; (*Patent Record*) 5074 (ii); (year book) 8226 (iii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2271 (i); 5027 (ii); (salaries) 2257, 3027 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8689 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Quarantine stations) 9954; (N.S.) 9945 (iii); Ont. (Patent office, photographic establishment) 5090 (ii); Ottawa (steel shelving) 9990; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Knowlton Landing) 10020; Montreal Harbour improvements) 9972; (Sabrevois wharf) 10026 (iii).

Quarantine (amount transferred to Pub. Works) 5075 (ii); (cattle) 8340 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 5075 (ii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 8338; (tuberculosis, prevention among cattle) 8344; Winnipeg, hospital) 8338 (iii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Sydenham River, Amount expended for Dredging (Ans.) 3820 (ii).
Tobacco Experimental Station, Establishment in Essex Co. (Ans.) 2486 (i).
Tuberculosis Inspection in Chicoutimi County, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 5097 (ii).
——— Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6301 (ii).
Victoria Harbour, Rep. of Resident Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 3828 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9890 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C., *Quebec County.*
Administration in the Yukon, Living Expenses of Judges Dugas and McGuire, Instruction *re*, &c., 5490 (ii).
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Wallaceburg (remarks) 5492 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3764 (ii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 3310 (i).
Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of, Names of Tenderers (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
British American Bank Note Co. *vs.* the Queen, Action by Govt. (Ans.) 6050 (ii).
B.C., Chief Justice McColl, Judicial Residence, &c. (Ans.) 3546 (ii).
Choquette, Mr. Justice, Place of Residence, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5097 (ii).
Clarke *vs.* the Queen, Claims against Govt., on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 5751 (ii).
Companies Act Amt. (B. 160) 1°*, 5744 (ii).
Coulombe *vs.* the Queen, Trial Proceedings, &c. (Ans.) 3946 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 2165, 2172 (i).
——— B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2918 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2949 (i).
Exchequer Court and Railway Debts (B. 159) 1°, 5385; in Com., 6101 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4567 (ii).
Judges and Political Preferments (Ans.) 4484 (ii).
Martin, Mr. Justice, Judicial Residence, B.C. (Ans.) 3546 (ii).
Meagher, Thos., Arrest, &c., Claims on U. S. Govt. for further compensation (remarks) 5492 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Ret., 2752 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Consolid. Act Amt. (B. 91) 1°*, 2182 (i); 2° m., 3914, in Com., 3915; 3° m., 3985, on amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3988; Sen. Amts., 6100 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commission, Total Cost, Claims Unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 5484 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Schafheitlin & Fitzgibbon, Customs Infraction (Ans.) 2190 (i).
Spinks, County Court Judge, B. C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Alien Labour Law, enforcement) 5472; (circuit allowance, B.C.) 5471; (Exchequer Court) 5473; Yukon (law books, &c.) 5469; (living expenses, one Judge) 5469; (maintenance of prisoners) 5468; (supplies for Judge Dugas) 5469; (stationery, &c.) 5470; (travelling expenses for Judge Maguire) 5469 (ii)
Civil Government: Justice (salaries) 2063 (i).
Customs (contingencies) 5856 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 4724 (ii).
Legislation (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5740 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Canadian Law Library, London, Eng.) 5470; (Chief Justice Strong's expenses in Eng.) 5471 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 5479; (Dorchester) 5478, 5480; (Manitoba) 5479; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).
Post Office (legal expenses) 5802 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3890 (ii).
Yukon District, Appnmt. of Sheriff, &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1692 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 109) 1°, 2604 (i).
Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2137 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6444 (ii).
Hudson Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co. (M.) to receive Pet., 2182 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 8782 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5359 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9732 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Cheggozin breakwater) 9990; (removal of obstructions, Chebogue river) 9990; (Town Point wharf) 10000; (wharfs) 7742 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10130 (iii).
Militia (salaries) 7081 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3050 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9889 (iii).
Yukon Territory Act. Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amt.) 9857 (iii).

Fortin, Mr. T., *Laval.*
Champ de Mars, Lease, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2143 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1926 (i); in Com., 5903, 5918 (ii).

Fortin, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2131 (i).
Jesus River, Construction of Fishway, Plans, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 3269 (i).
Le Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 895 (i).
Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges, &c., Personal Explanation *re* par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 7632 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7227 (iii).
Priv. and Elections Com. (M.) to employ shorthand writer, 7193 (iii).
——— (M.) to print evidence, 7194 (iii).
——— (M.) to sit concurrently with sessions of the Hse., 7771 (iii).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 9461 (iii).
——— Stenographers' Fees, 9461 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Rep. of Commission, Printing and Distribution (M.) 1879 (i).
SUPPLY:
Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9091 (iii).
Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 31) 2° *n.*, 1867; in Com., 4314 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *York, N.B.*
Active Militia Force, Resignation of Majors, &c. (Ques.) 5487 (ii).
Address, Closing of Debate (remarks) 975 (i).
——— on The, 109 (i).
——— on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1622 (i).
——— Her Majesty *re* Transvaal Question (seconded) 8995 (iii).
Allan SS. Service and Govt. Contract, Names of Vessels sailing from St. John, 1897-8 (Ques.) 3258 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Dies, Plates, &c., Duties collected, &c. (M. for Ret.) 3828 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 3498 (ii).
British American Bank Note Co., Claims for Balance due (M. for cor.*) 2180 (i).
Brockville Election, Mailing of Voters' Lists (Ques.) 2482 (i).
Budget Speech and Estimates (remarks) 1952 (i).
——— The (Date of delivery) remarks, 2249 (i).
——— (reply) 2537 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 2247 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., N.B., Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3554, 3824 (ii).
——— (M. for cor., &c.*) 3873 (ii).
Central Ry. Co. of N.B. and Dept. of Rys. and Canals, Cor., &c., *re* Subsidies (M. for copies*) 2788 (i).
——— Cor. in Dept., Inquiry for, 5667 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5902 (ii).
Coal Mining under Nanaimo Harbour, Leases, &c. (Ques.) 8991 (iii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Commissions *re* Investigations against Govt. Employees, Names of Commissioners, Allowances, &c., Dismissals, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2180 (i).
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O.C.'s, 5327 (ii).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9600, 9729 (iii).
Clark, H. W., Services as Engineer on Dredge *Canada*, &c. (Ques.) 8630 (iii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8924; in Com. on Bill, 9665, 9678 (iii).
Dawson and Vancouver Mail Service, Arrival, Despatch, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2961 (i).
Dom. and Ont. Accounts, Indebtedness by Dom., 1898 (Ques.) 3544 (ii).
——— Election Act (Voting Machines) Amt. B. 81 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 1°, 2036 (i).
——— Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6400, 6412, 6419; on M. for 3°, 6461 (ii).
——— Notes, Number of Sheets, Back and Tint Plates, Delivered to Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 1878.
Drummond Co. Ry. (Inquiry for Ret.) 2972 (i).
See "I. C. R."
Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. on Res., 8474; in Com. on Bill, 8758 (iii).
Edgar, Sir James, late Speaker, Decease of (remarks) 9061 (iii).
Estimates, Suppl. (Ques.) 4147 (ii).
——— Suppl. for 1900 (remarks) 6458 (ii).
Financial Situation (Amt.) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 10228 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9309, 9464 (iii).
Gaspé Customs Officer and Election, Charges against, 10222 (iii).
Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6396 (ii).
German Discriminating Duties on Can. Imports (Ques.) 1851 (i).
Govt. Rys., Working Expenses for May and June, 1898, &c. (Ques.) 4810 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Appnmts. since Aug., 1896, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for List) 1877 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3759 (ii).
Inspection (Wheat) Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) on M. for 1°, 5099 (ii).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6392 (ii).
I.C.R. and C.P.R., Running Privileges between St. John and Halifax (remarks) 2247 (i).
——— Drawback, Payments of on Freight Charges, Amount paid for Jan. and Feb., 1899 (M. for Ret.*) 3149 (i).
——— Earnings, Gross, and Working Expenses from 1898 to 1899 (M. for Ret.*) 2027 (i).
——— Extension to Montreal, Amount Accrued and paid to G.T.R. since July, 1898 (Ques.) 4478 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Car Mileage *re* Victoria Bridge, Incomplete Ret., 4858 (ii).

——— Extension to Montreal, Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2793; on M. for 2°, 3908, 4152; in Com., 4165; on M. for 3°, 4733, 4899 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2811 (i).

——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4067, 4144; in Com. on Bill, 4354-4476, 4554-4711; on M. for 3°, 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9716 (iii).

——— Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4450.

——— G.T.R. Engine and Car Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 4811 (ii).

——— Expenditure, &c. (M. for Ret.) 5313 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 1849.

——— Papers *re* Car Mileage (remarks) 4891 (ii).

——— Passes issued since Aug., 1896, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1860 (i).

——— Trois Pistoles, Dismissal of Pierre Michaud and F. Belanger, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 5945 (ii).

Interior Act Amt. B 147 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6398 (ii).

International Commission between G.B. and U.S., Persons connected therewith, Names and Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2180 (i).

Loan Companies B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8475 (iii).

Manitoba Lake, Drainage, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (i).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Claims for Land Damages by Farmers of Lindsay, Letter read by P.M.G., Ruling asked for, 5006 (ii).

Militia, Age Limits, Service of Lt.-Cols., Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1852, 2183 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9880 (iii).

——— Island Belt Line Ry. B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 6327 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 1896 (i).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Minister of the Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5561 (ii).

North Shore Ry., Payment to Quebec Govt. by Legislation of 1884 (Ques.) 3080 (i).

Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Gold Fields Co. (M. to adjn.) 3801 (ii).

Ont. Provincial Debt, Reduction of Interest (Ques.) 3074 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Fielding*) Definition of the Word "impertinent" 5608; Appeal to Speaker 5610 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorizatcn B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9187; on M. for 2°, 9612; in Com., 9626 (iii).

Pacific Cable between Australia and G.B. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 8383.

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8763 (iii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection B. 131 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3884 (ii).

Postal Notes, Contract, Cost, &c. (M. for Copy) 1982 (i).

——— engraving, printing, &c., Tenders, &c. (M. for Cor., O.Cs., &c.) 1877 (i).

——— Cards, issued by P. O. Dept., Quality, &c. (M. for Cor. &c.*) 1879 (i).

——— Stamps, Cards, &c., issued since Jan., 1897 (M. for stmnt.*) 1877 (i).

Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par in Newspaper, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 9843 (iii).

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. Stationery, &c., on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5378 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Stenographers' Fees, 9462 (iii).

——— Rep. of Committee (remarks) 10115 (iii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Amount paid and Balance due (Ques.) 5859 (ii).

——— Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting (M. to adjn.) 2037 (i).

——— request that they be laid on Table 1894, 1955 (i).

Pub. Accounts Com., Meeting (remarks) 2604, 2965 (i).

——— Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3233 (i).

——— Postponement and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4344 (ii).

——— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr *Wallace*) to print, 9837 (iii).

——— Report of Com. (remarks) 10116 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3917 (ii).

——— B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9684; in Com., 9861, 9878 (iii).

Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remark) 9001 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731 (iii).

——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4746.

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9311, 9332, 9469, 9500, 9561; in Com. on Bill, 9770, 9786, 9810 (iii).

——— Subsidies in Pub. Accounts 1898, Sums paid to Prov. of Que. (Ques.) 3267 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3457 (ii).

Returns, Incomplete, 9836 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Central Ry. of N.B.) 5387.

——— Michaud and Belanger Papers, incomplete (remarks) 9844, 9895 (iii).

Returns (inquiry) 1432 (i); 4171, 6320, 6596 (ii); 8075, 8224, 8386, 8754, 9310, 9595 (iii).

Royal Military College, Clothing Contract (Ques. 6722 (ii); 6932 (iii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence River and Canals, Deepening of Navigation, &c., Contracts entered into, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2788 (i).

Safety of Ships B. 170 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2', 9599 (iii).

Schafheitlin & Fitzgibbons, Customs Infraction (Ques.) 1889, 2190 (i).

Scugog Indians, Liquor sold, Cor. between Dept. and Mr. A. Soper (M. for copies*) 3149 (i)

Smith, Mr. Abner, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3256 (i).

Speaker, late Sir James Edgar, Decease of (remarks) 9061 (iii).

Stamps, Jubilee and Greater Empire, Stamp Plates, Cost, Number, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2028.

Stony Mountain Penitentiary Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 9837 (iii).

Sugar Imports from British West Indies, Quantity and Value (Ques.) 2327 (i).

SUPPLY:

Res. in Com., 6462 (ii).

(M.) that Com. rise, 5481 (ii).

Administration of Justice: Yukon (additional Judge) 10191; (living expenses) 10194 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 8224: (dairy commissioner) 8265; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 8237 (iii): (experimental farm) 5073 (ii); (farm bulletins, printing, &c.) 8264; (general statistics) 8236; (illustration stations) 8279; (iii); (N. W. T., exhibition) 5074; (Omaha Exhibition) 5074 (ii); (Paris Exhibition) 10140 (iii); (Patent Branch Library) 5075; (patent record) 5074 (ii); (year book) 8227 (iii).

Canals: Chambly (telephone lines) 5783; Lachine (deepening river St. Pierre) 5782 (ii); (Heney and Borthwick's claims) 10153; Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 10155 (iii); (North Channel) 5780 (ii); Rainy River (lock and dam) 10154; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan's & Co.'s claim) 9240 (iii); Welland (remission of arrears of rental) 5790 (ii).

Charges of Management (agents' salaries) 5012; (printing of Dominion notes) 5012 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2270; (salaries) 2256; Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 2269; (salaries) 2086; Customs (contingencies) 2973, 2986; (salaries) 2093; Finance (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2090 (i) 5017 (ii); (Geological Survey (salaries) 2104; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 2047; Indian Affairs (salaries) 2083 (i); Inland Revenue (contingencies) 2270; Interior (clerical assistance) 5023 (ii); (salaries) 2077; Justice (salaries) 2063; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 2266, 2276; (salaries) 2070, 2102 (i); (clerical assistance, &c.) 5012 (ii); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 2083 (i); Post Office (contingencies) 5068; (contingencies, Dead Letter Branch) 5969 (ii); (Post Office Dept.) conc., 10202 (iii); Printing and Stationery, 2077; Pub. Works (Printing, &c.) 5072, 5085 (ii); Privy Council (contingencies) 2265; (salaries) 2048; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 2276; (salaries) 2250 (i); 6382 (ii); Sec. of State (contingencies) 2269 (i); (P. Mungovan's salary) 5019, 5853 (ii); (salaries) 2076; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2107, 2262 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Collection of Revenues (repairs, &c., to docks) 8182; telegraph lines (B.C.) 8184; (N.W.T.) 8183; (Pelee Island) 8188; (P.E.I.) 8180; (St. Lawrence cable) 8181 (iii).

Customs: B.C. (repairs to cruisers) 5602, (contingencies) 5856 (ii); N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8392 (iii); Ont. (salaries) 5595; (stationery, &c., B.C. and Yukon) 5600; (suspense account, Montreal) 5588; Yukon (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5596 (ii), 10109 (iii).

Dominion Lands (Chief Inspector, salaries, &c.) 9006, 9019; (surveys, printing plans, &c.) 9053 (iii).

Excise (allowance to Customs Officers) 4790; (commissions on stamps) 4791; (preventive service) 4788; (salaries of officers) 4770 (ii).

Fisheries (Behring Sea expenses) 5181; (dismissal of Capt. Babb) 4256; (gratuity to Mr. Venning) 5183; (gratuity to Com. Wakeham) 5183; (repairs, &c.) 5189 (ii).

Geological Survey (salaries) 5663 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8494, 8509, 8648; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9029 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (reserve commission) 5726; (*Vigilant*) 5729; (liquor traffic, suppression) 5710; (Man. and N.W.T. annuities) 5711 (ii); (boarding schools) 10110 (iii); (general expenses) 5722; (implements, &c.) 5712; (Sioux) 5721; (surveys, &c.) 5721; N.W.T. (annuities, &c.) 5695; (Oka Reserve) 5709; (Ont.) 5674; (St. Regis Lockup) 5711; (surveys, &c.) 5710; (Inspectors and agencies) 5730 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (salaries, &c.) 5587 (ii).

Interior: Yukon District (general expenditure) 6367 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Debates) 2280; (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2278 (i); (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (iii); (sessional clerks) 2280; (stationery supplies) 2278 (i), 5731 (ii); (voters' lists) 2302 (i), 8759, 10127; (Wood, late M.P., sessional indemnity) 10201 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5139; (salaries, &c.) 3524; (Traverse lightship) conc., 6384 (ii), 10162 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 8685; (Gaspé and Quebec) 8686; (Grand Manan) 8684; (G.B. and Can.) 8662; (Magdalen Islands) 8681; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157; (St. John, Halifax and London) 8673; (St. John and Liverpool) 8671; (St. John and Minas Basin) 8686; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 8675; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 8686 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5067, 5415 (ii); (arms, equipment, &c.) 9145; (armouries) 9125 (iii); (clothing) 5445 (ii), 9126; (compensation to Octave Ouelette) 9127; conc., 10218 (iii); (defence scheme) 5466; (Hamilton rifle range) 5465; (London property) 5465; (military properties) 5421; (military stores) 5431; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5451, 5857; (rifle range, B.C.) conc., 6390; (Royal Military College) 5464; (transport) 5451; (transportation and supplies) 6323 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Canadian Law Library, London, Eng.) 5470 (ii); (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113, 10169 (iii); (Crow's Nest Commission expenses) 5831 (ii); (Half-breed claims commis-

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—Con.
sion) 9056 (iii); (Half-breed claims expenses) 5832; International Commission) 5852; (printing) 5851 (ii); (Refund of Customs duties, on fish &c. P.E.I.) 10114, 10169, 10180 (iii); Translating Rep. of Liquor Commission) 5852 (ii); (well-boring machine, N.W.T.) 9056; (Wentworth vs. Mathieu, litigation) 10112 (iii); Yukon District (contingencies) 6376 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police (service) 5832; (Yukon service) 5834 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Bird Rock) conc., 6383; (maintenance and supplies) 5103 (ii); ("Minto" construction) 10161 (iii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).
Post Office (inspector's salaries) 5798; (inspector's salary) conc., 6387; (legal expenses) 5801 (ii); mail service) 10202 (iii); (Rainy River service) 5826; (refund for stamps stolen) 5800; Yukon District (railway mail service) 6360 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (B.C.) 9988; (Rossland building) 9988; N.B. (St. John Quarantine stations) 9954; N.W.T. (improvements, &c) 9988; (N.S.) 9944; Ont. (London drill hall) 9962; Ottawa (Astronomical Observatory) 9953 (iii); (electric lighting) 5184 (ii) 9939, 9989; conc., 6386 (ii); (furnishing &c., Deptl. Buildings) 9959; (Langevin Block) 9939; (military store) 9942; (Patent office) 5092; (repairing &c. East and West Block) 9957; (rewiring Library) 9956; (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9959; (steel shelving) 9990 (iii); (Western Deptl. Block) 5089; (ii); (St. Catharines Drill Hall) 9957; (Sarnia Post Office) 9962; (Windsor Drill Hall) 9962 (iii); Que. (repairs, &c.) 5090 (ii); (Victoriaville P.O.) 9954; (amt.) conc., 10218; Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 10070; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8085; (generally) 8102; (Man.) 8077; N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 10010; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10011; (Hopewell wharf) 10010; (Main River wharf) 10012; (St. John River and Belleisle wharfs) 10011; (N.W.T.) 8084; N.S. (Belliveau breakwater) 10000; (Berlin protection works) 10000; (Brooklyn wharf) 10003; (Cheggogin breakwater) 9990; (Chezzetcook wharf) 10005; (Gabarus breakwater) 9992; (Malignant Cove Breakwater) 10003; (Newellton wharf) 9998; (Porter's Lake, dredging &c.) 9993; (removal of obstructions Chebogue River) 9990; (Salmon River freight shed) 9997; (Saw's Pit wharf) 9997; (Shag Harbour wharf) 9998; (Town Point wharf) 9999; (Young's Landing wharf) 9997; Ont., 7966, 7989, 7987; (Port Colborne) 9256, 9290; (Toronto Harbour) 10066; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 10007; (Rocky Point breakwater) 10006; (West Point Pier) 10006; Que., 8104; (Baie des Hondeur wharf) 10019; (Cacouna wharf) 10016; (Carleton pier) 10014; (Coteau, dredging) 10058; (Lévis dock, enlargement) 9987; (Montreal Harbour improvement) 9964, 9982; (New Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (Rivière du Lièvre) 10069; (Sabrevois wharf) 10020 (iii); (St. Lawrence River channel) 5086 (ii) 9986; Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 10070; (Portage du Fort) 10071; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice District) 10070; Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10073; (B.C. Atlin, &c.) 10099; (Chetican camp and Meat Cove) 10072: Yukon District (buildings) 10107; (Edmonton trail) 10109; (river improvements) 8194 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5606, 5612, 5623, 5637 (ii) 10093; (B.C. and Teslin Lake) 10100; (trails, roads and bridges) 10087 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 8338; (Winnipeg hospital) 8338 (iii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Indiantown Branch Mr. Snowball's claim) 9167 (iii); (rolling stock) 5754 (ii); (Point Tupper improvement) 9171 (iii); (repairs to Car Victoria) 5785 (ii); (shops at Moncton) 5753; (telegraph service) 9171 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5754; conc., 6387 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9229 (iii); (subsidies, Central Ry. Co.) 5788 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District (customs) 8747; (salaries, &c.) 8986, 9002 (iii); Militia, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9072, 9109; (salaries, &c.) 8661 (iii).

Valleyfield Customs Collectors, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5503 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Delay in sending in Revision, (Ques.) 2530, 2698 (i).
——— N.B., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2530 (i).
Wharfs, Revenue, &c., Stmnt. promised (remarks) 10221 (iii).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8038 (iii).
——— On M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6192 (ii).
——— Charleson, Mr. J. B., O. C., Appointing, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).
——— Administrator and Officials, Instructions, &c. (M. for copies*) 1877 (i).
——— Appnmts. by Govt. since Aug., 1896, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1876 (i).
——— Dom. Police, Number, Distribution, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (i).
——— Dredging for Minerals, &c. (Ques.) 3079 (i).
——— Investigation, Inq. for Rets., 4341 (ii).
——— Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. (M.) to print, 3877 (ii).
——— Liquor Permits and sanction of Min. of Int. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— (cor.*, &c., Inquiry for) 5667 (ii).
——— names of Cos., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1877 (i).
——— quantity, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 1876 (i).
——— Mail Service between Dawson and Vancouver, &c. (Ques.) 1966 (i).
——— carriage of Registered Matter (remarks) 4352 (ii).
——— Mining Regulations: Inquiry for Ret., 2248 (i).
——— Ogilvie's, Mr., Letter *re* Connection with British Can. Goldfields Co. (M. to adjn.) 3719 (i).
——— Permanent Militia, Number, Cost of Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 1892 (i).
——— Rumours *re* conflict between U. S. and Can. Customs (remarks) 975 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Yukon Telegraph Lines, Construction by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 6047, 6120 (ii).
——— Territory Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9849 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Address, on The, 939 (i).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3995 (ii).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9601 (iii).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction, B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2926 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6453 (ii).
Dowding, Annie Inkson, Relief (B. 136) 1°*, 4147 (ii).
Militia Clothing, Tenders, &c., (M.) for Copies to be ref. to Pub. Accounts Com., 3874 (ii).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co's. B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6332 (ii).
N.W.T. Rebellion Losses (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3099 (i).
Nova Scotia Steel Co's. (B. 139) 1°*, 4259 (ii).
Pacific Cable, par. in *Citizen re* Conference of Sec. of State for Colonies, and High Commissioner 3268 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 2036 (i).
Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2965 (i).
——— Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) to adjn., 3246 (i).
——— Postponement and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4344 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com., conc., 4147 (ii).
——— (M.) to refer papers *re* Christie, Mr. W. J., to Com., 4477 (ii).
——— Delay in Meetings (remarks) 7195 (iii)
——— Meetings during Sittings of House (M.) 8780 (iii).
——— 6th. Rep. of Com. (presented) 9836 (iii).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7653 (iii).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9734 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Rys. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4749 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 8229 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8543; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9047 (iii).
Lighthouses and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5163 (ii).
Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5816 (ii).
Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, &c. on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5396 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3990 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. J., *East Lambton.*
Address, on The, Omission of Name from Division List, 1861 (i).
British American Bank Note Co. *vs.* The Queen, Action by Govt. (Ques.) 6050 (ii).
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 1986 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2134 (i).
London Mutual Fire Ins. Co. of Canada (B. 68) 1°*, 1949 (i).

Frost, Mr. F. T., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Address, on The, 1386 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9389 (iii).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*
Address, on The, 1095 (i).
Brown, Barth, Campobello, N.B. Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4482 (ii).
Dick, Isaac, Fishery Guardian, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7765 (iii).
Fishing Weirs, Charlotte Co., Licenses Issued, Dates, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2962 (i).
Gallant, W. A., Engineer Point Lepreaux Fog-alarm, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4806 (ii).
Glass, Jas., Fishery Guardian at Charlotte, N.B., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4482 (ii).
Lepreaux, N. B., Customs Officer, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5313 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) for Com. of Sup., 7686 (iii).
Milltown, N.B. Appnmt. of Fishery Guardian (Ques.) 4482 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries (cchtin-tingencies) 5028 (ii).
Public Works: Dredging (plant) 8140; N.S. (Wharves) 7718; (Ont.) 8003 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 7373; Postmasters' salaries) 5826 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 143) 1°, 4477 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Tobacco (Can.) Manufacture, Number of Factories, Memorials, &c. *re* Duty (M. for stmnt.*) 2027 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Address, on The, 1336 (i).
Fraserville Harbour and Board of Trade Resolutions (Ques.) 1968 (i).
I.C.R., Addition to Workshops at Rivière du Loup (Ques.) 4480 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Supt. W. A. Dube, Location of Headquarters (Ques.) 2533 (i).
——— Delay in furnishing Cars, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 1853 (i).
——— Employees Working Hours, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
I.C.R. Fraserville Accommodation, Pets. from Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (i).
——— pets., *re* Disorderly Conduct (Ques.) 2899 (i).
——— Headquarters at Lévis, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3551 (ii).
——— Machinery at Rivière du Loup, Application by Supt. for Additions, &c. (Ques.) 4481 (ii).
——— New time-table (Ques.) 4481 (ii).
——— Removal of Shops from Rivière du Loup to Lévis (Ques.) 2533 (i).
——— Roberge, Cyrille, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1857 (i).
——— Salaries of Employees at Rivière du Loup Workshops (Ques.) 4480 (ii).
Legris, Mr., Postmaster at Ste. Eulalie, Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 4272 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Can. Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 62) 1**, 1753 (i).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1**, 1753 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 4135 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for Com. 5250, 5256 (iii).
Printing Com. 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 5745 (ii).
Printing of Parlt. 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com., conc. (M.) 5378 (ii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 8913 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6777, 6803 (ii).
SUPPLY:
On M. (Mr. *Foster*) that Com. rise, 5482 (ii).
Canals: Trent (construction) 7301 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8614 (iii).
Legislation (distribution of blue books to law associations) 5738 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5130 (ii).
Militia (clothing) 7103; (monuments) 7152 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Wharfs, N.S.) 7744; Ont., 8006; (Port Colborne) 9262, 9274 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7157, 7180, 7189 (iii).
Welland Power and Supply Canal Co.'s (B. 67) 1**, 1949 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond N.S.*
Arichat Breakwater, N.S., Repairs, Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ques.) 5485 (ii).
Babin's Cove Wharf, Arichat, N.S., Cost, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 5486 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5916 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2916 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Descousse Wharf, N.S., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 5486 (ii).
Dredging, Richmond Co., N. S., Amount expended from 1891 to 1896 (Ques.) 5485 (ii).
Fourchie Harbour, N S., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2904 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4680 (ii).
Jerome Point Lighthouse, Inquiry for Ret., 3669.
L'Ardoise Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt. (Ques.) 1886 (i).
——— Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 2904 (i).
Little River, N.S., Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
McNeil, Stephen, Beaver Cove, Rental charged by Govt. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
——— Lighthouse-keeper at Richmond, Papers Respecting, Inquiry for Ret., 4732 (ii).
Newfoundland Fisheries and French Shore, Rep. of Royal Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 3070.
Petit de Grat Breakwater, Amount expended by Govt., Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 1886 (i).
Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4752 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4552 (ii).
St. Peter's Canal, Amount expended from 1891 to 1896, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 5472.
Fisheries (salaries of Inspectors) 4050 (ii).
Indians: B.C. (reserve commission) 5728; Man. and N. W. T. (implements, &c.) 5718 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 3528.
Militia (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5456 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 5478 (ii).
Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5820 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 4240 (ii).
Tobacco, Reduction of Duties (prop. Res.) allowed to stand, 4813 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., Finance Minister and Private Secretary (Ques.) 1880 (i).
Wharfs and Piers in different Provs., Number constructed, Maintenance, &c., from 1867 to 1899 (Ques.) 5861 (ii).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 6939 (iii).
Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5400 (ii).
Yukon District, Harper, Mr. F., Postmaster at Dawson City, Issue of Notice (Ques.) 1961 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*
Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3756 (ii).
Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7218 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6999 (iii).
Settlers from Eastern Can. to N. W. T., Aid by Govt. (Ques.) 2534 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8317.

Graham, Mr. D., *North Ontario.*
Trent Valley Canal, Land Valuations, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 5311 (ii).
Mr. F. D. Moore, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5311 (ii).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland (O.)*
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 2318 (i).
Printing Bureau and Sunday Labour (remarks) 3879 (ii).
Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac, Change of Title (B. 108) 1°*, 2529 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c) 8487, 8589 (iii).
Indians (N.S.) 7490 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7933; Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10030 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3765 (ii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3299; in Com., 3308 (i); Sen. Amts., 7578 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7639 (iii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3253 (i) 9177 (iii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5920, 5933 (ii).
Contracts let without Tender, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. C's, 5335 (ii).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9607 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6434 (ii).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1920 (i).
Drummond County Ry. Res., Inquiry for Papers, 2249; 2973 (i).
See I.C.R.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9637 (iii).
Great Northern Ry. Co's B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6970 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3761, 3881 (ii).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6392 (ii).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry., Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3345; on M. for 1°, 3771.
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2821 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Agreement, B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4069, 4113; on M. for 2°, 4164; in Com., 4357, 4370, 4685, 4712 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9710 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9881 (iii).
——— Island Belt Line Ry. Co's B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6336 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 1896 (i).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9612 (iii).
Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) in Com., 6878 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour and Charlottetown Authorization B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9758 (iii).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2040 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Public Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7673 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Tenders for Construction, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2112 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioner B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9868 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9736 (iii).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9319, 9458, 9468, 9472; in Com. on Bill, 9767 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6904, 6941 (iii).
Restigouche Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) on Order for 2°, 2650 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8076 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Chambly (telephone lines) 5784; Cornwall (repairs to locks) 5784; Farran's Point (enlargement) 5779 (ii); Galops (enlargement) 7442; Lachine (Atwater Avenue wall) 9173; (Heney & Borthwick's claim) 9173, 10153; Murray (landing stage) 7454 (iii); (North Channel) 5779 (ii); Rideau (Kilmarnock cut) 7454; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co., claims) 9235; Welland (Port Colborne) 7454 (iii); (remission of arrears of rentals) 5791 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 7463 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Interior (contingencies) 7468 (iii); Militia and Defence (salaries) 2073 (i); Post Office 7354 (iii); Privy Council Office (salaries) 2058; Railways and Canals (salaries) 2250 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Telegraph lines, B.C. 8186; (Pelee Island) 8189 (iii).
Customs (Suspense account, Montreal) 5593 (ii).
Geological Survey (Artesian borings) 7473 (iii).
Insurance (General expenses) 7463 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2281 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Construction, &c.) 5133 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Margaree Cheticamp) 10157; (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10159 (iii).
Militia (rifle ranges) 9144, 9154 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10169; (refund of duties on fish. &c., P.E.I.) 10173; (Regulation Code for railways) 10155 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7615, 7619; Ont., 7625, 9960; (Alexandria Reformatory) 9980; (London drill hall) 9961; (Ottawa electric lighting) 9940; (furnishing, &c., Deptl. Buildings) 9959; (Ottawa, heating, &c.) 7698; Royal Military College) 9980; Harbours and Rivers

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
(Man.) 8078; Ont. (Kaministiquia) 7612; (Port Colborne) 9252, 9277; (Wharfs, N.S.) 7700; Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10052; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9980; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7562, 7580, 7593; Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 10071; Yukon-Telegraph (B.C. and and Teslin Lake) 10100; Lewes and Yukon river improvement) 8194; (telegraph lines) 10094.
Railways (increased station accommodation) 9163; I.C.R. (freight rates) 7458; (increased siding accommodation) 9156; (Indiantown Branch, Mr. Snowball's claim) 9165; (Halifax, elevator) 9172; (passenger coach) 9172; (rolling stock) 7432; (telegraph service) 9172; (St. John, accommodation) 7404, 7420, 9164; St. John, elevator) 9163) (miscellaneous) 7455 (iii); (repairs to "Victoria") 5784; P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5755, 5773 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9228; (removal of curves) 7398 (iii).
Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9112 (iii); (N.W. Mounted Police) 6388 (ii).
Walker, Postmaster at Ailsa Craig, Charges against (M. for cor.*) 3873 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9890 (iii).
Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6580 (ii).

Harwood, Mr. H. S., *Vaudreuil.*
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4653 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Address, on The, 1075 (i).
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7575 (iii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 3498 (ii).
Binder Twine, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1837 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7208 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9921 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4987 (ii).
Consolidation of the Statutes of Can. (Ques.) 4270 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6443 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8938 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6437 (ii).
Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6876 (iii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4848 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1881 (i).
Grain Exports to Germany in 1898-99, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 8990 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
G.T.Ry. Trackmen's Strike, &c. on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4523 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4198; to M. for 3°, 4780 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4439, 4628 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4450 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s Pet. (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, 1948 (i).
Members of the Govt., Absence from Ottawa, (Ques.) 1819 (i).
Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3118 (i).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5043 (ii).
Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. 10 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com., 3344 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) 6778 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2152 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6105 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7915 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8908 (iii).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5042 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9741.
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9548; in Com., 9767 (iii).
Registered Letters, stolen off C.P.R. train (Ques.) 1829 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3465 (ii); in Com., 6972, 6993 (iii).
Stock, David, Relief B. 88 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3491 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farm) 8257; (illustration stations) 8286; (Paris exhibition) 10149; (year-book) 8226 (iii).
Canals: Trent (construction) 7314 (iii).
Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes) 7002 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Post Office, 7356 (iii).
Customs (suspense account, Montreal) 5595 (ii).
Fisheries (salaries of inspectors) 4040 (ii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8557, 8607 (iii).
Indians: Man. and N.W.T. (implements, &c.) 5719 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Digby) 8673 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 7062 (iii); (clothing) 5448 (ii), 7115 (iii); (military stores) 5426 (ii); (salaries) 7079; (Yukon supplies) 7050 (iii).
Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 5805 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Buildings (Ont.) 7623; Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 8002, 8013; (Sheguiandah pier) 10069; Que., (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7610 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5620 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3896 (ii); 9885 (iii).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *South Brant.*
Budget, The, 2682 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6550 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Excise (commissions on stamps) 4792 (ii).
Immigration: (agents, salaries, &c.) 8597, 8611 (iii).
Indians (Ont.) 5685 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3898 (ii).

Hodgins, Mr. W. T., *Carleton, Ont.*
Civil Service Employees, Names of Employees who have received their Statutory Increases since 1896 (M. for Ret.*) 5943 (ii).
Iron Doors for Public Buildings, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 4273 (ii).
Ottawa and Cyrville Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 8991 (iii).
Post Office Deptl. Employees, &c., Names of Employees who have not received Statutory Increases since 1896 (M. for Ret.*) 5943 (ii).
Ry. Mail Service, Supt. and Staff, Salaries and Travelling Expenses (M. for Ret.*) 5944 (ii).
Steel Boxes, Int. and Indian Depts., Purchased by Govt., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4482, 4995 (ii).

Holmes, Mr. R. *West Huron.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3322 (i).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1943 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8905 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting, &c.) 5185 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 8011 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Address, on The, 631 (i).
Balsam Lake, Removal of Stone Piles (Ques.) 2332 (i).
Can. Troops for the Transvaal, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 7328 (iii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Mr. Thornbury (Ques.) 1976 (i).
Devlin, Mr. James, Prosecution by Dept. of Justice (remarks) 7218 (iii).
Dibblee and Dupont, Messrs., Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 2114 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Entrance Fees to Limited Number, (prop. Res.,) 2358 (i).
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 974 (i).
——— Yukon Route, Instructions to Messrs. Dibblee and Dupont (Ques.) 2114 (i).
Fenelon Falls, Construction of Slides (Ques.) 1978 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4541, 4547 (ii).
Imperial Service, and Canadian Brigade and Can. Seamen, (prop. Res.,) 2335, 2352 (i).
Indian Agent at Rama, Payment of Witnesses *re* Inquiry (Ques.) 2114 (i).
McLaren's Creek, Construction of a Roadway (Ques.) 3257 (i).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Amounts paid by Govt. Services, &c. (Ques.) 1976, 2321 (i).
——— Farmer of Lindsay *re* Damages by Floods, &c., (Ques.) 4485 (remarks) 4486, 4499 (ii).
——— Claims for Land Damages by Farmers of Lindsay, 5000 (ii).
Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Ont. Alliance (remarks) 7326 (iii).
Permanent Corps, Pension System, (prop. Res.) on Order being called, 2487, 2706 (i).
Noble, Mr., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 2184 (i).
Ontario County Court Judge, Name, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i).
Pigeon River, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).
——— Swing Bridge, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2480 (i).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 974.
Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meetings (remarks) 7195 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9460, 9543, 9579 (iii).
Rama Indian Agent, Charges against, Cost of Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 1976 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*)) in Com., 6955 (iii).
Rosedale Swing Bridge, Expenditure, Amount contributed by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2333 (i).
Scugog River, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).
Stamped Envelope, 2-cent purple, Number issued and distributed, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (i).
——— Number purchased in Toronto, Issue of and Distribution (Ques.) 2189 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 8237; (year book) 8230 (iii).
Canals: Trent (construction) 7299, 7305; (Rosedale bridge) 7318 (iii).
Civil Government: Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 2089; Customs (salaries) 2094; Geological Survey (salaries) 2105; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2103 (i); Post Office, 7331 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Dominion Lands (Chief Inspector, salary, &c.) 9022 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8494, 8585, 8603, 8626; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9028, 9042 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 7063; (armaments, &c.) 7153; (armouries) 9126; (arms, equipment, &c.) 9150; (clothing) 7100; (miscellaneous) 7148; (pay, allowance) 7027; (properties, &c.) 7088; (provisions) 7130; (Royal Military College) 7140; (salaries) 7078; (stores, &c.) 7098; (transport, &c.) 7131 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings Ont., 7627; (Ottawa military store) 9943; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Gabarus breakwater) 9992; (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9993; Que., (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7579, 9986 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7432; (rolling stock) 7434.
Yukon District: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9067 (iii).
Trent Canal, Jordan, Mr. Wm., Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 1977 (i).
——— Payment of Workmen (Ques.) 1977 (i).
Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Issue of Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i).
Volunteers of 1866, Granting of Medals (Ques.) 2114 (i).
Yukon District, "Bench" and "Creek" Claims, Disputes pending, &c. (Ques.) 3077 (i).
——— Militia Force, Charges against *re* Misconduct: on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 9963 (iii).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., *East Hastings.*
Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s Bill (M.) to extend Time for receiving Pet., 5384.
——— B. (No. 162) 1°*, 5945 (ii); in Com., 7480.

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Atlas Loan Co's (B. 30) 1°*, 895 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co's (B. 43) 1°*, 1165 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° 4341 (ii).
——— Request to have placed on Govt. Orders, 7218, 7322 (iii).
G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3982 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4519, 4544 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4616 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4453 (ii).
Knights of Labour and Mechanics Assembly, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3149 (i).
Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7241 (iii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9612 (iii).
Quebec Cartridge Factory, Dismissal of Labourers &c. (Ques.) 2186 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Ry. Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act. Amt. B. 32 (Mr. *Beattie*) on M. for 2°, 1876 (i).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 9442, 9493, 9570, 9777 (iii).
St. Thomas and Aylmer Mail Service, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 9698 (iii).
Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4237 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Welland (bridges &c.) 7454 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Post Office 7332, 7347 (iii).
Excise (salaries of officers) 4770 (ii).
Fisheries (oyster culture) 4241; (salaries of Inspectors) 4014, 4045 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2302 (i).
Militia (armouries) 9129 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 7368 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings Ottawa (electric lighting) 5186; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 5203 (ii); Roads and Bridges (Banff) 5204 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7430; (rolling stock) 7433; (uniforms) 7459 (iii).
Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9124.

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Address, on The (remarks) 1447, 1462 (i).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3992 (ii).
Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd. Rep., on conc., 3441 (ii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3308 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn. 3971 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn. 4508 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4612, 4699 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5043 (ii).
Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3293 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Consolidated Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3917 (ii).
Ry. Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2199 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2263 (i).
Indians (Ont.) 5679 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (stationery) 2278.

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place o Free List, 2006, 2013 (i).

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G., *Portneuf.*

Adulteration of Food Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 3335; in Com., 3990 (ii).

Allaire, Mr. J. P. O., St. Boniface, Man., Claim against Govt. (Ans.) 1894 (i).

Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3758 (ii).

Atlin District, Brewery Licenses issued (Ans.) 5484 (ii).

Buffalo and Crystal Beach Ferry Service, License and Privileges Granted, &c. (Ans.) 4994 (ii).

Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O.C.'s, Reps., Cor., on M. (Mr. *Roche*) for Copies, 2406 (i).

Civil Service (Dismissal of Officials) Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2231 (i).

Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2127 (i).

Costigan, Hon. Mr., on Personal Explanation, 3667 (ii).

——— Cor. between Dept. laid on Table, 3875 (ii).

Curless, Chas. H., Preventive Officer, Grand Falls, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4056 (ii).

Excise, Inspection of Sealed Food Packages, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 2705 (i).

Financial Situation, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 10237 (iii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. *Penny*) on M. for 2°, 3872 (ii).

——— (Petroleum and Naphtha) Act Amt. (B. 131) 1°, 3749 (ii).

——— (Wheat) Act Amt. (B. 132) 1°, 3751; M. to wthdrw. Bill, 5098 (ii).

——— (B. 156) in Com., 9636, 9651 (iii).

Grain Exports from Can. Harbours during 1898 (Ans.) 3075 (i).

Grain Standards, N.W.T., Legislation *re* Inspection, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3837 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act, Violation *re* Seizure of Tobacco (remarks) 10227 (iii).

——— (B. 124) 1°*, 3335; in Com., 3759, 3881 (ii).

Inspection of Wheat, Deputations, &c. (remarks) 1540 (i).

——— (Wheat) Amt. (B. 156) 1°, 5099 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8769 (iii).

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection (B. 131) prop. Res., 3885; in Com., 3884 (ii).

Potash Inspection and Montreal Board of Trade (Ans.) 1858 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners' B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9862 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8294, 8306 (iii).

Civil Government: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 2270 (i); (printing and stationery) 5013 (ii); (salaries) 2100 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7554 (iii).

Dominion Lands (Chief Inspector's salary) 9026 (iii).

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Excise (allowance to Customs Officers) 4790; (commissions on stamps) 4790; (preventive service) 4788, 5578; (salaries of officers) 4770, 4787; (special translation) 4803 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (salaries, &c.) 5586 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 8105 (iii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 5578; (salaries, &c.) 4803 (ii).

Tobacco, Duties collected (Ans.) 1818 (i).

——— Foreign Leaf, Percentage required under Regulations (Ans.) 2486 (i).

——— Excise Duty paid since 1898, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3075 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 128) 1°, 3544; in Com., 3885 (ii), 9883 (iii).

——— B. 143 (Mr. *Ganong*) on M. for 1°, 4478 (ii).

Yukon District, Liquor Permits issued by Mr. Ogilvie, Disallowance by Govt., 3790 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*

Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 8077, 8172 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4152 (ii).

License Fees for Fishing Traps, Issue of (remarks) 2046 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7687 (iii).

Newfoundland and Canadian Fishermen, Supply of Bait, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9465 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Resolutions (remarks) 8921 (iii).

——— B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9452, 9488, 9580 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.): 3523 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2996 (i).

Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5811 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7616; Dredging (plant) 8140; Harbours and Rivers (wharfs, N.S.) 7728, 7750 (iii).

Kendry, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c. on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4543 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Purchase of Land for Dam at Nassau (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Klock, Mr. J. B., *Nipissing.*

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Ship Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Papers respecting, 4878 (ii).

Kloepfer, Mr. C., *South Wellington.*

International Commission between Can. and U. S., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1815 (i).

Medals for Long Service, Regulations respecting (Ques.) 7320 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8556 (iii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 4730 (ii); in Com., 7480 (iii).
Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. *Hurley*) to extend Time for receiving Pet., 5385 (ii).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 5096 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for Com. (amt.) to ref. back to Com. on. Rys., 5042 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) Member repeating Private Conversation; on Mr. Speaker's ruling, 5406 (ii).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 2182 (i); 5378 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9400 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3461; on M. for 2°, 6636 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 2246 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8608 (iii).
Van Wart, Isaac Stephen, Relief (B. 180) 1°*, 8913 (iii).
Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6577 (ii).

Lang, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*
Havelock and Oak Lake Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3824 (ii).
Lang P. O., and Ry. Station, Carriage of Mails, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3823 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Wharves, N.S.) 7703 (iii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Allaire, J. P. O., St. Boniface, Man., Claim against Govt. (Ques.) 1894 (i).
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7576 (iii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3301, 3306 (i); Sen. Amts., 7578 (iii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1934 (i).
Committees of the Hse., Meetings at same hour (remarks) 2320 (i).
Debates Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1746 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6405, 6435 (ii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4310 (ii).
Man. Legislation, Disallowance by Dom. Govt., Pets., Memorials, &c., from Executive Council, protesting against (M. for Ret.*) 2788 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 5351 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9614 (iii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*
Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5380 (ii).
Return, Inquiry for, 1753 (i).
——— Non-production (remarks) 3071 (i).
St. Norbert, Inundations of Red River, Claims of Owners (Ques.) 1894 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8514 (iii); (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9036 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5742 (ii); (voters' lists) 2293 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G., *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 84 (i).
——— consdn. (M.) 6 (i).
——— Closing of Debate (remarks) 975, 1016 (i).
——— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2963 (i).
——— to Her Maj. *re* Transvaal Question (M.) 8992 (iii).
Adjournment for Ascension Day (M.) 2790 (i).
——— Deceased Members (M.) 6; (remarks) 7 (i).
——— Easter (M.) 531 (i).
——— Queen's Birthday (remarks) 3340, 3379 (ii).
——— (M.) 3440 (ii).
Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 3442 (ii).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 5877, 5894 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary, American rumours *re* Canada's Contention on, M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 3846 (ii).
——— modus vivendi (remarks) 1074, 1166 (i).
——— and Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5386 (ii).
See International Commission.
Alien Act, B.C., Cor. with B. C. Gov. respecting (Ans.) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).
——— Disallowance by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 7768 (iii).
——— Labour Law, Enforcement, par. in Toronto *Star* (remarks) 2907 (i).
——— Enforcement at Hamilton (remarks) 3880 (ii).
Anticosti Island, Cor. between British Govt. and Can. (Ans.) 1841 (i).
Appnmts. by late Govt., Commuication from Sec. of State for Colonies, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) for Cor., 2734 (i).
——— Members to Offices, par. in Victoria *Colonist*, 6382 (ii).
Auditor General's Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 532, 700, 803 (i).
Ball, Mr. W. D., Postmaster at Bath, Ont., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2393 (i).
Banque du Peuple, B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), on M. for Com., 3306; in Com., 3312 on M. for 3°, 3485 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Batiscan Post Office, Charges against Postmaster, Rep. of Inspector (Ans.) 1967 (i).
Benefit Association, Insurance and Assessments (remarks) 1353 (i).
Binder Twine, Output of Kingston Penitentiary, Tenders, Price, &c. (Ans.), 825, 1837 (i).
——— Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6934 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 7205 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 9927.
Bonds or Securities registered as provided by Statute, Preparation for Parliament (Ans.) 4991 (ii).
B. C. Fishermen, Seizure of Nets, &c., by Americans, par. in Victoria *Daily Colonist* (remarks) 8634 (iii).
——— Anti-Chinese and Japanese legislation, Govt. policy *re* Fourteen Statutes already in force (Ans.) 5860 (ii).
——— disallowance, &c., on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 6844 (iii).
——— Statutes for 1899, Date of receiving by Sec. of State (Ans.) 5666 (ii).
See "Chinese, &c."
Brockville Election, Name, &c., of Dep. Returning Officer (Ans.) 2322 (i).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to ref. Documents to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6736 (ii); 6823 (iii).
Burrard, Member for, Speech *re* Amounts paid Vancouver Liberals by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 1838.
Business of the House (remarks) 802, 2247 (i), 8217 (iii).
——— Budget Speech (remarks) 2318 (i).
——— Morning Sittings (M.) 7768 (iii).
——— Redistribution Bill (remarks) 2535 (i) 3845, 3875 (ii).
——— Senate Resolutions (remarks) 7321, 7442.
——— *re* Unopposed Returns (remarks) 6938 (iii).
See "Govt. Business."
Cabinet Ministers, Names of, &c. (Ans.) 1818 (i).
Canadian Emigration to U.S., par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 1895 (i).
Canadian Troops for the Transvaal, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 7329 (iii).
Champ de Mars, Lease, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2144 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Ellis*) 4339 (ii).
——— anti-Legislation in B.C. and Govt.'s Action (Ans.) 1837 (i).
See "Disallowances, &c."
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries Bill (Ans.) 1852 (i).
——— B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1924 (i) 5375 (ii).
——— B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2215 (amt.) 6 m.h., 2218 (i); agreed to (Y. 64, N. 39) 2244 (i).
——— List (presented) 421 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Colonial Securities and Imperial Tax (remarks) 1639, 1813 (i).
Commissions under the Great Seal, Regulations respecting (Ans.) 4483 (ii).
Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8775 (iii).
Consolidation of the Statutes of Can. (Ans.) 4270.
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O.Cs., 5346 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act, Registrar's Fees (remarks) 8348 (iii).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation (B. 171) 2° m., 9599; in Com., 9600, 9726 (iii).
Copyright Bill and Govt. Action (Ans.) 1981 (i).
County Court Judges, Retirement, &c., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 1970 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com. (Ans.) 1968 (i).
——— Death of Mr. Thornbury (Ans.) 1976 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8925; in Com. on Bill, 9663, 9679 (iii).
Deadman's Island, par. in Montreal *Witness re* Lease, 1353 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 6 (i).
——— 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1744 (i).
Devlin, Mr. James, Prosecution by Jus. Dept. (remarks) 7218 (iii).
Disallowance of B.C. Legislation *re* Japanese and Chinese, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5408, 5489, 5745 (ii).
See "Japanese, &c."
Dom. Census and B.N.A. Act Amt., on prop Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2388 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6407 (ii).
Dorothy, Seizure by U.S. Customs Authorities at Skagway, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Ans.) 2367.
Doukhobors, Quarantined at Grosse Isle (remarks) 4550 (ii).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands, B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1917; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2933, 2952 (i).
Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8760 (iii).
Edgar, Sir James, late Speaker, Decease of (remarks) 9060 (iii).
Election Act Amt. B., on request (Mr. *Ingram*) to place on Govt. Orders, 7219, 7322 (iii).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Printing and Distribution (Ans.) 1979 (i).
Estate Duty, Cor. incomplete (remarks) 8221 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°, 9178; 1°*, 9309; 2° m., 9835 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 185) 1°*, 9178 (iii).
Foster, Hon. Geo. E., ex-Minister, Travelling and Living Expenses (Ans.) 1834 (i).
Franchise Act Amt., Amendments by N.B. Govt. (Ans.) 2530.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Franchise Act Amt., Schedules (remarks) 1074 (i).
——— (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9309, 9464 (iii).
Gagne, Hon. Mr. Justice, and Connection with Lake St. John Ry., Delay and Inconvenience to Litigants (Ans.) 2190 (i).
Geoffrion, Hon. Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7630 (iii).
Gouin, Mr. Lomer, Speech *re* Subsidies to Provs. (Ans.) 1981 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 2409 (i).
——— on Wednesdays (M.) 3555, 3647 (ii).
——— on Mondays (M.) 6279 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down (remarks) 8221.
Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1917 (i).
G.T.R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3962.
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4502, 4512 (ii).
——— Cor. respecting (Ans.) 4730, 4858 (ii).
——— Rumoured Settlement (remarks) 5206 (ii).
Hubert, Miss Annabella, Claims for Injury to Property, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2535, 3256 (i).
Huron, West, Representation, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 9597 (iii).
Immigrants in Quarantine, par in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2193 (i).
Insolvency Legislation (remarks) 3253 (i).
——— Cor. with Boards of Trade (remarks) 4997 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2794 (i); on M. for 1°, 3773; on M. for 3°, 4733 (ii).
——— On M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2823 (i).
——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4369, 4432, 4470, 4575, 4687 (ii).
——— on Appeal (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) from Chairman's ruling to Speaker, 4449 (ii).
——— Harris, Mr. A. H., Appnmt. by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Pope*) for Cor., 2905 (i).
——— Lévis Station Improvements, Amount expended (Ans.) 8220 (iii).
International Commission, Alaskan Boundary and Rumoured Compromise, par in Montreal *Gazette* 4739 (ii).
——— par. in Montreal *Star*, 4169 (ii).
——— par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 6937 (iii).
——— Alaskan Boundary Protocols (presented) 4259 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 8165 (iii).
——— Cost, &c., of Commission (Ans.) 1815 (i).
——— par. in Montreal *Gazette re* Negotiations 3341 (ii).
——— par. in London *Times re* Settlement of Questions, 3668 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
International Commission, Business of the House, on Proposal (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to expedite, 3786 (ii).
——— Rumoured Cancellation of Meetings at Quebec (remarks) 2908 (i).
Ives, Hon. Mr., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 7533 (iii).
Japanese Anti-Legislation in B.C., Disallowance of Bill (remarks) 2536 (i); 4344 (ii).
——— (M. to print cor.) 4477 (ii).
——— Cor. between B. C. Govt. and Dom. Govt. (remarks) 5207 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Superannuation, &c., since 1899 (Ans.) 6379 (ii).
Library Committee, Joint (M.) 531 (i).
Liberation, Conditional, of Convicts (B. 171) 1°*, 7090 (iii).
See Convicts, &c.
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co's. Pet., on M. (Mr. *Henderson*) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, 1948 (i).
Lotteries (art unions) in Montreal, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 2324 (i).
Lumber imported into U. S. from Can. (remarks) 1638 (i).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Amounts paid by Govt., Services, &c. (Ans.) 1976, 2321 (i).
——— Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4487 (ii).
——— Letter read by P.M.G., on Order of Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5007 (ii).
Man. Election Frauds, on Inquiry for Ret., 3876 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to ref. Papers to Pub. Accts. Com., 4055 (ii).
Man. School Question, Cor. with the Holy Father, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 1822 (i).
Members of the Govt., Absence from Ottawa (Ans.) 1819 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 158 (i).
Ministerial Responsibility *re* Transaction of Official Business, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).
Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7230 (iii).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fortin*) 7637 (iii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4298 (ii).
Montreal Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 5359 (ii).
——— Post Office, Resignation of Postmaster (Ans.) 1827 (i).
Moody, Inspector N.W. Mounted Police, Charges against (Ans.) 8220 (iii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 7768 (iii).
See Business of the House, &c.
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2179 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 1866 (i).
North-west Mounted Police Rep. (presented) 4995 (ii).
——— Constables, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1843 (i).
North American Transportation Co. and Govt. subsidies, &c. (remarks) 5666 (ii).
Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Ministers of Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5554 (ii).
N.W.T. Dual Language, Opinion of Min. of Jus. (Ans.) 2188 (i).
——— 1885 Rebellion Losses, Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3104 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, 4; *pro forma* (i).
Ocean Freight Rates, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for Cor., Reps., &c., 1861 (i).
Ogilvie, Mr., Refusal of Min. of Int. to read Letter in Ans. to Question, 3800, 3812 (ii).
Ontario County Court Judge, Name, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 1848 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *McDougall*) Unparliamentary Language, 5406 (ii).
——— on Member being asked to wthdrw. Word "cowardly," 6153 (ii).
——— Members abusing the Privilege of M. to adjn., Authorities quoted, 6591 (ii).
——— Ref. to Deb. in Com. of the Hse., 6826 (iii).
——— Reference to Debate in another House, 9897 (iii).
——— Ref. to past Debate, 6753 (ii).
Ottawa City Indemnification, &c., and Govt. Intention to other cities (Ans.) 6379 (ii).
——— Govt. Grant (prop. Res.) 5098 (ii).
Pacific Cable, Communication from B. C. Govt. (remarks) 2697 (i).
——— par. in *Citizen re* Conference between Sec. of State for Colonies, and High Commissioner (remarks) 3268 (i).
——— (remarks) 1352 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. (B. 173) 1°*, 7873; in Com., 8763 (iii).
——— Printing by Convicts (Ans.) 1832 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) *re* par. in Montreal *Star* on Purchase of Wharf at St. John, 7328 (iii).
Poaching on the Pacific Coast (remarks) 8347 (iii).
Pointe Claire Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4806 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., Govtl. Intention (remarks) 8469 (iii).
——— on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7790 (iii).
——— on prop. M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8222, 8347, 8633 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) 9755 (iii).
Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par. in Newspaper, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 9840, 10220 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
P. E. I. and Mainland Mail Service, Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 1838 (i).
Printing Bureau and Sunday Labour (remarks) 3879 (ii).
Printing Committe, Joint (M.) 531 (i).
——— 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (Stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5382 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9181 (iii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9184 (iii).
——— Stenographers' Fees, 9463 (iii).
———(M.) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 10116 (iii).
———Rep. of Com. (M.) to print Evidence, 10115 (iii).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1814 (i).
——— Number of Votes polled, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2321 (i).
——— Poll-books, Voters' Lists, &c., on M. (Mr. *Moore*) for Copies, 2906 (i).
——— Leeds Co., Rep. of Returning Officers (Ans.) 1848 (i).
——— Ret. of Votes polled, Papers, &c., (remarks) 1894 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2039, 2045 (i).
——— Quebec Counties, Reps. asked for, 5748 (ii).
——— Discussion, &c. (remarks) 9466 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Flint*) remarks, 5359 (ii).
Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2964 (i).
——— Postponment and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4345 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to print 6th Rep. of Com. (objection) 9836 (iii).
Rep. of Com. (M.) to print Evidence, &c., 10116 (iii).
Public Works, Preservation of Health (B. 105) 1°*, 2604 (i); 2° m., 7645, 7665 in Com., 7667 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7241 (iii).
Quebec Cartridge Factory, Employees, Number, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).
——— Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9686; in Com., 9861 (iii).
——— Injurious Legislation (remarks) 9596 (iii).
——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 9700 (iii).
——— Superior Court, Additional Judges, Salaries, &c. (Ans,) 1846 (i).
Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 9060, 9064 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9733 (iii).
——— Commission, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1890 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3868 (ii).
——— Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. *Beattie*) on M. for 2°, 1875 (i); Sen Amts., 9461 (iii).
——— Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2202 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4742 (ii).

Laurier, Rt Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Railways Subsidies (remarks) 9064, 9185 (iii).
——— B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9204, 9337, 9366, 9435, 9450, 9471, 9478, 9492, 9512, 9543, 9551; on M. for 2°, 9759; in Com., 9760, 9771, 9813 (iii).
Reading Room, Ventilation, Light, &c. (remarks) 975 (i).
Reciprocity between U.S. and B. West Indies, par in Chicago *Record*, 4552 (ii).
Registered Letters stolen off C.P.R. train (Ans.) 1829 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) 1° m., 3442, 3456, 3466; on M. for 2°, 5207; in Com., 6758, 6797 (ii); 6910; (amt.) 6927; (M.) to ref. back to Com. of the Whole, 6940; (amt.) 6940; in Com., 6943, 6966, 6984.
———on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. Deb., 5299 (ii).
Restigouche Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Private Bills, 6825 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3558 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for, 8753, 8920, 9845, 10116 (iii).
——— Ministerial Responsibility (remarks) 5410 (ii).
Revision of the Statutes, Appnmt. of Commission (Ans.) 1881 (i).
St. Joseph d'Alma Postmaster, Increase in Salary (Ans.) 1847 (i).
St. Norbert, Inundations of Red River, Claims of Owners (Ans.) 1894 (i).
Scott Act Repeal, Brome County, Applications for (Ans.) 2187 (i).
——— Delay in Voting (Ans.) 3547 (ii).
Sec. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 421 (i).
Select Standing Coms. (M.) 6 (i).
——— (M.) to prepare Lists, 158 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 525 (i).
Senate Reform and the Provinces (Ans.) 1821 (i).
——— Resolutions. wthdn., 8752 (iii).
Skelton *vs.* Queen, Rep. of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 8217 (iii).
Speaker, late Sir James Edgar, Decease of (remarks) 9060 (iii).
——— Hon. Thos. Bain, Election of (M.) 9062.
——— Mess. from His Ex., 9064 (iii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2767 (i).
Stony Mountain Penitentiary, Rep. of Commissioner, Printing, &c. (remarks) 9837 (iii).
Superior Court Judges, Quebec, Sums paid for Travelling Expenses, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 2148 (i).
SUPPLY:
(Res. in Com.) 6463 (ii).
Administration of Justice (additional Judge in Ont.) 10122; (Alien Labour law enforcement) 10123; (Meagher's claim against U.S.) 10120, 10194; Yukon (additional Judge) 10191; (clerk's salary) 10193; (living expenses) 10193; (maintenance of prisoners) 10195 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 8224; (illustration stations) 8307 (iii).
Canals: Lachine (Heney and Borthwick's claim) 10153 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2386 (i); (Gov. Gen's office) 5012 (ii); Privy Council (salaries) 2049 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Telegraph lines, N.W.T.) 8183 (iii).
Customs (suspense account, Montreal) 5594 (ii).
Dominion Lands (scrip for half-breeds) 7517 (iii).
Dominion Police (increase of pay) 10127 (iii).
Immigration (St. Paul des Metis, seed grain, &c.) 9034, 9046 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10193; (Library, messengers) 10140; (Restaurant keeper) 10138 (iii); (sessional indemnity to Mr. Beattie, M.P.) 5782 (ii); (voters' lists) 8750, 10127 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10158; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 10157 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5418; (London property) 5465 (ii); (pay allowance) 7011; (stmnt. *re* Bate & Co.'s contract) 7117; (transport, &c.) 7133 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113, 10167 (iii); (claim for translation of Rep. of Liquor Commission) 5852; (International Commission) 5852 (ii); (Paris Agency) 8704; (Wentworth *vs.* Mathieu, litigation) 10112 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police (salaries) 8746, 10122 (iii); (service) 5832 (ii).
Pensions (Fenian raid) 8750; (rebellion, 1885) 8750 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9959; Que. (Victoriaville P.O.) 9954; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Colborne) 9255; Que., 8103, 8117, 8135; (Baie des Honfleur wharf) 10019; (Cacouna wharf) 10016; (Cap à L'Aigle wharf) 10017; (Isle aux Grues wharf, &c.) 10018; (Kamouraska wharf) 10018; (Knowlton Landing) 10020; (Les Eboulements) 10017; (Lévis dock enlargement) 9987; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9988; (Newport breakwater) 10014; (New Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Sabrevois wharf) 10021; Roads and Bridges, Que. (Portage du Fort) 10071; (Anticosti Island) 10073; Yukon (telegraph lines) 10097; (B. C. and Teslin Lake) 10100 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7281; (suspension of Mr. McDonald) 7281, 7288 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5766; (Private Cars) 5788 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: Militia (clothing contract) 9116 (iii).

Tanner, John, Claims against Spanish Govt. for Detention, &c. (Ans.) 4306 (ii).
Tobacco, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) allowed to stand, 4813 (ii).
Tupper, Sir Charles, Birthday Congratulations, 6382 (ii).
——— Expenses whilst Minister and High Commissioner (Ans.) 1835 (i).
Turner Administration, B.C., Dismissal by Lt. Gov., Papers laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Voters' Lists, N.B., Delay in sending in Revisions (Ans.) 2530, 2698 (i).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).
——— Revised Copies, &c. (Ans.) 1820 (i).
Winding Up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 2°, 1871 (i); in Com., 4320 (ii).
Winnipeg Electoral Division, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 8040, 8469 (iii).
——— Lists, Preparation, &c. (remarks) 2908 (i).
——— Representation (Ans.) 1830 (i).
Yukon Provisional District Administration Act Amt. (B. 186) 1°*, 9178 (iii).
——— Charges against, Proposal to adjn. Deb., 6100 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6180 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6567 (ii).
——— Appellate Court, Establishment, &c. (Ans.) 5308 (ii).
——— Bonds, Securities, &c., registered under R.S.C., Preparation for Parlt. (Ans.) 4805, 4991 (ii).
——— British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co., Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 2905.
——— Expedition of Mr. Coste, Rep., &c. (remarks) 5360 (ii).
——— Investigation, Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. and Papers *re* (remarks) 2410 (i).
——— on inquiry for Rets., 4341 (ii).
——— Ogilvie's Rep., Printing Evidence (remarks) 5307, 5360 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5747 (ii).
——— received by Govt. (remarks) 3795 (ii).
——— Liquor Importation, Disallowance of Ordinance (remarks) 1638 (i).
——— permits issued by Mr. Ogilvie and cancelled by Govt. (remarks) 2909 (i); 3791 (ii).
——— Militia Force, Mr. Justice Dugas' Representations (Ans.) 1842 (i).
——— Representation in Parlt. (Ans.) 2902 (i).
——— U. S. Vessels and Can. Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for Ret. 3298 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Arthabaska Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 1165 (i).
Financial Situation, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 10237 (iii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Address, on The, 1344 (i).
Nicolet River Public Works, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3549 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*
Address, on The, 234 (i).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 2789 (i); on M. for Com., 5898; in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6332 (ii).
——— Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7229 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Paris Exposition, Can. Commissioners, Space, &c. (Ques.) 1829 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation (distribution of blue books to Law Associations) 5742 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 8685; (Gaspé Basin and Quebec) 8686; (Magdalen Islands) 8679; (Port Mulgrave and Irish Cove) 8693 (iii).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Alaska-Yukon Co.'s (B. 5) 1°*, 617 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3984 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8909 (iii).

Livingston, Mr. J., *South Waterloo.*
SUPPLY:
Militia (Yukon supplies) 7047 (iii).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Address, on The, 1278 (i).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3995 (ii).
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7576 (iii).
Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4837 (ii).
Home Life Association of Canada (B. 13) 1°*, 618.
N. W. T. Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3097 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6615, 6704, 6706, 6707 (ii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2763 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8577, 8593 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5444 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *Kings (P.E.I.)*
Address, on The, 1264 (i).
Cardigan Bridge, P.E.I., Bonded Warehouse, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2961 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4611, 4633 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) to Com. of Sup., 7684 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Mail Service, Contractor's Name, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2113 (i).
Morris, Dr., Postmaster at Dundas, P.E.I., Resignation, &c. (M. for copies of cor.*) 3873 (ii).
Nevfrage Pond, P.E.I., Survey, Reps. (M. for Ret.*) 3873 (ii).
P.E.I., Fishing Bounties, Names of Persons receiving, Amount Paid, &c. (M. for Ret.) allowed to stand, 5961 (ii).
——— Ry. and Branch Lines, Pets., Cor., Res., &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) 2386 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3140 (i).
Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 9009, 9064 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3449 (ii); in Com., 6924.
Scrimgeour, J. G., Grant of Bonded Warehouse, Date, Lease, &c. (Ques.) 2113 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8293.
Civil Government: Mar. and Fisheries (contingencies) 5025 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (telegraph line, Pelee Island) 8190; (telegraph lines, P.E.I.) 8180 (iii).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait, &c.) 10165 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5159 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 8679; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8691; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 8684 (iii).
Militia (arms, equipment, &c.. 9143 (iii); miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5459 (ii); (stores) 7094.
Miscellaneous (refund of duties on fish, &c., P. E. I.) 10174 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2994, 3019 (i).
Public Works: Dredging (plant) 8140; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Wharfs) 7738; (P.E.I.) 7753, 7756; (Cardigan Pier) 10010 (iii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9231; (removal of curves) 7391 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York (Ont.)*
C.P.R., Mileage Tariff on Hay, Straw, &c., Approved by O.C. (Ques.) 4057 (ii).
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9606 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9637 (iii).
G. T. R. Strike, Cor. respecting (Ques.) 4730 (ii).
——— Rumoured Settlement (remarks) 5206 (ii).
——— (M. to adjn.) 4501 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4776 (ii).
Huron, W., Representation, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 9597 (iii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9612, 9618; in Com., 9628 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731; (amt.) 9735 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4769.
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9323, 9362, 9382; in Com. on Bill, 9760.
Toronto, East, Postmaster, Recommendations for Vacant Position (Ques.) 4272 (ii).

Macpherson, Mr. T. H., *Hamilton.*
Atlantic and North-west Ry. Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 618 (i).

Macpherson, Mr. T. H.—*Con.*
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2182 (i).
Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7945 (iii).

Macdonell, Mr. J. A., *Selkirk.*
Committee Meetings, Accommodation in Rooms (remarks) 3314 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9355 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8079 (iii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Address, on The, 1144 (i).
Canadian Mutual Benefit Advertising Co. incorp. (B. 99) 1°*, 2318 (i).
Emigration to U.S., para. in Newspapers (Ques.) 2115 (i).
Manitoba and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 157) 1°*, 5205 (ii).
Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) in Com., 6879 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6978 (iii).
Restigouche Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 65) 1°*, 1949; on Order for 2°, 2649 (i); M. to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 6824 (iii
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (cold storage for bait, &c.) 10166 (iii).
Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5822 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (Ont.) 7623; Dredging (plant) 8144; Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 7763; (Campbellton wharf) 10012; (Shippegan wharf) 10012; (N.S.) 9947; Que., 8104, 8123, 8133; (Carleton Pier) 10014; (New Carlisle wharf) 10014; (Newport breakwater) 10015; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7571 (iii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9224, 9234 (iii).
Temiscouata Ry. Co's (B. 166) 1°*, 6120 (ii).
——— Pet. (M.) to present, 5746 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and Modus Vivendi Licenses, Concessions granted, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (i).
——— Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2788 (i).
Venner, Dr., Indian Agent, Commissioner's Expenses *re* Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G. *North Simcoe.*
Address, on The, 1002 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2940 (i).
Contracts let without Tender since June 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. Cs., 5326 (ii).
G. B. and Russia, Treaty of 1825, Protocols, &c. (M. for copy*) 6939 (iii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90, (Mr. *MacPherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4785 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Hogg, W. A., Customs Officer at Collingwood, Charges against, Commissioner's Rep., &c. (M. for copy*) 2788 (i).
Patent Commissioner Power of Relief of G. L. Williams (B. 12) 1°*, 618 (i).
Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3865 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9544 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6690; in Com., 6811 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8076 (iii).
Stock, David, Relief (B. 88) 1°*, 2604 (i); in Com., 3489 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 8004; (Port Colborne) 9297 (iii).
U. S. Trade Relations Treaty of 1874 (M. for copy) 6939 (iii).
Winding Up Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8780 (iii).

McCleary, Mr. W., *Welland.*
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement at Hamilton (remarks) 3879 (ii).
Buffalo and Crystal Beach Ferry Service, License and Privileges granted, &c. (Ques.) 4994 (ii).
——— (B 96) 1°*, 2247 (i).
G.T.R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) to adjn., 3973 (ii).
Humberstone Post Office, Charges against James O. Rose, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6562 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5050; on M. for Com., 5256 (ii).
Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements (prop. Res.) 3276 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6780, 6802 (ii).
Secord, Mr. T. R., Supt. of Welland Canal, Charges against (Ques.) 1833 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Welland (bridges, &c.) 7455 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 5191 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (Port Colborne) 9260, 9285 (iii).
Welland Canal, Entrance at Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements on M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Com. of Sup., 4001 (ii).

McClure, Mr. F., *Colchester.*
Address, on The, 497 (i).
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7576 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8840; (amt.) 8850 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8595 (iii).
Militia (salaries) 7085 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (wharves) 7740, 7749; (Ont.) 7999 (iii).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
Duceis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Timber Limits, Removal of Indians (Ques.) 2700 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co. (B. 73) 1°* 2029 (i).
Rama Indians and Statute Labour, Govt. Aid to Maintenance of Roads and Bridges, &c. (Ques.) 2700 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9457, 9494 (iii).

McDougall Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Address, on The, 1354 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4976 (ii).
Cabinet Ministers, Names of, &c. (Ques.) 1818 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8944 (iii).
Eastern Extension Ry., Claims of N.S. Govt. (Ques.) 3551 (ii).
Fredericton Military School, Recommendations for Admission and Instruction, &c. (Ques.) 3795 (ii).
Gabarus Breakwater, Inspection, &c., by Govt. (Ques.) 2698 (i).
Hubert, Miss Annabella, Claims for Injury to Property, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2534, 3256 (i).
I.C.R. and Sunday Traffic, par. in newspaper (remarks) 3877 (ii).
——— Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 3743; on M. for 1°, 3765 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4415, 4692, 4710 (ii).
——— Freight carried from 1897-9, Number of Tons and Receipts (Ques.) 3257 (i).
——— Freight Rates on Flour, 1896-8 (Ques.) 3549 (ii).
——— Gillis, Frank A., Station Agent at Tracadie, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4056 (ii).
——— Harris, Mr. A. H., Appnmt. by Govt. (M. for cor.) 2905 (i).
——— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7194 (iii).
——— Rates on Flour, &c. (Ques.) 4731 (ii).
——— Restaurant at Grand Narrows, Cor. *re* Contract, &c. (M. for copy*) 3149 (i).
Lobster Fishery Regulations (remarks) 3960 (ii).
McKeen's Point, Construction of Storm Signals, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3083 (i).
McKenzie, Mr. Francis, and Instructions at Fredericton Military School (Ques.) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).
Margaree and Orangedale Mail Service, Changes, &c., *re* Contractors (Ques.) 3261 (i).
Marine Insurance Rates, Mar. Provs., Advancement in Price (remarks) 8822 (iii).
Military School, Fredericton, N.B., Admission for Instruction, Recommendations, &c. (Ques.) 8334 (ii).
See "McKenzie."

McDougall, Mr. H. P.—*Con.*

North Sydney Postmaster, Rumoured Dismissal (remarks) 4899, 4996 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 5404 (ii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1814 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, Grand Narrows, Lease of Property, &c., 4997, 5410 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 4151, 6595 (ii); 7771 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8727; (dairy branch) 8275; (illustration stations) 8323; (year book) 8226 (iii).

Civil Government: Marine & Fisheries (contingencies) 5024; Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5032 (ii).

Customs: N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8449 (iii).

Excise (commissions on stamps) 4793 (ii).

Fisheries (protection service) 4719; (salaries of Inspectors) 4036 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c., salaries) 8477, 8493 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5138, 5176 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Port Mulgrave and Irish Cove) 8693 (iii).

Marine Hospitals (care of sick seamen) 4012 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5056; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5455; Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6348 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2992, 3025 (i); 5102 (ii); (registration) 3065 (i).

Post Office: Yukon District (mail service) 6364 (ii).;

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers. (Mar. Provs.) 5201; (N.S.) 5198 (ii); 7715, 7742; (Ont.) 7980; (Que.) 8123; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 8200; Yukon District (river improvements) 8194 (iii).

Quarantine (cattle, expenses, salaries, &c.) 5079 (ii).

Tobacco, Duties collected (Ques.) 1818 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6305 (ii).

Victoria County, N.S., Patronage, &c., par in North Sydney *Herald* (M. to adjn.) 5388, 5398.

Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. (remarks) 6827 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3900 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Carriage of Registered Matter (remarks) 4353 (ii).

——— Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3792 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*

Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7576 (iii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty to Manufacturers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4837 (ii).

B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6901 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6440 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3981 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 141) 1°*, 4340 (ii).

Postage Stamps, Reproduction of Facsimilies by Bank Note Co. (Ques.) 2301 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9831 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3475 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8300 (iii).

Customs: B.C. (contingencies, &c.) 8460 (iii).

Collection of Revenues (telegraph line, Pelee Island; 8189 (iii).

Fisheries (Noble Bros.) 4248; (protection service) 4723 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 7071; (pay, allowance) 7021; (Yukon supplies) 7047 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8080; N.S. (Chezzetcook wharf) 10004; (Ont.) 7990; Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10059 (iii).

Quarantine (cattle) 8342 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7423 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8983 (iii).

McHugh, Mr. G., *South Victoria (O.).*

Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6456 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4549 (ii).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Co's. (B. 66) 1°*, 1949 (ii).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Claims for Land Damages by Farmers of Lindsay, 4496, 5004 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9447 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Trent (construction) 7310 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Otonabee, navigation) 10065; (Scugog, dredging) 10065 (iii).

McInerney, Mr. G. V., *Kent, N.B.*

Address, on The, 676 (i).

Franchise Electoral Act, Amendments by N. B. Govt. (Ques.) 2530 (i).

Gross, Mr. Boaz, Harbour Master at Hillsboro, Papers Respecting, Inquiry for Ret., 4732 (ii).

Hillsboro, N. B., Harbour Master, Charges against, Evidence and Commissioner's Rep., &c. (M. for copy*) 2027 (i).

I.C.R. Steel Rails, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2328 (i).

Lachine Canal, Evidence taken before Royal Commission (M. for copies *) 5944 (ii).

——— Final Estimate of Section 3, Enlargement of 1875-80 (M. for copy*) 5944 (ii).

——— Rep. of Commission on Wellington and G.T.R. Bridges (M. for copy*) 5944 (ii).

——— Royal Commission of Investigation, Exhibits, &c. (M. for copies*) 5944 (ii).

——— Plans, Profiles, &c. (M. for copies*) 5944.

McInerney, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*
Lobster Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 2319 (i).
——— (remarks) 2909 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2282 (i).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2989 (i).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., *Vancouver.*
Atlin District, Brewery Licenses issued (Ques.) 5484 (ii).
Beaumont, Wm., Claims for distributing Mail at Maple Bay prior to Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 3820 (ii).
Bedlington and Nelson Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 2529 (i).
Brotchies Ledge, B.C., Lighthouse, Completion and Operation (Ques.) 2331 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 111) 1°*, 2696 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. and C.P.R. Rates and Tolls, Revision of by Gov. in Council (Ques.) 2331 (i).
Dom. Census and B.N.A. Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 2386 (i).
Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. (amt.) 6868 (iii).
Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s Change of Title (B. 158) 1°*, 5384 (ii).
Grey, Robert, Lighthouse-keeper at Entrance Island, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 7319 (iii).
Immigration Restriction (B. 48) 1°*, 1165 (i).
Japanese Labour Exclusion Bill, B. C. Legislation, Disallowance by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 4343 (ii).
Lighthouse Service, B.C., Adjustment of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3821 (ii).
Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can. (prop. Res.) 3106 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 37) 1°*, 974; 2° m., 2176; on resmng adjd Deb. of 2°, 2527 (i).
Oyster Bed, B.C., Claims of Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co. (Ques.) 3821 (ii).
Rifle Ranges, B.C., Applications, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 5484 (ii).
Rothwell's Rep. *re* Settler's Claims, Transmission to B.C. Govt. (Ques.) 2531 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians (B.C.) 5703; (salaries) 5725 (ii).
Yukon Territory Act Amt. (B. 64) 1°, 1813 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Behring Sea Arbitration, Cost to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2186 (i).
Bronson and Weston Lumber Co., Change of Title (B. 70) 1°*, 1949 (i).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3577 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Wharfs, N.S.) 7732 (iii).

McLellan, Mr. B. D., *West Prince, P.E.I.*
I.C.R., Employees, Wages, Working hours, &c. (Ques.) 1860, 2332 (i).
P.E.I. Lobster Fishing, Pets. *re* Extension of Season (Ques.) 6122 (ii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3138 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (refund of duties on fish, P.E.I.) 10175 (iii).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Address, on The, 1402 (i)
Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3758 (ii).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition, B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3689 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4357, 4372, 4418, 4589 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9456; in Com. on Bill, 9834 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8333 (iii).
Militia (arms, equipment, &c.) 9148 (iii).
Pensions (rebellion, 1885) 8750 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (Ont.) 7622; Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 7992, 8006; (Kaministiquia) 7613 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7429 (iii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3996 (ii).
I.C.R., Alba Section, Number of Employees (Ques.) 5310 (ii).
——— Morrison, Hugh, Riverside, Claims for Damages (Ques.) 5310 (ii).
——— Reynolds, Capt., Str. "Mulgrave," Complaints against (Ques.) 5309 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Protection, Regulations *re* on M. for Com. of Sup., 7675 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying commissioner) 8268 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 8678; (Port Mulgrave and Irish Cove) 8694 (iii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Apples, Fraudulent Packing, par. in Toronto *World* (M. to adjn.) 3753 (ii).
Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7211 (iii).
C. P. R. Act (1881) Power respecting Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 3315 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2957 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7861 (iii).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Ry. Commission, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1890 (i).

——— Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford)* 2498 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock)* in Com., 6813 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8736; (dairy commissioner) 8265; (experimental farms) 8238; (illustration stations) 8285, 8299, 8326; (year book) 8233 (iii).

Civil Government (Post Office) 7348 (iii).

Fisheries (protection service) 4719 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5082 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick)* to Com. of Sup., 6297 (ii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Expenses whilst Min. and High Commissioner (Ques.) 1835, 1885 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 122) 1°, 3254 (i); in Com., 3904 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*

Adjournment, Queen's Birthday (remarks) 3340 (ii).

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5878 (ii).

Apples, Fradulent Packing on M. (Mr. *McMillan)* to adjn., 3757 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4841 (ii).

Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor)* to adjn., 7207 (iii).

C. P. R. Contract with A. Onderdonk, Awards by Arbitrators, *re* Value of Rolling Stock, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 5944 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill (Ques.) 1956 (i).

——— B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1931 (i); in Com., 5901 (ii).

——— (B. 63) 1°*, 1753; 2° m., 3316, 3324 (i).

Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2135 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8930; in Com. on Bill, 9670 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6438 (ii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E., ex-Minister, Travelling and Living Expenses (Ques.) 1834 (i).

Funeral Wreath, late Sir John Thompson, Question dropped, 1849 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9656 (iii).

General Trust Corporation of Can. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 3646 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmens' Strike, Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean)* to adjn., 4538 (ii).

I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4168, 4582, 4620; on M. for 3°, 4961 (ii)

——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4128 (ii) Sen. Amts., 9712 (iii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Con.*

I.C.R. M. (Mr. *Taylor)* to adjn., 2816 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 4447 (ii).

——— St. Charles Branch, Claims for Expropriation or Purchase of Land, &c., (M. for stmnt.*) 3873 (ii).

McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4491 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6329 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5043; in Com., 5257 (ii).

Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3812 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Fielding*) "impertinent" not parliamentary language, 5610 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9614 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2289 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting, (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3216 (i).

——— Postponment and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4345 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9182 (iii).

——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) 9182 (iii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2044 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9742 (iii).

——— Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3864 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9375, 9546; in Com. on Bill, 9767, 9806 (iii).

——— Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2199 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6481 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3072 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Alien Labour law enforcement) 10125 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8334; (Paris exhibition) 10144; (year book) 8230 (iii).

Civil Govt : Aud. Gen's Office (salaries) 2086; Customs (contingencies) 2977 (i); Finance (salaries, &c.) 5016 (ii); Justice (salaries) 2067; Militia and Defence (salaries) 2072 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7542 (iii).

Dom. Lands : (Chief Inspector salary) 9025 (iii).

Indians : Man. and N. W. T. (implements, &c.) 5716 (ii).

Legislation (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5739 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia (clothing) 5445 (ii); (pay, &c.) 7030 (iii).
Miscellaneous (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10178 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3044 (i).
Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 5819 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (B.C.) conc., 6386 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10047; Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10033 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5643 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7178; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour, construction) 9220, 9223 (iii).
Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8952 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., of Hon. Geo. E. Foster, ex-Fin. Min. (Ques.) 1885 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Address to Her Maj. *re* Transvaal Question (remarks) 8996 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary, and Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5387 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Govtl. Action (remarks) 4740, 5410 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Dismissals, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5414 (ii).
B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6853, 6896 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4988 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5923, 5934 (ii).
Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8777 (iii).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction, B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2915, 2926 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4509 (ii).
Imperial Service and Can. Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2355 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2839 (i).
Order (Ques. of) member imputing motives to another *re* vote, 5881 (ii).
——— Speaker's ruling asked, 7213 (iii).
Pacific Cable between Can. and Australia Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8381 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Militia Expenditure, 1354 (i).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, Contract, &c. (remarks) 9310 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., Govtl. Intention (remarks) 8469 (iii).
——— on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7809 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) 8633, 8634 (iii).
——— (remarks) 8221, 8347 (iii).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8851 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3233 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9736 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4760 (ii).
N.W.T., Rebellion Losses, 1885, Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3102 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3458; on M. for 2°, 6596; in Com., 6789, (ii), 6907, 6942, 6962 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. Deb., 5302.
Saugeen Indian Reserve, Medical Supt., Patrick Scott, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8732; (dairy commissioner) 8265; (experimental farms) 8263; (year book) 8226 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Privy Council Office (salaries) 2055 (i); Public Works (salaries) 7538, 7550 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8506; (St. Paul des Metis, seed grain, &c.) 9029, 9037 (iii).
Legislation (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5741 (ii); House of Commons (voters' lists) 2296 (i); stationery (supplies) 5737 (ii).
Militia (arms, equipment, &c.) 9141 (iii); (clothing) 5444 (ii).
Post Offices (postmasters' salaries) 5805 (ii).
Public Works.: Harbours and Rivers (Port Colborne) 9257; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7609 (iii).
Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation St. John) 7174; 7182 (iii); P. E. I. (Mount Stewart Wharf) 5772 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspection) 5583 (ii).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6245 (ii).

Mackie, Mr. T., *North Renfrew.*
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O.C's., 5325 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Cor., &c. 5366 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9449 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8513 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7990 (iii).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Address, on The, 666 (i).
Hamilton Powder Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 2029 (i).
Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7224 (iii).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Quebec Steamship Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 618 (i).

Marcil, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4409 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6988 (iii).

Marcotte, Mr. F. A., *Champlain.*
Address, on The, 516 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1843 (i).
Batiscan, Charges against Postmaster, Rep. of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1966, 2320 (i).
——— Obstructions to Navigation, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3552 (ii).
——— Salary of Postmistress (Ques.) 1970 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1933 (i).
——— B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2213 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act. Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8934 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1751 (i).
Guay Post Office, Revenue, Salary paid to Postmaster Verrault, &c. (Ques.) 3260 (i).
Immigrants, Doukhobor, Finland, &c., Number, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2481 (i).
I. C. R., Blanchette, Mr. Eugene, Reinstatement by Govt. (Ques.) 5859 (ii).
——— Employees at Lévis, and Provincial Election, Transfer, &c., Instruction to Mr. Desjardins, &c. (Ques.) 3260 (i).
——— Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4646 (ii).
——— Lévis Station, Improvements, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 8220 (iii).
Lévis Forts, Contract for Cordwood, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3082 (i).
——— Purchase of Property, Amount paid, &c., (Ques.) 8468 (iii).
Ouellet, Mr. Agapit, par. in *Le Soleil*, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3259 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Tower Clock, Change in Mode of Lighting, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6121 (ii).
Powers, Mr. Thos., Lease of Govt. Land at Lévis, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 3082, 3259 (i).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Bagot Co., Unpaid Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3924 (ii).
Repatriation of Canadians from U.S., Number, &c. (Ques.) 3078 (i).
Samson, Mr. Pierre, Caretaker at St. Joseph de Lévis Fort, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3082 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (salaries) 7085 (iii).
Yukon, Miners' Grievances against Companies buying Water Grants (remarks) 3315 (i).

Martin, Mr. A., *East Queens, P.E.I.*
Belle River, P.E.I., Seizure of Fish Traps (M. for cor.*) 2787 (i).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Brookside, P.E.I., Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (i).
China Point Pier, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2485 (i).
——— Reconstruction, Amount paid, &c., (M. for Ret.*) 3148 (i).
Clifton Postmaster, P.E.I., Cor., Pets., &c., *re* Appnmt. (M. for copies*) 5377 (ii).
Cold Storage for Fish Transportation from Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1978 (i).
Franchise Act. Amt. (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9309, 9464 (iii).
"Illustration Stations," Fruit, Cereals, &c., Govt. Action (Ques.) 2110 (i).
Lobster Fishing, Extension of Season in P.E.I. (Ques.) 6561 (ii).
——— Seizure of Traps, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5504 (ii).
Mount Albion, P.E.I., Mail Service, Pets. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 2112 (i).
Poultry Feeding Experiments, Govt. Action (Ques.) 2110 (i).
P.E.I. and Grand View Mail Service, Proposed Change, Cor., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 5377 (ii).
——— Dominion Govt., Delegation *re* Questions at Issue, Claims, Stmnts., &c. (M. for copies*) 1879 (i).
——— G.B., Cold Storage and SS. Communication, &c. (remarks) 5493 (ii).
——— Grand View, Changes in Mail Services, Pets. against (Ques.) 4994 (ii).
——— Lobster Fishery, Infraction of Regulations, Fines imposed, Cost of Prosecutions, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 5377 (ii).
——— Mail Service between I.C.R. and Cape Tormentine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2325 (i).
——— Mainland Mail Service, Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 1838 (i).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, B. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9750 (iii).
——— Ry. and Branch Lines, Pets., Cor., Res., &c. (M. for copy) 2364, 2368 (i).
——— Straightening Curves at North Wiltshire, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
——— Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies) 3124 (i).
Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 9060 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6913 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, Pub. Works, P.E.I., &c., 3878 (ii).
——— Inquiry for, 1953 (i); 6319 (ii); 10225 (iii).
Souris Breakwater, P.E.I., Claim for Damages by Messrs. Mellish and Wrightman (Ques.) 4270 (ii).
Spraying Fruit Trees, Govt. Action (Ques.) 2110 (i)

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairy branch) 8275; (year book) 8236 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Post Office, 7351 (iii).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 10163 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8687; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 8683 (iii).
Miscellaneous (refund of duties on fish, &c. P.E.I.) 10176 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 7751, 7757; (Canoe Cove breakwater) 10007 (iii).
Railways: P. E. I., 7462 (iii); (Mount Stewart wharf) 5762 (ii); (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9212; (removal of curves, &c.) 7389. (iii).
Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8956 (iii).
Wood Island Light-keeper, Dismissal of D. McMillan, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies) 4813 (ii).
—— Dismissal of Wm. D. McMillan, 10117 (iii).
—— Light-keeper, Dismissal and Charges against, Rep. of Commissioner (Ques.) 2326 (i).

Martineau, Mr. P. R. L., *Montmagny.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 21 (i).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard.*
Address, on The, 1016 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 49) 1°*, 1165 (i); 2° m., 4323 (ii).
Klondike Mining and Ry. Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2409 (i).
Members' (Pictou) Mileage Allowance (Ques.) 6722 (ii).
Northern Commercial Tel. Co., and Dept. of Pub. Works (M. for cor.*) 3873 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries of Inspectors) 4030 (ii).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*
Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9437 (iii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4663 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1716 (i).
Annapolis and Digby Basin, Rep. *re* Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 4993 (ii).
—— Mr. McCarthy's Contract, Expiration of, for Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 4056 (ii).
—— Port George Harbour, Pier, &c. (Ques.) 7532 (iii).
—— Post Office, Irregularities, &c. (Ques.) 8989, 9179, 9697 (iii).
—— Public Buildings, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2701 (i).
—— Tenders for Painting (remarks) 2410 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7638 (iii).
Electoral Lists, N. S., Printing and Distribution (Ques.) 1979 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4678 (ii).
Port George, Annapolis Co., Postmaster, Irregularities in Office (Ques.) 9179, 9697 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9744.
—— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9777 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Customs: N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8451.
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10129 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5132 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Digby) 8674 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (Ont.) 7626; Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 10012; N. S. (Parker's Cove wharf) 10001 (iii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3893 (ii); 9884, 9887 (iii).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*
Address, on The, 532 (i).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3302 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4654.
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com. (amt.) 6091, 6404 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9446 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, on The, 241 (i).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3304; in Com., 3311 (i).
Belœil Public Works, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3827 (ii).
Canada Accident Assurance Co. (B. 3) 1°*, 617.
Canada Plate Glass Insurance Co. incorp. (B. 4) 1°*, 617 (i).
Canadian Coast, Survey of Currents, &c. (Ques.) 1824 (i).
Chambly Canal, Emplymt. of Geo. Peppin by Govt. (Ques.) 3821 (ii).
—— Investigation (Ques.) 3553 (ii).
Champ de Mars, Lease, &c. (M. for cor.) 2141 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 50) 1°*, 1264; 2° m., 2204 (i).
Coal Oil, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List. 2010 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1750 (i).
Insolvency Legislation and Boards of Trade, Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies*) 5377 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Contracts for Ties, Names of Tenderers (Ques.) 5308 (ii).
Jacques Cartier County, Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iii).
Lake St. Louis, Removal of Shoal, Representations from Shippers, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (i).
Lotteries (art unions) in Montreal, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 2323 (i).
Mail Service, Jacques Cartier County (Ques.) 6933 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Improvements, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (i).
——— Post Office, Repairs, &c., Advertisement *re* Tenders (Ques.) 2112 (i).
——— Repairs, &c., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 1974 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) on M. for 2°, 2177 (i).
N. W. T. Dual Language, Opinion of Min. of Jus. (Ques.) 2188 (i).
Penitentiaries, Printing by Convicts (Ques.) 1832 (i).
Point Claire Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2111 (i); 4806 (ii).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2962 (i).
Postage Stamp Dies, Number ordered by Govt., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3943 (ii).
Postmasters, Jacques Cartier County, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6933 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9442, 9544, 9555, 9577 (iii).
Return, Inquiry for, 5747 (ii).
Richelieu River, Placing of Buoys, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3796 (ii).
Ste. Geneviève, Land Damages, Rep. of Commissioner (Ques.) 6934 (iii).
St. Louis Lake, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8219 (iii).
St. Ours Lock, Dismissal of Supt. Coderre, &c. (Ques.) 3552 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commission, Total Cost, Claims Unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 5484 (ii).
Soulanges Canal Arbitration, Land Valuators, Appnmts. and Dismissal (Ques.) 2333 (i).
Superior Court Judges, Quebec, Sums paid for Travelling Expenses (M. for stmnt.) 2145 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses to 1899 (M. for stmnt.*) 2245 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Lachine (Atwater Avenue wall) 9173 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8527, 8542 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 5708 (ii).
Legislation (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5742 (ii); (voters' lists) 2306 (i).
Militia (arms, equipment, &c.) 9144; (compensation for injuries) 9130 (iii).
Railways: Miscellaneous (Ottawa River) 9176; I. C. R. (passenger coach) 9172 (iii).
Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9092; 9124 (iii).
Tate's Dry Dock, Montreal, Rent, Lessees, &c. (Ques.) 1831 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Ville Marie Bank Suspension (remarks) 9065 (iii).
Walmsley, Alex., Superannuation as British Mail Clerk (Ques.) 3797 (ii).
Yule Bridge, Richelieu River, Arbitrators' Award, &c. (Ques.) 3827 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Address, on The, 1037 (i).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3993 (ii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 3313 (i).
Benefit Associations, Insurance and Assessments (remarks) 1353 (i).
Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7212 (iii).
Business of the House (remarks) 9177 (iii).
Cattle Embargo, Cor. between Can. and Imp. Govts. (M. for copies*) 1877 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5924, 5936 (ii).
Colborne and Maitland Ports, Harbour Improvements, Reps., &c. (remarks) 7771, 8633 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6443 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6400, 6422, 6431 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. (P.E.I.) Bill, not on Order Paper (remarks) 9308 (iii).
Friendly Society Insurance, Govt.'s Policy *re* Legislation (remarks) 3342 (ii).
Grand River Floods, Govt. Rep. *re* (remarks) 2536 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3970 (ii).
I. C. R., Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138, in Com., 4573, 4579 (ii).
——— Order (Ques. of) "humbug" not parliamentary, 4643, 4669 (ii).
McLaughlin, R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4486, 4498 (ii).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6097 (ii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) *re* par. in Montreal *Star* on Purchase of Wharf, St. John's, 7328 (iii).
Port Maitland Harbour, Inquiry for Reps., &c., 9185 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).
Quarantine Service, Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3826 (ii).
Quebec Ry., Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carrol*) in Com., 5042 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9315 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3466 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for (Papers *re* cattle embargo) 3253 (i).

Superannuations in Agriculture Dept., Appnmts. made, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3873 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (experimental farm) 5073; (N.W.T. Exhibition) 5073; (patent record) 5074 (ii).

Canals: Galops (enlargement) 7299; Lake St. Louis (deepening) 7298; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7296 (iii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5020; Inland Revenue (printing and stationery) 5014; Interior (clerical assistance) 5023; Militia (clerical assistance) 5013 (ii); Post Office, 7330 (iii); (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5033; Public Works (printing, &c.) 5072; Sec. of State (P. Mungovan's salary) 5020 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8561, 8604, 8615, 8624, 8648 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5129, 5139, 5165 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Liverpool) 8671 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 9126, 9128; (clothing) 7108, 9127; (miscellaneous) 7150; (monuments) 7152; (Royal Military College) 7140; (stores, &c.) 7098 (iii).

Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) 8703; (classification of record) 8702; (commutation of duties) 8704; (Dom. and Ont. arbitration) 8702; (extra clerks) 8705; (Paris Agency) 8705; (printing) 8703; (Printing Bureau plant) 8703; (Royal Society publications) 8705 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance and supplies) 5105 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 7968, 7998; (Port Colborne) 9252, 9270 (iii).

Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5075 (ii).

Railways: C. P. R. (land damages) 7153; I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7156, 7242; (increased siding accommodation) 9157; (installation of Pintsch gas) 9172; (land damages) 7154; (telegraph service) 9171 (iii).

Yukon District: Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9070, 9079, 9116; Railways (surveys, &c.) 8700 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3886 (ii).

Welland Canal, Entrance at Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

Moore, Mr. A. H., *Stanstead.*

Address, on The, 319 (i).

Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty (prop. Res.) 2118, 2127, 2130 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2922 (i).

Plebiscite, Speech of Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa Convention (Ques.) 1826 (i).

——— Vote and Quebec Counties, Reps. asked for, 5748 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6111, 6117 (ii).

Moore, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7846 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8823 (iii).

——— Poll Books, Voters' Lists, &c. (M. for copies) 2906 (i).

Scott Act, Repeal in Brome Co., Delay in Voting, &c. (Ques.) 3547 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 8262; (year book) 8232 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2281 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 7072 (iii); (clothing) 5448 (ii).

Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 5805, 5826 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3897 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3744; in Com. on Bill, 4666 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9569 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector, salary, &c.) 9023 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 10160 (iii).

Militia (miscellaneous) 7149 (iii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1754 (i).

Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 1165 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co's incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 1322 (i).

Domville, Lt.-Col., Leave of Absence from Command of 8th Hussars (Ques.) 2898 (i).

Glenora Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 2409 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3383 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. for Com., 6091, 6095 (ii).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.'s (B. 152) 1°*, 5096 (ii).

Ottawa Suburban Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 2966 (i).

Pacific Cable, Communication from B.C. Govt. (remarks) 2697 (i).

Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4232 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8328 (iii).

Fisheries (salaries of inspectors) 4048 (ii).

Legislation (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5739 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia (pay allowance) 7013; (salaries) 7075; (Yukon supplies) 7050 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 3062 (i).
Public Works: Dredging (Mar. Provs. and B.C.), 10070; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8089; N.S. (Gabarouse breakwater) 9992 (iii).
Yukon—British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co., Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 2905 (i).
——— Gold Commissioner, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).
——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).
——— Mining, Trading and Transportation (B. 94) 1°*, 2246 (i).
——— O.C.'s regulating Mining Claims by Officials, &c. (Ques.) 1824 (i).
——— Officials in Gold Commissioner's Office, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 1823 (i).
——— salaries, cost of living, &c. (Ques.) 1824.
——— Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2409 (i).
——— Timber Inspector, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).
——— Walsh, Maj., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1823 (i).

Mulock, Hon. W., *North York, Ont.*
American Bank Note Co., Plates, Dies, &c., Duties collected, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Ret., 3828 (ii).
Annapolis Co., Port George Post Office, Irregularities, &c. (Ans.) 8989 (iii).
Batiscan Post Office, Charges against Postmaster, Cor., *re* (Ans.) 2321 (i).
——— Salary of Postmistress (Ans.) 1970 (i).
Beaumont, Wm., Claims for distributing Mail at Maple Bay prior to Confederation (Ans.) 3820 (ii).
Berthier (en haut) Postmaster and Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).
Bilodeau, Mr. Job. Postmaster at Chambord, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1962 (i).
Bourget, P. A., Postmaster at Lévis, Increase of Salary (Ans.) 4059 (ii).
Brantford Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1968 (i).
——— Salary, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 8465 (iii).
Brookside, P.E.I., Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1969 (i).
Dargavel, Mr. J. R., Postmaster at Elgin, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1955 (i).
Distribution of Political Speeches (remarks) 1166 (i).
Franking Privilege to Legislative Reps., &c. (Ans.) 3823 (ii).
Galt Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3825 (ii).
Gauthier, Jean, Postmaster at Metabetchouan, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4059 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9641 (iii).
Govt. Contracts, Prohibition of Sweating (Ans.) 1975 (i).
Guay Post Office, Revenue, Salary paid to Postmaster Verrault, &c. (Ans.) 3260 (i).
Havelock and Oak Lake, Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3824 (ii).
Humberstone Post Office, Charges against James O. Rose, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6562 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6594 (ii).
Inverness Post Offices, Change of Locations, Appnmt. and Dismissals (Ans.) 3825 (ii).
Jacques Cartier County Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6934 (iii).
Lang P. O. and Ry. Station, Carriage of Mails, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3824 (ii).
Larouche, Mr. Wm., Postmaster at Lake Bouchette, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1962 (i).
Leake, Mr. J. R., Postmaster at Morton, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1963 (i).
Legris, Mr., Postmaster at Ste. Eulalie, Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 4272 (ii).
Lévis Mail Service, Names of Carriers, &c. (Ans.) 3554 (ii).
London Letter Carriers, and Kingston Street Ry. Transportation, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4483, 4995 (ii).
Mail Bags, Contracts between Govt. and Ottawa Supply Co. (Ans.) 2185 (i).
Mail Service, Jacques Cartier County (Ans.) 6933 (iii).
——— Pacific Coast, Facilities by Govt. (Ans.) 3254 (i).
Margaree and Orangedale Mail Service, Changes, &c. *re* Contractors (Ans.) 3261 (i).
Martel, Mr., Postmaster at St. Prime, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1965 (i).
McKenzie P. O., Man., Pets. *re*, Name of Postmaster (Ans.) 2185 (i).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Claims for Land Damages by Farmers in Lindsay, Letter of Mr. McLaughlin (read) 4998, 5005 (ii).
Montreal and Labelle Mail Service, Appnmt. of Mail Conductor (Ans.) 1966
——— Post Office, Dismissals and Appnmts., Names, &c. (Ans.) 6047 (ii).
Moonstone, Ont., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1957 (i).
Mount Albion, P.E.I., Mail Service, Pets. *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1969 (i).
Murray Bay and Quebec Mail Service, Complaints of Delay (Ans.) 1960 (i).
North Sydney, Rumoured Dismissal (remarks) 4899, 4996 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) Reading Bill in both Languages, 4649 (ii).
Ottawa and Cyrville Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 8991 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ottawa Supply Co., and Contracts with Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (i).

Ouellet, Mr. Agapit, par. in *Le Soleil*, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3259 (i).

Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement (B. 176) prop. Res., 1950 (i); 8348; in Com. on Res., 8383 (iii).

Pariseau, Mr. C. D., Postmaster at St. Esprit, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1962 (i).

Port George, Annapolis Co., Name of Postmaster, Charge of Irregularities, &c. (Ans.) 9179, 9697 (iii).

Postage Stamp Dies, Number ordered by Govt., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).

——— Reproduction of Facsimiles by Bank Note Co. (Ans.) 2901 (i).

Postal Notes, Contract, Cost, &c., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for copy, 1982 (i).

——— Lost through Transmission (remarks) 10226 (iii).

Post Office, Jacques Cartier County, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6933 (iii).

——— Rep. (presented) 159 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 155) 1°, 5096; 2° *m.*, 6102; in Com., 6104 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).

P. E. I., Grand View, Changes in Mail Service, Pets. against (Ans.) 4994 (ii).

——— Mail Service, between I. C. R. and Cape Tormentine, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2325 (i).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2043 (i).

Purple Stamped 2-cent envelopes, Error in Printing, Circulation, &c. (Ans.) 3798 (ii).

See "Stamped Envelopes."

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9797; in Com. on Res., 9337, 9356, 9431, 9480, 9587.

Representation in the H. of C. (B. 126) 2° *m.*, 5207; in Com. (amt.) 6763, 6820 (ii) 6905, 6910 (iii).

Returns, on Inquiry (Mr. *Foster*) 6320, 6596 (ii).

St. Jérôme Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 2182 (i).

St. Thomas and Aylmer Mail Service, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 9698 (iii).

Singleton, Mr. W. R., Postmaster at Delta, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1956 (i).

Sintulata, Dismissal of Postmistress, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 10119 (iii).

——— Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8468 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Abner, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3256 (ii).

Sproule, R. J., Postmaster at Flesherton, Ont., Complaints against (Ans.) 9179 (iii).

Stamped Envelopes, 2-cent Purple, Number issued and distributed, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (i).

——— 2-cent Green, Number purchased in Toronto, Issue and Distribution (Ans.) 2189 (i).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Rainy River (lock and dam) 10153 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Post Office, 7330; conc., 10202 (iii); (contingencies) 5068 (ii); 7359 (iii); (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5032, 5053 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police: (Yukon service) 5837 (ii).

Post Office (Inspectors' salaries) 5798; conc., 6387; (legal expenses) 5801 (ii); (mail service) 7366; conc., 10202; (miscellaneous) 7388 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5803; (Rainy River service) 5827; (refund for stamps, &c., stolen) 5800; Yukon District (railway mail clerks) 6360; (mail service) conc., 6390 (ii); 7359 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings (B.C.) conc., 6385 (ii); (N.S.) 9947; Ont. (Sarnia Post Office) 9962; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 10066; (Port Colborne) 9256; Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10023 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7247 (iii).

Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9075, 9082, 9101 (iii); (N. W. Mounted Police) conc., 6388 (ii).

Sydenham Postmaster, Irregularity in Accts. (Ans.) 6935 (iii).

Toronto, East, Postmaster, Recommendations for Vacant Position (Ans.) 4272 (ii).

——— Appnmts. by Govt., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1981 (i).

Vancouver Island SS. Service, Subsidy by Govt. (Ans.) 3797 (ii).

Verrault, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3555 (ii).

Victoria, B.C., Letter Carriers, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1960 (i).

Walmsley, Alex., Superannuation as British Mail Clerk (Ans.) 3797 (ii).

Waltham and Chapeau, Mail Service, Pet. from Pontiac County Council (Ans.) 2330 (i).

Yukon, Administratron of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6267 (ii).

——— Bourassa, Mr., Postmaster at Dawson City (Ans.) 1958 (i).

——— Harper, Mr. F., Postmaster at Dawson City, Issue of Notice (Ans.) 1961 (i).

——— Mail Service between Dawson City and Vancouver, &c. (Ans.) 1966 (i).

——— contracts, advertisements, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) for Copies, 2706 (i).

——— efficiency of Contractors, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) for Cor., 2705 (i).

——— Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3793 (ii).

——— Registered Parcels, &c., returned from Dead Letter Office (remarks) 4352 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1804 (i).

Alberta Irrigation Co. Change of Title (B. 23) 1°*, 803 (i).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co. (land subsidy), Amount selected and still due, &c. (Ques.) 2326 (i).
C. P. R. Commission, Appnmt. by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2785 (i).
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2008 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2126 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. (amt.) 2645; on M. for 3° (amt.) 2934; (Neg. Y. 14; N. 61) 2949 (i).
Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 2246 (i); in Com., 4303, 4847, 4852 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9642 (iii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co. B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4785 (ii).
Hudson Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2696 (i).
Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3122 (i).
N.W.T. Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2022 (i).
——— Mounted Police, Issue of Scrip, Pets, &c., *re* (Ques.) 2484 (i).
——— Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3096 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7655 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9745 (iii).
——— Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3867 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9372, 9435, 9454, 9495, 9504, 9529, 9593 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Dominion Lands (scrip, &c.) 7520 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8520; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9047 (iii).
Indians (industrial schools) 7490 (iii).
Miscellaneous (half-breed claims commission) 9059 (iii).
Veterans of 1885, at Edmonton, Issue of Scrip and Medals, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 2701 (i).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6275 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*
Address, on The, 307 (i).
Can. Permanent and Western Can. Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 2029 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4619 (ii).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4501 (ii).
Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3121 (i).
Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8371 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7944 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9363 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6718 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8721 (iii).
Civil Government: Post Office 7350 (iii).
Indians (Ont.) 5680 (ii).
Legislation (stationery supplies) 5735 (ii).
Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 5814 (ii).
Public Works: Building (Rideau Hall) 7695; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Wharfs) 7700, 7735, 7740; Ont. Port Colborne) 9253 (iii).

Parmalee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8852; (amt.) 8856 (iii).

Paterson, Hon. W., *North Grey.*
Address, on The, 1167 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported from U.S., Bases of Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 6048 (ii).
American Bank Note Co., Dies, Plates, &c., Duties collected, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Ret., 3828 (ii).
Binder Twine imported in 1899 (Ans.) 8218, 8990 (iii).
Budget, The, 2637, 2650 (i).
Busby, Mr., Customs Collector at Skagway, Date of Appnmt. and Salary, (Ans.) 4805 (ii).
Chambord Customs House, Collections, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 1851 (i).
Coasting Laws, Enforcement, Cor. respecting (Ans.) 3257 (i).
——— Rep. of Capt. John Irving *re* Enforcement, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (i).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 154) 1°*, 4991; in Com., 6443 (ii).
Customs House, Toronto, Employees, Appnmts., Dates, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 9643 (iii).
Grain exported from Can. Ports, Number of Bushels, &c. (Ans.) 3256 (i).
——— to Germany in 1898-99, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 8990 (iii).
Indian Corn imported from 1896-99 (Ans.) 8217 (iii).
——— imported for Home Consumption, &c. (Ans.) 8632, 8990 (iii).
Iron Bounties, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1828 (i).
John C. Barr, Valuation by Customs Authorities (Ans.) 2706 (i); 8219 (iii).
——— Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 8469 (iii).
Lebel, Mr. Wenceslas, Customs Official and Revision of Electoral Lists, par. in *Le Soleil* (Ans.) 1889 (i).
Lepreaux, N.B., Customs Officer, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5313 (ii).

Paterson, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Pingree and *Lowe* Strs., Undervaluation, &c. (Ans.) 8219 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9768, 9782 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5280; in Com., 6762, 6802 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 8077 (iii).
Schafheitlin & Fitzgibbon, Custom, Law Infraction (Ans.) 1889 (i).
Scrimgeour, Mr. J. G., Grant of Bonded Warehouse, Date, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2113 (i).
Sugar Imports from British W. Indies, Quantities and Value (Ans.) 2327 (i).
SUPPLY:
On M. (Mr. Foster) that Com. rise, 5482 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2973; (salaries) 2091 (i).
Customs (contingencies) 5855; (B. C. and Yukon) stationery, &c., 5600 (ii); (contingencies, &c.) 8453 (iii); B.C. (revenue cruisers repairs) 5602 (ii); Man. (contingencies, &c.) 8453; N. W. T. (contingencies, &c.) 8453; N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8390; Ont. (contingencies, &c.) 8452 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 5595; Que. (suspense account, Montreal) 5588; Yukon (salaries, &c.) 5596 (ii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8614 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (supplies, &c.) 3541 (ii).
Militia (pay, &c.) 7037; (Yukon supplies) 7045 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 7979 (iii).
Yukon Provisional District (customs) 8746; (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5620, 5642 (ii).
U. S. Vessels registered at Dawson, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2700 (i).
Wheat exported from Montreal, St. John, Fort William and Winnepeg, Quantities (Ans.) 2702 (i).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6248 (ii).
——— Post Office, Emplymt. of Mr. Bourassa (Ans.) 1833 (i).
——— Rumours *re* Conflict between U. S. and Can. Customs (remarks) 975 (i).
——— U. S. SS. *John C. Barr*, Undervaluation, &c. (Ans.) 3266 (i).

Penny, Mr. E. G., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Committee Meetings, Accommodation in Rooms (remarks) 3314 (i).
Criminal Code, Cruelty to Animals (B. 116) 1°, 2963 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1741 (i).
Inspection (Fruit) Act Amt. (B. 56) 1°*, 1352; on Order for 2°, 3316 (i); 2° *m.*, 3872; wthdn., 5360 (ii).
Inspection Act Amt. (B. 55) 1°*, 1352 (i); 2° m., 3871; wthdn., 5360 (ii).
Potash Inspection, and Montreal Board of Trade (Ques.) 1858 (i).

Penny, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 5476 (ii).

Pettet, Mr. W. V., *Prince Edward.*
Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 152 (Mr. *Hurley*) in Com., 7480 (iii).
Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Ont. Alliance, 7326 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (construction) 7299 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (Ont.) 7623 (iii).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*
Address, on The, 398 (i).
Budget, The, 2672 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4158 (ii).
——— Govt. Rys., Cars, Locomotives, Number, Cost, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2028 (i).
——— Harris, Mr., Agreement with as Traffic M'gr. (Ques.) 1975, 1980 (i).
——— (M. for cor., &c.*) 2961 (i).
——— Tariffs, Special Rates, Reps. of Mr. Harris (M. for copies*) 2961 (i).
Magdalen Island Mail Service, Terms of Contract, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2789 (i).
Scott Act Repeal, Brome County, Applications for (Ques.) 2187 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries of inspectors) 4016 (ii).

Poupore Mr. W. J., *Pontiac.*
Canadian Pacific Ry. and Hull Electric Co's. Confirmation of Agreement (B. 25) 1°*, 895 (i).
Contracts let without Tender on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. Cs., 5326 (ii).
Davis, Edward, Slide Master at Coulonge, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3946 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal (prop. Res.) 4273, 4884 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2289 (i).
Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 1165 (i).
Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, Claims for Damages, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2789 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1854 (i).
Waltham and Chapeau Mail Service, Pet. from Pontiac County Council (Ques.) 2330 (i).
Zenith Mining and Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 20) 1°*, 803 (i).

Powell, Mr. H. A., *Westmorcland.*
Address, on The, 1124 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5906, 5914, 5942 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 2168 (i).

Powell, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Schedules (remarks) 1073 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4514 (ii).
I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital and Revenue (Ques.) 2531 (i).
——— Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3413 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2825 (i).
——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3600, 4077, 4123 ; in Com., 4392, 4686, 4707 (ii).
——— Chaudière to Montreal, Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2027 (i).
——— Expenditure, Revenue, from 1898 to 1899 (M. for Ret.*) 2789 (i).
——— Leblanc, Mr. A. T., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1964 (i).
——— Snow Shovelling, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1964 (i).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6334, 6405 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9633 (iii).
P. E. I. Winter Mail Service, Contracts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Copies, 3145 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7659, 7674 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6695 (ii) ; in Com., 6948, 6973 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals: Chambly (telephone lines) 5783 (ii) : Trent (construction) 7306 (iii). ; Welland (refund for damages to lock) 5793 (ii).
Fisheries: Protection Service (repairs, &c.) 5180 (ii).
Insurance (general expenses) 7464 (iii).
Interior: Yukon District (general expenditure) 6373 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3030 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 7379 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 5196 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation, St. John) 7409, 7424 ; (rolling stock) 7434 ; P. E. I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9220 ; (removal of curves) 7398 (iii) ; (repairs to car "Victoria") 5785 (ii).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) to Com of Sup., 6256 (ii).
——— Lynch, Mr. W. H., Emplymt. by Govt., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve.*
Banque du Peuple (B. 6) 1°*, 618 ; (M.) for Com., 3298 (i) ; 3° m., 3485 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6097 (ii).

Prefontaine, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Potash Inspection at Montreal, Board of Trade, Res., Pets., &c. (M. for cor.*) 1878 (i).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 895 (i).

Prior, Hon. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Address, on The, 975 (i).
Alaska Boundary and Customs Officials, Difficulties with Mounted Police (remarks) 2193 (i).
——— American Rumours *re* Canada's Contention (M. to adjn.) 3846 (ii).
Alien Act B. C., Cor. with B. C. Govt. respecting (Ques.) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).
——— Disallowance by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 7768 (iii).
Anti-Japanese Legislation, Cor. between B. C. Govt. and Dom. (remarks) 5206 (ii).
——— Motion dropped, 5313 (ii).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Fourteen Statutes already in Force (Ques.) 5859 (ii).
Appnmt. of Members to Offices, par. in Victoria *Colonist*, 6381 (ii).
Ashcroft, B.C., Sale of Ry. Lands, &c. (Ques.) 1855 (i).
——— Cor. with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2408 (i).
Boston and Alaskan Transportation Co., Contract with Can. Govt. (Ques.) 1828 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4985 (ii).
B. C. Fishermen, Seizure of Nets, &c., by Americans, par. in Victoria *Daily Colonist* (remarks) 8633 (iii).
——— Lt. Gov. and Turner Administration and Can. Govt. (M. for cor.) 2362 (i).
——— Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, Disallowance, &c. (M. to adjn.) 6828, 6902 (iii).
——— Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 895 (i).
——— Statutes for 1899, Date of receiving by Sec. of State (Ques.) 5666 (ii).
Bubonic Plague and Quarantine of Pacific Strs. at B. C. (remarks) 5989 (ii).
Burrard, Member for, Speech *re* Amounts paid to Vancouver Liberals by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 1838 (i).
Chemainus, B.C., Pilotage Limits (Ques.) 5312 (ii).
Anti-Chinese Legislation in B. C. and Govt.'s Action (Ques.) 1837 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts., B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9670 (iii).
Deadman's Island, par. in Montreal *Witness re* Lease, 1353 (i).
——— Leases, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1640, 1815 (i).
——— Cor. between Dom. Govt. and B. Haigh & Son (1880) *re* Application for use, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2788 (i).
——— O. Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 2334 (i).
——— Forfeiture of Lease by Mr. Ludgate (remarks) 4739 (ii).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*

Deadman's Island and Stanley Park (M. to print papers) 3959 (ii).

Disallowance of Anti-Japanese Legislation, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5408, 5491 (ii).

Dorothy, Seizure by U. S. Customs Authorities at Skagway, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Ques.) 2367 (i).

Drill Hall, Vancouver, B.C., Contract, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5487, 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).

Dry Dock, Victoria, B.C., Pets. *re* Reduction of Charges, &c. (Ques.) 7766 (iii).

Esquimalt, B.C., Dry Dock, Reduction of Rates, &c., Pets. against, &c. (Ques.) 6122 (ii).

Fraser and Skeena River Fish Hatcheries, Erection by Govt. (Ques.) 4058 (ii).

Govt. Property, B.C., Lease, &c., Cor. respecting (Ques.) 8465 ; Rental, &c. (Ques.) 8991 (iii).

Governor Pingree and *J. B. Lowe*, Strs., Registry in Can. (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Indians, Yale and Cariboo, Medical Attendance, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8630, 8989 (iii).

International Commission and Alaskan Boundary, par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 6936 (iii).

John C. Barr, Undervaluation, &c. (Ques.) 8218, 8469 (iii).

Letter Carriers (B.C.), Number, Salaries, &c., from 1895 to 1899 (M. for Ret.*) 2789 (i).

Macaulay Point Fortifications, Claims for Compensation, &c. (M. for cor., &c.*) 3874 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5489 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Pension System, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2715 (i).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Mins. of the Crown, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5510 (ii).

——— Non-Production of High Commissioner's Telegram, 5747 (ii).

——— Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Victoria *Daily Times*, 6051 (ii).

Pacific Cable between Can. and Australia Agreement B. (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 8373 (iii).

Parlt. and Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Electric Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 5308 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Kettle River Ry. Bill, 9595 (iii).

Pingree and *Lowe*, Strs., Undervaluation, &c., (Ques.) 8218 (iii).

Poaching on the Pacific Coast (remarks) 8347 (iii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Number of Votes Polled, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2321 (i).

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7673 (iii).

Quadra, Str., Payment of Crew and Officers (Ques.) 3076 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Amount Expended and Loans advanced by Govt. (Ques.) 5309 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9406, 9499 (iii).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for (Commercial Tel. Construction Syndicate) 3752 (ii).

——— Cor. between Ministers and Northern Tel. Co. (remarks) 5409, 5746 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 8387 (iii).

Songhee, Indians (B. C.) Removal from Reserve, Settlement with B. C. Govt. (Ques.) 3797 (ii).

——— Cor. between Dom. and Provl. Govt. (M. for copies) 3873 (ii).

——— (Inquiry for Ret.) 4713 (ii).

Strathcona, Str., and Relief of Destitute Miners, Arrangement with Govt. (Ques.) 9179 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice : Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 5468 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8309 (iii).

Canals : Cornwall (payment to A. P. Ross) 9177 (iii); Welland (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5795 (ii).

Civil Govt. : Agriculture (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5030; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5026 (ii); Post Office, 7331 (iii); (contingencies, Dead Letter Branch) 5071 (ii): Public Works (salaries) 7553 (iii).

Collection of Revenue (telegraph lines, B. C.) 8184 (iii).

Customs (contingencies) 5856 (ii).

Fisheries (Behring Sea legal expenses) 5181 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 5704 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5140 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5065 (ii); 7071 (iii); (arms, &c., accoutrements) 5466 (ii); (Macaulay Point claim) 9133; (pay, allowance) 7027; (properties, &c.) 7089 (iii); (rifle range, B.C.) conc., 6389 (ii); (salaries) 7077; (Yukon supplies) 7040 (iii).

Miscellaneous (half-breed claims commission) 9059 (iii); (professional services, C. J. R. Bethune) 5471 (ii); (relief of Canadians in foreign countries) 7529 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police (service) 5833; (Yukon service) 5839 (ii).

Post Office (Inspectors' salaries) 5799; conc.,6387; (Postmasters' salaries) 5807 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings (B.C.) 8085, 8090; conc., 6385 (ii); (N.B,) 7764; (N.S.) 7613 (iii); (Ottawa electric lighting) 5187 (ii); (Ont.) 7994; Yukon District (Lewes and Yukon river improvements) 8192 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5622, 5658 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5078 (ii); (salaries and contingencies) 8338; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 8338 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District (salaries,&c.) 8658 (iii).

Valleyfield Customs Collectors, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5501 (ii).

Vancouver Island SS. Service, Subsidy by Govt. (Ques.) 3797 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, Rep. of Resident Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 3828 (ii).

Victoria, B.C., Letter Carriers, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1960 (i).

——— Post Office, Old Site, Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 4269 (ii).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*
Victoria and Montreal Harbours, Grants by Dom. Govt. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1877 (i).
——— P. O., Safes, Elevators, &c., Tenders for, &c. (Ques.) 1887 (i).
Wade, Mr. F. C., Emplymt., Amounts paid to by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1830 (i).
Yukon, Alien Labourers at Lake Bennet, and Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— Appellate Court, Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 5308 (ii).
——— Liquor Permits issued by Mr. Ogilvie and cancelled by Govt. (remarks) 2908 (i); 3789 (ii).
——— Skagway and Dawson Telegraph line, Construction by English Co., &c. (Ques.) 3073 (i).

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., *Montreal, St. Ann's.*
Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9729 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6449 (ii).
Insolvency Legislation and Boards of Trade, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 5945 (ii).
Isle au Noix, Militia Property, Lease, Rental, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2961 (i).
Montreal Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 5859 (ii).
——— Post Office, Dismissals and Appnmts., Names, &c. (Ques.) 6047 (ii).
Newspapers, Issued and Mailed in Toronto and Montreal, Weight, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2787 (i).
Prohibition, Plebiscite Vote, Expenses in Montreal City, Amounts unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 5312 (ii).
Purple Stamped 2-cent envelopes, Circulation, Error in Printing (Ques.) 3797 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 5476 (ii).
Customs (suspense account, Montreal) 5592 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (voters' lists) 2308 (i).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 5478, 5480; (Manitoba) 5479; (St. Vincent de Paul) 5477 (ii).
Yukon District, Messrs. Coste and Lafontaine's Instructions (Ques.) 1893 (i).

Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.*
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2011 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
G. T. R. Trackmens' Strike, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4541 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8721 (iii).
Pensions (Fenian raid) 8750 (iii).

Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.*
Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1787 (i).
C. P. Ry. Commission, Appnmt. by Govt., prop. Res., 2773 (i).

Richardson, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries (B. 38) 1°*, 974; 2° *n.*, 1923 (i) 5374; in Com., 5900, 5912, 5923, 5929, 5940 (ii).
Coal Oil, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) to place on Free List, 2009 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2126 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2947 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator (M.) to conc., 1738, 1739 (i).
——— 2nd Rep., conc. (M.), 2180 (i).
——— 5th Rep., conc. (M.) 5665 (ii).
——— 6th Rep., conc. (M.) 8913 (iii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4309, 4856 (ii).
Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1912 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4528, 4771 (ii).
Ont. and Rainy River Co., Correction in Min. of Rys. speech (remarks) 9699 (iii).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Mail and Empire re* Speech at Picton, Ont., 5375 (ii).
Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5384 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8889 (iii).
Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3219 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9741 (iii).
——— Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2515 (i).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9206, 9349 (amt.) 9363, 9425, 9531; in Com. on Bill, 9761 (iii).
Shannon, Thos., dismissal, (M. for papers*) 3333 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (construction) 7308, 7315 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8552 (ii).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6276 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
Usury (B. 174) 1°*. 8217 (iii).

Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, *East Toronto.*
Address, on The, 1013 (i).
Biggar, J. L., Appnmt. by Govt., Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3549 (ii).
Brevet Promotions, Permanent Force, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2936.
Copyright Bill, Govt. Action (Ques.) 1981 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. Ross—*Con.*
Costigan, Hon. Mr., on Personal Explanation, 3666 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6451 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6411 (ii).
G.T.R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement (M. to adjn.) 3960, 3984 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4534 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3423 (ii).
International Commission, par. in London *Times re* Settlement of Questions, 3668 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. Intention of Govt. (Ques.) 3551 (ii).
——— Army Service Corps, Recommendations or Reps. of Maj. Gen. (Ques.) 9697 (iii).
——— Artillery Instruction in Eng., Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (i).
——— Officer appointed in 1898, Requirements as to qualifications (Ques.) 2329 (i).
——— list and certificates of Qualification (Ques.) 2329 (i).
——— Regulations Presented to Parlt. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
Patent Commissioner Power of Relief of Thos. Robertson (B. 11) 1°*, 618 (i).
Permanent Force Appointments, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6107 (ii).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7647 (iii).
Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2512 (i).
——— Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2202 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9343 (iii).
Regimental Establishments, Lists submitted to Parlt. (Ques.) 3550 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3462; on M. for 2°, 6539.
Royal Military College Inspection, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 3796 (ii).
Strathy, Mr. J. A. L., Reinstatement as Lt. Col. (Ques.) 2329 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8654 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 8664 (iii).
Militia (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 7151; (miscellaneous) 7147; (transport, &c.) 7132 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 8705; (Royal Society Grant) 8706 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings (lighting, heating, &c.) 7694; (Ont.) 7626 (iii) (patent office, photographic establishment) 5090 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Volunteers organized in Chicago, Eligibility for Medals, &c. (Ques.) 2704 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Address, on The, 454 (i).
C.P.R. and Great North-west Central Ry., Survey of Branch Line (Ques.) 2532 (i).
Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O.C's, Reps. Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 2393 (i).
——— (M.) to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com., 3341 (ii).
Dickson, Mr. R., Immigration Agent, Appnmt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1855 (i).
Elkhorn Indian School, Printing Plant, Lease to W. J. Thompson, &c. (Ques.) 3076 (i).
Govt. Lands, Man., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co's B. 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4194 (ii).
Hudson's Straits, Navigability, Cost of Expedition, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Jerome, Mr. Martin, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6723 (ii); 7194 (iii).
Land Transfers in Man. and Govt. Agents Speculations (remarks) 4735 (ii).
McKenzie P.O., Man., Pets. *re*, &c., Name of Postmaster (Ques.) 2185 (i).
Martin, Mr. A. F., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7534 (iii).
Portage La Prairie Post Office, Name and Salary of Caretaker (Ques.) 2485 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8901 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6685 (ii).
Virden, Man., Inland Rev. Office, M. for Cor., dropped, 5313 (ii).
Winnipeg Electoral District and Representation (Ques.) 1830 (i).
——— Issue of Writ (remarks) 8469 (iii).
Winnipeg Grain Exchange and Fort William Harbour, Cor. with Pub. Works Dept. (M. for cor.*) 1879 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 3990 (ii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6282 (ii).

Rogers, Mr. D. D., *Frontenac.*
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4989 (ii).
Calvin Co., Limited (B. 9) 1°*, 618 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3321, 3330 (i).
Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty on, prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2125 (i).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9624 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7931 (iii).

Rogers, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Ry. Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2197 (i).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9395, 9583 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6786 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8723 (iii).
Canals: Trent (construction) 7316 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2987 (i); Post Office) 7342 (iii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8516 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., conc., 10218 (iii).
Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5081 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspection) 5584 (ii).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*
N. W. T. Settlers, from Ont., Privileges granted by Govt. (Ques.) 2902 (i).
Ont. Settlers in N.W.T., Privileges granted by Govt. (remarks) 6051 (i).
Order, (Ques. of) member using word "insinuation," 5617 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9100 (iii).

Russell, Mr. B., *Halifax.*
I. C. R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 3633, 3669, 3707 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) 4453 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Commissioners' Report (remarks) 2249 (i).
Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2286 (i).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6660 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 3530 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3026 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 9945; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9995 (iii).
Tanner, John, Claims against Spanish Govt. for Detention, &c. (Ques.) 4805 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr. J. G., *Macdonald.*
C. P. R., Powers respecting Branch Lines, &c., (Ques.) 9309 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9641 (iii).
Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1905 (i).
Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co's. (B. 83) 1°*, 2107 (i).
Order (Ques. of) *re* the use of the word "thimble-riggers," 9655 (iii).
Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, prop. Res., 2488 (i).

Rutherford, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Railways Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9383 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8987 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6288 (ii).

Savard, Mr. P. V., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1934 (i).
Gagné, Hon. Mr. Justice, and Connection with Lake St. John Ry. Co., Delay and Inconvenience to Litigants (Ques.) 2189 (i).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Change of Title (B. 118) 1°*, 2966 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4664 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 8117 (iii).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7577 (iii).
Private Bills Com., Meeting during Sitting of the House (M.) 8751 (iii).
——— Reduction of Time for posting (M.) 6119 (ii).
——— Com., Sel. Standing, Reduction of Quorum (M.) 4729 (ii).
——— Extension of Time (M.) 894 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairy branch) 8265 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sabrevois wharf) 10027 (iii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3897 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8290; (year book) 8226 (iii).
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 7351 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*
Address, on The, 800, 806 (i).
Administration of Justice in Man. and Keewatin (B. 167) 1°*, 6279 (ii); 2° *m.*, 8171 (iii).
Alaska Boundary and Customs Officials, Difficulties with Mounted Police (remarks) 2194 (i).
Ashcroft, B.C., Sale of Ry. Lands, &c. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
Bauer, Mr., *re* Examination Papers, &c. (remarks) 4898, 4996 (ii).
British Can. Goldfields Co., Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).
B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, Disallowance, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6850 (iii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co. (Land Subsidy) Amount selected and still due (Ans.) 2326 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Clarke, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. in the Yukon (Ans.) 5486 (ii).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Restrictions and Instructions by Govt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon Council (Ans.) 2322 (i).
Coal Mining under Nanaimo Harbour, Leases, &c. (Ans.) 8991 (iii).
Colpron, Mr. Jos. N., Claims against Govt. for Services performed, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
Constantin, Dr. Jules, Emplymt. by Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1847 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Commission, French Translation of Rep. (Ans.) 1852 (i).
Dibblee and Dupont, Messrs., Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 2114 (i).
Dickson, Mr. R., Immigration Agent, Appnmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 148) 1°, 4894; in Com., 6400, 6410, 6426; 3° *m.*, 6459 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Man., Fraudulent Transactions by Officials, par. in Winnipeg *Telegram* (remarks) 4995 (ii).
Duceis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Timber Limits, Removal of Indians (Ans.) 2700 (i).
Dupuis, P. C., Prosecution for selling Liquor to Indians (Ans.) 4060 (ii).
Edmonton-Yukon Route, Instructions to Messrs. Dibblee and Dupont (Ans.) 2114 (i).
Elevator Restrictions by C. P. R., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 2904 (i).
Elkhorn Indian School, Printing Plant, Lease to W. J. Thompson, &c. (Ans.) 3076 (i).
Emigration to U. S., pars. in Newspapers (Ans.) 2116 (i).
Fairlie, Mr., Dismissal from Rupert's Land Industrial School (Ans.) 2532 (i).
Fawcett, Mr., Advice *re* recording Mining Claims, &c. (Ans.) 3822 (ii).
Fluhman, Dr., Medical Officer to Indians at Pointe Bleue, Pets. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4030 (ii).
French Canadian Repatriation from U. S. (Ans.) 1844 (i).
Galicians and Doukhobors, Number brought into Can., Names of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 2481 (i), 8467 (iii).
——— Immigrants at Saltcoats, Outbreak of Scarlet Fever (remarks) 4896, 4996 (ii).
——— Commissioner's Investigation (remarks) 6936 (iii).
Game Preservation Act (1894) Amt. (B. 153) 1°, 4991; in Com., 6442 (ii).
Geological Survey Act Amt. (B. 146) 1°, 4891; in Com., 6396 (ii).
Govt. Lands, Man., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Grain Elevators in N.W.T., par. in Winnipeg *Tribune*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 5497 (ii).
Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1915 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Greater Britain Exhibition and Canadian Representation of Mineral Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 1959.
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90, on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4782 (ii).
Half-breed, N.W.T., Cor. between Mr. Macdowall and Govt. *re* Reserve (Ans.) 2486 (i).
Homestead Law in N.W.T., Pre-emption, Interest, Memorial from Settlers, &c. (Ans.) 3080 (i).
Immigrants, Arrival in 1898, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3553 (ii).
——— Doukhobor, Finland, &c., Number, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2481 (i), 8467 (iii).
——— from Europe, Number and Distribution (Ans.) 1980 (i).
——— from G. B., Inducements to Settle in Can., &c. (Ans.) 3077 (i).
——— Number sent by Agents from G. B. and U. S. (Ans.) 2192 (i).
——— from U. S., Number and Distribution (Ans.) 1979 (i).
——— Bonuses, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1975, 2191 (i).
Indian Agent at Rama, Charges against, Cost of Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 1976, 2114 (i).
See Rama.
Indians, Yale and Cariboo, Medical Attendance, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 8630, 8989 (iii).
Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for Ret., 4713 (ii).
Interior Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°, 4892; in Com., 6398 (ii).
Interior, Minister's Travelling and Living Expenses, &c., 1819 (i).
Jerome, Mr. Martin, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6723 (ii), 7194 (iii).
Klondike Official Guide, Preparation by Mr. Ogilvie (Ans.) 1827 (i).
Labreque, Mr. C. O., Emplymt. by Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1846 (i).
Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 149) 1°, 4895; in Com., 6442 (ii).
Land Transfers in Man. and Govt. Agents' Speculations (remarks) 4737 (ii).
Liquor sold to Indians, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
McKay, Thos., Indebtedness to Govt. for Timber Dues, Collection, &c. (Ans.) 2486 (i).
——— Emplymt. by Govt., Salary paid, &c. (Ans.) 2487 (i), 5487 (ii).
Maguire, Mr. Justice, Arrival and Departure from Dawson (Ans.) 4062 (ii).
Man. and North-western Ry., Miles constructed, Land Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2900 (i).
Martin, Mr. A. F., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7534 (iii).
Miller, Mr. R. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1974 (i).
Noble, Mr., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

N. W. Mounted Police, Issue of scrip, Pets., &c., *re* (Ans.) 2484 (i).

——— Barracks at Batoche, Supplies for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2487 (i).

N. W. T., Abandoned Homesteads, Dewdney District, Cancellation by Govt. (Ans.) 3074 (i).

——— Rebellion Losses (1885) Claims Commission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3103 (i).

——— Seed Grain Indebtedness Security (B. 189) 1°, 9464 (iii).

——— cancellation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2020 (i).

——— Settlers from Ont., Privileges granted by Govt. (Ans.) 2903 (i).

Ogilvie, Mr. W., Relationship to Min. of the Int. (Ans.) 1841, 2704 (i).

——— Connection, &c., with British Goldfields Co., on refusal to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3810 (ii).

See Yukon.

Ont. Settlers in N. W. T., Privileges granted by Govt. (remarks) 6051 (ii).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6938 (iii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9182 (iii).

——— Stenographers' Fees, 9462 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8879 (iii).

Quarantine Service, Employees, Salaries, &c., (Ans.) 3827 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9738 (iii).

Ry. Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4761 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9357, 9467, 9473 (iii).

Rama Indians and Statute Labour, Govt. Aid to Maintenance of Roads and Bridges (Ans.) 2700 (i).

Repatriation of Canadians from U. S., Number, &c. (Ans.) 3079 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for, 415 (i); 3560, 3559 (ii).

——— Incomplete, Tels., &c., from Archer Martin (remarks) 4731 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 9845 (iii).

——— laid on Table 3560 (ii).

——— Ordered by Hse., non-compliance by Govt. on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 2972 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, Non-production (remarks) 3071 (i).

Roads and Road Allowances in Man. (B. 175) 1°, 8151; in Com., 8470 (iii).

Rothwell's Rep. *re* Settlers' Claims, Transmission to B. C. Govt. (Ans.) 2531 (i).

Saugeen Indian Reserve, Medical Supt. Patrick Scott, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 9699 (iii).

Saw Logs, Exportation, Prevention by Govt. on Indian Reserves, &c. (Ans.) 1835 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

School Lands, Sale of, Stmnt. (read) 6461 (ii).

Scrip issued to the Half-breeds, par. in Calgary *Herald*, 7196 (iii).

Seed Grain Liens, Cancellation, Legislation *re*, Res. from N. W. T. Council (Ans.) 2903 (i).

See N. W. T.

Settlers from Eastern Can. to N. W. T., Aid by Govt. (Ans.) 2534 (i).

Songhees Indians, Removal from Reserve, Settlement with B. C. Govt. (Ans.) 3797 (ii).

Steel Boxes, Int. and Indian Depts., Purchased by Govt., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4482 (ii).

Steveston, B. C., Transfer of Property (Ans.) 3544 (ii).

Strathcona, Str., and Relief of Destitute Miners, Arrangement with Govt. (Ans.) 9179 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (N.W.T.) 10123 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 10149 (iii).

Canals (St. Andrew's Rapids) 10155 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Geological Survey (salaries) 2104; Indian Affairs (salaries) 2083 (i); Inland Rev. (clerical assistance) 5015; Interior (clerical assistance) 5022 (ii); (contingencies) 7467 (iii); (salaries) 2077 (ii), 7466 (iii).

Dom. Lands (arrears of salaries) 5849 (ii); (Chief Inspector's salary) 9007 (iii); (gratuities) 5850 (ii); (Inspectors, Agents, &c.) 7528; (scrip, &c.) 7501; (seed grain, homesteads, &c.) 7527; (surveys, printing plans, &c.) 9053 (iii).

Geological Survey (artesian borings) 7469 (iii); (salaries) 5668 (ii).

Government of N. W. T. (schools) 7499 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8478, 8485, 8558, 8583, 8648; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9027, 9046, 9049 (iii).

Indians (B.C.) 5703; (reserve commission) 5727; (salaries) 5725; (*Vigilant*) 5729; (Industrial schools) 7488; (Man. and N.W.T.) 5691; (annuities, &c.) 5694, 5711 (ii); (boarding schools) 10110 (iii); (general expenses 5722; (implements, &c.) 5712 (ii); (industrial schools) 10110 (iii); (saw mills and grist mills) 5722; (surveys) 5721; (Sioux) 5721 (ii); (Treaty negotiations, provisions, &c.) 10111; (Treaty negotiations, travelling expenses, &c.) 10110; (Veterinary surgeons) 10111 (iii); Indians (N.S.) 5691 (ii); 7480 (iii); (Ont.) 5673 (ii); (Mr. J. B. Brosseau, services, &c.) 10110 (iii); 5699; (suppression of liquor traffic) 5710; (surveys, &c.) 5710; (St. Regis lockup) 5711; (Removal of Oka band) 5709 (ii).

Interior: Yukon District (general expenditure) 6366 (ii).

Militia: Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6353 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10113 (iii); Crow's Nest Commission expenses) 5831; (destitute half-breeds, N.W.T.) 5830 (ii); (Govt. expenses, Keewatin District) 7529 (iii); (half-breed claims commission) 5832 (ii) 9056; (relief of Canadians in foreign countries) 7530; (roads, &c., Banff, N.W.T.) 7580; well-boring machines, N. W. T.) 9055; (wharf, Banff Park) 9055 (iii).; Yukon District (contingencies) 6373 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
N. W. Mounted Police (Yukon service) 5835 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (Astronomical Observatory) 9950; Yukon (Edmonton trail) 10109; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 8078; Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 10071; Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10078 (iii); Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5614 (ii), 10096; (B. C. and Teslin Lake) 10104; (trails, roads and bridges) 10087; Interior (salaries, &c.) 8953, 9002, 9016; (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii).
Venner, Dr., Indian Agent, Commissioner's Expenses *re* Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).
Wade, Mr. F. C., Emplymt, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 1831 (i).
——— (remarks) 7242, 7320, 7442 (iii).
Walsh, Maj., Instructions as Commissioner by Govt., Rep. of Interview at Skagway, &c. (Ans.) 3078, 3258 (i).
——— Authority for Commission issued, &c. (Ans.) 4269 (ii).
——— Philip, Relationship to Major Walsh. (Ans.) 3823 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3888 (ii).
Wright, Wm., Official in Recorder's Office at Dawson, Relationship to Editor of the *Globe* (Ans.) 4270 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. (B. 186) 1°*, 9178; in Com., 9849; (amt.) 9850 (iii).
Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6124 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6581 (ii).
——— Alien Labourers at Lake Bennett and Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1860 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Messrs. Wade, McGregor and Norwood, Date of Arrival at Dawson, &c. (Ans.) 3081 (i).
——— Appnmt. of second Judge, &c. (Ans.) 3081 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Sheriff, Commission, Bond, &c. (Ans.) 4269 (ii).
——— "Bench" and "Creek" Claims, Disputes pending, &c. (Ans.) 3078 (i).
——— Bennett Hospital, Matron and Medical Supt., Names, &c. (Ans.) 1980 (i).
——— Bonds given by Officials, Record or List of Names (Ans.) 5310 (ii).
——— Commissioner Maj. Walsh, Alterations in Rep. (Ans.) 2704 (i).
——— Commission of Inquiry, Request from Mr. Ogilvie to extend his Powers, &c. (Ans.) 3081 (i).
——— Council, Names, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 1832 (i).
——— ordinances received from Council, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).
——— Dom. Police, Number, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1965 (i).
——— Dredging for Minerals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3079 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Yukon Gold Commissioner, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1823.
——— on Inquiry for Ogilvie's rep., 4713 (ii).
——— Instructions to Walsh (Ans.) 3258 (i).
——— Investigation, Mr. Ogilvie's Reps., Purport, &c. (Ans.) 3820 (ii).
——— laid on Table, 3876 (ii).
——— papers Respecting (M.) to print, 4730 (ii).
——— protest from Miners' Committee, Cor., &c. (Ans.) 2329 (i).
——— returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4340 (ii).
——— Klondike River Bridge, Owner, Tolls, &c. (Ans.) 2902, 3074 (i).
——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1823 (i).
——— Liquor Permits, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1843 (i).
——— sanctioned by Min. of Int. (Ans.) 1859 (i).
——— issued by Archer Martin, on inquiry for Ret., 3875 (ii).
——— issued by Maj. Walsh (Ans.) 2481 (i).
——— rep. *re* (Ans.) 2704 (i).
——— issued by Mr. Ogilvie, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3077 (i).
——— cor., &c., on Inquiry for, 5667 (ii).
——— Lynch, Mr, W. H., Emplymt. by Govt., Reps., &c. (Ans.) 1848 (i).
———Maguire, Mr, Justice, Appnmt. and Arrival at Dawson, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (i), 3960 (ii).
——— Miner's Grievances and Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. (Ans.) 2531 (i).
——— Miner's Right to cut Timber (Ans.) 1836 (i).
——— Mining Regulations, Publication, &c. (Ans.) 1841 (i).
——— Ogilvie, Mr., Reps. *re* Investigations, &c. (Ans.) 3548 (ii).
——— presented to Parlt., 3795 (ii).
——— Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Can. Goldfields Co. (Ans.) 3799 (ii).
——— O. C.'s, regulating Mining Claims by Officials, &c. (Ans.) 1824 (i).
——— Officials, Appnmts. by Govt., Names, &c. 1833 (i).
——— salaries, cost of living, &c. (Ans.) 1824 (i).
——— nationality, &c. (Ans.) 1823 (i).
——— Professional Immorality, Taxes imposed (Ans.) 1842 (i).
——— Registrar of Titles, Instructions and Restrictions by Govt. (Ans.) 2324 (i).
——— Steamboat Owners, Permits to cut Timber, &c. (Ans.) 1837 (i).
——— Survey of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 3547 (ii).
——— Timber Inspector, Appnmt. by Govt., (Ans.) 1823 (i).
——— regulations, Issue of Permits, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1836 (i).
——— Transportation Cos. employed by Govt. Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1958 (i).
——— Wade, Mr. F. C., Date of Arrival at Dawson (Ans.) 3546 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Yukon, Walsh, Maj., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1824 (i).
——— Reps., Number sent in and laid on Table (Ans.) 3798 (ii).
——— Water Front, Dawson, Lease, &c., to Morrison and McDonald (Ans.) 3547 (ii).
——— Willison, Mr. J. W., Crown Timber Agent (Ans.) 3823 (ii).
——— Relationship to Editor of the *Globe* (Ans.) 4270 (ii).
Yule Bridge, Richelieu River, Arbitrators' Award, &c. (Ans.) 3827 (ii).

Snetsinger, Mr. J. G., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5172 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Wentworth and Brant.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1936 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1071; conc. (M.) 1071 (i).
——— 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1742 (i).
Quebec Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co., Change of Title (B. 84) 1°*, 2108 (i).
Red River Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 2966 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Sir JAMES D. EDGAR) *West Ontario.*
Address, on The, Omission of Name from Division List, 1862 (i).
——— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2963.
Adjournments of the Hse. Motions (ruling) 3816-7 (ii).
Appeals from ruling of Chairman to Speaker in Com. of the Whole Hse, Stmnt. and Authority quoted, 4553 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 6928; Mess. by Black Rod, 6930 (iii).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, Attendance of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with papers, &c., 6821 (ii).
Burrard, Member for, Use of Reverend in Ques. (ruling) 1838 (i).
Business of the Hse.: Remarks *re* Introduction of Bills, 618 (i).
Controverted Elections, Judges' Reps. (read) 1 (i).
Demonstration in Galleries of Hse. checked, 2397 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) ruling, 2157 (i).
Elections, Certificates received during Recess (read) 1 (i).
Emigration to U.S. (ruling) as to answer of Question, 2117 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Res. of Condolence, Reply to (read) 3 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) ruling, 4448.
——— Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) ruling, 4449, 4455 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 158 (i).
International Com., Alaskan Boundary Protocols, Minister may move to lay Communication on Table, according to English Practice, 4264.
Irrelevancy of Debate, 2794, 2805 (i); 7635 (iii).
——— (ruling) 6741 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).
McLaughlin, R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (ruling) as to form of Ques., 4485, 4492, 4497 (ii).
——— Letter read by P.M.G., Irregularity of Procedure (ruling) 5006, 5011 (ii).
Members addressing Chair (ruling) 7214 (iii).
Members asked to formulate their Questions so as not to make statements of fact, 4483 (ii).
——— asked not to interrupt speakers, 1175 (i).
——— asked to keep within the Motion before Hse., 4816 (ii).
——— asked to speak to the Motion before Chair, 1565, 1574 (i).
——— asked to withdraw statement, 1020, 1177, 1555 (i); 4006 (ii).
——— breaking Rule on calling Orders of the Day, 3558 (ii).
——— cannot refer to previous Deb. in asking Questions (ruling) 3262 (i).
——— cannot speak twice on same Motion, 3777, 5375 (ii).
——— can only make Personal Explanation not a Speech, 5376 (ii).
——— Motion not in Order, 3342 (ii).
——— must confine himself to M. before Hse., 4780, 5402 (ii).
——— must conclude with a Motion, 3754 (ii).
——— must not interrupt without permission of Speaker, 6170 (ii).
——— must not quote from previous Debate, 7196 (iii).
——— making Speeches out of Order, must make a Motion, 3846 (ii).
——— New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 1, 338 (i).
——— remarks checked, 47, 167, 1871, 1953, 1954, 2733, 2734, 2742, 2830, 2837, 3193 (i); 3557, 6315, 5493 (ii).
——— Resignation of (notification) 3 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 158, 2963 (i); 4858 (ii); 7638, 9835 (iii).
M. *re* Procedure for Rets. (ruling) 3560 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to apologize for the use of the word "beast," as applied to Members of the Hse., 6225 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Order, Ques. of, Member asked to withdraw Statement, 989 (i); 5394 (ii).

——— (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Member imputing motives (ruling) 6230 (ii).

——— (ruling) 390, 1606 (i).

——— Members requested not to interrupt, 427, 1447 (i).

——— (Mr. *McNeill*) Statements made generally (ruling) 7213 (iii).

——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Ref. to Deb. in Com. of Hse. (ruling) 6826 (iii).

Ogilvie, Mr., Refusal of Min. to read letter in ans. to a question (ruling) 3800, 3814 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2290 (i).

Parlt., Opening, Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).

Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Application for Mr. Costigan's seat, 3845 (ii).

Petition, Dufferin County, *re* Increase of Militia Grant, ruled out of Order, 1071 (i).

——— Essex County, *re* Increase of Militia Grant, ruled out of Order, 803 (i).

——— Lanark County, *re* Increase of Militia Grant, Ruled out of Order, 1639 (i).

——— Irregularity of (remarks) 421 (i).

——— Rule of Procedure, 1737 (i).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. of Com., on conc., 5745 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Members (Ruling) 9183 (iii).

Procedure on calling Orders of the Day (ruling) 2118 (i).

Procedure for Wednesdays, Attention of Members called to, 3269 (i).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Production of Papers (ruling) 2041, 2045 (i).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 10246 (iii).

Public Accts. Com., Postponements and Hours of meeting, &c. (remarks) 4351 (ii).

Questions, Form of asking (remarks) 2322, 2484 (i).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, Precedence in Deb., 6464 (ii).

Speaker, Dep., Delegation of Powers, &c. (ruling) 5492 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (rep.) 4 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 2280; (stationery, &c.) 2279 (i); (stationery) 5730 (ii).

Unparliamentary language (ruling) 5406 (ii).

Vacancies (notification) 1, 617, 700 (i).

Votes and Proceedings, Typographical Errors (remarks) 6120 (ii).

Winnipeg Electoral District, Vacancy (remarks) 619 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. T. W. BAIN) *S. Wentworth.*

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep. (printing of evidence) conc., 3440 (ii).

Huron, West Representation, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 9597 (iii).

London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 3647 (ii).

Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. 10 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com., 3843 (ii).

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5250 (ii).

Speaker, Election of (remarks) 9063 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8331 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector's salary) 9019 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Library Messengers) 10140; (stationery) 10139 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 8000 (iii).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. L. P. BRODEUR) *Rouville.*

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Ellis*) ruling 4339 (ii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) (ruling) 2934, 2949 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (ruling) "humbug" as applied to Language not out of Order, 4644 (ii).

Irrevelancy of Debate, 8451, 8577, 8744 (iii).

Member asked to withdraw objectionable expression, 10133, 10063 (iii).

——— called to order—must address the Chair, 5162 (ii); 9647 (iii).

——— cannot interrupt without the consent of the h. m. making speech, 3226 (i).

——— cannot move adjnmt. twice on Orders of the Day being called, 4551 (ii).

——— checked in discussing Speaker's rulings, 2820 (i).

——— discussing items generally in supply (ruling) 7033 (iii).

——— may speak to M. to go into Sup., 8644 (iii).

——— moving reading of B. (ruling) 2918 (i).

——— must conclude with a motion, 3499 (ii).

——— must not impute unfair motives to Chairman, 5616 (ii).

——— must not refer to previous Debate, 3328 (i); 10075 (iii).

——— Remarks checked, 3224, 3225 (i); 4626 (ii); 10038 (iii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Fielding*) appeal from Chairman's decision (ruling) 5611 (ii).

——— (ruling) 242 (i); 5608, 6778 (ii); 7303, 8810 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of Deb., 8921, 9481, 9348 (iii).

——— Members abusing privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6594 (ii).

Speaker, Deputy—*Con.*
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *McNeil*) one member imputing motives to another member *re* vote (ruling) 5882 (ii).
——— member may ask question if h. m. will allow it, 10055 (iii).
——— Members must obey the Chair, 9802, 9803 (iii).
——— member must withdraw the word "cowardly," 6157 (ii).
——— Reading bill clause by clause (ruling) 4647 (ii).
——— Reference to Newspaper report, 1236 (i).
——— Ref. to past Debate (ruling) 6753 (ii).
——— Ruling of the Chair must be respected, 7073-4 (iii).
——— Unparliamentary language, 8603, 8609, 8615, 9044, 9208 (iii).
——— Word "demagogue" is unparliamentary, 9655 (iii).
Plebiscite Vote, Prov. of Que., Poll Books, &c., Ret. laid on Table, 7320 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) wthdn. by consent of Hse., 8755 (iii).
Reference to previous Debate (ruling) 7081 (iii).
Rutland and Noyan Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 120) 1°*, 3149 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Address, on The, 469 (i).
——— on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1675 (i).
Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 44) 11*, 1165 (i).
Apples, Fraudulent Packing, on M. (Mr. *McMillan*) to adjn., 3757 (ii).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3299; in Com., 3309 (i).
Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt. &c., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9908 (iii).
Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c. (prop. Res.) 4823 (ii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4978 (ii).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c., to Com of Privs. and Elections, 6749 (ii).
Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6281 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1929 (i).
——— B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2211 (i).
——— B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3321 (i).
Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2138 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 895; on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2944 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 2175 (i).
——— Combinations in Restraint of Trade (B. 40) 1°*, 1073; 2° m., 1936 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. (B. 182) in Com. on Res., 8945; in Com. on Bill, 9668 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. on M. to conc., 1073 (i).
Dolphin Fishery Cruiser, Sale of, Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 1855 (i).
Dom. Census and B.N.A. Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2389 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands, B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1919; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2933, 2950 (i).
Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8757 (iii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4307 (ii).
General Inspection (Wheat) Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1°, 3751 (ii).
——— B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) 9658 (iii).
Grain Standards, N.W.T., Legislation *re* Inspection, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3835 (ii).
Immigrants in Quarantine, par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2192 (i).
Imperial Service and Canadian Brigade and Can. Seamen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2347 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 2109 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. 2817 (i).
——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4378, 4390, 4670 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9715.
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s Pet. on M. (Mr. *Henderson*) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, 1948 (i).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4498 (ii).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6093; in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6328 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Papers respecting, 4883 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for Com., 5253; on amt. (Mr. *McLean*) to M. for 3°, 5535 (ii).
Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Mins. of Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5536 (ii).
Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3817 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members abusing privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6593 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Rutherford*) Member must wthdw. the word "Thimbleriggers," 9655 (iii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 4302 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9193; on M. for 2°, 9619; in Com., 9627 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 18 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2151; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2284, 2287 (i).

——— (remarks) 2318 (i).

Personal Explanation, par. in Toronto *World*, 6825 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6103; in Com., 6109 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7852 (iii).

Private Bills Com., Select Standing, on M. (Mr. *Scriver*) to Reduce Quorum, 4729 (ii.)

——— on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to extend Time, 5378 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9185 (iii).

——— Stenographers' Fees (remarks) 10116 (iii).

Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2040 (i).

Public Accounts Com. Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3221, 3227 (i).

——— Postponements and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4350 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2965 (i).

Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7649; in Com., 7667 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9689; in Com., 9863, 9871 (iii).

Queen's County (P.E.I.) Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 9002 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9746 (iii).

Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines, 22nd Rep. of Com. on conc., 9210 (iii).

——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9205, 9328, 9468, 9485, 9544; in Com. on Bill, 9785, 9807 (iii).

Reading Room, Ventilation, Light, &c. (remarks) 974 (i).

Regimental Meetings of 8th Hussars, Annual Rep. (M. for copy*) 3873 (ii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3468, 3496; on M. for 2°, 6673; in Com., 6758 (ii) 6912 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 45) 1°*, 1165 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (additional Judge in Ont.) 10122 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 10144 (iii).

Canals: Welland (rebate to Forwarding Co.) 5794; (refund for damages to lock) 5793 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2270; (salaries) 2258; Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 2269; (salaries) 2086; Customs (salaries) 2091; Finance (salaries) 2091; Geological Survey (salaries) 2104; Interior (salaries) 2077, 2082; Indian Affairs (salaries) 2083; Inland Revenue (salaries) 2100; Justice (salaries) 2064; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2102; Militia and Defence (contingencies) 2268; (salaries) 2070; Privy Council (contingencies) 2265; Railways and Canals (salaries) 2253; Sec. of State (contingencies) 2269; (salaries) 2076; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2277; (salaries) 2107, 2264 (i).

Collection of Revenues (St. Lawrence telegraph and cable) 8182; (telegraph lines, B. C., 8186 (iii).

Customs: conc., 10212 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector, salary) 9003 (iii).

Fisheries (protection service) 4728 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) conc., 10215; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9030, 9038, 9046 (iii).

Indians: Man. and N. W. T. (general expenses) 5722; (implements, &c.) 5713 (ii); (industrial schools) 10110 (iii); (saw-mills) 5721 (ii); (Veterinary surgeons) 10111 (iii); (Ont.) 5676; (removal of Oka band) 5709; (surveys, &c.) 5710 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (salaries, &c.) 5587 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (distribution of blue-books to Law Associations) 5743 (ii); (stationery) 2278 (i); 5733 (ii); (voters' lists) 2282, 2310 (i); 10128 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5140, 5177 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 7061, 7066 (iii); (arms, &c., accoutrements) 5467; (clothing) 5444; (military stores) 5424; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5452, 5461 (ii); (pay, allowance) 7016; (properties, &c.) 7090; (salaries) 7074; (stores, &c.) 7097 (iii); (Royal Military College) 5464 (ii); 7026, 7140 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act, cost of election) 10111; half-breed claims commission) 9059; (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10179, 10188; (well-boring machine, N. W. T.) 9056; Wentworth *vs.* Mathieu, litigation) 10112 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3041 (i).

Penitentiaries (B C.) 5480; (Dorchester) 5477 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 5798; (legal expenses) 5801 (ii); (mail service) conc., 10204 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5803 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 9945; Ont., 9960; (London drill hall) 9962; (Ottawa, Astronomical Observatory) 9953 (iii); (electric lighting) 5185 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 9989; (rewiring Library) 9956; (Royal Military College) 9960; Que. (Victoriaville P. O.) 9955; Dredging (plant) 5203, 8138 (iii) Ont., 5203 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 7764; N.S. (Brulé wharf) 10003; (Cheaxetcook wharf) 10004; (Shag Harbour wharf) 9998; Tatamagouche wharf) 10003; (wharfs) 7705, 7711; Ont., 7967, 7971, 7983; (Port Colborne) 9255, 9299; Sheguiandah pier) 10008; (P.E.I.) 7761; Que., 8112; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9967; (Sabrevois wharf) 10027, 10035; Miscellaneous (statue of Her Majesty) 8150; (statue of the late Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 8150; Roads and Bridges

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

(Ottawa) 5204 (ii); 8148; Yukon (Edmonton trail) 10109 (iii).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5754; (shops at Moncton) 5754 (ii); P. E. I. (construction, Murray Harbour, &c.) 9211, 9233 (iii); (Mount Stewart wharf) 5763 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 5581 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8950, 9004, 9016 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6292 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9884 (iii).

Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9853 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6578 (ii).

——— par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8069 (iii).

——— Liquor Importation: par in Montreal *Witness* (remarks) 1638 (i).

Stenson, Mr. M. T., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Address, on The, 250 (i).

I. C. R., Gosselin, Mr. F., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3827 (ii).

——— Locomotive Engineers, Number employed, &c. (Ques.) 9697 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (illustration stations) 8291 (iii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*

Address, The, on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1541 (i).

Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Hurley*) to extend Time for receiving Pet., 5385 (ii).

Binder Twine Contract, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 7216 (iii).

British American Pulp and Paper Co.'s Incorp. (B. 172) 1**, 7441 (iii).

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4302, 4306 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3971 (ii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6970 (iii).

Great North-west Central Ry. (B. 90) 3° m., 4189, 4193; on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4780 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4643 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 5897; on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6093, 6405; in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6327 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5048; in Com., 5352; on amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 5535 (ii).

Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 4302 (ii).

Prime Minister's Reply to Invitation to Chicago Demonstration, par. in Newspaper, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 9842 (iii).

Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5381 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Royal Commission, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1885 (i).

Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2964 (i).

——— Postponements and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4349 (ii).

——— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to print, 9837 (iii).

Quebec Ry., Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5041, 5249 (ii).

Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines, 22nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 9209 (iii).

——— Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9731, 9743, 9781 (iii).

——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9500, 9518, 9539, 9583 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Customs: conc., 10214 (iii).

Militia (military stores) 5439 (ii); (Yukon supplies) 7045 (iii).

Public Works: Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5615, 5621 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8981 (iii).

Yale-Kootenay Telegraph Co. (B. 7) Sen. Amts., 8822 (iii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Address, on The, 273 (i).

Customs and Inland Rev. Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8933 (iii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4403, 4405 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia (salaries) 7086 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sabrevois Wharf) 10027 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (suspension of Mr. McDonald) 7294 (iii).

Tarte, Hon. J. I., *St. John and Iberville.*

Address, on The, 570 (i).

Annapolis Public Buildings, Tenders for Painting (remarks) 2410 (i).

Anticosti Island, Pub. Works Inspection Trip, Name of Str. (Ans.) 2188 (i).

Batiscan River, Obstructions to Navigation, &c., Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3552 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*
Blais, Mr. J. C., Amount paid by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3545 (ii).
Boivin, Gideon, Contract for Stone for Rivière la Pipe Wharf (Ans.) 4061 (ii).
China Point Pier, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2485 (i).
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1896, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. C.'s, 5320 (ii).
Davis, Edwd., Slide Master at Coulonge, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3946 (ii).
Donahue, W., Contract for Timber for Dredge at Roberval, &c. (Ans.) 4061 (ii).
Fenelon Falls, Construction of Slide (Ans.) 1978 (i).
Fraserville Harbour and Board of Trade Resolutions (Ans.) 1969 (i).
Little River, N.S., Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Drainage, &c. (Ans.) 1965 (i).
Montreal Harbour Improvements, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (i).
——— Post Office, Repairs, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders (Ans.) 2112 (i).
——— Repairs, &c., Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1974 (i).
Nicolet River Public Works, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3549 (ii).
Orillia Public Building, Caretaker, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1957 (i).
Parker, Mr. Charles H., Dismissal, &c. (Ans,) 1972 (i).
Parlt. and Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Electric Lighting, &c. (Ans.) 5308 (ii).
Pigeon River Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 2112 (i).
Pointe Claire Wharf, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2111 (i).
Portage La Prairie Post Office, Name and Salary of Caretaker (Ans.) 2485 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) remarks, 421 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4997 (ii).
Returns *re* P.E.I., on Inquiry for, 3878 (ii).
Scugog River, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
Simcoe Lake, Lowering Waters, Requests, &c., made to Dept. (Ans.) 2192 (i).
Souris Breakwater, P.E.I., Claim for Damages by Messrs. Mellish and Wrightman (Ans.) 4271 (ii).
Steel Boxes for Indian Dept., Number supplied, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4995 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence, Construction, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1963 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Post Office, Old Site, Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 4270 (ii).
Yukon District, Lafontaine, Mr. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1958 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Address, on The, 207 (i).
Anticosti Island, Cor. between British Govt. and Can. (Ques.) 1841 (i).
Binder Twine Contracts, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iii).
——— Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of, Names of Tenderers (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
——— Output of Kingston Penitentiary, Tenders, price, &c. (Ques.) 1825 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).
Brockville Election, Ballot Papers, Printing and Distribution (Ques.) 3074 (i).
Busby, Mr., Customs Collector at Skagway, Date of Appnmt. and Salary (Ques.) 4805 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2221 (i).
——— B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3327 (i).
Choquette, Hon. Mr. Justice, Place of Residence, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5097 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, Amts. &c., paid to Mr. Rubidge, C.E., since Jan. 1897, Expenses *re* Strs. *Alert* and *Alaska*, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1878 (i).
——— Award of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1853 (i).
Curless, Chas. H., Preventive Officer, Grand Falls, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4056 (ii).
Dargavel, Mr. J. B., Postmaster at Elgin, Dismissal (Ques.) 1955 (i).
Debates Official, 2nd Rep., Dismissal of French Translator, on M. to conc., 1743 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6440 (ii).
Farran's Point and Iroquois Canal, Locks at, Reps. of Mr. Shanly, C.E., and Mr. Keefer, C.E., (M. for copies*) 1878 (i).
Fishery Officers, Leeds Co., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1818 (i).
Franking Privilege to Legislative Reps. &c. (Ques.) 3823 (ii).
Galicians and Doukhobors, Number brought into Canada, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques,) 8466 (iii).
Gananoque Public Building, Heating, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1881 (i).
General Inspection (Wheat) Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1°, 3751 (ii).
G.T.R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3966 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4520 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. Deane (read) 4786 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Compensation for Damages, &c. (Ques.) 4992 (ii).
——— Maintenance of Roads, &c., Letter of Mr. G. S. Conway (Ques.) 6380 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 6048 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) (M. to adjn.) 2795 (i).
——— G.T.R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4475, 4590, 4607 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
I. C. R., on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4451 (ii).
Leake, Mr. J. R., Postmaster at Morton, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1963 (i).
——— Rep. of Inspector, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2962 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3150 (i).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 95) 1°*, 2246 (i).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4491 (ii).
Montreal Post Office, Resignation of Postmaster (Ques.) 1827 (i).
Ogilvie, Mr., Relationship to Min. of the Int. (Ques.) 1841 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Binder Twine Contract, par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 7197 (iii).
——— (M. to adjn.) 7205 (ii).
Plebiscite Voters, Leeds Co., Rep. of Returning Officers (Ques.) 1848 (i).
Prohibition Plebiscite, Ret. of Votes polled, Papers respecting, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2045 (i).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3474 (ii).
St. Francis Lake Channel Improvements (Ques.) 1852 (i).
——— Survey and Services of Strs. *Alert* and *Alaska* (M. for Ret.*) 1878 (i).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, North Channel, Contracts, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1877 (i).
Singleton, Mr. W. R., Postmaster at Delta, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1956 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Contracts (M. for cor. notices, &c.) 1861 (i).
Stony Mountain Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 9837 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Alien Labour law enforcement) 10126 (iii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8734; (illustration stations) 8745 (iii).
Canals: Chambly (telephone lines) 5783 (ii); Lachine (enlargement) 7297 (iii).
Civil Govt.: Agriculture (salaries) 2261; Customs (salaries) 2098 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 5023; Mar. & Fisheries (contingencies) 5025; Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5053; Sec. of State (P. Mungovan's salary) 5021, 5854 (ii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 2107 (i).
Customs: B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8458; Man. (contingencies, &c.) 8453 (iii); (suspense account, Montreal) 5591 (ii).
Excise (allowance to Customs officers) 4802 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 4719; (repairs, &c.) 5180; (salaries of Inspectors) 4035 (ii).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8497 (iii).
Legislation (sessional indemnity to Mr. Beattie, M.P.) 5782 (ii); House of Commons (voters' lists) 2280, 2314 (i); 10134 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 3524, 3534 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia (Bate & Co.'s contract) 7041, 7118; (clothing) 7106, 7125; (miscellaneous) 7148; (pay allowance) 7030; (properties, &c.) 7091; (provisions) 7129; (Royal Military College) 7147; (salaries) 7076, 7080; (stores, &c.) 7091; (transport, &c.) 7135; (Yukon supplies) 7041 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 2996, 3001 (i); 5104, 5136 (ii).
Penitentiaries (general vote) 8750 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 7380 (iii); (Postmasters' salaries) 5823 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings Ont., 7622 (iii); (Ottawa electric lighting, &c.) 5183 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 7693; (Que.) 7620; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Wharfs) 7704; (Ont.) 7977; Que., 8110, 8131; (Coteau, dredging) 10051; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7593, 7602; (Sabrevois wharf) 10023; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8148 (iii); Yukon Provisional District (telegraph lines) 5629, 5633 (ii); 10095; (trails, roads and bridges) 10088 (iii).
Railways (repairs to private cars) 5785 (ii).
Weights and Measures (rent, fuel, stationery, &c.) 4804; (salaries, &c.) 4804 (ii).
Yukon District: Militia (clothing contract) 9114 (iii).
Valleyfield Customs Collectors, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5502 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3898 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amt.) 9857 (iii).
——— Mail Service, Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3792 (ii).
——— Registered Parcels, &c., returned from Dead Letter Office (remarks) 4351 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for Com., 3304 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 7769 (iii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5938 (ii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) to M. for 3°, 2942 (i).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1945 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2923 (i).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands, B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1918; on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2156, 2932 (i).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6099 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt B. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 1863; in Com., 1897 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 7674 (iii).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5249 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D.—*Con.*
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3463 (ii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2764 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (armaments, &c.) 7153; (clothing) 7115 (iii).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 2°, 1868 (i).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John City and County.*
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6951 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation. St. John) 7177, 7187 (iii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9887 (iii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart., *Cape Breton.*
Address, on The, 26 (i).
——on amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1553 (i).
Adjournment, Deceased Members (remarks) 7 (i).
——Ascension Day and Friday's sitting, 2706 (i).
——Queen's Birthday (remarks) 3340 (ii).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3992 (ii).
Agricultural and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 3442 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary, American Rumours *re* Canada's Contention, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3848 (ii).
—— *Modus Vivendi*, Rumoured Arrangements (remarks) 2535 (i).
—— Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5386 (ii).
—— rumoured compromise, par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 4738 (ii).
—— *Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 1074, 1166 (i).
See International Commisson.
Appnmts. by late Govt., Communication from Sec. of State for Colonies (M. for cor.) 2724, 2728 (i).
Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 531, 700 (i).
Beet Root Sugar, Bounty for Manufacture, &c., on prop Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4837 (ii).
Birthday Congratulations from Premier, 6382 (ii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4974; in Com. on Res., 4990 (ii); in Com. on Bill, 7639 (iii).
Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to ref. Documents, &c., to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 6738 (ii).
Budget, The, 2605 (i).
Business of the Hse. and Redistribution Bill (remarks) 3844 (ii).
——Senate Resolutions (remarks) 7321, 7442 (iii).
——Redistribution Bill (remarks) 2535 (i).
——(remarks) 801 (i) 7769, 8216 (iii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.*
Can. Troops for the Transvaal, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 7329 (iii).
Civil Service. Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1924 (i).
—— B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 2218 (i).
Colonial Securities and Imperial Tax (remarks) 1639 (i).
Commercial Treaties with British W. Indies, &c., on M. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) to Com. of Sup., 8177.
Companies Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8776, 8926 (iii).
Costigan, Hon. Mr., on Personal Explanation, 3660 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res., 8926 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 1072 (i).
Distribution of Political Speeches (remarks) 1166 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 6400, 6409 (ii).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands B. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1917; on M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 2154 (i).
Dry Docks Construction B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8473; in Com. on Bill, 8758 (iii).
Estate Duty, Cor. incomplete (remarks) 8220 (iii).
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 7242, 7442 (iii).
Geoffrion, Hon. Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7631 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Monday, 6280 (ii).
—— on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, 3647 (ii).
—— Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2409 (i).
Grain Transit, Man. and N. W. T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 1916 (i).
G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3964 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Savard*) in Com., 6970 (iii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) to M. for 3°, 4781 (ii).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B. 133 (Mr *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2793 (i); in Com. on Res., 3377, 3703, 3738, 4164; on M. for 2°, 3907; in Com., 4165; on M. for 3°, 4961 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2795 (i).
—— papers, Inquiry for, 2697 (i).
—— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4065; on M. for 2°, 4171; in Com., 4685 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.*
I.C.R., A. H. Harris, Appnmt. by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Pope*) for Cor., 2905 (i).
——— District Supt. Ouelette, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditure, Stmnt. of Accts. (remarks) 2791 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3761 (ii).
International Commission-Alaskan Boundary (M. to adjn.) 8152 (iii).
——— Protocols, on Presentation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4264 (ii).
——— par. in Montreal *Star*, 4169 (ii).
——— and Business of the Hse., Proposal to expedite, 3779 (ii).
——— Rumoured Cancellation of Meetings at Quebec (remarks) 2908 (i).
See Alaskan Boundary.
Ives, Hon. Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7532 (iii).
Japanese Anti-legislation in B.C., Disallowance of Bill (remarks) 2536 (i).
Judges and Political Preferments (remarks) 4484 (ii).
Loan Companies B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 6391 (ii).
Lumber imported into U. S. from Can., par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 1638 (i).
McLaughlin, R. J., and Farm Lands, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) 4488 (ii).
Military Canteens and Sale of Liquor, par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Ont. Alliance (remarks) 7325 (iii).
——— Officers, Regulations *re* French and English Language, Enforcement, &c. (remarks) 8632 (iii).
——— Permanent Corps, Pension System on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2722 (i).
Ministerial Responsibility *re* Transaction of Official Administration, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6093, 6095 (ii).
Montreal Judicial District, Additional Judges (remarks) 7240 (iii).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fortin*) 7635 (iii).
Northern Commercial Telegraph Co., and Cor. with Mins. of the Crown, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5533, 5542 (ii).
Ogilvie, Mr., Letter *re* Connection with British Goldfields Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) adjn., 3799.
——— Rep. and Evidence, Inquiry for, 8337 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, on being asked to withdraw the word "cowardly," 6157 (ii).
——— reference to newspaper report, 1256 (i).
——— (Mr. *McDougall*) on ruling of Mr. Speaker, 5405 (ii).
——— h. m. (Sir *Louis Davies*) imputes motives, 6228 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.*
Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members abusing Privilege of Ms. to adjn., 6592 (ii).
Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9190 (iii).
Pacific Cable between Australia and Can. Agreement B. 176 (Mr. *Mulock*) M. for Com. on prop. Res., 1951 (i) 8358; in Com. on Res., 8383 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1352 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Application for Mr. Costigan's seat, 3845 (ii).
——— (Sir *Louis Davies*) remarks, 618, 701 (i).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8766 (iii).
Petroleum Refining License Fee, on prop. Res. (Sir *Henri Joly*) 3885 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6102 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7773, 7789, 7840, 7942, 7953 (iii).
——— on prop. M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8222 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8639 (iii).
——— (remarks) 8754 (iii).
Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5383 (ii).
Private Bills Petitions, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to extend Time, 5378 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Absence of Ministers (remarks) 9183 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, par. in Winnipeg *Free Press re* Appnmt. of McGregor and Norwood, 9180 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8805 (iii).
Pub. Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2964 (i).
Public Works (Preservation of Health) B. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 7665 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7241 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 3914 (ii).
——— B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 8752 (iii).
Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of a Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3854 (ii).
——— Passes to Members and Senators B. 37 (Mr. *Bostock*) on M. for 2°, 2196 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Cos. (remarks) 4738; on M. for Com. of Sup., 4740, 4744 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9198 (iii).
——— (remarks) 8633, 8755, 9064, 9185 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3449; on M. for 2°, 5234, 5252 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. Deb., 5299 (ii).
——— in Com., 6759 (ii), 6981 (iii).
——— on Ques. of precedence in Deb., 6464 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2964 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8753, 8920 (iii).
Roads and Road Allowances in Man. B. 175 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8470 (iii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.*
Senate Reform Resolutions, wthdrl. by Govt. (remarks) 8752 (iii).
Speaker, Hon. Thos. Bain, Election of, 9063 (iii).
——— attention called to member's speech out of order, 3754 (ii).
SUPPLY
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8707; (dairy branch) 8271; (illustration stations) 8288, 8308, 8329 (iii).
Canals: Farran's Point (enlargement) 5779 (ii); Galops (enlargement) 7443 (iii).
Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes) 7001 (iii).
Civil Government: Public Works (salaries) 7536, 7543 (iii).
Customs: N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 8392 (iii).
Dominion Lands (scrip, &c.) 7511 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8482, 8490 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Can.) 8661; (St. John and Liverpool) 8672; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 8678 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5417 (ii); (clothing) 7099; (pay allowance) 7002; (Royal Military College) 7022; (stores, &c.) 7094 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 8704 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Bird Rock) 6384 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 7374 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7563 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at St. John) 7277; (freight rates) 7457 (iii); P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5759, 5774 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: Interior (salaries, &c.) 8947, 8975; Militia (food, clothing, transportation, &c.) 9067, 9069 (iii); (N.W. Mounted Police) conc., 6388 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 8658 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6286 (ii).
Turner Administration, B.C., Dismissal by Lt.-Gov. (M. to print papers) 3959 (ii).
Victoria Co., N.S., Patronage, &c., on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 5392 (ii).
Ville Marie Bank Suspension, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) 8756 (iii).
Wade, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 7242, 7320 (iii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3889 (ii).
Winnipeg Electoral District, Issue of Writ (notification): Remarks, 619, 804 (i).
Yukon Administration, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 6569 (ii).
——— par. in *North British Daily Mail*, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 8028 (iii).
——— Expedition of Mr. Coste, Rep., &c. (remarks) 5360 (ii).
——— Investigation, Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. and Papers *re* (remarks) 2409 (i).
——— Mail Service, Registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt., 3793 (ii).
——— Ogilvie's Rep., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 5307 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—*Con.*
Yukon Administration, received by Govt. (remarks) 3794 (ii).
——— U.S. Vessels and Can. Registry—Fraudulent Valuations, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for Ret., 3298 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, *Pictou.*
Address, on The, 701 (i).
——— closing of debate (remarks) 1016 (i).
Banque du Peuple B. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) on M. for 3°, 3488 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3763 (ii).
Bliss, Maj. D. C. F., Positions held under Govt., Date of Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3261 (i), 3335 (ii).
B. C., Chief Justice McColl, Judicial Residence (Ques.) 3546 (ii).
——— Judgeships, Appnmt., Minutes of Council, Commissions, &c. (M. for cor., &c.*) 1879 (i).
——— Supreme and County Court Judges, Cor. between B. C. and Can. Govt. *re* Administration of Justice in B. C. (M. for cor.) 2362 (i).
Bonds, Securities, &c., registered under R. S. C., Preparation for Parlt. *re* Yukon District (Ques.) 4804 (ii).
Bauer, Dom. Land Surveyor, B.C., Examination of Papers, &c. (remarks) 4061, 4313 4713, 4898.
Burns, Mr., Priv. Sec. Min. of Fin., Appnmt. to Permanent Force (Ques.) 8469 (iii).
Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 6281 (ii).
Can. Eastern Ry. Co., Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Canadian Fisheries and American Fish Trusts, Complaints *re* and Official Reps. (Ques.) 4993 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Ellis*) 4338 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3329 (i).
——— Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5905 (ii).
Clarke, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. in the Yukon (Ques.) 5486 (ii).
Clarke *vs.* The Queen, Claims against Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5750 (ii).
Coasting Laws, Enforcements, Cor. respecting (Ques.) 3257 (i).
——— Rep. of Capt. John Irving *re* Enforcement (Ques.) 3258 (i).
Commissions under the Great Seal, Regulations respecting (Ques.) 4483 (ii).
Coste, Mr., Expedition to Eng., Instruction, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for Papers*) 3334 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 2911 (i).
Crown Timber Office, New Westminster, B.C., Complaints, Instructions and Rep. of Mr. Archer Martin (M. for copies*) 3149 (i).
Dom. Census and B. N. A. Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2389 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—*Con.*
Doukhobors, Quarantine at Grosse Isle (remarks) 4550 (ii).
Fawcett, Mr., Advice *re* recording Mining Claims, &c. (Ques.) 3822 (ii).
Fraser River (B.C.) Miller's Landing Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2701 (i).
Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 4892 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, 3555 (ii).
Inland Fisheries, Issue of Licenses by Local Govt. (remarks) 2910 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 124 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3883 (ii).
Inquiry for Ret., 4713 (ii).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Steel Rails, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1814 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 1876 (i).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal—G.T.R. Agreement B. 138, in Com., 4673 (ii).
——— Order (Ques. of) Appeal from Chairman's ruling to Speaker, neg. (Y. 65; N. 20) 4448, 4457 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4446 (ii).
——— Green Sand Castings, Tenders, Price, &c. (Ques.) 5860 (ii).
Interior Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 4893 (ii).
Inverness Post Offices, Change of Location, Postmasters, Appnmt. and Dismissals (Ques.) 3825.
John C. Barr Str., Valuation by Customs Authorities (Ques.) 2700 (i).
Lynch, Mr. W. H., Rep. referred to by Min. of Int. (M. for copy*) 3874 (ii).
McKeown, E.. Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5487 (ii).
McLaughlin, Mr. R. J., Letter read by P. M. G., on Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 5009 (ii).
Mail Service, Pacific Coast, Facilities by Govt. (Ques.) 3254 (i).
Man. Election Fraud, Inquiry for Ret., 3876 (ii).
——— (M.) to further consider proceedings in Pub. Accounts Com., 2479 (i).
——— (M.) that Papers be ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 4054 (ii).
——— Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 2246 (i).
Martin, Mr. Justice, Judicial Residence, B.C. (Ques.) 3545 (ii).
Militia Clothing Contract, &c., and Cor. with Mr. Workman (M. for copies*) 5377 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 4806 (ii).
Ministerial Responsibility *re* Transaction of Official Administration, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
Motion *re* Procedure for Rets., on ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3560 (ii).
Ogilvie, Mr., Refusal of Min. to read letter in ans. to a question, 3811 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—*Con.*
Ogilvie, Mr., Relationship to Min. of Int. (Ques.) 2703 (i).
Pacific Cable and Govt. of B. C., Offers respecting (M. for cor.*) 3873 (ii).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Globe re* Mr. Fred. Peters and Yukon Charges, 3337 (ii).
——— *re* Question as to Mr. Mark Workman, 4990 (ii).
Printing Com., 3rd, 4th and 5th Reps. of Com. (stationery) on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc., 5384 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Postponement and Hours of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 4344 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2965 (i).
——— Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) (M.) to adjn., 3150 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission Consolid. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 3914; in Com., 3921; on amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to M. for 3°, 3988; Sen. Amts., 6101 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3492 (ii).
Restigouche Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) on Order for 2°, 2649 (i).
Returns, Incomplete, Yukon Charges and Man. election frauds (remarks) 3313 (i).
———Incomplete, Tels., &c., from Archer Martin, &c. (remarks) 4731 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Coasting Regulations, Enforcement of, 2696 (i).
——— Inquiry for Mr. Coste's Rep. *re*, 4997 (ii).
——— Ordered by Hse., Ministerial Responsibility (remarks) 5410 (ii).
——— non-compliance, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2966 (i).
——— non-production (remarks) 3071 (i).
——— Cor. between Mr. F. Peters and Ministers, Personal Explanation *re*, 4896 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 3498, 3555, 3752, 4151, 4313 (ii).
St. John, N.B., Deep Water Terminal Facilities (M. for Specifications, Plans, &c.*) 1876 (i).
Shamrock Tug, Amount paid John C. Kaine, &c. (Ques.) 5666 (ii).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Special Com., 2769 (i).
Spinks, County Court Judge, B.C., Charges against, on M. to Com. of Sup., 4172, 4201 (ii).
Steamship Service between P. E. I. and Liverpool, par. in *Examiner*, 3543 (ii).
Steveston, B.C., Tidal Lands, Application for Leases, &c. (Ques.) 3822, 4058 (ii).
——— O. Cs., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 3873 (ii).
——— Transfer of Property, &c. (Ques.) 3544 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (circuit allowance, B.C.) 5471; (Exchequer Court) 5473; Yukon (living expenses of one Judge) 5469 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 2980 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 5021; Post Office (salaries, Dead Letter Branch) 5034, 5053; Public Works (printing, &c.) 5085 (ii).

Fisheries (dismissal of Capt. Babb) 4256; (jurisdiction) 4242; (Noble Bros.) 4246; (salaries of Inspectors) 4013 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5116; (salaries, &c.) 3523 (ii).

Marine Hospitals (care of sick seamen) 4009; (shipwrecked seamen) 4012 (ii).

Militia (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5452; (military stores) 5441 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Law Library, London, Eng.) 5470; (Chief Justice Strong's expenses in Eng.) 5470; (professional services, Mr. C. J. R. Bethune) 5471 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving rewards) 3064; (maintenance) 2989 (i); (maintenance and supplies, &c.) 5101 (ii); (masters and mates) 3058; (removal of obstructions) 3065 (i).

Penitentiaries (B. C.) 5480; (Dorchester) 5481; (Kingston, investigation) 5073 (ii).

Public Works (St. Lawrence River channel) 5088; Yukon District (telegraph lines) 5605, 5613 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, salaries, &c.) 5080 (ii).

Railways: P.E.I. (Mount Stewart wharf) 5766 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (Dom. Steamers, &c.) 4713; (fog alarms) 4240 (ii).

Tidal Survey, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

——— in Can. Waters, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3795 (ii).

——— Stmnt. of Min. as to remarks of Allan SS. Captains, Rep. of Capt. Spain, &c. (Ques.) 3262 (i).

U. S. Boats registered at Dawson, Names, &c. (Ques.) 2699 (i).

——— Customs and Can. Vessels, Regulations, &c., *re* entering at American Ports (remarks) 2528 (i).

Voters' Lists, revised copies, &c. (Ques.) 1819 (i).

Votes and Proceedings, Typographical errors (remarks) 6120 (ii).

Walsh, Maj, Authority for Commission issued, &c. (Ques.) 4269 (ii).

——— Instructions by Govt. as Commissioner, Rep. of Interview at Skagway, &c. (Ques.) 3078, 3258 (i).

Walsh, Philip, Relationship to Major Walsh (Ques.) 3823 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3886 (ii).

Willison, Mr. J. W., Crown Timber Agent, Yukon District (Ques.) 3823 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt B. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4315 (ii).

Wood Island Light-keeper, Dismissal of D. McMillan, on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for Cor., &c., 4819 (ii).

Wright, Wm., Official in Recording Office at Dawson, Relationship to Editor of *Globe* (Ques.) 4270 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles H.—*Con.*

Yukon Act, Reps. from Yukon Council (remarks) 2536 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against (M.) (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 5945, 6053; (amt.) 6022, 6268; (amt.) Neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6278 (ii).

——— personal Explanation *re* Judge Dugas, 6158 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Sheriff, &c. (Ques.) 3943, 4268 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Sheriff, and Clerk of Court, O. C.'s, Bond Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 3149 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Messrs. Wade, McGregor and Norwood, Date of arrival at Dawson, &c. (Ques.) 3081 (i).

——— Bliss, Maj., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3552 (ii).

——— Bonds given by Officials, Record or List of names (Ques.) 5310 (ii).

——— Hunker Creek, Klondike Mining, applications and grants for hydraulicing (M. for copies*) 2962 (i).

——— Commissioner, Maj. Walsh, Instructions and Cor. from Govt. of Can. (M. for copies*) 2787 (i).

——— Commissioner Ogilvie, Instruction and Cor. with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2787 (i).

——— Commission of Inquiry, Request from Mr. Ogilvie to extend his powers, &c. (Ques.) 3080.

——— Council, Ordinances received, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).

——— Expedition, Mr. Coste's Expenses, &c. (M.) to ref. Papers to Pub. Accts. Com., 5489 (ii).

——— inquiry for Mr. Coste's Rep. on Expedition, 5408 (ii).

——— Documents, &c. asked for, 3067 (i).

——— Freight Transportation, Guarantee by Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2902 (i).

——— Instructions and Cor. between Dom. Govt. and Yukon Council (M. for copies*) 2787 (i).

——— Instructions to Walsh (Ques.) 3258 (i).

——— Investigation, Protest from Miners' Committee, Cor., &c. (Ques.) 2329 (i).

——— reps. from Mr. Ogilvie, Purports, &c. (Ques.) 3820 (ii).

——— Mr. Ogilvie's Report, Printing, &c. (remarks) 5359, 5746 (ii).

——— inquiry for Mr. Ogilvie's Rep., 4713 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Sifton*) to print Papers, &c., 4730 (ii).

——— Returns, Inquiry for, &c. 4340 (ii).

——— Judicial District, Appnmt. of second Judge, &c. (Ques.) 3081 (i).

——— Klondike River Bridge, Owner, Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 2902, 3073 (i).

——— Letters from Americans *re* Administration, &c. (Ques.) 3822 (ii).

——— Liquor Permits, issued by Archer Martin (remarks) 3875 (ii).

Tupper. Hon. Sir Charles H.—*Con.*
Yukon Liquor Permits issued by Maj. Walsh (Ques.) 2481 (i).
——— reps. *re* (Ques.) 2704 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 2789 (i).
——— issued by Mr. Ogilvie, Number, &c. 3077 (i).
——— disallowance by Govt.. 3791 (ii).
——— Living Expenses of Judges Dugas and Maguire, &c., Instructions *re* &c., 5489 (ii).
——— Maguire, Mr. Justice, Arrival and Departure from Dawson, 3258 (i); 3959 (ii).
——— Mail Service, Contracts, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies) 2705 (i).
——— Mining Regulations, Publication, &c. (Ques.) 1841 (i).
——— Miners' Grievances and Mr. Ogilvie's Rep. (Ques.) 2531 (i).
——— Officials, Bonds or Securities registered (Ques.) 4991 (ii).
——— Ogilvie, Mr., Reports *re* Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 3548 (ii).
——— Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Can. Goldfields Co. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).
——— Registrar of Titles, Instructions and Restrictions by Govt. (Ques.) 2324 (i).
——— Representation in Parlt. (Ques.) 2901 (i).
——— Russell, Mr., Inspector of Steamboats, Dismissal, Reps., &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 3334 (i).
——— Survey of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 3547 (ii).
——— Telegraph Line from Skagway and Dawson, Communications between Ministers and English syndicates *re* construction (M. for copies*) 3334 (i).
——— U. S. Vessels and Can. Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 3266 (i).
——— U. S. Vessels and Can. Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 3296 (i).
——— Wade, Mr. F. C., Date of arrival at Dawson (Ques.) 3546 (ii).
——— Walsh, Maj., Reps., Number sent in and laid on Table (Ques.) 3798 (ii).
——— alterations in Rep. (Ques.) 2704 (i).
——— Water Front, Dawson, Lease, &c. to Morrison & McDonald (Ques.) 3547 (ii).
——— Willison, J. W., Crown Timber Agent, Relationship to Editor of *Globe* (Ques.) 4270 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Lévis Military Camp, Qualification of Officers, Percentage, &c. (Ques.) 9309 (iii).
Militia Officers, at Lévis Camp, Numbers passed Qualifying Exams. (Ques.) 8632 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* French and English language, Enforcement, &c. (Ques.) 8631 (iii).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6717 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 8235 (iii).
Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector, salary) 9022 (iii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8481 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Restaurant keeper) 10138 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5417 (ii); (annual drill) 7072 (iii); (clothing) 5450; (military stores) 5429 (ii); (provisions) 7130; (salaries) 7082; (transport, &c.) 7137 (iii); (unforeseen expenses) 5858 (ii); (Royal Military College) 7144 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Chas. Bremner, compensation, &c.) 10114 (iii).
Post Office (Postmasters' salaries) 5802, 5829 (ii).

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke, *West York, O.*
Address, on The, 172 (i).
——— *re* Transvaal Question (remarks) 8998 (iii).
Agricultural Implements imported from U.S., Bases of Valuations, &c. (Ques.) 6047 (ii).
Alaska Boundary and Pacific Cable, Announcement of Agreement (remarks) 5387 (ii).
See "International Commission."
Aronsberg, Abraham, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) in Com., 7480 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, and Messrs. Peterson, Tate & Co's Deposit (Ques.) 1883 (i).
Aud. Gen's Rep., Inquiry for, 803 (i).
Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9934 (iii).
B. C. Legislation *re* Chinese and Foreign Immigration, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 6890 (iii).
Brown, Marion, Commutation of Death Sentence, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for Ret.*) 6939 (iii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7640 (iii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5744 (ii).
——— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 6938 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3331 (i).
——— Attachment of Salaries B. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 5926 (ii).
Coal Oil, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2131 (i).
Combination in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) on M. for 2°, 1944 (i).
Contracts let without Tender since June, 1895, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for O. Cs., 5340 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9661 (iii).
Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 6872 (iii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4312 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 9636 (iii).
Georgian Bay and Toronto Ship Canal, Pets. Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.) 4819 (ii).
G. T. R. Trackmen's Strike, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3777 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 4512 (ii)

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—*Con.*

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond Co. Ry. Acquisition B 133 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2795 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 2828 (i).

——— G. T. R. Agreement B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401, 4584, 4602, 4636, 4687 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4448 (ii).

International Commission Alaskan Boundary Protocols, on Presentation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4268 (ii).

——— par. in Montreal *Gazette re* Negotiations, 3340 (ii).

Iron Bounties, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1827 (i).
See "Bounties."

Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3118 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9882 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 6118 (ii).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co. and Cor. with Minister of Crown on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to Com. of Sup., 5573 (ii).

Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with British Goldfields Co., Refusal of Min. to read Letter in ans. to Question, 3813 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Casey*) 5617 (ii).

——— (Mr. *Fielding*) use of the word "impertinent," 5608 (ii).

——— (Mr. *McNeill*) one member imputing motives to another member, 5882 (ii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9187 ; in Com. on Bill, 9626 (iii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8767 (iii).

Personal Explanation in ref. to Remarks on Coal Oil Prices, 2247 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6113 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7905 (iii).

Pub. Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (Man. Election Frauds) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 3242 (i).

——— Postponements and Hours of Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4348 (ii).

——— 6th Rep. of Com. (M.) to print in Votes and Proceedings, 9836 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 9684 ; in Com., 9874 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9737 (iii).

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, 22nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 9210 (iii).

——— Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2509 (i).

——— Policy of Govt. *re* Yukon Ry. Co.'s on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 4766. (ii).

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9312, 9398, 9467, 9479, 9532, 9567 ; in Com., on Bill, 9762, 9783 (iii).

Reciprocity between U.S. and B. W. Indies, par. in Chicago *Record*, 4550 (ii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3458 ; on M. for 2°, 6464 ; in Com., 6806 (ii), 6941, 6945, 6967 (iii).

——— (M.) to adjn. Deb., 5299 ; Neg. (Y. 18 ; N. 23) 5305 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, (remarks) 5410 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 8718, 8745 ; (illustration stations) 8331, 8745 ; (Paris exhibition) 10144 (iii).

Canals : Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co.'s claims) 9238 (iii).

Civil Govt. : Agriculture (contingencies) 2272 ; (salaries) 2261 ; Customs (contingencies) 2974 (i) ; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies, &c.) 8748 ; Interior (salaries) 7466 (iii) ; Militia and Defence (contingencies) 2267 (i) ; Post Office, 7334, 7352 (iii) ; Railways and Canals (salaries) 2251 (i).

Customs : B. C. (contingencies, &c.) 8456 (iii) ; (repairs to cruisers) 5603 ; B. C. and Yukon (stationery, &c.) 5600 (ii) ; conc., 10206 ; Man. (contingencies, &c.) 8453 ; (N.S.) 8387 (iii) ; (Ont.) 5595 ; (suspense account, Montreal) 5590 ; Yukon (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 5597 (ii), 10109 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Chief Inspector's salary) 9025 ; (scrip, &c.) 7522 ; (Inspectors, agents, &c.) 7529 (iii).

Excise (commissions on stamps) 4790 (ii).

Geological Survey (artesian borings) 7469 (iii) ; (salaries) 5668 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 8492, 8578, 8620 ; conc., 10214 (Amt.) ; (St. Paul des Métis, seed grain, &c.) 9028, 9039 (iii).

Insurance (general expenses) 7464 (iii).

Legislation : House of Commons (gratuity to Lady Edgar) 10196 (iii) ; (sessional clerks) 2280 (i) ; (stationery supplies) 5732 (ii) ; (voters' lists) 2282, 2294, 2312 (i) ; (Wood, Mr., late M.P. s, essional indemnity) 10201 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5130 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 8663 ; (Quebec and Manchester) 8695 ; (St. John, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 8676 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5416 ; (clothing) 5450 (ii), 7106 (iii) ; (military stores) 5440 ; (miscellaneous and unforeseen) 5454 (ii) ; (pay allowance) 7029 ; (stores, &c.) 7094 ; (transport, &c.) 7131 (iii) ; (transportation and supplies) 6346 (ii) ; (Yukon supplies) 7040 (iii).

Miscellaneous : (commutation of duties) 8704 ; (Paris agency) 8704 ; (refund of duties on fish, &c., P.E.I.) 10189 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance) 3046 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 7375 ; (miscellaneous) 7388 (iii) ; (Postmasters' salaries) 5812 (ii) ; (Yukon mail service) 7360 (iii).

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 9941; (lighting, repairs, &c.) 9989; (repairs, &c.) 7690; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Chezzetcook wharf) 10004; (Gabarus breakwater) 9992; (Ont.) 7973; (Otonabee navigation) 10065; (Port Colborne) 9251, 9281; (Porter's Lake, dredging, &c.) 9993; (Portsmouth wharf) 10065; (Toronto Harbour) 10066; Que. (Coteau, dredging) 10062; (Montreal Harbour improvements) 9984; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7597; (Sabrevois wharf) 10038; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 5205 (ii); Telegraphs (Anticosti Island) 10073; Yukon (buildings) 10108 (iii); (telegraph lines) 5605, 5627, 5648 (ii), 10093; (trails, roads and bridges) 10089 (iii).

Railways: P. E. I. (Murray Harbour, &c., construction) 9211, 9217 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8698 (iii).

Yukon District (customs) 8747; Interior (salaries, &c.) 9005; Militia (clothing contract) 9077, 9122 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. *Roddick*) to Com. of Sup., 6305 (ii).

Valleyfield Customs Collector, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Com. of Sup., 5502 (ii).

Wheat exported from Montreal, St. John, Fort William and Winnipeg, Quantity (Ques.) 2702 (i).

Winnipeg Electoral Lists, Preparation, &c. (remarks) 2908 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6165 (ii).

——— Mail Service, Carriage of Registered Matter, 4352 (ii).

——— Policy of Govt., 3793 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Address, on The, 1320 (i).

Ball, Mr. W. D., Postmaster at Bath, Ont., Papers, &c., *re* Dismissal (M. for copies) 2390 (i).

Bath Postmaster, Dismissal, inquiry for Ret., 3877 (ii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 9601 (iii).

Herns, John, Caretaker Napanee Public Building, Cor. *re* Dismissal, &c. (M. for copies *) 5377 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Immigrants from U. S., Number and Distribution (Ques.) 1979 (i).

——— Europe, Number and Distribution (Ques.) 1980 (i).

——— Number sent by Agents in G. B. and U. S. (Ques.) 2192 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Agreement with G. T. R. B. 138 (Mr. *Blair*) Sen. Amts., 9722 (iii).

Ottawa City, Grant of Money Authorization B. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 9190; on M. for 2°, 9613; in Com., 9635 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8883 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9330, 9578, 9585 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agents, &c., salaries, &c.) 8480, 8486, 8618 (iii).

Indians: Man. and N. W. T. (implements, &c.) 5714 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7614; (Ont.) 7623; (London drill hall) 9961; (Rideau Hall, additional wing) 9959; Dredging (plant) 8143; Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 8087; (Man.) 8079; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 8147 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation, St. John) 7414 (iii).

Wood, Mr. A. T., *Hamilton.*

Binder Twine, Sale of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9914 (iii).

Can. Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 2182 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts., B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 9663 (iii).

G. T. R. Trackmen and Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, on M. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) to adjn., 3975 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on amt. (Mr. *Monet*) 6096; in Com. on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 6328 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) on amt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5043 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 190 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9355, 9401 (iii).

——— B. 85 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9732 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (protection service) 4723 (ii).

Militia: Yukon Force (transportation and supplies) 6324, 6345 (ii).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABENAKIS INDIANS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).

ACCOMMODATION AT LÉVIS: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 8705 (iii).

"ACADIA," STR., REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10191 (iii).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: consdn., M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

——— moved (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 9; seconded (Mr. *Martineau*) 21 (i).

Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 26, 1553; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 84; (Mr. *Foster*) 109; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 152, 159; (Mr. *Wallace*) 172; (Mr. *Casey*) 194; (Mr. *Taylor*) 207; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 234; (Mr. *Monk*) 241; (Mr. *Stenson*) 250; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 258; (Mr. *Talbot*) 273; (Mr. *Craig*) 275, 1772; (Mr. *Broder*) 290; (Mr. *Osler*) 307; (Mr. *Britton*) 311; (Mr. *Moore*) 319; (Mr. *Davin*) 338, 1807; (Mr. *Pope*) 398; (Mr. *Davis*) 422; (Mr. *Roche*) 454; (Mr. *Sproule*) 469, 1675; (Mr. *McClure*) 497; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 504; (Mr. *Carroll*) 509; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 516; (Mr. *Monet*) 532; (Mr. *Clancy*) 541; (Mr. *Tarte*) 570; (Mr. *Bennett*) 594; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 619; (Mr. *Hughes*) 631; (Mr. *Madore*) 666; (Mr. *McInerney*) 676; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 701; (Mr. *Sifton*) 800, 806; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 885, 895; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1002; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1013; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1016; (Mr. *Montague*) 1037; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1061; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1075; (Mr. *Ganong*) 1095; (Mr. *Powell*) 1124; (Mr. *McAlister*) 1144; (Mr. *Paterson*) 1167; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1197; (Mr. *Desmarais*) 1245; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 1264; (Mr. *Macdonald*, Huron) 1278; (Mr *Wilson*) 1320; (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1336; (Mr. *Legris*) 1344; (Mr. *McDougall*) 1354; (Mr. *Frost*) 1386; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1432; (Mr. *Clarke*) 1463; (Amt.) 1499; (Mr. *Bertram*) (Amt.) 1514; agreed to, Y 101, N. 48, 1811; (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 1514; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1541; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1598; (Mr. *Foster*) 1622; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1640; (Mr. *Flint*) 1692; (Mr. *Mills*) 1716; (Mr. *Morrison*) 1754; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1787; (Mr. *Domville*) 1793; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1804 (i).

——— CLOSING OF DEBATE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 975, 1016 (ii).

——— REPLY TO, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2963; read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i).

ADDRESS, OMISSION OF NAMES FROM DIVISION LIST: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1861 (i).

——— TO HER MAJ. *re* TRANSVAAL QUESTION: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8992 (iii).

ADJOURNMENTS, MS.:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2790 (i).

——— AND FRIDAY'S SITTING: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2706 (i).

EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3340; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3440 (ii).

MOTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3816, 3817 (ii).

CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION, PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9695; (M. to adjn.) 9837 (iii).

——— LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHLSAAT: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10220 (iii).

G.T.R. TRACKMEN AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT: (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3960, 3984 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION. ALASKAN BOUNDARY: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8152 (iii).

MEMBERS DECEASED: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

YUKON—OGILVIE'S LETTER *re* CONNECTION WITH BRITISH GOLDFIELD CO.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 3799 (ii).

Administration of Criminal Justice in Keewatin, &c., B. No. 167 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°*, 6279 (ii); 2°, 8171; in Com. and 3°*, 8172 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

——— YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii), 10191; conc., 10217 (iii).

——— LIVING EXPENSES OF JUDGES DUGAS AND MAGUIRE, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 123 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°*, 3334; 2°*, and in Com., 3990, 3996; 3°*, 3997 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 8705 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE, 2ND REP. OF COM., PRINTING OF EVIDENCE: Conc. (Mr. *Bain*) 3440 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2256, 2270 (i); contingencies, 5028 (ii).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 1352 (i).

—— MINISTER OF, TRAVELLING AND LIVING EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1825 (i).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS IMPORTED FROM U. S., BASES OF VALUATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 6047 (ii).

—— REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5861, 5893 (ii).

—— SOCIETIES: in Com. of Sup., 8237 (iii).

ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 8224 (iii).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 8224 (ii).

BUBONIC PLAGUE AND QUARANTINE OF PACIFIC STEAMERS AT B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5989 (ii).

BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8264 (iii).

CATTLE EMBARGO, COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Montague*) 1877 (i).

—— Inquiry for Returns (Mr. *Montague*) 3253 (i).

CATTLE INSPECTION, &c., AT HEBERTVILLE, COR. *re* APPOINTMENT OF DR. HALL: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5944 (ii).

—— FOR TUBERCULOSIS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND DR. J. A. DUCHESNE OF CHICOUTIMI SINCE JUNE, 1896: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5944 (ii).

—— MONTREAL, REGULATIONS, &c: Ques., 10115 (iii).

—— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii), 8339 (iii).

COLD STORAGE FOR FISH TRANSPORTATION FROM MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1978 (i).

—— PRESERVATION OF BAIT FOR FISHERMEN; Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1978 (i).

—— DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 10163.

COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8706 (iii).

CONSTANTIN, DR. JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).

DAIRYING AND AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8265 (iii).

DAIRYING INTERESTS, ADVANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup, 8337 (iii).

DUCHESNE, DR. J. A., COMPLAINTS *re* APPNMT. OF DR. HALL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, BALANCE DUE ON PROPERTY: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).

—— ESTABLISHMENT IN ST. JACQUES: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2110 (i).

—— FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 8237 (iii).

—— FARM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7688 (iii).

GREATER BRITAIN EXHIBITION, CANADIAN REPRESENTATION OF MINERAL EXHIBIT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1959 (i).

HALL, DR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF CATTLE AT CHICOUTIMI: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).

HOG CHOLERA, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5085 (ii).

"ILLUSTRATION STATIONS," FRUIT, CEREALS, &c., GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 8279, 8745 (iii).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).

OMAHA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

PARIS EXPOSITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS, SPACE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1829 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 10140 (ii).

PATENT OFFICE, Library: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

—— PHOTOGRAPHIC ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

"PATENT RECORD," PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

PLEBISCITE, SPEECH OF MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AT OTTAWA CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 1826 (i).

POULTRY FEEDING EXPERIMENTS, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).

P. E. I. AND G. B., COLD STORAGE AND SS. COMMUNICATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 5493 (ii).

QUARANTINE SERVICE, EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 3826 (ii)

—— in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii).

—— ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).

—— STATION, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

—— WILLIAM'S HEAD: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).

REFRIGERATOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).

SPRAYING FRUIT TREES, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).

STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup , 8236 (iii).

—— YEAR BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 8226 (iii).

STEEL SHELVING, DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 9989 (iii).

SUPERANNUATIONS IN AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPNMTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3873 (ii).

TOBACCO EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ESTABLISHMENT IN ESSEX CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).

TUBERCULOSIS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii).

—— INSPECTION IN CHICOUTIMI COUNTY, AMOUNT PAID &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5097 (ii).

—— PREVENTION OF: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Roddick*) 6282 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 8344 (iii).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY, AMERICAN RUMOURS *re* CANADA'S CONTENTION: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 3846 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, DIFFICULTIES WITH MOUNTED POLICE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 2193 (i).

—— MODUS VIVENDI: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1074, 1166 (i).

—— RUMOURED ARRANGEMENTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2535 (i).

—— PACIFIC CABLE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5386 (ii).

Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Gillies*) 1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389 (i).

Alaska-Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 617; 2°*, 933 (i).

ALBA SECTION, I.C.R., NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5310 (ii).

Alberta Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°*, 803; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iii).

Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 50).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, APPNMT. OF AGENT AT WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 5492 (ii).

ALIEN ACT, B.C., COR. WITH B. C. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).

ALIEN ACT, B.C., DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7768 (iii).
——— LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii); 10123 (iii).
——— ENFORCEMENT AT HAMILTON: Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 3879 (ii).
——— ENFORCEMENT AT TORONTO, INSTRUCTION TO AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3084 (i).
——— ENFORCEMENT, PAR. IN TORONTO *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 2907 (i).
——— LABOURERS AT LAKE BENNETT, AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1859 (i).
ALLAIRE, J. P. O., ST. BONIFACE, MAN., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).
ALLAN SS. SERVICE AND GOVT. CONTRACT, NAMES OF VESSELS SAILING FROM ST. JOHN, 1897-8: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3258 (i).
AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY, DIES, PLATES, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 3828 (ii).
AMMUNITION, AMOUNT ISSUED TO 7TH BATTALION, LONDON: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1956 (i).
ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BUOY SERVICE, EXPIRATION OF MR. MCCARTHY'S CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4056 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN, REPORTS *re* BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4993 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS CO., PORT GEORGE HARBOUR, PIER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7532 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE, IRREGULARITIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 8989, 9179 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2701 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 2410 (i).
ANNUAL DRILL: in Com. of Sup., 5055, 5414 (ii); 7002 (iii).
ANSE À BEAUFILS, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, BREAKWATER; in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN BRITISH GOVT. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTION TRIP, NAME OF STR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188 (i).
——— M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2789 (i).
——— TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
ANTI-JAPANESE LEGISLATION, COR. BETWEEN B. C. GOVT. AND DOM.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5206 (ii).
——— Motion Dropped (Mr. *Prior*) 5313 (ii).
——— INCOMPLETE RETURN: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5408, 5491 (ii).
——— GOVT. POLICY *re* FOURTEEN STATUTES ALREADY IN FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5859 (ii).
ANTLER AND MOOSE MOUNTAIN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9467 (iii).
APPEALS FROM RULING OF CHAIRMAN TO SPEAKER IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE, STMNT. AND AUTHORITY: Quoted (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4553 (ii).
APPELLATE COURT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).
APPLES, FRAUDULENT PACKING, PAR. IN TORONTO *World*: M. to adjn. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3753 (ii).
APPNMTS. BY LATE GOVT., COMMUNICATION FROM SEC. OF STATE FOR COLONIES: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2724, 2738 (i).
APPNMTS. BY GOVT., YUKON DISTRICT, SINCE AUG., 1896, NAMES, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876 (i).
——— MESSRS. WADE, MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD, DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).
——— SECOND JUDGE, YUKON JUDICIAL DISTRICT, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).
——— SHERIFF, &C., YUKON TERRITORY: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3943, 4268 (ii).
——— YUKON TER., CLERK OF COURT, O. CS., BOND CERTIFICATES, &C.: M. for copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).
ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT., COST OF: in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).
ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 8224 (iii).
ARCHIVES, CANADIAN: Report Presented (Mr. *Fisher*). 4061 (ii).
ARICHAT BREAKWATER, N.S., REPAIRS, &C., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9125 (iii).
ARMS, AMMUNITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5466 (ii); 9141 (iii).
ARMY AND NAVY IMPORTATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8704 (iii).
Aronsberg, *see* "Divorce."
Arnprior, &c., *see* "Canada Atlantic."
Arthabaska Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)
ARTESIAN BORINGS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7468, 9055 (iii).
ARTILLERY, FORTRESS ARMAMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 8224 (iii).
ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2790 (i).
ASSENT, *see* "Bills.
ASHCROFT, B.C., SALE OF RY. LANDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1855 (i).
——— RY. LANDS PURCHASED BY ASHCROFT WATER AND ELECTRIC CO., COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Prior*) 2408 (i).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of of Sup., 9943 (iii).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE AND GOVTL. ACTION: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 4740, 5411 (ii).
——— PETERSON, TATE & CO.'S BOND: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2481 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1883 (i).
ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9450 (iii).

Atlantic and North-west Ry. Co.'s B. No. 8 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

Atlas Loan Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

ATLIN DISTRICT, BREWERY LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

ATWATER AVENUE, REBUILDING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

AUD. GENERAL'S REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2180 (i).

—— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2086, 2269 (i).

—— REP. PART I: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1165 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 531, 700 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Wallace*) 803 (i).

Australasian and Canada Submarine Tel. Co.'s B. No. 176 (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res., 1950, 8348; in Com. on Res., 8383; 1°*, 8386; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 8475 (iii). (62-63 Vic., c. 3.)

Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 8348, 8383; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8358, 8383; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8369; (Mr. *Craig*) 8370; (Mr. *Osler*) 8371; (Mr. *Bostock*) 8372; (Mr. *Prior*) 8373; (Mr. *Casey*) 8373; (Mr. *McNeill*) 8381; (Mr. *Foster*) 8383; (Mr. *Britton*) 8383 (iii).

AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9958 (iii).

BABIN'S COVE WHARF, ARICHAT, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).

BADDECK, EAST BAY, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).

—— N. S., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO., AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1843 (i).

—— AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

BAIE DES HONFLEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10019 (iii).

BAIE ST. PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 8104 (iii).

BAIN, HON. THOS., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).

BALL, MR. W. D., POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT., DISMISSAL, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Wilson*) 2390 (i).

BALSAM LAKE, REMOVAL OF STONE PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2332 (i).

BANFF SPRING, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 3497; 2°* and in Com., 3763; 3°*, 3985 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

Bank of Nova Scotia Authorization B. No. 53 (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1585 (i); wthdn., 6047 (ii).

Banque du Peuple B. No. 6 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934: on Order for Com., 3003; in Com., 3298 (i); 3° *re.*, 3485 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 123.)

BARNETT, C., ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).

BATE & CO.'S CONTRACT *re* YUKON SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii); 7036, 7124 (iii).

BATH POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3877 (ii).

BATISCAN POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER, REP. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1966, 2320 (i).

—— SALARY OF POSTMISTRESS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*, 1970 (i).

—— OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3552 (ii).

BAUER, MR., DOM. LAND SURVEYOR *re* EXAMINATION PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4713 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4061, 4313, 4713, 4898 (ii).

BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9489, 9551 (iii).

BEAR RIVER, REMOVAL OF OLD PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10161 (iii).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., conc., 10120 (iii).

—— DAMAGE TO FARM LANDS BY OVERFLOW: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4859 (ii).

—— DISMISSALS: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5411 (ii).

—— LOCK LABOURERS, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3267 (i).

—— STEEL BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iii).

—— WATER POWER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1883 (i).

BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR DISTRIBUTING MAIL AT MAPLE BAY PRIOR TO CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3820 (ii).

Bedlington and Nelson Ry. Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Bostock*) 1°*, 2529; 2°*, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BEET ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY FOR MANUFACTURE, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4823 (ii).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).

—— COST TO GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2186 (i).

Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 162 (Mr. *Hurley*). M. to introduce, 5384; 1°*, 5945; 2°*, 6338; in Com., 7479; 3°*, 7480 (ii). (62-63 Vic., c. 95).

BELLEVILLE PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE CO.'S BILL: M. to extend Time for receiving Pet. (Mr. *Hurley*) 5384 (ii).

BELLE RIVER, P.E.I., SEIZURE OF FISH TRAPS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2787 (i).

BELLEY RIVER BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).

BELŒIL PUBLIC WORKS, TOTAL COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).

"BENCH" AND "CREEK" CLAIMS, YUKON DISTRICT, DISPUTES PENDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3077 (i).

BENEFIT ASSOCIATIONS, INSURANCE AND ASSESSMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 1353 (i).

Benevolent Societies Incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 2109 (i); wthdn., 3748 (ii).

BENNET HOSPITAL, YUKON DISTRICT, MATRON AND MEDICAL SUPT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1979 (i).

BERNIER, MR. N., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., conc., 10204 (iii).

BERTHIER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c., POSTMASTER'S SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1893, 2702, 2703 (i).

BETHUNE, MR. C. J. R., PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

BIGGAR, J. L., APPNMT. BY GOVT., QUALIFICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3549 (ii).

BILODEAU, MR. JOB, POSTMASTER AT CHAMBORD, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

BILODEAU, MR. L. P., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 6928 (iii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 4; *pro formâ.*

BILL (No. 2) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, so as to make more effectual provision for the punishment of Seduction and Abduction.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 421; 2°*m.*, 1898; in Com., 2525; 3°*m.*, 2911; agreed to (Y. 68; N. 29) 2930 (i.)

BILL (No. 3) Respecting the Canada Accident Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Monk.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 933 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5042 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 4) To incorporate the Canada Plate Glass Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Monk.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 933 (i); in Com., 5042; 3°*, 5249 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 5) To incorporate the Alaska-Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 933 (i).

BILL (No. 6) Respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; on Order for Com., 3003; in Com., 3298 (i); 3°*m.*, 3485 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 7) To incorporate the Yale-Kootenay Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 8822 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 131.)

BILL (No. 8) Respecting the Atlantic and North-west Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Calvin Company (Limited).—Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; wthdn., 2897 (i).

BILL (No. 10) Respecting the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934 (i); in Com., 3842; 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 119.)

BILL (No. 11) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Thomas Robertson.—(Mr. *Ross Robertson.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 127.)

BILL (No. 12) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George L. Williams.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 130.)

BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Home Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)

BILL (No. 14) Respecting the Quebec Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Malouin.*)
1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 125.)

BILL (No. 15) To regulate the trade in grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°*, 618; 2°, 1901 (i).

BILL (No. 16) Respecting joint securities for seed grain indebtedness, Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°*, 618; wthdn., 9893 (iii).

BILL (No. 17) Respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 700; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2524 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 18) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 100; 2°*, 934; in Com., 2150; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2284 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

BILL (No. 19) To amend the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 700; 2°, 1862; in Com., 1896; 3°*, 2153 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 20) To incorporate the Zenith Mining and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Pouzare.*)
1°*, 803; 2°*, 1113 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 803; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 803; 2°*, 1113 (i.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the Alberta Irrigation Company, and to change its name to "The Canadian North-west Irrigation Company."—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°*, 803; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 24) Concerning drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°*, 803; 2°*, 1917; M. for Sel. Com., 2153, 2930, 2949 (i); ref. to Sel. Com., 3849 (ii.)

BILL (No. 25) To confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2320 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 26) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*, 1389; in Com., 2645; 3°*m.*, 2934; agreed to (Y. 61; N. 14) 2949 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the British Columbia and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate "Le Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord."—(Mr. *Bourassa.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 31) To amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Mr. *Fortin.*)
1°*, 895; 2°*m.*, 1867 (i), 4314; in Com., 4314; 3°*, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 32) To amend the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets.—(Mr. *Beattie.*)
1°, 895; 2° m., 1875 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4323 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9461 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 33) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 974; 2°*, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)
1°*, 974; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)
1°*, 974; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 36) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 974; 2°*m.*, 2160, 2527 (i).

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)
1°*, 974; 2°*m.*, 2176, 2527 (i).

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the attachment of salaries of public officers and employees of the Government.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°*, 974; 2°*m.*, 1923 (i); 2°, 5374, in Com., 5898 (ii).

BILL (No. 39) To provide for the issuing of railway passes to members of the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 1073; 2° m., 2195 (i).

BILL (No. 40) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to Combinations in Restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 1073; 2°, 1936 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 41) In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 1073; 2°, 1947 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3849 (ii).

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Portage du Fort and Bristol Branch Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)
1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4857 (ii).

BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 44) To incorporate the Alaska and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gillies.*)
1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389 (i).

BILL (No. 45) To incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 1165 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 128.)

BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Arthabaska Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62 63 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 47) Respecting the Brandon and Southwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 2290 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 48) To impose certain restrictions on Immigration.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)
1°*, 1165 (i).

BILL (No. 49) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1165 (i); 2° *m.*, 4323 (ii).

BILL (No. 50) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Monk.*)
1°*, 1264; 2°*m.*, 2204; Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 64; N. 39) 2245 (i).

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Canadian Inland Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Richardson*).
1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1862 (i.)

BILL (No. 53) To authorize the Bank of Nova Scotia to issue sterling notes for circulation in the Island of Jamaica.—(Mr. *Borden*, Halifax.)
1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1585 (i); wthdn., 6047 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. *Borden*, Halifax.)
1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 55) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Penny*)
1°*, 1352 (i); 2°, 3871; wthdn., 5360 (ii).

BILL (No. 56) To define the size of small fruit packages.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°*, 1352; on Order for 2°, 3316 (i); 2°, 3872; wthdn., 5360 (ii).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough.)
1°*, 1431; 2°*, 1862 (ii).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1540; 2°*, 1862; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1540; 2°*, 1862; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 60) To authorize the amalgamation of the Erie and Huron Railway Company and the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGregor.*)
1°*, 1540; 2°*, 1862 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3492 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 1753; 2°*, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 1753; 2°*, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3689 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 63) To amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 1753; 2°*m.*, 3316 (i).

BILL (No. 64) In amendment of the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)
1°*, 1813 (i).

BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Restigouche Boom Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 1949; on Order, 2152, 2524, 2648; 2°*, 2698 (i); ref. back to Sel. Com., 6824 (ii); wthdn., 8989 (iii).

BILL (No. 66) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *McHugh.*)
1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2290; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2290; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (22-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152 (i); M. for Com., 5042, 5250; in Com., 5262, 5351; 3°, 5535 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company, and to change its name to the Bronson Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Algoma Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 72) Respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1952 (i).

BILL (No. 73) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)
1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. *Beattie.*)
1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com., 4302; 4846; 3°*, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2320 (i); in Com., 4302, 4846; 3°*, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 76) Respecting the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

BILL (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Power Company, and to change its name to the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290; in Com., and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 138.)

BILL (No. 79) To amend the Mounted Police Pensions Act, 1887.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1° *m.*, 2029 (ii).

BILL (No. 80) Further to amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Ethier.*)
1° *m.*, 2032 (i).

BILL (No. 81) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, by providing for the use of Macdonald voting machines.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°, 2035 (i).

BILL (No. 82) To determine the length of the working day for workmen and labourers.—(Mr. *Beattie.*)
1°*, 2036 (i).

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rutherford.*)
1°*, 2107; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, and to change its name to "The Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Carroll.*)
1°*, 2108; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com., 5041, 5249; 3°*, 5250 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1°, 2108 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3503 (ii); in Com., 9731; 3°*, 9749 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 86) To further amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2108 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3504; in Com., 6391 (ii); 7001; 3°*, 7001 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Incorporation of Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2109 (i); wthdn., 3748 (ii).

BILL (No. 88, from the Senate) For the relief of David Stock.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 2604; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com., 3489; 3°*, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 134.)

BILL (No. 89) Relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Wood.*)
1°*, 2182; 2°*, 2320 (i); wthdn., 4477 (ii).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson.*)
1°*, 2182; 2°*, 2320 (i); 3° *m.*, 4189, 4524, 4771; agreed to (Y. 51; N. 21) 4786 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 2182 (i); 2° *m.*, 3914; in Com., 3915; 3° *m.*, 3985; agreed to (Y. 80; N. 40) 3990; 3°*, 3990; Sen. Amts., 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com., 4302, 4847; 3°*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company (Foreign).—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2525 (i).

BILL (No. 95) Respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)
1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2525 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McCleary.*)
1°*, 2247; 2°*, 2525 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 97) In further amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 2247 (i).

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guillet.*)
1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2650; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Canadian Mutual Benefit Advertising Company (Limited).—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2525 (i).

BILL (No. 100) Respecting the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank, and to change its name to the Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Glenora Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2650 (i).

BILL (No. 102) To incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2650 (i).

BILL (No. 103) To incorporate the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62 63 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 104) Respecting the Dominion Permanent Loan Company.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2525 (i); in Com., 6868; 3°*, 6878 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 105, from the Senate) For the Preservation of Health on Public Works.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 2604 (i); 2°, 7645; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7675 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 106) To incorporate the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company.—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 2529; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 107) Respecting the Bedlington and Nelson Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 2529; 2°*, 2650 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac, and to change its name to The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pembroke.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)
1°*, 2529; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)

BILL (No. 109) To further amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 2604 (i).

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 2696; 2°*, 3003 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 111) In further amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)
1°*, 2696 (i).

BILL (No. 112) Respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)
1°*, 2789; 2°*, 3004 (i); on order for Com., 5897; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 6091; in Com., 6327, 6404; 3°*, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Haley.*)
1°*, 2790; 2°*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic. c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 114) To amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 2790 (i).

BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Sudbury and Wahnapitae Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 2897; 2°*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)

BILL (No. 116) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to cruelty to animals.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°*, 2963 (i).

BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Ottawa Suburban Railway Company—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 2966 (i); 2°*, 3492 (ii).

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Savard.*)
1°*, 2966 (i); 2°*, 3492 (ii); in Com., 6970; 3°*, 6972 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Frost.*)
1°*, 2966 (i); 2°*, 3492; in Com. and 3°*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

BILL (No. 120) To incorporate the Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brodeur.*)
1°*, 3149 (i); 2°*, 3492; in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 121) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 3150 (i); 2°*, 3492; in Com., 4302; 3°*, 4524 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 122) In further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *McMillan.*)
1°, 3254 (i).

BILL (No. 123) Further to amend "The Adulteration Act."—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°*, 3334; 2°*, and in Com., 3990, 3996; 3°*, 3997 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 124) To amend "The Inland Revenue Act."—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°*, 3334; 2°*, and in Com., 3759, 3881; 3°*, 3884 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 125) To amend the Act respecting canned goods.—(Mr. *Ellis.*)
1°*, 3334 (ii).

BILL (No. 126) Respecting representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1° *m.*, 3442, 3492; 2° *m.*, 5207, 5262, 6464, 6596, 6606; agreed to (Y. 77; N. 41) 6722; in Com., 6758 (ii), 6904, 6940, 6972; 3°*, 7000 (iii).

BILL (No. 127) To amend "The Bank Act."—Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 3497; 2°*, and in Com., 3763; 3°*, 3985 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 128) Further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 3544; 2°*, and in Com., 3885 (ii); 9883; 3°*, 9893 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 129) Respecting "The General Trust Corporation of Canada."—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 3646; 2°*, 3844; in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 111.)

BILL (No. 130) Respecting the "The London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Bain.*)
1°*, 3647; 2°*, 5358; in Com. and 3°*, 6327 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

BILL (No. 131) Respecting the inspection of petroleum and naphtha.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
Prop. Res., 3647; 1°, 3749; 2°* and in Com., 3884; 3°*, 3990 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 132) To amend "The General Inspection Act."—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 3751; wthdn., 5098 (ii).

BILL (No. 133) To authorize the acquisition by the Dominion of the Drummond County Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Prop. Res., 1949, 2792; in Com. on Res., 2843 (i), 3345, 3379, 3560, 3689; 1°, 3765; 2° *m.*, 3907, 4152; in Com., 4165, 4733; 3° *m.*, 4899; agreed to (Y. 91; N. 40) 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9726 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 134) To amend the Temperance Act, 1864.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°, 3874 (ii).

BILL (No. 135) In further amendment of the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Domville.*)
1°, 4055 (ii).

BILL (No. 136, from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Inkson Dowding.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 4147; 2°*, 5359; in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 133.)

BILL (No. 137) Further to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 4150; 2°, 6118; in Com. and 3°*, 6119 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9597 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 138) To confirm an agreement entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Prop. Res., 3946; in Com. on Res., 4062; 1°, 4170; 2°, 4171; in Com., 4353, 4554; 3° *m.*, 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9702 (iii) (62-63 *Vic*,. *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company '(Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough.)
1°*, 4259; 2°*, 5359; in Com. and 3°*, 6606 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 121.)

BILL (No. 140) Respecting the Canadian Railway Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 4259; 2°*, 5359; in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 107.)

BILL (No. 141) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Penberthy Injector Company.—(Mr. *McGregor.*)
1°*, 4340; 2°*, 5359 (ii); in Com., 6878; 3°*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

BILL (No. 142) In further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°, 4341 (iii).

BILL (No. 143) To amend the Weights and Measures Act as respects the sale of Fish.—(Mr. *Ganong.*)
1°, 4477 (ii).

BILL (No. 144, from the Senate) For the relief of Abraham Aronsberg.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 4730; 2°*, 5359 (ii); in Com., 7480, 7575; 3°*, 7809 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 132.)

BILL (No. 145) To amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company under the name of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 4804; 2°*, 5359 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 146) Further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4891; 2° and in Com., 6396; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 147) Further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Interior.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4892; 2° and in Com., 6397; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 148) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4894; 2° and in Com., 6400, 6405; 3°, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 149) Further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4895; 2° and in Com., 6442; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 150, from the Senate) To incorporate the Imperial Loan Investment Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 5096; 2°*, 5536; in Com. and 3°*, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 5096; 2°*, 5536; in Com. and 3°*, 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 152, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 5096; 2°*, 5536; in Com. and 3°*, 5897 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)

BILL (No. 153) To amend the Unorganized Territories Game Perservation Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°*, 4991; 2° and in Com., 6442 (ii); 3°*, 6459 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 154) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson.*)
1°*, 4991; 2°, and in Com., 6443 (ii); 3°*, 6939 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 155) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°*, 5096; 2°, 6102; in Com., 6104; 3°*, 6118 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 156) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*).
1°, 5099 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 9636; 3°*, 9660 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 157) Respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)
1°*, 5205; 2°*, 5536; in Com. and 3°*, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 158) Respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company, and to change its name to the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 5384; 2°*, 5536 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 159) Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°, 5385; 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 6101 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 160, from the Senate) An Act to amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 5744 (ii); 2°*, 7645; in Com., 8774; 3°*, 8779 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 161) Respecting steel and iron made in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Prop. Res., 4150, 4967; in Com. on Res., 4989; 1°, 5744 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 7638; 3°*, 7644 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 162) To incorporate the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Hurley.*)
M. to introduce, 5384; 1°*, 5945; 2°*, 6338 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3°*, 7480 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 163, from the Senate) Further to amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 6120 (ii); 2°*, 7001; in Com., 8780; 3°*, 8781 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c*, 43.)

BILL (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 6120; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 6391 (ii); in Com., 8475; 3°*, 8477 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 165) To incorporate the Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 6120; 2°*, 6405 (ii); wthdn., 8947 (iii).

BILL (No. 166) Respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 6120; 2°*, 6338 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 167, from the Senate) To provide for the administration of Criminal Justice in the Territory East of Manitoba and Keewatin and North of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°*, 6279 (ii) ; 2°, 8171 ; in Com. and 3°*, 8172 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 168, from the Senate) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir *Louis Davies*).
1°*, 6397 (ii).

BILL (No. 169) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1899, and the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the public service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 6464 ; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 6596 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

BILL (No. 170) Respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 6929 ; 2°, 9598 ; in Com. and 3°, 9599 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 33.)

BILL (No. 171, from the Senate) To provide for the Conditional Liberation of Penitentiary Convicts.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 7000 ; 2° and in Com., 9599, 9726 ; 3°*, 9731 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the British America Pulp and Paper Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 7441 ; 2°*, 7809 ; in Com. and 3°*, 9250 (iii).

BILL (No. 173, from the Senate) Further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 7873 ; 2° and in Com., 8762 ; 3°*, 8774 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting Usury.—(Mr. *Rinfret.*)
1°*, 8217 (iii).

BILL (No. 175) Further to amend the Act respecting Roads and Road Allowances in the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 8151 ; 2° and in Com., 8470 ; 3°*, 9597 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

BILL (No. 176) To provide for the establishment of direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
Prop. Res., 1950 (i) 8348 ; in Com. on Res., 8383 ; 1°*, 8386 ; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 8475 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

BILL (No. 177) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Prop. Res., 6123 (ii) ; in Com. on Res., 8472 ; 1°*, 8474 ; 2° and in Com., 8757 ; 3°*, 8762 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c 9.)

BILL (No. 178) Respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 8751 ; 2°, 9683 ; in Com., 9861 ; 3°*, 9880 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 179) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
1°, 8752 ; 2° and in Com., 9880 ; 3°*, 9963 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

BILL (No. 180, from the Senate) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.
This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

BILL (No. 181, from the Senate) For the relief of Isaac Stephen Gerow Van Wart.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 8913 ; 2°*, 9056 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9532 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 135.)

BILL (No. 182) Respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Prop. Res., 8753 ; in Com. on Res., 8923 ; 1°*, 8947 ; 2° and in Com., 9661 ; 3°, 9683 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 183) To authorize the Government of Canada to construct a branch line of Railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, as a public work.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1°*, 8989 ; 2°* and in Com., 9750 ; 3°*, 9758 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 184, from the Senate) Further to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 9178.

BILL (No. 185, from the Senate) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 9178 ; 2° in Com., and 3°*, 10220 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 186, from the Senate) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 9178 ; 2° and in Com., 9849 ; 3°*, 9861 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

BILL (No. 187) Respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Prop. Res., 5098 (ii) ; in Com. on Res., 9186 ; 1°*, 9197 ; 2°, 9609 ; in Com., 9626 ; 3°*, 9636 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 10.)

BILL (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Act passed at the present Session of Parliament, intituled : "An Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts."—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 9309 ; 2°, 9835 ; in Com. and 3°*, 9835 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 189) Respecting securities for Seed Grain indebtedness.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 9464 ; 2° and in Com., 9847 ; 3°, 9849 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

BILL (No. 190) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Prop. Res., 8914 ; in Com. on Res., 9197, 9310, 9466, 9532 ; 1°*, 9597 ; 2°, 9758 ; in Com., 9759 ; 3°, 9893 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 191) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 9696 ; 2° and in Com., 9846 ; 3°*, 9847 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

BILL (No. 192) An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1900, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.
1°*; 2°*; in Com. and 3°*, 10246 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BINDER TWINE IMPORTED IN 1899: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8218, 8990 (iii).

—— OUTPUT OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, TENDERS, PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1825 (i), 3944 (ii), 6934 (iii).

—— —— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1837 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).

BLAIS, MR. J. C., AMOUNT PAID BY GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3545 (ii).

BLANCHETTE, MR. EUGENE, REINSTATEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5859 (ii).

BLISS, MAJ. D. C. F., POSITION UNDER GOVT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3261 (i), 3335, 3552 (ii).

BOIVIN, GIDÉON, CONTRACT FOR STONE AT RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4061 (ii).

BOLDUC, MR. A., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 5798; Conc., 6387 (ii).

BONDS GIVEN BY OFFICIALS, RECORD OR LIST FOR NAMES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5310 (ii).

—— REGISTERED UNDER R.S.C., PREPARATION FOR PARLT. *re* YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4804 (ii).

BOSTON AND ALASKAN TRANSPORTATION CO., CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1828 (i).

BOTHWELL ELECTION, SPEECH OF THE HON. MR. MILLS IN THE SENATE: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 9896 (iii).

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4150 (ii).

BOUNTIES. *See* "Iron and Steel."

BOURASSA, MR., EMPLYMT. IN YUKON POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1833, 1958 (ii).

BOURGET, P. A., POSTMASTER AT LÉVIS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

BOWMANVILLE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 2290 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BRANTFORD POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1968 (i), 8464 (iii).

BREMNER, CHAS., INDEMNITY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10113, 10167 (iii).

BREVET PROMOTIONS, PERMANENT FORCE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 3550 (ii).

BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY: in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).

BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE QUEEN, ACTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 6050 (ii).

BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO., CLAIMS FOR BALANCE DUE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2180 (i).

British American Pulp and Paper Co. incorp. B. No. 172 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 7441; 2°*, 7809; in Com. and 3°*, 9250 (iii).

BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS CO.: Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ABENAKIS INDIANS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).

ALASKA BOUNDARY AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, DIFFICULTIES WITH MOUNTED POLICE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2193 (i).

—— AND PACIFIC CABLE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5386 (ii).

—— MODUS VIVENDI, RUMOURED ARRANGEMENTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2535 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 8152 (iii).

—— PROTOCOLS: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4259 (ii).

ALIEN ACT, B.C., COR. WITH B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).

—— DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7768 (iii).

ASHCROFT, B.C., RY. LANDS PURCHASED BY ASHCROFT WATER AND ELECTRIC CO., COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Prior*) 2408 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1855 (i).

ATLIN DISTRICT, BREWERY LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

BAUER, DOM. LAND SURVEYOR, B.C., EXAMINATION OF PAPERS, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4061, 4313, 4713, 4898 (ii).

BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR DISTRIBUTING MAIL AT MAPLE BAY PRIOR TO CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3820 (ii).

BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS CO.: Ret. laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA LT.-GOVERNOR AND TURNER ADMINISTRATION, AND CAN. GOVT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 2362 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 3950 (ii).

—— SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COR. BETWEEN B.C. AND DOM. GOVT, *re* ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN B.C.: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2362 (i).

BROTCHIES LEDGE, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE, COMPLETION AND OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2331 (i).

BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).

BURRARD, MEMBER FOR, SPEECH *re* AMOUNTS PAID TO VANCOUVER LIBERALS BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1838 (i).

—— USE OF REVEREND IN QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1838 (i).

CHEMAINUS, B.C., PILOTAGE LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5312 (ii).

CHIEF JUSTICE MCCOLL (B. C.), JUDICIAL RESIDENCE: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).

CHINESE ANTI-LEGISLATION IN B.C., AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1837 (i).

CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE, B.C.: In Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

COAL MINING UNDER NANAIMO HARBOUR, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 8991 (iii).

COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).

COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY, COR. WITH MINISTERS, INCOMPLETE RETURN: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5409 (ii).

—— CONSTRUCTION SYNDICATE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 3752 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., COMPLAINTS, INSTRUCTIONS AND REP. OF MR. ARCHER MARTIN: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).

DEADMAN'S ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. HAIGH & SON (1880) *re* APPLICATION FOR USE, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2788 (i).

—— FORFEITURE OF LEASE BY MR. LUDGATE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4739 (ii).

—— LEASES, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1815 (i).

—— par. in Montreal *Witness re* Lease (Mr. *Prior*) 1353, 1640 (i).

—— Ret. Laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

DRILL HALL, VANCOUVER, B.C., CONTRACT, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5487, 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).

DRY DOCK, VICTORIA, B.C., PETS. *re* REDUCTION OF CHARGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7766 (iii).

ESQUIMALT (B. C.) DRY DOCK, REDUCTION OF RATES, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6122 (ii).

—— DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).

FISHERMEN, SEIZURE OF NETS BY AMERICANS, PAR. IN VICTORIA *Daily Colonist*: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 8633 (iii).

FRASER AND SKEENA RIVER FISH HATCHERIES, ERECTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4058 (ii).

FRASER RIVER, B.C., MILLER'S LANDING, IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. 2701 (i).

—— CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8088 (iii).

GOVT. PROPERTY (B.C.), LEASE, &C., COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8465 (iii).

—— RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8991 (iii).

GREY, ROBERT, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 7319 (iii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).

INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5703, 5725 (ii).

—— HOSPITALS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5726 (ii).

—— RESERVES (B.C.) AND MINING RIGHTS: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (ii).

—— YALE AND CARIBOO, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8630, 8989 (iii).

JAPANESE LABOUR EXCLUSION BILL, B.C., LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4343 (ii).

—— M. to print Cor. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4477 (ii).

—— COR. BETWEEN B.C. GOVT. AND DOM.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5206 (ii).

—— DISALLOWANCE, INCOMPLETE RETURN: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5408, 5491 (ii).

—— GOVT. POLICY *re* FOURTEEN STATUTES ALREADY IN FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5859 (ii).

—— DISALLOWANCE OF BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2536 (i).

—— LEGISLATION: Motion Dropped (Mr. *Prior*) 5313 (ii).

JUDGESHIPS, APPNMT., MINUTES OF COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, &C.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1879 (i).

KOOTENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).

LEGISLATION *re* CHINESE AND FOREIGN IMMIGRATION, DISALLOWANCE, &C.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 6823, 6902 (iii).

LETTER CARRIERS, B.C., NUMBER, SALARIES, &C., FROM 1895 TO 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2789 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE, B.C., ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).

MACAULAY POINT FORTIFICATIONS, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 3874, 5489 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 9133 (iii).

MACAULAY POINT, B.C.: Inquiry for Return (Mr. *Prior*) 5489 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE PACIFIC COAST, FACILITIES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3254 (i).

MARTIN, MR. JUSTICE, JUDICIAL RESIDENCE, B.C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3545 (ii).

NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY AND GOVT. SUPSIDIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5666 (ii).

NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CO. AND DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Maxwell*) 3873 (ii).

—— COR. WITH MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Prior*) 5510 (ii).

—— NON-PRODUCTION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER'S TELEGRAM: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5747 (ii).

OYSTER BED, B.C., CLAIMS OF ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).

PACIFIC CABLE AND GOVT. OF B. C., OFFERS RESPECTING: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).

—— COMMUNICATION FROM B. C. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 2697 (i).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).

POACHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8347 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).

—— AGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (ii).

"QUADRA," STR., PAYMENT OF CREW AND OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3076 (ii).

QUARANTINE STATION, WILLIAM'S HEAD: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).

RIFLE RANGES, B.C., APPLICATIONS, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* SETTLERS CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2530 (i).

RUSSELL, MR., DISMISSAL AS STEAMBOAT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 4713 (ii).

SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, B.C., COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND PROVL. GOVTS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Prior*) 3873 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5704 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 4713 (ii).

—— REMOVAL FROM RESERVE, SETTLEMENT WITH B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii).

SPINKS, COUNTY COURT JUDGE, B.C., CHARGES AGAINST: M. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4172, 4201 (ii).

STANLEY PARK AND DEADMAN'S ISLAND, O.C.'S, COR., &C., BETWEEN CAN. GOVT. AND B.C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Prior*) 2334 (i).

See "Deadman's Island."

STATUTES FOR 1899, DATE OF RECEIVING BY SEC. OF STATE: Ques (Mr. *Prior*) 5666 (ii).

STEVESTON, B.C., TIDAL LANDS, APPLICATION FOR LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822, 4058 (ii).

—— O. C.'S, COR., PLANS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).

—— TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3544 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*
"STRATHCONA," STR., AND RELIEF OF DESTITUTE MINERS, ARRANGEMENT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 9179 (iii).
TELEGRAPH LINES, ATLIN, B.C., AND TESLIN LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 10099 (iii).
—— B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (iii).
TURNER ADMINISTRATION, B.C., DISMISSAL BY LT.-GOV.: Papers laid on Table, 3950 (ii).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 2362 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SERVICE, SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii).
VICTORIA AND MONTREAL HARBOURS, GRANTS BY DOM. GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1877 (i).
VICTORIA HARBOUR, REP. OF RESIDENT ENGINEER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3828 (ii).
—— LETTER CARRIERS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1960 (i).
—— POST OFFICE, OLD SITE, OWNERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4269 (ii).
—— SAFES, ELEVATORS, &C., TENDER FOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1887 (i).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6335 (ii).

British Columbia and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Prior*) 1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BRITISH YUKON MINING, TRADING AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2905 (i).

British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 1°*, 1431; 2°*, 1862 (i).

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9960 (iii).
BROCKVILLE ELECTION, BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3074 (ii).
—— MAILING OF VOTERS' LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2482 (i).
—— NAME OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2322 (i).
—— AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, ATTENDANCE OF CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY WITH PAPERS, &C.: (Mr. *Speaker*) 6821 (iii).
—— M. to place Documents on Table (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6723 (ii); 6821 (iii).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6595 (ii).

Bronson and Weston Lumber Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BRONTÉ HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10069 (iii).
BROOKFIELD AND EASTVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9445 (iii).
BROOKSIDE, P.E.I., POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
BROTCHIES LEDGE, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE, COMPLETION AND OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2831 (i).
BROWN, BARTH, CAMPOBELLO, N.B., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
BROWN, MARION, COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS., COR.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wallace*) 6939 (iii).
BRUCE MINES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
BUBONIC PLAGUE AND QUARANTINE OF PACIFIC STEAMERS AT B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5989 (ii).
BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMNT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 2410 (i).
—— REPLY (Mr. *Foster*) 2537 (i).
Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2571; (Mr. *Craig*) 2590; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2605; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2637, 2650; (Mr. *Pope*) 2672; (Mr. *Heyd*) 2682 (i).
—— DATE OF DELIVERY: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2249 (i).
—— AND ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1952 (i).
BUFFALO AND CRYSTAL BEACH FERRY SERVICE, LICENSE AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4994 (ii).

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *McCleary*) 1°*, 2247; 2°* 2525 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BUILDING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
—— N. B.: In Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
—— N. S.: In Com. of Sup., 7613, 9943 (iii).
—— ONT.: In Com. of Sup., 7621, 9938, 9956 (iii).
—— OTTAWA: In Com. of Sup., 7689 (iii).
—— QUEBEC: In Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8264 (iii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7998 (iii).
BURRARD, MEMBER FOR, SPEECH *re* AMOUNTS PAID TO VANCOUVER LIBERALS BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1838 (i).
—— USE OF REVEREND IN QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1838 (i).
BURNS, MR., PRIVATE SEC. TO MIN. OF FIN., APPNMT. TO PERMANENT FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 8469 (iii).
BUSBY, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT SKAGWAY, DATE OF APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4805 (ii).
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BUDGET SPEECH: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2318 (i).
—— *re* ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 2025 (i).
—— Introduction of Bills (Mr. *Speaker*) 618 (i).
MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768 (iii).
—— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2409 (i).
—— REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2535 (i); 3844 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 8999 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 9177 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 3253 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2247 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 801 (i) 8216 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 5744 (ii).
—— AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7321, 7442 (iii).
—— UNOPPOSED RETURNS: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 6939 (iii).
—— *See* "Govt. Business."
CABINET MINISTERS, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1818 (i).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO. LAND SUBSIDY, AMOUNT SELECTED AND STILL DUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2326 (i).

Calvin Co. (Limited) B. No. 9 (Mr. *Rogers*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; wthdn., 2897 (i).

CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10012 (iii).

Can. Accident Assurance Co.'s B. No. 3 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1°*, 617; 2°*, 933 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5042 (ii). (62-63 *Vic*, *c.* 98).

CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).

——— AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).

Canada Atlantic and Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 4804; 2°*, 5359 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 81).

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY CO., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3554, 3824 (ii).

——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Foster*) 3873 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (i).

——— (CROSS CREEK) RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9445 (iii).

——— (NELSON BRANCH) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9495 (iii).

"CANADA GAZETTE": in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).

Can. Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Gibson*) 1°*, 1753; 2°*, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3689 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

——— **B. No. 89** (Mr. *Wood*) 1°*, 2182; 2°*, 2320 (i); wthdn., 4477 (ii).

Canada Mining and Metallurgical Co.'s incorp. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Haley*) 1°*, 2790; 2°*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

Can. and Ont. Power Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 105.)

Can. Permanent and Western Can. Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2320 (i); in Com., 4302, 4846; 3°*, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

Canada Plate Glass Assurance Co.'s B. No. 4 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1°*, 617; 2°*, 933 (i); in Com., 5042; 3°*, 5249 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

Canada. *See* "Australasian."

Can. Railway Accident and Insurance Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 803; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

Can. Railway Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 140 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 4259; 2°*, 5859 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 107.)

Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°, 2604 (i).

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT ELECTIONS, COST: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).

Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co.'s B. No. 106 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 2529; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

CANADIAN COAST, SURVEYS OF CURRENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1824 (i).

CANADIAN EMIGRATION TO U. S., PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1895 (i).

CANADIAN FISHERIES AND AMERICAN FISH TRUSTS, COMPLAINTS *re* AND OFFICIAL REPORTS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4993 (ii).

Canadian Inland Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) 1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, DOCUMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).

Canadian Mutual Benefit Advertising Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *McAlister*) 1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2525 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 5096; 2°*, 5536; in Com. and 3°*, 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

CANADIAN NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9457, 9581 (iii).

C. P. R. ACT (1881), POWER RESPECTING BRANCH LINES: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3315 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 9309 (iii).

——— AND GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL, SURVEY OF BRANCH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2532 (i).

C. P. R. and Hull Electric Agreement B. No. 25 (Mr. *Poupore*) 1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 2320 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

C. P. R. AND I. C. R., RUNNING PRIVILEGES BETWEEN ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2247 (i).

——— AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *Gibson*) 1°*, 1753; 2°*, 1955 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

——— RY. COMMISSION, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: PROP. Res. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2773 (i).

——— CONTRACT WITH A. ONDERDONK, AWARDS BY ARBITRATORS *re* VALUE OF ROLLING STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 5944 (ii).

——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iii).

——— MILEAGE TARIFF ON HAY, STRAW, &c., APPROVAL BY O. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4057 (ii).

CANADIAN TROOPS FOR THE TRANSVAAL, PAR IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7323 (iii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1862 (i).

CANALS:

ATWATER AVENUE, REBUILDING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

BALSAM LAKE, REMOVAL OF STONE PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2332 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., conc., 10129 (iii).

——— DAMAGE TO FARM LANDS BY OVERFLOW: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4959 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSALS: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5411 (ii).

—— LOCK LABOURERS, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3267 (i).

—— STEEL BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iii).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup, 7998 (iii).

CHAMBLY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).

—— EMPLYMT. OF GEO. PEPPIN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3821 (ii).

—— INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3533 (ii).

—— TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).

CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5784 (ii).

—— AMTS. PAID TO MR. RUBIDGE, C.E., SINCE JAN. 1897, EXPENSES *re* STRS. "ALERT" AND "ALASKA," &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1878 (i).

—— AWARD OF CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1853 (i).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).

—— PAYMENT TO MR. ROSS: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).

FARRAN'S POINT: in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).

—— AND IROQUOIS CANAL, LOCKS AT, REPS. OF MR. SHANLY AND MR. KREFER, C.E.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1878 (i).

—— TENDERS FOR 1897, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3873 (ii).

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299, 7442 (iii).

GRENVILLE CANAL, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4992 (ii).

—— MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAYS ON FARMS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6048 (ii).

—— LETTER OF MR. G. S. CONWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6380 (ii).

—— TOLL COLLECTOR, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2532 (i).

HENEY & BORTHWICK, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10153 (iii).

LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7297 (iii).

—— EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE ROYAL COMMISSION, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).

—— FINAL ESTIMATE OF SECTION 3, ENLARGEMENT OF 1875-80: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).

—— REP. OF COMMISSION ON WELLINGTON AND G.T.R. BRIDGES: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).

—— EXHIBITS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).

—— PLANS, PROFILES, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).

RAINY RIVER LOCK; in Com. of Sup., 10153 (iii).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iii).

REBATE OF CANAL TOLLS TO FORWARDING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 5794 (ii).

RIDEAU CANAL, KILMARNOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).

—— REPAIRS, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7463 (iii).

RYAN & CO.'S CLAIMS: *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS, DEEPENING OF NAVIGATION, &c., CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2788 (i).

—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iii).

CANALS—*Con.*

ST. LOUIS LAKE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).

ST. OURS LOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).

—— DISMISSAL OF SUPT. CODERRE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3552 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).

SECORD, MR. T. R., SUPT. ON WELLAND CANAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1833 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, CONTRACTS: M. for Cor., Notices, &c. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1861 (i).

—— SECS. 1 AND 2, CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i), 9701 (iii).

—— SECS. 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Cor.*, O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

—— AMOUNT EXPENDED IN CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2117 (i).

SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING WATER, REQUESTS, &c., MADE TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2192 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 2248 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL ARBITRATION, LAND VALUATORS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2333 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL; in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).

SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).

TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iii).

—— JORDAN, MR. WM., CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).

—— LAND VALUATIONS, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii).

—— PAYMENT OF WORKMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).

—— PAYMENTS TO MR. F. D. MOORE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF LAND FOR DAM AT NASSAU: Ques. (Mr. *Kendry*) 1857 (i).

MCLAUGHLIN, MR. R. J., AMOUNTS PAID AND DUE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976, 2321 (i).

—— AND FARMERS OF LINDSAY *re* DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 4485, 4486, 4499 (ii).

—— Letter of Mr. McLaughlin read (Mr. *Mulock*) 4998, 5005 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).

—— ENTRANCE AT PORT COLBORNE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) 3997 (ii).

—— "LAKESIDE," STR., INTEREST TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (ii).

—— WATER RENTAL: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (ii).

Canned Goods Inspection Act. Amt. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Ellis*) 1°*, 3334 (ii).

CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10007 (iii).

CAP SANTÉ: in Com. of Sup., 8105 (iii).

CARDIGAN BRIDGE, P.E.I., BONDED WAREHOUSE, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2961 (i).

CARS BUILT AND PURCHASED, NAME OF FIRM, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3945, 4479 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3553 (ii).

CARS, EQUIPMENTS, STANDARD COUPLERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
—— LIGHTING SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
—— OFFICIAL OR PRIVATE, NUMBER, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1835 (i).
—— LOCOMOTIVES, NUMBER, COST, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2028 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7151, 9124 (iii).
CATTLE EMBARGO, COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Montague*) 1877 (i).
—— INQUIRY FOR RETURNS (Mr. *Montague*) 3253 (i).
—— INSPECTION, &c., AT HEBERTVILLE, COR. *re* APPNMT. OF DR. HALL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5944 (ii).
—— FOR TUBERCULOSIS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND DR. J. A. DUCHESNE, OF CHICOUTIMI, SINCE JUNE, 1896: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5944 (ii).
—— MONTREAL, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques., 10115 (iii).
—— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii) 8339 (iii).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Edwards*) 1°*, 1540; 2°*, 1862; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)
CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8914; in Com., 9311, 9770 (iii).
CENTRAL RY. CO., N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5788 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. OF N. B., AND DEPTS. OF RYS. AND CANALS, COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDIES: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 2788 (i).
—— COR. IN DEPARTMENT: Inquiry for Ret. Mr. *Fostre*) 5667 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915, 8916; in Com., 9452, 9488, 9782, 9777 (iii).
CHAMBERLAND, MR. F. F., CHARGES AGAINST, LETTER FROM ACHILLE LEBEL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2900 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).
—— EMPLYMT. OF GEO. PEPPIN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3821 (ii).
—— INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3553 (ii).
—— TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).
CHAMBORD CUSTOMS OFFICE, SALARIES, COLLECTION, EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).
CHAMP DE MARS, LEASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 2141 (i).
CHARGES AGAINST YUKON ADMINISTRATION: M. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5945; (amt.) 6022, 6053; neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6278 (ii).
—— Proposal to adjn. Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6100 (ii).
—— PAR. IN LONDON *Times*: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 6562, 6585 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iii).
CHARLESON, J. B., SURVEYS, &c., FOR TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
—— O. C. APPOINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9699 (iii).
CHARLESON, J. B., TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8106 (iii).
CHEMAINUS, B. C., PILOTAGE LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5312 (ii).
Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1°*, 895; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)
CHEZZETCOOK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10004 (iii).
CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION, PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9695 (iii).
—— M. to adjn. 9837, 10220 (iii).
—— LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHLSAAT: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10220 (iii).
CHICOUTIMI, POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, PETS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2408 (i).
CHIEF JUSTICE, MCCOLL (B.C.), JUDICIAL RESIDENCE: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).
CHINA POINT, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).
—— RECONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3148 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2485 (i).
CHINESE ANTI-LEGISLATION IN B.C. AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1837 (i).
See "Anti-Japanese."
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1165 (i); 2° *m.* 4323 (ii).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION, ACT, ADMINISTRATION &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8697 (iii).
CHOQUETTE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5097 (ii).
CHRISTIE, MR. W. J., DISMISSAL FROM INLAND REV. DEPT., O. C.'S, REPS., COR., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Roche*) 2393 (i).
—— M. to ref. Papers to Public Accts. Com. (Mr. *Roche*) 3341 (ii).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
CITADEL, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. No. 38 (Mr. *Richardson*) 1°*, 974; 2° *m.*, 1923 (i); 2°, 5374; in Com., 5898 (ii).
—— **B. No. 50** (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 1264; 2° *m.*, 2204; Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 64; N. 39) 2245 (i).
—— **B. No. 63** (Mr. *McMullen*) 1°*, 1753; 2° *m.*, 3316 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. BILL: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1956 (i).
—— ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES BILL: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1852 (i).
—— EMPLOYEES, NAMES OF THOSE NOT RECEIVING STATUTORY INCREASES SINCE 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5943 (ii).
—— LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 421 (i).
CLAREAU, MR. J. A., CLAIMS FOR MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHICOUTIMI OR STE. ANNE'S WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).
CLARK, H. W., SERVICES AS ENGINEER ON DREDGE "CANADA," &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 8630 (iii).

CLARKE, JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. IN THE YUKON : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5486 (ii).

CLARKE *vs.* THE QUEEN, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : M. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5750 (ii).

CLEMENT, MR. W. H. P., RESTRICTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS LEGAL ADVISER TO YUKON COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2322 (i).

CLIFTON POSTMASTER, P.E.I., COR., PETS., &c., *re* APPNMT. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).

CLASSIFICATION OF OLD RECORDS : in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).

CLOTHING CONTRACTS *re* MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 9066, 9126 (iii).

COAL MINING UNDER NANAIMO HARBOUR, LEASES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 8991 (iii).

COAL OIL AND FREE LIST : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) ; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 68 ; N. 30) 2014 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Davis*) 1982 ; (Mr. *Fraser*, Lambton) 1986 ; (Mr. *Ellis*) 1996 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1998 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 1999 ; (Mr. *Beattie*) 2005 ; (Mr. *Johnston*) 2006, 2013 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 2008 ; (Mr. *Richardson*) 2009 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 2010 ; (Mr. *Ratz*) 2011 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2118, 2130 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Beattie*) 2124 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 2125 ; (Mr. *Rogers*) 2125 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 2126 ; (Mr. *Richardson*) 2126 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2126 ; (Sir *Henri Jo'y*) 2127 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2128 ; (Mr. *Fortin*) 2131 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2131 ; (Mr. *Fraser*, Lambton) 2134 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2135 ; (Mr. *Flint*) 2137 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2138 (i).

COASTING LAWS, ENFORCEMENTS, COR. RESPECTING : (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3257 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2696 (i).

——— REPORT OF CAPT. JOHN IRVING, *re* ENFORCEMENT : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (i).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co's B. No. 98 (Mr. *Guillet*) 1°*, 2318 ; 2°*, 2650 ; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

COLBORNE, PORT, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 9310 (iii).

——— AND MAITLAND PORTS, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS., &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 8633 (iii).

——— REPORTS OF ENGINEERS, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 7771 (iii).

COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT, DEEP SEA FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 10163 (iii).

——— FOR FISH TRANSPORTATION FROM MAR. PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1978 (i).

——— FOR PRESERVATION OF BAIT FOR FISHERMEN : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1978 (i).

COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8706 (iii).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8002 (iii).

——— ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTORS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1893 (i).

COLONIAL SECURITIES AND IMPERIAL TAX : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1639 (i).

COLPRON, MR. JOS. N., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. FOR SERVICES PERFORMED, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2191 (i).

COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) 1°*, 895 ; 2°*, 1389 ; in Com., 2645 ; 3° *m.*, 2934 ; agreed to (Y. 61 ; N. 14) 2949 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

Combinations in Restraint of Trade B. No. 40 (Mr. *Sproule*) 1°*, 1073 ; 2°, 1936 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 8698 (iii).

——— TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION SYNDICATE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 3752 (ii).

——— COR. WITH MINISTERS, INCOMPLETE RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5409 (ii).

——— TREATIES WITH BRITISH W. INDIES, &c. : M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 8077, 8172 (iii).

COMMISSIONS UNDER THE GREAT SEAL, REGULATIONS RESPECTING : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4483 (ii).

——— *re* HALF-BREED CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 5832 (ii).

——— OF INQUIRY, YUKON, REQUEST FROM MR. OGILVIE TO EXTEND HIS POWERS, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3080 (i).

——— *re* INVESTIGATIONS AGAINST GOVT. EMPLOYEES, NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, &c., DISMISSALS, &c. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2180 (ii).

——— OF STAMPS FOR CAN. TOBACCO : in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS, ACCOMMODATION IN ROOMS : Remarks (Mr. *Penny*) 3314 (i).

——— MEETINGS AT SAME HOUR : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2320 (i).

COMMITTEES :

AGRICULTURAL AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE, 2ND REP. OF COM., PRINTING OF EVIDENCE : conc. (Mr. *Bain*) 3449 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL COM. : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

——— 1ST REP. OF COM., CONC. : M. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 337 (i).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM. : conc. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1071, 1738 (i).

——— 3RD REP. OF COM., CONC. : M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2130 (i).

——— 4TH REP. OF COM. CONC. : M. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2529 (i).

——— 5TH REP. OF COM. CONC. : M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 5665 (ii).

——— 6TH REP. OF COM. CONC. : M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 8913 (iii).

LIBRARY COMMITTEE, JOINT : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).

PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).

——— 3RD REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. *Gibson*) 5745 (ii).

COMMITTEES—*Con.*
PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT: 4TH AND 5TH REP. OF COM.: M. conc. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5378 (ii).
——— 7TH REP. OF COM. CONC.: M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 8913 (iii).
PRIVATE BILLS, SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE, REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 4729 (ii).
——— MEETING DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 8751 (iii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE, ABSENCE OF MINISTERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9182 (iii).
——— M. to Employ Stenographers (Mr. *Fortin*) 7193 (iii).
——— Stenographer's Fees, 9462 (iii).
——— M. to Print Evidence (Mr. *Fortin*) 7194 (iii).
——— M. to sit concurrently with Sessions of the House (Mr. *Fortin*) 7771 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Fortin*) 9461 (iii).
——— REP. OF COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10115 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10115 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCTS. COMMITTEE, DELAY IN MEETING: M to adjn. House (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3150 (i).
——— DELAY IN MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7195 (iii).
——— MEETINGS DURING SITTING OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 8780 (iii).
——— MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2604 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2964 (i).
——— POSTPONEMENTS AND HOURS OF MEETING, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4344 (ii).
———REDUCTION OF QUORUM: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4347 (ii).
——— 3RD REP. OF COM.: conc. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 4147 (ii).
——— 6TH REP OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 9836 (iii).
——— REP. OF COM: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10116 (iii).
——— M. to Print Evidence (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10116 (iii).
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, 22ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr *Sutherland*) 9209 (iii).
SELECT STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
——— LISTS: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 525 (i).

Companies Act Amt. B No. 160 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5744 (ii); 2°*, 7645; in Com., 8774; 3°*, 8779 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 40.)

COMPENSATION TO MRS. F. E. STEWART: in Com of Sup., 9131 (iii).
——— TO OCTAVE OUELLETTE: in Com. of Sup., 9127.

Conditional Liberation of Convicts B. No. 171 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 7000; 2° and in Com., 9599, 9726; 3°*, 9731 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 49.)

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4270 (ii).
CONSTANTIN, DR. JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).
CONTINGENCIES, PRINTING, &C., PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iii).
CONTRACTS LET WITHOUT TENDER SINCE JUNE, 1896: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Davin*) 5314, 5348 (ii).
CONTRACTS FOR TIES, I. C. R., NAMES OF TENDERERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5308 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS.: 1 (i).
——— REGISTRAR'S FEES: Remarks (Mr. *Calvert*) 8348 (iii).
Convicts. *See* "Conditional."
COPYRIGHT BILL AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 1981 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5784 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).
——— AMTS. PAID TO MR. RUBIDGE, C.E., SINCE JAN., 1897, EXPENSES *re* STRS. "ALERT" AND "ALASKA," &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1878 (i).
——— AWARD OF CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1853 (i).
——— PAYMENT TO MR. ROSS: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).
COSTE, MR., EXPEDITION TO ENG., INSTRUCTIONS, COR., REPS., &C.: M. for Papers* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5360 (ii).
——— YUKON EXPEDITION: M. to refer Papers to Pub. Accounts Com. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).
——— REPORT *re* YUKON: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4997 (ii).
——— AND LAFONTAINE'S INSTRUCTIONS, YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1893 (i).
See "Yukon," &c.
COSTIGAN, HON. MR., ON PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3660 (ii).
——— AND JOHN H. BARRETT, COR. BETWEEN DEPT., &C.: laid on the table, 3375 (ii).
COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 10030 (iii).
——— CONTRACT FOR DREDGING, PAPERS, LETTERS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2026 (i).
COULOMBE *v.* THE QUEEN, TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3916 (ii).
——— ENFORCEMENT OF CONVICTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4479 (ii).
COUNCIL, YUKON, NAMES, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).
See "Yukon," &c.
COUNTERFEIT BILLS, CIRCULATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5206 (ii).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, ONT., RETIREMENT, &C., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Bennet*) 1970 (i).
COWAN'S BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7704 (iii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 421; 2° *m.*, 1898; in Com., 2525; 3° *m.*, 2911; agreed to (Y. 68; N. 29) 2930 (i).
——— **B. No. 36** (Mr. *Britton*). 1°*, 974; 2° *m.*, 2160, 2527 (i).
——— **B. No. 80** (Mr, *Ethier*) 1° m., 2032 (i).
——— **B. No. 111** (Mr. *McInnes*) 1°*, 2696 (i).
——— **B. No. 168** (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°*, 6397 (ii).

Criminal Code. *See* "Combinations."

CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., COMPLAINTS, INSTRUCTIONS AND REP. OF MR. ARCHER MARTIN: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COMMISSION: in Com of Sup., 5831 (ii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY. AND C. P. R., RATES AND TOLLS, REVISION BY GOV. IN COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2331 (i).

—— DEATH OF MR. THORNBURY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).

—— - FRENCH TRANSLATION OF REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1852 (i).

—— INVESTIGATION BY COMMISSIONER, REPS., &C.: M. for Copies,* (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 1878 (i).

—— REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1967 (i).

Cruelty to Animals Prevention Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Penny*) 1**, 2963 (i).

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS IMPORTED FROM U. S., BASES OF VALUATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 6047 (ii).

——REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4861, 5893 (ii).

ALASKA BOUNDARY AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, DIFFICULTIES WITH MOUNTED POLICE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2193 (i).

BEET ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY FOR MANUFACTURE, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4823 (ii).

BUSBY, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT SKAGWAY, DATE OF APPMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4895 (ii).

CHAMBORD CUSTOMS OFFICE, SALARIES, COLLECTION, EXPENSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).

CHRISTIE, MR.: M. to ref. Papers to Public Accounts Com. (Mr. *Roche*) 3341 (ii).

COAL OIL AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 1982 (i); Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 68; N. 30) 2014 (i).

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 2118, 2130 (i).

COSTIGAN, MR, AND JOHN H. BARRETT, COR. BETWEEN DEPT., &C.: laid on Table, 3875 (ii)

CURLESS, CHAS. H., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, GRAND FALLS, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4056 (ii).

CUSTOMS, BRITISH COLUMBIA: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (iii).

—— MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (iii).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

—— ONTARIO: in Com. of Sup., 8452 (iii); contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 5595, 5855 (ii).

CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i), 5588, 5855 (ii) 10207 (iii).

—— TORONTO, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1849 (i).

—— UNDERVALUATIONS AT TORONTO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

"DOROTHY," SEIZURE BY U.S. CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES AT SKAGWAY, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2367 (i).

GASPÉ CUSTOMS OFFICERS, AND ELECTION, CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10222 (iii).

GERMAN DISCRIMINATING DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1851 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

GRAIN EXPORTS FROM CAN. PORTS IN 1898: Ques (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 3075, 3256 (i).

—— TO GERMANY IN 1898-99, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 8990 (iii).

HOGG, W. A., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COLLINGWOOD, CHARGES AGAINST, COMMISSIONER'S REP., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2788 (i).

INDIAN CORN IMPORTED FROM 1896-9: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8217 (iii).

—— FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8632, 8990 (iii).

"JOHN C. BARR," AMERICAN STR., OWNERSHIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8218, 8469 (iii).

—— UNDERVALUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3061 (i).

—— VALUATION BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES: Ques.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2700 (i).

LEBEL, MR. WENCESLAS, CUSTOMS OFFICIAL, AND REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).

LEPREAUX, N. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5313 (ii).

LEVISON BROS., CUSTOMS UNDERVALUATION: in Com. of Sup., 8419 (iii).

LUMBER CUSTOMS DUTIES: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).

MCCORMICK, MR. F. D., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT PELEE ISLAND, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8438 (iii).

"PINGREE" AND "LOWE," STRS., UNDERVALUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8218 (iii).

P.E.I., CUSTOMS REFUND FOR DUTIES PAID ON FISH: in Com. of Sup., 10114, 10169 (iii).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY: in Com. of Sup., 5600 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).

SCHAFHEITLIN AND FITZGIBBON, CUSTOMS LAW INFRACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1889, 2190 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

SCRIMGEOUR, J. G., GRANT OF BONDED WAREHOUSE, DATE OF LEASE, &C., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).

SUGAR IMPORTS FROM BRITISH W. INDIES, QUANTITY AND VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2327 (i).

SUSPENSE ACCOUNT, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 5588 (ii).

TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1849 (i).

U.S. CUSTOMS AND CANADIAN VESSELS, REGULATIONS, &C., *re* ENTERING AT AMERICAN PORTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2528 (i).

VALLEYFIELD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5501 (ii).

WHEAT EXPORTED FROM MONTREAL, ST. JOHN, FT. WILLIAM AND WINNIPEG, QUANTITY: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2702 (i).

YUKON AND B C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (ii).

YUKON DISTRICT FRONTIER CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).

—— RUMOURS *re* CONFLICT BETWEEN U.S. AND CAN. CUSTOMS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 975 (i).

—— U.S. VESSELS AND CAN. REGISTRY, FRAUDULENT VALUATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3236 (i).

—— Ques. (*Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3266 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 154 (Mr. *Paterson*) 1**, 4991; 2*, and in Com., 6443 (ii); 3**, 6939 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 22.)

Customs and Inland Revenue Dept. Act Amt. B. No. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 8753; in Com. on Res., 8923; 1°*, 8947; 2° and in Com., 9661; 3°, 9683 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 8924; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8924; (Mr. *Foster*) 8924; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8925; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8926; (Mr. *McMullen*) 8930; (Mr. *Davin*) 8932; (Mr. *Talbot*) 8933; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8934; (Mr. *Bennett*) 8936; (Mr. *Henderson*) 8938; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 8939; (Mr. *Craig*) 8940; (Mr. *McDougall*) 8944; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8945; (Mr. *Clancy*) 8946 (iii).

DAIRYING AND AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8265 (ii).

—— ADVANCES &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8337 (iii).

DARGAVEL, MR. J. B., POSTMASTER AT ELGIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1955 (i).

DAVIS, EDWARD, SLIDEMASTER AT COULONGE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3946 (ii).

DAWSON AND VANCOUVER MAIL SERVICE, ARRIVAL, DESPATCH, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2961.

DEAD LETTER BRANCH, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5068 (ii).

DEADMAN'S ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. HAIG & SON (1880) *re* APPLICATION FOR USE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2788 (i).

—— LEASES, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1815.

—— FORFEITURE OF LEASE BY MR. LUDGATE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4739 (ii).

—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness re* LEASE (Mr. *Prior*) 1353, 1640 (i).
See "Stanley Park."

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

—— 1ST REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 337 (i).

—— 2ND REP. of COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1071, 1738 (i).

—— 3RD REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2180 (i).

—— 4TH REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Ellis*) 2529 (i).

—— 5TH REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Richardson*) 5665 (ii).

—— 6TH REP. OF COM.: M. conc. (Mr. *Richardson*) 8913 (iii).

—— OFFICIAL: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

DEFENCE SCHEME: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).

DELAY IN FURNISHING CARS, I. C. R., COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1853 (i).

DEMERS, DR., RAILWAY BICYCLE RIDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5308 (ii).

DEMERS, MAJOR, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1833 (i).

DEPTL. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REFURNISHING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 9957 (iii).

DESCOUSSE WHARF, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).

DEVLIN, MR. JAMES, PROSECUTION BY DEPT. OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7218 (iii).

DIBBLEE AND DUPONT, MESSRS., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).

DICK, ISAAC, FISHERY GUARDIAN, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 7765 (iii).

DICKSON, MR. R., IMMIGRATION AGENT, APPMNT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1855 (i).

DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9947 (iii).

DISTRESSED CANADIAN RELIEF FUND: in Com. of SUP., 7529 (iii).

DIVISIONS:

ADDRESS; Amt. (Mr. *Bertram*) to Amt. (Mr *Clarke*) agreed to (Y. 101; N. 48) 1811 (i).

APPEAL TO SPEAKER AGAINST A RULING OF DEP. SPEAKER (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Chairman's decision agreed to (Y. 65; N. 20) 4456 (ii).

APPEAL FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO SPEAKER (Mr. *Foster*) Chairman's decision agreed to (Y. 39; N. 10) 5611 (ii).

BINDER TWINE, SALE OF BY GOVT.: on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 20; N. 51) 9937 (iii).

CIVIL SERVICE (DISMISSAL OF OFFICIALS) B. 50 (Mr. *Monk*) Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h., agreed to (Y. 64; N. 39) 2244 (i).

COAL OIL AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 68; N. 30) 2014 (i).

COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S B. 27 (Mr. *Costigan*) Amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) neg. (Y. 14; N. 61) 2948 (i).

CRIMINAL CODE (1892) B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) 3° agreed to (Y. 69; N. 29) 2930 (i).

DEBATES OFFICIAL, 2ND REP., DISMISSAL OF FRENCH TRANSLATOR: on Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1752 (i); neg. (Y. 40; N. 89).

FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW OF: Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Ways and Means, neg. (Y. 12; N. 30) 10244 (iii).

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S B. 90 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 3°; Amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) neg. (Y. 21; N. 51) 4786 (ii).

IMMIGRATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to strike out W. T. R. Preston's salary neg. (Y. 13; N. 27) 10216 (iii).

I. C. R., DRUMMOND CO. B. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) M. for Com. on Res. agreed to (Y. 80; N. 38) 2841 (i).

INLAND REVENUE AND CUSTOMS DEPT. B. 182 (Mr. *Fielding*) Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) neg. (Y. 11; N. 27) 9683 (iii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) neg. (Y. 41; N. 77) 7965 (iii).

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS B. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3° *m.*, Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 40: N. 80) 3969 (ii).

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES B. 190: Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) neg. (Y. 12; N. 47) 9894 (ii).

REPRESENTATION IN THE H. OF C. B. 126 (Mr. *Mulock*) M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. deb. on 2°, neg. (Y. 18; N. 23) 5336 (ii).

—— M. for 2° agreed to (Y. 77; N. 41) 6720 (ii).

SABREVOIS WHARF: Amt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to strike out vote, neg. (Y. 25; N. 12) 10219 (iii).

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS B. 189 (Mr. *Sifton*) Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) neg. (Y. 17; N. 56) 9848 (iii).

VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 13; N. 27) 10218 (iii).

YUKON, ADMINISTRATION OF, CHARGES AGAINST: Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6277 (ii).

Divorce: Aronsberg, Abraham, B. No. 144 (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1°*, 4730; 2°*, 5359 (ii); in Com., 7480, 7575; 3°*, 7809 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 132.)

—— **Dowding, Annie Inkson, B. No. 136** (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 4147; 2°*, 5359; in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 133.)

—— **Stock, David, B. No. 88** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2604; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com., 3489; 3°*, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 134.)

—— **Van Wart, Stephen Gerow, B. No. 181** (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1°*, 8913; 2°*, 9056; in Com., and 3°*, 9532 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 135.)

Docks, Reduction of Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).

Documents, &c., Yukon District: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3067 (i).

"Dolphin," Str., Sale, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4045 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1855 (i).

Dom. of Can. Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s B. No. 76 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

Dom. Census and B. N. A. Act Amt.: prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2386 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Britton*) 1°, 2035 (i).

—— **B. No. 142** (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°, 4341 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4894; 2° and in Com., 6400, 6405; 3°, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iii).

—— Chief Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 9006 (iii).

—— Man., Fraudulent Transactions by Officials, par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4995 (ii).

—— Survey Returns, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9053 (iii).

Dom. Notes, Number of Sheets, Back and Tint Plates, Delivered to Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1878 (i).

—— Printing: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii), 7001 (iii).

Dom. and Ontario Accounts, Indebtedness by Dom., 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3544 (ii).

Dom. Permanent Loan Co.'s B. No. 104 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2525 (i); in Com., 6868; 3°*, 6878 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

Dominion Police Force: in Com. of Sup., 10127 (iii).

—— Yukon District, Number, Distribution, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

Dominion Public Buildings, Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).

—— Rifle Association, Annual Grant by Govt. of Transport and Entrance Fees to Limited Number: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2358, 2361 (i).

—— Steamers, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).

Domville, Lt.-Col., Leave of Absence from Command of 8th Hussars: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2898 (i).

—— par. in St. John *Sun*: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2899 (i).

—— Charges Against, Evidence before Public Accounts Com.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1845 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1839 (i).

Donahue, W., Contract for Timber for Dredge at Roberval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4069 (ii).

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).

"Dorothy," Seizure by U. S. Customs Authorities at Skagway, par. in Ottawa *Citizen*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2367 (i).

Doukhobors, Quarantined at Grosse Isle: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4550 (ii).

Dowding. *See* "Divorce."

Drainage across Railway Co's. Lands B. No. 24 (Mr. *Casey*) 1°*, 803; 2°, 1917; M. for Sel. Com., 2153, 2930, 2949 (i); ref. to Sel. Com., 3849 (ii).

Drawbacks on Freight Charges on N. S. Portion I. C. R. since 1898: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 5945 (ii).

—— Payments on Freight Charges, Amount paid for Jan. and Feb., 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).

Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

—— for Minerals, Yukon, Number of Leases (1897) Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3079 (i).

—— Plant, Mar. Provs. and B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).

—— new plant, in Com. of Sup., 8137 (iii).

—— Richmond, N.S., Amount Expended from 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).

—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).

Drill Hall, Vancouver, Contract for Construction, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).

Drummond County Railway: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2972 (i).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Haggart*) 2249 (i).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2697 (i).

Drummond County. *See* "I. C. R."

Dry Docks Construction B. No. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6123 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8472; 1°*, 8474; 2° and in Com., 8757; 3°*, 8762 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

Dry Docks Subsidy: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6123 (ii).

Dry Dock, Victoria, B.C., Pets. *re* Reduction of Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7766 (iii).

Dubé, Appnmt. of Supt., Location of Headquarters: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2533 (i).

Duceis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale of Timber Limits, Removal of Indians: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).

DUCHESNE, DR. J. A., COMPLAINTS *re* APPNMT. OF DR. HALL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).
—— EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1887 (i).
DUNN AVENUE, RY. CROSSING, TORONTO, PROTECTION TO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1857 (i).
DUPUIS, P. C., PROSECUTION FOR SELLING LIQUOR TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).
EARNINGS (GROSS) AND WORKING EXPENSES FROM 1898 TO 1899, I.C.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2027 (i).
EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).
See "Adjournments."
EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, CLAIMS OF N. S. GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3551 (ii).
Eastern Trust Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1°*, 1352; 2°*, 1585 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)
EDGAR, LADY, BALANCE OF SALARY OF LATE SPEAKER: in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).
—— SIR JAMES, LATE SPEAKER, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii).
EDMONTON BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8196 (iii).
Edmonton and Saskatchewan incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com., 4302, 4847; 3°*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *Poupore*) 1°*, 974; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
EDMONTON TRAIL TO YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 10109 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 158 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 5384; 2°*, 5536 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)
EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9489, 9495, 9581, 9809 (iii).
EDMONTON AND YUKON ROUTE, INSTRUCTIONS TO MESSRS. DIBBLEE AND DUPONT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).
ELECTION ACT AMT. BILL: Request to have placed on Govt. Orders (Mr. *Ingram*) 7218, 7322 (iii).
ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES RECEIVED DURING RECESS (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques: (Mr. *Mills*) 1979 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHTING INSPECTION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4804, 5518 (ii).
—— OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii), 9939, 9989 (iii); conc., 6386 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).
ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2332 (i).
ELEVATOR RESTRICTIONS AND C.P.R., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).
ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, PRINTING PLANT, LEASE TO W. J. THOMPSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3076 (i).
EMIGRATION TO U.S., ANSWER TO QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2117 (i).
—— PAR IN NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2115 (i).
EMPLOYEES, I.C.R., AT LEVIS AND PROVINCIAL ELECTION, TRANSFER, &C., INSTRUCTIONS TO MR. DESJARDINS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).
—— NUMBER, WAGES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 1860, 2332 (i).
—— INCREASE OF STAFF AT RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1974 (i).
Erie and Huron and Lake Erie and Detroit Amalgamation Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *McGregor*) 1°*, 1540; 2°*, 1862 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3492 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 67).
ESTATE DUTY, COR. INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8220 (iii).
ESQUIMALT DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).
—— DRY DOCK, REDUCTION OF RATES, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6122 (ii).
ESTIMATES, THE, YEAR ENDING 1900: Presented Mr. *Fielding*) 2026 (i).
—— SUPPL. ENDING 1899: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 4857 (iii).
—— ENDING 1900: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 7638.
—— FURTHER SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9835 (iii).
——SUPPL., Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4147, 6458 (ii).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7242, 7442 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 159 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°, 5385; 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 6101 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 44).
—— **B. No. 184** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 9178 (iii).
——**B. No. 188** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 9309; 2°, 9835; in Com. and 3°*, 9835 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 45).
EXCHEQUER COURT OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5472 (ii).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
—— INSPECTION OF SEALED FOOD PACKAGES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2705 (i).
EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL AND REVENUE, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2531 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 7688, 8237 (iii).
—— BALANCE DUE ON PROPERTY: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).
—— ESTABLISHMENT IN ST. JACQUES: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2110 (i).
—— FARM REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 3070 (i).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 185 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 9178; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 10220 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 39).
EXTENSION TO MONTREAL, AMOUNT ACCRUED AND PAID TO G.T.RY. CO. SINCE JULY, 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4478 (ii).
—— CAR MILEAGE FOR VICTORIA BRIDGE, INCOMPLETE RETURN (Mr. *Foster*) 4858 (ii).
—— PAPERS RESPECTING CAR MILEAGE: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 4891 (ii).

FAIRLIE, MR., DISMISSAL FROM RUPERT'S LAND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2532 (i).
—— M. for Reps., Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2788 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT AND IROQUOIS CANAL, LOCKS AT, REPS. OF MR. SHANLY AND MR. KEEFER, C.E.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1878 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).
—— TENDERS FOR 1897, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3873 (ii).
FAWCETT, MR., ADVICE *re* RECORDING MINING CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).
—— DISMISSAL AS GOLD COMMISSIONER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1878 (i).
FENELON FALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF SLIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1978 (i).
FINANCE:
AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY, DIES, PLATES, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson*) 3828 (ii).
ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT., COST OF: in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup. 2086, 2269 (i).
BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE QUEEN, ACTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*, Lambton) 6050 (ii).
—— CLAIMS FOR BALANCE DUE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2180 (i).
BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4150 (ii).
BURNS, MR., PRIVATE SEC. TO MIN. OF FIN. APPNMT. TO PERMANENT FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 8469 (iii).
CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT ELECTIONS, COST: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iii).
COLONIAL SECURITIES AND IMPERIAL TAX: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1639 (i).
COUNTERFEIT BILLS, CIRCULATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5206 (ii).
DOMINION AND ONTARIO ACCOUNTS, INDEBTEDNESS BY DOM., 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3544 (ii).
DOM. NOTES, NUMBER OF SHEETS, BACK AND TINT PLATES, DELIVERED TO GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1878 (i).
—— PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii); 7001 (iii).
ESTATE DUTY, COR, INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8220 (iii).
FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2090, 2973 (i).
—— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5016 (ii).
FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &c.: 10228; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 12; N. 30) 10244 (iii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8748 (iii).
INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION AND BOARDS OF TRADE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5944 (ii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 5377 (ii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Quinn*) 5945 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4997 (ii).
—— LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3253 (i).
INSURANCE, SUPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7463 (iii).
IRON BOUNTIES, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1827 (i).
LETTERS OF CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (iii).
FINANCE—*Con.*
LIQUOR COMMISSION REPORT, TRANSLATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5851 (iii).
LOBSTER FISHERY COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Remarks (Mr. *McInerney*) 2909 (i).
MINT, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT. IN CANADA: prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3106 (i).
—— GOVT., ESTABLISHMENT IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallan*) 2190 (i).
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL DEBT, REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3074 (i).
P. E. I. AND DOM. GOVT., DELEGATION *re* QUESTIONS AT ISSUE, CLAIMS, STUNTS., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 1879 (i).
PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, AMOUNT PAID AND BALANCE DUE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5859 (ii).
—— COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1814 (i).
—— EXPENSES IN MONTREAL CITY, AMOUNTS UNPAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5312 (ii).
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ROYAL COMMISSION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1885 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c., OF FIN. MINISTER AND PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1880 (i).
VILLE MARIE BANK, SUSPENSION INSPECTION BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 8755 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 9065 (iii.).
VANLUVEN, PETER, *vs.* DOMINION BANK, ACTION OF GOVT, COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 9178 (iii).
FIREWORKS, &c., *re* DEMONSTRATION ON PREMIER'S RETURN: in Com. of Sup., 8111 (iii).
FISHERIES:
BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, COST TO GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2186 (i).
—— EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).
BELLE RIVER, P.E.I., SEIZURE OF FISH TRAPS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2787 (i).
CANADIAN FISHERIES AND AMERICAN FISH TRUSTS, COMPLAINTS *re* AND OFFICIAL REPORTS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4993 (ii).
COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT, DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 10163 (iii).
—— FOR FISH TRANSPORTATION, FROM MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1978 (i).
—— FOR PRESERVATION OF BAIT FOR FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1978 (i).
DICK, ISAAC, FISHERY GUARDIAN N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 7765 (iii).
FISHERY INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4013 (ii).
—— OFFICERS, LEEDS CO., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1818 (i).
—— PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5180.
—— Report presented (Sir *Louis Davies*) 700 (i).
—— WEIRS, CHARLOTTE CO., LICENSES ISSUED, DATES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ganong*) 2962 (i).
FRASER AND SKEENA RIVER FISH HATCHERIES, ERECTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4058 (ii).
GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN AT CHARLOTTE, N.B., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
GRATUITY TO COMMANDER WAKEHAM: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
—— TO R. N. VENNING: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
GRAY, ROBERT, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 7319 (ii).

FISHERIES--*Con.*
INLAND FISHERIES, ISSUE OF LICENSES BY LOCAL GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2910 (i).
LENOIR, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ret. laid on Table, 4268 (ii).
LICENSES FOR FISHING TRAPS, ISSUE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2046 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHERY COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *McInerney*) 2909 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2319 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2249 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3960 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHERY, P. E. I., INFRACTION OF REGULATIONS, FINES IMPOSED, COST OF PROSECUTIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).
——— M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Martin*) 5504 (ii).
——— FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 6561 (iii).
———PROTECTION, REGULATIONS *re*: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness)7675 (iii).
MILLTOWN, N. S., APPNMT. OF FISHERY GUARDIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADIAN FISHERMEN, SUPPLY OF BAIT, COR., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 9465 (iii).
——— REGULATIONS *re* EXPORT OF BAIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6938 (iii).
——— FISHERIES AND FRENCH SHORE, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3070 (i).
——— REGULATIONS *re* LIVE BAIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2194 (i).
——— REGULATIONS *re* PURCHASE OF BAIT: Inquiry for Return (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2696 (i).
NOBLE BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4244 (ii).
——— AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2184 (i).
OYSTER BED, B. C., CLAIMS OF ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).
OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 4241 (ii).
PETERS, MR. F., AND E. V. BODWELL, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5181 (ii).
POACHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8347 (iii).
P. E. I. FISHING BOUNTIES, NAMES OF PERSONS, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E I.) 5861 (ii).
——— LOBSTER FISHING, PETS. *re* EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*, P E I.) 6122 (ii).
QUICK, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: par. in Windsor *World* (Mr. *Cowan*) 7219 (iii).
U. S. FISHING VESSELS AND MODUS VIVENDI, LICENSES, CONCESSIONS GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2330 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2788 (i).
FITZGIBBON, &c., CUSTOMS UNDERVALUATION: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).
FLOUR RATES AND CAR MILEAGE, &c., I. C. R.: Papers laid on Table (Mr. *Blair*) 4730 (ii).
FLUHMAN, DR., MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS AT POINTE BLEUE, PETS. *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).
FORT FRANCIS AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9550 (ii).
FOSTER, HON. GEO. E., EX-MIN., TRAVELLING AND LIVING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1834 (i).
FOURCHIE HARBOUR, N.S., DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).
FRANCHISE ELECTORAL ACT, AMENDMENTS BY N.B. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2530 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT AMT. BILL (P.E.I.), NOT ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 9308 (iii).
FRANCHISE ACT SCHEDULES: Remarks (Mr. *Powell*) 1073 (i).
FRANKING PRIVILEGES TO LEGISLATIVE REPORTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3823 (ii).
FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8088 (iii).
——— MILLER'S LANDING, IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques., 2701 (i).
——— AND SKEENA RIVER FISH HATCHERIES, ERECTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4058 (ii).
FRASERVILLE HARBOUR AND BOARD OF TRADE RESOLUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1968 (i).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION, PETS. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1972 (i).
——— PETS. *re* DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2899 (i).
FRECHETTE, L. A., TRANSLATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).
FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND INSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3795 (ii).
FREIGHT CARRIED FROM 1897-9, I.C.R., NUMBER OF TONS AND RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3257 (i).
——— RATES, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7457.
——— RATES ON FLOUR, 1897-8, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3549 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTATION, YUKON, GUARANTEE BY CONTRACTORS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1844 (i).
FRIENDLY SOCIETY INSURANCE, GOVT.'S POLICY *re* LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 3342 (ii).
FRONTIER CUSTOMS, YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).
Fruit Packages Definition of Size B. No. 56 (Mr. *Penny*) 1°*, 1352; on Order for 2°, 3316 (i); 2°*, 3872; wthdn., 5360 (ii).
FUNERAL WREATH, LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON: QUESTION DROPPED (Mr. *McMullen*) 1849 (i).
GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii), 9991 (iii).
——— INSPECTION, &c., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2698 (i).
GAGNE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, AND CONNECTION WITH LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO., DELAY TO LITIGANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 2189 (i).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS AT SALTCOATS, OUTBREAK OF SCARLET FEVER: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4895 (ii).
——— SETTLEMENT AT SALTCOATS, COMMISSIONER'S INVESTIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6935 (iii).
——— AND DOUKHOBORS, NUMBER BROUGHT INTO CAN., NAMES OF AGENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 8466 (iii).

GALLANT, W. A., ENGINEER POINT LEPREAUX FOG ALARM, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4806 (ii).

GALLERIES OF THE HOUSE, DEMONSTRATION CHECKED (Mr. *Speaker*) 2897 (i).

GALNA, MR., DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8446.

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299, 7442 (iii).

GALT POSTMASTER, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3824 (ii).

Game Preservation Unorganized Territories Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 153 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4991; 2° and in Com., 6442; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 20.)

GANANOQUE PUBLIC BUILDING, HEATING, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1881 (i).

GASPE BASIN AND DALHOUSIE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8685 (iii).

GASPE CUSTOMS OFFICER AND ELECTION, CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10222 (iii).

GAUTHIER, JEAN, POSTMASTER AT METABETCHOUAN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Penny*) 1°*, 1352 (i); 2°, 3871; wthdn., 5360. *See* "Fruit Packages."

—— **B. No. 132** (Sir *Henri Joly*) 1°, 3751; wthdn., 5098 (ii).

—— **B. No. 156** (Sir *Henri Joly*) 1°, 5099 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 9636; 3°, 9660 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 25.)

General Trusts Corporation of Canada B. No. 129 (Mr. *McMullen*) 1°*, 3646; 2°*., 3844; in Com. and 3°*, 5792 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 111.)

GEOFFRION, HON. MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7630 (iii).

Geological Survey Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4891; 2° and in Com., 6396; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 21.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 2104 (i); 5668 (ii); 7467 (iii).

GEORGIAN BAY AND TORONTO SHIP CANAL, PETS., APPLICATIONS, COR., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Wallace*) 4819 (ii).

GERMAN DISCRIMINATING DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1851 (i).

GIANT'S TOOMB, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).

GILLIS, FRANK, I.C.R. STATION AGENT AT TRACADIE, N.S., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4056 (ii).

GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., RES. OF CONDOLENCE: Reply (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN AT CHARLOTTE, N.B., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).

Glenora Ry. Co's. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2650 (i).

GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8010 (iii).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8012 (ii).

—— IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1881 (i).

GOLD COMMISSIONER YUKON, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

GOSSELIN, MR. F., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 3827 (ii).

GOUIN, MR. LOMER, SPEECH *re* SUBSIDIES TO PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1981 (i).

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8221 (iii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6279 (ii).

—— WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3555 (ii).

—— CONTRACT, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1975 (i).

—— NUMBER OF CONTRACTS AWARDED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2961 (i).

GOVERNMENT OF KEEWATIN: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

GOVERNMENT LANDS, MAN., SALE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1856 (i).

—— STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5101 (ii).

—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004 (i); 3532, 4719 (ii).

GOVERNMENT OF THE N. W. TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iii).

—— PROPERTY (B.C.) LEASE, &c., COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8465 (iii).

—— RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8991 (iii).

—— RYS., TENDERS FOR OIL, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

—— WORKING EXPENSES FOR MAY AND JUNE, 1898, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4810 (ii).

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2047 (i).

—— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

—— LETTER *re* PROROGATION: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 10246 (iii).

"GOVERNOR PINGBEE" AND "J. B. LOWE," STRS., REGISTRY IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1856 (i).

GRAIN ELEVATORS IN N.W.T., PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Tribune*: M. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5494 (ii).

—— EXPORTED FROM CAN. PORTS, NUMBER OF BUSHELS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 3256 (i).

—— EXPORTS FROM CAN. HARBOURS IN 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 3075 (i).

—— EXPORTS TO GERMANY IN 1898-99, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 8990 (iii).

—— N. W. T., LEGISLATION *re* INSPECTION, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3829 (ii).

—— STANDARDS, BOARD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5586 (ii).

Grain Transit Man. and N. W. T. Regulation B. 15 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°*, 618; 2°, 1901 (i).

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8634 (iii).

GRAND NARROWS, LEASE OF PROPERTY: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4997 (ii).

GRAND RIVER FLOODS, GOVT. REPORTS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2536 (i).

G. T. R. and I. C. R., ENGINE AND CAR MILEAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4811 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5313 (ii).

——— TRACKMENS' STRIKE: (Mr. *Clarke*) to Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).

——— AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3960, 3984 (ii).

——— SETTLEMENT, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4501 (ii).

Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4503, 4512; (Mr. *Casey*) 4505; (Mr. *Blair*) 4506; (Mr. *Ives*) 4508; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4509; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4512; (Mr. *Powell*) 4514; (Mr. *Ingram*) 4519, 4544; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4520; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4523; (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 4534; (Mr. *Davin*) 4536; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4538; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4539; (Mr. *Bell*, P. E. I.) 4540; (Mr. *Hughes*) 4541, 4547; (Mr. *Reid*) 4541; (Mr. *Kendry*) 4543; (Mr. *McHugh*) 4549 (ii).

——— COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4730 (ii).

——— LETTER FROM MR. DEANE: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 4786 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Papers *re* Settlement (Mr. *Clarke*) 4858 (ii).

——— RUMOURED SETTLEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5206 (ii).

GRAND TRUNK. *See* "I. C. R."

GRATUITY TO COMMANDER WAKEHAM: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).

——— TO INDIANS, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 5694. (ii).

——— TO MRS. MUIRHEAD: in Com. of Sup., 5179.

——— TO R. N. VENNING: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).

GREATER BRITAIN EXHIBITION, CANADIAN REPRESENTATION OF MINERAL EXHIBIT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1959 (i).

G. B. AND RUSSIA, TREATY OF 1825, PROTOCOLS, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6939 (iii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Savard*). 1°*, 2966 (i); 2°*, 3492 (ii); in Com., 6970, 3°*, 6972 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8914, 8918; in Com., 9435, 9770 (iii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No 90 (Mr. *Macpherson*). 1°*, 2122; 2°*, 2320 (i); 3° *m.*, 4189, 4524, 4771; agreed to (Y. 51; N. 21) 4786 (ii) (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)

GREEN SAND CASTINGS, I. C. R., TENDERS, PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5360 (ii).

GRENVILLE CANAL, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4992 (ii).

——— MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAYS ON FARMS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6048 (ii).

——— LETTER OF MR. G. S. CONWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6380 (ii).

——— TOLL COLLECTOR, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2532 (i).

GREY, ROBERT, LICHT-HOUSE KEEPER AT ENTRANCE ISLAND, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 7319 (iii).

GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPENSES, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1849 (i).

GROSS, MR. BOAZ, HARBOUR MASTER AT HILLSBORO, PAPER RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4732 (ii).

GUAY POST OFFICE, REVENUE, SALARY PAID TO POSTMASTER VERRAULT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).

HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9056, 10110 (iii).

——— N. W. T., COR. BETWEEN MR. MCDOWALL AND GOVT. *re* RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).

HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).

HALIFAX DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).

——— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 8920 (iii).

——— NFLD. AND LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).

——— AND PORTO RICO, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).

——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9945. (iii).

HALL, DR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF CATTLE AT CHICOUTIMI: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).

Hamilton Powder Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. *Penny*) 1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

HAMILTON RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).

HANTSPORT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).

HARBOUR AND RIVER WORKS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii): 8102, 8105 (iii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).

——— MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).

——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 10010 (iii).

——— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 8084 (iii).

——— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii); 7693, 9990; conc., 10218 (iii).

——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 7966, 10065 (iii).

——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).

——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7557, 8103, 10014.

HARPER, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY, ISSUE OF NOTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1961 (i).

HARRIS, MR., AGREEMENT WITH, AS TRAFFIC MANAGER I. C. R.: Ques.: (Mr. *Pope*) 1975, 1980 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2905 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2961 (i).

HAVELOCK AND OAK LAKE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3824 (ii).

HAWKESBURY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9456 (iii).

HEADQUARTERS AT LÉVIS, I. C. R., TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3551 (ii).

HENEY & BORTHWICK, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10153 (iii).

HERNES, JOHN, CARETAKER NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING COR. *re* DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Wilson*) 5377 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8748 (iii).

HILLSBORO, N. B., HARBOUR MASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE AND COMMISSIONERS' REP., &c., M. for Copy* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2027 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5085 (ii).

HOGG, W. A., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COLLINGWOOD, CHARGES AGAINST, COMMISSIONER'S REP., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2788 (i).

Home Life Association of Canada, B. No. 13 (Mr. *McGregor*). 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)

HOMESTEAD LAW IN N. W. T., INTEREST ON PREEMPTIONS, MEMORIAL FROM SETTLERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3080 (i).

HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOURE KEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i), 5486 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Consdn., M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

—— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i).

—— CLOSING OF DEBATE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 975, 1016 (i).

—— OMISSION OF NAMES FROM DIVISION LIST: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1861 (i).

—— GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., RES. OF CONDOLENCE: Reply (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

—— TO HER MAJ. *re* TRANSVAAL QUESTION: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8992 (iii).

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY AND FRIDAY'S SITTING: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2706 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2790 (i).

—— EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).

—— MEMBERS DECEASED: M. to adjn. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

—— OF THE HOUSE, MOTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3816, 3817 (ii).

—— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3340 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3340.

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3440 (ii).

APPEALS FROM RULING OF CHAIRMAN TO SPEAKER IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE, STMNT. AND AUTHORITY QUOTED (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4553 (ii).

BAIN, HON. THOS., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).

BARNETT, C., ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 6928 (iii).

BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMNT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 2410 (i).

—— Reply (Mr. *Foster*) 2537 (i).

BURRARD, MEMBER FOR, USE OF REVEREND IN QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1838 (i).

BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, ATTENDANCE OF CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY WITH PAPERS, &c. (Mr. *Speaker*) 6821 (iii).

—— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6595 (ii).

—— M. to place Documents on Table (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 5713 (ii), 6821 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BUDGET SPEECH: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2313 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE *re* ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 2025 (i).

—— Introduction of Bills (Mr. *Speaker*) 618 (i).

—— MORNING SITTING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768 (iii).

—— UNOPPOSED RETURNS: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 6938 (iii).

—— SENATE RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7321, 7442 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. *See* "Govt. Business."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS, ACCOMMODATION IN ROOMS: Remarks (Mr. *Penny*) 3314 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

EDGAR, LADY, BALANCE OF SALARY OF LATE SPEAKER: in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).

—— SIR JAMES, LATE SPEAKER, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii).

ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES RECEIVED DURING RECESS (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1979 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE TO LEGISLATIVE REPORTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3823 (ii).

FUNERAL WREATH, LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON: Question dropped (Mr. *McMullen*) 1849 (i).

GALLERIES OF THE HOUSE: Demonstration checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 2897 (i).

GEOFFRION, HON. MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7630 (iii).

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8221 (iii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6279 (ii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3555 (ii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2409 (i).

HURON, W., ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 9597 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, ALASKAN BOUNDARY PROTOCOLS: ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4264 (ii).

IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6741 (ii), 7635 (iii).

IVES, HON MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7532 (iii).

LEGISLATION—SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 5739 (ii).

LIBRARY COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, DISTURBANCE BY MESSENGERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10221 (iii).

—— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 10140 (iii).

MEMBERS ADDRESSING CHAIR: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7214 (iii).

—— ASKED TO FORMULATE THEIR QUESTIONS SO AS NOT TO MAKE STATEMENTS OF FACTS (Mr. *Speaker*) 4483 (ii).

—— ASKED TO KEEP TO MOTION BEFORE HOUSE (Mr. *Speaker*) 4816 (ii).

—— ASKED NOT TO INTERRUPT SPEAKERS (Mr. *Speaker*) 1175 (i).

—— ASKED TO RETRACT STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 4006 (ii).

—— ASKED TO SPEAK TO MOTION BEFORE HOUSE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1565, 1573 (i).

—— ASKED TO WITHDRW. STMNT. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1177, 1555 (i).

—— ATTENTION CALLED TO PROCEDURES FOR WEDNESDAYS (Mr. *Speaker*) 8269 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

MEMBERS BREAKING RULES ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY (Mr. *Speaker*) 3558 (ii).
—— CANNOT INTERRUPT, WITHOUT CONSENT OF MEMBER MAKING SPEECH (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 3226 (i).
—— CANNOT MOVE ADJNMT TWICE ON ORDER OF THE DAY BEING CALLED (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4551 (ii).
—— CANNOT REFER TO PREVIOUS DEBATE IN ASKING QUESTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3262 (i).
—— CANNOT SPEAK BUT ONCE ON A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 3777 (ii).
—— CANNOT SPEAK TWICE ON SAME SUBJECT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5375, 5376 (ii).
—— CHECKED IN REFERRING TO PREVIOUS DEBATE (Mr. *Speaker*) 3193 (i).
—— IN ORDER TO SPEAK TO MOTION TO GO INTO SUPPLY (Mr. *Speaker*) 8644 (iii).
—— INTRODUCED, 4, 421, 2897 (i).
—— MILEAGE ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 6722 (ii).
—— MOTION NOT IN ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 3342 (ii).
—— MOVING READING OF BILL: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2918 (i).
—— MUST ADDRESS THE CHAIR (Mr. *Chairman*) 9647 (iii).
—— MUST CONCLUDE WITH A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 3754 (ii).
—— MUST CONCLUDE WITH A MOTION (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 3499 (ii)
—— MUST CONFINE REMARKS TO BILL BEFORE HSE. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4780 (ii).
—— MUST CONFINE HIS REMARKS TO MOTION BEFORE HSE. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5402 (ii).
—— MUST NOT INTERRUPT WITHOUT PERMISSION OF SPEAKER (Mr. *Speaker*) 6170 (ii).
—— MUST NOT QUOTE FROM PREVIOUS DEBATE (Mr. *Speaker*) 7196 (iii).
—— MUST NOT REFER TO PAST DEBATE (Mr. *Speaker*) 3328 (i).
—— NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification, 1 (i).
—— RESIGNATION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.
—— SPEECHES OUT OF ORDER, MUST MAKE A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 3846 (ii).
—— REMARKS CHECKED (Mr. *Speaker*) 1871, 1953, 1954, 2733, 2734, 2742, 2794, 2805, 3193, 3224, 3225 (i); 3557, 5493, 6315 (ii).
MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).
—— INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).
—— Read (Mr *Speaker*) 2963 (i), 4858 (ii).
—— Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7638 (iii).
—— read (Mr. *Speaker*) 9835 (iii).
MESS. BY BLACK ROD, 6930 (iii).
MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768 (iii).
ORDER, QUES. OF, ABUSING THE PRIVILEGES OF MOTIONS TO ADJN.: Authorities Quoted (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6591; (Mr. *Speaker*) 6594 (ii).
—— IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 8921 (iii).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. WORD "BEAST" (Mr. *Speaker*) 6225 (ii).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. WORD "COWARDLY" (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6157 (ii).
—— MEMBER (SIR CHARLES TUPPER) ASKED TO WTHDR. STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5394 (ii).
—— MEMBER IMPUTING MOTIVES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 5882, 6239 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

ORDER, QUES. OF. MEMBERS REQUESTED NOT TO INTERRUPT (Mr. *Speaker*) 427 (i).
—— MUST WTHDRW. THE WORD "DEMAGOGUE," 9655 (ii).
—— REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN ANOTHER HOUSE, 9897 (iii).
—— REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN COM.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6826 (iii).
—— REFERENCE TO PAST DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6753 (ii).
—— ON STATEMENTS MADE GENERALLY: Ruling *Speaker*) 7213 (iii).
—— Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6778 (ii).
PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec. (read) 10246 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION, CHANGE OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIS PARTY (Mr. *Costigan*) 3555, 3648 (ii).
—— *re* QUESTION AS TO MR. MARK WORKMAN (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4990 (ii).
—— *re* VOTE ON KETTLE RIVER RY. BILL (Mr. *Prior*) 9595 (iii).
PETITIONS, IRREGULARITY OF: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 421 (i).
—— RULE OF PROCEDURE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1737 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS PETITIONS, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 894 (i).
—— EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2182 (i).
—— M. to Suspend Rule (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5378 (ii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF: Insertion of Remarks in HANSARD by Min. of Public Works (Mr. *Davin*) 421 (i)
PROCEDURE FOR RETURNS, MOTION *re*: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3560 (ii).
—— ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2118 (i).
PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, POLL BOOKS, VOTERS' LISTS, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Moore*) 2906 (i).
—— RET. OF VOTES POLLED, PAPERS, &C.: Request that they be laid on the Table (Mr. *Foster*) 1894, 1895 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2037 (i).
—— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2041, 2045 (i).
PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 10246 (iii).
QUESTIONS, FORM OF ASKING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2322 (i).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. OBJECTIONABLE WORD (Mr. *Speaker*) 2484 (i).
READING ROOM, VENTILATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
RESTAURANT, H. OF C.; in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 2280 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2278, 2280 (i).
SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES OF DECEASED SENATORS AND MEMBERS; in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).
SPEAKER'S ATTENTION CALLED TO MEMBER'S SPEECH OUT OF ORDER: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3754 (ii).
—— ELECTION OF: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).
—— DEP. DELEGATION OF POWERS: Ruling asked from Mr. Speaker (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5491 (ii).
—— SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
—— LATE SIR JAMES EDGAR, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2755, 2770 (i).
STATIONERY, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii); 10139 (iii).
—— SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS: on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to Conc. in 3rd. 4th and 5th Rep. of Printing Com. 5378 (ii).
—— SUPPLIES, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup. 2278 (i).
UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 5406 (ii); 9268 (iii).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
VENTILATION OF READING ROOM: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6120 (ii).
VOTERS LISTS: in Com. of Sup., 8750, 10127 (iii).
—— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2281, 2290 (i).
—— N. B., DELAY IN SENDING IN REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530, 2698 (i).
—— PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 6827 (ii).
—— REVISED COPIES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1819 (i)
WINNIPEG ELECTORAL DISTRICT AND REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1830 (i).
—— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 804 (i).
—— VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 619, 804 (i).
—— LISTS, PREPARATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 2908 (i).
YUKON TERRITORY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2901 (i).
HUBERT, MISS ANNABELLA, CLAIMS AND PETS.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2534, 3256 (i).
Hudson's Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2696; 2°*, 3003 (i); in Com. and 3°* 4357 (ii). (62-63 *Vic. c.* 70.)
HUDSON BAY AND YUKON RY. AND NAV. COMPANY: M. to Receive Pet. (Mr. *Flint*) 2182 (i).
HUDSON'S STRAITS, NAVIGABILITY, COST OF EXPEDITION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3337 (ii).
HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 6594 (ii).
—— &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 6562 (ii).
HUNKER CREEK, YUKON, KLONDIKE MINING, APPLICATION AND GRANTS FOR HYDRAULICING: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2962 (i).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co's B. No. 74 (Mr. *Beattie*) 1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com., 4302, 4846; 3°*, 4846 (ii). (62-63 *Vic. c.* 115.)
HURON, W. ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 9597 (iii).
ILLUSTRATION STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8279, 8745 (iii).
"ILLUSTRATION STATIONS," FRUIT, CEREALS, &c., GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).
IMMIGRATION:
AGENTS, APPTMTS. SINCE AUG., 1896, NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for List*, (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).
—— BONUSES TO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1975, 2191 (i).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
AGENTS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8477, 8648; conc., 10214 (iii).
—— BONUSES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1975, 2191 (i).
CANADIAN EMIGRATION TO U.S.: par in Montreal *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1895 (i).
DICKSON, MR. R., IMMIGRATION AGENT, APPTMT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1855 (i).
DOUKHOBOR, FINLAND, &c., NUMBER, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2481 (i).
—— QUARANTINED AT GROSSE ISLE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4550 (ii).
EMIGRATION TO U.S. ANSWER TO QUESTION: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2117 (i).
—— PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2115 (i).
—— EUROPEAN, NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1980 (i).
—— FINLAND, DOUKHOBOR, &c., NUMBER, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2481 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1844 (i).
GALICIANS AND DOUKHOBORS, NUMBER BROUGHT INTO CAN., NAMES OF AGENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3466 (iii).
—— IMMIGRANTS AT SALTCOATS. OUTBREAK OF SCARLET FEVER: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*), 4895 (ii).
—— COMMISSIONER'S INVESTIGATION; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6935 (iii).
IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 8477, 9027 (iii).
INDUCEMENTS TO SETTLERS (G. B.) IN CAN. &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3076 (i).
NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS SENT OUT BY AGENTS IN G.B. AND U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2192 (i).
—— ARRIVAL IN 1898, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3553 (ii).
JURY, MR. A. F., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 8620 (iii).
ONTARIO SETTLERS IN N.W.T., PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Rosamond*) 6051 (ii).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8704 (iii).
PRESTON, W. T. R., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8569; amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) 8578; conc., 10214 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6938 (iii).
QUARANTINE: par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Sproule*) 2192 (i).
REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS FROM U.S., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3078 (i).
SETTLERS FROM EASTERN CANADA TO N.W.T., AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 2534 (i).
—— FROM U.S., NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1979 (i).
Immigration Restriction B. No. 48 (Mr. *McInnes*) 1°*, 1165 (i).
IMMORALITY, PROFESSIONAL, YUKON DISTRICT, TAXES IMPOSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1842 (i).
Imperial Loan Investment Co.'s incorp. B. No. 150 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 5096; 2°*, 5536; in Com., and 3°*, 6326 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 116.)
IMPERIAL SERVICE AND CANADIAN BRIGADE AND CAN. SEAMEN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2335, 2352 (i).
INCREASED STATION ACCOMMODATION I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

INDIANS:
ABENAKIS INDIANS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
DUCEIS INDIAN RESERVE, NEGOTIATIONS *re* SALE OF TIMBER LIMITS, REMOVAL OF INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).
DUPUIS, P. C., PROSECUTION FOR SELLING LIQUOR TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).
ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, PRINTING PLANT, LEASE TO W. J. THOMPSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3076.
FLUHMAN, DR., MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS AT POINTE BLEUE, PETS. *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).
GRATUITIES TO INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2083 (i), 5669 (ii).
—— AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).
—— GENERAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5722 (ii).
—— HOSPITALS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5726 (ii).
—— IMPLEMENTS, TOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5712 (ii).
—— MAN., N.W.T., ANNUITIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (ii).
—— SEED GRAIN, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
—— B.C. RESERVES AND MINING RIGHTS: in Com. of Sup., 5703, 5725 (ii).
—— RESERVE SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 5710, 5721 (ii).
INDUSTRIAL AND BOARDING SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iii).
LIQUOR SOLD TO INDIANS, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).
—— TRAFFIC ON INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 5710 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).
OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
RAMA INDIANS AND STATUTE LABOUR, GOVT. AID TO MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AND BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).
—— CHARGES AGAINTS AGENT, COST OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).
—— WITNESSES FEES *re* INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (ii).
ST. REGIS INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5699 (ii).
SAUGEEN INDIANS RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT., PATRICK SCOTT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 9699 (ii).
SAW LOGS, EXPORTATION, PREVENTION BY GOVT. ON INDIAN RESERVES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).
SCUGOG INDIANS, LIQUOR SOLD, COR., BETWEEN DEPT. AND MR. A. SOPER: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).
SEED GRAIN, MAN. AND N.W.T. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5721 (ii).
SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5704 (ii).
—— COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND PROVL. GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Prior*) 3873 (ii).
—— REMOVAL FROM RESERVE, SETTLEMENT WITH B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 4713 (ii).
INDIANS—*Con.*
STEEL BOXES FOR INDIAN DEPT., NUMBER SUPPLIED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4995 (ii).
VENNER, DR., INDIAN AGENT COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McAllister*) 1858 (i).
YALE AND CARIBOO, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8630, 8989 (iii)
INDIAN CORN IMPORTED FROM 1896-99: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8217 (iii).
—— IMPORTED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8632, 8990 (iii).
INDIAN GARDEN AND SHELBURNE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9454, 9780 (iii).
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AWARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).
INDIAN TREATY WITH N. W. T. INDIANS AND HALF-BREEDS: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
INLAND FISHERIES, ISSUE OF LICENSES BY LOCAL GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2910 (i).
INLAND REVENUE:
APPLES, FRAUDULENT PACKING: par. in Toronto *World*, M. to adjn. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3753 (ii).
CHRISTIE, MR. W. J., DISMISSAL FROM INLAND REV. DEPT., O. C.'s, REP., COR., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Roche*) 2393 (i).
COMMISSION ON STAMPS FOR CAN. TOBACCO: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION:: in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).
—— EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4804 (ii).
ELEVATOR RESTRICTIONS AND C. P. R., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
—— INSPECTION OF SEALED FOOD PACKAGES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2706 (i).
GRAIN STANDARDS BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 5586 (ii).
—— N. W. T., LEGISLATION *re* INSPECTION, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3829 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2100, 2270 (i).
—— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5013 (ii).
INSPECTION ACT, &c.; Remarks on M. for Ways and Means (Mr. *Davin*) 10225 (iii).
—— EXCISE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4770, 4787 (ii).
—— WHEAT, DEPUTATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1540 (i).
—— WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).
POTASH INSPECTION AND MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 1858 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1878 (i).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE, EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8173 (iii).
TOBACCO, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, EXCISE DUTY PAID SINCE 1898, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 3075 (i).
—— (CAN.) MANUFACTURE, NUMBER OF FACTORIES, MEMORIALS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2027 (i).
—— COMMISSION ON STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

TOBACCO, DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1818 (i).

—— FOREIGN LEAF, PERCENTAGE REQUIRED UNDER REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).

—— GROWN IN ESSEX CO., EXCISE DUTIES, &c.: par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Cowan*) 2117 (i).

—— REDUCTION OF DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4813 (ii).

VIOLATION *re* SEIZURE OF TOBACCO: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10227 (iii).

VIRDEN, MAN., INLAND REVENUE OFFICE: M. for Cor., dropped (Mr. *Roche*) 5313 (ii).

WHEAT INSPECTION, DEPUTATION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1540 (i).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).

—— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 124 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°*, 3334; 2°* and in Com., 3759, 3881; 3°*, 3884 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

INLAND REVENUE ACT, VIOLATION *re* SEIZURE OF TOBACCO: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10227 (iii).

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION AND BOARDS OF TRADE, COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 5377 (ii).

—— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Quinn*) 5945 (ii).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5944 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4997 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3253 (i).

INSPECTION ACT, &c.: Remarks on M. for Ways and Means (Mr. *Davin*) 10225 (iii).

—— OF WHEAT, DEPUTATION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) 1540 (i).

INSPECTORS OF EXCISE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4770, 4787 (ii).

—— OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4803 (ii).

Inspection. *See* "General."

INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND YUKON COUNCIL: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 2108 (i); 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 3504; in Com., 6391 (ii), 7001; 3°*, 7001 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

INSURANCE, SUPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7463 (iii).

INTERIOR:

ARTESIAN BORING, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7468, 9055 (iii).

ASHCROFT, B.C., RY. LANDS PURCHASED BY ASHCROFT WATER AND ELECTRIC CO., COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Prior*) 2408 (i).

ATLIN DISTRICT, BREWERY LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

BAUER, DOM. LAND SURVEYOR, B.C., EXAMINATION OF PAPERS, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4061, 4313, 4898 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4713 (ii).

BLISS, MAJ. D. C. F., POSITIONS HELD UNDER GOVT., DATE OF APPNMT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3261 (i) 3552 (ii).

BREMNER, CHAS., INDEMNITY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10113, 10167 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS COMPANY: Ret. laid on Table, 3979 (ii).

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, DOCUMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8702 (iii).

CLARKE, JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5486 (ii).

COAL MINING UNDER NANAIMO HARBOUR, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 8991 (iii).

COULOMBE *vs.* THE QUEEN, TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3946 (ii).

CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., COMPLAINTS, INSTRUCTIONS AND REP. OF MR. ARCHER MARTIN: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY., AND C. P. R., RATES AND TOLLS, REVISION BY GOV. IN COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2331 (i).

—— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 5831 (ii).

DEADMAN'S ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. HAIGH & SON (1880) *re* APPLICATION FOR USE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Prior*) 2788 (i).

—— FORFEITURE OF LEASE BY MR. LUDGATE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4739 (ii).

—— LEASES, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1815. *See* "STANLEY PARK," &c.

DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iii).

—— CHIEF INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 9006 (iii).

—— MAN., FRAUDULENT TRANSACTIONS BY OFFICIALS, PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Telegram*: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4995 (ii).

—— SURVEY RETURNS, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9053 (iii).

FAIRLIE, MR., DISMISSAL AS PRINCIPAL OF INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: M. for Reps., Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2788 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2532 (i).

FAWCETT, MR., ADVICE *re* RECORDING MINING CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 2104 (i) 5668 (ii) 7467 (iii).

GOVT. LANDS, MAN., SALE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Roche*) 1856 (i).

HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5832 (ii) 9056 (iii).

—— TRAVELLING: 10110 (iii).

—— N. W. T., COR. BETWEEN MR. MCDOWALL AND GOVT., *re* RESERVES: Ques. (Mr. *Davie*) 2486 (i).

HOMESTEAD LAW IN N. W. T., INTEREST ON PREEMPTIONS, MEMORIAL FROM SETTLERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3080 (i).

INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 2077 (i), 7466 (iii).

—— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5021 (ii).

—— EXPENDITURE YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 6366 (ii).

JEROME, MR. MARTIN, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 6723 (ii), 7194 (iii).

KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE, PREPARATION BY MR. OGILVIE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1827 (i).

LAND TRANSFERS IN MAN., AND GOVT. AGENTS SPECULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 4735 (ii).

LYNCH, MR. W. H., REP. REFERRED TO BY MIN. OF INT.: M. for Copy* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3874 (ii).

MCKAY, THOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).

—— INDEBTEDNESS TO GOVT. FOR TIMBER DUES, COLLECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

McKeown, E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5487 (ii).

Martin, Mr. A. F., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 7534 (iii).

Mining Claims and Homestead Entries by Govt. Officials, O.C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).

Minister of Interior's Travelling and Living Expenses: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 1818 (i).

Moody, Inspector of N.-W. Mounted Police, Charges Against: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8219 (iii).

North American Transportation Company and Govt. Subsidies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5666 (ii).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Company non-Productionof High Commissioner's Telegram: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5747 (ii).

N.-W. Mounted Police Barracks at Batoche, Supplies for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).

——— Force *re* Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (ii).

——— Police: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).

——— issue of Scrip, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2484 (i).

——— Veterinary Surgeons: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).

N. W. T., Abandoned Homesteads, Dewdney District, Cancellation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3074 (i).

——— Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c.: M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2015 (i).

——— Settlers from Ont., Privileges granted by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2902 (i).

——— Territorial Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).

Ogilvie, Mr., Connection with Goldfields Co.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 3801 (ii).

——— Relationship to Minister of Interior: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).

Paris Agency, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8704.

Prince Albert Mounted Police Barracks, Date of Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8467 (iii).

——— Registry Office, Date of Erection, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8468 (iii).

Rothwell's Report *re* Settlers Claims, Transmission to B.C. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2530 (i).

Royalties on Mining Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 8947, 9002 (iii)

St. Paul des Metis Colony: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).

School Lands, Man., Stmnt. of Sale: Read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6461 (ii).

Scrip Issued to the Half-Breeds: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii), 7501 (iii).

Seed Grain, &c., to Settlers in N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).

——— Liens, Cancellation, Legislation, re Res. from N. W. Council: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).

Stanley Park and Deadman's Island, O. Cs., Cor., &c., between Can. Govt. and B.C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Prior*) 2334 (i).

——— ret. Laid on Table, 3959 (ii).

See "Deadman's Island," &c.

Steel Boxes, Interior and Indian Depts., Purchased by Govt., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4182 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

"Strathcona," Str., Relief of Destitute Miners, Arrangement with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 9179 (iii).

Surveys Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5849 (ii).

——— Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).

Treaty with N. W. T. Indians and Half-Breeds; in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).

Wade, Mr. F. C., Emplymt., Amounts, &c., Paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1830 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7442 (iii).

——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7242. 7320, 7442 (iii).

Walsh, Maj., Authority for Commission Issued, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4269 (ii).

——— Instructions by Govt. as Commissioner, Rep. of Interview at Skagway, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3078, 3258 (i).

Walsh, Philip, Relationship to Major Walsh: Ques. (*Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823 (ii).

Willison, Mr. J. W., Crown Timber Agent, Yukon District: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823, 4270 (ii).

Winnipeg Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).

Wright, Wm., Official in Recording Office at Dawson, Relationship to Editor of Globe: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4270 (ii).

Yukon District, Administrator and Officials, Instructions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Messrs. Wade, McGregor and Norwood, Date of Arrival at Dawson, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).

——— "Bench" and "Creek" Claims, Disputes Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3077 (i).

——— Bennett Hospital, Matron and Medical Supt., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1979 (i),

——— British Yukon Mining Trading and Transportation Company, Claims against Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2905 (i).

——— Bliss, Maj., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3261 (i) 3552 (ii).

——— Commissioner, Maj. Walsh, Alterations in Rep.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2704.

——— instructions and Cor. from Govt. of Can.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).

——— Commissioner Ogilvie, Instructions and Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).

——— Commission of Inquiry, Request from Mr. Ogilvie to Extend his powers, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3080 (i).

——— Dredging for Minerals, Number of Leases (1897) Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3079 (i).

——— Fawcett, Mr., Dismissal as Gold Commissioner; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1878 (i).

——— Freight, Transportation, Guarantee by Contractors, &c.: Ques, (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902 (i).

——— Gold Commissioner, Appnmt.; Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

——— Hunker Creek, Klondike Mining, Application and Grants for Hydraulicing: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2962 (i).

——— Instructions and Cor., between Dom. Govt. and Yukon Council: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2787 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

YUKON DISTRICT INSTRUCTIONS TO MAJ. WALSH: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (ii).

—— INVESTIGATION, MR. OGILVIE'S REP. AND PAPERS RE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2410 (i).

—— laid on Table, 3876 (ii).

—— PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5359 (ii).

—— PURPORT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3820 (ii).

—— PROTEST FROM MINERS' COMMITTEE, COR., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2329 (i).

—— KLONDIKE RIVER BRIDGE, OWNER, TOLLS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902 (i).

—— LAFONTAINE, MR. E., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1958 (i).

—— LIQUOR PERMITS AND SANCTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1859 (i).

—— COR. BETWEEN MR. MARTIN AND MIN. OF INT.: M. for Papers,* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

—— COR. BETWEEN N. W. T. GOVT. AND INT. DEPT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clarke*) 1878 (i).

—— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5667 (ii).

—— ISSUED BY ARCHER MARTIN: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3875 (ii).

—— ISSUED BY MAJ. WALSH: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2789 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2481, 2704.

—— ISSUED BY MR. OGILVIE AND CANCELLED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2908 (i); 3789 (ii).

—— NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3077 (i).

—— NAMES OF CO.'S, &c.: M. for Return* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

—— NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1843 (i).

—— QUANTITY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876.

—— TO MR. PETERS; M. for Cor* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

—— LYNCH, MR. W. H., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., REPS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1847 (i).

—— MAGUIRE, MR. L., JUSTICE, APPNMT. AND ARRIVAL AT DAWSON. &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (i).

—— MINERS GRIEVANCES AGAINST COMPANIES BUYING WATER GRANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3315 (i).

—— AND MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2531 (i).

—— RIGHT TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

—— MINING REGULATIONS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2248 (i).

—— REGULATIONS, PUBLICATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1841 (i).

—— N.W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., conc. 6388 (ii).

—— OFFICIALS, APPNMT. BY GOVT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).

—— BONDS, SECURITIES REGISTERED: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4991 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).

—— GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, NATIONALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— SALARIES, COST OF LIVING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).

—— OGILVIE, MR., CONNECTION WITH BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS CO.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3799 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

YUKON DISTRICT, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3548 (ii).

—— O.C.'s REGULATING MINING CLAIMS BY OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).

—— STEAMBOAT OWNERS, PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

—— SURVEY OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).

—— TESLIN LAKE ROUTE, REPS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 2026 (i).

—— TIMBER INSPECTOR, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— REGULATIONS, ISSUE OF PERMITS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

—— TRANSPORTATION CO., EMPLOYED BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1958 (i).

—— WADE, MR. F. C., DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).

—— INSTRUCTIONS OR PERMISSION TO STAKE CLAIMS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).

—— WALSH, MAJOR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— REPORTS, NUMBER SENT IN AND LAID ON TABLE: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3798 (ii).

—— WATER FRONT, DAWSON, LEASE, &c. TO MORRISON AND MCDONALD: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).

Interior Department Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4892; 2° and in Com., 6397; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Drummond County Ry. Acquisition B. No. 133 (Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 1949, 2792; in Com. on Res., 2843 (i); 3345, 3379, 3560, 3689; 1°, 3765; 2°*m.* 3907, 4152 in Com., 4165, 4733, 3°*m.*, 4899, agreed to (Y. 91; N. 40) 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9726 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

Deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 2792, 2809; (Mr. *Foster*) 2793, 2811; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2793, 2795; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2794, 2823; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2795, 2828; (Mr. *Taylor*) M. to Adjn. House, 2795; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2816; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2817; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2821; (Mr. *Powell*) 2825; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2839 (i).

Deb. in Com. on Res.: (Mr. *Blair*) 2843 (i), 3351, 3709 (ii); (Mr. *Haggart*) 3345; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3377, 3703; (Mr. *Morrison*) 3383; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 3408; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3408, 3425, 3560, 3747; (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3423; (Mr. *Powell*) 3413, 3600; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 3577; (Mr. *Russell*) 3633, 3669, 3707; (Mr. *McLennan*, Glengarry) 3689; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3734; (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 3739; (Mr. *McDougall*) 3743; (Mr. *Morin*) 3744 (ii).

1° *m.* (Mr. *Blair*) 3765.

Deb. on 1°, (Mr. *McDougall*) 3765; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3769; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3771; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3773.

2° *m.* (Mr. *Blair*) 3907, 4152.

Deb. on 2° (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3907, 4164; (Mr. *Foster*) 4152; (Mr. *Kaulback*) 4152; (Mr. *Pope*) 4158; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4168.

In Com. on B.

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 4165; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4165; (Mr. *Blair*) 4165.

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—*Con.*
3° *m.* (Mr. *Blair*) 4733, 4899, 4920, 4925.
Deb. on 3°, (Mr. *Foster*) 4733, 4899 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4733; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4951; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4961; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4961 (ii).
3°, Agreed to (Y. 91; N. 40) 4967 (ii).

—— **Grand Trunk Agreement B. No. 138** (Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 3946; in Com. on Res., 4062; 1°, 4170, 2°, 4171; in Com., 4353, 4554; 3° *m.*, 4966 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9702 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)
Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4062; conc., 4170; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4113, 4164, 4069; (Mr. *Powell*) 4077, 4123; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4125; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4128; (Mr. *Gibson*) 4135; (Mr. *Foster*) 4067, 4144; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4065 (ii).
2° *m.* (Mr. *Blair*) 4171 (ii).
Deb. on 2° (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4171 (ii).
In Com. (Mr. *Blair*) 4353-4476.
Deb. in Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 4354-4476; 4554-4711; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 4356, 4380, 4399, 4435, 4445, 4562, 4571, 4601, 4689, 4710; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4357, 4372, 4418, 4685, 4712; (Mr. *McLennan*, Glengarry) 4357, 4372, 4418, 4589; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4369, 4432, 4470, 4575, 4687; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4367, 4374, 4405, 4434, 4472, 4622, 4647; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4378, 4390, 4670; (Mr. *Powell*) 4392, 4636, 4707; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4401, 4584, 4602, 4636, 4687; (Mr. *Talbot*) 4403, 4405; (Mr. *Marcil*) 4409; (Mr. *McDougall*) 4415, 4692, 4710; (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 4419, 4641, 4668; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4439, 4628; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4448, 4452, 4561, 4600; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4458, 4590, 4607; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4567; (Mr. *Britton*) 4568; (Mr. *Montague*) 4573, 4579, 4643, 4669; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4582, 4620; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4597, 4635, 4649, 4705, 4711; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4597, 4639; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 4611, 4633; (Mr. *Ives*) 4612, 4699; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4612, 4639; (Mr. *Ingram*) 4616; (Mr. *Osler*) 4619; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 4643; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4646; (Mr. *Dugas*) 4649; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4649; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4651; (Mr. *Harwood*) 4653; (Mr. *Monet*) 4654; (Mr. *Mignault*) 4663; (Mr. *Savard*) 4664; (Mr. *Ethier*) 4665; (Mr. *Morin*) 4666; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4673; (Mr. *Davin*) 4677; (Mr. *Mills*) 4678; (Mr. *Gillies*) 4680; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4685 (ii).
3° (Amt.) (Mr. *Foster*) 4966 (ii).
Deb. on Sen. Amts. (Mr. *Blair*) 9702; (Mr. *Haggart*) 9710; (Mr. *McMullen*) 9712; (Mr. *Sproule*) 9715; (Mr. *Foster*) 9716; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9722; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9723 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY: *See* "Railways"—I.C.R.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, WASHINGTON: in Com. of Sup., 5852 (ii).

—— AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Proposal to Expedite (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3779 (ii).

—— BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 1815 (i).

—— CANCELLATION OF MEETINGS AT QUEBEC: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2908 (i).

—— PAR. IN LONDON *Times*) *re* SETTLEMENT OF QUESTIONS (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 3668 (ii).

—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette re* NEGOTIATIONS (Mr. *Wallace*) 3340 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4738 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 8152 (iii).

—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4169 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Prior*) 6936 (ii).

—— PERSONS CONNECTED THEREWITH, NAMES AND EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2180 (i).

—— PROTOCOLS, MINISTER MAY MOVE TO LAY COMMUNICATION ON TABLE ACCORDING TO ENGLISH PRACTICE (Mr. *Speaker*) 4264 (ii).

—— PROTOCOLS: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4259 (ii).

INVERNESS POST OFFICES. CHANGE OF LOCATIONS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3825 (ii).

IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).

IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6741, 7635 (iii).
See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

Iron and Steel Bounties B. No. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*) Prop. Res., 4150, 4967, in Com. on Res., 4989; 1°, 5744 (ii); 2° and in Com., 7638; 3°*, 7644 (iii.) (62 63 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

IRON BOUNTIES, QUANTITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1827 (i).

IRON DOORS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4273 (ii).

ISLE AUX NOIX, FORTIFICATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).

—— LEASE, RENTAL, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2961 (i).

IVES, HON. MR., LATE M. P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7532 (iii).

JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6934, 6933 (iii).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1°*, 2029; 2°*, 2290 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

JAPANESE LABOUR EXCLUSION BILL, B.C. LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4343 (ii).

—— M. to print Cor. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4477 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2536 (i).
See "ANTI-JAPANESE," &c., "JUSTICE."

JEROME, MR. MARTIN, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 6723 (ii); 7194 (iii).

JÉSUS RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAY, PLANS, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Fortin*) 3269 (i).

"JOHN C. BARR," AMERICAN STR., OWNERSHIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8469 (iii).

—— UNDERVALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8218 (iii).

—— VALUATION BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2700 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 3061 (i).

Joint Stock Companies Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Britton*) 1°, 2790 (i).

JUDGES AND POLITICAL PREFERMENTS: Quer. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4484 (ii).
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
JURY, MR. A. F., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 8620 (iii).
JUSTICE:
ADDITIONAL JUDGE, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10191 (iii).
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: conc., 10217 (iii).
—— YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii); 10191 (iii).
—— LIVING EXPENSES OF JUDGES DUGAS AND MAGUIRE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).
—— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).
ALIEN ACT, B. C., COR. WITH B. C. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8220, 8466, 8757 (iii).
—— DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7768 (iii).
—— APPNMT. OF AGENT AT WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 5492 (ii).
—— ENFORCEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii); 10123 (iii).
—— AT HAMILTON: Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 3879 (ii).
—— TORONTO, INSTRUCTION TO AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3084 (i).
—— PAR. IN TORONTO *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 2907 (i).
ANTI-CHINESE AND JAPANESE B. C. LEGISLATION, GOVT. POLICY *re* FOURTEEN STATUTES ALREADY IN FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5859 (ii).
—— DISALLOWANCE OF BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2536 (i).
—— COR. BETWEEN B. C. GOVT. AND DOM.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5206 (ii).
—— DISALLOWANCE, INCOMPLETE RETURN: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5408, 5491 (ii).
—— GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1837 (i).
BETHUNE, MR C. J. R., PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
BINDER TWINE CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS, &C.: Ques (Mr. *Taylor*) 6934 (iii).
—— IMPORTED IN 1899: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8218, 8990 (iii).
—— KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, SALE OF, NAMES OF TENDERERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3944 (ii).
—— OUTPUT OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, TENDERS, PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1825 (i).
—— SALE OF: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9898 (iii).
—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1837 (i).
B. C. JUDGESHIPS, APPNMT., MINUTES OF COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, &C.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1879 (i).
—— LEGISLATION *re* CHINESE AND FOREIGN IMMIGRATION, DISALLOWANCE, &C.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 6838, 6902 (iii).
—— LT. GOVERNOR AND TURNER ADMINISTRATION, AND CAN. GOVT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 2262 (i).
—— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).
—— SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COR. BETWEEN B. C. AND DOM. GOVT. *re* ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN B.C.: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2262 (i).
BROWN, MARION, COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS., COR.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wallace*) 6939 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
CHIEF JUSTICE MCCOLL (B. C.) JUDICIAL RESIDENCE: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).
CHOQUETTE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5097 (ii).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
CLARKE *vs.* THE QUEEN, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5750 (ii).
CLEMENT, MR. W. H. P., RESTRICTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS LEGAL ADVISER TO YUKON COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2332 (i).
COMMISSIONS *re* INVESTIGATIONS AGAINST GOVT. EMPLOYEES, NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, &C., DISMISSALS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2180 (i).
CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4270 (ii).
COULOMBE *vs.* THE QUEEN, ENFORCEMENT OF CONVICTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4479 (ii).
—— TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3946 (ii).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, ONT., RETIREMENT, &C., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1970 (i).
COPYRIGHT BILL AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Roberteon*) 1981 (i).
CROW'S NEST PASS COMMISSION, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1852 (i).
—— ACTION OF GOVT. ON REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1967 (i).
—— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 5831 (ii).
—— INVESTIGATION BY COMMISSIONER, REPS., &C.: M. for Copies* 1878 (i)
—— OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1967 (i).
—— DEATH OF MR. THORNBURY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).
DEVLIN, MR. JAMES, PROSECUTION BY DEPT. OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7218 (iii).
DOMINION POLICE FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 10127 (iii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
EXCHEQUER COURT OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5472 (ii).
GAGNE, HON. MR. JUSTICE, AND CONNECTION WITH LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO., DELAY TO LITIGANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 2189 (i).
GOVERNMENT OF THE N. W. TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iii).
JAPANESE LABOUR EXCLUSION BILL, B. C. LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4343 (ii).
—— M. to print Cor. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4477 (ii)
JUDGES AND POLITICAL PREFERMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4484 (ii).
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 2063 (i); 10119 (iii).
—— REPORT: Inquiry for (Mr. *Clancy*) 4899 (ii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, SUPERANNUATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6379 (ii).
LAW LIBRARY, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
—— FOR YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5469 (ii).
LOTTERIES (ART UNION) IN MONTREAL, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2323 (i).
MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

MANITOBA ELECTION FRAUDS, FURTHER CONSIDERATION IN PUB. ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2479 (i).

—— LEGISLATION, DISALLOWANCE BY DOM. GOVT., PETS., MEMORIALS, &C., FROM EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, PROTESTING, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 288 (i).

—— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).

MANITOULIN ISLAND JUDGESHIP: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

MARTIN, MR. JUSTICE, JUDICIAL RESIDENCE, B.C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3545 (ii).

MEAGHER, THOS., CLAIMS ON U.S. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5474 (ii), 10194 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 5492 (ii).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2742, 2754 (i).

MONTREAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, &C.: Personal Explanation *re* par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Fortin*) 7632 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Madore*) 7224 (iii).

N. W. T., DUAL LANGUAGE, OPINION OF MIN. OF JUS.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).

O'CONNOR & HOGG, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (ii).

ONTARIO COUNTY COURT JUDGE, NAME, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).

PENITENTIARY COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES, PRINTING BY CONVICTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1832 (i).

PETERS, MR. F., AND E. V. BODWELL, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5181 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS BILL, INJURIOUS LEGISATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9596 (iii).

—— OPINION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700 (iii).

—— SUPERIOR COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1845 (i).

QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 9000 (iii).

REVISION OF THE STATUTES, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1881 (i).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).

—— TOTAL COST, CLAIMS UNPAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5484 (ii).

—— REP. OF COMMISSION, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fortin*) 1879 (i).

SKELTON *vs.* THE QUEEN: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Davin*) 7770 (iii).

—— REP. OF MIN. OF JUS. *re* RELEASE: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7441 (iii).

—— REP. OF MIN. OF JUS.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Davin*) 8171, 8217, 8346 (iii).

SPINKS, COUNTY COURT JUDGE, B. C., CHARGES AGAINST: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4172, 4201 (ii).

STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS REPORT: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9837 (iii).

STRONG, HON. CHIEF JUSTICE, EXPENSES *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, QUEBEC, SUMS PAID FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2145 (i).

TANNER, JOHN, CLAIMS AGAINST SPANISH GOVT. FOR DETENTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 4805 (ii).

TURNER ADMINISTRATION, B. C., DISMISSAL BY LT. GOV.: Papers laid on Table, 3950 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

VELDT, RABBI, DISMISSAL AS CHAPLAIN, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10246 (iii).

WENTWORTH *vs.* MATHIEU: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).

YUKON TERRITORIES ACT, REPS. FROM YUKON COUNCIL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2536 (i).

—— DISTRICT, ADMINISTRATION BY MR. OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

—— ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com of Sup., 5468 (ii), 8947, 9002 (iii).

—— APPELLATE COURT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).

—— APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, BONDS, COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4268 (ii).

—— APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, CLERK OF COURT, O. C.'S, BOND CERTIFICATES, &C.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).

—— APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3943, 4268 (ii).

—— APPNMT. OF SECOND JUDGE, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).

—— ALIEN LABOURERS AT LAKE BENNETT, AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1859 (i).

—— BONDS, SECURITIES, &C., REGISTERED UNDER R. S. C., PREPARATION OF PARLT. *re* YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4804 (ii).

—— COUNCIL, NAMES, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).

—— LEGAL ADVISER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— LETTERS FROM AMERICANS *re* ADMINISTRATION: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).

—— LIQUOR IMPORTATIONS, DISALLOWANCE OF ORDINANCE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1638 (i).

—— MAGUIRE, MR. JUSTICE, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE FROM DAWSON: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3959 (ii).

—— ORDINANCES RECEIVED, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

—— REGISTRAR OF TITLES, INSTRUCTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2324 (i).

—— SALARIES, &C., *re* ADMINISTRATION: in Com. of Sup., 8658 (iii).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).

Keewatin. *See* "Administration of Justice."

KENTVILLE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).

KINCARDINE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).

KINGSTON HARBOUR, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).

KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9493 (iii).

—— PENITENTIARY, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6379 (ii).

KLONDIKE RIVER BRIDGE, YUKON, TOOLS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902, 3073 (i).

—— RAILWAY SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8700 (iii).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B No. 103 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE, PREPARATION BY MR. OGILVIE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1827 (i).
KNIGHTS OF LABOUR AND MECHANICS ASSEMBLY, COR., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ingram*) 3149 (i).
KNOWLTON LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 10020 (iii).
KOOTENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
LABELLE, MR. L. V., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1887 (i).
LABELLE AND NOMININGUE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).
Labourers Working Day, Length B. No. 82 (Mr. *Beattie*) 1°, 2036 (i).
LABRECQUE, MR. C. O., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1846 (i).
LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii) 7297 (iii).
——— EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE ROYAL COMMISSION, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
——— FINAL ESTIMATE OF SECTION 3, ENLARGEMENT OF 1875-80: M. for Copies*(Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSION ON WELLINGTON AND G.T.R. BRIDGES: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
——— ROYAL COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION, EXHIBITS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
——— ROYAL COMMISSION, &c., PLANS, PROFILES, &c.: M. for Copies*, (Mr. *McInerney*) 5944 (ii).
LACHUTE AND ST. ANDREWS RAILWAY, COR., CONTRACTS, REPS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Christie*) 4808 (ii).
LAC RIVER BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).
LAFONTAINE, MR. E., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1958 (i).
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9490, 9819 (iii).
LAKE ST. JOHN, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
LAKE ST. LOUIS, REMOVAL OF SHOAL, REPRESENTATIONS FROM SHIPPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2331 (i).
LAND DAMAGES, OXFORD DIVISION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4895; 2° and in Com., 6442; 3°*, 6459 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*. *c.* 17.)
LAND TRANSFERS IN MAN., AND GOVT. AGENTS' SPECULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 4735 (ii).
LANGEVIN, AUGUST, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6561 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, STEEL SHELVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7625, 9938 (iii).
LANG POST OFFICE AND RY. STATION, CARRIAGE OF MAILS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3823 (ii).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).
——— CHAPEL GROVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).
LAROUCHE, MR. WM., POSTMASTER AT LAKE BOUCHETTE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).
LAW LIBRARY, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
——— FOR YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5469 (ii).
LEAKE, MR. J. R., POSTMASTER AT MORTON, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1963 (i).
LEBEL, MR. WENCESLAS CUSTOMS OFFICIAL AND REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).
LEBLANC, MR. A. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1964 (i).
LEGAL ADVISER, YUKON, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
LEGISLATION, SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).
LEGRIS, MR., POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE, INVESTIGATION, REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4272 (ii).
LENOIR, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ret. laid on Table, 4268 (ii).
LEPREAUX, N. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5313 (ii).
LETTERS FROM AMERICANS *re* ADMINISTRATION, YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, B.C., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c., FROM 1895 TO 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2789 (i).
LETTERS OF CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (iii).
LÉVIS FORTS, CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).
——— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 9987.
LÉVIS MAIL SERVICE, NAMES OF CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3554 (ii).
——— MILITARY CAMP, QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS, PERCENTAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 9309 (iii).
——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8468 (iii).
——— STATION IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8220 (iii).
LEVISON BROS., CUSTOMS UNDERVALUATION: in Com. of Sup., 8419 (iii).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (iii).
LIBERATION *See* "Conditional."
LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
——— COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).
——— DISTURBANCE BY MESSENGERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10221 (iii).
——— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 10140 (iii).
LICENSE FEES FOR FISHING TRAPS, ISSUE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2046 (i).
LT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
LIFE SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 3064 (i).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3523, 5116 (ii).
——— SERVICE, B.C., ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).

LIGHT-KEEPERS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *McHugh*) 1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2290; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 95 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2525 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

LINDSAY, HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RY. CO.'S PET.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Standing Orders (Mr. *Henderson*) 1948 (i).

LIQUOR COMMISSION REPORT, TRANSLATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5851 (ii).

LIQUOR PERMITS, COR. BETWEEN MR. MARTIN AND MIN. OF INT.: M. for Papers* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

——— COR. BETWEEN N.W.T. GOVT. AND INT. DEPT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clarke*) 1878 (i).

——— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5667 (ii).

——— IMPORTATIONS, DISALLOWANCE OF ORDINANCE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1638 (i).

——— ISSUED BY ARCHER MARTIN: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3875 (ii).

——— ISSUED BY MR. OGILVIE, DISALLOWANCE BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2908 (i); 3789 (ii).

——— NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3077 (i).

——— ISSUED BY MAJ. WALSH: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2789 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2481, 2704 (i).

——— NUMBER, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1843 (i).

——— NAMES OF CO.'S, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

——— TO MR. PETERS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

——— QUANTITY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876 (i).

——— AND SANCTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1859 (i).

LIQUOR SOLD TO INDIANS, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).

——— TRAFFIC ON INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 5710 (ii).

LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).

LITTLE RIVER, N.S., BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).

Loan Companies B. No. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 6120; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 6391 (ii); in Com., 8475; 3°*, 8477 (iii). (62-63 *Vic. c.* 41.)

LOBSTER COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2319 (i).

——— REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3960 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Remarks (Mr. *McInerney* 2909 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2249 (i).

LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 6561 (ii).

——— P.E.I., SEIZURE OF TRAPS, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Martin*) 5504 (ii).

——— FISHERIES, PROTECTION, REGULATIONS *re*: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 7675 (iii).

LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, I.C.R., NUMBER EMPLOYED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 9697 (iii).

London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s. B. No. 130 (Mr. *Bain*) 1°*, 3647; 2°*, 5358; in Com. and 3°*, 6327 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9961 (iii).

——— LETTER CARRIERS AND STREET RY. TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4483, 4995 (ii).

London Mutual Fire Ins. Co. of Canada B. No. 68 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2152 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)

LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).

LOTTERIES (ART UNION) IN MONTREAL, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2323 (i).

LUMBER CUSTOMS DUTIES: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).

——— IMPORTED INTO U. S. FROM CAN., par. in Toronto *Globe*: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1638 (i).

LYNCH, MR. W. H., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., REPS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1847 (i).

——— REP. REFERRED TO BY MIN. OF INT.: M. for Copy* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3874 (ii).

MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).

MCCORMICK, MR. F. D., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT PELEE ISLAND, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8438 (iii).

MCDONALD, A. R., DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iii).

——— INVESTIGATION INTO CHARGES AGAINST, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1971 (i); 4812 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4811, 5098 (ii).

——— inquiry for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 8757 (iii).

MCDOUGALL, MR. BRUCE, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 7194 (iii).

MCKAY, THOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).

——— INDEBTEDNESS TO GOVT. FOR TIMBER DUES, COLLECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).

MCKEEN'S POINT, CONSTRUCTION OF STORM SIGNALS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3083 (i).

MCKENZIE, F., DISMISSAL FROM FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 5056 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).

MCKENZIE POST OFFICE, MAN., PETS. *re*, &c., NAME OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2185 (i).

MCKEOWN, E., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5487 (ii).

MCLAREN'S CREEK, CONSTRUCTION OF A ROADWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3257 (i).

McLaughlin, R. J., and Farmers of Lindsay *re* Damages by Floods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976, 2321 (i); 4485, 4486, 4499 (ii).

——— Letter of Mr. McLaughlin read (Mr. *Mulock*) 4998, 5005 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. W. D., Dismissal as Lightkeeper from Wood Island, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2327 (i).

McNeil, Stephen, Beaver Cove, Rental Charged by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).

——— Lighthouse-keeper at Richmond, Papers Respecting: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4732 (ii).

Macaulay Point Claims, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9133 (iii).

——— Fortifications, Claims for Compensation, &c.: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Prior*) 3874 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Return (Mr. *Prior*) 5489 (ii).

Machinery at Rivière du Loup, Application by Supt. for Additions: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4481 (ii).

Magdalen Islands, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

——— Mail Service, Contractor's Name, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).

——— Terms of Contract, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2789 (i).

——— and Mainland, Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (iii).

Maguire, Mr. Justice, Appnmt. and Arrival at Dawson, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3959 (ii).

Mail Bags, Contracts between Govt. and Ottawa Supply Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).

——— Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 7331 (iii).

——— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (ii).

——— Service: in Com. of Sup., 7366, 8661 (iii).

——— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7350 (iii); conc., 6390 (ii); 10202 (iii).

——— Jacques Cartier County: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).

——— Pacific Coast, Facilities by Govt.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3254 (i).

——— Yukon District (1898-8) Efficiency of Contractors, Reps., &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2705 (i).

——— between Dawson and Vancouver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

——— registered Letters, &c., Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3792 (ii).

——— returned from Dead Letter Office: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4351 (ii).

Maintenance of Prisoners, Yukon Territory: in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).

Maitland Harbour: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 9185 (iii).

See "Colborne, &c."

MANITOBA:

Allaire, J. P. O., St. Boniface, Man., Claim against Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

C.P.R. and Great North-west Central, Survey of Branch Line: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2532 (i).

C.P.R. Commission, Appnmt. by Govt.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2773 (i).

Christie, Mr. W. J., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept., O. C.'s, Reps., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Roche*) 2393 (i).

——— M. to ref. Papers to Public Accts. Com. (Mr. *Roche*) 3341 (ii).

Costigan, Mr. H. A., and John R. Barrett, Cor. between Dept., &c.: laid on Table, 3875 (ii).

Dominion Lands, Man., Fraudulent Transactions by Officials, par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 4995 (ii).

Fairlie, Mr., Dismissal as Principal of Industrial School: M. for Reps., Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2788 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2532 (i).

Govt. Lands, Man., Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1856 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii)

Jerome, Mr. Martin, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 6723 (ii), 7194 (iii)

Land Transfers in Man., and Govt. Agents Speculations: Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 4735 (ii).

McKenzie Post Office, Man., Pets. *re*, &c., Name of Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2185 (i).

Manitoba and North-western Ry., Miles Constructed, Land Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2900 (i).

Manitoba Election Frauds, Delay in Meeting of Pub. Accts. Com.: M. to Adjn. Hse. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3150 (i).

——— Further Consideration in Pub. Accts. Com.: M (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2479 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3876 (ii).

——— M. that Papers be referred to Pub. Accts. Com. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4054 (ii).

Manitoba Lake, Additional Outlets, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).

——— Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

Manitoba Legislation, Disallowance by Dom. Govt., Pets, Memorials, &c., from Executive Council, Protesting, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2788 (i).

——— Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 5479 (ii).

——— School Question, Cor. with the Holy Father, Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1822 (i).

Martin, Mr. A. F., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 7534 (iii).

Railway Commissioners, Establishment of Board: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2488 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10155 (iii).

St. Norbert, Inundations of Red River, Claims of Owners: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).

School Lands, Man., Stmnt. of Sale: Read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6461 (ii).

Shannon, Thos., Dismissal: M. for Papers* (Mr. *Richardson*) 3338 (i).

Stony Mountain Penitentiary, Commissioner's Report: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9837 (iii).

Virden, Man., Inland Revenue Office: M. for Cor. dropped (Mr. *Roche*) 5313 (ii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

WINNIPEG ELECTORAL DISTRICT AND REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1830 (i).

—— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 8469 (iii).

—— GRAIN EXCHANGE AND FORT WILLIAM HARBOUR, COR. WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*) 1879 (i).

—— HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).

—— LAKE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8079 (iii).

Manitoba and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 157 (Mr. *Hughes*) 1°*, 5205; 2°*, 5536; in Com., and 3°*, 6405 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 75).

MANITOULIN ISLAND JUDGESHIP: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

MARGAREE AND ORANGEDALE MAIL SERVICE, CHANGES, &C., *re* CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3261 (i).

MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

MARINE:

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN, REPORTS, *re* BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4993 (ii).

—— BUOY SERVICE, EXPIRATION OF MR. MCCARTHY'S CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4056 (ii).

"ACADIA," STR., REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5180 (ii).

BUFFALO AND CRYSTAL BEACH FERRY SERVICE, LICENSE AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4994 (ii).

BROTCHIES LEDGE, B. C., LIGHTHOUSE, COMPLETION AND OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2331 (i).

CANADIAN COAST, SURVEYS OF CURRENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1824 (i).

CHEMAINUS, B. C., PILOTAGE LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5312 (ii).

CLARK, H. W., SERVICES AS ENGINEER ON DREDGE "CANADA," &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 8630 (iii)

COASTING LAWS, ENFORCEMENTS, COR. RESPECTING: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3257 (i).

—— REPORT OF CAPT. JOHN IRVING, *re* ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (i).

"DOLPHIN," STR., SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4045 (ii).

—— PURCHASER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1855 (i).

DOM. STEAMERS, INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).

GALLANT, W. A., ENGINEER POINT LEPREAUX, FOG ALARM, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4806 (ii).

GIANT'S TOMB LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).

GOVT. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004 (i); 4719, 5101 (ii).

"GOVERNOR PINGREE" AND "J. B. LOWE," STRS., REGISTRY IN CAN.; Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1856 (i).

GRATUITY TO COMMANDER WAKEHAM: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).

HALIFAX HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*), Halifax) 8920 (iii).

HILLSBORO, N. B., HARBOUR MASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE AND COMMISSIONER'S REP., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2027 (i).

HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i): 5486 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

HUDSON'S STRAITS, NAVIGABILITY, COST OF EXPEDITION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3337 (ii).

I. C. R., REYNOLDS, CAPT., STR. "MULGRAVE" COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5309 (ii).

"JOHN C. BARR" AMERICAN STR., OWNERSHIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8469 (iii).

—— UNDERVALUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8218 (iii).

—— UNDERVALUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3061.

—— VALUATION BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2700 (i).

LIFE SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 3064 (i).

LIGHT-KEEPERS SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3523, 5116 (ii).

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE, B.C., ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).

MCKEEN'S POINT, CONSTRUCTION OF STORM SIGNALS, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3033 (i).

MCMILLAN, MR. W. D., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER FROM WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2327 (i).

MCNEILL, MR., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT RICHMOND, PAPERS RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4732 (ii).

MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2102, 2276 (i).

—— HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).

—— INSURANCE RATES. MAR. PROVS. ADVANCEMENT IN PRICE: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 8922 (iii).

—— REP.: Presented (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1165 (i).

MASTERS AED MATES EXAMINATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3058 (i).

MIDLAND HARBOUR, AMOUNT OF DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).

"MINTO," STR.: in Com. of Sup., 10159 (iii).

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS, REMOVAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004 (i); 4719, 5100; conc., 6363 (ii).

"PINGREE" AND "LOWE" STRS., UNDERVALUATION, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Prior*) 8218 (iii).

POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER: Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. *Gillies*) 3668 (ii).

REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).

REVENUE CRUISERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5602 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3796 (ii).

RUSSELL, MR., DISMISSAL AS STEAMBOAT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 4713 (ii).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5170 (ii).

"SHAMROCK," TUG, AMOUNT PAID JOHN C. KAINE, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5666 (ii).

SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (i).

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4013, 4713 (ii).

STEVESTON, B.C., TIDAL LANDS, APPLICATION FOR LEASES, &C.: Ques.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822, 4058 (ii).

—— M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3373 (ii).

SUPPLIES FOR GOVT. DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
TIDAL SURVEYS IN CANADIAN WATERS, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3795 (ii).
—— SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3050 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3505 (ii).
—— STMNT. OF MINISTER AS TO REMARKS OF ALLAN SS. CAPTAINS, REP. OF CAPT. SPAIN., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3262 (i).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 5116 (ii), 10162 (iii).
See "SUPPLY."
U.S. BOATS REGISTERED AT DAWSON, NAMES, VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2699 (i).
—— CUSTOMS AND CANADIAN VESSELS, REGULATIONS, &c., *re* ENTERING AT AMERICAN PORTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2528 (i).
"VIGILANT" STR., B. C. COAST SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (ii).
WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL AND CHARGES AGAINST, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques, (Mr. *Martin*) 2326 (i).
—— DISMISSAL OF D. MCMILLAN, COR., PETS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Martin*) 4613 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr *Martin*) 10117 (iii).
WRECKS, INVESTIGATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3064 (i).
YUKON, RUSSELL, MR, INSPECTOR OF STEAMBOATS, DISMISSAL, REPS., &c.: M. for Copies (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
MARTEL, MR. P., POSTMASTER AT ST. PRIME, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1964 (i).
MARTIN, MR. A. F., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 7534 (iii).
MARTIN, MR. JUSTICE, JUDICIAL RESIDENCE, B.C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3545 (ii).
MARYSVILLE, N.B., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iii).
MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).
MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3058 (i).
MEAGHER, THOS., CLAIMS ON U.S. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5474 (ii) 10194 (iii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2742, 2754 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 5492 (ii).
MEDALS, GENERAL SERVICE, CLAIMS ALLOWED BY COMMISSION, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5860 (ii).
—— DATE OF ROYAL WARRANTS, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8630 (iii).
—— DELAY IN ISSUE, BOARD OF CLAIMS, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2699 (i).
—— DESIGN APPROVED BY CAN. OR IMPERIAL AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3266 (i).
—— NOTICE IN CAN. *Gazette re* CLASPS, RIBBONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3083 (i).
—— RECOMMENDATIONS BY MILITIA DEPT., TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3945 (ii).
—— FOR LONG SERVICE, REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 7320 (iii).
See CAN. SERVICE, GEN. SERVICE, &c.
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, QUEBEC INDIANS; in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).
MEMBERS ADDRESSING CHAIR: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7214 (iii).
—— APPOINTED TO OFFICE: par. in Victoria *Colonist* (Mr. *Prior*) 6381 (ii).
—— ASKED TO FORMULATE THEIR QUESTIONS SO AS NOT TO MAKE STATEMENTS OF FACTS (Mr. *Speaker*) 4483 (ii).
—— ASKED NOT TO INTERRUPT SPEAKERS (Mr. *Speaker*) 1175 (i).
—— ASKED TO SPEAK TO MOTION BEFORE HOUSE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1565, 1573 (i), 4816 (ii).
—— ASKED TO WTHDRW. STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 1177, 1555 (i), 4006 (ii).
—— ATTENTION CALLED TO PROCEDURE FOR WEDNESDAYS (Mr. *Speaker*) 3269 (i).
—— BREAKING RULES ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY (Mr. *Speaker*) 3558 (ii).
—— CANNOT INTERRUPT WITHOUT CONSENT OF HON. MEM. MAKING SPEECH (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 3226 (i).
—— CANNOT MOVE ADJNMT. TWICE ON ORDER OF THE DAY BEING CALLED (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4551 (ii).
—— CANNOT REFER TO PREVIOUS DEBATE IN ASKING QUESTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3262 (i).
—— CANNOT SPEAK TWICE ON SAME SUBJECT: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3777, 5375, 5376 (ii).
—— DECEASED: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
—— OF THE GOVT., ABSENCE FROM OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1819 (i).
—— INTRODUCED, 4, 421, 2897 (i).
—— MUST ADDRESS THE CHAIR: (Mr. *Chairman*) 9647 (iii).
—— MUST CONCLUDE WITH A MOTION, 3499 (ii), 3754 (ii).
—— MUST CONFINE HIS REMARKS TO MOTION BEFORE HSE. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5402 (ii).
—— MOTION NOT IN ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 3342 (ii).
—— MOVING READING OF BILL: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2918 (i).
—— MUST CONFINE REMARKS TO BILL BEFORE HSE.: (Mr. *Speaker*) 4780 (ii).
—— MUST NOT INTERRUPT WITHOUT PERMISSION OF SPEAKER: (Mr. *Speaker*) 6179 (ii).
—— MUST NOT QUOTE FROM PREVIOUS DEBATE: (Mr. *Speaker*) 7196 (iii).
—— MUST NOT REFER TO PAST DEBATE: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3328 (i).
—— NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification, 1, 338 (i).
—— IN ORDER, TO SPEAK TO MOTION TO GO INTO SUPPLY (Mr. *Speaker*) 8644 (iii).
—— MILEAGE ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 6722 (ii).
—— REMARKS CHECKED, 1871, 1953, 1954, 2733, 2734, 2742, 2794, 2805, 3193, 3224, 3225 (i), 3557, 5493, 6315 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
—— SPEECHES OUT OF ORDER, MUST MAKE A MOTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 3846 (ii).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:
MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 158 (i).
—— Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2026 (i).
—— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2963 (i), 4858 (ii), 9335 (iii).
—— Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7638 (iii).
MESS. BY BLACK ROD, 1 (i); 6930 (iii).
MICHAUD, MR. EUGENE, GRANTING OF RAILWAY PASSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2904 (i).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR, AMOUNT OF DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).
MIDLAND RY. CO.'s BRIDGE SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).
MILITIA:
ACTIVE FORCE, RESIGNATION OF MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5487 (ii).
AGE LIMITS, SERVICE OF LT.-COLS., REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1852 (i).
ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7002 (iii).
AMMUNITION, AMOUNT ISSUED TO 7TH BATTALION, LONDON: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1956 (i).
ANNUAL DRILL: in Com. of Sup., 5055, 5414 (ii); 7002 (iii).
ARMS, AMMUNITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5466 (ii); 9141 (iii).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9125 (iii).
ARMY AND NAVY IMPORTATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8704 (iii).
ARMY SERVICE CORPS, RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPS. OF MAJ. GENERAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 9697 (iii).
ARTILLERY, FORTRESS ARMAMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
—— INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, EXAMINATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2330 (i).
BATE & CO.'s CONTRACT *re* YUKON SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii) 7036, 7124 (iii).
BATTALION, 94TH, INCREASE OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).
BIGGAR, J. L., APPNMT. BY GOVT., QUALIFICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3549 (ii).
BLISS, MAJ. D. C. F., POSITIONS HELD UNDER GOVT., DATE OF APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3261 (i); 3335 (ii).
BOSTON AND ALASKAN TRANSPORTATION CO., CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1823 (i).
BREVET PROMOTIONS, PERMANENT FORCE, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550 (ii).
CANTEENS AND SALE OF LIQUOR, PAR. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Dom. Alliance in Ont.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 7322 (iii).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 7151, 9124 (iii).
CHAMP DE MARS, LEASE, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 2141 (i).
CITADEL, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii).
CLOTHING CONTRACT, &C., AND COR. WITH MR WORKMAN: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5377 (ii).
—— NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4806 (ii).
—— TENDERS, &C.: M. for Copies to be Ref. to Pub. Accounts Com. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysboro) 3874 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 5443 (ii); 7099, 9086, 9126 (iii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
COMPENSATION TO MRS. F. E. STEWART: in Com. of Sup. 9131 (iii).
DEFENCE SCHEME: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).
DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL GRANT BY GOVT. OF TRANSPORT AND ENTRANCE FEES TO LIMITED NUMBER: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2358, 2361 (i).
DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE BEFORE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1839 (i); 1845 (i).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM COMMAND OF 8TH HUSSARS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2898 (i).
—— PAR. IN ST. JOHN *Sun* Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2899 (i).
EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5429 (ii).
ESQUIMALT DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).
FORCE, ARTILLERY INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, EXAMINATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2330 (i).
—— OFFICER APPOINTED IN 1893, REQUIREMENTS AS TO QUALIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).
FREDERICTON SCHOOL, N.B., ADMISSION FOR INSTRUCTION, RECOMMENDATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3335 (ii).
—— RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND INSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3795 (ii).
GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND SWEATING CLAUSE, NUMBER OF CONTRACTS AWARDED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2961 (i).
—— PROHIBITION OF SWEATING: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1975 (i).
HAMILTON RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).
HUSSARS, 8TH, N.B., ANNUAL ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 3072 (i).
IMPERIAL SERVICE AND CANADIAN BRIGADE AND CAN. SEAMEN: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2335, 2352 (i).
ISLE AU NOIX, FORTIFICATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).
—— MILITIA PROPERTY, LEASE, RENTAL, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2961 (i).
LÉVIS FORTS, CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).
—— MILITARY CAMP, QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS' PERCENTAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 9309 (iii).
LISTS AND CERTIFICATES OF QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).
MCKENZIE, F., DISMISSAL FROM FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 5056 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i).
MACAULAY POINT FORTIFICATIONS, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 3874 (ii).
—— CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9133 (iii).
MEDALS, CAN. SERVICE, DELAY IN ISSUE, BOARD OF CLAIMS, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2699 (i).
—— DESIGN APPROVED BY CAN. OR IMP. AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3266 (i).
—— NOTICE IN *Canada Gazette re* CLASPS, RIBBONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3083 (i).
—— RECOMMENDATION BY MILITIA DEPT., TERMS, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3945 (ii).
—— LONG SERVICE, REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 7820 (iii).
—— DATE OF ROYAL WARRANTS, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8629 (iii).
See "Can. Service, Gen. Service, &c."
MILITIA ACT AMENDMENTS, INTENTION OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3551 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

MILITIA AND DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 2070, 2266 (i) 5055; 5857 (ii) 9066; (iii); conc., 6389 (ii).

—— Rep. presented (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 421 (i).

MISCELLANEOUS AND UNFORESEEN EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).

MONUMENTS ON BATTLE FIELDS: in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).

NAVAL BRIGADE RESERVE, &c., ORGANIZED BY CAN. GOVT., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 6048 (ii).

N. W. T. REBELLION (1885), CLAIMS COMMISSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3084, 3102 (i).

OFFICERS APPOINTED IN 1898, REQUIREMENTS AS TO QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).

REGULATIONS *re* FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE, ENFORCEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 8631 (iii).

PENSIONS *re* FENIAN RAID: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).

—— *re* REBELLION, 1885: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).

PERMANENT CORPS, PENSION SYSTEM: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2706 (i).

—— PENSION SYSTEM: on Order being called for Prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2487 (i).

—— QUALIFICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550 (ii).

PETITION, DUFFERIN COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1071 (i).

—— ESSEX COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 803 (i).

—— LANARK COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1639 (i).

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, LEASE, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2026 (i).

PROPERTIES: in Com. of Sup., 5421 (ii).

RIFLE RANGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup.: 7088 (iii).

QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY, DISMISSAL OF LABOURERS, &c.: Ques, (Mr. *Ingram*) 2186 (i).

—— EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques, (Mr. *Claney*) 9699, 9843 (iii).

REGIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS, LISTS SUBMITTED TO PARLT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550 (ii).

—— MEETINGS OF 8TH HUSSARS, ANNUAL REP.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3873 (ii).

REGULATIONS AS TO AGE LIMIT FOR LT. COLS., RETIREMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2183 (i).

—— PRESENTED TO PARLT: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATION GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 7147 (iii).

—— RANGES, B.C., APPLICATIONS, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

—— SALE BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 1817 (i).

ST. JOHN BATTALION, 8TH HUSSARS, CHARGES AGAINST COMMANDING OFFICER, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Domville*) 2026 (i).

SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).

STORES, 8TH HUSSARS, SALE OF BY I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1858 (i).

—— TRANSFER, ORDERS FROM DEPT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2897 (i)

—— in Com. of Sup., 5423 (ii).

—— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 9942 (iii).

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, CLOTHING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6722 (ii); 6932 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, EXPENDITURE SINCE FOUNDATION, REGULATIONS, NUMBER OF GRADUATES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 1879 (i).

—— INSPECTION, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3796 (ii)

—— in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii) 7022, 7140, 9960 (iii).

—— MILITIA STAFF, AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1867 TO 1889: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Domville*) 2029 (i).

STRATHY, MR. J. A. L., REINSTATEMENT AS LT. COL.; Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).

SUSSEX, N.B., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1857 (i).

TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iii).

TRANSPORTATION OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).

VETERANS OF 1864-5, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1853 (i).

—— 1885 AT EDMONTON, ISSUE OF SCRIP AND MEDALS, APPLICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2701 (i).

—— 1866, GRANTING OF MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).

—— 1866 AND 1870, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).

—— 1866, VOLUNTEERS ORGANIZED IN CHICAGO, ELIGIBILITY FOR MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2704 (i).

WARLIKE STORES: in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iii).

WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON, LAND PURCHASED, PRICE, &c.: (Mr. *Calvert*) 1840 (i)

YUKON DISTRICT, DOM. POLICE, NUMBER, DISTRIBUTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

—— FORCE, PROVISIONS AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iii).

—— CHARGES AGAINST FOR MISCONDUCT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes*) 9963 (iii).

—— MR. JUSTICE DUGAS' REPRESENTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1842 (i).

—— STRENGTH OF FORCE, COST OF SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1831, 1841 (i).

—— TRANSPORTATION, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6321, 6339, 7030 (iii).

—— PERMANENT MILITIA, NUMBER, COST OF TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1892 (i).

—— PERMANENT FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Domville*) 1°, 4055 (ii).

MILLER, MR. R. C., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Bennett*) 1974 (i).

MILLTOWN, N. B., APPNMT. OF FISHERY GUARDIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).

MINERS' COMMITTEE, PROTEST FROM, YUKON INVESTIGATION, COR., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2329 (i).

—— YUKON, AGAINST COMPANIES BUYING WATER GRANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3315 (i).

—— YUKON, RIGHT TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

MINING CLAIMS AND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES BY GOVT. OFFICIALS, O.C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).

—— REGULATIONS, YUKON, PUBLICATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1841 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2248 (i).

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY *re* TRANSACTION OF OFFICIAL ADMINISTRATION: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4002 (ii).
—— RETURNS ORDERED BY HOUSE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5410 (ii).
MINT, GOVT., ESTABLISHMENT IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2190 (i).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3106 (i).
"MINTO," STR.: in Com. of Sup., 10159 (iii).
MISTASSINI AND STE. METHODE STOREHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).
MONCTON SHOPS, MACHINERY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 179 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 8752; 2°, and in Com., 9880; 3°*, 9963 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 36.)
Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 2789; 2°*, 3004 (i); on Order for Com., 5897; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 6091; in Com., 6327, 6404; 3°*, 6405 (ii). (62 63 *Vic., c.* 76.)
MONTREAL EXTENSION, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE FROM 1898 TO 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2789 (i).
See "Railways, &c."
MONTREAL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (iii).
—— IMPROVEMENTS, PLANS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2187 (i).
—— JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES: Remarks (Mr. *Madore*) 7224 (iii).
—— personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Fortin*) 7632 (iii).
—— AND LABELLE SERVICE, APPNMT. OF MAIL CONDUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1966 (i).
—— OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4273 (ii).
—— resmd. adjd. Deb. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 4300, 4859 (ii).
—— resmd. adjd. Deb. (Mr. *Casey*) 5360 (ii).
—— POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5859 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1827 (i).
—— DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 6047 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, ADVERTISEMENTS *re* TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2112 (i).
—— REPAIRS, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1974 (i).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
MONUMENTS ON BATTLEFIELDS: in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
MOODY, INSPECTOR, OF N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8219 (iii).
MOONSTONE, ONT., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).
MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7768.
See "Business of the House."
MORRIS, DR., POSTMASTER AT DUNDAS, P.E.I., RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
MORRISON, HUGH, RIVERSIDE, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5310 (ii).
MORTON, POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF MR. J. R. LEAKE, REP. OF INSPECTOR, COR., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2962 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3150 (i).
MOUNT ALBION, P.E.I., MAIL SERVICE, PETS. *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
Mounted Police Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 79 (Mr. *Davin*) 1°m., 2029 (i).
MOUNT STEWART WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5754; conc., 6387 (ii).
MUNGOVAN, P., TEMPORARY CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
See "Supply," &c.
MURRAY BAY AND OUELLE RIVER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
—— AND QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS OF DELAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1960 (i).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *McInnes*) 1°*, 974; 2°m., 2176, 2527 (i).
NAVAL BRIGADE RESERVE, &c., ORGANIZED BY CAN. GOVT., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 6048 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Britton*) 1°*, 700; 2°, 1862; in Com., 1896; 3°*, 2153 (i). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 32.)
—— **B. No. 137** (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 4150; 2°, 6118; in Com. and 3°*, 6119 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9597 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 31.)
NEUFRAGE POND, P.E.I., SURVEY, REPS., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
NEW BRUNSWICK:
BROWN, BARTH., CAMPOBELLO, N.B., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10012 (iii).
CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY, N.B., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3554, 3824 (ii).
—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Foster*) 3873 (ii).
—— SALE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (ii).
CENTRAL RAILWAY OF N.B. AND DEPTS. OF RYS. AND CANALS, COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDIES: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 2788 (i).
CENTRAL RAILWAY CO., N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).
CHEZZETCOOK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10004 (iii).
CURLESS, CHAS. H., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, GRAND FALLS, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4056 (ii).
DICK, ISAAC, FISHERY GUARDIAN, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 7765 (iii).
DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1839 (i).
—— EVIDENCE BEFORE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1845 (i).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM COMMAND OF 8TH HUSSARS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2898 (i).
—— PAR. IN ST. JOHN *Sun*: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2899 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).

FISHING WEIRS, CHARLOTTE CO., LICENSES ISSUED, DATES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ganong*) 2962 (i).

FRANCHISE ELECTORAL ACT, AMENDMENTS BY N. B. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2530 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY SCHOOL, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND INSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3795 (ii).

GALLANT, W. A., ENGINEER POINT LEPREAUX FOG ALARM, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4806 (ii).

GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN AT CHARLOTTE, N.B., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 10010 (iii).

HILLSBORO, N.B., HARBOUR MASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, EVIDENCE AND COMMISSIONER'S REP., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2027 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4732 (ii).

LEPREAUX, N. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5313 (ii).

LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN: in COM. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).

MILITARY SCHOOL, FREDERICTON, N.B., ADMISSION FOR INSTRUCTION, RECOMMENDATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2485, 2699, 2899 (i) 3335 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5056 (ii).

MILITIA, 8TH HUSSARS, N.B., ANNUAL ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 3072 (i).

——— STORES, 8TH HUSSARS, SALE OF BY I.C.R.; Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1858 (i).

——— TRANSFER, ORDERS FROM DEPT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2897 (i).

MILLTOWN, APPOINTMENT OF FISHERY GUARDIAN, Ques.: (Mr. *Ganong*) 4482 (ii).

MONCTON SHOPS, MACHINERY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).

PARKER, CHARLES H., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1972 (i).

PORT MULGRAVE, &c., STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).

REGIMENTAL MEETINGS OF 8TH HUSSARS, ANNUAL REP.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3873 (ii).

ST. JOHN BATTALION, 8TH HUSSARS, CHARGES AGAINST COMMANDING OFFICER, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Domville*) 2026 (iii).

ST. JOHN ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).

——— DEEP WATER TERMINAL FACILITIES: M. for Specifications, Plans, &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1876 (i).

——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

SUBSIDIES BETWEEN ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2900 (i).

SUSSEX, ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1857 (i).

TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 5116 (ii); 10162 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, CHETICAMP AND MRAT COVE: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

VOTERS' LISTS, N. B., PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES AND FRENCH SHORE, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3070 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND REGULATIONS *re* PURCHASE OF BAIT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2696 (i).

——— LIVE BAIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2194 (i); 6938 (iii).

——— SUPPLY OF BAIT, COR., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 9465 (iii).

NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).

NEWSPAPER AGENCIES, LESSEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 1971 (i).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS:

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT, PAR IN TORONTO *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 2907 (i).

APPLES, FRADULENT PACKING, PAR. IN TORONTO *World*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3753 (ii).

B.C. FISHERMEN, SEIZURE OF NETS BY AMERICANS, PAR. IN VICTORIA *Daily Colonist*: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 8633 (iii).

CANADIAN EMIGRATION TO U.S., PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1895 (i).

CANADIAN TROOPS FOR THE TRANSVAAL, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7328 (iii).

DEADMAN'S ISLAND, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness re* LEASE (Mr. *Prior*) 1353, 1640 (i).

"DOROTHY," SEIZURE BY U.S. CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES AT SKAGWAY, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2367 (i).

EMIGRATION TO U.S., PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2115 (i).

GRAIN ELEVATORS N.W.T., PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Tribune*: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5494 (ii).

IMMIGRANTS IN QUARANTINE, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* (Mr. *Sproule*) 2192 (i).

I.C.R. AND SUNDAY TRAFFIC, PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3877 (ii).

——— ROLLING STOCK, ADDITION TO, PAR. IN MONCTON *Star* (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, ALASKAN BOUNDARY AND RUMOURED COMPROMISE, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4738 (ii).

——— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4169 (ii).

——— PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* (Mr. *Prior*) 6936 (iii).

——— PAR. IN LONDON *Times re* SETTLEMENT OF QUESTIONS (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3668 (ii).

——— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette re* NEGOTIATIONS (Mr. *Wallace*) 3340 (ii).

NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CO., &c., PAR. IN *Daily Times*: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Prior*) 6051 (ii).

LEBEL, MR. WENCESLAS, CUSTOMS OFFICIAL AND REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).

LUMBER IMPORTED INTO U.S. FROM CAN., PAR. IN TORONTO *Globe*: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1638 (i).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OFFICE, PAR. IN VICTORIA *Colonist* (Mr. *Prior*) 6381 (ii).

MILITARY CANTEENS AND SALE OF LIQUOR, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen re* DOM. ALLIANCE IN ONT.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 7322 (iii).

MONTREAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, &c.: Personal Explanation *re* par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Fortin*) 7632 (iii).

OUELLET, MR. AGAPIT, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3259 (i).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS—*Con.*
PACIFIC CABLE AND PAR. IN *Citizen re* CONFERENCE BETWEEN SEC. OF STATE FOR COLONIES AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 3268 (i).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION IN REF. TO REMARKS ON COAL OIL PRICES (Mr. *Wallace*) 2247 (i).
—— PAR. IN *La Patrie* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1953 (i).
—— PAR. IN *Mail and Empire re* SPEECH AT PICTON, ONT. (Mr. *Richardson*) 5375 (ii).
—— PAR. IN *Mail and Empire re* YUKON CHARGES (Mr. *Domville*) 1167 (i).
—— PAR. IN *Globe re* MR. FRED PETERS AND YUKON CHARGES (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3337 (ii).
—— PAR. IN MAN. *Free Press* (Mr. *Davin*) 1952 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette* (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 2036 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 701 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star* (Sir *Louis Davies*) 618, 701 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star re* WHARF AT ST. JOHN (Mr. *Blair*) 7326 (iii).
—— *re* BINDER TWINE CONTRACT: par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 7197; M. to Adjn., 7205 (iii).
—— PAR. IN TORONTO *World* (Mr. *Sproule*) 6825 (iii).
—— PAR. IN *United Canada re* APPLICATION FOR MR. COSTIGAN'S SEAT (Mr. *Davin*) 3845 (ii).
PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION, PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9695; M. to Adjn., 9837 (iii).
—— LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHLSAAT: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10220 (iii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN *Daily Patriot*, P.E.I., *re* SWEATING CLAUSE (Mr. *Davin*) 9594 (iii).
—— PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Free Press re* APPNMT. OF MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9180 (iii).
QUICK, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: par. in Windsor *World* (Mr. *Cowan*) 7219 (iii).
SCRIP ISSUED TO THE HALF-BREEDS: par. in Calgary *Herald* (Mr. *Davin*) 7196 (iii).
STEAMSHIP SERVICE BETWEEN P.E.I. AND LIVERPOOL: par. in *Examiner* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3543 (ii).
YUKON ADMINISTRATION, CHARGES AGAINST, PAR IN LONDON *Times*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 6562, 6563 (ii) 6585.
—— PAR. IN LONDON *Times* (Mr. *Davin*) 7535 (iii).
—— PAR. IN *North British Daily Mail*: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 8020 (iii).
NEWSPAPERS ISSUED AND MAILED IN TORONTO AND MONTREAL, WEIGHTS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2787 (i).
NEW TIME TABLE, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4481 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1949, 2°*, 2152 (i); M. for Com., 5042, 5250; in Com., 5262, 5351; 3°*, 5535 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)
NICOLET RIVER BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).
—— PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 3549 (ii).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 974; 2°*, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)
Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert B. No. 10 (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934 (i); in Com., 3842; 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 119.)
NOBLE BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4244 (ii).
—— AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2184 (i).
NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY AND GOVT. SUBSIDIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5666 (ii).
NORTH CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).
Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.'s. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 5096; 2°*, 5536; in Com. and 3°*, 5897 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)
NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY AND COR. WITH MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Prior*) 5510 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Maxwell*)) 3873 (ii).
—— NON-PRODUCTION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER'S TELEGRAM: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5747 (ii).
—— PAR. IN DAILY *Times*: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Prior*) 6051 (ii).
Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1°*, 2107; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3489 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)
Northern Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Bostock*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i); Sen. Amts., 8822 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 131.)
NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, PAYMENT TO QUEBEC GOVT. BY LEGISLATION OF 1884: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3080 (i).
NORTH SYDNEY POSTMASTER, RUMOURED DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4899, 4996 (ii).
N.-W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 5830, 5832, 5834 (ii); 8746 (iii); conc., 6388 (ii).
—— FORCE IN YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (ii).
—— BARRACKS AT BATOCHE, SUPPLIES FOR CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).
—— ISSUE OF SCRIP, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2494 (i).
—— - POLICE REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4995 (ii).
—— SPECIAL CONSTABLES, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1843 (i).
—— VETERINARY SURGEONS: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
N.-W. T., ABANDONED HOMESTEADS, DEWDNEY DISTRICT, CANCELLATION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3074 (i).
—— DUAL LANGUAGE, OPINION OF MIN. OF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).
—— ENTRY GRANT TO W. C. MIDDLETON, BY AGENT AT YORKTON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).
—— EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).
—— EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Douglas*) 1878 (i).

N. W. T. Rebellion (1885) Claims Commission: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davis*) 3084, 3102 (i).
——— Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation: M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2015 (i).
——— Settlers from Ont., Privileges Granted by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2902 (i).
——— Use of French Language: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
Administration of Justice, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 5861, 5893 (ii).
Artesian Borings, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7468, 9055 (iii).
Banff Springs, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
Belley River Bridge, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
Bremner, Chas., Indemnity, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10113 (ii).
——— Claims, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10167 (iii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co., Land Subsidy, Amount selected and still Due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2326 (i).
Commission *re* Half-Breed Claims; in Com. of Sup., 5832 (ii).
Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8196.
——— Trail to Yukon District: in Com. of Sup., 10109 (iii).
Elevator Restrictions and C.P.R., Legislation Respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).
Elkhorn Indian School, Printing Plant, Lease to W. J. Thompson, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3076 (i).
Galician Settlement at Saltcoats, Commissioners Investigation: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6935 (iii).
Government of the N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iii).
Grain Elevators in N.W.T., par. in Winnipeg *Tribune*: on M. for Com of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5494 (ii).
——— Standards, N.W.T., Legislation *re* Inspection, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3829 (ii).
Gratuities to Indians, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
Half-Breed Commission, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
——— N.W.T., Cor., between Mr. McDowall and Govt. *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N. W. Territories: in Com. of Sup., 8084 (iii).
Homestead Law in N. W. T., Interest on Pre-emptions, Memorial from Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3080 (i).
Indians, Man. and N. W. T. Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
——— Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (ii).
——— Treaty with N. W. T. Indians and Half-Breeds; in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).
Industrial and Boarding Schools; in Com. of Sup., 10110 (iii).
——— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iii).
Lt. Gov's. Residence, Regina: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
McKay, Thos., Indebtedness to Govt. for Timber Dues, Collection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2486 (i).
Mining Claims and Homestead Entries by Govt. Officials, O. Cs, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).
Moody, Inspector of N. W. Mounted Police, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8219 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police, Barracks at Batoche, Supplies for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2487 (i).
——— Force *re* Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police: in Com. of Sup., 5830, 5832, 5834 (ii); 8746 (iii).
——— Issue of Scrip, Pets, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2484 (i).
——— Special Constables, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1843 (i).
——— Veterinary Surgeons: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
N. W. T. Abandoned Homesteads, Dewdney District, Cancellation by Govt.; Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3074 (i).
——— Dual Language, Opinion of Min. of Jus.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).
——— Entry Grant to W. C. Middleton, by Agent at Yorkton: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).
——— Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (ii).
——— Expenditure on Capital Account: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Douglas*) 1878 (i).
——— Rebellion (1885), Claims Commission: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3084, 3102 (i).
——— Seed Grain Indebtedness, Cancellation, &c.: M. (Mr. *Davin*) 2015 (i).
——— Settlers from Ont., Privileges Granted by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2902 (i).
——— Use of French Language: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2188 (i).
Ontario Settlers in N. W. T., Privileges granted by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Rosamond*) 6051 (ii).
Prince Albert Mounted Police Barracks, Date of Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8467 (iii).
——— Registry Office, Date of Erection, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8468 (iii).
Public Works, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
Roads and Bridges, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, 10070 (iii).
St. Paul des Metis Colony: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
Saskatchewan Valley Railway Facilities, Res. of N. W. T. Assembly: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3255 (i).
Scrip Issued to Half-Breeds: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii); 7501 (iii).
——— par in Calgary *Herald* (Mr. *Davin*) 7196 (iii).
Seed Grain, &c., to Settlers in N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
——— Liens, Cancellation, Legislation, *re* Res. from N. W. Council: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).
——— Man. and N. W. T. Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
Skelton vs. The Queen: Inquiry for Papers, (Mr. *Davin*) 7770 (iii).
——— Rep. of Min. of Jus.: 8171; M., 8217, 8346 (iii).
——— Rep. of Min. of Jus. *re* Release: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7441 (iii).
Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 8183 (iii).

Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 1°*, 4659; 2°*, 5359, in Com. and 3°*, 6606 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 121.)

NOVA SCOTIA:

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY BASIN, REPORTS *re* BUOYS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Mills*) 4993 (ii).

—— BUOY SERVICE, EXPIRATION OF MR. MCCARTHY'S CONTRACT, &C. Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4056 (ii).

—— Co., PORT GEORGE HARBOUR, PIER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7532 (iii).

—— POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 8989, 9179, 9697 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.; Ques. (Mr *Mills*) 2701 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 2410 (i).

ARICHAT BREAKWATER, N.S., REPAIRS, &C., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).

BABIN'S COVE WHARF, ARICHAT, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii)

BADDECK, EAST BAY, &C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).

—— ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).

BUILDINGS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7613, 9943 (iii).

CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10007 (iii).

CENTRAL RAILWAY, COR. IN DEPARTMENT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5667 (ii).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7704 (iii).

CUSTOMS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (iii).

DESCOUSSE WHARF, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).

DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9947 (iii).

DREDGING, RICHMOND, N.S., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, CLAIMS OF N.S. GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3551 (ii).

ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2332 (i).

FOURCHIE HARBOUR, N.S., DREDGING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).

GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii) 9991 (iii).

—— INSPECTION, &C., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2698 (i).

GRAND NARROWS, LEASE OF PROPERTY: Inquiry for Return (Mr. *McDougall*) 4997 (ii).

HALF-BREED'S COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9056 (iii).

HALIFAX AND PORTO RICO: Mail Subsidy in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).

HALIFAX DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).

—— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 8920 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).

—— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).

HANTSPORT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii) 7698, 9990 (iii).

HUBERT, MISS ANNABELLA, CLAIMS AND PETS.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2534, 3256 (i).

INDIANS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).

I.C.R., MCDOUGALL, MR. BRUCE, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 7194 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

I. C. R., MORRISON, HUGH, RIVERSIDE, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5310 (ii).

—— RESTAURANT AT GRAND NARROWS. COR. *re* CONTRACT, &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McDougall*) 3149 (i).

INVERNESS POST OFFICES, CHANGE OF LOCATIONS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3825 (ii).

IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).

KENTVILLE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).

—— CHAPEL GROVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).

LENOIR, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ret. laid on Table 4268 (ii).

LITTLE RIVER, BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).

MCKEEN'S POINT, CONSTRUCTION OF STORM SIGNALS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3083 (i).

MCNEILL, MR., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT RICHMOND, PAPERS RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4732 (ii).

MCNEIL, STEPHEN, BEAVER COVE, RENTAL CHARGED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).

MARGAREE AND ORANGEDALE MAIL SERVICE, CHANGES, &C. *re* CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3261 (i).

MARYSVILLE, N.S., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iii).

NORTH SYDNEY POSTMASTER, RUMOURED DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4899, 4996 (ii).

PARKER'S COVE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10001 (iii).

PETIT DE GRAT BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).

PICTOU AND CHETICAMP MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).

POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3668 (ii).

POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).

PORT MULGRAVE, &C., IRISH COVE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).

QUARANTINE STATION, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).

ST. PETERS CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3255 (i).

SHAG HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9998 (iii).

SPRINGHILL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).

TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., conc. 6384 (ii).

TRUEMAN, MR, W. H., APPNMT. TO RYS. AND CANALS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 4483 (ii).

VICTORIA COUNTY, N.S., PATRONAGE, &C., PAR. IN NORTH SYDNEY *Herald*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5388, 5398 (ii).

VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).

WHARFS, &C., N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iii).

WINDSOR, ONT., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).

—— N.S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7615 (iii).

OAKVILLE, PIERS AND DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8015 (iii).

OATHS OF OFFICE. *See* "Administration."

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).

OCEAN FREIGHT RATES: M. for Cor., Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davin*) 1861 (i).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2990, 3004(i); 4719, 5100 (ii); conc., 6363 (ii).

O'CONNOR & HOGG, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5861 (ii).

O'DONOHUE, MR. W. T., CARETAKER AT ROBERVAL, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

OFFICIALS, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).

——— APPNMT. BY GOVT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).

——— BONDS, SECURITIES REGISTERED: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4991 (ii).

——— IN GOLD COMMISSIONERS OFFICE, NATIONALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

——— SALARIES, COST OF LIVING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).

OGILVIE, MR., ADMINISTATION BY, INSTRUCTIONS, &c., M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

——— INSTRUCTION AND COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787.

——— REPS. *re* YUKON INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3548 (ii).

——— Inq. for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8387 (iii).

——— PRINTING OF EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier* 5507 (ii).

——— PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5359, 5746 (ii).

——— REPS., PURPORT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3820 (ii).

——— LAID ON TABLE, 3876 (ii).

——— MINERS GRIEVANCES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2531 (i).

——— REP. RECEIVED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3794, 3795 (ii).

——— REP. AND PAPERS *re* YUKON INVESTIGATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*, 2410 (i).

——— CONNECTION WITH BRITISH GOLDIFLED CO.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 3799, 3801 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3799 (ii).

——— RELATIONSHIP TO THE MINISTER OF THE INT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper* 2703 (i).

OIL SPRINGS POSTMASTER, REFUND FOR STOLEN STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (ii).

OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5709.

OMAHA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

ONTARIO, BELMONT AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 (iii); in Com., 9490 (iii).

——— COUNTY COURT JUDGE, NAME, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).

——— PROVINCIAL DEBT, REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3074 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 803; 2*, 1113 (i).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 3150 (i); 2°*, 3492; in Com., 4302; 3°*, 4524 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915, 8918; in Com., 9454, 9529, 9532, 9581, 9780 (iii).

——— CORRECTION IN MIN. OF RYS. SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 9699 (iii).

——— SETTLERS IN N. W. T., PRIVILEGES GRANTED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Rosamond*) 6051 (ii).

ONTARIO:

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iii).

AMMUNITION, AMOUNT ISSUED TO 7TH BATTALION, LONDON: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1956 (i).

BALL, MR. W. D., POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT., DISMISSAL, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Wilson*, 2390 (i).

BALSAM LAKE, REMOVAL OF STONE PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2332 (i).

BATH POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inq. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3877 (ii).

BOTHWELL ELECTION, SPEECH OF THE HON. MR. MILLS IN THE SENATE: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 9896 (iii).

BOWMANVILLE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

BRANTFORD POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT., &c.) Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1968 (i); 8464 (iii).

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9960 (iii).

BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, ATTENDANCE OF CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY WITH PAPERS, &c.: (Mr. *Speaker*) 6821 (iii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6595 (ii).

——— M. to place Documents on Table (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6723 (ii); 6821 (iii).

——— BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3074 (i).

——— MAILING OF VOTERS' LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2482 (i).

——— NAME OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2322 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10069 (iii).

BRUCE MINES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

BUFFALO AND CRYSTAL BEACH FERRY SERVICE, LICENSE AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4994 (ii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9938, 9956 (iii).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7998 (iii).

COLBORNE AND MAITLAND PORTS, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 8633 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 7771 (iii).

——— CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 9310 (iii).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1893 (i).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8002 (iii).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, ONT., RETIREMENT, &c., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1970 (i).

COWAN'S BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).

DARGAVEL, MR. J. B., POSTMASTER AT ELGIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1955 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

DUCEIS INDIAN RESERVE, NEGOTIATIONS *re* SALE OF TIMBER LIMITS, REMOVAL OF INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).

FENELON FALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF SLIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1978 (i).

FISHERY OFFICERS, LEEDS CO., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1818 (i).

GALNA, MR, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8446.

GALT POSTMASTER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3824 (ii).

GANANOQUE PUBLIC BUILDING, HEATING, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1881 (i).

GEORGIAN BAY AND TORONTO SHIP CANAL, PETS., APPLICATIONS, COR., &C.: M. for Cor., (Mr. *Wallace*) 4819 (ii).

GIANT'S TOMB LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).

GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8010 (iii).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8012 (ii).

—— IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1881 (i).

GRAND RIVER FLOODS, GOVT. REPORTS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2536 (i).

HAMILTON RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 5465 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS; in Com. of Sup., 10063 (iii).

HAVELOCK AND OAK LAKE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3824 (ii).

HOGG, W. A., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COLLINGWOOD, CHARGES AGAINST, COMMISSIONER'S REP., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2788 (i).

HOPE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i); 5486 (ii).

HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 6594 (ii).

INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AWARDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).

KINCARDINE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).

KINGSTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).

LANG POST OFFICE AND RY. STATION, CARRIAGE OF MAILS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques (Mr. *Lang*) 3823.

LEAKE, MR J. R., POSTMASTER AT MORTON, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1963 (i).

—— INSPECTOR'S REP., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2962 (i).

LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9961 (iii).

MAITLAND HARBOUR: Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. *Montague*) 9185 (iii).

MANITOULIN ISLAND JUDGESHIP: in Com. of Sup., 10122 (iii).

MCCORMICK, MR. F. D., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT PELEE ISLAND, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8438 (iii).

MCLAREN'S CREEK, CONSTRUCTION OF A ROADWAY: Ques. (Mr *Hughes*) 3257 (i).

MCLAUGHLIN, MR. R. J., AMOUNTS PAID AND DUE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976, 2321 (i).

—— Letter from Mr. McLaughlin read (Mr. *Mulock*) 4998, 5005 (ii).

—— AND FARMERS OF LINDSAY *re* DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 4485, 4486, 4498 (ii).

MEAGHER, CLAIMS AGAINST U. S. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5474 (ii); 10194 (iii).

—— M. for Ret., (Mr. *Cowan*) 2742, 2754 (i).

—— CLAIMS ON U. S. GOVT. FOR FURTHER COMPENSATION: Remarks (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 5492 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MEDALS, GENERAL SERVICE, CLAIMS ALLOWED BY COMMISSION, DISTRIBUTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5860 (ii).

MIDLAND HARBOUR, AMOUNT OF DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).

MILLER, MR. R. C., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1974 (i).

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4273 (ii).

MOONSTONE, ONT., POSTMASTER, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).

NOBLE, MR., AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2184 (i).

OAKVILLE, PIERS AND DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8015 (iii).

OIL SPRINGS POSTMASTER, REFUND FOR STOLEN STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (ii).

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY CO., CORRECTION IN MIN. OF RYS. SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 9699 (iii).

ONTARIO COUNTY COURT JUDGE, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).

ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).

OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 8951 (iii).

OTTAWA SUPPLY CO., AND CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).

OWEN SOUND, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).

PIGEON RIVER, DREDGING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).

—— SWING BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques (Mr. *Hughes*) 2480 (i).

PETITION, DUFFERIN COUNTY, *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1071 (i).

—— ESSEX COUNTY, *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 803 (i).

—— LANARK COUNTY, *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1639 (i).

PORT COLBORNE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).

—— AND PORT DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: Prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3276 (i).

PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9993 (iii).

PORTSMOUTH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10065 (iii).

RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).

—— LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 10153 (iii).

ROSEDALE SWING BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).

—— EXPENDITURE, AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2333 (i).

RYAN & CO.'S CLAIMS *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).

SARNIA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).

SAUGEEN INDIAN RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT., PATRICK SCOTT, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 9699 (iii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).

SCUGOG INDIANS, LIQUOR SOLD, COR. BETWEEN DEPT. AND MR. A. SOPER: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).

—— RIVER, DREDGING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).

SECORD, MR. T. R., SUPT. ON WELLAND CANAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1838.

ONTARIO—*Con.*
SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING WATER, REQUESTS, &c., MADE TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2192, 2248 (i).
SINGLETON, MR. W. R., POSTMASTER AT DELTA, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Taylor*) 1956 (i).
SPROULE, R. J., POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 9179 (iii).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9957 (iii).
ST. THOMAS AND AYLMER MAIL SERVICE, ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 9696 (iii).
SYDENHAM POSTMASTER, IRREGULARITY IN ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 6935 (iii).
SYDENHAM RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8018 (iii).
—— AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3820 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES, PELEE ISLANDS: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (iii).
TOBACCO EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ESTABLISHMENT IN ESSEX CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
—— GROWN IN ESSEX CO., EXCISE DUTIES, &c.: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Cowan*) 2117 (i).
TORONTO, EAST, POSTMASTER, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACANT POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4272 (ii).
—— CUSTOM HOUSE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1849 (i).
—— HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (iii).
—— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
—— P.O., APPNMTS. BY GOVT., NAMES, SALARIES, Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1981 (i).
—— SINCE 1895: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2905 (i).
TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
—— JORDAN, MR. WM., CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).
—— LAND VALUATION, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii))
—— PAYMENT OF WORKMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).
—— PURCHASE OF LAND FOR DAM AT NASSAU: Ques. (Mr. *Kendry*) 1857 (i).
WALKER, POSTMASTER, AT AILSA CRAIG, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3873 (ii).
WELLAND CANAL, ENTRANCE AT PORT COLBORNE, HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) 3997 (ii).
—— "LAKESIDE," STR., INTEREST TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (ii).
WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON, LAND PURCHASED, PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1840 (i).
O. C.'s REGULATING MINING CLAIMS BY OFFICIALS, YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).
ORDER, QUES. OF: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6778.
—— ABUSING THE PRIVILEGES OF MOTION TO ADJOURN: Authorities Quoted (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6591; (Mr. *Speaker*) 6594 (ii).
—— IRREGULARITY OF DEBATE (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 8921 (iii).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. STATEMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5394 (ii).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. WORD "BEAST" (Mr. *Speaker*) 6225 (ii).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. WORD "COWARDLY (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 6157 (ii).
ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. THE WORD "DEMAGOGUE" 9655 (iii).
—— MEMBER ASKED TO WTHDRW. THE WORD "THIMBLE-RIGGER," 9655 (iii).
—— MEMBER IMPUTING MOTIVES: Ruling (Mr. Dep. *Speaker*,) 5882, 6230 (ii).
—— MEMBERS REQUESTED NOT TO INTERRUPT (Mr. *Speaker*) 427 (i).
—— REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN ANOTHER HOUSE, 9897 (iii).
—— REFERENCE TO DEBATE IN COM.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6826 (iii).
—— REFERENCE TO PAST DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. Dep. *Speaker*,) 6753 (ii).
—— ON STATEMENTS MADE GENERALLY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7213 (iii).
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9450 (iii).
ORDINANCES RECEIVED, YUKON COUNCIL, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).
ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).
OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9456 (iii).
OTTAWA BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).
—— BUILDING, VENTILATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
Ottawa City B. No. 187 (Mr. *Fielding*). Prop. Res., 5098 (ii); in Com. on Res., 9186; 1°*, 9197; 2°, 9609; in Com., 9626; 3°*, 9636 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)
OTTAWA CITY INDEMNIFICATION, &c., AND GOVTL. INTENTION TO OTHER CITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6379 (ii).
OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 8991 (iii).
Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. *Champagne*). 1°*, 700; 2°*, 934; in Com., 2150; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2284 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3842 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)
OTTAWA ELECTRIC STREET RY. B. 18: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2318 (i).
Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Champagne*). 1°*, 700; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2524 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)
OTTAWA AND GATINEAU RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9489, 9809 (iii).
—— NOON-DAY GUN, FIRING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i).
—— RIVER, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).
—— WATER POWER, LEASES, TERMINATIONS, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Copp*) 2961 (i).
OTTAWA SUPPLY CO., AND CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).
Ottawa Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°*, 2966 (i); 2°*, 3492 (ii).

OUELLET, MR. AGAPIT, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (MR. *Marcotte*) 3259 (i).
—— SUSPENSION, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1859 (i).
OWEN SOUND, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).
OWEN SOUND AND MEAFORD RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 ; in Com., 9782 (iii).
OYSTER BED, B.C., CLAIMS OF ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO. : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3821 (ii).
—— CULTURE : in Com. of Sup., 4241 (ii).
PACIFIC CABLE BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND AUSTRALIA : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1950 (i).
—— AGREEMENT B. 8383 (iii).
See AUSTRALASIAN.
PACIFIC CABLE AND GOVT. OF B. C., OFFERS RESPECTING : M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).
—— COMMUNICATION FROM B. C. GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 2697 (i).
—— M. to print Papers (Mr. *Casey*) 2963 (i).
—— COR. BETWEEN IMP. AND COLONIAL GOVTS. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casey*) 1879 (i).
—— PAR. IN *Citizen re* CONFERENCE BETWEEN SEC. OF STATE FOR COLONIES AND HIGH COMMISSIONER. : Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 3268 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1352 (i).
PAPERS, YUKON INVESTIGATION : M. to print Papers (Mr. *Sifton*) 4730 (ii).
PAR. IN LONDON *Times*, ADMINISTRATION OF YUKON, (Mr. *Davin*) 7535 (iii).
—— IN NORTH BRITISH *Daily Mail*, YUKON, CHARGES AGAINST : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 8020 (iii).
PARISEAU, MR. C. D., POSTMASTER AT ST. ESPRIT, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1962 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 8704.
—— EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 10140 (iii).
—— EXPOSITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS, SPACE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1829 (i).
PARKER, CHARLES H., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1972 (i).
PARKER'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10001 (iii).
PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY, REWIRING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 9956 (iii).
—— OPENING : Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
—— PROROGATION : Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. read, 10246 (iii).
PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 ; in Com., 9494 (iii).
PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 ; in Com., 9818 (iii).
PASSES ISSUED, I. C. R., SINCE AUGUST, 1896, NAMES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1860 (i).
PATENT OFFICE LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
—— PHOTOGRAPHIC ESTABLISHMENT : in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
" PATENT RECORD " PRINTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
Patents. *See* Penberthy "Robertson," " Williams."
PEDNAULT, MR. P., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &C. ; Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii).
PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res., (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 (iii).
Penberthy Injector Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 141 (Mr. *McGregor*) 1°*, 4340 : 2°*, 5359 (ii) ; in Com., 6878 ; 3°*, 6879 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. No. 173 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 7873 ; 2°, and in Com., 8762 ; 3°*, 8774 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)
PENITENTIARIES, PRINTING BY CONVICTS : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1832 (i).
—— COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
Pension Fund, Dom. Bank Society B. No. 100 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 2409 ; 2°*, 2650 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4302 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)
PENSIONS, *re* FENIAN RAID : in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).
—— *re* REBELLION 1885 : in Com. of Sup., 8750 (iii).
Pensions. *See* "Mounted Police."
PERMANENT FORCE, YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* BINDER TWINE CONTRACT : par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Taylor*) 7197 (iii).
—— M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7205 (iii).
—— CHANGE OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIS PARTY (Mr. *Costigan*) 3555, 3648 (ii).
—— IN REF. TO REMARKS ON COAL OIL PRICES (Mr. *Wallace*) 2247 (i).
—— *re* COR. BETWEEN MINISTERS AND MR. F. PETERS (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4896 (ii).
—— MILITIA EXPENDITURE (Mr. *McNeill*) 1354 (i).
—— PAR. IN "GLOBE" *re* MR. FRED. PETERS AND YUKON CHARGES (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3337 (ii).
—— PAR. IN "LA PATRIE" (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1953 (i).
—— PAR. in "MAIL" AND "EMPIRE" *re* SPEECH AT PICTON, ONT. (Mr. *Richardson*) 5375 (ii).
—— PAR. IN "MAIL" AND "EMPIRE" *re* YUKON CHARGES (Mr. *Domville*) 1167 (i).
—— PAR. IN MAN. "FREE PRESS" (Mr. *Davin*) 1952 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 2036 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL "STAR" (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 701 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL "STAR" (Sir *Louis Davies*) 618, 701 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL "STAR" *re* WHARF AT ST. JOHN (Mr. *Blair*) 7326 (iii).
—— *re* QUESTION AS TO MR. MARK WORKMAN (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4990 (ii).
—— PAR. IN TORONTO "WORLD" (Mr. *Sproule*) 6825 (iii).
—— PAR. IN "UNITED CANADA" *re* APPLICATION FOR MR. COSTIGAN'S SEAT (Mr. *Davin*) 3845 (ii).
—— *re* VOTE ON KETTLE RIVER RY. BILL (Mr. *Prior*) 9595 (iii).
PETERS, MR. F. AND E. V. BODWELL, LEGAL EXPENSES ; in Com. of Sup., 5181 (ii).
PETIT DE GRAT BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).

PETITION, DUFFERIN COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1071.
—— ESSEX COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 803 (i).
—— IRREGULARITY OF: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 421.
—— LANARK COUNTY *re* INCREASE OF MILITIA GRANT: Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1639 (i).
—— RULE OF PROCEDURE (Mr. *Speaker*) 1737 (i).
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection B. No. 131 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*) prop. Res., 3647; 1°, 3749; 2°*, and in Com., 3884; 3°*, 3990 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)
PHILIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res., (Mr. *Blair*) 8914; in Com., 9437 (iii).
PICHETTE, MR., PRIVILEGES AT LÉVIS STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4992 (ii).
PICTOU AND CHETICAMP MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
PIGEON RIVER, Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).
—— SWING BRIDGE, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2480 (i).
PINETTE HARBOUR, P.E.I., Pets. *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2112 (i).
"PINGREE" AND "LOWE," STRS., UNDERVALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8218 (iii).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, EXPIRY OF LEASE, MEMORIALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1835 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2026 (i).
POACHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8347 (iii).
POINTE CLAIRE WHARF, ESTIMATED COST, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2111 (i), 4806 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2962 (i).
POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER: Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. *Gillies*) 3668 (ii).
POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9448 (iii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. *Poupore*). 1°*, 974; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 2152 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)
PONTIAC. *See* "Roman Catholic."
PONTYPOOL AND BOBCAYGEON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*), 8915; in Com., 9447 (iii).
Portage du Fort and Bristol Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Poupore*). 1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4857 (ii).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10071 (iii).
—— RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8915; in Com., 9449 (iii).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE, CARETAKER, SALARY, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2485 (i).
PORT CLYDE AND LOCKPORT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8916; in Com., 9781 (iii).
PORT COLBORNE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).
—— AND PORT DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*), 3276 (i).
PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9993 (iii).
PORT GEORGE, ANNAPOLIS CO., NAME OF POSTMASTER, CHARGE OF IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*), 9697 (iii).
PORT HAWKESBURY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8916; in Com., 9457, 9781 (iii).
PORT HAWKESBURY AND ST. PETER'S RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*), 8914; in Com., 9444, 9772 (iii).
PORT MULGRAVE, &c., STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
—— IRISH COVE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
PORTSMOUTH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10065 (iii).
POSTMASTERS, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 6933 (iii).
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5805 (ii).
POST OFFICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7330; conc., 10202 (iii).
—— DEAD LETTER BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5032, 5052 (ii).
—— DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, &c., NAMES OF THOSE NOT RECEIVING STATUTORY INCREASES SINCE 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hodgins*), 5943 (ii).
—— INSPECTOR'S SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (ii).
—— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7388 (iii).
POST CARDS ISSUED BY P. O. DEPT., QUALITY, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Foster*), 1879 (i).
—— CARDS, &c., ISSUED SINCE JAN., 1897: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*), 1877 (i).
POSTAL NOTES, CONTRACT, COST, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Foster*), 1982 (i).
—— ENGRAVING, PRINTING, &c., TENDERS, &c.: M. for Cor., O.C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Foster*), 1877 (i).
—— LOST THROUGH TRANSMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*), 10226 (iii).
—— STAMP DIES, NUMBER ORDERED BY GOVT., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3943 (ii).
—— REPRODUCTION OF FACSIMILES BY BANK NOTE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*), 2901 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 155 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 5093; 2°, 6102; in Com., 6104; 3°*, 6118 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)
POST OFFICE:
ANNAPOLIS CO., PORT GEORGE POST OFFICE, IRREGULARITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 8989, 9179 (iii).
AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9958 (iii).
BALL, MR. W. D., POSTMASTER AT BATH, ONT., DISMISSAL, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Wilson*) 2390 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3877 (ii).
BATISCAN POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER, COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2320 (i).
—— Rep. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1966 (i).
—— SALARY OF POSTMISTRESS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1970 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR DISTRIBUTING MAIL AT MAPLE BAY PRIOR TO CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3820 (ii).

BERTHIER (*en haut*) POSTMASTER AND EMPLOYERS, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2702 (i).

BILODEAU, MR. JOB., POSTMASTER AT CHAMBORD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

BRANTFORD POSTMASTER, APPNMT., BY GOVT.: Ques (Mr. *Clancy*) 1968 (i), 8464 (iii)

BOURGET, P. A, POSTMASTER AT LÉVIS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

BROOKSIDE, P. E. I., POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).

CHICOUTIMI, POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, PETS., CORS., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2408 (i).

CLIFTON POSTMASTER, P. E. I., COR., PETS., &C.: *re* APPOINTMENT: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).

DARGAVEL, MR. J. B., POSTMASTER AT ELGIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1955 (i).

DAWSON AND VANCOUVER MAIL SERVICE, ARRIVAL DESPATCH, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2961 (i).

DEAD LETTER BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5032, 5052 (ii).

—— CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup.. 5068 (ii).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE TO LEGISLATIVE REPORTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3823 (ii).

GALT POSTMASTER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3824 (ii).

GAUTHIER, JEAN, POSTMASTER AT METABETCHOUAN, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

GUAY POST OFFICE, REVENUE, SALARY PAID TO POSTMASTER VERREAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).

HAVELOCK AND OAK LAKE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3824 (ii).

HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 6562 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 6594 (ii).

INSPECTOR'S SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (ii).

INVERNESS POST OFFICES, CHANGE OF LOCATIONS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3825 (ii).

JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6934, 6933 (iii).

LANG POST OFFICE AND RAILWAY STATION, CARRIAGE OF MAILS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 3823 (ii).

LAROUCHE, MR. WM., POSTMASTER AT LAKE BOUCHETTE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

LEGRIS, MR., POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE INVESTIGATION, REP., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4272 (ii).

LETTER CARRIERS, B.C., NUMBER, SALARIES, &C., FROM 1895 TO 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2789 (i).

LÉVIS MAIL SERVICE, NAMES OF CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3554 (ii).

LONDON LETTER CARRIERS AND STREET RY., TRANSPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4483 (ii).

—— RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION, SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4995 (ii).

MCKENZIE POST OFFICE, MAN., PETS. *re* &C., NAME, OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2185 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

MAGADALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2789 (i).

MAIL BAGS, CONTRACTS BETWEEN GOVT. AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).

MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 7331 (iii).

—— SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7366 (iii).

—— JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).

—— PACIFIC COAST, FACILITIES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3254 (i).

MARGAREE AND ORANGEDALE MAIL SERVICE, CHANGES, &C., *re* CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3261 (i).

MARTEL, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT ST. PRIME, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1964 (ii).

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7388 (iii).

MONTREAL AND LABELLE MAIL SERVICE, APPNMT. OF MAIL CONDUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1966.

MONTREAL POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5859, 6047 (ii).

—— RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1827 (i).

MOONSTONE, ONT., POSTMASTER, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).

MORRIS, DR., POSTMASTER AT DUNDAS P.E.I., RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*. P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).

MORTON POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF MR. J. R. LEAKE, REP. OF INSPECTOR, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2962 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3150 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1963 (i).

MOUNT ALBION, P.E.I., MAIL SERVICE, PETS. *re*, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).

MURRAY BAY AND QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS OF DELAY, &C.: Ques, (Mr. *Casgrian*) 1960 (i).

NEWSPAPERS ISSUED AND MAILED IN TORONTO AND MONTREAL. WEIGHTS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2787 (i).

NORTH SYDNEY POSTMASTER, RUMOURED DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4399, 4996 (ii).

OIL SPRINGS POSTMASTER, REFUND FOR STOLEN STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (ii).

OTTAWA AND CYRVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 8991 (iii).

PARISEAU, MR. C. D., POSTMASTER AT ST. ESPRIT, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1962 (i).

PORT GEORGE, ANNAPOLIS CO., NAME OF POSTMASTER, CHARGE OF IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 9697 (iii).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE CARETAKER, SALARY, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2485 (i).

POSTAGE STAMP DIES, NUMBER ORDERED BY GOVT., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3943 (ii).

—— REPRODUCTION OF FACSIMILIES BY BANK NOTE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*) 2901 (i).

—— NOTES, CONTRACT, COST. &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Foster*) 1982 (i).

—— ENGRAVING, PRINTING, &C., TENDERS, &C.: M. for Cor., O. C.'s. &C.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

—— STAMPS LOST THROUGH TRANSMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10226 (iii).

—— STAMPS, CARDS, &C., ISSUED SINCE JAN., 1897: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

POST CARDS ISSUED BY P. O. DEPT., QUALITY, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1879 (i).

POSTMASTERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup. 5805 (ii).

—— JACQUES CARTIER CO., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933 (iii).

POST OFFICE DEPT., DEAD LETTER BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5032, 5052 (ii).

—— DEPTL. EMPLOYERS, &c., NAMES OF THOSE NOT RECEIVING STATUTORY INCREASES SINCE 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5943 (ii).

—— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7330; conc., 10202 (iii).

—— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7388 (iii).

P. E. I. GRAND VIEW, CHANGES IN MAIL SERVICE, PETS. AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4994 (ii).

—— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).

—— MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN I. C. R. AND CAPE TORMENTINE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2325 (i).

—— AND MAINLAND MAIL SERVICE, ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1838 (i).

—— WINTER MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Martin*) 3124 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iii).

PURPLE STAMPED 2-CENT ENVELOPES, CIRCULATION, ERROR IN PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 3797 (ii).

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF, SALARIES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5944 (ii).

REGISTERED LETTERS STOLEN OFF C. P. R. TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1829 (i).

ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2182 (i).

ST. JOSEPH D'ALMA, POSTMASTER, INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).

ST. THOMAS AND AYLMER MAIL SERVICE, ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 9698 (iii).

SINGLETON, Mr. W.R., POSTMASTER AT DELTA, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1956 (i).

SINTULATA POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 8468 (iii).

—— M. to Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10118 (iii).

SMITH, MR. ABNER, POSTMASTER AT RUSAGORNIS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3256 (i).

SPROULE, R. J., POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 9179.

STAMPED ENVELOPES, 2-CENT, GREEN, NUMBER PURCHASED IN TORONTO, ISSUE OF AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2189 (i).

—— 2-CENT, PURPLE, NUMBER ISSUED AND DISTRIBUTED: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2187 (i).

STAMPS, JUBILEE AND GREATER EMPIRE, STAMP PLATES, COST, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2028 (i).

SYDENHAM POSTMASTER, IRREGULARITY IN ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 6935 (iii).

TORONTO EAST POSTMASTER, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACANT POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4272 (ii).

TORONTO P. O., APPNMTS. BY GOVT., NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1981 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2905 (i).

VICTORIA, B.C., LETTER CARRIERS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1960 (i).

WALKER, POSTMASTER AT AILSA CRAIG, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3873 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

WALMSLEY, ALEX., SUPERANNUATION AS BRITISH MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3797 (ii).

WALTHAM AND CHAPEAU MAIL SERVICE, PET. FROM PONTIAC CO. COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2330 (i).

YUKON MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (ii) 7350 (iii).

—— SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6390 (ii) 10202 (iii).

—— BETWEEN DAWSON AND VANCOUVER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

—— (1898-9) EFFICIENCY OF CONTRACTORS, REPS., &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2705 (i).

—— REGISTERED LETTERS, &c., POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3792 (ii).

—— REGISTERED PARCELS, &c., RETURNED FROM DEAD LETTER OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4351 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE, EMPLYMT. OF MR. BOURASSA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1833, 1958 (i).

—— HARPER, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY, ISSUE OF NOTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1961 (i).

POTASH INSPECTION AND MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 1858 (i).

—— PETS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1878 (i).

POULTRY FEEDING EXPERIMENTS, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).

POWERS, MR. THOS., LEASE OF GOVT. LAND AT LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082, 3259 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) neg. (Y. 41; N. 77.) 7965 (iii).

—— amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7773, 7789, 7840, 7942, 7953 (iii).

Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7790; (Mr. *McNeill*) 7809; (Mr. *Mulock*) 7835; (Mr. *Moore*) 7846; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7852; (Mr. *McMillan*) 7861; (Mr. *Davin*) 7874; (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 7894; (Mr. *Wallace*) 7905; (Mr. *Henderson*) 7915; (Mr. *Rogers*) 7931; (Mr. *Osler*) 7944; (Mr. *McPherson*) 7945; (Mr. *Montague*) 7946; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7950; (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 7955; (Mr. *Broder*, Dundas) 7961 (iii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B., GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8469 (iii).

—— prop. Motion: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8221, 8347 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8221, 8347, 8469; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8222, 8347, 8469; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8222 (iii).

—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8633 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8633, 8634, (wthdn.) 8755; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8638, 8755; Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8639, 8754; (Mr. *Edwards*) 8643; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8754, 8755 (iii).

Preservation of Health. *See* "Public Works."

PRESTON, MR. W. T. R., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8569; Amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) 8578; conc., 10214 (iii).

—— EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6938 (iii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5578 (ii).

PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO INVITATION TO CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION :
——— Par. in Newspaper: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9695; M. to Adjn., 9837, 10220 (iii).
——— LETTER OF PRIME MINISTER TO H. H. KOHLSAAT: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10220 (iii).
PRINCE ALBERT MOUNTED POLICE BARACKS, DATE OF ERECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8467 (iii).
——— REGISTRY OFFICE, DATE OF ERECTION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 8468 (iii).
Prince Albert. *See* "Nisbet."
P. E. I. Ry. (Murray Harbour Branch) B. No. 183 (Mr. *Blair*) 1**, 8989; 2** and in Com., 9750; 3**, 9758 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND :
BEAR RIVER, REMOVAL OF OLD PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 10161 (iii).
BELLE RIVER, SEIZURE OF FISH TRAPS, &C. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2787 (i).
BROOKSIDE. POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: &C ; Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
CARDIGAN BRIDGE, BONDED WAREHOUSE, PETS., COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2961 (i).
CHINA POINT : in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C. : M. (Mr. *Martin*) 2485 (i).
——— M. for Ret* (Mr. *Martin*) 3148 (i).
CLIFTON POSTMASTER. COR., PETS. &C., *re* APPNMT.; M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).
CUSTOMS REFUND FOR DUTIES PAID ON FISH: in Com. of Sup., 10114, 10169 (iii).
FISHING BOUNTIES, NAMES OF PERSONS, AMOUNT PAID, &C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 5861 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT AMT. BILL (P.E.I.) ABSENT FROM ORDER PAPER : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 9308 (iii).
GRAND VIEW, CHANGES IN MAIL SERVICE, PETS., AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4994 (ii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).
LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 6561 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*, P.E.I.) 6122 (ii).
——— SEIZURE OF TRAPS, &C. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Martin*) 5504 (ii).
——— INFRACTION OF REGULATIONS, FINES IMPOSED, COST OF PROSECUTIONS, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 5377 (ii).
MORRIS, DR., POSTMASTER AT DUNDAS, RESIGNATION, &C. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
MOUNT ALBION,, MAIL SERVICE, PETS. *re* &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1969 (i).
MOUNT STEWART WHARF,: in Com. of Sup., 5754; conc., 6387 (ii).
NEUFRAGE POND, SURVEY, REPS. &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).
NEWS AGENTS : in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iii).
P.E.I. AND DOM. GOVT., DELEGATION *re* QUESTIONS AT ISSUE, CLAIMS, STMNTS., &C. ; M. for Copies* (Mr. *Martin*) 1879 (i).
——— AND G.B., COLD STORAGE AND SS. COMMUNICATION, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 5493 (ii).
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*
P. E. I. AND I. C. R., STEEL RAILS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1876 (ii).
——— MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN I.C.R. AND CAPE TORMENTINE, COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2325 (i).
——— ARRANGEMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1838 (i).
——— MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8683, 8687 (iii).
——— PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).
——— RY. AND BRANCH LINES, PETS., COR., &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Martin*) 2364, 2368 (i),
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 9211 (iii).
——— STRAIGHTENING CURVES AT NORTH WILTSHIRE, COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1854 (i).
PINETTE HARBOUR, P. E. I., PETS., *re* DREDGING, Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2112 (i).
QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.), APPNMT. OF JUDGE : Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 9000 (iii).
ROLLING STOCK, CURVES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iii).
SCRIMGEOUR, J. G., GRANT OF BONDED WAREHOUSE, DATE OF LEASE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).
SOURIS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES, BY MESSRS. MELLISH AND WRIGHTMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4270 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 8180 (iii).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &C. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Martin*) 3124 (i).
WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, AND CHARGES AGAINST, REP. OF COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2326 (i).
——— M. for Copies (Mr. *Martin*) 4813 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 10117 (iii).
PRINTING BUREAU : in Com of Sup., 8703 (iii).
——— AND SUNDAY LABOUR : Remarks (Mr. *Guillet*) 3879 (ii).
PRINTING, JOINT COM. : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 531 (i).
——— 3RD REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. *Gibson*) 5745 (ii).
——— 4TH AND 5TH REP. OF COM. : M. Conc. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5378 (ii).
——— 7TH REP. OF COM. : M. Conc. (Mr. *Gibson*) 8913 (iii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS : in Com. of Sup., 5850 (ii).
——— AND STATIONERY, P. O. DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iii).
PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2182 (i), 5378 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 894 (i).
——— COMMITTEE, MEETING DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE : M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 8751 (iii).
——— SEL. COMMITTEE, REDUCTION OF QUORUM : M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 4729 (ii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE : M. to Employ Stenographers (Mr. *Fortin*) 7193 (iii).
——— M. to print Evidence (Mr. *Fortin*) 7194 (iii).
——— M. to sit concurrently with Sessions of the House (Mr. *Fortin*) 7771 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. *Fortin*) 9461 (iii).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE, ABSENCE OF MINISTERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9182 (iii).
——— REP. OF COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10115; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10115 (iii).
——— Stenographer's Fees, 9462 (iii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF: Insertion of Remarks in *Hansard* by Min. of Public Works (Mr. *Davin*) 421 (i).
——— PAR. IN *Daily Patriot*, P.E.I., *re* SWEATING CLAUSE (Mr. *Davin*) 9594 (iii).
——— PAR. IN WINNIPEG *Free Press re* APPNMT. OF MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9180 (iii).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2408, 2265.
PROCEDURE ON CALLING ORDERS OF THE DAY: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2118 (i).
——— FOR RETURNS, MOTION *re*: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3560 (ii).
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ROYAL COMMISSION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1885.
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, DISCUSSION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9466 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) 5359 (ii).
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*).
Deb. (Mr. *Flint* 8782; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8805: (Mr. *Charlton*) 8814; (Mr. *Christie*) 8822; (Mr. *Moore*) 8823; (Mr. *McClure*) 8840, (amt.) 8850; (Mr. *McNeill*) 8851; (Mr. *Parmalee*) 8852, (amt.) 8856; (Mr. *Broder*) 8856; (Mr. *Craig*) 8864; (Mr. *Bell*, P E.I.) 8869; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8879; Mr. *Wilson*) 8883; (Mr. *Richardson*) 8889; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 8891; (Mr. *Davin*) 8896; (Mr. *Roche*) 8901; (Mr. *Holmes*) 8905; (Mr. *Henderson*) 8906; (Mr. *Logan*) 8909 (iii).
——— M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 2037 (i).
Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2039, 2045; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2040; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2040; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2041; (Mr. *Davin*) 2043: (Mr. *Mulock*) 2043; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2043; (Mr. *Casey*) 2044; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2044; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2045 (i).
PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, AMOUNT PAID AND BALANCE DUE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5859 (ii).
——— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1814 (i).
——— BAGOT CO., UNPAID CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1967 (i).
——— EXPENSES IN MONTREAL CITY, AMOUNTS UNPAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5312 (ii).
——— POLL BOOKS, VOTERS' LISTS, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Moore*) 2906 (i).
——— RET. OF VOTES POLLED, PAPERS, &C.: Request that they be laid on Table (Mr. *Foster*) 1894, 1895 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2037 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2041, 2045 (i).
——— COSTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2321 (i).
——— LEEDS CO., REP. OF RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1848 (i).
——— AND QUEBEC COUNTIES: Reports asked for (Mr. *Moore*) 5748 (ii).
——— QUEBEC PROV., POLL BOOKS, RET., &C., LAID ON TABLE (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7320 (iii).
——— SPEECH OF MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AT OTTAWA CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 1826 (i).
PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 10246 (iii).
PROVISIONS AND SUPPLIES, YUKON FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCTS. COMMITTEE, DELAY IN MEETING: M. to Adjn. House (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3150 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7195 (iii).
——— MEETINGS DURING SITTING OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 8780 (iii).
——— MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2604 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2964 (i).
——— POSTPONEMENTS AND HOURS OF MEETING, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4344 (ii).
——— REDUCTION OF QUORUM: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4347 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10116 (iii).
——— M. to Print Evidence (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10116 (iii).
——— 3RD REP. OF COM.: Conc. (Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough) 4147 (ii).
——— 6TH REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) Guysborough) 9836 (iii).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (iii).
Public Works, Preservation of Health B. No. 105 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 2604 (i); 2°, 7645; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7675 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
PUBLIC WORKS:
ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iii).
ANNAPOLIS CO., PORT GEORGE HARBOUR, PIER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7532 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2410, 2701 (i).
ANSE A BEAUFILS, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, INSPECTION OF PUBLIC WORKS, 1886, COST OF TRIP: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2789 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188 (i).
——— TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
ARICHAT BREAKWATER, N.S., REPAIRS, &C., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).
BABIN'S COVE WHARF, ARICHAT, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).
BADDECK, N.S., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2111 (i).
BAIE DES HONFLEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1001. (iii).
BAIE ST. PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 8104 (iii).
BANFF SPRING, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
BATISCAN RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3552 (ii).
BEAR RIVER, REMOVAL OF OLD PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10161 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

BEAUHARNOIS WATER POWER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1883 (i).
BELLEY RIVER BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
BELŒIL PUBLIC WORKS, TOTAL COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).
BERNIER, MR. N., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., conc., 10204 (iii).
BERTHIER (*en haut*) PUBLIC WORKS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1893, 2703 (i).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
BOIVIN, GEDÉON, CONTRACT FOR STONE AT RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4061 (ii).
BOWMANVILLE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY: in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).
B.C., PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 8085, 8190 (iii).
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9960 (iii).
BRONTE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup,, 10069 (iii).
BRUCE MINES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7613, 9943 (iii).
—— ONTARIO: in Com. of Sup., 7611, 7621, 9938, 9956 (iii).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).
CAMPBELLTON WHARF; in Com. of Sup., 10012 (iii).
CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10007 (iii).
CAP SANTE: in Com., of Sup., 8105 (iii).
CHARLESON, MR., J. B., O.C., APPOINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9699 (iii).
—— SURVEYS, &c., FOR TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
—— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8106 (iii).
CHEZZETCOOK WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 10004 (iii).
CHINA POINT, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).
——, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. (Mr. *Martin*) 2485 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3148 (i).
CLAREAU, MR., J. A., CLAIMS FOR MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHICOUTIMI OR STE. ANNE'S WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).
COLBORNE, PORT, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 9310 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 8633 (iii).
—— REPORTS OF ENGINEERS, &c: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 7771 (iii)
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8002 (iii).
——'ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1893 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENT, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION SYNDICATE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 3752 (ii).
CONTRACTS LET WITHOUT TENDER SINCE JUNE 1896: M. for O.C.'s, (Mr. *Davin*) 5314, 5348 (ii).
COSTE, MR., EXPEDITION TO ENG. INSTRUCTIONS, COR., REPS., &c.: M. for Papers* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4997 (ii)
COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10030 (iii).
—— CONTRACT FOR DREDGING, PAPERS, LETTERS, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2026 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7704 (iii).
COWAN'S BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
DAVIS, EDWARD, SLIDE MASTER AT COULONGE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3946 (ii).
DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9947 (iii).
DESCOUSSE WHARF, N.S., COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5486 (ii).
DOMINION PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).
DONAHUE, W., CONTRACT FOR TIMBER FOR DREDGE AT ROBERVAL, &c.: Ques (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).
DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
—— PLANT, MAR. PROVS. AND B.C.: in Com. of Sup, 8137, 10070 (iii).
—— RICHMOND, N.S., AMOUNT EXPENDED FROM 1891 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5485 (ii).
—— SALARIES, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).
DRILL HALL, VANCOUVER, B.C., CONTRACT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Prior*) 5487, 6122 (ii), 7765 (iii).
DRY DOCK, VICTORIA, B.C., PETS., *re* REDUCTION OF CHARGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7766 (iii).
EDMONTON AND YUKON ROUTE, INSTRUCTIONS TO MESSRS. DIBBLEE AND DUPONT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).
EDMONTON BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8196 (iii).
—— TRAIL TO YUKON DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 10109 (iii).
ELECTRIC LIGHTING, GAS, &c., OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9989 (iii).
—— OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5183, 5308, 6386 (ii), 9939 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).
ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2332 (i).
ESQUIMALT (B.C.), DRY DOCK, REDUCTION OF RATES, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6122 (ii).
FENELON FALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF SLIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1978 (i).
FIREWORKS, &c., *re* DEMONSTRATION ON PREMIER'S RETURN: in Com. of Sup., 8111 (iii)
FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8088 (iii).
FOUECHIE HARBOUR, N.S., DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).
GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii), 9991 (iii).
—— INSPECTION, &c., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2698 (i).
GANANOQUE PUBLIC BUILDING, HEATING, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1881 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8010 (iii).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8012 (iii).
—— IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1881 (i).
GOVT. PROPERTY (B.C.) LEASE, &c., COR., RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8465 (iii).
—— RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8991 (iii).
GROSS, MR. BOAZ, HARBOUR MASTER AT HILLSBORO', PAPER RESPECTING: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4732 (ii).
HALIFAX DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9943 (iii).
—— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).
HANTSPORT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C. in Com. of Sup., 8085 (iii).
—— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 8102 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 10010 (iii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup, 5198 (ii) 7698, 9990 (iii).
—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8084 (iii).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 7966, 10065 (iii).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7557. 8103, 10014 (iii).
—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8105 (iii).
—— WORKS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5201 (ii).

HERNS, JOHN, CARETAKER NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING, COR. *re* DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Wilson*) 5377 (ii).

INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1880 (i).

IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5198 (ii).

IRON DOORS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4273 (ii),

JÉSUS RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAY, PLANS, PAPERS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Fortin*) 3269 (i).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).

KENTVILLE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iii).

KINCARDINE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii).

KINGSTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).

KLONDIKE RAILWAY SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8700 (iii).

KNOWLTON LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 10020 (iii).

KOOTENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).

LABREQUE, MR. C. O., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1846 (i).

LAKE ST. JOHN, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).

LAKE ST. LOUIS, REMOVAL OF SHOAL, REPRESENTATIONS FROM SHIPPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2331 (i).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, BALANCE DUE CONTRACTOR: in Com. of Sup., 9938 (iii).
—— STEEL SHELVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7625 (iii).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.; Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).
—— CHAPEL GROVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2904 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 9987 (iii).
—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8468 (iii).
—— STATION IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8220 (iii).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (iii).

LT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).

LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8014 (iii).

LITTLE RIVER, N.S., BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3944 (ii).

LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9961 (iii).

LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).

MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

MAITLAND HARBOUR: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 9185 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

MANITOBA LAKE, ADDITIONAL OUTLETS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8077 (iii).
—— DRAINAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

MARYSVILLE, N.B., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iii).

MISTASSINI AND STE. METHODE STOREHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2028 (i).

MONTREAL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, PLANS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2187 (i); 9964 (iii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, ADVERTISEMENTS *re* TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2112 (i).
—— REPAIRS, &c., NAME OF CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1974 (i).

MOUNT STEWART WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup. 5754; conc., 6387 (ii).

NEUFRAGE POND, P.E.I., SURVEY, REPS., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3873 (ii).

NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).

NICOLET RIVER PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 3549 (ii).

NORTH CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).

NORTHERN COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH CO., AND COR. WITH DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Maxwell*) 3873 (ii).
—— COR. WITH MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Prior*) 5510 (ii).

OAKVILLE, PIERS AND DREDRING: in Com. of Sup., 8015 (iii).

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3965 (i).

O'DONAHUE, MR. W. T., CARETAKER OF ROBERVAL, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1957 (i).

OTTAWA BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 8147 (iii).
—— RIVER, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9176 (iii).
—— RIVER WATER POWER, LEASES, TERMINATIONS, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Copp*) 2961 (i).
—— SUPPLY CO. AND CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2185 (i).

OWEN SOUND, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).

PARKER'S COVE WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 10001 (iii).

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY, REWIRING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9956 (iii).

PETIT DE GRAT BREAKWATER, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1886 (i).

PIGEON RIVER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).
—— SWING BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2480 (i).

PINETTE HARBOUR, P.E.I., PETS. *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2112 (i).

POINTE CLAIRE WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2962.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2111 (i), 4806 (ii).

POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10071 (iii).

PORT COLBORNE AND PORT DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Prop. Res. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3276 (ii).
—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 9993 (iii).

PORTSMOUTH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10065 (iii).

POWERS, MR. THOS., LEASE OF GOVT. LAND AT LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3259 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii), 7557, 7536 (iii).

—— AGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (iii).

—— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8085, 8190 (iii).

—— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iii).

—— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 5203 (ii), 7536, 7557 (iii).

—— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5072, 5085 (ii).

—— INSPECTION, EXPENSES OF TOUR, NAMES OF STRS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1880 (i).

—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).

—— ONTARIO: in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iii).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iii).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2112 (i).

RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8016 (iii).

READING ROOM, VENTILATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).

RECORDS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SAFETY OF, REP. OF COMMISSION: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1878 (i).

RIDEAU HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7693 (iii).

—— ADDITIONAL WING: in Com. of Sup., 9958 (iii).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).

—— CHARGES AGAINST MR. CHAMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1884 (i).

RIVIÈRE LA PIPE AND FERIBONKA WHARFS, EMPLYMT. OF LABOURERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii).

—— WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).

—— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1891 (i).

ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).

—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, 10070 (iii).

ROBERVAL HARBOUR, DREDGING, MR. DONAHUE'S CONTRACT FOR SCOWS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2028 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).

ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Poupore*) 2789 (i).

ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10006 (iii).

ROSEDALE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).

—— SWING BRIDGE, EXPENDITURE, AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2333 (i).

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10155 (iii).

ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9957 (iii).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE CHANNEL IMPROVRMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1852 (i).

—— LAKE SURVEY AND SERVICES OF STRS. *Alert* AND *Alaska*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1878 (i).

STE. GENEVIÈVE, LAND DAMAGES, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6934 (iii).

ST. JOHN ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

—— DEEP WATER TERMINAL FACILITIES: M. for Specification, Plans, &c.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1876 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, LENGTHENING: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1882 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL PROTECTION TO NAVIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3343 (ii).

—— NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, CONTRACT FOR POLES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

—— AND CANALS, DEEPING OF NAVIGATION, &C., CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2788 (i).

—— RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, NORTH CHANNEL, CONTRACTS, PLANS, &C.: M. for Copies* ((Mr. *Taylor*) 1877 (i).

—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5086 (ii), 9986 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8219 (iii).

ST. MAURICE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).

ST. NORBERT, INUNDATIONS OF RED RIVER, CLAIMS OF OWNERS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).

ST. OURS' LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).

ST. PIERRE RIVER, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

SABREVOIS WHARF, CONC., 10026, 10219 (iii).

SAPPER'S BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).

SARNIA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).

SCUGOG RIVER, DREDGING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).

SHAG HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9998 (iii).

"SHAMROCK," TUG, AMOUNT PAID JOHN KAINE, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5666 (ii).

SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup. 8178 (iii).

SOURIS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES BY MESSRS. MELLISH AND WIGHTMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4270 (ii).

SPRINGHILL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).

STEEL BOXES, INTERIOR AND INDIAN DEPTS., PURCHASED BY GOVT., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4482 (ii).

STEVESTON, B.C., TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3544 (ii).

STIKINE-TESLIN ROUTE, SURVEY, REP. OF ENGINEER; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1885 (i).

SUPPLIES FOR GOVT. DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iii).

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).

SYDENHAM RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8018 (iii).

—— AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3820 (ii).

TATE'S DRY DOCK, MONTREAL, RENT, LESSEES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1851 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ANTICOSTI, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

—— ATLIN, B C., AND TESLIN LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 10099 (iii).

—— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (iii).

—— CABLES, &C., ST. LAWRENCE SHORES: in Com. of Sup., 8181 (iii).

—— CHETICAMP AND MEAT COVE: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

—— NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i).

—— N.W. TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 8183 (iii).

—— PELEE ISLANDS: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

TELEGRAPH LINES, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 8180 (iii).
—— ST. LAWRENCE SHORE; in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
—— SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
—— YUKON AND B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10193 (iii).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 9259 (iii).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF MINISTER OF PUB. WORKS AND PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1880 (i).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6384 (ii).
TOWER AND POST OFFICE CLOCKS, PARLT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE IN LIGHTING, INVENTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 6381 (ii).
—— COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 6121 (ii).
TORONTO HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (iii).
—— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup.: 5179 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).
—— WATER POWER, DEEPENING OF BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).
VANCOUVER DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
—— CONTRACT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5487 (ii).
VENTILATION READING ROOM: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
VICTORIA AND MONTREAL HARBOURS, GRANTS BY DOM. GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1877 (i).
VICTORIA HARBOUR, REP. OF RESIDENT ENGINEER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3828 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE, OLD SITE, OWNERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4269 (ii).
—— SAFES, ELEVATORS, &c., TENDER FOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1887 (i).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6385 (ii).
VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
WESTERN DEPTL. BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 9950 (iii).
—— RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup, 5089 (ii).
WHARFS AND PIERS CONSTRUCTED BY DOM. GOVT. IN SEVERAL PROVINCES SINCE 1867: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gillies*) 6939 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5861 (ii).
WHARVES, &c., N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iii).
—— REVENUE, &c., STMNT. PROMISED: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10221 (iii).
WINDSOR, ONT., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
—— N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 7615 (iii).
WINNIPEG GRAIN EXCHANGE AND FORT WILLIAM HARBOUR, COR. WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*) 1879 (i).
—— LAKE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8079 (iii).
YAMASKA LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
YUKON—KLONDIKE RIVER BRIDGE, TOOLS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3073 (i).
—— MESSRS. COSTE AND LAFONTAINE'S INSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1893 (i).
—— M. to refer papers to Pub. Accounts Com. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5429 (ii).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5360 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

YUKON TELEGRAPH LINES, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6047, 6120 (ii).
—— TELEGRAPH LINE FROM SKAGWAY AND DAWSON, COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN MINISTERS AND ENGLISH SYNDICATE, U. S. GOVT., &c. *re* CONSTRUCTION: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
—— SKAGWAY AND DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINE, CONSTRUCTION BY ENGLISH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3073 (i).
—— TELEGRAPH LINES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (iii).
"QUADRA," STR., PAYMENT OF CREW AND OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3076 (i).
QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii).
—— STATION, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii), 8090 (iii).
—— ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
—— SERVICE, EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 3826 (ii).
QUEBEC BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8919; in Com., 9571 (iii).
—— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2112 (i).
—— CARTRIDGE FACTORY, DISMISSAL OF LABOURERS, &c.: (Mr. *Ingram*) 2186 (i).
—— EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9699, 9843 (iii).
—— CITY MAIL SERVICE AND I.C.R., MEMORIALS, &c., FROM BOARD OF TRADE AND CITY COUNCIL: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1879 (i).
—— AND GASPÉ BASIN, MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 8686, 10157 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. No. 91 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 2182 (i); 2°* *m.*, 3914; in Com., 3915; 3° *m.*, 3985; agreed to (Y. 80; N. 40) 3990; Sen. Amts. 6100 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

—— **B. No. 178** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 8751; 2°, 9683; in Com., 9861; 3°*, 9880 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 35).

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNT EXPENDED AND LOANS ADVANCED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5309 (ii).
—— BILL, INJURIOUS LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9596 (iii).
—— OPINION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700 (iii).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9456, 9780 (iii).
QUEBEC AND MANCHESTER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8695 (iii).

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co's B. No. 84 (Mr. *Carroll*) 1°*, 2108; 2°*, 2524 (i); in Com., 5041, 5249; 3°*, 5250 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 85).

Quebec Steamship Co's. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Malouin*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2697 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 125).

QUEBEC SUPERIOR COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gasgrain*) 1845 (i).

QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) APPNMT. OF JUDGE : Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 9000 (iii).

QUESTIONS, FORM OF ASKING : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2322, 2484 (i).

QUICK, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : par. in Windsor *World* (Mr. *Cowan*) 7219 (iii).

QUEBEC :

ANSE À BEAUFILS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).

ANSE AUX GASCONS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 8103 (iii).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, COR. BETWEEN BRITISH GOVT. AND CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).

—— INSPECTION OF PUBLIC WORKS, 1898, COST OF TRIP, &c. : M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2789 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188 (i).

—— TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

ATWATER AVENUE, REBUILDING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, EXPENSES, &c. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

—— AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1843 (i).

BAIE DES HONFLEUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10019 (iii).

BAIE ST. PAUL : in Com. of Sup., 8104 (iii).

BATISCAN POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER, COR., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1966, 2320 (i).

—— SALARY OF POSTMISTRESS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1970 (i).

BATISCAN RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3552 (ii).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL : in Com. of Sup., Conc., 10120 (iii).

—— DAMAGE TO FARM LANDS BY OVERFLOW : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4859 (ii).

—— DISMISSALS : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5411 (ii).

—— LOCK LABOURERS, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3267 (i).

—— STEEL BRIDGE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iii).

—— WATER POWER, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1883 (i).

BELOEIL PUBLIC WORKS, TOTAL COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).

BERNIER, MR. N., DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., Conc., 10204 (iii).

BERTHIER (EN HAUT) POSTMASTER AND EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2702 (i).

—— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c., POSTMASTER'S SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1893 (i).

—— PUBLIC WORKS, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2703 (i).

BILODEAU, MR. JOB, POSTMASTER AT CHAMBORD, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

BILODEAU, MR. L. P., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3336 (ii).

BLAIS, MR. J. C., AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3545 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

BOIVIN, GEDEON, CONTRACT FOR STONE AT RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4061 (ii).

BOLDUC, MR. A. : in Com. of Sup., 5798 : conc., 6387 (ii).

BOURGET, P. A., POSTMASTER AT LÉVIS, INCREASE OF SALARY : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iii).

CAP SANTE : in Com. of Sup., 8105 (iii).

CARTRIDGE FACTORY : in Com. of Sup., 7151, 9124 (iii).

CATTLE INSPECTION, &c., AT HEBERTVILLE, COR. *re* APPOINTMENT OF DR. HALL : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5944 (ii).

CHAMBERLAND, MR. F. F., CHARGES AGAINST, LETTER FROM ACHILLE LEBEL : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2900 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, EMPLYMT. OF GEO. PEPPIN BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3821 (ii).

—— INVESTIGATION ; Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3553 (ii).

—— TELEPHONE LINES : in Com of Sup., 5782 (ii).

CHAMBORD CUSTOMS OFFICE, SALARIES, COLLECTIONS, EXPENSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1850 (i).

CHAMP DE MARS, LEASE, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 2141 (i).

CHICOUTIMI, POSTMASTERS DISMISSAL, PETS., COR., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2408 (i).

CITADEL, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

CLAREAU, MR. J. A., CLAIMS FOR MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHICOUTIMI OR STE. ANNE'S WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10030 (iii).

—— CONTRACT FOR DREDGING ; PAPERS, LETTERS, &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2026 (i).

COLPRON, MR. JOS. N., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. FOR SERVICES PERFORMED, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2191 (i).

CONSTANTIN, DR. JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).

DAVIS, EDWARD, SLIDEMASTER AT COULONGE, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3946 (ii).

DEMERS, MAJOR, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1833 (i).

DONAHUE, W., CONTRACT FOR TIMBER FOR DREDGE AT ROBERVAL, &c. : (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).

DUCHESNE, DR. J. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1887 (i).

FLUHMAN, DR., MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS AT POINTE BLEUE, PETS. *re* DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4060 (ii).

FRASERVILLE HARBOUR AND BOARD OF TRADE RESOLUTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1968 (i).

GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 8685 (iii).

—— CUSTOMS OFFICER AND ELECTIONS, CHARGES AGAINST : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10222 (iii).

GAUTHIER, JEAN, POSTMASTER AT METABETCHOUAN, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4059 (ii).

GOUIN, MR. LOMER, SPEECH *re* SUBSIDIES TO PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1961 (i).

GRENVILLE CANAL, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES, &c. : Ques. (Mr *Taylor*) 4992 (ii).

GUAY POST OFFICE, REVENUE, SALARY PAID TO POSTMASTER VERRAULT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).

HUMBERSTONE POST OFFICE, CHARGES AGAINST JAMES C. ROSE, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 6562 (ii).

QUEBEC--*Con.*

HERNS, JOHN, CARETAKER NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING, COR. *re* DISMISSAL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Wilson*) 5377 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).

I. C. R., BLANCHETTE, MR. EUGENE, REINSTATEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5859 (ii).

—— DEMERS, DR., RY. BICYCLE RIDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5308 (ii).

—— MICHAUD, MR. EUGENE, GRANTING OF RY. PASSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2904 (i).

—— TROIS PISTOLES, DISMISSAL OF PIERRE MICHAUD AND F. BELANGER, COR., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Foster*) 5945 (ii).

—— VALCOUER, OCTAVE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5309 (ii).

ISLE AUX NOIX, FORTIFICATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).

—— MILITIA PROPERTY, LEASE, RENTAL, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 2961 (i).

JACQUES CARTIER CO. MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).

JÉSUS RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAY, PLANS, PAPERS, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Fortin*) 3269 (i).

KNOWLTON LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10020 (iii).

LABELLE, MR. L. V., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID TO, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1837 (i).

LABREQUE, MR. C. O., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1846 (i).

LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii) 7297 (iii).

LACHUTE AND ST. ANDREWS RY., COR., CONTRACTS, REPS., &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Christie*) 4808 (ii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8116.

LAKE ST. LOUIS, REMOVAL OF SHOAL, REPRESENTATIONS FROM SHIPPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2331 (i).

LANGEVIN, AUGUST, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6561 (ii).

LAROUCHE, MR. W., POSTMASTER AT LAKE BOUCHETTE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1962 (i).

LEGRIS, MR., POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE, INVESTIGATION, REP., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4272 (ii).

LÉVIS FORTS, CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).

—— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 9987 (iii).

—— MAIL SERVICE, NAMES OF CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3554 (ii).

—— MILITARY CAMP, QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS, PERCENTAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 9309 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8468 (iii).

LONDON LETTER CARRIERS, RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 4995 (ii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

—— MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 2113 (i).

—— TERMS OF CONTRACT, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2789 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933, 6934 (iii).

MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8133 (iii).

MARTEL, MR. P., POSTMASTER AT ST.-PRIME, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1964 (i).

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5669 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

MISTASSINI AND STE. METHODE STOREHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &C., NAME OF CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).

MONTREAL AND LABELLE MAIL SERVICE, APPNMT. OF MAIL CONDUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1966 (i).

MONTREAL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (iii).

—— PLANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2187 (ii).

—— POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5859 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE, DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 6047 (ii).

—— REPAIRS, ADVERTISEMENTS *re* TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1974, 2112 (i).

—— RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1827 (i).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5090 (ii).

MURRAY BAY AND OUELLE RIVER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).

—— AND QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS OF DELAY, &C. Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1960 (i).

NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10014 (iii).

NICOLET RIVER PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris* 3549 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, PAYMENT TO QUEBEC GOVT. BY LEGISLATION OF 1884: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3080 (i).

O'DONAHUE, MR. W. T., CARETAKER AT ROBERVAL, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

PARISEAU, MR. C. D., POSTMASTER AT ESPRIT, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1962 (i).

PEDNAULT, MR. P., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii).

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, EXPIRY OF LEASE, MEMORIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1835 (i).

—— M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2026 (i).

POINTE CLAIRE WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2962 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2111 (i); 4806 (ii).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10071.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE CARETAKER, SALARY, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2485 (i).

POSTMASTER, JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6933 (iii).

POWERS, MR. THOS., LEASE OF GOVT. LAND AT LÉVIS, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082, 3259, 3299 (i).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2112 (i).

—— CARTRIDGE FACTORY, DISMISSAL OF LABOURERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 2186 (i).

—— EMPLOYERS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9699, 9843 (iii).

—— HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNT EXPENDED AND LOANS ADVANCED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5309 (ii).

—— BILL, INJURIOUS LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9596 (iii).

—— OPINION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700 (iii).

—— SUPERIOR COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1845 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3796 (ii).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8135.

—— CHARGES AGAINST MR. CHAMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1884 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

RIVIÈRE LA PIPE AND PERIBONKA WHARFS, EMPLYMT. OF LABOURERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii).

RIVIÈRE À LA PIPE, WHARF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).

—— COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1891 (i).

ROBERVAL, DREDGING SCOWS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).

—— MR. DONAGHUE'S CONTRACT FOR SCOWS: M. for Cor.* (Mr *Casgrain*) 2028 (i).

ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 1854 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Poupore*) 2789 (i).

SABREVOIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10026; Conc., 10219 (iii).

STE. GENEVIÈVE, LAND DAMAGES, REP. OF COMMISSIONER, Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6924 (iii).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1852 (i).

ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2182 (i).

ST. JOSEPH D'ALMA, POSTMASTER, INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).

ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, LENGTHENING: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1882 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PROTECTION TO NAVIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3343 (ii).

—— NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, CONTRACT FOR POLES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).

—— RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, NORTH CHANNEL, CONTRACTS, PLANS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1877 (i).

—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5086 (ii); 7557, 9936 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8219 (iii).

—— CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).

ST. MAURICE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).

ST. METHODE AND MISTASSINI, WHARFS, CONSTRUCTION OF SHEDS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2028 (i).

ST. OURS LOCK, DISMISSAL OF SUPT. CODERRE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3552 (ii).

ST. PIERRE RIVER, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).

SAMSON, MR. PIERRE, CARETAKER AT ST. JOSEPH DE LEVIS FORT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).

SCOTT ACT REPEAL, BROME COUNTY, APPLICATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 2187 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2117 (i).

—— ARBITRATION, LAND VALUATORS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2333 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).

—— CONTRACTS: M. for Cor., Notices, &c. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1861 (i).

—— SECS. 1 AND 2, CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i); 9701 (iii).

—— SECS. 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Cor., O. Cs.,* &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, QUEBEC, SUMS PAID FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2145 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

TATE'S DRY DOCK, MONTREAL, RENT, LESSEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1831 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ANTICOSTI, RENEWAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

—— CABLES, &c., ST. LAWRENCE SHORES: in Com. of Sup., 8181 (iii).

—— NORTH SHORE OF ST. LAWRENCE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i).

—— ST. LAWRENCE SHORE: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).

TOBACCO (CAN.) MANUFACTURE, NUMBER OF FACTORIES, MEMORIALS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2027 (i).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, PAYMENTS TO MR. F. D. MOORE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii).

VALLEYFIELD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5501 (ii).

—— LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1815 (i).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).

—— WATER POWER, DEEPENING OF BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).

VERRAULT, JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3555 (ii).

VILLE MARIE BANK SUSPENSION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 9065 (iii).

WALTHAM AND CHAPEAU MAIL SERVICE, PET. FROM PONTIAC CO. COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2330 (i).

WENTWORTH *vs.* MATHIEU: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).

YAMASKA LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).

YULE BRIDGE, RICHELIEU RIVER, ARBITRATOR'S AWARD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Davin*) 1°, 1952 (i).

—— **B. No. 85** (Mr. *Blair*) 1°, 2108 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3503 (ii); in Com., 9731; 3°*, 9749 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

—— **B. No. 97** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2247 (i).

—— **Passes (Members and Senators) Issuing B. No. 39** (Mr. *Bostock*) 1°*, 1073; 2°m., 2195 (i).

—— **Subsidies Authorization B. No. 190** (Mr. *Blair*) Prop. Res., 8914; in Com. on Res., 9197, 9310, 9466, 9532; 1°*, 9597; 2°, 9758; in Com., 9759; 3°, 9893 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 9197, 9311-9459, 9467-9594; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 9198; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9204, 9337, 9366, 9435, 9450, 9471, 9478, 9492, 9512, 9543, 9551; (Mr. *Sproule*) 9205, 9328, 9468, 9485, 9544; (Mr. *Richardson*) 9206, 9349, (amt.) 9363, 9425, (amt.) 9531; (Mr. *Davin*) 9208, 9337, 9429, 9468, 9486, 9518, 9530; (Mr. *Foster*) 9311, 9332, 9469, 9500, 9561; (Mr. *Wallace*) 9312, 9398, 9467, 9479, 9532, 9567; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9315, 9423, 9470, 9494, 9517, 9553; (Mr. *Montague*) 9315; (Mr. *Haggart*) 9319-9458, 9468, 9472; (Mr. *Cochrane*) 9321, 9470; (Mr. *Maclean*) 9323, 9362, 9382; (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 9330; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9330, 9578, 9585; (Mr. *Mulock*) 9337, 9356, 9431, 9480, 9587; (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 9343; (Mr. *Wood*) 9355, 9401; (Mr. *Macdonell*, Selkirk) 9355; (Mr. *Sifton*) 9357, 9467, 9473; (Mr. *Osler*) 9363; (Mr. *Oliver*)

Railways Subsidies—*Con.*

Deb. in Com. on Res.—*Con.*

9372, 9435, 9454, 9495, 9504, 9529, 9593; (Mr. *McMullen*) 9375, 9546; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 9383; (Mr. *Frost*) 9389; (Mr. *Davis*) 9393, 9586, 9588; (Mr. *Rogers*) 9395, 9583; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 9400; (Mr. *Prior*) 9406, 9499; (Mr. *Meigs*) 9437; (Mr. *Britton*) 9440, 9494, 9590; (Mr. *Calvert*) 9441; (Mr. *Ingram*) 9442, 9493, 9570, 9777; (Mr. *Monk*) 9442, 9544, 9555, 9577; (Mr. *Casey*) 9443; (Mr. *Campbell*) 9443; (Mr. *Fielding*) 9444; (Mr. *Monet*) 9446; (Mr. *McHugh*) 9447; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9449; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 9452, 9488, 9580; (Mr. *McLennan*, Glengarry) 9456; (Mr. *McCormick*) 9457, 9494; (Mr. *Hughes*) 9460, 9543, 9580; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9489; (Mr. *Beattie*) 9491; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 9500, 9518, 9539, 9583; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9507; (Mr. *Domville*) 9509; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 9544; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9544; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9548; (Mr. *Charlton*) 9549; (Mr. *Morin*) 9569; (Mr. *Ellis*) 9591 (iii).

2°m. (Mr. *Blair*) 9758 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9758; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9759 (iii).

In Com. on B. (Mr. *Blair*) 9815 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9759, 9819; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9760, 9771, 9813; (Mr. *Maclean*) 9760; (Mr. *Richardson*) 9761; (Mr. *Wallace*) 9762, 9783; (Mr. *McMullen*) 9767, 9806; (Mr. *Haggart*) 9767; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9767; (Mr. *Foster*) 9770, 9786, 9810; (Mr. *Fielding*) 9768, 9778; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 9767; (Mr. *Paterson*) 9768, 9782; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9771; (Mr. *Mills*) 9777; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 9781; (Mr. *Sproule*) 9785, 9807; (Mr. *Davin*) 9792; (Mr. *Mulock*) 9797; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9828; (Mr *Campbell*) 9830; (Mr. *McGregor*) 9831; (Mr. *Beattie*) 9833; (Mr. *McLennan*, Glengarry) 9834 (iii).

3°m., 9893 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Clancy*) (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 12, N. 47) 9894 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. back to Com., 9894 (iii).

RAILWAYS:

Ashcroft, B.C., Sale of Ry. Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1855 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Sale, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (i).

Car Equipments, Standard Couplers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).

—— Lighting System: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).

—— Official or Private, Number, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1835 (i).

C.P.R. Act (1881) Power Respecting Branch Lines: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3315 (i).

—— Branch Lines, &c., Power respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 9309 (iii).

—— Contract with A. Onderdonk, Awards by Arbitrators. *re* value of Rolling Stock, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 5944 (ii).

—— Land Damages: in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iii).

—— Mileage Tariff on Hay, Straw, &c., Approval by O.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4057 (ii).

Compensation to Octave Ouellette: in Com. of Sup., 9127 (iii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Mr. Thornbury: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).

—— Rep. of Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1967 (i).

Drummond County Railway Res.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Haggart*) 2249 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Dunn Avenue, Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1857 (i).

Government Rys., Tenders for Oil, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

—— Working Expenses for May and June, 1898, &c.: Ques. ((Mr. *Foster*) 4810 (ii).

G. T. R. Trackmens' Strike: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3774 (ii).

—— and Alien Labour Law Enforcement: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3960, 3984 (ii).

—— Settlement, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4501 (ii).

—— cor., respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4730 (ii).

—— Letter from Mr. Deane: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 4786 (ii).

—— Papers, Inquiry for *re* Settlement (Mr. *Clarke*) 4858 (ii).

—— Rumoured Settlement: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5206 (ii).

Indiantown Branch, Awards, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).

I.C.R. Accommodation at Lévis: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

— Addition to Workshops at Rivière du Loup: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4480 (ii).

—— Alba Section, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5310 (ii).

—— Appnmt. of Supt. W. A. Dube, Location of Headquarters: Ques. Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2533 (i).

— Cars Constructed and Purchased by Govt., Name of Firm, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3945, 4479 (ii).

—— Cars Purch. sed, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3553 (ii).

—— and C.P.R., Running Privileges between St. John and Halifax: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2247 (i).

—— Chaudière to Montreal, Revenue Collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1856 (i).

—— Contracts for Ties, Names of Tenderers: Ques. Mr. *Monk*) 5308 (ii).

—— Delay in furnishing Cars, Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1853 (i).

—— Drawback, Payments of, on Freight Charges, Amount paid for Jan. and Feb., 1899, M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).

—— Drawbacks on Freight Charges on N. S. Portion since 1898: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 5945 (ii).

—— Earnings (gross) and Working Expenses from 1898 to 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*: 2027 (i).

—— Employees at Lévis and Provincial Election Transfer, &c., Instructions to Mr. Desjardins: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3260 (i).

—— Employees' Working Hours, Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr, *Gauvreau*) 1974 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 1860 (i).

—— Expenditure on Capital and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2531 (i).

—— Extension to Montreal, Amount accrued and Paid to G. T. Ry. Co. since July, 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4478 (ii).

—— car mileage for Victoria Bridge, Incomplete Return (Mr. *Foster*) 4858 (ii).

—— papers respectings car mileage: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 4891 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

I.C.R. Flour Rates and Car Mileage, &c.: Papers laid on Table (Mr. *Blair*) 4730 (ii).

—— Fraserville Station Accommodation, Pets. from Board of Trade, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1972 (i).

—— Pets. *re* disorderly conduct: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2899 (i).

—— Freight Carried from 1897-99, Number of Tons and Receipts: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3257 (i).

—— Freight Rates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7457 (iii).

—— Freight Rates on Flour, 1897-98: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3549 (ii).

—— Gillis, Frank A., Station Agent at Tracadie, N.S., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4056 (ii).

—— Gosselin, Mr. F., Emplymt. by Govt., Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 3827 (ii).

—— and Govt. Rys., Cars, Locomotives, Number, Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2028 (i).

—— and G.T.R., Engine and Car Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4811 (ii).

—— and G.T.R., Combined Engine and Car Mileage,-Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret., (Mr. *Foster*) 5313 (ii).

—— Green Sand Castings, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5860 (ii).

—— Gross Earnings and Expenses: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1849 (i).

—— Harris, Mr., Agreement with as Traffic Manager: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 1975, 1980 (i).

—— Harris, Mr. A. H., Appnmt. by Govt.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2905 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Pope*) 2961 (i).

—— Headquarters at Lévis, Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3551 (ii).

—— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).

—— Increased Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9163 (iii).

—— Land Damages, Oxford Division: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).

—— Leblanc, Mr. A. T., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1964 (i).

—— Lévis Station Improvements, Amount Expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8220 (iii).

—— Locomotive Engineers, Number Employed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 9697 (iii).

—— McDonald, Mr. A. R., Dismissal as Supt.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1971 (i); 4811, 4812, 5098 (ii); in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 8757.

—— Machinery at Rivière du Loup, Application by Supt. for Additions: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4481 (ii).

—— Moncton Shops, Machinery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (ii).

—— Montreal Extension, Expenditure, Revenue from 1898 to 1899: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2789 (i).

—— Newspaper Agencies, Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 1971 (i).

—— New Time Table: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4481 (ii).

—— Number of Employees, Wages Paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 2332 (i).

—— Original Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

I.C.R., Ouelette, District Supt., Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1859 (i).

—— Passes Issued since August, 1896, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1860 (i).

—— Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis Station: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4992 (ii).

—— and P. E. I. Rys., Steel Rails, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1814 (i).

—— M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1876 (i).

—— and Quebec City Mail Service, Memorials, &c., from Board of Trade and City Council: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1879 (i).

—— Rates on Flour, Car Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4731 (ii).

—— Receipts and Expenditures, Stmnt. of Accounts: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2791 (i).

—— Removal of Shops from Rivière du Loup to Lévis: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2533 (i).

—— Restaurant at Grand Narrows, Cor. *re* Contract, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McDougall*) 3149 (i).

—— Revenue Collected between Chaudière and Montreal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2027.

—— Reynolds, Capt., Str. "Mulgrave," Complaints against: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5309 (ii).

—— Roberge, Cyrille, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1857 (i).

—— Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5754 (ii).

—— addition to: par. in Moncton *Star* (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).

—— expenditure: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6562 (ii).

—— St Charles Branch, Claims for Expropriation or Purchase of Land, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 3873 (ii).

—— St. John Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).

—— Salaries at Rivière du Loup Workshops: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4480 (ii).

—— Siding Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9156 (iii).

—— Snow Shovelling, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1964 (i).

—— Starr and DeWolfe's Contract, Rep. of Mr. Shanley, C.E.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2962 (i).

—— Steel Rails, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2328 (i).

—— Tariffs, Special Rates, Reps. of Mr. Harris: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Pope*) 2961 (i).

—— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7456 (iii).

—— Ocean Freight Rates: M. for Cor., Reps, &c. (Mr. *Davin*) 1861 (i).

—— P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch: in Com. of Sup., 9211 (iii).

—— News Agents: in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iii).

—— Rolling Stock, Curves, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iii).

—— Railways and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 2250, 2276 (i), 7153, 7455 (iii); conc., 6382 (ii); 10201 (iii).

—— - miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iii).

—— Ry. Commission Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1890 (i).

—— establishment of a Board: Debate rsmd., (Mr. *Bostock*) 3849 (ii).

—— committee of the Privy Council, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10156 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
I. C. R., MAIL SERVICE, SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF, SALARIES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5944 (ii).
—— POLICY OF GOVERNMENT *re* YUKON RAILWAYS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4736, 4740 4744 (ii).
—— RULES AND REGULATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10155 (iii).
—— LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5748.
—— REGULATIONS, AMERICAN STANDARD, ADOPTION BY CAN. RYS.: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 1969 (i).
—— SUBSIDIES IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1898, SUMS PAID TO PROV. OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3267 (i).
—— SUBSIDIES, RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8633, 9064, 9185 (iii).
SNOWBALL, HON. MR., CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).
"VICTORIA," GOV. GEN.'S CAR: in Com. of Sup., 5785 (ii).
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, 22ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 9209 (iii).
RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD: prop. Res. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2488 (i).
—— Deb. Rsmd. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3849 (ii).
—— APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1890 (i).
—— COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10156 (iii).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Report presented (Mr. *Blair*) 249 (i).
—— LEGISLATION *re* WORKING RULES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5748 (ii).
—— MAIL SERVICE, SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF, SALARIES TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hodgins*) 5944 (ii).
Railway Passenger Tickets, Sale Amt. Act B. No. 32 (Mr. *Beattie*) 1°, 895; 2°m., 1875 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4323 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9461 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)
RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVERNMENT *re* YUKON RAILWAYS: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4738, 4740, 4744 (ii).
—— RULES AND REGULATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9175, 10155 (iii).
—— AMERICAN STANDARD, ADOPTION BY CAN. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1969 (i).
—— SUBSIDIES IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1898, SUMS PAID TO PROV. OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3267 (i).
—— SUBSIDIES, RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 8921 (iii).
—— SUBSIDIES, RESOLUTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8633, 9064, 9185 (iii).
RAILWAYS. *See* "Drainage," "Subsidies."
RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8016, 10153 (iii).
RAMA, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST, COST OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1976 (i).
—— AND STATUTE LABOUR, GOVT. AID TO MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AND BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 2700 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iii).
RATES ON FLOUR, CAR MILEAGE, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4731 (ii).
READING ROOM, VENTILATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
REBATE OF CANAL TOLLS TO FORWARDING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 5794 (ii).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, I. C. R., STMNT. OF ACCOUNTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2791 (i).
RECIPROCITY BETWEEN U. S. AND B. W. INDIES, PAR IN CHICAGO *Record* (Mr. *Wallace*) 4550 (ii).
RECORDS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SAFETY OF, REP. OF COMMISSION: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1878.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co's B. No. 119 (Mr. *Frost*) 1°*, 2966 (i); 2°*, 3492; in Com. and 3°*, 4189 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)
REFRIGERATOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (iii).
REGIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS, LISTS SUBMITTED TO PARLIAMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3550.
—— MEETINGS OF 8TH HUSSARS, ANNUAL REP.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3873 (ii).
REGISTERED LETTERS STOLEN OFF C. P. R. TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1829 (i).
REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (i).
REGISTRAR OF TITLES, YUKON DISTRICT, INSTRUCTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2324 (i).
REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS FROM U. S., NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3078 (i).
REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2964 (i).
Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 126 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°m., 3442, 3492; 2°m., 5207, 5262, 6464, 6596, 6606; agreed to, 6722; in Com., 6758 (ii); 6904, 6940, 6972, 3°*, 7000 (iii).
1°m. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3442, 3456, 3466.
Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3449; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3449; (Mr. *Foster*) 3457; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3458; (Mr. *Clarke*) 3458, 3464; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3458; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3461; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 3462; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3463; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3465; (Mr. *Montague*) 3466; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3468, 3496; (Mr. *Casey*) 3470; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3471; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3474; (Mr. *McGregor*) 3475; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3476; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3481 (i).
M. for 2° (Mr. *Mulock*) 5207.
Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5207; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5262; (Mr. *Paterson*) 5280; on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. deb., 5299; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5299; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5299; (Mr. *McNeill*) 5302; (Mr. *Bennett*) 5305; deb. on 2°, (Mr. *Wallace*) 6464; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6481; (Mr. *Clancy*) 6493; (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 6524; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6539; (Mr. *Heyd*) 6550; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6596; (Mr. *Macdonald*, Huron) 6615; (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6636; (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 6650; (Mr. *Russell*) 6660; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6673; (Mr. *Bostock*) 6681; (Mr. *Roche*) 6685; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6690; (Mr. *Powell*) 6695; (Mr. *Clarke*) 6703; (Mr. *Britton*) 6715; (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 6717; (Mr. *Osler*) 6718; (Mr. *Bertram*) 6718; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 41) 6720 (ii).

Representation in the House of Commons—*Con.*
In Com. (M.) 6758.
Deb. (Mr. *Sproule*) 6758, 6910; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6758, 6797, 6910, (amt.) 6927, (M.) to ref. back to Com. (amt.) 6940, 6943, 6966, 6984: (Sir *Charles Tupper*, 6759, 6981; (Mr. *Clancy*) 6760, 6777, 6906, 6913; (Mr. *Paterson*) 6762-6802; (Mr. *Mulock*) (amt.) 6763-6820, 6905, 6910; (Mr. *Bennett*) 6763, 6910; (Mr. *Clarke*) 6768, 6782, 6796: (Mr. *Gibson*) 6777, 6803; (Mr. *McCleary*) 6780, 6802; (Mr. *Rogers*) 6786; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6789, 6907, 6942, 6962; (Mr. *Beattie*) 6802; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6803, 6940, 6947, 6963, 6983; (Mr. *Wallace*) 6806, 6941, 6945, 6967; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6811; (Mr. *McMillan*) 6813; (Mr. *Martin*) 6913; (Mr. *Haggart*) 6904, 6941; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 6924, 6940, 6963; (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 6924; (Mr. *Fielding*) 6941, 6979; (Mr. *Blair*) 6941, 6956, 6979; (Mr. *Powell*) 6948, 6973; (Mr. *Ellis*) 6969; (Mr. *Tucker*) 6951; (Mr. *Costigan*) 6952; (Mr. *Hughes*) 6955; (Mr. *McAlister*) 6978; (Mr. *Marcil*) 6988; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6993; (Mr. *Gilmour*) 6999 (ii).

REPRESENTATION OF YUKON TERRITORY IN PARLIAMENT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2901 (i).

REPS. FROM YUKON COUNCIL, YUKON TERRITORIES ACT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2536 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:
AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Fisher*) 1352 (i).
ARCHIVES, CANADIAN (Mr. *Fisher*) 4061 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S (Mr. *Fielding*) 1165, 2180 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 421 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Fisher*) 3070 (i).
FISHERIES (Sir *Louis Davies*) 700 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP. (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
MARINE (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1165 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Borden*, King's) 421 (i).
NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4995 (ii).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Blair*) 249 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 421 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1860 (i).

RESTAURANT AT GRAND NARROWS, I. C. R., COR. *re* CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McDougall*) 3149 (i).
——— H OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 10137 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co's. incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *McAlister*) 1°*, 1949; on Order for 2°, 2152, 2524, 2648; 2°*, 2698 (i); ref. back to Sel. Com., 6824 (ii); wthdn., 8989 (iii).
——— ON ORDER FOR 2°: Remarks (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2152 (i).

RESTIGOUCHE AND WESTERN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917 (iii).

RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 3759 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9700, 9845 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2696 (i).
——— (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1073, 3253 (i).
——— (Mr. *Davin*) 8753, 9595, 9895, 10116 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Foster*) 1432 (i); 4171, 5387, 6320, 6595 (ii); 8075, 8224, 8386, 8754, 9310, 9595, 9836, 9844, 9895 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Gillies*) 4552 (ii).
RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. *Haggart*) 8076 (iii).
——— (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1753 (i).
——— (Mr. *McCarthy*) 8076 (iii).
——— (Mr. *McDougall*) 4151, 5410, 6595 (ii); 7771 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Martin*) 1953 (i); 6319 (ii); 10225 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Monk*) 5747 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Montague*) 3253 (i).
——— (Mr. *Prior*) 8387 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Taylor*) 3150 (i).
——— (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8753, 8920 (iii).
——— (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2696 (i); 3498, 3555, 4151, 4313 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Wallace*) 5410 (ii).
——— CROW'S NEST PASS RY. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 3314 (i).
——— INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3313 (i).
——— INCOMPLETE, TELEGRAMS FROM ARCHER MARTIN, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4731 (ii).
——— ORDERED BY HOUSE, NON-COMPLIANCE BY GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2966, 3071 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS, P. E. I. (Mr. *Martin*) 3878 (ii).
——— YUKON INVESTIGATION, &C. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4340 (ii).
——— YUKON EXPEDITION, MR. COSTE'S REP. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5407 (ii).

REVISION OF THE STATUTES, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1881 (i).

REVENUE COLLECTED, &C., CHAUDIÈRE TO MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1856 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2027 (i).
See "Rys., I. C. R."

REVENUE CRUISERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com, of Sup., 5602 (ii).

REYNOLDS, CAPT., STR. "MULGRAVE," COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) 5309 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATION GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 7147 (iii).

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1°*, 895; 2°*, 1113; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).
——— PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3796 (ii).

RIDEAU CANAL, KILMARNOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (ii).
——— HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7693, 9958 (iii).
See "Supply," &c.

RIFLE RANGES, B. C., APPLICATIONS, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 5484 (ii).

RIFLES, SALE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 1817 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ADDITION TO WORKSHOPS AT: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4480 (ii).
——— REMOVAL OF SHOPS TO LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2533 (i).
——— SALARIES AT WORKSHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4480 (ii).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).
——— WHARF, CHARGES AGAINST MR. CHAMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1884 (i).
RIVIÈRE LA PIPE, WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8116 (iii).
——— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1891 (i).
——— AND PERIBONKA WHARFS, EMPLYMT. OF LABOURERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3337 (ii)
Roads and Road Allowances in Man. B. No. 175 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 8151; 2° and in Com., 8470; 3°*, 9597 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 19.)
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).
——— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, 10070 (iii).
ROBERGE, CYRILLE, DISMISSAL OF: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1857 (i).
Robertson Patent Relief B. No. 11 (Mr. *McAlister*) 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 2644 (i). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 127.)
ROBERVAL, DREDGING SCOWS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1888 (i).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING, MR. DONAGHUE'S CONTRACT FOR SCOWS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2028 (i).
See "Quebec," &c.
ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 1854 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Poupore*) 2789 (i).
ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10066.
ROLLING STOCK, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5754 (ii).
——— ADDITION TO: par. in Moncton *Star* (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6562 (ii).
Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac B. No. 108 (Mr. *Poupore*) 1°*, 2529; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3491 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 124.)
ROSEDALE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
——— SWING BRIDGE, EXPENDITURE, AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2333 (i).
ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* SETTLERS CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B. C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2530 (i).
ROWE, MRS. ELIZABETH, POSTMISTRESS AT SINTULATA, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 8468 (iii).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 6928 (iii).
See "Bills."
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii) 7022, 7140, 9960 (iii).
——— CLOTHING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6722 (ii) 6932 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE SINCE FOUNDATION, REGULATIONS, NUMBER OF GRADUATES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 1879 (i).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3796 (ii).
ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8705 (iii).
ROYALTIES ON MINING LICENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8947, 9002 (iii).
RUMORS *re* CONFLICT BETWEEN U. S. AND CAN. CUSTOMS IN YUKON: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 975 (i).
Russell, Dundas and Grenville Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Edwards*) 1°*, 1540; 2°*, 1862; in Com. and 3°*, 3072 (i). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 87.)
RUSSELL, MR., DISMISSAL AS STEAMBOAT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 4713 (ii).
——— DISMISSAL, REPS., &C., *re*: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
Rutland and Noyan Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1°*, 3149 (i); 2°*, 3492; in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 88.)
RYAN & CO.'S CLAIMS *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10152 (iii).
See "Supply," &c.
ST. ANDREWS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 9173, 10155 (iii).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Stp. 9957 (iii).
ST. CHARLES BRANGH I. C. R., CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OR PURCHASE OF LAND, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 3873 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 1165; 2°*, 1389; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 128.)
ST. FRANCIS BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8918 (iii).
——— LAKE CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1852 (i).
——— LAKE SURVEY, AND SERVICES OF STRS. "ALERT" AND "ALASKA": M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1878 (i).
STE. GENEVIÈVE, LAND DAMAGES, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6934 (iii).
ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2182 (i).
ST. JOHN ACCOMMODATION I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7155, 7242, 7401 (iii).
——— DEEP WATER TERMINAL FACILITIES: M. for Specifications, Plans, &c.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1876 (i).
——— BATTALION, 8TH HUSSARS, CHARGES AGAINST COMMANDING OFFICER, REP. *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Domville*) 2026 (i).
ST. JOHN AND BELFAST, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
——— AND DIGBY, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8673 (iii).
——— ELEVATOR: in Com, of Sup., 9163 (iii).
——— AND GLASGOW, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
——— AND HALIFAX, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).

St. John and Liverpool, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (iii).
——— and Minas Basin, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
——— Valley and Rivière du Loup Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8914; in Com., 9443, 9772 (iii).
——— and West Indies, Mail Subsidy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8675 (iii).
St. Joseph d'Alma, Postmaster, Increase in Salary: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1847 (i).
St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1882 (i).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5086 (ii); 7557, 9986 (iii).
——— Canals, Deepenieg of Navigation, &c., Contracts entered into, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2788 (i).
——— Improvements, North Channel, Contracts, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1877 (i).
——— Protection to Navigation: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3343 (ii).
——— North Shore Telegraph Line, Contract for Poles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3335 (ii).
St. Louis Lake Channel: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iii).
——— Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8219 (iii).
St. Maurice River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 10070 (iii).
St. Methode and Mistassini, Wharfs, Construction of Sheds, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2028 (i).
See "Quebec," &c.
St. Norbert, Inundations of Red River, Claims of Owners: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1894 (i).
St. Ours Lock: in Com. of Sup., 7318 (iii).
——— Dismissal of Supt. Coderre, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3552 (ii).
St. Paul des Métis Colony: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
St. Peters Canal, Amount Expended from 1891 to 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3255 (i).
St. Pierre River, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).
St. Regis Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5699 (ii).
St. Rémi and Stottsville Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9446, 9773 (iii).
St. Thomas and Aylmer Mail Service, Advertisements for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 9698 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 5477 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commission, Printing and Distribution: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fortin*) 1879 (i).
——— Total Cost, Claims Unpaid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5484 (ii).
Sabrevois Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 10020; conc., 10219 (iii).
Salaries, &c., *re* Administration Yukon District: in Com. of Sup., 8658 (iii).
Samson, Mr. Pierre, Caretaker at St. Joseph de Lévis Fort, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3082 (i).
Sapper's Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5204 (ii).
Sarnia Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1°*, 2246; 2°* 2524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3996 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
Saskatchewan Valley Railway Facilities, Res. of N. W. T. Assembly: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3255 (i).
Saugeen Indians Reserve, Medical Supt., Patrick Scott, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 9699 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7296, 10152 (iii).
Savings Banks Agents, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (ii).
Saw Logs, Exportation, Prevention by Govt. on Indian Reserves, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1834 (i).
Schafheitlin and Fitzgibbon, Customs Law Infraction: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1889, 2190 (i).
School Lands, Man., Stmnt. of Sale: Read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6461 (ii).
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 5170 (ii).
Scott Act Repeal, Brome County, Applications for: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 2187 (i).
——— Delay in Voting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 3547 (ii).
Scrimgeour, J. G., Grant of Bonded Warehouse, Date of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.,) 2113 (i).
Scrip for Half-breeds: in Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii) 7501 (iii).
——— par. in Calgary *Herald* (Mr. *Davin*) 7196 (iii).
Scugog Indians, Liquor Sold, Cor. between Dept. and Mr. A. Soper: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3149 (i).
Scugog River, Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2191 (i).
Secord, Mr. T. R., Supt. on Welland Canal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1833 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE:
B. C. Statutes for 1899, Date of Receiving by Sec. of State: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5666 (ii).
Brockville Election, Ballot Papers, Printing and Distribution: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3074 (i).
——— Mailing of Voters' Lists: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2482 (i).
——— Name of Dep. Returning Officer: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2322 (i).
"Canada Gazette": in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).
Canada Temperance Act Elections, Cost: in Com. of Sup., 10111 (iii).
Commissions under the Great Seal, Regulations Respecting: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4483 (ii).
Electoral Lists, N. S., Printing and Distribution: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1979 (i).
Franchise Electoral Act, Amendments by N. B. Government: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2530 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*
MUNGOVAN, P., TEMPORARY CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
See "Supply," &c.
PLEBISCITE VOTERS, LEEDS CO., REP. OF RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1848 (i).
—— Reports asked for (Mr. *Moore*) 5748 (ii).
—— Poll Books, &c.: laid on Table (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7320 (iii).
PRINTING BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 2077 (i).
—— PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8703 (iii).
—— SUNDAY LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Guillet*) 3879 (ii).
PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, AMOUNT PAID AND BALANCE DUE: Ques (Mr. *Foster*) 5859 (ii).
PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1814 (i).
—— NUMBER OF VOTES POLLED, Cost, &c.: Ques, (Mr. *Prior*) 2321 (i),
—— RET. OF VOTES POLLED, PAPERS RESPECTING: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 2037 (i).
—— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2041, 2045 (i).
—— EXPENSES IN MONTREAL CITY, AMOUNTS UNPAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 5312 (ii).
SECRETARY OF STATE REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 421 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2076, 2269 (i).
SCOTT ACT REPEAL, BROME COUNTY, APPLICATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 2187 (i).
—— DELAY IN VOTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 3547 (ii).
—— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2281, 2290 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS: in Com. of Sup., 8750, 10127 (iii).
—— N. B., DELAY IN SENDING IN REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530, 2698 (i).
—— PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530 (i).
—— PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 6827 (iii).
—— REVISED COPIES, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1819 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Securities, Man. and N. W. T. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°*, 618 (i); wthdn., 9893 (iii).
—— **B. No. 189** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 9464; 2°, and in Com., 9847; 3°, 9849 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 18.)
SEED GRAIN, MAN. AND N. W. T. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
—— TO SETTLERS IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (iii).
—— LIENS, CANCELLATION, LEGISLATION, *re.* RES. FROM N. W. COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2903 (i).
SEL. STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6, 158 (i).
—— LISTS: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 525 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 191 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 9696; 2°, and in Com., 9846; 3°*, 9847 (iii). (62-63 *Vic., c.* 12.)
SENATE REFORM AND THE PROVINCES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1821 (i).
—— RESOLUTIONS: Wthdrl. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8752 (iii).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2278, 2280 (i).
SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES OF DECEASED SENATORS AND MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 10196 (iii).
SETTLERS FROM EASTERN CANADA TO N.W.T., AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 2534 (i).
SHAG HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9998 (iii).
"SHAMROCK," TUG, AMOUNT PAID JOHN C. KAINE, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5666 (ii).
SHANNON, THOS., DISMISSAL: M. for Papers* (Mr. *Richardson*) 3333 (i).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. No. 170 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 6929; 2°, 9598; in Com. and 3°, 9599 (iii). (62-63 *Vic. c.* 33.)
SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
SIDING ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9156 (iii).
SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING WATER, REQUESTS, &C., MADE TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2192 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 2248 (i).
SINGLETON, MR. W. R., POSTMASTER AT DELTA, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1956 (i).
SINTULATA POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 8468 (iii).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10118 (iii).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5721 (ii).
SKAGWAY AND DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINE, YUKON, CONSTRUCTION BY ENGLISH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3073 (i).
See "Yukon," &c.
SKELTON *vs.* THE QUEEN: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Davin*) 7770 (iii).
—— REP. OF MIN. OF JUS., M. (Mr. *Davin*) 8171; 8217, 8346 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7441 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
SMITH, MR. ABNER, POSTMASTER AT RUSAGORNIS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3256 (i).
SNOWBALL, HON. MR., CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).
SNOW SHOVELLING, I.C.R., NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1964 (i).
SONGHEES, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5704 (ii).
—— REMOVAL FROM RESERVE, SETTLEMENT WITH B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii).
—— COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND PROVL. GOVTS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Prior*) 3873 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 4713 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2117 (i).
—— ARBITRATION, LAND VALUATORS, APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2333 (i).
—— CONTRACTS: M. for Cor., Notices, &c. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1861 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
—— SECS. 1 AND 2, CONTRACTS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i), 9701 (iii).
—— SECS. 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS, &C.: M. for Cor., O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2028 (i).

SOURIS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY MESSRS. MELLISH AND WIGHTMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4270 (ii).

SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9551 (iii).

SPEAKER'S ATTENTION CALLED TO MEMBER'S SPEECH OUT OF ORDER (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3754 (ii).

—— DEP., DELEGATION OF POWERS: Ruling asked from Mr. Speaker (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5491 (ii).

—— DEP., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

—— ELECTION OF: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9062 (iii).

—— LATE SIR JAMES EDGAR, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9060 (iii),
See "House of Commons."

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &C.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2755, 2770 (i).

SPINKS, COUNTY COURT JUDGE, B. C., CHARGES AGAINST: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4172, 4201 (ii).

SPRAYING FRUIT TREES, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2110 (i).

SPRINGHILL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 9945 (iii).

SPROULE, R. J., POSTMASTER AT FLESHERTON, ONT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 9179 (iii).

STAMPED ENVELOPES, 2-CENT GREEN, NUMBER PURCHASED IN TORONTO, ISSUE OF, AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2189 (i).

—— 2-CENT PURPLE, NUMBER ISSUED AND DISTRIBUTED: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2187 (i).

—— JUBILEE AND GREATER EMPIRE, STAMPED PLATES, COST, NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2028 (i).
See "Post Office," &c.

STANLEY PARK AND DEADMAN'S ISLAND, O.C.'S, COR., &C., BETWEEN CAN. GOVT. AND B.C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Prior*) 2234 (i).

—— Ret. Laid on Table, 3959 (ii).
See "Deadman's Island, &c."

STARR AND DE WOLFE'S CONTRACT, I.C.R., REP. OF MR. SHANLEY, C.E.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2962 (i).

STATIONERY, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i), 5730 (ii), 10139 (iii).

STATIONERY SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS: on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to conc. in 4th and 5th Reports of Printing Com., 5378 (ii).

STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 8236 (iii).

STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 8226 (iii).

STATUES AND MONUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).

STATUTORY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 2048, 2256, (i), 7536 (iii).

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4013, 4713 (ii).

—— SERVICE BETWEEN P.E.I. AND LIVERPOOL: Par. in *Examiner* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3543 (ii).

STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. *See* "Mail Subsidies."

STEEL BOXES, INTERIOR AND INDIAN DEPTS., PURCHASED BY GOVT., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hodgins*) 4482, 4995 (ii).

STEEL RAILS, I.C.R., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2328 (i).

STEEL SHELVING, DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 9989 (iii).

STEVESTON, B.C., TIDAL LANDS, APPLICATION FOR LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822, 4058 (ii).

—— O. C.'s, COR., PLANS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).

—— TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3544 (ii).

STIKINE-TESLIN ROUTE, SURVEY, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1885 (i).

Stock. *See* "Divorce."

STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9837 (iii).

"STRATHCONA," STR., AND RELIEF OF DESTITUTE MINERS, ARRANGEMENT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 9179 (iii).

STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8914; in Com., 9440, 9771 (iii).

STRATHY, MR. J. A. L., REINSTATEMENT AS LT.-COL.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2329 (i).

STRONG, HON. CHIEF JUSTICE, EXPENSES *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

SUBSIDIES BETWEEN ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 2900 (i).

SUBSIDIES: *See*

Antler and Moose Mountain Ry. Co.
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.
Brookfield and Eastville Ry. Co.
Canada Eastern (Cross Creek) Ry. Co.
—— (Nelson Branch) Ry. Co.
Canada Northern Ry. Co.
C.P.R. and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.
Central Ry. Co.
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.
Fort Francis and Rainy River Ry. Co.
Great Northern Ry. Bridge Co.
Great Northern Ry. Co.
Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.
Hawkesbury Ry. Co.
Indian Garden and Shelburne Ry. Co.
I.C.R. and Central Ry. Co.
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.
Labelle and Nominingue Ry. Co.
Lac River Bridge Co.
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.
Massawippi Valley Ry. Co.
Midland Ry. Co.
Nicolet River Bridge Co.
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.
—— (Stanley and Port Arthur Branch) Ry. Co.
Ontario, Belmont and Northern Ry. Co.
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.
Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.
Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.

SUBSIDIES—*Con.*
Parry Sound Ry. Co.
Paspébiac and Gaspé Ry. Co.
Pembroke Southern Ry. Co.
Philipsburg Ry. and Quarry Co.
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.
Pontypool and Bobcaygeon Ry. Co.
Portage du Fort Ry. Co.
Port Clyde and Lockport Ry. Co.
Port Hawkesbury Ry. Co.
Port Hawkesbury and St. Peter's Ry. Co.
Quebec Bridge Co.
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.
Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.
Richelieu River Bridge Co.
Rivière du Loup Bridge Co.
St. Francis Bridge Co.
St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Ry. Co.
St. Rémi and Stottsville Ry. Co.
South Shore Ry. Co.
Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.
Sunnybrae and Country Harbour Ry. Co.
Témiscouata (St. Francis Branch) Ry. Co.
Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.
United Counties Ry. Co.
Western Alberta Ry. Co.
Windsor and Truro Ry. Co.
Yamaska Bridge Co.

Sudbury and Wahnapitae Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 2897; 2°*, 3004 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4857 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)

SUGAR IMPORTS FROM BRITISH WEST INDIES, QUANTITY AND VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2327 (i).

SUNDAY TRAFFIC, I. C. R. AND PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3877 (ii).

SUNNYBRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).

SUPERANNUATIONS IN AGRICULTURE DEPT., APPNMTS., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3873 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, QUEBEC, SUMS PAID FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2145 (i).

SUPPLIES FOR GOVT. DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iii).

Supply B. No. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°, 6464; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6596 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

—— **No. 192** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 10246 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

SUPPLY:
(Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.)
AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Orders of the House not complied with, 2966; (Mr. *Foster*) Drummond County Ry., 2972; (Mr. *Prior*) Liquor Licenses in the Yukon, 2973 (i); (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Tidal Survey, 3504; (Mr. *Montague*) Welland Canal, Lake Erie entrance, 3997; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Ministerial responsibility, 3997: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Investigation into conduct of Judges in B. C., 4172; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Bauer, Mr., Dom. Land Surveyor, Papers *re* examination, 4713; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Railway Communication with the Yukon, 4740; (Mr. *Bergeron*) Beauharnois Canal, dismissal of employees, 5411; (Mr. *Davin*) Elevators in the N. W. Ters., 5494; (Mr. *Bergeron*) Valleyfield Collector of Customs, 5501; (Mr. *Martin*) Seizure of Traps, &c., P.E.I., 5504; (Mr. *Prior*) Northern Commercial Telegraph Co., 5510; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Clarke *ve.* The Queen, 5750; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Administration of the Yukon, 5945, 6053, 6124; neg. (Y. 32; N. 82) 6278; (Mr. *Roddick*) Tuberculosis, prevention, &c., 6281; (Mr. *Davin*) I. C. R., Rolling Stock, par. in *Star*, 6319 (ii): (Mr. *Cowan*) Dismissal of Lighthouse-keeper Quick, 7219; (Mr. *Fortin*) Judicial District of Montreal, 7224: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Preservation of Health on Public Works, 7241; (Mr. *Borden*, King's) Liquor in Military Canteens, 7322; (Mr. *Blair*) Long Wharf, par. in *Star*, 7327; (Mr. *Hughes*) Canadian Troops for the Transvaal, 7328; (Mr. *McLennan*, Inverness) Lobster Fishing, 7675; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Preferential Trade with G. B., 7773; Amt., 7789, 7874; neg. (Y. 77; N. 41) 7965; (Mr. *Davin*) Administration of the Yukon, 8020; (Mr. *McNeill*) Preferential Trade with G. B., 8221, 8634; (Mr. *Taylor*) Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, contract, 9898; (Mr. *Clancy*) Bothwell Election, Hon. Mr. Mills speech in the Senate, 9896; (Mr. *Hughes*) Conduct of Troops in the Yukon, 9963; (Mr. *Davin*) Sintulata Postmistress, dismissal, 10118 (iii).
MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1899-1900, 2026 (i); Suppl., 1900, 4857 (ii); further Suppl., 7638, 9835 (iii).
RES. (Mr. *Fielding*) FOR COM., 1813; Ms. for Com., 2047, 2250, 2966 (i), 3504, 3997, 4713, 4740, 5411, 5494, 5750, 6281 (ii), 7001, 7219, 7322, 7675, 7773, 8020, 8172, 8221, 8386, 8634, 9895, 9963, 10118 (iii).
IN COM., 2047, 2250, 2973 (i), 3504, 3523, 4009, 4240, 4713, 4770, 5011, 5100, 5414, 5578, 5668, 5753, 6321 (ii), 7001, 7242, 7330, 7442, 7536, 7966, 8077, 8178, 8224, 8387, 8477, 8648, 8947, 9002, 9066, 9211, 9938, 9964, 10119 (iii).

COMMITTEE:
Administration of Justice. See "Justice."
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 8224 (iii).
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 8237 (iii).
Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 8264 (iii).
Cold Storage, 8706 (iii).
Commissioner's Branch, Agriculture and Dairying, 8265 (iii).
Dairying Interests, 8337 (iii).
Experimental Farms, 5073 (ii), 7688, 8237 (iii).
General Statistics, 8236 (iii).
Illustration Stations, 8279, 8745 (iii).
North-west Territorial Exhibition, 5073 (ii).
Omaha Exhibition, 5074 (ii).
Paris Exhibition, 10140 (iii).
Patent Record, 5074 (ii).
Purchase of Books for Library, 5074 (ii).
Statistical Year-book, 8226 (iii).
Charges of Management, 7001 (iii).
Dominion Notes, Printing, &c., 5012 (ii).
Salaries of Agents of Country Savings Banks, 5012 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 2256 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 2086 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 2270 (i), 5028 (ii).
Auditor General, 2269 (i).
Finance, 5016 (ii).
Governor General's Office, 2265 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 8748 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 2270 (i), 5013 (ii).
Interior, 5021 (ii), 7467 (iii).
Justice, 2266 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 2276 (i), 5023 (ii).
Militia and Defence, 2266 (i), 5012 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 2277 (i).
Post Office Dept., 5032 (ii), 5052, 5068, 7330, 7358 (iii).
Printing and Stationery (P. Mungovan's Salary), 5019, 5853 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 2265 (i), 5012 (ii).
Public Works, 5072, 5085 (ii), 7554 (iii).
Railways and Canals, 2276 (i).
Secretary of State, 2269 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 2277 (i).
Customs, 2091 (i).
Finance, 2090 (i), 5016 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2104 (i).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 2047 (i).
Indian Dept., 2083 (i).
Inland Revenue, 2100 (i).
Interior, 2077 (i), 7466 (iii).
Justice, 2063 (i), 10119 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, 2102 (i).
Militia and Defence, 2070 (i).
Mounted Police, 2083 (i), 10122 (iii).
Privy Council Office, 2048 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 2077 (i).
Public Works, 7536 (iii).
Railways and Canals, 2250 (i).
Secretary of State, 2076 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 2107, 2262 (i).
Collection of Revenues:
Customs:
B.C., 8453 (iii).
B.C. and Yukon, Salaries, &c., 5596 (ii).
Manitoba, 8453 (iii).
N.W.T., 8453 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 8387 (iii).
Old Suspense Account, Montreal, 5588 (ii).
Ontario, 8452 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5600 (ii).
Revenue Cruisers, Maintenance, 5602 (ii).
Salaries Contingencies, 5595, 5855 (ii).
Excise:
Collectors' Allowance and Duties Collected, 4790 (ii).
Preventive Service, 4788, 5578 (ii).
Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 4770, 4787 (ii).
Sale of Stamps for Can. Tobacco, Commission, 4790 (ii).
Special Translation, L. A. Frechette, 4803 (ii).
Post Office, Outside Service:
Mail Service, 7366 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5798 (ii), 7388 (iii).
O'Connor & Hogg, Legal Services, 5801 (ii).
Public Works:
B.C. Agency, 8190 (iii).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, 8178 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Collection of Revenues—Con.
Public Works—*Con.*
Land and Cable Lines, &c., 8181 (iii).
Slides and Booms, Salaries, &c., 8178 (iii).
Telegraph between P.E.I. and Mainland, 8180 (iii).
—— B.C., 8184 (iii).
—— N.W.T., 8183 (iii).
—— Signal Service, Generally, 8188 (iii).
Weights and Measures, Gas, &c.:
Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &c., 4804 (ii).
Salaries of Officers, Inspectors, &c., 4803, 5578 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital:
General Vote, 7501 (iii).
Surveys, &c., 9053 (iii).
Dominion Lands—Income:
General Vote, 7528, 9006 (iii).
Gratuity to Mrs. Cadenhead, 5859 (ii).
Dominion Police:
Salaries, increases, 10127 (iii).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Claims Commission, 5180 (ii).
Cold Storage for Bait, 10163 (iii).
Gratuity to R. N. Venning, 5183 (ii).
Oyster Culture, 4241 (ii).
Repairs to Fisheries Protection Steamers, 5180 (ii).
Salaries, Inspectors, &c., 4013 (ii).
To pay John S. Hall, Q.C., 5183 (ii).
To pay F. Peters and E. V. Bodwell, 5181 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 7468 (iii).
Salary, John McLeish, 5668 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Territories, 7499 (iii).
Govt. of the Yukon Provisional District:
Amount required for Mail Service, 7359 (iii).
Customs, 8746 (iii).
Lewes and Yukon, River Improvements, 8192 (iii).
Salaries and Expenses of Administration, 8658, 8947, 9002 (iii).
[*See* "Yukon Provisional District, &c."]
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G.B. and Foreign Countries, 8477 (iii).
General Expenses of Agencies, 8648 (iii).
Payment to St. Paul des Métis Colony, 9027 (iii).
Women's Protective Society, Montreal, 8628 (iii).
Indians:
British Columbia, 5725-5730 (ii).
General Vote, 5722 (ii).
Liquor Suppression, 5710 (ii).
Manitoba and N. W. T., 5691 (ii), 10110 (iii).
Annuities to Half-breeds, Peace River District, 5694, 5711 (ii).
Grist Mills, &c., 5721 (ii).
Implements, &c., 5712 (ii).
Sioux, 5721 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 5691 (ii), 7480 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec, 5669 (ii), 10110 (iii).
Oka Indians, Removal, 5709 (ii).
St. Régis, Lock-up, 5711 (ii).
Surveys, 5710, 5721 (ii).
Inspection of Staples:
Expenses of Winnipeg Grain Exchange Members, 5586 (ii).
Insurance:
General Vote, 7463 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Justice, Administration of:
Circuit Allowance, B.C., 5471 (ii).
Enforcement of Alien Labour Law, 5471 (ii), 10123 (iii).
Exchequer Court, 5472 (ii).
N. W. T., 10122 (iii).
Ontario, Additional Judge, 10122 (iii).
[*See* "Govt. of Yukon," "Yukon District," &c.]
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Balance of Salary, late Sir J. D. Edgar, 10196 (iii).
Committees, Sessional Messengers, &c., 2278 (i).
Dep. Speaker's Salary, 2278 (i).
Estimate of Sergeant-at-Arms, 2280 (i).
French Translation, 10139 (iii).
Indemnity, late Hon. J. F. Wood, 10200 (iii).
Publishing Debates, 2280 (i).
Restaurant-keeper, Allowance, 10137 (iii).
Stationery, 10139 (iii).
Voters' Lists, 2280, 2290 (i), 8750, 10127 (iii).
Library: Additional Messengers, 10140 (iii).
Senate:
Sessional Indemnity, late Senator Sanford, 10196 (iii).
Stationery, &c., 5730 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Gratuities, 5179 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances of Keepers, 3523 (ii).
Upper Traverse Lighthouse, 5116 (ii), 10162 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 8692 (iii).
Canada and Great Britain, 8661 (iii).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 8685 (iii).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 8684 (iii).
Great Britain and P. E. I., 8687 (iii).
Halifax and Porto Rico, 10158 (iii).
Halifax, St. John, Nfld. and Liverpool, 8672 (iii).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 8678 (iii).
Montreal and Manchester, 8695 (iii).
Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 10158 (iii).
Pictou and Cheticamp, 10156 (iii).
Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge, 8686 (iii).
Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso, 10156 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 8683 (iii).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 8686, 10157 (iii).
St. John and Digby, 8673 (iii).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 8672 (iii).
St. John and Glasgow, 8672 (iii).
St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth, &c., 8686 (iii).
St. John, Halifax and London, 8673 (iii).
St. John and Liverpool, 8671 (iii).
St. John and Minas Basin Ports, 8686 (iii).
St. John, &c., West Indies and South America, 8675 (iii).
St. Peters and Port Mulgrave, 8692 (iii).
Marine Hospitals:
Marine Hospitals, &c., 4009 (ii).
Shipwrecked Seamen, 4012 (ii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5414 (ii), 7061 (iii).
Arms and Accoutrements, 5466 (ii), 9141 (iii).
Artillery, Fortress Armament, &c., 7152 (iii).
Battlefield Monuments, 7152 (iii).
Claim of F. X. Mathieu, 9127 (iii).
Clothing, 5443 (ii), 7099, 9126 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Militia—Con.
Compensation to Octave Ouellette, 9127 (iii).
—— to Mrs. F. E. Stewart, 9131 (iii).
Construction of Small Armouries, 9125 (iii).
Defence Scheme Committee, 5465 (ii).
Esquimalt Defences, 7151 (iii).
Gen. Service Medals, 9127 (iii).
General Vote, 5055, 5857 (iii).
Govt. Cartridge Factory, 7151 (iii).
Hamilton Rifle Range, Purchase, 5465 (ii).
Military College, 5464 (ii), 7140 (iii).
Military Properties, 5421 (ii), 7088 (iii).
—— Stores, 5423 (ii).
Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 5451 (ii), 7147 (iii).
Pay, Allowances, &c., 7002 (iii).
Provisions and Supplies, 7126 (iii).
Salaries of Civil Employees, 5420 (ii), 7074 (iii).
Transport, 5451 (ii), 7130 (iii).
Warlike and other Stores, 7091 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
Academy of Arts, 8705 (iii).
Amount for Charles Bremner, 10113, 10167 (iii).
Arbitration, Dom., and Ont. and Quebec Accounts, 8702 (iii).
Canada Gazette, 8703 (iii).
Canada Mining Institute, 8702 (iii).
Canada Temperance Act, Cost of Elections, 10111 (iii).
Classification of Privy Council Records, 8702 (iii).
Commutation in Lieu of Remission of Duties, 8704 (ii).
Contributions to Can. Law Library, London, Eng., 5470 (iii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Commissioner's Expenses, 5831 (ii).
Distressed Canadians in Foreign Countries, 7529 (iii).
Expenses of Chief Justice Strong, 5470 (ii).
Gratuity to Wm. Wakeham, 5183 (ii).
Half-breed Claims Commissioner, Salary, &c., 5832 (ii).
—— Commission's Expenses, 9054 (iii).
International Commission at Washington, 5852 (ii).
Keewatin District, Expenses of Govt., 7529 (iii).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff, 7530 (iii).
Manniwanka Lake, Wharf, 9055 (iii).
Monument of late Mr. Mackenzie, 8150 (iii).
Mounted Police, Assistance to Half-breeds, 5830 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 8149 (iii).
Paris Agency, Salaries and Contingencies of, 8704, (iii).
Payments of Extra Clerks, 8705 (iii).
P. E. I. Fish Oil Duties, 10114, 10169 (iii).
Printing Bureau Plant, 8703 (iii).
Printing Dr. Rand's Dictionary, 10112 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5850 (ii), 8703 (iii).
Privy Council. Wentworth v. Mathieu, 10112 (iii).
Professional Services to C. J. R. Bethune, 5471 (ii).
Relief to People of West Indies, 5852 (ii).
Repairs to Gov. Gen's Car "Victoria," 8751 (iii).
Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 8705 (iii).
Statute of Her Majesty, 8150 (iii).
Surveys and Inspections, 8149 (iii).
To pay A. M. Montpetit, for translation, 5851 (ii).
Well-boring Machines in N. W. T., 9055 (iii),
Mounted Police:
General Service, 5832 (ii), 8746 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service:
Generally, 5100 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 3004 (i).
Investigation into Wrecks, 3064 (i).
Masters and Mates, Examination, 3058 (i).
New Steamer, "Minto," 10160 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 3065 (i).
Removal af Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 3065 (i), 10161 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 3064 (i).
Pensions:
Fenian Raid, 8750 (iii).
Rebellion of 1885, 8750 (iii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 5479 (ii).
Dorchester, 5477 (ii).
General, 8750 (iii).
Kingston:
Expenses of Devlin Investigation. 5073 (ii).
Manitoba, 5479 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 5477 (ii).
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Nova Scotia, Halifax Building, 9943 (iii).
Digby Post Office, &c., 9947 (iii).
Quarantine Station, 9945 (iii).
Springhill Building, 9945 (iii).
Ottawa, Western Deptl. Block, 5089 (ii) 9938, 9943 (iii).
Electric lighting, &c., 9939 (iii).
Military Buildings, New Store, 9942 (iii).
Observatory, 9943, 9950 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Lévis Graving Dock, enlargement, 9987 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Improvements, 9964 (iii).
River Kaministiquia, 7611 (iii)
St. Andrew's Rapids, 10155 (iii).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 5086 (ii) 7557, 7579, 9986 (iii).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Kamloops, Public Building, 9988 (iii).
Nelson, Public Buildings, 9988 (iii).
New Westminster, Public Buildings, 9988 (iii).
Rossland, Public Building, 9988 (iii).
Vancouver, Drill Hall, 9988 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Marysville, Public Building, 7616 (iii).
St. John, Quarantine Station, 9954 (iii).
North-west Territories:
Lieut. Governor's residence, 9988 (iii).
Nova Scotia:
Halifax, Drill Hall, &c., 7613 (iii).
—— Quarantine Station, 5089 (ii).
Windsor, Public Building, 7615 (iii).
Ontario:
Alexandria, Reformatory, 9960 (iii).
Brockville, Drill Hall, 9960 (iii).
General Vote, 7621 (iii).
Kingston, Military College, 9960 (iii).
Library rewiring, 9956 (iii).
London Drill Hall, &c., 9961 (iii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa, photographic establishment, 5090 (ii).
East block, elevator, 9960 (iii).
Concrete floors, Deptl. Buildings, 9957 (iii).
West block, 9959 (iii).
Rideau Hall, 9958 (iii).
Sarnia, Public Building, 9962 (iii).
St. Catharines, Drill Hall, 9957 (iii).
Toronto, Post Office, 9958 (iii).
Windsor, Drill Hall, 9962 (iii).
Quebec:
General Vote, 7619 (iii).
Montreal Public Buildings, 5090 (ii).
Quebec Citadel, 5090 (ii).
Victoriaville, Public Building, 9954 (iii).
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Ottawa, 5183 (ii).
—— Lighting, &c., 8136, 9989.
—— Steel shelving, Agriculture Dept., 9989 (iii).
Dredging, 5203 (ii).
New Dredging Plant, 8137, 10070 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers, generally, 8102 (ii).
British Columbia:
Columbia River, Improvements, 8085-86 (iii).
Fraser River, Improvements, 8088 (iii).
Kootenay River, Improvements, 8090 (iii).
William's Head Quarantine Station, 8090 (iii).
Manitoba:
Lake Manitoba, Outlets, 8077 (iii).
Wharf on Lake Winnipeg, 8079 (iii).
Maritime Provinces, Generally, 5201 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Campbellton, Wharf, 10012 (iii).
Campobello, Breakwater, 10010 (iii).
Cape Tormentine, Breakwater, 10011 (iii).
Generally, 7763 (iii).
Hopewell Cape, Wharf, 10010 (iii).
Main River, Wharf, 10012 (iii).
St. John River, Wharfs, 10011 (iii).
St. Nicholas River, Wharf, 10010 (iii).
Shippegan, Wharf, 10012 (iii).
Nova Scotia:
Arcadia, Removal of Obstructions, 9990 (iii).
Belliveau, Breakwater, 10000 (iii).
Black Rock and Meat Cove, Harbour, 9991 (iii)
Brooklyn, Wharf, 10003 (iii).
Brule, Wharf Repairs, 10003 (iii).
Chebogue River, Wharf, 9999 (iii).
Chegoggin, Breakwater, 9990 (iii).
Chezzetcook, Wharf, 10004 (iii).
Clifton, Wharf Repairs, 9991 (iii).
East Ragged Island, Wharf, 9991 (iii).
Gabarus Bay, Breakwater, 9991 (iii).
Generally, 5198 (ii) 7698; 8084 (iii).
Gunning Cove, Wharf, 9991 (iii).
Harbourville, Wharf, 10002 (iii).
Jordan Bay East, Breakwater, 9998 (iii).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 9991 (iii).
Lockeport, Breakwater, 9991 (iii).
Malignant Cove, Breakwater, 10003 (iii).
Newellton, Wharf, 9998 (iii).
North River, St. Anne's Wharf, 9991(
Parker's Cove, Wharf, 10001 (iii)
Parrsboro', Dredging, 10003 (iii

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Porter's Lake, Dredging, &c , 9993 (iii).
Salmon River, Freight Shed, 9996 (iii).
Saw's Pit, Wharf, 9997 (iii).
Shag Harbour, Wharf, 9998 (iii).
Tatamagouche, Wharf Repairs, 10003 (iii).
Trout Cove, Breakwater, 10000 (iii).
West Berlin, Protection Works, 10000 (iii).
Wolfville, Harbour Improvements, 10002 (iii).
Yarmouth, Breakwater, 9990 (iii).
Young's Landing, Wharf, 9997 (iii).
Ontario:
Bowmanville, Harbour, 7966 (iii).
Bruce Mines, Wharf, 7966 (iii).
Burlington Channel, 7998 (iii).
Collingwood 8002 (iii).
Generally, 8013 (iii).
Goderich, Breakwater, &c., Dredging, 8010-12 (iii).
Kincardine, North Pier reconstruction, 5203 (iii).
Kingston, Harbour Dredging, 8014 (iii).
Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 8014 (iii).
Oakville, Repairs to Piers, &c., 8015 (iii).
Otonabee River, Dredging, 10065 (iii).
Owen Sound, Dredging, &c., 8016 (iii).
Pelee Island, Wharf, 10068 (iii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 9250 (iii).
Portsmouth, Wharf, 10065 (iii).
Providence Bay, Wharf, 10068 (iii).
Rainy River, Channel Improvements, 8016, 9173 (iii).
Scugog, River Channel, 10065 (iii).
Shegiuandah, Pier, 10068 (iii).
Sydenham River, Dredging, 8018 (iii).
Toronto Harbour, Dredging, 10066 (iii).
Prince Edward Island:
Canoe Cove, Breakwater, 10007 (iii).
China Point, Pier, 7751 (iii).
North Cardigan, Pier, 10010 (iii).
Rocky Point, Breakwater, 10006 (iii).
St. Peter's Bay, Pier, 7755 (iii).
Souris, Breakwater, 7755 (iii).
Summerside, Harbour, 7757 (iii).
West Point, Pier, 10006 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Quebec:
Anse à Beaufils, Harbour Improvements 8103 (iii).
Anse aux Gascons, Breakwater, 8103 (iii).
Baie de Honfleur, Wharf, 10019 (iii).
Baie St. Paul, Repairs to Wharf, 8104 iii).
Beauport, Wharf, 10039 (iii)
Black Brook, Wharf, 10014 (iii).
Cacouna, Wharf, 10016 (iii).
Cap à L'Aigle, Wharf, 10017 (iii).
Cap Santé, Removal of Boulders, 8105 (iii).
Carleton, Pier, 10014 (iii).
Coteau Landing, Dredging, 10039 (iii).
General Repairs, 8105 (iii).
Isle aux Grues, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
Kamouraska, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
Knowlton Landing, Wharf, 10020 (iii).
Lake St. John, Piers, &c., 8116 (iii).
Les Eboulements, Wharf, 10017 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 8132 (iii).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 8133 (iii).
Maria, Wharf, 8133 (iii).
New Carlisle, Wharf, 10014 (iii).
Newport, Breakwater, 10014 (iii).
Richelieu River, Belœil Channel, 8138 (iii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock, 10039 (iii).
Rivière du Loup, Dredging Channel, 8135 (iii).
Rivière à la Pipe, Wharf, 8116 (iii).
St. Alexis, Pier, 8136 (iii).
Ste. Anne, Wharf, 10039 (iii).
St. Gedeon, Wharf, 10019 (iii).
Ste. Irénée, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
Ste. Jerome, Wharf, 10018 (iii).
Sabrevois, Wharf, 10020 (iii).
Saguenay River, Dredging, 8136 (iii).
Sillery Cove, Wharf, 8136 (iii).
Roads and Bridges:
Belly River, Bridge, 10070 (iii).
Edmonton Bridge, 8196 (iii).
Generally, 8146 (iii).
Ottawa, Bridge over River, 8147 (iii).
—— Maria Street Bridge, 8147 (iii).
—— Sappers Bridge, 5204 (ii), 8148 (iii)
Portage du Fort, 10071 (iii).
Slides and Booms:
St. Maurice River, 10070 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Anticosti Island, 10072 (iii).
Cheticamp and Meat Cove, 10072 (iii).
North Shore St. Lawrence, 8149 (iii).
Quarantine:
Amount Transferred to Public Works Dept., 5075 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine, 5075 (ii), 8339 (iii).
Hog Cholera and Sheep Scab, 5085 (ii).
Salaries and Contingencies of Organized Districts, 8338 (iii).
Tracadie Lazeretto, 8338 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, 8344 (iii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 8338 (iii).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 7450 (iii).
Chambly, Telephone Lines, 5783 (ii).
Surveys, Planting Stones, &c., 7454 (iii).
Cornwall, Enlargement, 7298 (iii).
—— Repairs, New Locks, 5784 (ii).
Farran's Point, Enlargement, 5779 (ii).
Galops, Straightening, &c., 7299, 7442 (iii).
Lachine, Atwater Ave., Wall, 9173 (iii).
—— Deepening, St. Pierre River, 5781 (ii), 9173 (iii).
—— Enlargement, 7297 (iii).
To pay Heney & Borthwick, 9173, 10153 (iii).
Lake St. Louis, Channel, 7298 (iii).
Murray, Landing Stage, 7454 (iii).
North Channel, Deepening, &c., 5779 (ii).
Rainy River, Lock and Dam, 10153 (iii).
Rapide Plat, Enlargement, 7299 (iii).
Repairs, &c., Operating Expenses, 7463 (iii).
Rideau, Kilmarnock Rock Cut, 7454 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Canals—*Con.*
St. Ours Lock, New Scows, 7318 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 7296 (iii).
—— H. Ryan & Co., Claims, 9235, 10152 (iii).
Soulanges, 7295 (iii).
Trent, Construction, 7299, 7318 (iii).
Pigeon Creek Bridge, 9172 (iii).
Salary of Concrete Inspector, 5782 (ii).
Welland, 5790, 5792 (ii), 7454 (iii).
Rebate to Forwarding Co., 5794 (ii).
Railways:
Canadian Pacific Railroad:
Land Damages, &c., 7153 (iii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
Car Couplings, 9171 (iii).
Elevator at Halifax, 9172 (iii).
General Vote, 7456 (iii).
Increased Accommodation at Lévis 9163 (iii).
—— at Moncton, 5753 (ii),
—— at St. John, 7155, 7242, 7401, 9164 (iii).
—— Siding Accommodation, 9156 (iii).
—— Station Accommodation, 9163 (iii).
Indiantown Branch, 9165 (iii).
Land Damages, 7154 (iii).
One First Class Coach, 9172 (iii).
Pintsch Gas Apparatus, 9172 (iii).
Point Tupper, Improvements, 9171.
Refrigerator Cars, 9172 (iii),
Rolling Stock, 5754 (ii).
St. John, Elevator, 9163 (iii).
Telegraph Service, 9171 (iii).
Prince Edward Island:
Construction of Murray Harbour Branch, 9211 (ii).
General Vote, 7462 (iii).
Purchase of Wharf at Mount Stewart, 5754 (iii).
Straightening Curves, Rolling Stock, &c., 7389 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
General Vote, 7455 (iii).
Payment to A. P. Ross, 9176 (iii).
Ry. Com. of Privy Council, 9175, 10156 (iii).
Ry. Regulations, 9175, 10155 (iii).
Repairs to Gov. Gen.'s Car "Victoria," 5785 (ii), 8751 (iii).
Survey of Ottawa River, 9176 (iii).
Railway Subsidies.
Subsidy to Central Ry. of N.B., 5788 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
Toronto Observatory, Rebuilding Dwelling, 5179 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 4013, 4240, 4713 (ii).
Trade and Commerce:
Administration of Chinese Immigration Act, 8697 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 8698 (iii).
Weights and Measures, Gas, &c. See "Collection of Revenues."
Yukon Provisional District:
Administration of Justice:
Additional Judge, 10191 (iii).
Clerk of the Court, Salary, 10193 (iii)
Law-books, &c., 5469 (ii).
Living Expenses of Judges, 5469 (ii), 10193 (iii).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 5468 (ii), 10195 (iii).
Customs, 10109 (iii).
Expenditure of Interior Dept., 6366 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Yukon Provisional District—Con.
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements, Telegraphs, &c., 5604 (ii).
Maintenance of Mounted Police Force, 5834 (ii).
—— of Troops, &c., 6321 (ii), 9066 (iii).
Postal Service, 6360 (ii), 7359 (iii).
Public Buildings, 10107 (iii).
Survey of All-Canadian Route, 8700 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, 10093, 10099 (iii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges, 10087 (iii).
Edmonton, 10109 (iii).
[*See* "Govt. of Yukon," &c.]

CONCURRENCE:
Beauharnois Canal, 10201 (iii).
Customs, 10206 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia, 10218 (iii).
—— Quebec, 10219 (iii).
Justice, Administration of, 10217 (iii).
Mail Service, 10202 (iii).
Militia and Defence, 6389 (ii), 10218 (iii).
Mount Stewart Public Wharf, 6387 (ii).
Ocean and River Service, 6383 (ii).
Post Office, 6387, 6390 (ii), 10202 (iii).
Public Buildings, Ottawa, 6386 (ii).
Railways and Canals Dept., Salaries, 6382 (ii).
—— Income, 10204 (iii).
Sabrevois Wharf, 10219 (iii).
Salaries of Immigration Agents, 10214 (iii).
Upper Traverse Lighthouse, 6384 (ii).
Victoriaville Public Buildings, 6385 (ii), 10218 (iii).
Yukon Provisional District:
Mounted Police Service, 6388 (ii).

SURVEYS BRANCH, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup 5849 (ii).
—— AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
SURVEY OF LANDS, YUKON, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).
SUSPENSE ACCOUNT, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup. 5588 (ii).
SUSSEX, N.B., ERECTION OF DRILL SHED: Ques. (Mr. *Domville* 1857 (i).
SYDENHAM POSTMASTER, IRREGULABITY IN ACCOUNTS Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 6935 (iii).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8018 (iii).
—— AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3820 (ii).
TANNER, JOHN, CLAIMS AGAINST SPANISH GOVT. FOR DETENTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 4805 (ii).
TARIFFS, SPECIAL RATES, I. C. R., REPS. OF MR. HARRIS: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Pope*) 2961 (i).
TATE'S DRY DOCK, MONTREAL, RENT, LESSEES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1831 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES, ANTICOSTI, RENEWAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).
—— ATLIN, B.C., AND TESLIN LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 10099 (iii).
—— B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (iii).
—— CABLES, &C., ST. LAWRENCE SHORES: in Com. of Sup., 8181 (iii).
—— CHETICAMP AND MEAT COVE: in Com. of Sup., 10072 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6047, 6120 (ii).
——— NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1890, 1891, 1963 (i), 3335 (ii).
——— N. W. TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 8183 (iii).
——— PELEE ISLANDS: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE SHORE: in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
——— SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).
——— FROM SKAGWAY AND DAWSON, COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN MINISTERS AND ENGLISH SYNDICATE, U. S. GOVT., &c., *re* CONSTRUCTION: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i).
——— YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).
——— YUKON AND B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10093 (iii). *See* "Yukon," &c.

Temiscouata Railway Co's. B. No. 166 (Mr. *McAlister*) 1°*, 6120; 2°*, 6338 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6879 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

TEMISCOTATA RAILWAY CO.: M. to present Pet. (Mr. *McAlister*) 5746 (ii).
——— (ST. FRANCIS BRANCH) RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8917; in Com., 9483, 9818 (iii).

Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 134 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°, 3874 (ii).

TESLIN LAKE ROUTE, REPS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 2026 (i).
TIDAL SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3050 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3505 (ii).
——— IN CANADIAN WATERS, PETS., &c.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3795 (ii).
——— STMNT. OF MINISTER AS TO REMARKS OF ALLAN SS. CAPTAINS, REP. OF CAPT. SPAIN, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3262 (i).
TILSONBURG AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916; in Com., 9570 (iii).
TIMBER INSPECTOR, YUKON, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
TIMBER PERMITS, YUKON STEAMBOAT OWNERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).
TOBACCO, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, EXCISE DUTY PAID SINCE 1898, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 3075 (i).
——— COMMISSION ON STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
——— DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1818 (i).
——— EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ESTABLISHMENT IN ESSEX CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
——— FOREIGN LEAF, PERCENTAGE REQUIRED UNDER REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 2486 (i).
——— GROWING IN ESSEX CO., EXCISE DUTIES, &c.: par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Cowan*) 2117 (i).
——— MANUFACTURE, NUMBER OF FACTORIES, MEMORIALS; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2027 (i).
TOBACCO, REDUCTION OF DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4813 (ii).
TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, DATE OF APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1849 (i).
——— EAST, POSTMASTER, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACANT POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4272 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (iii).
——— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
——— P. O., APPNMTS. BY GOVT., NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1981 (i).
——— SINCE 1895: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2905 (i).
TOWER AND POST OFFICE CLOCKS, PARLT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE IN LIGHTING, INVENTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 6381 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 6121 (ii).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE:
ALASKAN BOUNDARY, AMERICAN RUMOURS *re* CANADA'S CONTENTION: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 3846.
——— PACIFIC CABLE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5386 (ii).
——— MODUS VIVENDI: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1074, 1166 (i).
ALLAN SS. SERVICE AND GOVT. CONTRACT, NAMES OF VESSELS SAILING FROM ST. JOHN, 1897-8: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3258 (i).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S BOND, PAYMENT TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2481 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1883 (i).
——— GOVT.'L ACTION: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 4740, 5411 (ii).
BADDECK, EAST BAY, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).
——— AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8697 (iii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 8698 (iii).
——— TREATIES WITH BRITISH W. INDIES, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 8077, 8172 (iii).
GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8685 (iii).
GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8684 (iii).
G.B. AND RUSSIA, TREATY OF 1825, PROTOCOLS, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6939 (iii).
HALIFAX, NFLD. AND LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
HALIFAX AND PORTO RICO, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Proposal to Expedite (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3779 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).
MURRAY BAY AND OUELLE RIVER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10158 (iii).
PACIFIC CABLE BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND AUSTRALIA: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1950 (i).
——— GOVT. OF B. C., OFFERS RESPECTING: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3873 (ii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
——— Cor. between Imp. and Colonial Govts.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casey*) 1879 (i).
——— Communication from B. C. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 2697 (i).
——— M. to print Papers (Mr *Casey*) 2963 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1352 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G. B.: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7773-7789, 7840, 7942, 7953 (iii).
——— Govtl. Intention: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8469 (iii).
——— Prop. Motion: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8221, 8347 (iii).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 8633 (iii).
P. E. I. and Great Britain, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8687 (iii).
——— and Mainland, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8683 (iii).
Port Mulgrave, &c., Irish Cove, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8692 (iii).
——— Steam Communication: in Com. of Sup., 10156 (iii).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
——— and Manchester, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8695 (iii).
Reciprocity between U. S. and B. W. Indies, Par. in Chicago *Record* (Mr. *Wallace*) 4550 (ii).
Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 2107, 2262, 2277 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1860 (i).
U. S. Trade Relations, Treaty of 1874: M. for Copy (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6939 (iii).
St. John and Belfast, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
——— and Digby, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8673 (iii).
——— and Glasgow, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (iii).
——— and Halifax, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
——— and Liverpool, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (iii).
——— and Minas Basin, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8686 (iii).
——— and W. Indies, Mail Subsidy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8675 (iii).
Steamship Subventions. *See* "Mail Subsidies."
Vancouver Island SS. Service, Subsidy by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii).

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 1073; 2°, 1947 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3849 (ii).

Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (iii).

Transportation of Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).

——— Cos., Yukon, Employed by Govt., Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1958 (i).
——— Supplies, &c., Yukon Militia Force: in Com. of Sup., 6321, 6339 (ii); 7030 (iii).

Transvaal Question, Address to Her Maj.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8992 (iii).

Travelling Expenses, &c., of Fin. Minister and Private Secretary: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1880 (i).
——— Hon. Geo. E. Foster, ex-Fin. Min.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1885 (i).
——— Minister of Pub. Works and Private Secretary: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1880 (i).
——— Sir Charles Tupper, ex-Min. and High Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1835, 1885 (i).

Traverse Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 5116 (ii) 10162 (iii) conc., 6384 (ii).

Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii) 7299 (iii).
——— Jordan, Mr. Wm., Claims for Land Damages: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977.
——— Land Valuations, Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii).
——— Payments to Mr. F. D. Moore by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Graham*) 5311 (ii).
——— Payment of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1977 (i).
——— Purchase of Land for Dam at Nassau: Ques. (Mr. *Kendry*) 1857 (i).
——— Trueman, Mr. W. H., Appnmt. to Railways and Canals Dept.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 4483 (ii).

Trois Pistoles, I. C. R., Dismissal of Pierre Michaud and F. Belanger, Cor., &c.: M. for for Copy* (Mr. *Foster*) 5945 (ii).

Tuberculosis Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (ii) 8344 (iii).
——— Prevention of: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Roddick*) 6282 (ii).
——— Inspection in Chicoutimi County, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5097 (ii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Birthday Congratulations (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6382 (ii).
——— Expenses whilst Min. and High Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1835, 1885 (i).

Turner Administration, B.C., Dismissal by Lt. Gov.: Papers laid on the Table, 3959 (ii).

United Counties Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 8915: in Com., 9451, 9550, 9773 (iii).

Uniforms, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7456 (iii).

U. S. Vessels and Canadian Registry, Fraudulent Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3266 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3296 (i).
——— *re* entering at American Ports: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2528 (i).
——— registered at Dawson, Names, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2699 (i).
——— Fishing Vessels and Modus Vivendi, Licenses, Concessions Granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2330 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2788 (i).
——— Trade Relations Treaty of 1874: M. for Copy (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6939 (iii).

Unparliamentary Language: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 5406 (ii) 9208 (iii).
See "House of Commons."

Usury B. No. 174 (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1°*, 8217 (iii).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 617, 700 (i).
VALCOEUR, OCTAVE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 5309 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5501 (ii).
——— LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1815 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).
——— WATER POWER, DEEPENING OF BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1882 (i).
VANCOUVER DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9988 (iii).
——— CONTRACT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5487, 6122 (ii).
VANCOUVER ISLAND S.S. SERVICE, SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3797 (ii)
VANLUVEN, PETER VS. DOMINION BANK, ACTION OF GOVERNMENT, COR. &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 9178 (iii).
Van Wart. *See* "Divorce."
VELDT, RABBI, DISMISSAL AS CHAPLAIN, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 10246 (iii).
VENNER, DR., INDIAN AGENT, COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES, *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1858 (i).
VENTILATION READING ROOM: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 974 (i).
VERRAULT, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3555 (ii).
VETERANS OF 1864-5, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1853 (i).
——— OF 1866 AND 1870, ISSUE OF MEDALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1848 (i).
——— VOLUNTEERS ORGANIZED IN CHICAGO, ELIGIBILITY FOR MEDALS: Ques (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2704 (i).
——— 1885 AT EDMONTON, ISSUE OF SCRIP AND MEDALS, APPLICATIONS, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2701 (i).
VICTORIA, B. C., LETTER CARRIERS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1960 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C., AND MONTREAL HARBOURS, GRANTS BY DOM. GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1877 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C., POST OFFICE, OLD SITE, OWNERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4269 (ii).
——— SAFES, ELEVATORS, &c., TENDER FOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1887 (i).
VICTORIA HARBOUR, REP. OF RESIDENT ENGINEER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3828 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., Conc., 6385 (ii).
VICTORIA COUNTY, N.S., PATRONAGE, &c.: Par in North Sydney *Herald*: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5388, 5398 (ii).
ICTORIA" GOV. GEN.'s CAR: in Com. of Sup., 5785 (ii).
VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9954 (iii).
"VIGILANT," STR., N.W. COST SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (ii).
VILLE MARIE BANK, SUSPENSION, INSPECTION BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 8755 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 9065 (iii).
VIRDEN, MAN., INLAND REVENUE OFFICE: M. for Cor. dropped (Mr. *Roche*) 5313 (ii).
VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, GRANTING OF MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).
VOTERS' LIST: in Com. of Sup., 8750, 10129 (iii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c.: in Com of Sup., 2281, 2290 (i).
——— N.B., DELAY IN SENDING IN REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530, 2698 (i).
——— PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2530 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 6827 (ii).
——— REVISED COPIES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1819 (i).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6120 (ii).
WADE, MR. F. C., DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).
WADE, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7442 (iii).
——— &c., PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1830 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7242, 7320, 7442 (iii).
——— INSTRUCTIONS OR PERMISSION TO STAKE CLAIMS YUKON DISTRICT, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).
WALKER, POSTMASTER AT AILSA CRAIG, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3873 (ii).
WALMSLEY, ALEX., SUPERANNUATION AS BRITISH MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3797 (ii).
WALSH, MAJOR, ALTERATIONS IN REP.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2704 (i).
——— AUTHORITY FOR COMMISSION ISSUED, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4269 (ii).
——— EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).
——— INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. FROM GOVT. OF CAN.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).
——— INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS COMMISSIONER, REP. OF INTERVIEW AT SKAGWAY, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3078, 3258 (i).
——— REPORTS, NUMBER RECEIVED AND LAID ON TABLE: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3798 (ii).
WALSH, PHILIP, RELATIONSHIP TO MAJ. WALSH: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823 (ii).
WALTHAM AND CHAPEAU MAIL SERVICE, PET. FROM PONTIAC CO. COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2330 (i).
WARLIKE STORES: in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iii).
WATER FRONT, YUKON, DAWSON, LEASE, &c. TO MORRISON AND MCDONALD: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS—The Tariff.
BUDGET, THE, FINANCIAL STMNT.: (Mr. *Fielding*) 2410 (i).
——— For deb., *See* Budget, The.
Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6463 (ii); 10225 (iii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 122: (Mr. *McMillan*) 1°, 3254 (i).
——— **B. No. 128**: (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1° 3544; 2°*, and in Com., 3885 (ii); 9883; 3°*. 9893 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 28).
——— **B. No. 143**: (Mr. *Ganong*) 1°, 4477 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 5578 (ii).
WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iii).
——— ENTRANCE AT PORT COLBORNE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Montague*) 3997 (ii).
——— "LAKESIDE," STR., INTEREST TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (ii).
——— WATER RENTAL: in Com of Sup., 5790 (ii).
Welland Canal Power and Supply Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 1949; 2°*, 2290; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)
WESTERN ALBERTA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8916 (iii).
WESTERN DEPTL. BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5089 (ii), 9950 (iii).
WEST INDIES RELIEF FUND: in Com. of Sup., 5852 (ii).
WENTWORTH *vs.* MATHIEU: in Com. of Sup., 10112 (iii).
WHARFS, &C., N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iii).
WHARFS AND PIERS CONSTRUCTED IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES, NUMBER, MAINTENANCE, &C., FROM 1867 TO 1899: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5861 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gillies*) 6939 (iii).
——— REVENUE, &C., STMNT. PROMISED: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10221 (iii).
WHEAT EXPORTED FROM MONTREAL, ST. JOHN, FT. WILLIAM AND WINNIPEG, QUANTITY: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2702 (i).
WILLIAM'S HEAD STATION: in Com. of Sup., 8090 (iii).
Williams Patent Relief B. No. 12 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°*, 618; 2°*, 934; in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (i). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 130.)
WILLISON, MR. J. W., CROWN TIMBER AGENT, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823, 4270 (ii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Fortin*). 1°*, 895; 2° m., 1867 (i); in Com., 4314; 3°*, 4859 (ii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)
——— **B. No. 163** (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 6120 (ii); 2°*, 7001; in Com., 8780; 3°*, 8781 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)
WINDSOR DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9962 (iii).
——— N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7615 (iii).
——— AND TRURO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8915; in Com., 9444, 9772 (iii).
WINNIPEG ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 804 (i).
——— remarks (Mr. *Roche*) 8469 (iii).
WINNIPEG ELECTION LISTS, PREPARATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 2908 (i).
——— REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1830 (i).
——— VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 619, 804 (i).
——— GRAIN EXCHANGE AND FORT WILLIAM HARBOUR, COR. WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*) 1879 (i).
——— HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 8338 (iii).
——— LAKE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 8079 (iii).
WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON, LAND PURCHASED, PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1840 (i).
WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL AND CHARGES AGAINST, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2326 (i).
——— M. for Copies (Mr. *Martin*) 4813 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 10117 (iii).
Working Day. *See* "LABOURERS."
WRECKS, INVESTIGATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3064 (i).
WRIGHT, WM., OFFICIAL IN RECORDING OFFICE AT DAWSON, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4270 (ii).
YAMASKA BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 8919; in Com., 9580, 9834 (iii).
——— LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (iii).
Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°*, 2246; 2°*, 2525 (i).
Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 102 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°*, 2409; 2°*, 2650 (i).
Yukon River and Atlin Lake Improvement Co.'s B. No. 165 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 6120; 2°*, 6405 (ii), wthdn., 8947 (iii).
Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McInnes*). 1°*, 1813 (i).
——— **B. No. 186** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*). 1°*, 9178; 2°, and in Com., 9849; 3°*, 9861 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)
YUKON:
ADDITIONAL JUDGES, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 10191 (iii).
ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com of Sup., 8947, 9002 (iii).
ADMINISTRATION BY MR. OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).
ADMINISTRATION, CHARGES AGAINST: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5945 (Amt.) 6022, 6053 (ii).
——— PROPOSAL TO ADJN. DEB. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6100 (ii).
——— PAR. IN LONDON *Times*; M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 6562, 6585 (ii).
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 5468 (ii) 10191 (iii).
——— LIVING EXPENSES OF JUDGES DUGAS AND MAGUIRE, INSTRUCTIONS, &C. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).
ADMINISTRATOR AND OFFICIALS. INSTRUCTIONS; &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).
ALASKAN BOUNDARY. AMERICAN RUMOURS *re* CANADA'S CONTENTION: M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 3841 (ii).
——— MODUS VIVENDI: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1074, 1166 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

ALIEN LABOURERS AT LAKE BENNETT, AND GOVTL. ACTION; Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1859 (i).

APPELLATE COURT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5308 (ii).

APPNMTS. BY GOVT. SINCE AUG. 1896, NAMES, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1876 (i).

APPNMT. OF SHERIFF, BONDS, COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4268 (ii).

—— CLERK OF COURT, O. C.'S, BOND CERTIFICATES, &C.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3149 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3943, 4268 (ii).

—— MESSRS. WADE MCGREGOR AND NORWOOD, DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &C.; Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3081 (i).

"BENCH" AND "CREEK" CLAIMS, DISPUTES PENDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3077 (i).

BENNETT HOSPITAL, MATRON AND MEDICAL SUPT., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1979 (i).

BLISS, MAJ., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3552 (ii).

BONDS, SECURITIES, &C., REGISTERED UNDER R. S. C., PREPARATION OF PARLT. *re* YUKON DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4804 (ii).

BOSTON AND ALASKAN TRANSPORTATION CO., CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1823

BOURASSA, MR., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1958 (i).

B. C. AND YUKON CUSTOMS OFFICERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com of Sup., 5596 (ii).

BRITISH YUKON MINING, TRADING AND TRANSPORTATION CO., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2905 (i).

BUSBY, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT SKAGWAY, DATE OF APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4805 (ii).

CHARLESON, MR. J. B., O. C. APPOINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9699 (iii).

—— SURVEYS, &C., FOR TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (ii).

—— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8106 (iii)

CLARKE, JOS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5486 (ii).

CLEMENT, MR. W. H. P., RESTRICTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS LEGAL ADVISER TO YUKON COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2322 (i).

COMMISSIONER OGILVIE, INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).

—— REQUEST FROM MR. OGILVIE TO EXTEND HIS POWERS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3080 (i).

COMMISSIONER, MAJ. WALSH, ALTERATIONS IN REP.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2704 (i).

—— INSTRUCTION AND COR. FROM GOVT. OF CAN.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).

COSTE, MR., EXPEDITION, REPORT, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5360 (ii).

—— EXPENSES, &C.: M. to refer Papers to Pub. Accounts Com. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5489 (ii).

—— REPORT *re* YUKON: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4997 (ii).

COSTE AND LAFONTAINE, MESSRS., INSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1893 (i)

YUKON—*Con.*

COUNCIL, NAMES, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).

—— ORDINANCES RECEIVED, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

DAWSON AND VANCOUVER MAIL SERVICE, ARRIVAL, DESPATCH, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 2961 (i).

DOCUMENTS, &C.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3067 (i).

DOM. POLICE, NUMBER, DISTRIBUTION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

DREDGING FOR MINERALS, NUMBER OF LEASES (1897), RENTALS, &C.: Ques, (Mr. *Foster*) 3079 (i).

EDMONTON AND YUKON ROUTE, INSTRUCTIONS TO MESSRS. DIBBLEE AND DUPONT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2114 (i).

FAWCETT, MR., ADVICE *re* RECORDING MINING CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).

—— DISMISSAL AS GOLD COMMISSIONER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1878 (i).

FORCE, PROVISONS AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iii).

FREIGHT, TRANSPORTATION, GUARANTEE BY CONTRACTORS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902 (i).

FRONTIER CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 8746 (iii).

GOLD COMMISSIONER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

HARPER, MR. F., POSTMASTER AT DAWSON CITY, ISSUE OF NOTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1951 (i).

HUDSON BAY AND YUKON RY. AND NAV. COMPANY: M. to receive Pet. (Mr. *Flint*) 2182 (i).

HUNKER CREEK, KLONDIKE MINING, APPLICATION AND GRANTS FOR HYDRAULICING: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2962 (i).

INSTRUCTIONS AND COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND YUKON COUNCIL: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2787 (i).

INSTRUCTIONS TO MAJ. WALSH: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (ii).

INTERIOR EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6366 (ii).

INVESTIGATION, MR. OGILVIE'S REP. AND PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2410 (i).

—— PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5746 (ii).

—— PURPORT, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3820 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Returns (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4349 (ii).

—— Mr. Ogilvie's Report; laid on Table, 3876 (ii).

—— M. to print Papers (Mr. *Sifton*) 4730 (ii).

—— PROTEST FROM MINERS' COMMITTEE, COR., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2329 (i).

JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF SECOND JUDGE, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3061 (i)

KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE, PREPARATION BY MR. OGILVIE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1827 (i).

—— RAILWAY SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8700 (iii).

—— RIVER BRIDGE, OWNER, TOLLS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2902, 3073 (i).

LAFONTAINE, MR. E., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1958 (i).

LAW LIBRARY, &C., FOR YUKON; in Com. of Sup., 5469 (ii).

LEGAL ADVISER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

LETTERS FROM AMERICANS *re* ADMINISTRATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3822 (ii).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (iii).

LIQUOR IMPORTATIONS, DISALLOWANCE OF ORDINANCE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1638 (i).

—— PERMITS, AND SANCTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1859 (i).

—— COR. BETWEEN MR. MARTIN AND MIN. OF INT.: M. for Papers* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

—— COR. BETWEEN N. W. T. GOVT. AND INT. DEPT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clarke*) 1878 (i).

—— ISSUED BY ARCHER MARTIN: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3875 (ii).

—— ISSUED BY MAJ. WALSH: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2789 (i).

—— REPS. *re*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2481, 2704 (i).

—— ISSUED BY MR. L. OGILVIE AND CANCELLED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2908 (i), 3789 (ii).

—— NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3077 (i).

—— TO MR. PETERS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2027 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5667 (ii).

—— NAMES OF COS., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1877 (i).

—— NUMBER, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1843 (i).

—— QUANTITY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1676 (i).

LYNCH, MR. W. H., EMPLYMT BY GOVT., REPS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1847 (i).

MAGUIRE, MR. JUSTICE, APPNMT. AND ARRIVAL AT DAWSON, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3258 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3959 (ii).

MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7350 (iii); conc., 6390 (ii), 10202 (iii).

—— BETWEEN DAWSON AND VANCOUVER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1965 (i).

—— (1898-99) EFFICIENCY OF CONTRACTORS, REPS., &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 2705 (i).

—— REGISTERED LETTERS, &c., POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3792 (ii).

—— RETURNED FROM DEAD LETTER OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4351 (ii).

MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).

MILITIA FORCE, CHARGES AGAINST FOR MISCONDUCT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes*) 9963 (iii).

—— FORCE, STRENGTH, COST OF SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1831 (i).

—— COST OF TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1841 (i).

—— MR. JUSTICE DUGAS' REPRESENTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1842 (i).

—— TRANSPORTATION, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6321, 6339 (ii).

MINERS' GRIEVANCES AGAINST COS. BUYING WATER GRANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3315 (i).

—— AND MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2531 (i).

MINING REGULATIONS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2248 (i).

—— PUBLICATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1841 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

MINER'S RIGHT TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., conc., 6388.

O. Cs., REGULATING MINING CLAIMS BY OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).

OFFICIALS: in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).

—— APPNMT. BY GOVT., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1832 (i).

—— BONDS, SECURITIES REGISTERED: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4991 (ii).

—— GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, NATIONALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— SALARIES, COST OF LIVING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1824 (i).

OGILVIE, MR., CONNECTION WITH BRITISH CANADIAN GOLDFIELDS CO.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3799 (ii).

—— M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 3799, 3801 (ii).

—— RELATIONSHIP TO MIN. OF THE INT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1841 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

—— REPORT AND EVIDENCE: Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8387 (iii).

—— REPORTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3548 (ii).

—— RECEIVED BY GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3794 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 3795 (ii).

—— PRINTING OF EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5307 (ii).

—— PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5359 (ii).

PERMANENT FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

—— MILITIA, NUMBER, COST OF TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1892 (ii).

PROFESSIONAL IMMORALITY, TAXES IMPOSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1842 (i).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (iii).

RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVERNMENT *re* YUKON RAILWAYS: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4738, 4740, 4744 (ii).

REGISTRAR OF TITLES, INSTRUCTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2324 (i.)

REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT: Ques.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2901 (i).

RUMOURS *re* CONFLICT BETWEEN U. S. AND CANADIAN CUSTOMS; Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 975 (i).

RUSSELL, MR., INSPECTOR OF STEAMBOATS, REPS., &c., *re* DISMISSAL: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3334 (i)

SKAGWAY AND DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINE, CONSTRUCTION BY ENGLISH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3073 (i).

STEAMBOAT OWNERS, PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

STIKINE-TESLIN ROUTE, SURVEY, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1835 (i).

SUPPLIES, TRANSPORTATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iii).

SURVEY OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6047, 6120 (ii).

—— FROM SKAGWAY AND DAWSON, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MINISTERS AND ENGLISH SYN. U. S. GOVT., &c., *re* CONSTRUCTION * Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*

YUKON—*Con.*

TELEGRAH LINES, YUKON AND B. C.: in Com. of Sup. 10093 (iii).

—— TERRITORIES ACT. REPS. FROM YUKON COUNCIL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2536 (i).

—— TESLIN LAKE ROUTE REPS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 2026 (i).

—— TIMBER INSPECTOR, APPNMT. BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— REGULATIONS, ISSUE OF PERMITS, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1836 (i).

—— TRANSPORTATION CO'S., EMPLOYED BY GOVT., AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1958 (i).

U.S. BOATS REGISTERED AT DAWSON, NAMES, VALUATION, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2699 (i).

—— VESSELS AND CAN. REGISTRY, FRAUDULENT VALUATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3296 (i).

WADE, MR. F. C, DATE OF ARRIVAL AT DAWSON: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3546 (ii).

—— AMOUNTS, &C., PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1830 (i).

—— BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7442 (iii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7242, 7320 (iii).

—— INSTRUCTIONS OR PERMISSION TO STAKE CLAIMS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 1877 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

WALSH, MAJ., AUTHORITY FOR COMMISSION ISSUED, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4269 (ii).

—— EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1823 (i).

—— INSTRUCTIONS BY GOVT. AS COMMISSIONER, REP. OF INTERVIEW AT SKAGWAY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3978, 3258 (i).

—— REPORTS, NUMBER RECEIVED AND LAID ON TABLE: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3798 (ii).

WALSH, PHILIP, RELATIONSHIP TO MAJ. WALSH: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3823 (ii).

WATER FRONT, DAWSON, LEASE, &C. TO MORRISON AND MCDONALD: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3547 (ii).

WILLISON, J. W., CROWN TIMBER AGENT, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe*: Ques., 3823, 4270 (ii).

WRIGHT, WM., OFFICIAL IN RECORDING OFFICE AT DAWSON, RELATIONSHIP TO EDITOR OF *Globe*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4270 (ii).

YULE BRIDGE, RICHELIEU RIVER, ARBITRATORS' AWARD, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3827 (ii).

Zenith Mining and Ry. Co's. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Poupore*) 1**, 803; 2**, 1113 (i); in Com. and 3**, 7577 (iii). (62-63 *Vic.*, *c.* 92).